

18, 1885

THE FOODS WORLD.

OLD Company, EAST,

D GR

AYS USED

TEO—To sell the History of the I. Maps, Charts

CO., Elkhart, Ind.

Empire North West Co., Portland, Me.

SNR, ER, E ST.

by firm of the

ESS

fully manifested use Appliances.

S' Stove.

ESS, SIMPLICITY CE.



od or coal, water feeder. No loss of heat. It forms a fire and is safe.

ESS, and Manufacturers.

, Toronto.

IT SOLD OR ed. Books from REGAN & CO., Newington, D.

London Phys. Establishes as in New York BUREAU OF MEDICAL Meserole, who makes of Epilepsy, has with- out other living phre- nology; we have ing cured by him, at Trenton and 11 Street, New York.

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 Wootten, Proprietor, & Publisher,
Address: P. O. Box 2640.
Office, No. 11 Imperial Buildings, 39 Adelaide St. E.
west of Post Office, Toronto.

FRANKLIN B. BILL, Advertising Manager.

LESSONS for SUNDAYS and HOLY-DAYS.

Aug. 9th—10th SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.
Morning—1 Kings xii. Rom. viii. 18.
Evening—1 Kings xiii. or 1 Kings xvii. Matthew xxi. 23.

THURSDAY, AUG. 13, 1885.

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

"CLEAR GLASS" FOR PUBLIC-HOUSES.—The justices and magistrates of the Newington division of Surrey, England, have enacted that in cases of applications for new licenses, or for renewals, it shall be a condition of granting such license that the outer doors and windows of the bar and public rooms be glazed with clear glass so that the view from the street into the bar and public rooms be unobstructed. The object of this regulation, is to bring the public rooms of public-houses under more public observation, and thus to promote decent and orderly conduct among the frequenters of those places, to discourage immoderate drinking, to facilitate police supervision, and to secure a better enforcement of the law without unreasonable interference with the legitimate trade of the persons licensed. It is therefore to be hoped that soon "clear glass" may take the place of the gaudily painted boards in the gin-shop window, and of the stuffy red curtains in the lower class of public-houses. One plausible objection is, that the working folk have a right to privacy when they are drinking, as they have such poor homes. But the reason they have poor homes is because they drink in public-houses. Now that general attention has been called to the subject, it is to be hoped that the "clear glass" rule will soon be everywhere enforced. Publicans who wish to show that they have nothing to be ashamed of in the way in which they conduct their business, would do well to pull down their barricades of secrecy, and we may surely appeal to the great brewers and distillers who own so many public houses, and whose name appear on them in such conspicuous places, that they will apply the clear-glass rule to the licensed premises, and so anticipate the benevolent action of the magistrates. Some of these brewers and distillers take prominent part in religious and philanthropic

movements; they say that they provide for the lawful use of alcohol, and are not responsible for its abuses. Let them prove the sincerity of their words by adopting this "clear-glass" rule for their houses which, even fifty years ago, was affirmed to be one means for the discouragement of drunkenness.

Although the above has more direct reference in England, we should be glad to see such a rule in Canada. What is desired, is to suppress the evils of drinking, and publicity is a great help in all such work.

CANON LIDDON'S CONSECRATION SERMON.—As some of our readers, says *Church Bells*, may have heard with interest, or even with anxiety, Dr. Liddon's recent sermon discussed, it may be useful, with the text of the sermon before us, to point out what he has actually said, and what he evidently means.

In the first place, it is not true that the preacher unchurched all the foreign communions which have not episcopal orders. This was the inference drawn by the *Record* from the first report of the sermon. We maintain that such an inference was no more justified by the earlier form of the sermon than by the latter. In the first utterance Dr. Liddon had spoken of the "greatest divines" of the English Church having insisted upon the Episcopate as necessary not merely to the *bene esse*, but to the *esse* of the Church, or, as he put it otherwise, "organically necessary to the structure of the visible Body of Christ." In the copy of the sermon revised by himself and printed, it is "some English divines" who are spoken of. The change was, perhaps, a prudent one—just the change which a man would make when he submitted to the colder criticism of readers words which had conveyed his own impressions to those who listened to them from the pulpit. As regards the point upon which he was insisting, the change makes no difference whatsoever.

