



Dominion Churchman.

THE ORGAN OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN CANADA.

DECISIONS REGARDING NEWSPAPERS.

1. Any person who takes a paper regularly from the post-office, whether directed in his 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, while unpaid, is "prima facie" evidence of intentional fraud.

The DOMINION CHURCHMAN is Two Dollars a Year. If paid strictly, that is promptly in advance, the price will be one dollar; and in no instance will this rule be departed from. Subscribers at a distance can easily see when their subscriptions fall due by looking at the address label on their paper. The Paper is sent until ordered to be stopped. (See above decisions.)

The "Dominion Churchman" is the organ of the Church of England in Canada, and is an excellent medium for advertising—being a family paper, and by far the most extensively circulated Church journal in the Dominion.

Frank Weston, Proprietor, & Publisher,
Address: P. O. Box 9640.

Office, No. 11 Imperial Buildings, 30 Adelaide St. E
west of Post Office, Toronto.

FRANKLIN B. HILL, Advertising Manager.

LESSONS for SUNDAYS and HOLY-DAYS.

Oct 11th—19th SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.
Morning—Ezekiel xiv. Colossians 1 to 21.
Evening—Ezekiel xvii; or xiv. 15. Luke ix. 51 to x. 17

THURSDAY, OCT. 8, 1885.

The Rev. W. H. Wadleigh is the only gentleman travelling authorized to collect subscriptions for the "Dominion Churchman."

A FEW POINTED PERSONAL REMARKS.—In looking over the names of speakers at recent Conferences and meetings at which resolutions were passed in favour of the Scott Act, we noticed that several of the speakers who advocated prohibition, are persons known to be in the daily habit of temperately using wine or other such beverage. In one instance we could furnish medical testimony that such a habit is essential to the health, nay to the life of him who advocates prohibition. We feel tempted to parody the saying of the witty Frenchman, who was willing to oppose the death penalty on condition that assassins set the example! We should have less objection to prohibition and Scott Acts, if those who advocate this class legislation, imposed it upon themselves. *Theirs is a guide post morality*—their motto is, "do as I say, not as I do." In such meetings, and in many speeches and sermons, the ground is taken that if our Lord had only lived in these days, He would not have provided wine for a marriage feast. The speakers are therefore in this dilemma, they thus deny the divinity of Christ for, being God, time is non-existent to Him, for He sees the end from the beginning. Presbyterian ministers who thus talk like Unitarians, have clearly lost their heads with fanaticism. Again, there is a strong current of feeling being generated, that the temperate use of wine is in some way opposed to piety. The whole drift of the argument from the Bible as now used, is to show that Christians cannot justify themselves in the use of any such beverage. It is very strange, to say the least, that the most pious men who ever adorned the profession of Christ, never had any such scruples. Take for instance, the late JAMES MONTGOMERY, the author of so many hymns, especially of "What is Prayer." We have seen this most saintly man drink wine, and in his life (see vol. vi.) he is described as calling on a wine merchant and drinking a glass of wine with him. The modern

standard of piety is, we fear, very far below that of JAMES MONTGOMERY, who like our Lord—was a wine bibber!

THE ROYAL SUPREMACY.—It is not an uncommon experience, to hear objections raised to the Church of England, on the ground that we acknowledge the reigning Monarch to be "Head of the Church." The case quoted in our last issue, illustrates the true state of affairs, which is, that the State is supreme in power over all estates and persons in the realm, in all matters involving legal rights, personal or of property. The Congregationalists not long ago appealed to the Supreme court, nominally to the Queen, to decide what the true doctrines of that body are. There are to-day Quakers in a Toronto Court, asking the Queen to say which of two sets of people is the true Quaker "Church," and which is the schismatical body. The Queen is thus acknowledged to be Head in temporal affairs of even Congregationalists and Quakers. The *Church Times* has a note on this subject. "The English sovereign is not 'Head of the Church of England.' Even when Henry the VIII. assumed that title, and forced it on the timorous clergy of his time, they had courage enough to declare synodically, that they allowed it 'only so far as was permitted by Christ's law.' Edward VI. and Mary I. retained the title, but Elizabeth laid it aside at her accession, and it has never been resumed since. In every country, all legal judgments involving temporal penalties, whether civil or ecclesiastical, must come from the civil power, and in that sense, the Royal Supremacy or its equivalent is universally established even in Republican lands. But the Royal Supremacy, so far as the Church of England is concerned, is not a tenet of belief nor an obligation of conscience. It is simply a matter of civil police, on a level with poor rates and law courts." Those who boast of their being free from any such headship, who make such unfair allusions to the Church of England, are in exactly the same legal position as we are. The great essential difference in regard to the "Head of the Church" between them and us is this—they hold that Christ is the Head of a number of bodies, all of them His Churches, we hold that there can be but One Body of which Christ is the Divine Head. Their theory involves a notion which to us is unthinkable.

