

more worldly course. It is easy to understand that the duty is an irksome one, and that it would be distasteful to most of the so-called Evangelical *alias* Puritanic school; although the confession of Evangelicals so thorough as Deans Close and McNeale, that personal experience of daily service had converted them to a belief in its spiritual value, ought, it is believed, to take it out of the list of party questions.

But no plea which a thorough Churchman can advance in defence of the neglect of this positive Law of the Church is of the slightest weight whatever. Indeed we may say that no really sound Churchman will for a moment attempt to offer an objection to a fundamental regulation upon which his Church so positively insists.

An objection has been offered on the ground that the energy expended in the daily service would be much more satisfactorily spent in the performance of some other ministerial duty. But independently of the necessity of obeying "the Law," if a man would be a good Churchman, there is the stern principle inseparably connected with all practical religious questions as well as moral ones, that Example is more effective than precept; and all the direct ministrations the most fervent pastor can furnish will have infinitely less effect in producing a devotional feeling and practice among his people than in his regular attention to the daily morning and evening prayer (that is matins and evensong) in his church; so that the objection, on the ground of waste or misappropriation of energy, falls to the ground at once, with any one who has had the least experience of the matter.

There is also a notion among some Church people—we rather think it originated among the sects—that religion is a thing for Sundays, and has very little or nothing to do with the weekdays. So detestable a doctrine can hardly claim for itself a nook or a corner in any system that has the slightest pretension to Christianity. But yet the priest who shuts up his church all the week and opens it on Sundays only is doing all in his power to preach by example that false doctrine—loudly as he may disclaim it. Such a clergyman is inviting the retort from a parishioner when blamed for staying away from church on Sundays:—"You are not so very fond of church yourself, for you only go on Sundays, though your own Prayer Book bids you go every day; and I am only doing on Sunday what you by your example teach me to do all the rest of the week."

#### ADDRESSES TO THE BISHOP OF TORONTO.

WITHIN the last few days, two statements have been made in the daily Toronto press, which appear to emanate from two opposite sources, although they by no means directly clash with each other. One is to the effect that—

"Twenty thousand signatures are expected to be attached to an address which is being prepared for presentation to the Bishop of Toronto, thanking his Lordship for his charge to the Synod, and for his determination to uphold the Protestant character of the Church."

The other states:

"It is expected that forty-five thousand Churchmen will attach their names to an address to the Lord Bishop of Toronto, now in circulation, thanking him for the bold assertion, in his primary charge, of the fundamental doctrine of Apostolic Succession, and for his manly vindication of the Apostolic origin and Catholic character of the Church of England."

Now, what can be the possible advantage of keeping up party strife in the Diocese of Toronto in this miserably petty manner, it is impossible to imagine. Whichever party began this stupid kind of movement, it furnishes a

pretty strong indication that the embers of party strife must be dying out rather fast, or those who are born for mischief and nothing else would not find it necessary to resort to so wretched an expedient as this, in order to keep up the agitation and contention they are so fond of, and without which their own existence would seem to be exceedingly precarious. The present Bishop of Toronto was elected as a compromise between two sides—the Prayer-Book, Church school and the No-Church "party"—with the general belief that whatever might be the personal "views" of the Bishop, he would, at least, offer no obstruction to the legitimate action of any school of thought sanctioned by the Church. And we, therefore, on our own behalf, and on behalf of the church of the diocese of Toronto, protest most strongly against this attempt to draw his Lordship into such a conflict of parties as this. The Bishop of Toronto as well as every other Bishop has no right to be regarded as the Bishop of a "party," however much it may suit the "views" of some people to carry on all ecclesiastical as well as political matters with reference to "party" interests and with a bearing on "party" issues. Indeed we cannot imagine the possibility of the Bishop's receiving an address drawn up in the spirit and temper of either of those mentioned above—each of them indicating, and indeed, intended to express a triumph over opponents. If one address is received, the other cannot possibly be refused; and therefore the Bishop of Toronto will find the simplest treatment to be the easiest, which will be to decline (*with thanks*, if his Lordship chooses) to receive either of them.

