THE COST OF TRANSLATION TO AN ARCHBISHOP.—Very exaggerated statements have been circulated about the enormous fees exacted by various officials from Dr. Magee in the course of his transfer from Peterborough to York. It was said to be £7,000 in all. It now appears that it was only £400, and that not for red-tape officials, but expenses of furniture, &c. The rumour, however, was enough excuse for some to attack the Church.

SCARCITY OF PARSONS.—The report is abroad that the ordinations this year on Trinity Sunday, in England, show a decrease of nearly 100 as compared with last year. The average is only about 15 per diocese, for 31 dioceses. This decay among the laity of the zeal for saving souls deserves to be noted, watched, and if possible corrected. The root of the matter is the want of liberality in religious offerings. They make livings into starvings, and then shrink from them in horror.

ST. AUGUSTINE'S COLLEGE AND THE UNIVERSITY OF WINDSOR, NOVA SCOTIA.—The Board of Governors of this University have adopted the suggestions recommended a few weeks ago by a correspondent in these columns, and St. Augustine's men can now enjoy at Windsor the same status accorded by the University of Durham. Full particulars will be published in the University calendar for next term. King's College, Windsor, is the oldest Church university of the Dominion and possesses a Royal Charter from George III., dated 1802. The hoods worn by graduates are identical with those of the University of Oxford.

OBITER DICTA.

(THINGS SAID BY THE WAY.)

Statements made and approved in court are so called when they form no essential part of the "Reasons for Judgment," but lead up to a decision towards which they usually contribute some degree of corroboration. They are like particles of gold-dust thrown off in the course of manufacture, and adding some additional lustre to the occasion, as well as capable of giving additional value to that which is done, serving, meantime, too, as illustrations of the character of the work. It may even be said that—deprived of these dicta in the course of usage—the coinage or manufacture would deteriorate in intrinsic value, though still stamped and hall-marked by authority. In fact the line between *obiter dicta* and *res judicata*. is a faint and varying one. The appeal case of Read v. the Bishop of Lincoln, now before the Privy Council Judicial Committee, seems, from the report in the *Guardian* (a marvel of *verbatim* accuracy) to be particularly rich in such material, and to promise a large fund of useful information to those who follow it.

THE ASSISTANCE OF AN OPPONENT

is a privilege the absence of which Sir Horace Davy (for the prosecution) pathetically laments, but the members of the committee—notably the Lord Chancellor, Lord Herschell, and Archbishop-elect Maclagan—rather humorously at times consent to fill the gap for the Bishop of Lincoln. The learned counsel sometimes gave way to a feeling that the bishop gets too much of this kind of consideration, and that the absence of an opponent is almost too well atoned for by the keen and trenchant criticisms of the learned board of her Majesty's advisors. As a rule, perhaps, the defendant gains more than he loses by his conspicuous absence; as, in most other cases, the sympathy of the court inclines rather to his side, and fair play is called most persistently. In one case Sir Horace is startled by being

QUOTED AGAINST HIMSELF

because the Lord Chancellor happened to remember a very learned argument of Sir Horace in another court on the question of what constituted a labourer in the time of Queen Elizabeth, although the learned counsel in this case was trying hard to get ruled out the great mass of contemporaneous evidence which Archbishop Benson had made use of in his court in order to show the meaning of Liturgical arrangements introduced or approved by Cranmer and Cosin. Sir Horace pleads *ad-misericordian* that he had done a great many irregular things in his time, but now might be assumed as older and wiser.

"NEW LIGHT"

was an expression used by Lord Cairns in a former Privy Council finding, as a reason for re-hearing a case when new material for judgment had been discovered. Of this admission of Lord Cairns, the Archbishop had made full use, to the extent of practically ignoring and setting aside former Ritual decisions of the Privy Council on the ground that all the necessary evidence for a correct judgment had not been put before them. The Archbishop educed from his vast stores of Liturgical learning, ancient and modern, an array of material with which the clever lawyer finds himself overwhelmed.

"WINE."

