

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 made, and then collect the whole amount, whether the paper 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 3640.
Office, No. 11 Imperial Buildings, 30 Adelaide St. E
west of Post Office, Toronto.

FRANKLIN BAKER, Advertising Manager.

LESSONS FOR SUNDAYS AND HOLY DAYS.

Mar. 31st.—FOURTH SUNDAY IN LENT.
Morning.—Gen. 42.—5 to v. 17.
Evening.—Gen. 43 or 45. 2 Cor. 4.

THURSDAY, MAR. 28, 1889.

The Rev. W. H. Wadleigh is the only gentleman travelling authorized to collect subscriptions for the "Dominion Churchman."

ADVICE TO ADVERTISERS.—The *Toronto Saturday Night* in an article entitled "Advertising as a Fine Art" says, that the DOMINION CHURCHMAN is widely circulated and of unquestionable advantage to judicious advertisers.

CHARACTERISTIC.—The habit of fraternizing with sectarian in preference to their Church brethren, leads those who do so at times to the doing and to saying things which are questionable not in taste only, but in morality. In their anxiety to please their nonconformist companions they pander to their prejudices, confirm their ignorances, and inflame their animosities against the Church. A striking illustration of this is given in a letter to the *Globe*, by the young clergyman who declared that there were 800 Jesuits amongst his ministerial brethren. In that letter he declared that his authority for this crazy slander, also stated that there were a number of Jesuits in the ministry of the Presbyterian and Wesleyan bodies. Now surely common honesty demanded that in stating that there were Jesuits amongst our clergy, he should have also given the rest of this charge or statement affirming that there were also Jesuits amongst the nonconformist ministers. But he willfully suppressed that which might have damaged or annoyed his sectarian associates, and gave only that which was calculated to injure the Church of England, of which he is a paid official! It is quite as wicked to thus wilfully suppress the truth as to state wilfully that which is not the truth. This tender regard for sectarians and ruthless attack upon the whole ministry of the Church, shows that he who so discriminated is not in his right place amongst our clergy—his heart is not with us. He is not a true son of the English Church who slanders his brethren wholesale.

IN NEED OF ELEMENTARY TEACHING.—The writer of the letter above alluded to gives his authority for declaring that there are 800 Jesuits amongst our clergy in these words; "A French Jesuit paper published in Paris in 1884, I think it was." So this wholesale slander has no foundation except a Jesuit paper, of which however the repeater of it is not sure, he only thinks it was, and yet he, in the same letter, affirms that the Jesuits believe "the end justifies the means." While on general principles he regards the Jesuits as liars, he accepts as absolutely true any statement of theirs which is likely to injure the Church of England! He deliberately, as a priest of the Church of England, declares that he prefers the word of a Jesuit paper to the solemn assertions of those church clergy whom he slanders, and he places more reliance upon a Jesuit paper than on the solemn pledge given by our Bishops, who in and by the act of ordination assure the Church of the loyalty of those they ordain! Imagine the sort of teaching a young clergyman has been the victim of, who supposes a Jesuit paper to be a sound authority on the internal life of the Church of England! He might as well take any old woman at a wash tub as an authority on a critical point of theology. It is revolting, it is shocking, it is humiliating, that we are getting into the priesthood of our Church men who are so illiterate as to base statements injurious to the Church on what they think they saw in a Jesuit newspaper, and which being there they regard as a sufficient authority for accepting such slander and spreading it! No demonstration of its falsehood could be more satisfactory than the "authority" which the Rev. Francis M. Baldwin gives for the disgraceful libel he has promulgated as to there being 800 Jesuits serving in the sacred ministry of the Church of England. He would do well to seek elementary teaching on what constitutes an "authority" in the judgment of educated men. He speaks in his letter of the Church as, "a Church of the Reformation," elementary teaching on this matter he also grievously needs.

We do not dwell on this unhappy incident from any personal considerations, it is folly to break a fly on the wheel. But as grave an issue as any before the Church is raised by this affair. It has manifested the disloyal spirit being infused into our young clergy, and shown the lamentably deficient training they undergo. The Church has far less to fear from want of clergy than from having our parishes placed in charge of men who are ready to circulate any wholesale slander against the Church that her enemies invent, and who fancy that anything in print, even in a Jesuit paper, is to be quoted as an authority for ought said which is injurious to the Church. Such clergy will soon so infest the Church in their parishes with dry rot, as to make her a laughing stock for those who are without.

