

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 uncollected 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 2640.
Office, No. 11 Imperial Buildings, 30 Adelaide St. E.
west of Post Office, Toronto.

FRANKLIN B. BILL, Advertising Manager.

LESSONS for SUNDAYS and HOLY-DAYS.

JUNE 27th—SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY
Morning—Joshua iii. 7 to iv. 15. Acts viii. 5 to 26.
Evening—Joshua v. 13 to vi. 21; or xxiv. 1 John ii. 15.

THURSDAY, JUNE 24, 1886.

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

THE WESLEYANS AND UNIVERSITY FEDERATION.—It is understood that the authorities of Trinity University and Victoria have been working harmoniously in regard to the proposed federation of these institutions with the State University at Toronto. Already a private institution of a partially Church character is affiliated with the State University. It is also a fact that although it is affirmed that the State objects to giving grants in aid of sectarian colleges, yet that grants have been made with the special object of giving the Colleges of certain of the sects, and the private and partially Church College such help as they need. It is, therefore, interesting to know how the Methodists as a body feel in regard to the removal of Victoria to Toronto and its ceasing to be distinct, self-contained university, as proposed. At the recent conference a debating duel took place, between Dr. Dewart and Dr. Sutherland on this question. We compliment both speakers on their very able addresses. The former marshalled with skill, the somewhat threadbare arguments as to the advantages of young men of different faiths mingling together, as Mr. Edward Blake once strongly set forth. He dwelt also upon the point that a common examination would raise the standard of education. As to the first, Dr. Dewart seems not to know that the mingling he speaks of does not take place, there is no opportunity for it in the work of the colleges and the advantages even if it did occur, would be far outweighed by drawbacks of a most serious character, as practical teachers well know. As to the "common examination" argument, it is very shallow. In such matters the standard is not raised but lowered by a variety of Colleges of such a character as those now affiliated with

Toronto University. They are all mere Divinity Schools, and the standard of Arts is necessarily very low, in order that they may secure candidates for the ministry. If they were all Art Colleges, the standard would be raised by competition, but at present the standard is fixed by the weakest teaching staff, and that staff is that of the private College we allude to, which is utterly incapable of giving a tolerable arts training to its students. Dr. Sutherland's address was pitched in far nobler key than Dr. Dewart's. He spoke as a Christian divine, having profound convictions as to the overwhelming importance of the necessity of infusing education with religious influences. With admirable directness and boldness of speech he shattered the plea of those who contend that a State University cannot be anti-Christian, by appealing not to theoretic probabilities but to facts. Dr. Sutherland said:

"The Minister of Education, who to-day may be a Christian man, might to-morrow be anything else, and when to-day a paper published in the Provincial University speaks disparagingly of the denominational colleges, when a notorious infidel and political charlatan can be invited to lecture in the college halls, when a student attends Divine service on the Sabbath, and on Monday can be told by a professor that he would have spent his time better dissecting the leg of a frog, it was time to ask 'Whither are we drifting?'"

No wonder that these words elicited universal and prolonged applause from the conference. The Wesleyans need be cautious how they surrender their privileges at Victoria, as we need be especially on guard lest the University of Trinity be swamped by the enemies of the distinctive principles of the Church of England.

WHENCE COMES GREAT INFLUENCE.—The *Central Presbyterian*, published at Richmond, Virginia, has been trying to account for the "vast influence" of the "Episcopal Church"—an influence which it states is "overwhelmingly disproportionate" to its "numerical strength." It solves the problem by enumerating "elements of strength," which we quote in the hope that our readers will be encouraged to cultivate them more and more:—

"1. Its Churchliness.—It lays the greatest stress upon the Church. The position, importance, power, etc., of the Church is ever brought to the forefront. Her worship, her ordinances, her sacraments, her clergy, are always held forth as worthy of all love and reverence. Everything connected or associated with the Church shares in this devotion. You never see an Episcopalian who believes that it makes little difference what church you join, provided only you are a Christian. You rarely see an Episcopalian who will attend any other church when his own is open, whether at home or in a strange town. They do not think lightly of the sacraments, are not careless about the baptism of their children, and are very careful to see that the members of their household attend their own church and Sabbath school. They are steadily and constantly taught to love their own Church; to consider it as immeasurably, incomparably, indefinitely superior to any and all others. This one thing goes far to account for its influence and its growth.