THE TENDERNESS OF DIVINE LOVE.—The following beautiful passage is from the sermon preached by Mr. Linklater, against whom so fierce an opposition was raised by the party agitators. His text was St. John i. 11 and 12:

Oh, my brethren, let us take to our hearts the full meaning of this appeal, and in the Crucified Heart of Jesus see how dearly we are loved. He came. Consider the manner of His coming. He, the Terrible and Mighty God—who shakes the earth—the All-holy and All-pure. He might have come in the indignation of His outraged and rejected Majesty to drag to judgment the puny creatures who have defied His will. He could easily have crushed us; could easily have compelled our homage. Just as all rebellion will be shattered at the awful Judgment Day. But He could not then have won our love. He yearned for our love. And so He emptied Himself of His Majesty. He clothed Himself with our Humanity. He became Incarnate, one of ourselves, that He might find an entrance to our hearts. Nay, He became a helpless little child and threw Himself into the arms of the world, that He might appeal to our pity and claim our protection and our love. We might have resisted a Majesty that compelled, but what can we do with Helplessness that appeals? My brethren, in this way our Blessed Lord touched the one cord of Divine nature that was left in fallen man—the sense of pity. The one lingering spark of our native nobility. The spirit of chivalry and heroism which compels a man to have pity on the weak. I have seen this divine sense of pity most

wonderfully exhibited in the least likely cases. A great, strong, hulking savage nursing a sick child with all the tenderness and delicacy of a woman. Let me give you an illustration from Russian history. There was once a dangerous rebellion in St. Petersburg. The army fraternized with the mob, and an infuriated multitude rushed to the Winter Palace to have the life of the Czar. What do you think he did? He drove out into their midst, and held aloft in his arms his little baby boy that was to be their heir. And the savage mob was tamed, the rebellion was crushed, the populace shouted "Long live the Czar." You see it was an inspiration. And Jesus of Bethlehem and of Nazareth thus appeals to every heart.

The text as it proceeds supplies to us a method of peace. "But as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God." My brethren, this means that we are absolutely lifted out of our old life into the life of God. We have passed from death unto life. We are new creatures in Christ Jesus. By virtue of our membership with the risen, glorified Body of Christ we have entered into heavenly places in Christ Jesus. And if we are risen with Christ we must seek those things that are above. My brothers and sisters in Christ, does not this supply a means whereby we can defeat the enemy who is ever seeking to cause division in our camp; and in the spirit of generous devotion to Christ to throw overboard our own personal grievances and dislikes, and sink our differences, whatever they may be, for the good of the common cause.

THE TRUE CURE FOR PARTY DIVISIONS.—The preacher quoted above continued as follows: "My brethren, of all the broken-hearted cries that have ever rent this atmosphere of ours, surely that was the most bitter which burst from the disappointed love of Jesus, and rang through the Temple courts, after His final rejection by the Jews, 'O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not; Behold your house is left unto you desolate.' (St. Matthew xxiii. 37 and 38) All His love spurned. His purpose defeated. The enemy triumphant in the very citadel of His heart. The crass stupidity and obstinacy of puny men victorious over the generous self-sacrificing love of Almighty God. It is well for us to try to enter thus into the sorrows of the heart of Jesus. Thus we can forget ourselves. Thus we can sweep away all differences and yield ourselves to the attraction of our common faith. Thus we can loyally put aside all personal considerations, and remember only that we are fellow soldiers of the King, and that our swords, consecrated to fight against our common foe, must never be unsheathed against a brother. Let us remember the terrible lesson of the Crusaders, how the army of Christendom fell to pieces before the infidel because of internal jealousies and quarrels. Just as, in the days of duelling, it was high treason to draw one's sword within the precincts of the Court, so in the presence of the Majesty of God, and in view of all the interests of the Kingdom, we must bury our paltry little quarrels, and remember we are comrades in the great campaign. My brethren, I don't believe that my most bitter enemy, who of course is quite sure of getting to Heaven himself, would be altogether shocked to see in some humble corner there such an unworthy wretch as he believes I am. And I think that in the blaze of that Majesty of God, and in the all-sufficing joy of Heaven, he will be ashamed to remember the contemptible trivialities that for a time have marred our peace below. My brethren we must begin to do this now. For the Kingdom of God is within you. And we have received this wondrous power to become the sons of God.