

OUR NEXT ISSUE, SEPTEMBER 3rd.

In consequence of taking our Annual Holiday, there will be no issue of the Dominion Churchman on the 27th of August. Our next will be the 3rd of September.

WASHING THE CHURCH'S DIRTY LINEN IN PUBLIC.

WHY is it that Churchmen are so ready to rush into print whenever some little breeze springs up in their own Church circle, or in some other congregation with whose affairs they intermeddle? What interest has the great Canadian public in that tremendous question, surplice *versus* black gown, now convulsing a section of St. James' Parish Church, Toronto? Are the people of Canada gaping with insatiable interest to know what anonymous writers have got to say about Amen and Awmen? Are the pious members of our Church and of other religious bodies edified by or interested in the operation of washing the Church's dirty linen in public, in which wretched job so many, who are not pious but passionate, are so fond of exhibiting their skill? Does it never occur to those who are for ever parading themselves as censors and critics of their brethren, as indeed veritable Apollyons and Accusers, that their vehement party-passion, spite, maledictions, dire prophecies, and almost universal mendacity of malignity, are so utterly scandalous that no truly Christian-minded person, no one with a loving, forgiving, forbearing disposition, can regard their work without loathing and pain? Have they so little respect for that noble word Evangelical, that they are determined to associate it with rancorous and absurd accusations? Have those, for instance, who make the saying Amen or Awmen the supreme, infallible test of Evangelicalism, or the reverse, no friends to tell them how dense is their ignorance? Are they indeed serious, or is some wicked mocker, masked behind a Churchman's name, poking fun at religion, and seeking to make its profession contemptible? Can we suppose any sane member of our Church so devoid of historical knowledge, common sense, and a decent share of sanity, as really in very truth to believe that the great upheaval of the Reformation all turned upon the wearing of a black gown or surplice? Yet several writers have said this in our public prints! What a glorious Reformation it must have been on this theory, almost equal in dignity to the squabble of washerwomen at their tubs. Have our people no knowledge of this fact, that the press they use for this discreditable exhibition of bad temper, ignorance and unevangelical backbiting, glories in making the Church of England a laughing stock? The paper commonly used by these scandal-making and retailing scribblers, is a bitter enemy of the Church, its control is dual; one the most violent form of political dissent, the other the intensest form of ultramontane Popery. To such a paper, letters which disgrace the Church are delicious

morsels. The writers who fondly fancy their rabid effusions are printed out of sympathy with their cause are fearfully "sold," if the slang may be pardoned. The Editor passes on such letters with a sardonic laugh at the marvellously damaging exhibition Churchmen continually make of themselves and their Church. We never see such letters from members of other Churches, yet they have their congregational spats as troublesome as any of ours. Either the sense of loyalty to the body is keener in the Presbyterians, Wesleyans and others, or they are less troubled with cranks afflicted with the scribbling mania. We believe the truth is they are loyal to their body and we have members who are disloyal. Further, we have strong grounds for asserting that these shameful letters are traceable to one source, they come out in shoals like bullets from a Gatling, but one or two men are working the crank which sets them loose. We grievously need discipline for such offenders. No organization can thrive when its members use their privileged position to harry, worry, and annoy their brethren by anonymous attacks. We condemn thus severely, this incessant stream of letters appealing to the public in regard to Church matters, about which the vast public care not a straw, save as an occasion for a laugh or a sneer, because they cannot by any chance accomplish any result but mischief. They are a scandal to all of us. The very name of Churchman is fast becoming a synonym for rabid excitement over trifles. The Church is coming to be regarded as a rat pit by those who judge us by our public correspondence. Do let us have peace, and a little patience, and a little fraternal charity. The Catholic Church has many mansions, but not one inch of ground for quarrels. These are fought out on ground outside the domain of religion, and with weapons unknown in the armory of God.

SOME BOLD ASSERTIONS.

THE Vatican and its entourage wax no shyer as the world grows older. If Vaticanism is not the perfection of Governmental system, it is not for the want of claiming that merit. From the egg to the apple, Romanism sings the same song, "The Church is the support of just government." This threadbare theme has again come to the front, the occasion being the appointment of Dr. Walsh, a pronounced Fenian, to the usurped office of Roman Archbishop of Dublin, who, as the avowed opponent of righteous government in Ireland, by his mere presence in the Irish Capital proves that the policy of the Curia is virtually a policy of retrogression into spiritual despotism.

Of course, many deny this. How shall they be undeceived? They won't read for themselves; they won't use their eyes. Possibly they may use their ears. Would it not, therefore, be the wiser course for the Church to take the matter up as a body? When the blatant but pernicious nonsense uttered by those who preach a pseudo liberality is published in the public press, should she not at once nail the lie

in her own organs, or treat the subject familiarly on the lecture platform in the Sunday School and Bible class, or in the pulpit? It will be found that, to the majority, the fact that we are the Catholics, and Romanists the true Protestants, is news to the multitude, who know just as much about the history of the Church, her doctrines, and her discipline, as the average Romanist does of the real teaching. The mutual ignorance of his Church as opposed to the accretions of Vaticanism. The mutual ignorance in which each is sunk from a potent factor on the side of the Papal Curia, and affords it a leverage which it is only too ready to employ—for its own interests, not for the good of the State.

Yet this very appointment of an avowed enemy of good government, is in itself useful as a handle to be employed against the assumption of liberality, put forward by Bishop Ireland of St. Paul, in his sermon preached at the opening of last year's Plenary Council at Baltimore, in which that prelate claimed everything for Rome, and complained because the spirit of the age was so unreasonable, and men so prejudiced as still to entertain a prejudice against the Communion to which he belonged, as if she were an institution too hard for governments to get along with; as if she interfered with the duties of citizenship by dividing the allegiance "of subjects." To a student, even of modern Irish history, the effrontery of this claim to undivided loyalty towards the State, in the face of the records of all time, is simply amazing.

But when we remember that Cardinal Manning, on being told that the Infallibility dogma would necessitate the re-writing of the history of Christendom, in so many words devoted history to effacement:—"So much the worse for history!"—our amazement comes to an end. When therefore, we read Bishop Ireland's denial that the Roman Church was ever anything else than the support of just governments, and that her motto has ever been to render Cæsar's things to Cæsar, and God's to God, to reserve the temporal administration, the practical method of government, to the State exclusively, we simply laugh at the man's contempt for the laws of truth, and in that contempt read a denial of his claim that the "[Roman] Church proclaims the principles of justice and morality which are binding upon men, whether as individuals or communities." Nor again are we startled when we find him fulminating against the "individual conscience, uninstructed by the light of private reason." It was of obligation that he should save the rights of his order and Communion—even at the expense of truth, nor was it unlooked for that he should have a shy at Protestantism in the jump—for, of course, he was careful not to define the term as a system that "did nothing for liberty," that had "introduced into the world not one new principle that favoured liberty," whose "claim to private judgment was religious anarchy," and in civil and political matters, "political anarchy which always leads to despotism." "Protestantism (he added) is not an organized force, and its con-