

Dominion Churchman.

THE ORGAN OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN CANADA.

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 can easily see when their subscriptions fall due by looking at the address label on their paper.

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 York Chambers, Toronto St., Toronto

FRANKLIN B. BILL, Advertising Manager.

LESSONS for SUNDAYS and HOLY-DAYS.

JAN. 7. SECOND SUNDAY AFTER EPHIPHANY
Morning... Isaiah lv.; Matthew viii. 18.
Evening... Isaiah lvii. or lxi.; Acts viii. 26.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 11, 1888.

PAY YOUR SUBSCRIPTIONS.

In this number of the DOMINION CHURCHMAN, envelopes are enclosed for subscribers (who have not yet paid) to remit their arrears and also in advance. We trust this will be a sufficient hint for all to pay up immediately. Those who have already done so, will be doing a kind favour by forwarding one dollar for a new subscription.

OUR esteemed and gifted friend, the editor of the *Canadian Illustrated News*, writes as follows of Archbishop Benson:—"The appointment of an Archbishop of Canterbury is in any case an important event for the Church of England, especially in the position in which its relations with the State are now placed. That in the appointment of Dr. Benson no political purpose has been followed is evident, for the new Archbishop is not only a staunch Conservative, but was the nominee of the late Lord Beaconsfield for the See of Truro. This significant fact makes the victory of the High Church party all the more marked, and when to the Archbishop's well-known principles is added the fact that he is a comparatively young, and a remarkably energetic man, it must be evident that his influence upon the future of the Church must be very great.

The present writer may be allowed, perhaps, a sort of personal interest in the appointment, inasmuch as for eight years he was at Wellington College under Dr. (then Mr.) Benson, and for more than half that time under his personal teaching in the sixth form. As a head master, he was one of the most successful of his time. He came to Wellington, then a new school numbering some sixty or seventy boys. He left it fifteen years later, with a role of nearly four hundred, and applications for admission so numerous that it now takes several years to gain admission for a pupil; and with a claim to rank amongst the great public schools, which no one can question, and a good reputation not only at the Universities and Woolwich, but in the playing fields and at Princes. A better record than this no head master can have.

As a class teacher Benson was remarkably successful. His range of general knowledge was very extensive, and what is more unusual, remarkably accurate. It was scarcely possible, either in the class room (or at the dinner table in later days), to propound any subject to which he was unable to contribute some facts, often garnished with copious quotations, and invariably correct so far as they went. His lessons were filled with miscellaneous illustrations, and but for an occasional loss of

temper, when some unfortunate was likely to suffer were fascinating in the extreme. But he was more than an amusing teacher. His scholarship was very ripe and wonderfully accurate, and in his hatred of a false quantity, he forgot occasionally the Christian precept of loving the sinner in spite of his sin. *Eheu! fugaces*—We can see his good qualities now more clearly than perhaps we saw them then. But the moral of all this tale perhaps more than any other, is his thoroughness as master, as chancellor, as bishop, and now, we doubt not, as Primate of England. He had, more than any man I can remember, that essential attribute of success—backbone. And the Church of England will yet, I believe, see how stiff it is.

The above allusion to the humour of the new Primate, reminds us of a like characteristic in his predecessor, who was never so happy as when witnessing the frolics of young people, and sharing their amusement with unrepressed glee. To look at that sad face of his one would hardly believe so solemn a pair of lips could ripple with a joke, but when his cares were heaviest, Dr. Tait could find mental relief in humorous sallies of merry banter or retort. The love of and capacity for humour are indeed so intensely human, that men of large natures, strong men in influence, are rarely without these traits. Humour and pathos are indeed inseparable, and he who as a writer or speaker is incapable of pathos, is ill equipped for any work which calls for the keep of the heart.

The annual recital at St. Paul's Cathedral of Spohr's *Last Judgment*, as Professor Taylor's version of the oratio, *Die Letzten Dinge*, is styled, suggests the reflection that it would be well to use Cathedrals more frequently for such imposing "services of song." To ask for additional orchestral services would be equivalent to suggesting a heavy tax upon the Cathedral revenues; but as it is a genuine treat to musicians to listen to the music of the great masters sung with proper organ accompaniment, it is only a question of enlisting the services of the choirsters for this special work. It might, also, be worthy of the consideration of the Deans and Chapters, and organists, whether a more elementary "service of song" might not be occasionally given, in which solos and anthems by members of the Cathedral choir could be alternated with hymns and chorales sung by the people. "Hymnal oratorios," as they are termed, have been welcomed in parish churches, and they would probably meet with a still more cordial reception in our Cathedrals.

