

present day were taught by this manual, or by manuals on a very similar principle, the effects would be most important and beneficial before the new century dawns upon the world.

The work before us contains one or two portions which some of us would probably regret; but where is the book with every utterance of which every reader agrees? This manual needs but a very copious index to add very greatly to its already great usefulness while possibly a suggestion or two at the end of several of the lessons whereby to render it personally applicable to the scholar might give it a spiritually useful turn more distinctly than it now possesses. The information contained in it is just what is needed, and is given in an engaging way. Whoever masters this manual will become acquainted with grand Christian truths for his soul's profit, will perceive sound Christian principles of great value, will know much Church history, will know concerning Church orders, will learn the story of the Church in England from the earliest times of Roman usurpations, and will be taught something of Church and State; also of the Catholic Church in Ireland, Scotland, the United States, and the British Dominions. There is (page 214) an Appendix I., giving the succession of Bishops from the Apostle St. John, and also from the Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul to the present Bishops of the Scottish and American Churches. Appendix II., gives the succession in Ireland from St. Patrick, A. D. 445. There is also (page 281) a simple and very useful synopsis of the Old and New Testaments. At page 78 is an interesting statement of the doings of our blessed Lord through Holy Week.

I have thus sought to draw attention to what appears to me to be one of the most valuable manuals for use in a Sunday school that I have met with, not forgetting my own far inferior efforts, and some by others of a very high order. Then there are four grades—Primary, Junior, Middle, and Senior—having the same lesson in all grades. The instruction given on confirmation, liturgic worship, and the history of the Book of Common Prayer, is just what ought to be made known. It certainly seems to be highly necessary that plain catechetical teaching should be everywhere put into force when one is told of a dying person gathering her friends around her and with the greatest confidence charging them to meet her in heaven. Far be it from me or any one to judge her, but it was not well for one whose two successive husbands were brothers (Lev. xviii, 16) to talk thus. The ready answer, too, by those who neglect Confirmation and the Lord's Supper is startling: 'They are customs in this country, but I don't hold with them and don't approve them.' Is it not marvellous that steady and respectable men can be found who talk thus? For my part, I am heartily glad that Bibles abound and that all can read them; but I much doubt whether they are known as well as they were forty years ago, and it would seem that when read it is often with the intention of cavilling, and with no desire to obedience. Manuals of Christian Doctrine, graduated, to be well used in all our Sunday schools would, I submit, do much to help the people, and while feeling uncomfortable lest I seem invidious, I have fulfilled the task which I was requested to undertake in asking attention to this important subject, and in also mentioning a work which, I must submit, is admirably adapted to the object, albeit still capable of improvement. Neither he for whom I have written this, nor I myself, have any interest whatever in the work, except only as it may promote real good; and I may conclude by stating that copies of each of the four grades are on sale at J. Masters & Co., New Bond Street, London.

GEORGE VENABLES,

Burghcastle Rectory, } Hon. Canon of Norwich  
near Great Yarmouth, }  
May 8th, 1890.

THE JUDICIAL COMMITTEE OF THE PRIVY COUNCIL.

