

seem far more removed from us, but which has not such hindrances to union with us as the Church of Rome has. When the Bishop of Tenos was in England I had the pleasure of entertaining him at Ely, and we had much conversation on the Articles of our Faith. A publication came out later on his visit, and he said that he had come to the conclusion that the Church of England was the purest in character, next to the Eastern Church. I will only allude to the other bodies. The movement amongst the Old Catholics in Germany and Switzerland was necessary; the Old Catholics have conducted themselves with great moderation and wisdom, although they failed to do as we hoped they would do—produce a complete reformation; but they are not losing ground, as many people suppose. With regard to the great Church of Rome, all our Christianity and Church principles have come down to us from this channel, and I would not have any one speak with disrespect of a Church to which our fathers owed so much. I do not, however, see how any one who holds the Catholic faith could join with it when it holds such a heresy, if one may call it a heresy, in Church organization, as the absorbing of all Church order into one man who shall be absolute, but who is really a slave to lead others. I do not see how a Church which lets Episcopacy merge into the Bishop of Rome can be united to us; or, again, a Church which accepts the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary; for, if they believe that human nature was healed by the Virgin Mary before the birth of Christ, I see no hope of our uniting with them. They will not allow union; it must be unconditional surrender. Still, putting all this aside, we may hope that things may so come about by the grace of God, that union may take place between us and other bodies, and also with the Church of Rome. We ought to act with perfect generosity, liberality, and kindness of feeling, but also with wisdom and moderation, and these are the feelings of this Society. At the Conference at Lambeth these questions will shortly be discussed by 140 or 150 Bishops from all parts of the world, who ask God to vouchsafe the true and right conclusions to their deliberations; and they ask of you, both clergy and laity, to give us your prayers. There are many hopes, but they are like the glimmering twilight: we must all work in our different spheres, with true humility, for as we work in the sphere God has put us in He will bless us, and a better understanding will arrive between us and our brethren, and the spirit of unity will at last grow up amongst us.

THE BISHOP OF ROCHESTER ON THE LORD'S DAY.

The Bishop of Rochester, speaking last week at his Diocesan Conference, said: As to Sunday, there can hardly, I suppose, be two opinions as to the considerable increase of persons who deliberately use it as a day of social pleasure and physical recreation without any apparent recognition of its obligation on the Christian conscience as "the Lord's Day." This pervades all classes alike. Among the young men of the various strata of the middle-class, the bicycle has effected an entire revolution in the use and observance of Sunday. The Thames, which flows past our own borders, has always, I suppose, been the Sunday resort of Londoners; but the modern invention of the house-boat and steam-launch goes far to aggravate the painfulness of the scandal. I have been informed that the constant blowing of the steam-whistle from morning to night is in some places an actual disturbance to public worship. On the mass of toilers from the great city, who come for air and greenery, and for the music of the birds and the sweetness of the flowers, and for the moral bath of nature's harmonies, I, for one, will not cast too stern or reproachful a look. Their needs are great. The glory of nature is God's kind gift

to them. The Church desires to help them to enjoy it. Their Saviour shall judge them; we will not. Further, it is no lofty ideal of a rare devoutness that we claim imperiously to lay on the necks of our toiling brethren. Nor do we ask any to go back out of the personal liberty of the man made free in Christ, by Christ's spirit, into the yoke of an obsolete Judaism, with its necessary strictness and its impracticable ordinances. Nor would I, for one, excommunicate or even upbraid the Churchman (I do not concur with him, and I think his example unfortunate) who, careful of his worship and his communion in the early part of the day, uses the rest of it for recreation. But we may blame and warn those pleasure-lovers of the well-to-do classes of society who, having all the week wherein to enjoy and amuse themselves, must have Sunday as well; whom no one compels to worship God, if they do not wish to worship Him; but who have no right to prevent others from worshipping Him, though employing them to minister to their pleasures. To take from the poor man his precious inheritance of a seventh day's rest is a kind of moral robbery. The observance of Sunday is no mean bulwark of the fear, and sense, and recollection of God. It lies at the very root, not only of religion, but even of morals. To secularise Sunday may be, in the end, to banish God out of the thoughts of the people. It is increasingly perceptible that none are more jealous of keeping Sunday as a day of rest than the working classes; none view more sternly, more bitterly, the increasing encroachments of wealthy and luxurious selfishness on the needful repose of the poor. But the hard thing is to know how to remedy it. Will the Conference help us? If we preach about it, the people about which we preach are not present to hear us. If we write tracts about it, should our compositions ever reach their hands (which is most improbable), the last thing that is likely to happen to them is their being read. Anything like a public protest might only win a bitter scuff at priestly interference with the innocent liberty of the people. What is even a more difficult matter is that we are a house divided against itself. The Divine authority for the Lord's Day with some of us is a matter of passionate and indisputable conviction; with others it is hedged by so many exceptions, and weakened by so many concessions, that it is practically valueless as a solid argument; and we all of us know sincere Churchmen—whom we respect for their intrepidity, and esteem for their excellence, while we could wish that their energies were employed in denouncing real moral evils—who seem inspired by a melancholy enthusiasm for disabusing the public mind of its noxious superstitions about the sacredness of Sunday; and who are succeeding so rapidly and so fatally in their effort to separate the idea of the Hebrew Sabbath from the weekly festival of the Lord's Resurrection, that they may soon be spared the necessity of vindicating His religion at all. Sunday is a Divine foundation. "If the foundations are cast down, what shall the righteous do?"

