

# Dominion Churchman.

THE ORGAN OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN CANADA.

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 can easily see when their subscriptions fall due by looking at the address label on their paper.

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 2640.  
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.

July 15...NINTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Morning—1 Kings x. to 25. Acts xiii. 23 to xxiii 12

Evening—1 Kings xi. to 15; or 1 Kings xi. 26. Matt. xi.

July 25 ST. JAMES, APOSTLE AND MARTYR.

Morning—2 Kings i. to 16. Luke ix. 51 to 57.

Evening—Jeremiah xxvi. 8 to 16. Matthew xiii. to 24.

THURSDAY, JULY 19, 1888.

A STEP FORWARD.—The Churchman says: The Synod of the Old Catholics of Germany, held at Bonn, unanimously adopted a resolution offered by Pfarrer Bergmann of Coblenz, permitting the clergy to administer the cup in the Lord's Supper to members of the Anglican Church. As a forward step in reform this is important, as it is a recognition of the fact that the laity have a right to the Holy Communion in both kinds.

It is devoutly to be hoped that the Old Catholics may soon utterly do away with that mutilation of the sacrament which they have inherited from the Papal Church. Meantime this present action is to be looked on not merely as a courtesy toward the English Church, but as an assertion that whenever the Old Catholic laity are convinced of its lawfulness they also may receive the Holy Communion in both kinds.

THE SCOTTISH CHURCH.—Dr. Wordsworth, Bishop of Lincoln, a name full of honour among American Churchmen, recently presented a petition to the House of Lords, from the bishops of the Episcopal Church in Scotland. We gladly quote from Bishop Wordsworth's speech the following: "This petition, my lords, comes from a venerable and learned body, and it comes from the whole of that body; it bears the signatures of all the bishops of the Episcopal Church in Scotland. The bishops of that church are not represented in either House of Parliament, their predecessors in former times were peers of Scotland. They are the legitimate successors of bishops, some of whose Episcopal sees are more ancient than the Norman Conquest; and though those bishops are now reduced to half their former number, namely, to seven, yet they occupy the original Scottish sees, some of which have been now blended together. The present time is a memorable one in the history of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, and suggests some interesting reminiscences. Nearly two centuries ago, namely, in 1689, that church was disestablished, and greatly has it suffered from its disestablishment; all the bishops of Scotland were then deprived of their secular rank, civil privileges, and temporal revenues for conscience' sake, because they refused to take the oath of allegiance to King William and Queen Mary as their sovereigns *de jure* in the place of King James II., although they were ready, I believe, to affirm that they would submit to them as their rulers *de facto*. My lords, a good deal has been said lately about the oath of allegiance and many have condemned it as a mistake. My lords, if the oath of allegiance is a mistake, the disestab-

lishment of the Scottish Episcopal Church in 1689 was a crime. But to pass on. Next year, the year 1884, will be a remarkable one in the history of the Episcopal Church in Scotland and of Western Christendom. Just a century will then have passed away since the disestablished and persecuted Episcopal Church in Scotland bestowed the gift of Episcopacy upon America. It did this by the hands of three of its bishops in the city of Aberdeen on November the 14th, 1784, in the consecration of Dr. Samuel Seabury, the first of a line of bishops who now amount to no less a number than sixty in the United States of America, to say nothing of British America.

A NOTE ON CONFIRMATION.—The Rev. G. D. Nicholas in the *Literary Churchman* has this short but forcible note on Confirmation in reply to the common statement of the uneducated in Church doctrine that the chief act of confirmation is that of the child. "A person goes to receive, not to give, Confirmation. The Office says Confirmation is the 'laying on of hands.' Ask a child on its way to Confirmation what it is going for, and it will answer, 'To be Confirmed,' not 'to Confirm.' The Bishop comes to do that—to Confirm. I always tell a child that, to reply to the question: 'What is it to be confirmed?' 'To Confirm my Baptismal Vow,' is to give a crooked answer to a straight question! The child has confirmed its Baptismal Vow every time it has said the Answer in the Catechism, 'Yes, verily, &c.,' and there can be no need for the Bishop to come to hear it do so once more. I am surprised that any one should be found to maintain the contrary opinion in your paper."

