

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 rate 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.
Oct. 29th 21st SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.
Morning—Daniel iii. 1 Timothy i. 18 & ii.
Evening—Daniel iv. or v. Luke xviii to 31.

THURSDAY, OCT. 29, 1888.

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

LECTURES BY REV. JOHN LANGTRY, M.A.—We have much pleasure in being able to publish the lectures given by the Rev. John Langtry, rector of St. Luke's, Toronto, who has entered the lists as the champion of the Catholic Church, against the Roman Catholic Archbishop, whose misrepresentation of our position, historic and doctrinal, Mr. Langtry is exposing with great ability. We note that one non-denominational paper which never loses an opportunity to sneer at the Church in true Romanist style, ridicules the contest between Mr. Langtry and Dr. Lynch, as incapable of doing any good. It is singular but instructive to watch the so-called non-denominational organs, how on all possible occasions they side with the Papacy against the Church of England!

CHURCH PRINCIPLES—CATHOLIC VERSUS ROMAN.—We owe thanks to the *Toronto Mail*, for supplying a happy phrase which condenses the whole controversy between us and the Papal Church into three words. The case is as the *Mail* puts it, "Catholic vs. Roman." It is interesting and instructive to observe the points of view taken by writers in the old land on this topic, and give in the following paragraphs, extracts from an address by the Rev. W. H. Leeds, of the Llandaff diocese, whose pithy illustrations will be found useful.

"The difference between the Catholic standpoint in religious controversy and the Protestant standpoint was this: that the Catholic dealt with positive truth, the Protestant dealt chiefly with negations. The Catholic asserted: the Protestant denied. The Catholic told the world what he believed, and why he believed: the Protestant told them what he did not believe, and why he did not believe. The Catholic tried to show that he was right: the Protestant tried to show that everybody but himself was wrong. He (the lecturer) appealed to those

present—when they listened to a lecture delivered by a man calling himself a staunch Protestant, was not the greater part of his time taken up, not in teaching what was right, but in showing that his opponents were believing what was absolutely wrong? Whatever the Protestant believed, whether he was a Churchman or Dissenter, he (the speaker) believed, only he believed more. The Protestant was right in his belief as far as it was positive; he was wrong in his negations and refusals to believe."

THE PRAYER BOOK A WITNESS TO CONTINUITY.—There was one thing which it was very necessary to remember before examining the teaching of the Book of Common Prayer, and it was this: the Church of England, or rather, the Church in England, the Catholic Church, was not created some 300 years ago by Act of Parliament and forced upon the nation. There had been no breach of continuity whatever in the history of the Church in England from the time it was first established up to the present day. This they could learn from the Prayer Book. Some people had an idea that, up to the time of the Reformation, there was a Catholic Church in England; that at the Reformation that was swept away; and that Parliament then created a brand-new Church called by a new name—the "Protestant Church." The Church knew nothing of such a word, and in no single document of the Church would the expression "Protestant" be found. The Church of England put into our hands the Apostles' Creed, wherein occurred the words: "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church." In many of her documents the Church declared that in no way did she separate herself from the Church of all other countries. There was an expression in the Preface to the Book of Common Prayer which was very valuable, since it showed that the Church did not only consider herself to be the old Catholic Church of the country, but to be a portion of the Holy Catholic Church throughout all the world. The expression occurred where the writers were referring to "sundry alterations proposed unto us," and ran thus: "We have rejected all such as were either of dangerous consequence (as secretly striking at some established doctrine or laudable practice of the Church of England, or indeed of the whole Catholic Church of Christ) or else of no consequence at all, but utterly frivolous and vain," by which was implied that she herself was a portion of the Holy Catholic Church of Christ. This was a simple historical fact.