It may, of course, be urged that, if you regard the episcopate as necessary to the *esse* of the Church, you must unchurch every community which has no bishops. But this is a mere inference. The preacher might reply that he has no call to give any opinion on such a subject. He is not the judge as to the responsibilities of those who either rejected Episcopacy, or were under the practical necessity of organizing a Church without bishops. He is not able to decide how much they may have lost by this deprivation. He certainly would not deny that all baptized persons belong to the Church, to the "visible Body of Christ;" nor would he deny that such as use those Christian ordinances which they believe to be divine do receive that blessing which they seek in them. Beyond this he does not pretend to go, and how could he go further, since further we have no guidance?

THE POSITION OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.—Continuing from the above paragraph, the writer says:

"But what Canon Liddon insisted upon was this—that Episcopacy was not merely one of several possible methods of Church government, nor even the best of these methods, and that one in which the wise choice of the Church had been most conspicuously manifested. If it were no more than this, he contends, we should not be justified in maintaining it, and so keeping ourselves apart from those other reformed Churches with which we have so much in common. Such isolation can be justified only upon the principle that the Episcopate is of Divine institution. If it is—if we can trace back this form of Church government to the Apostles—if we are thus satisfied that it represents the Divine plan for the government of the Church, then we have no right to change it or to give it up, whatever advantages may seem to result from its surrender.

Now, this is exactly the position of the Church of England. She declares in her ordinal that these three orders have existed from the time of

the Apostles; she refuses to allow any one not Episcopally ordained to minister at her altars. It is nothing to the purpose to show that at a certain period during the throes of the Reformation, Presbyterian divines were allowed to minister, or even to hold benefices, in the English Church. We know now what is the deliberate judgment of the Church. She requires all her ministers to be episcopally ordained. And she is quite right and quite consistent in making this demand if episcopacy is of Divine institution; otherwise she is not."

HIGH EPISCOPALIANS ARE ALONE CONSISTENT.—This is, as in above passage, in substance, the contention of Canon Liddon. And those who ignore the real force of his contention and try the *argumentum ad invidiam* by pointing out not the essence of that which he contends for, but inferences which they are disposed to draw from his principles, are, in truth, dealing unfairly with the preacher. Let us put it in another way. Those who do not regard episcopacy as of Divine institution must condemn the action of the Church of England in insisting upon it as a necessary part of the institution of the Church, or—which is the same thing—in refusing to allow men not episcopally ordained to minister. It is somewhat difficult to understand how they can maintain their connexion with such a Church. Surely it is a very serious responsibility to assist in keeping up a barrier to the reunion of Christendom, or, at least, of the reformed Churches, which they must believe to be of human and not of divine origination.

We may think 'high Episcopalians' in error, superstitious, or the like, but we must at least admit that they are consistent. It is very difficult to know what to think of those who support a system which they feel constrained to condemn. Doubtless they have some way of explaining it which satisfies themselves, and we should be sorry to hint that they are otherwise than conscientious. Two things only we can say with some measure of confidence: first, that we do not understand their position; and, secondly, that they are not quite the people who have a right to question the consistency of others."

THE INFALLIBLE GUIDE SOPHISM.—The following from the *Church Times* pricks the infallibility bubble in a very neat way. In answer to a correspondent it says:

"Even assuming the trustworthiness of what your Roman friend tells you about the advantage of having an infallible guide, there is just this leak in the argument. You are told that the use of an infallible Pope is to prevent the fallible flock from going wrong on matters of faith and morals, where their private judgment is all but certain to lead them astray. Very good, but the Pope's own infallibility is itself a matter of faith, and the only warrant you have for its truth is your own private opinion that it is true. Why should you be better able to decide that tenet than any other? You cannot take it on the Pope's own word, for the very matter in question is whether he is right in claiming the power; you cannot take it on your confessor's word, for he is himself fallible; you cannot take it on the word of the Vatican Council, for (without enquiring whether the doctrine was enacted by the Council at all, which able canonists deny) the very terms of the decree imply that the Council was fallible too; so it comes to your private opinion, and if that decides for infallibility, it must contradict the whole Church up to 1870."

CONGRATULATIONS.—We beg to congratulate the Hon. Thomas White, M.P., upon his elevation to the dignity of Minister of the Crown. In this case "*Palmarum qui meruit ferat*," is fulfilled. The new Minister of the Interior was sworn in at Toronto on the 5th inst, and went down to Ottawa the same day to commence work.