

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 Wootten, Proprietor, & Publisher,
Address: P. O. Box 2640.
Office, No. 11 Imperial Buildings, 30 Adelaide St. E.
west of Post Office, Toronto.

FRANKLIN BAKER, Advertising Manager.

LESSONS for SUNDAYS and HOLY-DAYS.

October 16th, NINETEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.
Morning.—Ex-iel xiv. 1 Thessalonians i.
Evening.—Ezekiel xviii; or xxiv. 15. Luke xii to 35.

THURSDAY, OCT. 18, 1887.

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

To CORRESPONDENTS.—All matter for publication in any number of **DOMINION CHURCHMAN** should be in the office not later than Thursday for the following week's issue.

THE VISIT OF A CARDINAL.—The city of Toronto has been honoured by a visit from Cardinal Taschereau. We did not give him the reception that his flock gave the Salvation Army, but received him with much honour. An English throat in a healthy state rises in the gorge at the very name of Cardinal, that word recalls some of the shamefullest deeds done to dishonour our nation's church. At present it is a mere phrase of honour, slightly ludicrous, suggestive of "Sir Knight," of the Pythian brotherhood. Since the Pope was deprived of sovereignty his "Princes," as Cardinals are called, have lost all reasonable claim to this dignity, they are in solid truth mere bogus Princes, and our good Roman Catholic friends will excuse us if we smile at their giving this pompous and falsely hollow title to the Archbishop of Quebec. It has been suggested that Dr. Taschereau's visit was political, that some new Ross Bible movement was on hand, but we hardly think so. Dr. Lynch is quite able to manipulate the political wires in Ontario, and has shown marvellous skill in drawing the wool over the eyes of even Protestants of the S. H. Blake rank.

PRESBYTERIANS ON REVIVALS.—At a recent conference of presbyterian divines the question of revivals was discussed. The Rev. Mr. Parsons, of Toronto, spoke out some bold words in condemnation, not of revivals, but of the means used to produce those forms of religious excitement that are mis-called revivals. Mr. Parsons likened Sam Jones and his school to circus heroes, and said that Methodist societies had been demoralized by the

itinerant sensation mongers who make revivalism a trade. The subject is a somewhat stale one, the Church's mind was long ago made up and expressed on this matter, so no sensible Churchman regards the Sam Jones methods with respect, "the end justifies the means," is however held by Methodists and others. If persons would write down and ponder over some of the expressions common at revival meetings they would be much shocked. The slangy addresses to God, the appealing to Him as if He were indeed such an one as themselves, the habit of addressing the Holy Spirit as though they were masters and the Spirit their servant, to be ordered hither and thither—these and many other tricks of speech arranged to tickle the ears of those who hate decency and solemnity, are revolting and scandalous to religion.

MOCKERY OF CHRISTIAN UNITY.—The *Mail* of 5th inst. has this sharp paragraph:

"Anglican, Methodist, Presbyterian and Congregational Sunday School children united in a demonstration at Montreal on Sunday, and sang with great fervour the hymn, 'Onward, Christian Soldiers,' in which it is declared that

"We are not divided,
All one body we,
One in faith and doctrine,
One in charity."

May the little ones never be undeceived!"

Undeceived! Even children must have smiled as they sang that hymn, knowing as they do so early in life how divided in faith, how at variance in doctrine, how lacking in charity are the different sects in regard to each other and the Church of Christ. It is a sad mistake to give children a hymn to sing which states that which they know to be false. This "make believe" unity is immoral and dangerous to the faith of the young. Children are apt to ask strange questions of a startling kind, as showing perceptive powers of a higher order than many adults possess. We can imagine a very young child asking his Methodist parents: "The hymn says we Christians are not divided. why then do we worship apart, why keep up so many different Churches, why am I a Methodist child, and why is Tom Sprat a Congregationalist and Sally Jones a Presbyterian, if we are all one in faith?" It would puzzle any honest minded person to give a rational reply to such questions. A Church child knows that it is a member of the Catholic and Apostolic Church of Christ, and that is the only right home for Christ's family.