That oratorios ought to be performed in churches, and not in concert halls, seems to us a truism, and why any and what reasonable objection can be raised to such works being heard in a sacred edifice, surpasses our power to guess at. We heard the *Messiah* first in a village church, given wholly by miners and village folk who spent their leisure in practising such charming and edifying music. Had they been prohibited the Church, they would have dropped their music for cards or dice, or drink. Music and musical talents are God's gifts, very blessed ones, and in thankfulness for them they should be exercised in their noblest forms in His Temples.

Some rearrangement of the methods by which Episcopal vacancies in the colonial dioceses are filled up would seem to be imperatively demanded in the interests of the Church, for there is much inconvenience, and not a little want of dignity, in such public statements as have been made in reference to the Sydney bishopric. The announcement of the selection in Australia of three English clergymen was speedily followed by a note to the effect that Bishop Parry would not feel able to accept the post, and this was followed by a "*Nolo episcopari*" on the part of Canon Fleming, uttered from the pulpit of his church in Chester Square. Would it not be more consonant with

Church order, and more consistent with common delicacy, to regard all the negotiations as private until their completion made it possible to render such disclaimers altogether needless? *Church Bells* ask this; we reply, "Does not common sense suggest that before any name is put up for voting upon, that the owner of it should be asked to assent?"

The discussion still goes on in the English press touching the best way of making the Prayer Book more easy to use by persons who do not read freely, or follow indications quickly. That some reform is needed, cannot be denied; but so far no plan suggested really meets the difficulty. Finding the collect of the day takes usually as much time as saying it, and few people turn to any special parts of the service. The Psalms are numbered in a way to baffle the young and unlearned, and a stranger to our services is bewildered if he attempts to use a Prayer Book. Much of this is needless; it comes down from a time when the people did not follow the clergy as they now do. To-day the Romanist worshipper does not use his Missal as we use our Prayer Books, but mainly for private devotion, often utterly regardless of what is being done at the altar.

An old clergyman writes thus on Unsectarian Charities:—"The Christian public is being continually appealed to for aid in support of this or that charity, and it is often made a ground of special appeal that the charity in question is strictly unsectarian in its character. In other cases, although this feature is not prominently announced, it is often found on inquiry that the charity is conducted practically on the same lines (in religious matters) as those which openly profess their unsectarianism. The reason, I think, is obvious: the system pays; it draws in Dissenters' support, and it draws in also the support of "large-hearted Churchmen, whose religious views differ very little from those of their Dissenting neighbours. But now, what are the lines on which such unsectarian charities are practically conducted? They are, I believe, simply these: that while ministrations and literature of a sectarian or dissenting character are freely admitted and welcomed, those which are of a distinctively Church character would be discouraged, or even disallowed, for they would be thought to compromise the character of the Institution. Now, I do not write to complain of the inconsistency of such a mode of proceeding, but to ask my brother Churchmen and Churchwomen, Is it consistent with true fealty to the Church of Christ to support any unsectarian charity, when such a system is either openly or practically carried out? Is there not abundant room for every penny of our alms being devoted to cases which do not aid charities conducted on such loose and time-serving religious principles? I would certainly aid the suffering, without regard to race or creed; but I would at the same time confine my assistance to such charities as do at the least give full and free welcome to ministrations and literature of a definitely Church character. The subject is worth consideration.

Worth consideration! It demands consideration. There cannot be a doubt that what are styled "unsectarian" institutions, are almost without exception, intensely sectarian, are often governed by sectarians for sectarian ends, and Churchpeople's money is used to do the Church injury and wrong. Besides this, there is an enormous waste of money and energy in administering the varied, duplicated and triplicated machines of charity, which in these busy days are used by Christians for doing their duty, just as prayer wheels are used in the East. We want fewer institutions, and more personal devotion to the sick and poor. The Church is capable of doing every good work this world needs, without any sectarian institutions; but if we will not do these works, we have no right to cry out against others doing them.