DARWINISM v. EVOLUTION.

BY THE REV. JAS. MCCANN, D.D.

The Christian world is again under an obligation to Mr. Gladstone for his crushing reply to Col. Ingersoll, published in the current number of the *North American Review*. In it, however, Mr. Gladstone seems to commit the common mistake of confounding Darwinism with evolution, while in reality they are far apart as the poles. Colonel Ingersoll maintains that Darwinism carried to its legitimate conclusion destroys the creeds and Scriptures of mankind. Mr. Gladstone asks: "On what ground and for what reason is the system of Darwin fatal to Scriptures and creeds?" Without entering into the larger question of all Scriptures and creeds, I reply that Darwinism is incompatible with a belief in the Christian Scriptures and creeds, because Darwinism affirms not only that there has been a transformation of species, but also that it has been accomplished by the survival of the fittest. In other words, Darwinism is the doctrine of chance, pure and simple. This transformation of species is not the working out of any foreknown plan or design, but the result alone of an accidental possession by some plant or animal of some advantage beyond its fellows. In the concluding chapter of *The Origin of Species* Mr. Darwin says: "Thus, from the war of nature, from famine and death, the most exalted object which we are capable of conceiving—namely, the production of the higher animals, directly follows. There is grandeur in this view of life, with its several powers, having been originally breathed by the Creator into a few forms or into one. A possible Creator is thus admitted, but "war," "famine," and "death" have done the work. It cannot be too clearly understood and enforced that any system which ignores intelligence in the direction of phenomena has only chance as an explanation. Consequently, a belief in Darwinism, which is chance, is wholly incompatible with a belief in Christianity; but it is also incompatible with a belief in reason. If

there was no necessary laws of thought reasoning would be impossible, and anything "necessary" is subversive of chance. It can also be mathematically demonstrated that the indefinite repetition of combinations in nature is by chance utterly impossible. It is not, however, my present purpose to disprove Darwinism, but to show its relation to Christianity.

"Evolution" is a totally different matter. It merely affirms that species have changed into higher forms, but does not postulate the agency by which those changes have been accomplished. This is quite consistent with the Scriptures, for they do not commit us to any theory of the production of species; in fact, the Bible is not committed to any theory on scientific matters, and herein lies its safety. Scientific theories rise like houses of cards and fall as rapidly, but the Bible stands outside them all, and challenges the scientific world to-day to name one fact of nature that is contradicted by one passage of Scripture. We are only told that "God created," and "God made;" the *modus operandi* is not indicated, but is left as a subject for investigation. Should future research discover evolution to have been the mode I see no reason for regret—in fact, there never ought to be regret at any discovery of truth, for it must in the long run add to the glory of God. There are many eminent Christians who believe in evolution, and think it a satisfactory explanation of God's working. I cannot agree with them, because I feel that if all the present species of plants and animals had been thus produced, there must have been discovered some indisputable evidence of it either in past or in recent times. Such evidence, however, is altogether wanting, not one single demonstration having been yet revealed. But be that as it may, Colonel Ingersoll is right when he says that Darwinism carried to its legitimate conclusion is fatal to creeds and Scriptures; Mr. Gladstone is wrong when he confounds Darwinism with evolution, but he is right when he says "there is no colourable ground for assuming evolution and revelation to be at variance with one another."—*The Rock*.

Home & Foreign Church News.

From our own Correspondents.

DOMINION.

MONTREAL.

St. Mary's.—An enthusiastic reception was tendered to the new pastor of St. Mary's Church, Marlborough street, Rev. John Edgecombe. The school room was tastefully decorated for the occasion, and the refreshment tables groaned under the liberal provision made for the invited guests, about one hundred in number, who did ample justice to the same. Rev. Mr. Rogers, of St. Luke's Church, presided, and on the platform were Messrs. Hawkins, Silverwood and Jackson. Rev. Mr. Edgecombe introduced the new pastor. Mr. Edgecombe made a telling speech, which showed that the reverend gentleman has work to be done and he means to do it. An interesting feature was the presentation of an address and purse of money to the retiring pastor, Mr. Borthwick, who is in ill-health, and who is about to visit Scotland and enjoy a well-earned holiday after twenty-two years constant labor in St. Mary's Church, besides for many years the work at the prisons.

ONTARIO.

DESERONTO.—Rural Dean Rollitt, of the diocese of Montreal, canvasser for the Sabrevois Mission, visited this town last week on behalf of that mission, and preached in St. Mark's Church on Sunday, July 1st.

MARYSBURG.—Good work is going on here. Rev. R. Atkinson has undertaken to thoroughly renovate St. Philip's Church, Milford, which, like the mission itself prior to his appointment, had gone very much to decay. A strawberry festival for the incumbent's individual benefit on Saturday, June 30th, yielded \$28 net.

ODESSA.—Rev. Mr. Quartermaine received an ovation from his people on returning home with his bride last week.

TORONTO.

CENTRETON.—St. John's Church.—A nine day's mission, commencing on Tuesday evening, the 19th ult., and closing on Wednesday evening, the 27th June, has been held in this neighbourhood, an outstation of the parish of Grafton. The Rev. W. C.