

# 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 uncalled 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 Wootten, 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.

4th SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

Morning—Job xxvii. Matthew xvi. 24 to xvii. 14.  
Evening—Job xxviii. or xxix. Acts xviii. to 24.

THURSDAY, JAN. 27, 1887.

**POPERY—THE DOUBLE FACED.**—A dispute has arisen in New York between a Roman Catholic priest, Dr. McGlynn and his superior, Archbishop Corrigan. The quarrel "is a pretty one as it stands," inasmuch as it reveals Popish tactics in a by no means new but by all means in a scandalous light. Dr. McGlynn, it appears, approves of the views of Mr. Henry George, the socialist land reformer. In order to give an exact idea of what Henry George teaches, we give the following cutting from his own paper—as near *fac-simile* as possible.

"THE SOCIETY FOR THE PROPAGATION OF THE GOSPEL among Landlords solicits the support of Christians. All previous efforts having proved of no avail in inducing landowners to restore to the public those values which the natural necessities of the people give to the land, this society has been formed to appeal to the landlords' conscience by means of Gospel truth. The attention of landlords is respectfully called to the fact that they have become rich without labor, through laws made by their class whereby the state-earned increment upon land, instead of being voted for taxes and public purposes, as it should have been, thus doing with all other taxes, has slipped into their pockets. It is now hoped that the efforts of this society to propagate the Gospel truths of justice and equity will so awaken the landlord conscience that it may come to see what so many Christians already apprehend, that their appropriation of the commonwealth property is the cause of lack of work and starvation among workers, and the enrichment of the idle, so prevalent all over the world."

Now this view of the landlords' position is that upon which the Irish Nationalist movement is based. But in Ireland the Romanist bishops and priests are openly aiding and abetting the anti-landlord crusade. Dr. McGlynn, poor simple man! fancied that what was approved in Ireland would also be orthodox in New York. He, however, found out his blunder. The Papal Church boasts of being and having been, always and everywhere the same. The boast is made with the tongue thrust hard into the cheek! Dr. McGlynn has been deprived of his charge for teaching a social theory which the Church of Rome has blessed and put into practice in Ireland. In the words of Mr. George's newspaper, "His sin is in taking a side in politics which was opposed to the ring that had the support of the Catholic hierarchy."

We are in the same condemnation, and extend our sympathy to the brave priest who, however mistaken in his notions, has proved himself a manly fellow. This Roman Catholic priest defied his ecclesiastical ruler, and subjects himself to such a severe punishment as deprivation of priestly functions, "because he resents the outrageous attempts to use the power of Rome in American politics." Compare this Romanist with Protestant editors, like those of the *Evangelical Churchman*, and others, who actually sank their Protestant convictions in order to assist a political party in making profit out of an outrageous attempt to use the power of Rome in Canadian politics! Popery, as we see in this case, can exercise a grinding tyranny over the mind and conscience. But the spectacle we have seen of late and are yet shown, of Protestant newspapers silenced by the power of Rome, of Protestant editors compelled to work in the shafts dragging the chariot of popery in triumph, that right demonstrates the existence in the sphere of Canadian politics of a tyranny over mind and conscience as debasing as ever humbled the most cowardly victim of Rome!

**WHAT ONTARIO IS COMING TO.**—In the *Methodist Magazine* for January, 1887, the Rev. Dr. Stevenson thus speaks of educational affairs in Melbourne, Australia. Unless we in Ontario stand firm "the slavery of the Government to the Roman Catholic electors," will bring down our schools to the same moral degradation which Dr. Stevenson describes. "The worst feature of the Victorian system of education is its offensive secularism. It is not only irreligious, it is anti-religious at least so far as the influence of the Ministry of Education can make it so. No religious services are permitted in the schools and the Bible is strictly excluded. And more still, at the bidding of Jewish or infidel parties in the electorate, all passages which in any sense recognize Christ Jesus as worthy of reverence, are expunged from the reading books. Nelson's Royal Readers are used in the schools, but only in the form of an edition specially prepared to the order of the Victorian Government, in which all passages that could be supposed to be Christian in their implications are cast out.