ARCHDEACON NORRIS AND CONFIRMATION.—In the same paper, Arch. Norris writes:—"I most respectfully beg leave to decline the responsibility with which some of your correspondents would saddle me, of putting forth a definition of my own with respect to confirmation, that it is 'a renewal of Baptismal vows.' Logically, such a 'definition' would be no definition at all, for it is altogether inadequate—it leaves out 'the essential attribute.' Theologically, it would be as inexact and wrong as it would be to 'define' Holy Baptism as 'a Sacrament in which a profession of faith or repentance is made.' I cannot think that Archdeacon Norris—whose book I have not seen—would for a moment sanction such a definition of Confirmation. If he does, I leave him to the tender mercies of his critics. All I meant to protest against was, that 'there is not a shadow of authority' for the statement that in the doctrine of the Prayer-Book, as laid down for us in the Office of the Laying on of Hands, there is 'a ratifying and renewal of Baptismal vows.' I am not concerned now either to find fault with—as some freely do—or to defend our Office; but taking it as we find it, I think I should not be far wrong in defining Confirmation, according to the Church of England view, to be 'a holy,—or, if you will,—a sacramental rite, in which, after public ratification of Baptismal vows by the candidate (baptized in infancy and come to years of discretion), the Holy Spirit's Grace is conveyed through the Laying on of Hands of the Bishop.'"

HOW TERRIBLE.—The recent decision of the Free Kirk to permit the use of organs in churches drew forth a remarkable protest from Dr. Begg, an ultra Puritan divine; "They were going to spend \$4,000 on an organ for St. Giles, and it was reported that they spent \$1000 a year in music in the Cathedral at Edinburgh. And what was the effect! From what he had learned, masses of young people flocked to the Cathedral every night, and that was going on all over Scotland!" It is encouraging to hear from so high an authority that the Church is attracting the young people of the land to her services. So says the *Church Review*, but there is another aspect which we in honesty must look at much as we delight in what is terrible to Dr. Begg. Are these

young people really attracted to the Church, or are they simply and only drawn to be "amused and charmed by good musical performance." That is for the clergy to consider and if they fail to give sound teaching to these young people and otherwise help to attach them to the Church by love and intelligence, there is very little to crow over.

THE SISTER'S MARRIAGE BILL.—So much abuse is being poured upon the bishops and clergy because of their determined stand against the legalizing of unions prohibited by the Church that it is only just to them and the laity at large to give the following condensed report of a meeting held on 7th June, Earl Beauchamp in the chair. The significance of the gathering is very greatly heightened by its being held under the auspices of the English Church Union, the *bete noir* of the Low Church party, and the chief spokesman being the celebrated and godly Lord Shaftesbury, the lay chief of that party and the distinguished patron of the Y. M. C. A., and Evangelical Alliance movements. We give of course only extracts from the speeches.

THE EARL OF SHAFTESBURY said:—"This is a special meeting of honest and holy men banded together to assert a great truth and maintain a great purpose. Whether they were agreed on other matters or not, they all professed the Head and they were come together to uphold a law which had been revealed to us, and to preserve to the utmost of their power a Divine Institution which was hedged about by many precautions, which constituted the basis of true domestic life and on which depended the honour and stability of the Empire. (Loud cheers). The measure before Parliament to legalize Marriage with a deceased wife's sister, would break down that security and open a door for innovations of a most perilous character. After a powerful exposure of the social evils which had flowed from this breach of the Divine Law in the States, where Divorce was almost as common as Marriage the noble Earl moved—"That this meeting pledges itself to resist by every means in its power the Bill to legalise Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister on the ground, that it is contrary to the law of the Christian Church from the beginning, violates the foundation upon which the marriage law of England is based, endangers the purity and happiness of families, and cannot fail to bring about disastrous conflicts between conscience and the civil law of the land."

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC BISHOP OF EMMAUS seconded this resolution.—DR. MILLIGAN, Professor of Biblical Criticism at Aberdeen, in supporting the motion, read the following extract from the "Westminster Confession," the authoritative standard of both the Established and the Free Presbyterian Churches of Scotland:—

"Marriages ought not to be within the degrees of consanguinity or affinity forbidden in the Word; nor can such incestuous marriages ever be made lawful by any of man or consent of parties, so as those persons may live together as man and wife. The man may not marry any of his wife's kindred nearer in blood than he may of his own, nor the woman of her husband's kindred nearer in blood than of her own Chapter xxiv. 4." If the measure which they were met that evening to oppose should pass into law, the Presbyterian ministers of Scotland would not, on pain of deposition from their office, be permitted to perform the ceremony of marriage between a man and his wife's sister (cheers); they would not under the same penalty, be allowed to admit persons who contracted such marriages to participation of the Sacraments (renewed cheers), and they would not be permitted to baptise the children that were born of such unions (sensation). There would immediately follow a conflict between the Church and the civil power (loud cheers). But it might be said that the Church might alter her rules. She could not alter them (loud cheers).