

largely with the double consecration there consummated; of the Church; of the confirmation candidates; for the service of Almighty God. After lunch, at the Lay Reader's the Bishop and Parson were taken homewards to Dildo by a crew of Norman's Cove men.

At 7.30, Evensong was said at New Harbour, and the Bishop preached a striking sermon—(appropriate to expectation week), on God's intervals in reference to His judgment and mercies. (To be continued.)

CORRESPONDENCE.

[The name of Correspondent must in all cases be enclosed with letter, but will not be published unless desired. The Editor will not hold himself responsible, however, for any opinions expressed by Correspondents.]

PRAYERS FOR THE FAITHFUL DEPARTED.

To the Editor of the CHURCH GUARDIAN:—

SIR,—The letter, in your issue of the 29th ult., over the signature of Chas. L. Ingles, written in the best of temper and revealing the kindest intention, hardly seems, to me, to deal *satisfactorily* with the question raised. My own obtuseness may have something to do with it, however, so that it would not be judicious to say that, in his inferences he is not correct. But it is possible, that he has been reading into the quotation, owing to his acquaintance with certain extraneous facts, something wholly without its original intention, at least as it stands in the Liturgy of the Reformed Church of England. It is hardly fair to make a bolster for any opinion out of anything that does not squarely and unequivocally support it. Terms do not at all times and in every connection mean the same thing, and, I confess, that unless it may happen in the case of some few clergymen and those under the immediate influence and inspiration of their views, the "faithful departed" are not in my opinion, thought of, far less prayed for, in this connection. The "faithful dead" are mentioned, and thanks offered to God in their behalf, in the prayer for "the whole state of Christ's Church militant here on earth;" but there is no mention of their needing "remission of sins," or lacking any of the "other benefits of His passion," to give the least colour to the view, that they stand in any sense, in need of our prayers, or that the Church teaches that they do. Mr. Ingles seems afraid of his own logic, when he emphasizes, the "all other benefits of his (Christ's) passion" in order to crowd as much as possible, from view "the remission of sins," which "all God's whole Church" must need even more than some "other benefits," seeing it is unmistakably specified, while we are left in uncertainty and largely to our own conjectures as to what the "other benefits" may be. Now, does Mr. Ingles want to make us believe, that the "faithful dead" *alike with us* stand in need of "remission of sins," and that the Church of England teaches such a doctrine? If so, he surely ought to be able to support his position by article, homily, rubric, or even the Bible—get a quotation that will help to sustain him and the Church, in the position in which he desires to place her on this question. If remission of sins be not prayed for in behalf of the "faithful dead," in this prayer, the whole argument falls to the ground; for there is no distinction whatever made in the prayer, to favour separate needs, unless it is to be found in the clause "all other benefits of His passion"; but this does not nullify the very express recognition of needed remission of sins, in the case of all prayed for in this beautiful prayer for "all the whole Church" the wide world over, standing in need of our sympathies, and claiming our intercessions.

We do indeed pray grace for ourselves, "to so follow their good examples that with them," (not *they* with us.) "We may be partakers of

God's heavenly Kingdom," and also "that we, with all those who are departed in the true faith of God's Holy name, may have our perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul, in His eternal and everlasting glory"; but, for any blessing of pardon, peace, rest or enjoyment, we are nowhere in God's Word, the Articles, the Homilies or the Liturgy, to my knowledge, called upon, at any time, in any case, to pray in their ("the faithful dead's") behalf.

I honestly stand by every assertion I make, until the contrary is unmistakably proved to be true, when, in love and loyalty, I am bound to submit. When I said, that "in some instances" the early Christians prayed for the dead, I should have said eucharistically remembered their virtues for the improvement of the living. Do not many of the fathers vigorously protest against the idea, that the dead can be benefited by any prayers in their behalf, and as strongly assert their changeless state in the other world? Mr. Engles may reply, that, even allowing this, only proves diversity of opinion; but that relegates the whole question to simple opinion, up to the time the Church of Rome began to raid the earth, with her doctrines of Indulgences, Purgatory, &c. This is not a question to be decided by two individuals. Therefore the question he asks me is not pertinent to the discussion, especially as Mr. Ingles knows, as well as I do, that the Church of England protests, in unmistakable terms, against the *form* in which prayers were offered generally in the Church for the dead, up to the time of the reformation after Rome's deformation, without giving a new one.

