

ed to interfere with that education of the soul which every man requires. Many of our people seem to think that being "diligent in business" is the whole of religion. We must bid them remember that it is also required that they be "fervent in spirit, serving the Lord." And when we reflect upon the difficulty attendant upon the proper education of the soul, we should infer that the former should in all cases be subordinate to the latter.

Another difficulty in regard to this matter, occurring to the clergy of this county, is the heating of the church edifice. This is the most serious obstacle of all, but not insurmountable—unless we choose to make it so. At the worst it is only half a difficulty, inasmuch as it does not apply to the summer months. To overcome this it may be suggested that in some cases the vestry would be found large enough, and the heating of which would be of comparatively little cost or labour. Should this not be possible, a room in the rectory or parsonage might be used for this purpose; or a small oratory might be attached to every such building for the holding of week-day services, with a small bell for calling the people to prayers.

With regard to the prejudices of a congregation against the introduction of daily service, this should constitute no difficulty or obstacle in our way. With some of our clergy their first concern, even in matters about which the voice of the Church is most plain, is the sanction and approval of their congregation. But let the faithful priest remember that he must not allow his people to constitute themselves his judges, neither must he become their servant. We must hearken to the words of the Judge of quick and dead, that to "our own Master, we stand or fall." And remember that at our admission into our sacred office, we declared in the sight of God, that we would be "diligent in prayers."

But lastly, how can we restore this practice to its proper position?

In an essay of this character, it is sought not only to gain a tacit assent to what is recognized as good and true, but also to influence the practice of those to whom it is addressed.

We conceive that any effort in the direction of carrying out the wishes of the Church in respect to daily service must be put forth carefully and wisely, and if possible must be a general effort. That is, we must seek to influence the opinions of men, that a general move in that direction may be made. It is only possible here to make suggestions. At our conferences, at the meetings of our Deaneries and Diocesan and Provincial Synods, the subject might be agitated, and if necessary the Bishops memorialized in regard thereto. One would suppose that they would be gratified at such an evidence of life in the Church, and if approached in the matter would issue pastorals recommending the practice. If that were done it would greatly smooth the way of, and support the hands of, the clergy in introducing it into their parishes.

Surely it is not Utopian to wish to see every parish in our land, from Victoria to Labrador, from Athabasca to Newfoundland, with the daily incense of prayer, praise and thanksgiving, ascending to Throne of God.

In the meantime, let the clergy of our Church endeavour to determine how far this should become a matter of conscience with them, remembering that as "stewards of the mysteries of God," we shall one day have to give an account.

Ask all your friends to subscribe to the DOMINION CHURCHMAN.

SCIENCE AND RELIGION.

THE following admirable discourse which claims for the Church, as we do, the whole realm of philanthropic enterprise as its kingdom, was preached at the last Social Science Congress, Nottingham, by the Rev. J. M. WILSON, head master of Clifton College. The preacher said—

By social science he meant all that might be learned by history and observation as to the nature and conditions of social and national well-being; the result of methodical inquiry into economical and sociological phenomena. Religion had always been a great and even universal power in social life, and its standard, though perhaps not its influence, had always been rising and never falling. It was based on human nature itself; on man's necessary relation to the Infinite, to the supernatural, to God. Now it was not necessary that there should be any relation or co-operation between these two great powers. They might be totally separate from each other. Social science might be toiled for from scientific or utilitarian motives, with as little religious feeling as was imported into chemistry. Religion might be either an abstract philosophy, or the sense of individual sin, forgiveness, salvation. Such a separation did in fact exist in the 2nd and 3rd centuries of our era, when politicians and lawyers formed a great Social Science Association, and Christianity was a system of religious individualism, concerning itself more with the next world than with this. But the separation of the two tended to the paralysis of both. Religion was the true brotherhood of men in Christ, giving more faith in God, teaching the rich that wealth was a splendid trust, and the poor that poverty was not ignoble. Religion alone, love of God alone, could support such workers as Oberlin and Edward Denison, as Mary Carpenter and Octavia Hill, and others of that noble band known to fame, who had served and were serving God in the services of their fellows. But it was not less true that the combination of social science and religion was the one condition for the permanence and true life and growth of social science, which must be ultimately based on some philosophy. It might be utilitarian and agnostic; it might be theologic and Christian.

Materialistic and evolutionary philosophies have for the time perhaps obscured the divine supernatural element in our sociological philosophy, or shaken confidence in it; but utilitarianism could never be the basis of vigorous social action. Men judged of their own interests, and the feelings of the nation in the long run often conflicted with the interests of the individual. The fundamental belief of religion that man was made in the image of God, and that CHRIST was our Restorer and Saviour; the proof to us that love and self-devotion were essential elements of the Divine, and therefore of the highest human character, were the only permanent springs of consistent endeavour to bring about the coming of the kingdom of God.