THE PARISH CHURCHES CONFIRM THE PROOF OF CONTINUITY.—"Take the old Parish Churches throughout the country; they existed long before the Reformation. Could anyone point out to any time when, or any document, or any proceedings whereby any of the Churches then existing were taken away from the Pre-Reformation Church, and handed over to some other Church? There had been no breach of continuity in the history of our Parish Churches. Take again the Episcopal Sees, such as Llandaff, London, and Canterbury. Could any series of the documents or proceedings whereby the Cathedrals and emoluments belonging thereto were taken away from the Pre-Reformation Church, and handed to some new Church, be produced? There was no breach of continuity whatever in the history of the dioceses. Men sometimes talked about our Reformed Church of England. A thing reformed must be the same thing as that which existed before the reformation took place. Take a man who had spent a dissipated life, but afterwards became reformed. He must be the same man, or else he could not be spoken of as reformed. A Romanist on one occasion said to a Churchman: 'Where was your Church before the Reformation?' The Churchman replied: 'Where was your face before it was washed?' If a man washed his face, it must be the same face after as before the washing. If a Church was reformed, it

must be the same Church as before the Reformation."

A HOMELY BUT STRIKING ILLUSTRATION.—The Rev. author of the above used, what seems to us a novel although very homely argument against the title "Reformed Church."

"He did not like the name 'Reformed Church.' It seemed to be an insult to be constantly speaking of the Church as reformed. Suppose when he (the lecturer) was at Oxford he was a very bad young man, and eventually he became reformed, he would not like to be spoken of as the reformed Rector or the reformed Mr. Leeds. He should consider such a designation an insult, and was not sure whether he would not have a case to take into court in a prosecution for libel. Such an expression applied to the Church of England showed, at any rate, that the Church must be the same that existed before the Reformation took place. If a person went to the Law Courts and heard an ecclesiastical case argued, he would find that the lawyers, and judges, and Ecclesiastical Courts, recognised no breach of continuity whatever in the Church. Those who referred to the old Canon Law would find it just as much to the point and as binding as the Canons passed since the Reformation. This was a very important point, for from this it followed that any doctrines that were authoritatively taught and believed before the Reformation were the right and the heritage of the Church now, unless it could be clearly shown that they were authoritatively rejected by some authoritative document at the time of the Reformation."

Thus we have Prayer Books, Parish Churches, Diocesan history and the Law Courts, all witnessing harmoniously and conclusively to the truth, that the Church of England to-day is the same ecclesiastical body as the Church of England, for all the centuries since Christ formed His Church in Britain to be His presence, His witness, His visible Body.

PROHIBITIONIST MANNERS.—It is one of the saddest effects of intoxication to lower the manners of its victims. Under the baneful influence of excess they became rude, insolent, overbearing and wild in assertion. It is singular to note as another proof of extremes meeting how prohibitionist writers and speakers show these signs of mental degradation, they are rude, insolent, overbearing and wild in assertion. Without the shadow of provocation, the champions of this cause in a local paper speak of their opponents as savages fighting in ambush, as newspaper scribblers and so forth. Several most temperate letters have appeared proving that the assertion is very wild indeed that a certain body was ever in favour of prohibition. The testimony for this statement is simply one man's word—against it these are the facts: First, that a public debate took place some years ago, on the of Prohibition side was a teetotal lecturer, on the side opposite a leading minister of the body said to be prohibitionist and he was supported by the whole strength of that body in his district. Second, that the use of stimulants has ever been universal with the members of that so-called prohibitionist body, even in its schools and colleges. Third, that the many of the president of this prohibitionist body were constantly in the habit of drinking wine. Fourth, that active support of this prohibitionist body was given and is given by rich brewers. Yet, it is still asserted that this body was ever prohibitionist, that whoever brings out any facts to disprove the statement, is a savage fighting in ambush, is a newspaper scribbler and so forth! Prohibition is clearly as weak in temper as it is in fact and logic.

—If you think you are only to believe the gospel, you are mistaken; you are also to live the gospel; you should be a living epistle of CHRIST, "known and read of all men."

T FOODS WORLD.

OLD Company, EAST,

D G R.

YS USED

ED—To sell the Journeys of History of H in the Holy Maps, Charts

XO., Elkhart, Ind

ages worth \$100. Co., Portland, Me

SNR. R, ST. firm of the

a old-fashioned ange, when you able and happy

ination



ontinuous are Shakes the No Cinders. or Bursting or labour in

SEASON!

lar to ES, Toronto, ENTEE.

SOLD OR Books free. AN & CO., Pat- rion. D P.

London Phys- icians as a New York. SAL OF MEDICINE role, who make illopsy, has with- d and cured more cher living phys- ians; we have cured by him, he visits sent free. Post. New York.