

ing a welcome social was accorded to the new pastor. The church over which Mr. Forster now is pastor, was formed in Commercial Eall, Radnor street, 1856, the chapel opened 1860. Rev. J. Clifford Hooper pastor. Rev. Richard Brindley succeeded in 1863, the present indefatigable and genial secretary of the London Congregational Union. Rev. Andrew Mearns, was the next pastor, 1866 and 1880, Rev. W. Cuthbertson B.A., for a brief time succeeded. Mr. Cuthbertson we believe was chairman of the Congregational Union of England and Wales in 1879. It will thus be seen that Mr. Forster has been called to fill no mean post in the ranks of our English churches, we, regretting his departure from us, can extend to him and the Markham Square church our warmest sympathies, and trust that the relation thus entered upon will be fraught with blessing to the pastor, his family, the church and neighbourhood. Markham Square is nearer than formerly to Canadian churches and hearts.

THE following gathered from our daily papers is not without its interest. The Governor-General of Canada has been informed by despatch from the secretary of State, that the Queen will not be advised to exercise her power of disallowance in respect of the Act legalizing marriage with a deceased wife's sister recently passed in the Dominion; i.e., that the assent of the Governor-General as the Queen's representative will be given to the Dominion Act, removing all disabilities in connection with the marriage in question, and that what is prohibited in England absolutely, becomes strictly legal in the Dominion of Canada, and therefor what is virtue here, is adultery there, even incest; locality draws the line between vice and virtue! Some one has put the anomalous state of things thus. Assuming the total area of Her Majesty's dominions to be, as estimated, 8,982,177 square miles, marriage with a deceased wife's sister is absolutely legal over an extent of 6,678,292 square miles of British territory, conditionally legal over 2,183,124 square miles, and still positively illegal over only 120,761 square miles. Can any one doubt the ultimate result in Britain.

THOUGH out of the arena of party politics, the change in the editorial management of the *Toronto Globe* cannot be passed over in sil-

ence by the contemporary press. The power of the *Globe* in Canadian matters heretofore has been unquestioned as to its extent. Neither friend nor foe could afford to ignore its utterances. Its influence hitherto has been inseparable from the name of Brown. Indeed the Hon. George Brown during his lifetime was the *Globe* and the party which that paper not so much represented as inspired, made, ruined and built up again. There can however be little doubt but that much of the true journalistic excellencies of the paper must be traced to Mr. Gordon Brown, who, on his brother's death, assumed the general management and editorship and who had been associated with his brother in the conducting of the paper. But the strong hand of the dictator lay in the grave, no other hand would be allowed to hold the reins, and "the party" have seen fit to bring a pressure to bear under which Mr. Gordon Brown honourably retires. The historic continuity is therefore broken, and the name of Brown virtually dissociated from the paper, to which hitherto it alone gave life and power. What will its future be under its changed relations? Time will tell. Certain it is that its "one man power" is gone, no other one man can gain that seat. As the exponent now of a party its course may in the altered position of the country be its only possible one of influence and prosperity, and the secured services of Mr. Cameron give assurance that such hope may be confidently indulged; meantime the *Mail*, having by enterprise and capital secured a first rank among Canadian journals is now doing its best by reckless statements regarding political opponents, and a system of personal abuse outrivalling the *Globe* in its bitterest days, to lose the vantage ground it has gained, and become a burden too great for its party, which may be constrained curb its utterances, or pass over to other premises.

DRESS is generally considered the especial care of women. It may astonish some gentlemen who keep a stricter account of their house than of their personal expenses, to let their eye rest upon the following statistical item gathered from the returns of trade. In the United States last year men's articles of wear footed up, 498 millions of dollars; womens 317. The average expenditure of a man's clothes for the year being \$45, a woman's