

tion Fund for Algoma, that fund which is 'the hope of the future,' because it will bring in, when completed, rather more than half the original S.P.G. grant. A response to this appeal from those whose love for the Church is such that they are grieved at its 'low estate' in this rapidly-increasing part of Canada, would go far towards enabling the fund to be closed by the end of June, as is most earnestly desired. If other bodies of Christians can adequately man and support their missions, why cannot we? There can only be one answer—they care more. What we need is to be endued from on High with a devotion to the faith which shall take the first place in all our thoughts, hopes and aims; and a whole-hearted love of alms-giving for its extension and support.

#### Church Freedom in England.

The friends of the Church in England are speaking out more plainly than they have in the past. "The National Church" combats the Liberationist party, and those few friends of it within the Church itself. It asserts that it is not the case that in Ireland the gains of Disestablishment have far outweighed the losses, and that in the colonies the Church is contented with her non-established position. It is too late to turn back the hands of time in Ireland and the colonies, but in England Church people may do much for themselves. This paper says; The fact is that the Church cannot legislate for herself except in quite small matters, and then only with great difficulty, and Parliament will not legislate for her. For this reason we have always supported the movement for the establishment of a "Church Parliament," which, subject to the supremacy of the Crown, should be free to legislate for the Church on purely Church matters. In other words, our view has been that Church defence cannot be a negative movement entirely: it must also have its constructive side. It is, of course, frequently argued that such legislative freedom can only exist if the Church is disestablished. This we emphatically deny. We have only to look over the Scottish border to find a Church both established and enjoying complete legislative freedom; whilst the valuable series of articles which appeared in these columns last year from the pen of the Rev. T. Hancock, entitled "The Freedom of Established Churches," showed conclusively that these two principles were not in the least incompatible. We have never been able to understand why what is possible in Scotland should not be possible in England also.

#### Bishop Grafton.

If there is one man on the United States Bench of Bishops who would be looked on as an extreme Ritualist it is the Rt. Rev. Charles C. Grafton, Bishop of Fond du Lac. But Bishop Grafton has published in the Living Church a series of papers on a proposed union with Rome which probably no other bishop or priest could do. For concentration, style and matter they are matchless, and clear away the attacks on our Church by present-day writers. A clergyman in England, the Rev. Spencer Jones, had urged the reconciliation of the two provinces of York and Canterbury, with the Apostolic See. If he reads these papers Mr. Jones will find how little he knew when he took his pen in hand. Bishop Grafton disposes of Mr. Jones very shortly, but has a good deal to say upon the subject in its broader aspect, and we take the liberty of reproducing two points. The whole contribution should be reproduced in popular form.

#### Reasons of Secession.

But it is asked, What takes the few who do go over to Rome? What are the reasons for their 'verting'? So far as my knowledge goes, a change of faith is usually preceded by a period of spiritual or mental depression. For some cause, and a clergyman is especially liable to such an attack, a mist of despondency has settled on his soul. He has allowed himself to become more and more critical of the failings of his own Church, and has gazed at them until they have assumed exaggerated proportions. He has met with parochial or other opposition, and not with the success he expected. He has allowed himself to dwell on the attractive features of Rome until his imagination has made her an ideal Church. As the elder Pugin said, who awoke with a great shock after his 'version, he had previously thought Rome was a Church filled with holy clergy, holy churches, holy monks, holy nuns, holy everything. In this abnormal mental state the 'vert allows himself to be caught by such shallow sayings as that "a visible Church must have a visible head." The fallacy here, as a little thought will show, lies in regarding the small portion of the Church which is upon the earth as the whole Church, or as a solidarity by itself. Or, our 'vert begins to adopt the inaccurate, ungrammatical,

