

The Church Guardian,

A WEEKLY NEWSPAPER

Published in the interests of the Church of England.

NON-PARTIZAN!

INDEPENDENT!

It will be fearless and outspoken on all subjects, but its effort will always be to speak what it holds to be the truth in love.

EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR: REV. JOHN D. H. BROWNE, Lock Drawer 29, HALIFAX, N. S.

ASSOCIATE EDITOR: REV. EDWYN S. W. PENTREATH WINNIPEG, MANITOBA.

A staff of correspondents in every Diocese in the Dominion. Price, ONE DOLLAR AND A HALF a year in advance.

The Cheapest Church Weekly in America. Circulation double that of any other Church paper in the Dominion.

Address: THE CHURCH GUARDIAN, Lock Drawer 29, HALIFAX, N. S.

The Editor may be found between the hours of 9 a. m. and 1 p. m., and 2 and 6 p. m., at his office, No. 54 Granville Street (up-stairs), directly over the Church of England Institute.

PAY FOR YOUR PAPER!

Will subscribers who find bills enclosed in the paper promptly remit us their subscription. Our patrons will please remember that while a single subscription is but little, the amount multiplied by a thousand is of very serious importance to a publisher. We ask all who owe—and subscribers can easily know by referring to the date on the printed slip—kindly to send us the money without delay. Those who wish well to a paper can best advance its interests by seeing that their subscription is promptly paid when due.

THE MISSIONARY ADDRESS.

THE Address of the Board of Management of the Board of Domestic and Foreign Missions, (prepared, we believe, by the Bishop of Ontario), and sent to every clergyman in Canada, was read in all the Churches on Sunday week. The document is more than an able one. It is a stirring appeal to the people on behalf of Missions. It recites the present position of the Church in Canada, and exposes the meagre offering of the past, and urges more liberal contributions for the future. We sincerely trust it will accomplish all that was intended, and that the \$50,000 asked for may be forthcoming.

ROME AND UNITY.

THE Church of Rome seizes upon every little trouble in the Church to descant on the perfect unity which exists in the Roman Church, and would have us believe that no dissensions ruffle the calm of its waters. Unhappily for itself, every little while the truth will out, and then we see sufficient "to make us rather bear those ills we have, than fly to others that we know not of," seeing quite enough to satisfy us that in the Church of England we are free from many things which cause difficulties and dissensions in the Roman communion. Below, for example, we see how the Pope and his delegate have their hands full in trying to harmonize opposing influences and interests in Canada. A few months ago, a Papal delegate came out to settle the religious difficulties which threatened to dismember the Roman Church in Quebec, and according to a Montreal correspondent of a leading paper, this is the present condition of things:—Dom. Smeulders, the Apostolic delegate, who has been making in-

spection daily of the various theological religious institutions since his arrival in this city, appears to be meeting with considerable opposition in his endeavors to settle the great religious difficulties at Quebec. Mgr. Dominique Racine, Bishop of Chicoutimi, has addressed a letter to his clergy, instructing them not to sign the petition to Dom. Smeulders now being extensively circulated throughout the Province.

OBSERVANCE OF THE LORD'S DAY.

THE question of Sunday observance has caused considerable discussion in the past. In the public press and in the pulpits of the Dominion, it is again occupying attention. The cause is patent to any careful observer. Very determined efforts are being made to secularise it. Some, it is apparent, are striving hard to violate its sanctity, and to bring it down to the low level which exists on the Continent of Europe and in the neighbouring Republic. Others again resist these attempts, and are doing all in their power to preserve the Lord's Day in its sanctity. And in pulpit and Parliament the battle wages.