THE BISHOP OF LINCOLN.—The saintly character of Dr. King is a weighty factor in judging the prudence and wisdom of the action against him. The cry has been that those who observe a ceremonial, such as the Bishop is being prosecuted for observing, are mere "formalists," that they make religion to consist wholly of ritual, they have been constantly compared to the most deluded victims of papal superstition, they have been accused of gross ignorance of the very elements of evangelical truth, yet here is a Bishop, who is admitted by all parties alike, to be one of the most spiritually minded men of the age, and he is being prosecuted for ritual observances that are said to be a certain sign of utter lack of spirituality! A letter from the clergyman to whom Dr. King first went after ordination, writes of him as follows:—Those who are now striving to herry the Bishop to the death, little know the manner of man whom they are pursuing. He was my surate between four and five years, in a difficult parish, which had been greatly neglected. I soon discovered how pre-eminently

he was a man of prayer; how deeply versed in Holy Scripture, and saintly in life; how yearning to do work for God among the depraved and ignorant people of the place. Thirty years have passed since those days, but he is not in the least forgotten in my old parish. There are several persons living now in whose conversion to God he was instrumental, to whom he proved, in the truest sense, a messenger of peace. I found, as time went on, how true was the description given, before he came to me, by a beloved tutor of his College, now gone to his rest, "King is indeed a royal fellow." "O sic omnes."

It is simply a matter of duty to say this, for the information of those who, judging from the tone of his persecutors, imagine that he is one absolutely absorbed in Ritual observance. Bishop King is nothing of the kind. His heart is too full of work for God, in the ministry of souls, to be absorbed by any subordinate matter, however interesting. He dwells habitually in an atmosphere too serene to be influenced by either Party warfare or narrow prejudices. There is nothing which has more moved the indignation of his friends than the charge brought against him of disloyalty to the English Church. In fact, it is his very loyalty to her which, I am confident, has brought him to his present position.

It has always been a guiding principle with him, to go back, not to mere Roman teaching, which he would abhor, but to the faith and practice in earlier times, the possession of which is her true and rightful heritage. Such is the man whom a promiscuous band of enemies seek now to despoil, and whose removal from his high place they are thirsting to accomplish. If, unhappily, they should succeed, they will, at least, though unwittingly, procure for him a greater honour; for when this generation has passed, and its miserable party-warfare is hushed, the name of Edward, Bishop of Lincoln, enrolled to all time among the noble army of confessors, will be regarded with reverence and love by many who come after us.

Bishop Wilberforce was once branded as a Romaniser, his words are now quoted by the same lips as those of a "defender of the Faith."

THE MEN WITH ONE TALENT.—The Bishop of Ripon preaching on the parable of the talents said: What, he asked in the course of his remarks, was religion? Conduct, said some, was three-fourths of life. Religion was neither opinion nor action. Character was the important thing. What a man believed, or, in theological parlance, the doctrines of the creed, did influence character. But Divine grace came in; it had to put the spirit of love into the character. There could be no character without love. It gave constancy to the character. Then, again, character could not be transferred. The foolish virgins thought the oil could be given them from the lamps of the wise virgins. Character stood firm, and was not to be given away. The second parable suggested the conduct of life. Life was an opportunity. The whole point was, what were we doing in life, not how much have we of it. The man who said he had no opportunities of doing great things, who said, "If only I had five talents, what should I not accomplish? but what do you expect of me with my poor one talent?" was essentially a conceited man. He was immeasurably conceited. How did he know that if things had been otherwise arranged for him he would have accomplished such wonders? Was it the men with many talents who had done the greatest deeds? No, for great opportunities bred great timidity. Look at what the men with one talent did—look at John Howard, with his sole talent of capacity for love. And was it not a proverbial saying that it was the men who had come to London with half-a-crown in their pocket who had carved out for themselves name and fame? Yes, it was the one-talented men who did heroic things, who were the true heroes.