

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 Weotten, 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.

May 2nd - SUNDAY AFTER ASCENSION.
Morning.—Deut. xxx. John vii. 25.
Evening.—Deut. xxxiv. Josh. i. 1 Titus i.

THURSDAY, MAY 19, 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.

THE CHURCH CATHOLIC, REFORMED, AND PROTESTANT.—An esteemed correspondent expresses pleasure at the use of the word "Protestant." We have no fear of any combination of letters or syllables; these things are very harmless. We do fear however, speaking the thing that is not, or concealing the thing that ought to be unveiled for truth's sake. For to call the Church of Christ "The Protestant Church," is to do our Lord's Body dishonor; it is to make that which is universal and Divine, human and partial. But we Churchmen are Protestants to the very core necessarily, for holding Truth we thereby protest against error, not merely Romanist, but of all kinds. We expressed surprise and regret recently at a preacher from and of a certain school showing his want of loyalty to the Church by ignoring the very existence of the Church of England in a discourse upon our national glories. A case of Hamlet with Hamlet's part left out! Nay, a case of ignoring Christ, for it is by His work in England by His Church, that England has any glory to glory in. Let our Evangelical friends forget those things of strife that are behind, and press forward to those things before us all that make for peace and for strength and for expansion, and they will find that the more honor they pay the Church the higher and deeper will become their love and worship and obedience to the Head of the Body in Whom they as Churchmen live and move and have their being.

THE CHURCHMAN MAGAZINE ON PARTY REFORM.—This admirable publication is the highest literary expression of the life and thought of the Evangelicals of England. A passage in the May number is as follows: "It is only of late years

that the ordinary laymen of the Church of England have begun to realize the greatness of his Church or even to think about it at all. Especially is this true of the Evangelical layman. If he were Evangelical merely in a party sense, his enthusiasm was easily evoked by the word 'Protestant,' but the sound of the word 'Church' made him feel uneasy, and he would suspect any speaker using it much as of Romeward proclivities. If he was an Evangelical in the true sense, a godly and praying man, he dreaded, and rightly dreaded anything that seemed to put the Church in the place of Christ; and he shrank from calling himself a Churchman, for fear he might by so doing disparage the higher name of Christian. Thousands of excellent Sunday School teachers looked askance at the Church Catechism, and we remember a goodly lady, a Churchwoman all her life, expressing her astonishment that so staunch an Evangelical should speak so enthusiastically of the Church of England. That there is a great change in this respect among Evangelical people we can all see. Does that change imply Romeward proclivities, or putting the Church in the place of Christ? Assuredly not. It is the result of two causes; first the enormously increased power of the Church of England as a spiritual agency; second, the insults upon her from without. Men and women engaged in practical evangelistic work, or who like to hear of and help it, see that the Church is in the fore front in all that is being done to save souls. Men and women who love the Word of God have seen the Church alone stand firm in defence of the Bible in the school. (how true this of Canada!) so that an Evangelical man feels that he can still put Christ and the Gospel first, still sympathize with all who do the same, though they be not Churchmen, still be proud of the ancient historical Church, Catholic, Reformed, Protestant, National, to which he belongs."

How much higher is the tone of the above than that of so many who use the same party name in Canada. No English Evangelical of this generation would, like the curate of St. James', Toronto, utterly ignore the existence of the Church of England in a discourse upon the sources and manifestations of England's glory. One often wonders what induces men to seek Orders in the Church of which they seem ashamed?

THE PARNELL LETTER.—It is needless for us to give the story of this famous letter. The London Times, a journal sober in management, even to sleepiness, according to modern ideas, gave a fac simile of this letter, and not a paper in Europe or the civilized world failed to notice the fact. We furnish our readers with the comments of the chief Church paper of England, The Times, we may say, of the Church of England, which, some of our friends will notice, discusses politics in every issue from an independent standpoint. The London Guardian says:

"That the Times not only believes its charges to be true, but has considerable apparent reason for so believing, is plain from the consequences it will incur if the contrary can be proved. To address such a challenge to Mr. Parnell is to risk an enormous property and to expose those primarily responsible for circulating the charges to great personal and professional inconvenience. If the Times can be shown to have no good ground for believing Mr. Parnell to be cognisant of the fac simile letter, its reputation as a leader of opinion will be gone, and its editor will justly be visited with a heavy sentence of imprisonment. Why should it thus place itself at Mr. Parnell's mercy?"

No matter how conclusive may be the evidence the Times has in its possession, it cannot produce it in a court of justice unless Mr. Parnell will give it the opportunity. The charge it makes against him is not technically an offence. There is no statutory penalty for saying that a murdered man deserved what he got. It is not as if the Times had said that Mr. Parnell is himself guilty of murder. In

that case a warrant might be applied for, and the whole case might be gone into first in the police-court, and then, if a prima facie case was made out, in the Central Criminal Court. But when the offence charged is moral, not legal, the only way in which it can be proved is as a defence against an action of libel. The procedure in such an action would rightly conform to Mr. Gladstone's canon. The burden of proof would lie on them that made the charge. Mr. Parnell would have to prove nothing beyond the publication of the libel. It would be for the Times to justify that publication by proving that the letter was genuine.

If it were Mr. Parnell's character alone that were at stake we should not presume to question the prudence of the course he has thought fit to follow. He must be fully aware of the interpretation to which the omission to answer the challenge of the Times leaves him open, and if notwithstanding this he takes no notice of it, it may be for very good reasons. It is the conduct of the Liberal Opposition that really concerns us. It is incredible that if the Times had brought charges equally grave and equally circumstantial against Sir William Harcourt or Mr. Morley they would have been treated with the same indifference. So good an opportunity of convicting the Times of falsehood would certainly not have been neglected. Why, then, do not the English Liberals urge Mr. Parnell to vindicate his honor in the same way? We know of no reason except that they are oppressed by the doubt whether if driven into a corner he would be able to vindicate it. They are not sure whether the effect of a trial would not be to disgrace beyond redemption the leader of their new allies, and they feel—this much credit may still be given them—that if he were so disgraced they could no longer avail themselves of his support. Rather than risk the loss of eighty five votes they are lavish of assurances that his own denial is all that is required to clear him.

PRACTICAL RELIGION.—We want a religion that softens the step and tunes the voice to melody, and checks the impatient exclamation and harsh rebuke; a religion that is polite, deferential to superiors, courteous to inferiors, and considerate to friends; a religion that goes into the family, and keeps the husband from being cross when the dinner is late, and keeps the wife from fretting when the husband tracks the newly-washed floor with his muddy boots, and makes the husband mindful of the scraper and the door-mat; keeps the mother patient when the baby is fretful, and amuses the children as well as instructs them; cares for the servants besides paying them promptly; projects the honeymoon into the harvest-moon, and makes the happy home like the Eastern fig-tree, bearing in its bosom at once the beauty of its tender blossoms and the glory of its ripened fruit. We want a religion that shall interpose between the ruts and gullies and rocks of the highway of life, and the sensitive souls that are travelling over them.

—Ask the man who has the most holiness what he thinks of himself, and he will be the first to lament that he has not yet reached the point which he desires. We are like those old-fashioned wine glasses which had no foot to them, so that they could not stand upon the table, but must be held in the hand. When Jesus has us in His hand we can be filled with the water of life; but out of His hand we cannot hold a drop, nor can we stand.

—Eternal self-communion is our destiny. Shall it be communion with selves that we must abhor or despise, or with selves into which we can look with gladness and gratitude?

—Who hath a greater combat than he that laboureth to overcome himself? This ought to be our endeavour, to conquer ourselves and daily wax stronger and to make a further growth of holiness.