

Council judgments of this kind, leaving it open to the clergy to deny every article of the Christian faith. Also this new judgment takes away from the Colonial dioceses the right of meeting in Synod to make rules and regulations for the management of the affairs of the Church, and for adapting the English parochial system to the circumstances and needs of the various Colonies. It may be said that this does not affect us in Canada, inasmuch as our Synods are established by Act of Parliament. This, however, will probably be found to be a mistake. So long as Canadian churchmen and clergy voluntarily submit to them, our synodical regulations and decisions will hold good; but in case of appeal, the Privy Council will set aside all those that are not in accordance with the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England, "as by law established." Our Provincial Court of Appeal goes at once—we *have none* now—the only appeal being from the Bishop's Court in each diocese to the civil courts of the country, and from them to the Privy Council in England. Whether English churchmen throughout the world will submit to so monstrous a tyranny as this, remains to be seen. Meantime an appeal from Lord Romilly's decision lies to the Privy Council, which may wholly reject or very considerably modify his judgment. It does not appear from the English papers whether notice of such appeal has yet been given.

The ritual movement continues to occupy a large share of public attention in England, and seems to be viewed by the more thoughtful with an increasingly grave anxiety. Bishop Ellicott, the learned, scholarly and catholic-minded Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, in a sermon preached in the Cathedral of Bristol on the 4th November "says justly of recent changes in ritual," (we quote the *Guardian*) "that they signify and are meant to signify if not changes, enhancements and developements" of doctrine: and as such he reprehends them severely, not without ample consideration for the various motives and causes which have tended and are tending to impel good men in this dangerous direction. "That is true" (the *Guardian* proceeds) "these changes are in fact substituting for the services of our liturgy other and different services which give to certain doctrines a character and prominence different from those which the liturgy assigns them; and such changes an individual clergyman has no right to make—no right toward his congregation, and no right toward the Church." There are however some cheering signs on the part of the more advanced ritualists of yielding to the general judgment and feeling of the Church. In several cases the vestments, incense, &c., have been abandoned.—On the other hand it is curious to note that the ritualistic movement has penetrated the dissenting bodies with great power. At the autumnal meeting of "the Congregational Union of England and Wales" lately held in Sheffield, the celebrated Newman Hall, the chairman, having complained that dissenters "have failed to win the upper classes, and do not even retain the children of those who have risen amongst us to a high social position," goes on to suggest as remedies greater attention to church architecture, "so as to attract persons of