Now, of course, the obligation to observe Sunday is differently interpreted and explained by different parties. Some unquestionably add a Primitive strictness to a Jewish restrictiveness, and the day of delights becomes a gloomy miserable day. Others, and they are in some cities in our own country the more numerous, ignore the natural demands for one day's rest in seven. They judge that the convenience, or the comfort, or the pleasure of the many, is a sufficient reason for denying the day of rest to a few. It is difficult in such complicated questions as enter into the consideration of this subject to preserve the happy mean. That some must suffer in the present condition of affairs seems absolutely inevitable. In every household servants must do some work on the Lord's Day. Coachmen, and grooms, and dairymen, cannot altogether rest from their constant employment. Those who are engaged in the printing trade, where daily papers are published, must go to work on Sunday night, and before the day of rest is ended. It seems inevitable, too, that telegraph operators, undertakers and hackmen, must work, and that very steadily. And if freight trains are to pass from one end of the Dominion to another, railway servants must be engaged in severe toil on the Lord's Day. Just where the sacrifice of some for the general good of all is to end, it is most difficult to say. We know it is proposed to run through trains from the great centres for the convenience of passengers, and these are now in actual operation. Then, naturally, a post office forms a necessary adjunct of such trains, and to this many public men have serious objections. For our own part, we can see little difference in this and despatching mail trains on the arrival of an ocean steamer.

Of course, the day should be spent so as to give the least possible occasion for the toil of others. The claims of domestic and other servants are undoubtedly often overlooked. They have an inalienable right to as much rest as can be consistent with the ordering of a godly and quiet household. And they certainly have an equal right to suitable opportunities for public worship and religious instruction on the Sunday. No head of a house can be thought guiltless who robs his servants of these privileges. And public

or state officials should be equally favored. Were these simple rules observed, how many of the difficulties that surround the Sunday question would be solved?

The Lord's Day should also witness the perfectly happy intercourse of home. The young should be gathered together, and talked to by parents in a free and loving fellowship. The day should not be made bitter to them by making it a time of drudgery in insisting on long reading or learning Scripture, or in such constant and wearisome attendance at Church and Sunday School that it is looked upon simply as a day of torment. Certainly, works of charity or of necessity may be performed on this day. The sick and destitute and ignorant may well be sought and comforted and taught. Christ Himself very plainly set us the example of doing this. The day is not for lament, any more than for labour. It should be as free from gloomy sadness as from oppressive toil. But it ought not to become simply a time for religious dissipation and such multiplied services for others, that personal rest and spiritual communion are quite neglected. This warning is not a little needed in the age in which we live. Nationally, the question of Sunday observance is of great importance. The subject deserves the most careful legislation, in order that whatever interferes with the sanctity of this day of rest and worship may be prevented. For our Dominion's future welfare, it is of the very highest moment that the religious interests of our people may be sacredly guarded. We sincerely trust that the present statute concerning the observance of Sunday may never be repealed, and that offered us everywhere against its spirit, if not against its very words, may speedily be brought to justice and righteously condemned.

THE EARLY BRITISH CHURCH.

IN a previous article we gave the evidence in favor of St. Paul the Apostle having planted the Church in Britain. That the evidence was not conclusive is admitted, but on the other hand it may be said that such a theory has probably more to support it than can be adduced for any other which has been advanced, such as, for example, that Joseph of Arimathea visited the Island, or the Story of Lucius and Eleutherus and others, although all or any of these may have been employed in doing something in the direction of extending the knowledge of Christ among the various tribes. One thing we were able to prove as an unquestionable historical fact, viz., that by whomsoever planted, a Church, governed by Bishops, having the three-fold order of the Ministry, accepting the Apostolic doctrines, and holding firmly to the Apostolic practices, existed in Britain hundreds of years before Augustine, the Roman monk, landed on British shores.

Having spoken already of the external relations of this Church to the Church at large, of her representatives in the Early Councils, etc., we shall now proceed to speak of her internal position and history, and thereby strengthen the conclusion already arrived at, viz., that the Early British Church was entirely independent of the Church of Rome, in fact a stranger to many of the uses of that branch of the Church, up to the time of and for many years after Augustine's coming to England. We must begin by going back to the days before Augustine's arrival to note the