

# The Church Guardian

— EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR: —

L. H. DAVIDSON, D.C.L., MONTREAL.

— ASSOCIATE EDITOR: —

REV. EDWYN E. W. PENTREATH, B.D., Winnipeg, Man.

Address Correspondence and Communications to  
the Editor, P.O. Box 504. Exchanges to P.O.  
Box 1968. For Business announcements  
See page 14.

## DECISIONS REGARDING NEWSPAPERS.

1. Any person who takes a paper regularly on the Post office, whether directed to his own name or another's, or whether he has subscribed or not, is responsible for payment.
2. If a person orders his paper discontinued he must pay all arrears, or the publisher may continue to send it until payment is made, and then collect the whole amount, whether the paper is taken from the office or not.
3. In suits for subscriptions, the suit may be instituted in the place where the paper is published although the subscriber may reside hundreds of miles away.
4. The courts have decided that refusing to take newspapers or periodicals from the Post office, or removing and leaving them uncalled for, is *prima facie* evidence of intentional fraud.

## CALENDAR FOR SEPTEMBER.

- SEPT. 6th—15th Sunday after Trinity.
- " 13th—16th Sunday after Trinity. [Notice of Ember Days: Ember Collects daily this week.]
- " 16th—
- " 18th— } EMBER DAYS.
- " 19th— }
- " 20th—17th Sunday after Trinity. [Notice of St. Matthew.]
- " 21st—St. Matthew. Ap. Ev. Mar. (Athenasian Creed.)
- " 27th—18th Sunday after Trinity. [Notice of St. Michael and All Angels.]
- " 29th—St. Michael and All Angels.

## THE ROD.

There is one advantage about the holiday season to our daily contemporaries—i. e. that it gives them the chance of discussing abstract subjects of social importance, clear from the excitements of party politics. Among these subjects one that has been a good deal discussed lately is that in which modern sentimentalism and prejudice is so markedly opposed to the teaching of the Bible and Church tradition—the lawfulness of the use of the rod in the discipline of children.

We own that sentimentalists have had some excuse for their views in the severity, and we might almost add the cruelty, of past ages, which tradition lingered on into the early part of our own century. Corporal punishment was abused in the England of our forefathers. Schools were too severe, and schoolmasters too often wielded the rod excessively and cruelly. Hence the reaction towards the total disestablishment of that old-fashioned domestic institution has become popular—so popular indeed that children are in danger of being spoilt and of having all reverence abolished in them. The spread of juvenile crime, the unchecked lawlessness of youth, has brought before the minds of many—as the correspondence in our contemporaries shows—the fact that the reaction may have gone even in public opinion too far, and that Solomon may have been right after all in his commendation of the rod as a discipline for the wayward and the lawless.

There is no doubt that modern sentimentalism

has gone wild on this subject. The pernicious nonsense that has been talked about the disgrace of all corporal punishment, its brutalizing effects, and the impropriety of correcting children except by mild persuasion, has had an injurious effect on our youth. The fact is either there should be no punishment at all, or else punishments have to be devised of a tedious and wearing kind, more really cruel to a high spirited, brave English boy than a smart chastisement followed by frank forgiveness. The Englishmen who won Waterloo and Trafalgar, who raised England to a pitch of glory, were men who, in their youth, were chastised when they deserved it. The flabby sentimentalism of Rousseau and his followers did not pervade old England.

The subject has been discussed in many ways and does in some points touch the question of religion. Why is it that Christianity, which is so charitable and kind, has not opposed corporal punishment? The answer is that corporal chastisement may be, and often is, the sincerest kindness to the thoughtless and inconsiderate offender, who is thereby restrained from evil. Chastisement is even used as a type of the Divine love for the human sufferer. 'The Lord loveth whom He chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom He receiveth.' And then the question is asked, 'What son is he whom the father chastiseth not?' This question would be well answered in the negative by thousands of spoilt children of our day, who have been taught to fear nothing and to respect nothing, and to have no regard for authority, human or Divine.

