

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.

July 3rd.—FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY
Morning.—1 Samuel xii. Acts x. 24.
Evening.—1 Samuel xiii; or Ruth i. 2 John.

THURSDAY, JUNE 30, 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.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

A quantity of Correspondence and Diocesan News unavoidably left over for want of space.

MUCH ADO ABOUT NOTHING.—In the Toronto Synod, a clergyman let fall the old fashioned and universally used old country expression, "Methodist Chapel." Whereupon there arose a tempest of indignation, if tempests can be ever ludicrous in origin and phenomena. Not alone our morbidly sensitive and wildly inconsistent neighbours, the Methodists, were offended, but, also, those very peculiar persons who, though nominally Churchmen, are more dissenterish in spirit than the average nonconformist. Now what is there in the word "Chapel" to be offended about? For calling her temples of worship "Churches," the Church of England has been ridiculed by both Wesleyans and others for many years. It is yet a stock objection to the English Church and has been for generations, made by the Independents, that the material structure was given the title "Church," due only to the spiritual building. We cannot pretend to keep track of all the turns and changes made by those who differ with us. Any old countryman who speaks of a "Methodist" or "Independent Chapel," is only using the very word preferred by those who attend those places of worship. An English visitor of ours this day spoke of going to "Chapel." Moreover, the English Church and the Roman Catholic Church use the word "Chapel" not "Church" to designate many of their richest structures. The Chapel

Royal, London, is perhaps equal to the Metropolitan in dignity, and St. George's Chapel, Windsor, Henry VII. Chapel, Westminster Abbey, the Sistine Chapel, Rome, are among the glories of Church architecture. Yet, forsooth, when the Metropolitan, Toronto, is called "Chapel," the Wesleyans are angry! Such morbid sensitiveness about distinctions of this kind is not wise. Men who are "touchy" about their titles, are those to whom distinctions are novel, and usually are the least worthy wearers of them. The sects who are so proud of calling their places of worship "Church" are open to the inference, that they are wearing a very new honour and are not sure about their title to it—being self-conferred. The Church Catholic and Apostolic got its name from Christ's own lips, a gift of the King whose right to confer dignity is not open to challenge. A society which in this generation has given itself the name of "Church" should be at least modest, and not offensively parade what it well knows is a title used in imitation only of the Church from which it seceded a few years ago. The anger of our Methodist neighbours suggests the question, "What would Wesley have thought of such indignation?" He would have rebuked it in scathing words of reproof, and have bidden his followers cease using the phraseology, distinguishing the Church of England from societies such as he organized inside her bounds. The speaker meant no offence, the phrase he used his utterly void of rational ground of offence, and if our neighbours will cool down and think over the matter, they will feel that their excitement has not been very creditable.

It seems, too, that our neighbours were also indignant because it was decided to hold a Jubilee Service in St. James' Church, Toronto, instead of Churchmen throwing in their lot with those who organized the service to be held by the Ministerial Association. This we presume is a manifestation of pleasantry on their part, the humour is not very refined, but that it is broad humour we freely admit. We would prefer jokes, however, not being made upon such subjects as Divine service.

DISCIPLINE THE ROAD TO LEADERSHIP.—In a sermon before the students of Harvard College, Professor Peabody said:

"I want to dwell with you on the workings of this twofold law of discipline—this power to command wrought out of the power to obey. I meet you here as soldiers on the eve of their campaign. Barrack life, drillrooms, dress parades, sham battles—all these are exchanged for active service. The varied fields of opportunity, with their tumultuous conflicts and strenuous rivalries, lie like strategic battle grounds before you, and you go out to take your place in one or another battalion, serving with the engineers who plan attacks, or the men of action who lead them, with the thinkers or administrators, with the pioneers or the reserve. Now, what is it that shall give in these varied careers the power of leadership? That is what we want to know to-day. How is it that a man is taken up out of the ranks and placed where he says to one man go, and he goeth, and to another come, and he cometh, and a third do this and he does it? The power to command, I answer, comes to a man through the power to obey. The first step toward leadership is through a sense of loyalty. The first claim to authority over others is the discovery of an authority over one's self, commanding, persuasive, absolute—like the word of Cæsar to his troops. Consider, for instance, the results of a liberal education. What is it that gives an educated man his opportunity for leadership? Wherein is his advantage in the competitions of life? What does he find left of his liberal education when he looks back to it from the midst of his active career and tries to sum up the advantage it has given him? Certainly, what is left is not its details of information, its specific instructions, its readiness with names, dates, tenses, or formulae. These

slip away from him with a rapidity and absolute-ness which would surprise him in his later years, if he had not already experienced the same shedding of accumulated knowledge, as if from the roof of his brain, at the end of many an examination hour. What then is left of all the faithfulness with which he has applied himself to his higher education? There is left its discipline. He is able to take hold of his new problems with a certain grasp, quickness, largeness of conception, and mastery because of the rapid demands on him for the same alertness and comprehensiveness in the course of his education. His standards have become high, his judgment broad. He knows what thoroughness, application, and completeness are through his liberal education.

THE DISCIPLINE OF EDUCATION.—Continuing his discourse the Professor above quoted said:

"And how does this discipline in education arrive? It comes to a man through contact with great thoughts and with great minds. The educated man has met the masters of literature, he has felt the sweep and force of scientific laws, he has sat at the feet of the philosophers, and as he has served thus in the ranks of the armies of scholars he has come to be prepared for leadership among scholars. Some time a man proposes to work out large problems without discipline of education. He will be a leader without having been a follower. He will have some new way of knowledge. He will astonish the world with a new system of thought or a new discovery of science. These are the men who strew the bookstores and Patent Office with their wrecks of literature and discovery. They have been self-satisfied only because they were ignorant. They have not known the masters or perceived the dimensions of truth, and so they thought that they were the masters and that truth was small. The disciplined mind, on the other hand, has been a mind under authority. Great minds have spoken to it; great thoughts have commanded it; round the little sphere of results which it has gained has spread the mystery of an unexplored universe. It has acquired reverence, humility, patience, thoroughness. It has seen the magnitude of truth, the range of its laws, the severity of its standards, the demands made upon its followers. Then, when the transition comes from obedience to authority, the disciplined mind takes the leader's place. It brings to the most practical affairs its high standard and thorough methods. It has seen service in the ranks and therefore is fit to command. It does not feel that it knows everything, or that, knowing little, it still knows enough for its purpose, for it has repeatedly discovered the magnitude of principles underlying the world's details.

"An undisciplined mind is overwhelmed by details. Discipline sees details in the light of general principles. Thus discipline escapes narrowness. A man is not wholly shut in by his vocation. He is its master instead of it being his master. This is a function of a liberal education—to liberate the mind from this despotism of circumstances into this mastery of them. The disciplined mind is fit to lead because it has been trained to obey."

—The following may be old, but it is good: A certain provost o'Dundee, who was an atheist, was going by sea from Dundee to London, accompanied by one of his bailies who was a Christian and an elder in the kirk. A storm came on, and the bailie anxiously inquired of the steward if "there was any danger." "Weel, sir," said the steward, "I canna say; we maun just trust to Providence." "O, Lor!" said the bailie, whimpering, "has it cam tae that?" "Hoot, awa, bailie," chimed in the provost, "dinna greet; we maun a'dee some time." "It's a' very weel," was the reply, "for ye awtheistical deevils, but what's tae become o' me?"