In the same combination lay the hope of the Church, and the hope of obtaining a less sectarian Christianity. In such a combination was also the cure of aimlessness, for melancholy, perhaps even for cynical worldliness, and an aid to purity and simplicity. Some social problems, too, might be solved in the same manner. One great evil of our age was the wedge of separation between classes in our cities. The wedge of separation was daily being driven home by natural causes which, if left to themselves, would widen the breach and ruin the nation. Social science had to find a cure for this, a cure by prevention, not revolution, and in such a work experience proved that the enthusiasm for social amelioration, the infection of a grand aim, were strong enough to make Christians of all denominations work together. Any

greater aggressive philanthropic movement, the abolition of slavery, the promotion of temperance, the protection of women and children, the relief of great temporary local distress, did in fact bring men on the same platform who would meet in no other way. For many ages past Christianity had too little aimed at the improvement of social conditions. We were too much haunted by the medieval unchristian opposition between the secular and the religious. We dared not boldly say, though few would deny, that the first religious duty of a community was to make the conditions of life for every member of it such that he might arrive at the best of which he was capable. If Christianity moved along that line it would find itself in the first place reinforced by the irresistible democratic movement of the age. The deeply-seated inherited religious feeling of the industrial classes in England, and their faith and trust in God, their wonderful kindness, patience, sympathy, and hope were still, in spite of all discouraging signs, the basis of a national religion and a national Church. In the second place, the appearance of a direct collision between religious faith and materialistic philosophy would be avoided. They would be seen to be moving on different lines. A contest about opinion would be seen to be of secondary importance as compared to the Christ-like and truth-loving life which never failed to command the honor and love of the materialist. In the third place, Christianity would co-operate with the sociological forces of the age. The age of struggling for liberty was nearly over in England as in America. What use was to be made of Liberty? Unrestrained liberty tended to widen the breach between rich and poor: it concentrated advantages on the strong and disadvantages on the weak. Now, it was the aim of the statesman, the social reformer, and of the Christian alike to secure favourable conditions for the physical, moral, and intellectual development of every individual. A nation might perish from excess of misdirected freedom. Freedom must be won only to be sacrificed to higher aims. To preach such a Christianity we required the help of associations such as that which he was addressing. It was not ignorant and uncombined philanthropic views, not mere charity sermons that were needed, but the co-operation of scientific organization with religious zeal. Let them never despair. There was plenty to do on the largest scale. Education, land, drink, prostitution, vagabondism required attention. Let no private right be pleaded as an excuse for public wrongs. For private rights compensation could be found. There was none for a public wrong. It was our duty to protect the weak; the helpless and the poor could not protect themselves against ignorance, vice, ill sanitation, overwork, tyranny. Let each one of them work for others. Let him do something for his city, his parish, for one street, one household. Let him give something more than money, his time, his thought, his love. We were not called on to reform the world, but each might do something for his neighbours to show that he had the spirit of Christ.

BISHOP WILBERFORCE AND ECCLESIASTICAL APPOINTMENTS.

THE third volume of Bishop Wilberforce's "Life" has been published, with great accidental opportuneness. It is interesting, just when an appointment is being made to the vacant Archbishopric of Canterbury, to read the details of a similar appointment.

The vacancy of Canterbury raised great excitement. Archbishop Longley died during the height of the controversy about the Irish Church, and Bishop Tait's appointment has commonly been attributed to Mr. Disraeli's knowledge of character. Apparently, this is altogether a mistake. A curious letter from Mr. Disraeli is printed in the "Life":—"Notwithstanding," he says "the fine sentiments in which it is very easy to indulge for those who are not responsible, it is all over with the Church of England, if she be disconnected with the State. . . . Every wise man on our side should attract the Protestant feeling as much as practicable to the Church of England." Even in 1868, Mr. Disraeli had made up his mind about Ritualism. "I think the chief Minister of this country, if he be ignorant of the bent of the national feeling at this crisis, must be an idiot. His means of arriving at the truth are so various. Now, certainly, I hold that the long pent-up feeling of this nation against ultra-Ritualism, will pronounce itself at the impending election." As we know, it was not Ritualism, but the Irish Church, against which the long-pent-up feeling of the nation pronounced itself; but Mr. Disraeli waited until the excitement which secured the passing of the Public Worship Regulation Bill seemed to justify his prediction. Apparently, the Prime Minister tried to make some very preposterous appointment to Canterbury, generally understood to be that of Bishop Ellicott, for though the name is suppressed in the extracts from the Bishop's diary, it was plainly one which startled Dean Welles-

ley, from whom the Dean said Queen. Disraeli principled; he then got frightened, injuring the round, and p-

Disraeli. The Queen was most reluctant then proposed objected strenuously, &c.; the not you, bec and Disraeli opposed Leigh's arate occasion him, but Disraeli conceive the or was overruled votes of the r all Church n ing." The Disraeli's ex Closet. Som Malmesbury raeli, he said me; I have The whole ir raeli is curio tained of him he certainly

Of the Bis good story: St. Patrick's of which Bis arranged an argumentati enough to su unread—no suaded to b in Ireland— into accepti simply a lov

The Chur a very real would have diocese he v his peculiar eminent an we are incli ubiquitous, But in Le right place. grappled v mankind w have broug his readiness sympathisin to be syn striking e which Lord no attempt gain—Bish

Home

MONTREAL with the c couraging occasion. Duvernét, of curate Duvernét at the har Canon He cident, is the colleg St. Jam been app Bishop.

ATLANTA be made that the I ingham, preached after rest

BOLTON menced a ly attend paving fo