"2. It appeals strongly to the love of order, decency, good taste. There is no danger of *gaucherie* in any of her services or ceremonies. No other denomination is so free from such danger. Her preachers may be men of very poor taste themselves and of very mediocre ability, but they are protected by their admirable ritual and liturgy. There are some dispositions on finely strung that a gross violation of taste in any part of the service of the sanctuary wounds like a blow. There is never any danger of this in the Episcopal worship. This is a great element of attractiveness. Rob her of this characteristic feature, and it would be like shaving Samson's head.

"3. The prominence given to the devotional in her Services.—The Episcopalian may have, and too often does have, a very poor sermon indeed, but he always has his liturgy. This he considers as more than compensation for a feeble discourse; this he prizes above his chief joy. The devotional part of the worship assumes chief place in time and importance. The absence of the rector makes little difference, provided they have a good 'lay reader.' When a ruling elder reads a sermon in the absence of the pastor, the faithful few who punctuate the spacious roominess of the pews is an invitation to solitude! The attraction is gone with the sermon; the idea of *worship* does not draw the congregation together."

Would that the whole of the above applied to the Church! Are our people, for instance, "taught to love their own Church, to consider it as incomparably superior to any and all others?" Are not many of our congregations, especially in the West, made to feel that the existence of our Church needs to be apologised for, that it is only one out of a number of "denominations," each of them equally admirable and superior to the Church of England? It is beyond all doubt that a certain College and its friends create this impression in the minds of the people.

A PLEA FOR NATIONAL CHURCHES.—Holy Scriptures teaches us to look to the history of the Jews for examples; why not, then, for precedents for ecclesiastical government? Our Lord expressly told His Apostles that He had appointed unto them a Kingdom, and that they should sit on thrones judging twelve tribes of Israel. Is it not, therefore, a reasonable inference that He intended the polity of Israel to prefigure in some sort the government of His Church? Now the constitution of Israel was a federation of twelve independent autonomous tribes, their unity depending, first, on the whole being brethren of one blood; secondly, on the reception of one covenant (that of circumcision) by all; and thirdly, on the setting up of a religious rite, which was supported by the tithes and offerings of all, and at which every man was required to assist three times a year. When the people went astray (as they were always doing), and so subjected themselves to chastisement, God raised up leaders and preachers of righteousness in the judges and prophets, but they were not taken from any one of the tribes exclusively. Thus several became in turn the leading tribe. At last the nation thought that they would prefer a King, and though they were allowed to have what they wished for, the act was regarded by Almighty God as one of rebellion; and from the days of Saul onward the history of the Hebrew people, with some gleams, no doubt, of wonderful prosperity, was a narrative of disasters. It is also to be noted that the civil revolt of Jeroboam is described not as a schism, but as from the Lord. It was only when Jeroboam set up an opposition altar and priesthood that he made Israel to sin. It seems to us, then, that the government of the Church ought to be tribal, that is to say national; each nation possessing the fullest rights of self-government, and unity being preserved by the one Baptism, the one Bread, and the one priesthood; and that there is nothing necessarily wrong in secessions from a patriarchate, provided that there be no setting up of a new creed or a new altar. It is at all events a very striking fact that the really great doctors and leaders of the Church have rarely sprung from Rome, or had any very close connection with the Papacy.

—At the recent presiding elders' convention in New York, a member narrated a tale of two boys in his district: A donkey was passing by. Said one boy to another, "Do you know what that is?" "Why yes," he answered. "That is a donkey. I have seen lots of them in the theological gardens."