We do not mean to say that either address contains anything which is not, to a large extent, true. The protesting character of our Church is self-evident, especially in the Articles and those godly sermons, the Homilies. And the protest is one very decided indeed, against the corruptions, the innovations of Rome, and one quite as decided, or more so, against the blasphemous heresies of Geneva. It is remarkable that the longest of the thirty-nine articles—the 17th—is one directed, every word of it, against the soul-destroying Calvinism of Geneva. When taken in its literal, grammatical sense, it can be understood in no other way, and if interpreted in any other than in an Anti-Calvinistic sense, it can only be by putting a non-natural interpretation upon the words and phrases employed. And in regard to the subject of the other address, it is plain enough that the whole Prayer Book, the Articles and Homilies especially, are constructed with a full recognition of the Apostolic origin and Catholic character of the Church of England; while the fundamental doctrine of its Apostolic Succession is unmistakably taught, as a principle absolutely essential, in the Preface of "the form and manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons," as well as elsewhere.

#### OBITUARY.

THE Rev. James Lynne Alexander, the oldest clergyman in the Diocese of Niagara, calmly and peacefully departed from this world on the 22nd of August, at Grimsby, where he has resided for the last six years. Mr. Alexander was born in Ireland in the year 1800. When sixteen years of age he emigrated to Canada with his father and family, who settled in the township of Markham. For some years he devoted himself to teaching, and for a short time held the position of assistant in the famous school of the late Bishop Strachan, at Toronto. He then prepared for the sacred ministry in the theological school of Rev.

Mr. Braithwaite, of Chambly, where many of the clergy of that period were trained. He was ordained Deacon in 1829 and Priest in 1832, by the Bishop of Quebec. His first appointment was curate of Cornwall. He was also missionary at Leeds, Megantic, from 1831 to 1845, in which year he was moved to Saltfleet and Binbrook, where he remained until 1873. Severe family affliction in that year—the loss of two promising children, one of whom was preparing to take Holy Orders—caused him to remove to Grimsby, where his son and daughter had just been interred, and from that time he gave up parochial duty. Fond of literary pursuits, Mr. Alexander kept up the habit of study, and frequently had young men with him for instruction.

His kindly, gentle disposition made all who knew him friends. The firm sincerity of his faith and humility of life beautifully set forth the excellency of the Gospel which he preached, and now at a good old age he has gone to join the five children at whose side he has just been placed in the pretty, peaceful churchyard of St. Andrews, Grimsby. His widow and family, in the midst of relatives and friends, have the deep sympathy of all around them who esteem his memory and regret his loss.

The Lord Bishop of Niagara, the Dean of Niagara, and the rector of the parish each took a part in the funeral service on Monday, the 25th. Rev. Canons Worrel and Roberts, Rural Dean Bull, Rev. C. C. Whitcombe, Messrs. Carscallon and Lutes, were pall bearers. Rev. R. S. Locke was also present.

Blessed are they who sleep in Jesus, waiting the glorious day when all things shall be made new.

#### CHURCH THOUGHTS BY A LAYMAN.

NO. II.—SCIENTIFIC IDIOCY.

THE general and true conception of science as being the embodiment of severe accuracy of expression and of reasoning to the point of demonstration based upon the demonstrable existence of phenomena and of facts, of "certainty grounded on demonstration," as Berkeley says, is likely ere long to give place to a conviction that looseness of phraseology, incapacity of proof, wild imagining, are the characteristics of scientific language, achievement, and argument. The time is shadowed forth in Scripture of a period when men shall "believe a lie;" that period is the present era and the men are scientists. It seems, nay, it is the case, that having set at naught the Word and made light of the manifestation of God in His creation, these searchers after a substitute for a Divine Creator have been plunged by Him into an abyss of folly; He who gave them reason has darkened their understandings, confounded their judgment, changed their light into darkness, their logic into incoherency, and turned their so-called Science, by which they have tried to expel Him from His throne as the source of all life and order and being, into speculations bordering upon idiocy.

The British Association for the Advancement of Science seems to have become an association for the promotion of Atheism, of Materialism, of Speculations upon the unknowable and the non-demonstrable. At the meeting of this society at Belfast, Professor Tyndal, in his Presidential address, set forth views directly opposed to the conception of man as a spiritual, an immortal being. His microscope and lancet and chemistry had failed to detect in any cadavre in a dissecting room the presence of the soul or spirit of man, therefore he pronounced man a mere compound