MR. BEECHER'S SUCCESSOR SNUBBED.—The higher social rank accorded in the old land to the clergy is a terrible affliction to dissenters who are ill-judged enough to expose this sore spot, often even on public platforms. The Rev. Dr. Parker, who is doubtless a very able man, has been weak enough to avow that his main reason for desiring to live in the States, is to rank higher socially than he can in England as an independent minister. An American newspaper, the *New York Sun*, speaks out plainly, and tells Dr. Parker that his reason is a "snobbish" one. "But even here," adds the *Sun*, "a Congregational minister is not commonly rated so high by fashionable society as an Episcopal minister, and a Baptist or a Methodist minister is apt to be put further down the scale. In many communities the social lines are drawn sharply according to the denominational differences. If, therefore, a preacher is a snob, he can be made just as uneasy here as in England by social discrimination." So poor Dr. Parker, like many others, will discover that there are as many grades in social life and as sharply defined in a democratic society as in the old world. The only difference is that in the old land the distinctions are based on good reasons for the most part, as better breeding, culture, official rank, while here social distinctions are as a rule highly ludicrous being merely based upon variations in the length of purses.

A GREAT LIBERAL LEADER ON IRELAND.—Mr. John Bright has written a letter denying the statement that he could not support the Government's Irish policy because he had declared that force was no remedy for the troubles in Ireland. Mr. Bright says: "Disunionists, whether under Mr. Gladstone in England, or Mr. Parnell in Ireland, are not careful as to the truth of their statements. Force is no remedy for just disputes, but it is a remedy, and often the only remedy, for disorder and violence. I supported Mr. Gladstone's Acts of 1881 and 1882 for the suppression of the Land League and disorder in Ireland, and I now support the Government in its efforts to suppress the National League, which is the Land League under another name. My sympathy for Ireland was not born of a faction in a struggle for place and pay. It was as strong as it is now thirty years ago, before Messrs. Gladstone, Harcourt, and Morley and their noisy followers had a word to say in favor of the Irish tenantry, or the sufferings of any portion of the people. Recent events have strengthened my sympathy."

"We have delivered the tenants from all that was unjust and oppressive in the laws affecting the tenure of the land. It is needful to free them from the wicked conspiracy which is leading them to dishonesty and crime. The leaders of the conspiracy teach the tenant that his true interest is to plunder his landlord and to cherish a bitter hatred for England. Industry, honesty and regard for the law are despised and condemned. It is this conspiracy with which the bulk of the Liberals are asked to ally themselves. The leaders of the Liberal party, forgetting whatever is honourable in its past history, march in the path which will lead only to party disgrace and national disaster. I would save the Liberal party with which I have been much longer associated, and for which I have worked more than any of the present acting leaders, from the humiliation with which it is menaced. I would, with my sympathy for Ireland, save the populace from the future conduct of men who are answerable for much of the present suffering and all of the disorder with which the country is now afflicted and disgraced."

Perhaps Home Rule Protestants will kindly make a note of the above.

PROTESTS AGAINST ROME BEFORE THE REFORMATION.—The *Church Times* says: The formal renunciation of the Pope's supremacy, made by the Anglican clergy in a national synod held in 1584, will be found in Wilkins, *Concilia*, iii. 782. The reply of Dinoh, Abbat of Bangor, repudiating Papal authority in the argument with St. Augustine of Canterbury, is of disputed authenticity, some eminent scholars accepting it as genuine, but others treating it as spurious. But those who reject it are careful to add that, if forged, it was in mediæval times, and that it does not go beyond the known and established fact that the British bishops and clergy told St. Augustine that they would not have him for their Archbishop, nor do any of the things which he called upon them to do in compliance with Roman usage (*Beda, Hist. Eccl. Gent. Angl.* ii. 2). And as he was Papal legate, this was a direct repudiation of Papal authority. Lappenberg, one of the latest and ablest writers on Anglo-Saxon England, is one of the scholars who hold to the genuineness of Dinoh's answer.

UNDER the title of "Church and Chapel, and Eireneion," the *Church in the West* this week gives the introductory article of a series in which the writer intends to explain the Church to Dissenters. He says: "The signs of the times are unmistakably encouraging for those who yearn and pray for the re-union of Christendom, and they all point to the Church of England as destined to be by Divine Providence the rallying point of Christ's dispersed and distracted flock."