"Some of our finest poetry has been murdered at the bidding of this worse than heathen vandalism in order that such words as 'Christ' and 'Christian' may not be heard in the State School walls. So far as the Government is concerned, all is done to secure that a child shall be able to pass through the whole of its school course without suspecting any such thing as Christianity ever existed on the planet.

"The slavery of the Government to the Roman Catholic electors lead them to treat history as their slavery to the infidel and Jewish electors leads them to treat religion.

"English history is tabooed for obvious reasons, and so the youth of Victoria are being brought up in entire ignorance of the history of the nation from which they sprung. The landing at Botany Bay is the dawn of history to them, and their legislators seem to think that an intelligent and self-respecting English community can be reared to whom Hastings, Runnymede, Orecy, Naseby, the Boyne and Waterloo have no meaning whatever.

"Happy indeed—far happier than their truest friends can hope—will the Victorian people be if they do not find this policy one day bearing bitter fruit."

That is in many respects true of Canada. Our youths are grossly ignorant of English history, and Churchmen's children are crammed with falsehoods as to Church history.

**DR. MOORHOUSE ON A SELF-APPOINTED MINISTRY.**—The Bishop of Manchester recently attended the inaugural meeting of the diocesan Society of Lay-Helpers, but in his address he said they had not met to inaugurate lay help. To have done that

would have involved the impossibility that our National Church had been leading a fruitful and successful existence for sixteen centuries—for he believed the British Church existed in the second century—without calling out the efforts of her faithful members. It was quite true mistakes were sometimes made as to the proper position of the laity in the Church of England. He had, for instance, heard a person say, "I mean to send my boy into the Church," meaning the ministry of the Church; but, of course, in saying that such a parent took the less for the greater. The boy was already in the Church; he was introduced into it by holy baptism. He could not help thinking that such a mistake of language denoted an imperfect idea as to the position, duties, and privileges of the lay members of the Church of England. He thought that until within the last century that misapprehension was almost universal. That the laity should maintain the clergy, that they should keep the church fabric in order, that they should assist in ecclesiastical administration, that they should contribute funds out of which the clergyman might relieve the poor of the flock—all that was clearly seen; but it was not so clearly seen that the lay believer should assist the clergyman not only charity and administration, but also in teaching and comforting the flock. He was only expressing his own personal opinion when he said he thought the time would come when properly qualified laymen, who had been properly authorised, would be asked to assist in teaching not only in Mission rooms, but also in consecrated buildings. That step had been taken in the diocese of which he was the last Bishop, and there seemed to be nothing to prevent it in England but a certain clause in the Act of Uniformity, which, perhaps, in course of time might be justly repealed. By saying that it was intended to procure an authoritative commission for the laity, he meant that it had been the doctrine of the Church Catholic in all ages that the authority for spiritual mission came above and not from below; that in conformity with the usages of the Church at first, so the Church in all ages should only have its ministers authorised by those who had authority given them to set apart people for teaching and ministering. He believed that the Church in all ages, and the Church of England in this age, had organized itself upon the apostolic principle, had imitated the apostolic practice, and had received and transmitted that authority which had come historically down to them from Christ Himself. He held it to be a most important principle that no man might set himself apart, and no man might be set apart by people of the same ecclesiastical level as himself who had not received authority to set people apart. A man must have received authority or he had no business to do it. In the Church of England the Bishops were the persons who had received authority to set people apart and give them mission. There was nothing particular in the Bishop to distinguish him from other people, and he might perhaps be very inferior in mental and spiritual qualities to many of the presbyters of his diocese, but he had received authority to give spiritual mission and they had not. Hence he was distinguished from them. He desired to see the members of the Church brought into one united phalanx, and when that was done he believed they would help the Church materially, inwardly and outwardly. He hoped to see not one member here and another there, but every man who was doing any work for Christ doing it under the aegis of the National Church. He would ask with what spirit they would then be able to work in defence of the Church, and with what efficacy and energy the Church's proper mission would be executed? Church workers should form one great army—a kind of imperial guard—a body of men who would give to the rest confidence in the battle, and victory in the critical moment. With such a body of workers they would increase the Church's efficiency in every direction.