unscriptural, untheological, and non-patristic Roman exegesis of the text "Thou art Peter." It is inaccurate, for the text does not say, as it would if Peter was to be the Rock, "thou art Peter, the Rock upon which I will build," but says, "upon this Rock," referring to something previously mentioned, namely, Peter's confession of Christ as the Son of God. It is ungrammatical, for while the name of Peter is of the masculine gender, the "Rock" on which the Church is to be built (and thereby showing it to be something different from Peter) is of the feminine gender. And though our Lord spoke Aramaic, yet in the Greek, which is the language of inspiration and given for our guidance, this distinction of genders is made between "Peter" and the "Rock" to prevent our identifying or confounding them together. It is unscriptural, for in the Old Testament the title "Rock" is synonymous with that of God. Peter thus having confessed Christ to be the Son of God, Christ declares on this Rock, i.e., Himself, He will build His Church. At the same time He gives to Simon his promised name (St. John i. 42) of Cephas, a stone. A stone is different from a rock. It was symbolical of what Simon was to become by being transformed or petrified, through union with the Rock which is Christ. It is untheological, because only a humanity which has been gathered into the Divine Life, and by its union with it is "The Resurrection and the Life," can be the foundation of a Church against which the gates of death (Hades) shall not prevail. It is not patristic, because there is no consent of the fathers, when commenting on the text, holding that here any authority was given to Peter which was to be transmitted to a successor. It is an exegesis which the action of the Apostles in reference to St. Peter shows to be untrue.

#### The Sin of Secession.

We cannot conclude without pointing out the sin of secession. A Churchman's joining Rome is a very different act from that of a sectarian. In joining Rome, the Churchman must submit to a conditional baptism. He must be confirmed, the repetition of which sacrament is a sacrilege. By receiving his so-called first-communion, he denies that he has before sacramentally received the Body and Blood of the Lord. If a priest, he denies his orders and the validity of his Sacraments. In all these acts he turns against the Holy Ghost and his Lord, denying their gifts and presence. Moreover, he deserts his post. It is thus a sin most presumptuous and deadly. It is the most presumptuous sin, we believe, a Christian man can commit. For in deciding on the claims of the Papal Supremacy as against the Eastern and Anglican Churches in favor of Rome, he assumes to himself the powers of an Ecumenical Council. It is also the most terrible spiritual sin, we believe, a Christian man can commit. For if our orders and sacraments are valid, and there is no surer proof of the existence of God than there is of their validity, he denies having received Christ in the Sacraments, and so perils his own soul. It is only very callow persons who are caught by the proselyter's fallacy, "You Anglicans say we Romans can be saved, but we do not admit this about yourselves. As a matter of prudence, therefore, come with us." Our answer is: We believe that those born in the Roman Communion and faithful to Christ can be saved, but we assert that for a Churchman to deny his sacraments, to desert his post, and to join Rome, is to run a great risk of being lost.

#### SCIENCE AND RELIGION.

It has long been claimed by thoughtful men that science was advancing and changing in many of its conclusions, and that when it conflicted with Revelation, or seemed to do, it was wise to suspend judgment till science had attained to greater finality as to what it really taught, or what scientists were united in believing with reference to it. Science was for a long time a disturbing element, and demanded a new statement of old truths. For instance, our views of Mosaic Cosmogony were greatly modified by the discoveries of geologists, and also of the flood, but as many eminent scientists have made clear, such as the late Sir William Dawson, there is no real conflict between the facts of science and the first chapter of Genesis, only science has cast a new light upon it, and we have perhaps a grander conception of creative power and wisdom. Darwin's theory of Evolution also greatly disturbed men's minds, but Tyndall, referring to it, said "If this hypothesis were even true it would not be final. The human mind would infallibly look behind the germ, and however hopeless the attempt, would enquire into the history of the Genesis." Huxley discredited some of the conclusions of evolutionists when he declared "that all known forms of life were derived from previously existing life, and discredited the theory of spontaneous