The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council is a comparatively new body. The office of the Privy Council is to advise the Sovereign in matters of State. In 1833 a Judicial Committee of Privy Councillors was created by Act 2 and 3, Will. IV., which constituted the Lord Chancellor, Lord Chief Justice, Master of the Rolls, and other legal Privy Councillors, a Committee of Advice to the Crown in all cases of appeal. In civil matters the new Judicature has worked fairly well. Lord Brougham was the chief author of the legislative reforms of 1832 and 1833, and in drafting his Bills he, unfortunately, included ecclesiastical appeals as well as civil appeals as within the scope of the newly-formed Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. The Church of England was not officially consulted in this momentous matter. Lord Brougham afterwards admitted that he had not realised the full consequences of his action, and certainly matters of faith and doctrine were never intended to come before the Privy Council by the authors of the legislation of 1832. The Church did not at the moment realise the unwarrantable invasion of her privileges which the legislation of 1832 involved. For years there had been no appellate cases involving faith and doctrine. Broadly speaking, the ecclesiastical suits of appeal in the Middle Ages never touched doctrine. They were concerned almost solely with matrimonial causes, and with disputes as to wills. At the Reformation an Appellate Court, called the Court of Delegates, was appointed to hear ecclesiastical appeals. It was created by Act 25, Henry VIII., and consisted of Bishops, Judges, and ecclesiastical lawyers, appointed under the Great Seal to deal with each case as it arose. Their decisions were not quoted as precedents, and the Court of Delegates never attempted to manufacture or manipulate the doctrine and discipline of the Church. The Court of Delegates was not ideally perfect, but it was, at all events, accepted by the Church of England as part of the Reformation Settlement. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council has never been accepted by the Church of England as her Final Court of Appeal. Its jurisdiction has been thrust upon her by the State, and she has never consented officially to this invasion of her just rights. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council is a purely secular Court, and it is impossible for the Church to submit to its usurped authority. The fifth Commandment bids us honor and obey all lawful authority which is set over us. But the saintly Keble said that he could never bring the Privy Council's authority in Church matters under the head of the fifth Commandment. The calm judgment of the author of the *Christian Year* condemned the usurpation by the State of the rights of the Church, which the unhappy legislation of 1832 involved, in very plain terms. 'Neither by oath nor engagement' says Mr. Keble, 'are we committed to such an arrangement. It is no part of the system to which the Clergy are pledged.' Mr. Keble says that it is the duty of the clergy to treat the ecclesiastical judgments of the Privy Council 'as Dissenters treated certain Acts of Parliament which fined them for not going to Church, i. e., to disregard them and take the consequences.' Mr. Keble died in 1866, and it is not too much to say that his line of action with regard to the interference of the Privy Council in church matters, is accepted by the majority of Churchmen at the present day. Archbishop Tait found the tension so great that in 1881 he procured the appointment of a Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Courts, which issued an elaborate and exhaustive report in 1883. The report condemned the

Court of Lord Penzance, which was created by the Public Worship Regulation Act of 1874, and also condemned the Privy Council as a Court of Appeal. Both Courts are alike secular and both alike have been forced on the Church of England by the State. In 1850 the Archbishop of Canterbury and nearly all the Bishops of the Church of England were roused to the danger of a purely civil court, like the Privy Council, dealing with matters of faith and doctrine. They introduced a Bill into the House of Lords providing that the Archbishops and Bishops of the Church of England should be constituted a final Court of Appeal in all matters of faith and doctrine. The Bill was unhappily lost. Archbishop Sumner in the course of debate said, 'It could never be satisfactory that questions relating to the doctrine and discipline of the Church should be submitted to a tribunal of laymen.' These words are a very remarkable testimony coming from so pronounced an Evangelical as Archbishop Sumner was. Bishop Blomfield pointed out that the Royal Supremacy must be exercised through proper spiritual Courts. This is the meaning of the 37th Article, which never contemplated the exercise of the Royal supremacy through secular Courts.

Henry VIII. never went so far as that.

The late Lord Derby gave his opinion in the following words; 'As he would entrust to the Judges the interpretation of the civil law so he would entrust the Bishops of the Church of England with the interpretation of the Articles of the Church of England.'

This unsuccessful attempt at legislation is at all events a distinct protest on behalf of the Church, through her natural leaders, against the usurped jurisdiction of the Privy Council. The arguments in the Bishop of Lincoln's case show that one party in the Church are determined to uphold this usurped authority for partizan purposes. Sir Horace Davey relies solely upon the decisions of a tribunal Churchmen can never accept, in urging his case against the Bishop of Lincoln. There are some people in South Africa who would like the Church of this Province to put herself under the Authority of the Privy Council, as a final Ecclesiastical Court. They would ask us to accept by our own free act and deed, a tribunal which the Church of England has never accepted, a tribunal condemned as unfit for its purpose by the Royal Commission of 1883, a tribunal which has shewn that its decisions are governed by policy instead of law, a tribunal whose decisions have contradicted each other over and over again, and finally, a tribunal we cannot accept without violating our Lord's own precept, 'Render unto Cæsar the things which be Cæsar's, and unto God the things which be God's.' Whilst rendering due and loyal obedience to the powers that be as ordained of God, we dare not let Cæsar touch the things of God, or permit the Courts of the State to decide the faith and doctrine of the Church.—*Southern Cross, South Africa.*

A DYING TESTIMONY.

"I believe from my heart the Truth which this Gospel (that of St. John) more especially enshrines—the truth that Jesus Christ is the very Word incarnate, the manifestation of the Father to mankind—is the one lesson which, duly apprehended, will do more than all our feeble efforts to purify and elevate human life here, by imparting to it hope and light and strength, the one study which alone can fitly prepare us for a joyful immortality hereafter."

These words from the Bishop of Durham's article in the January number of *The Expositor*, were printed at the head of the funeral service-paper placed in the hands of the crowds who thronged to show their loving reverence at his grave.—*Iowa Churchman.*