The committee seems to have spent some days on the question as to whether a mixture (Krama, in Greek) of wine with a little water was called, and could be properly called, by the simple term wine after all. At last they managed to get down to the idea that after all it is a ques ion of the *strength* of the wine, or the tempering of its alcoholic potency by the presence of more or less aqueous fluid, without altering its essential nature in the least degree or imparting any foreign ingredient whatever. So the usage of a mixed cup seems at last to have been put on a solid basis of common sense.

FALSE QUANTITIES AND ABLATIVES ABSOLUTE

afforded room for a good deal of by-play of scholastic learning on the part of the Lord Chancellor and the Bishop of St. David's. The former gave utterance to the "mot"—in regard to a quotation from a Latin "Consecration Service" rubric—"the number of absolutes do not, to my mind, absolutely convince as to what is meant." The question was whether "*effundit admistaque aqua*" implied mixing at the time or previously at any time. Lord Hatherly came in for some rather caustic remarks on all sides because of the want of lucidity in his judgments, based largely on garbled quotations, &c.

"THE LENGTH OF THE CHANCELLOR'S FOOT"

was quoted as a saying indicating the uncertainty of the decisions of courts with varying *personnels*. "It depends," said Sir Horace Davy, "on the particular lords who constitute a particular committee," whether a question should be re-opened by some succeeding committee or court on the ground of inadequate argument or mistaken consideration. So, it becomes clear, that judges are at liberty to examine the reasons of former decisions of the same or other courts, and "if they found themselves forced to dissent from the reasons, then to decide upon their own views of the law." Lord Esher remarked: "I cannot believe that the House of Lords or any other human beings are obliged to go on deciding nonsense because they have been misled into deciding nonsense once. I am a rebel to that!"

A CONTEXT OF 1,500 YEARS

—a very remarkable context—is what the Bishop of Lichfield urged as existing in the continuous Catholic tradition of a mixed cup from the days of the Apostles till those of the Reformers. Sir Horace had been arguing that "wine" must mean *wine only*, unless the context of the passage showed that water had been previously mixed with what was afterwards still called wine. Dr. Maclagan therefore suggested that the usage of the Church for 1,500 years had something to do with the meaning of the term "wine" in our liturgy.

CLASPING THE HANDS IN PRAYER

was noted by the Lord Chancellor as a ceremonial act, and admitted by Sir Horace Davy to be a "ceremony, as much as making the sign of the cross in the benediction." This is bad news for some pious Protestants! It was even questioned whether one could pray at all without *some* such ceremony, even if the hands hung by the sides passively. Then how about "turning up the eyes" and other concomitants of pious prayer. Is that unlawful ceremony? In the words of Sir Horace, "I am sure I do not know how that is!" It is *reductio ad*.

UNFIT FOR DUTY.

Not many years ago one of the most frightful railway accidents—a literal and horrible *holocaust*—which ever occurred in Canada was proven to have been originally due to the sleepiness of an overworked conductor. The company has had to pay handsomely for all the lives then lost, and yet any mere money payment only deals with the superficial discomforts and consequences. Nothing can ever replace adequately the husbands, brothers and sons who were removed in one fell swoop from the side of their dependent families and friends. Yet this is only a simple example of

A COMMON ERROR,

may we not call it a crime? If a man, knowing the approach of an important duty for which he is bound to provide, deliberately unfits himself for the due performance of that duty, does he not slight a solemn obligation, and become guilty of criminal negligence as to its performance? We make no reference to cases (exceptional) in which the duty is not foreseen, or in which the stress of present employment cannot be avoided. We refer to cases for which it is possible to provide.

THE LORD'S DAY

cannot be said to be unforeseen, and ordinarily there can be no great difficulty in preparing and providing for the performance of its special appropriate religious duties: yet large masses of the population are totally unfitted—by their previous degree of toil and labour, or pleasure and amusement, as the case may be—for the right observance of the sacred period of holy rest. Mere physical rest—doing nothing—does not begin to fill the obligation. The body is only one side of the human being. Mind, heart, soul, spirit, all cry out for consideration—for such usage as will afford them relief and refreshment from the strain of six days' fatigue.

MANY OTHER DUTIES,

both sacred and domestic, call as loudly for consideration. The rush and hurry of business, the excitements of speculation, the greedy search for gold, the impetuous pursuit of personal gratification—these are things which are always now-a-days interfering with the performance of the