What I ask for is information, not concerning individual opinion, whether read into the Church's prayers or otherwise, but concerning the direct teaching, of the Church of England, on the question raised. In this, I admit my ignorance, and am not desirous of prolonging controversy, but of receiving needful information. Thanking Mr. Ingles for the kind intention and you for your forbearance.

I am, &c,
LACOLLE,
JOHN C. GARRETT,
July 2nd, 1887.

[This matter has had full discussion in our columns. Unless there be some new arguments pertinent to the real question at issue, we cannot devote any further space to it. *Edr.*]

EDITORIAL NOTES.

We have received from many parts of the Dominion and from Newfoundland, lengthy and interesting accounts of the Jubilee Services, and of the sermons delivered in connection therewith. To print one-third of these would occupy most of our Home Field space for weeks. We therefore are compelled reluctantly to pass all. Suffice it to say that both services and sermons were inkeeping with, and worthy of the occasion. In St. John's, Nfld., not only was there a grand service in the Cathedral, attended by a congregation of over 2,500; but the Lord Bishop of Newfoundland also gave a dinner to all the children in the Church of England Orphanages, in honor of Her Majesty's Jubilee. About sixty persons were present including His Lordship and Mrs. Jones, with two of his children. After dinner the children adjourned to the ground connected with the Boys' Orphanage and spent part of the afternoon in various games.

We notice that the Synod of Toronto adopted a resolution to appoint a Standing Committee in regard to the desecration of the Lord's Day. It is surely time that some definite and energetic action were taken regarding this matter. Retrogression seems to be the order of

the day in some if not in all of our large cities, and under one plea and another the sacredness and quiet of the Lord's Day is sadly invaded. More and more urgently and emphatically should the Church ring out the Divine Command, "REMEMBER that thou keep HOLY the Sabbath Day"—when under the plea of necessity and urgency of business, manufacturing establishments,—in which are concerned men professing to be Christians—continue work with little reduction of staff; when Railway Companies use the day for repairing tracks and bridges, and in pushing forward freight from point to point; when tobacco shops and fruit stores openly ply their trade; and when the holiness of the Day is, it seems to us, equally disturbed and set at naught by the noisy irreverent and unnecessary parades of the Salvation Army.

The Lord God omnipotent reigneth still, however; His word is sure; His commands imperative; and it is time for the Church urgently to call a halt to this open desecration of the Day of Rest, and this dishonour to God.

THE Rev. Dr. Edgehill, Chaplain General of the British Army, has been elected by a large majority as Bishop of Nova Scotia, and from what we have been able to learn of the Bishop elect the Synod has in this done wisely. It is doubtful, however, as yet, whether Dr. Edgehill will accept, as the telegrams inform us that he has asked a week for consideration and decision. Probably those who were instrumental in bringing his name before the Synod had made enquiries as to his acceptance in case of election; but such enquiries are delicate, and anything like positive assurance from the party himself could hardly be expected. It is sincerely to be hoped, however, that Dr. Edgehill may not decline, and that we may not witness here (as the sister Church in the States has witnessed) useless election after election. This *nolo Episcopari* would seem to be carried to an extreme in some quarters; but we do not wish to judge any.

We are well pleased too that the election of the Bishop of Algoma to the See failed; simply because we think that the transference of Bishop from one See to another—except under peculiar and imperative circumstances—most objectionable. The connection of a Bishop with his diocese ought, in our judgment, to be for life,—and his work a *life* work. Had the Bishop of Algoma been elected, and had he accepted, it would not alone have involved the calling of special meeting of the Provincial Synod in order to fill his place, but also the interruption of settled and matured plans for Church work in this field, and probably grievous injury to the missionary diocese by the withdrawal—unnecessarily—of its chief shepherd; and one who seems peculiarly well fitted for, and to be effectively doing, the Church's work there.

We are unwilling to believe that his nomination was made on party grounds; though the telegraphic dispatches to hand seem to indicate some such spirit actuating it. If so we are doubly well pleased that his election failed; and we think the Bishop himself will in this agree with us. A Bishop elected by partizan means is pretty sure to prove the Bishop of a party and such an one is unworthy of his office and no credit to the Church.