generation." Time is confirming the Biblical revelation of a Creator, and the faith of the Catholic Church, as stated in the Apostles' Creed, "I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth." The relations of science and religion, and what the real teaching of science is as to the supernatural, as well as the natural, has come up again for discussion, because of a recent utterance of Lord Kelvin, who is recognized as a Prince of Science, who gave it as his deliberate and reiterated judgment that "scientific thought is compelled to accept the idea of creative power." Lord Kelvin's address on "Christian Apologetics" at University College, London, is so important a declaration on a subject which has caused anxiety to many minds, and carries such weight, coming from such an authority, that we give a synopsis of it, and commend it to the thoughtful consideration of our readers. In connection with University College Christian Association the first of a course of five public lectures on "Christian Apologetics" was delivered last Friday, in the Botanical Theatre, at University College, Gower-street. Lord Reay, president of University College, occupied the chair, and the large theatre was filled to overflowing, many visitors being unable to find seats. The Rev. Professor G. Henslow, who was the lecturer, spoke on the subject of "Present-day Rationalism, an Examination of Darwinism." Lord Kelvin, in moving a vote of thanks to the lecturer, said he wished to make a personal explanation. He had recently had occasion to make use of the expressions ether, atoms, electricity, and had been horrified to read in the press that he had spoken of ether-atoms. Ether was absolutely non-atomic; it was absolutely structureless and homogeneous. He was in thorough sympathy with Professor Henslow in the fundamentals of his lecture, but he could not say that with regard to the origin of life science neither affirmed nor denied creative power. Science positively affirmed creative power. Science made every one feel a miracle in himself. It was not in dead matter that they lived and moved and had their being, but in the creating and directive power which science compelled them to accept as an article of belief. They could not escape from that when they studied the physics and dynamics of living and dead matter all around. Modern biologists were coming once more to a firm acceptance of something, and that was a vital principle. They had an unknown object put before them in science. In thinking of that object they were all agnostics. They only knew God in His Works, but they were absolutely forced by science to admit and to believe with absolute confidence in a directive power—in an influence other than physical, dynamical, electrical forces. Cicero had denied that they could have come into existence by a fortuitous concourse of atoms. There was nothing between absolute scientific belief in creative power and the acceptance of the theory of a fortuitous concourse of atoms. Was there, he asked, anything so absurd as to believe that a number of atoms by falling together of their own accord could make a crystal, a sprig of moss, a microbe, a living animal? People thought that, given millions of years, these might come to pass, but they could not think that a million of millions of millions of years could give them unaided a beautiful world like ours. They had a spiritual influence, and in science a knowledge that there was that influence in the world around them. He admired the healthy, breezy atmosphere of free thought in Professor Henslow's lecture. Let no one, he urged, be afraid of true freedom. They could be free in their thought, in their criticisms, and with freedom of thought they were bound to come to the conclusion that science was not antagonistic to religion, but a help for religion. Lord Reay congratulated the association on the proceedings that day. It was a grand thing to hear that prince of science, Lord Kelvin, give his testimony on behalf of religion. As President of that college, he hoped they would always maintain the open door for free discussion and welcome the members of all Christian Churches within their walls.

#### PASTORAL SUCCESS.

The Rev. Dr. Rainsford, Rector of St. George's Church, New York City, well known in Canada, as well as in the United States, has contributed a series of articles to "The Outlook," entitled "A Preacher's Story of his Work," which is practically an autobiographical sketch of his life, and is from every point of view interesting and instructive. Dr. Rainsford, brought up amid narrow, ultra evangelical environment, both in the home and Church, in the fifties, when that phase of thought largely dominated the Church of England, yielded readily to it, and being of an emotional temperament sought by an emotional religion to bring men under its control.

His early' minis  
Canada was also  
though largely  
cretely, they  
fit in many  
men to  
their very nove  
personality, ar  
fashioned evan  
to realize or t  
cognizes. Spe  
even strangers,  
they were save  
have the appe  
able thirty yea  
possible now  
there is as n  
Dr. Rainsfor  
a change, and  
of the late T.  
ing of his ir  
Robertson; h  
I drank him  
can drink. I  
Unconsciousl  
go. Spiritua  
but He was  
messenger of  
at least, so n  
and developi  
the practica  
his labours  
ever may be  
and to us  
however mu  
admit that  
and that wi  
he has ma  
make St. G.  
a centre of  
metropolis  
on what I  
success as  
he speaks  
ants, of d  
being neit  
contraven  
particular  
a strict  
Canon are  
we can co  
manner th  
be seen a  
should ne  
uniform;  
Kings sh  
will help  
many to  
not do se  
manline  
wanted:  
the abse  
tone of  
repel. r  
ness an  
reading  
opinion  
Rainsfo  
to be n  
few oft  
fession  
their u  
attribu  
so wit  
must;  
ed his  
cause  
of all  
ences  
much  
pulpi  
more  
the c  
the s  
of th  
to m  
prea  
prea  
may  
the  
a re