The theory of corporal punishment is that, in the threefold nature of man, the lower, or criminal nature, is usually the offender, and in childish faults it is almost always so. Let that lower nature be chastised by physical pain, and not the higher nature, as in modern theories of punishments, which involve usually mental anxiety and worry, or tedium. To a high-spirited nature, especially in the case of a brave manly boy, mental punishment is far more cruel than the physical pain, which he learns 'to bear as a man.' In any case, physical pain cannot be abolished. No man or woman can go through the world without having to suffer. It is not always an unmixed evil to the higher nature. Still, we should be sorry to see the rod as wantonly used as it was in ages gone by. Childhood should be made as happy and bright, and the constant dread of chastisement should not darken it. As long as a child at home or at school is good, obedient, or even tries to be good, there should be no reason for the fear of the rod. Still, it has its elquence, and perhaps its power was never more needed than among the petted children of the present day.

'Those boys would be quite little angels if they were afraid of being caned,' was the verdict of a lady about some choristers with whom she had a great deal to do. She was in some sense right. They were fine high spirited boys with good principles, but some of them needed just a little restraint, and to be made afraid when they were inducing others to be troublesome. We should not wish to see the cane restored in the choir school, although St. Gregory the Great gave us an illustrious example of its use, but there is something in the thought that many of the boys of our day might be made everything that is desirable if only they were taught to be afraid of the consequences of being naughty.

The rod was really the origin of most symbols of sovereignty. Old Homer depicts how the sceptre of Odysseus was not always mere ornament. The royal sceptre represented the rod of the ruler over refractory subjects. Even the sharp point of the Bishop's pastoral staff was said to have a similar meaning. If there is no power to punish offenders authority becomes merged into mere persuasion. This may avail with the good and gentle, but it is impos-

sible to find any society composed of such alone. Sometimes those who need punishment are by no means hopelessly reprobate, but by chastisement may be taught to act well. Especially is this true of children, who often err from mere thoughtlessness.

The true position of the rod, as we would wish to see it used, is, however, merely as a last resource; it should be employed only when gentler modes of reproof or warning have failed. Some children rarely or never need it, and will try to be good from love of their parents or teachers, or, above all, from religious principles or else from a hope of reward or commendation. But there are thoughtless natures that require it, and these, in youth, are by no means the worst children, but rather those healthy vigorous natures that have little self-restraint. It still may be used prudently for the good of the young, and we are glad to see signs of a healthy reaction against the morbid, flabby sentimentalism which would leave children without restraint or correction. We hope that the discussion may do good, and that school-masters and parents who have to deal with refractory children will not be blamed if they use the rod in chastising them.—*Church Review*.

## "WHY AM I A CHURCHMAN."

[By the Bishop of Qu'Appelle.]

"Be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you, with meekness and fear." [1 Pet. iii. 15.]

## INTRODUCTION.

I suppose that anyone hearing this question asked would know at once that it referred to the religious body known in this country as 'the Church of England.'

No other religious body pretends to speak of its members as 'Churchmen.'

Now this, in itself is remarkable and should make us consider. For what does 'Churchman' mean? Is it not a 'man' or member of 'the Church?' We call them Churchmen because there is no distinctive mark by which they can be known beyond that of being members of the Church.

This is the only religious body that has no such distinctive name.

The Wesleyans, Lutherans, Calvinists, are called after the founders of their several organizations—Wesley Luther, Calvin.

The Presbyterians are called after the distinctive features of their system of Ministry, i. e., having only one Order, viz., Presbyters, instead of the three Orders that there had always been in the Christian Church—Bishops, Presbyters [or Priests], and Deacons—till the time of their separation under Calvin in the 16th century.

The Baptists, or 'Anabaptists,' as they were originally, and more correctly, called, are so called from their peculiar views concerning Baptism, [Anabaptists, meaning 're baptisers,'] because they considered the ancient practice of the Baptism of Infants wrong, and therefore baptized again those who had been thus baptized.

Congregationalists [or Independents] are so called from their system of Church government, each congregation being considered independent and being self governing.

And so with all the Denominations, each one is called by some distinctive mark that made it separate from the original Church.

Even the Church of Rome, though it, too, is part of the Catholic Church, and though it has arrogated to its members the exclusive use of the name 'Catholic,' a presumptuous claim that is too often conceded to them by others, is officially known as the 'Holy Roman Church,' thereby adding her peculiar claim to the simple title of 'the Church,' viz., that the true Church