

the fairness or the ability of the judges. No doubt, it may be said that the judges will come to these trials with their pre-conceived opinions; but, after the Lincoln trial before Archbishop Benson it will hardly be possible to call in question the independence of judgment in such a tribunal. The Archbishop of Canterbury has declared his desire to hear all that may be urged by any accused person in defence of the practices which may be called in question. We may therefore be sure that these subjects will now be sifted to the bottom, and that, if a decision is even possible, it will now be arrived at. Moreover, the Archbishops are both men of very great ability, of well-balanced and impartial minds, not in the least likely to be carried away by breezes from either quarter. Will the Ritualists respond to this offer? We believe that a considerable proportion of them will do so; and we think those who refuse will, in the eyes of their fellow-countrymen, put themselves out of Court, and then perhaps other ways may be found of dealing with them. God grant that, in some way, these troubles may cease. Give peace in our time, O Lord.

#### THE PHILIPPINES.

We must confess ourselves among the number of those who rejoice to hear of the successes of the American arms in the Philippines, and who regret that a lack of intelligence on the part of a portion of the inhabitants should lead them to resist the measures, which are calculated to lead to their own ultimate benefit. We do not for a moment believe the report that the Americans had stirred up the resistance of the natives, that they might have an excuse for putting it down with the sword. In the first place, the Americans have shown no blood-thirstiness in any part of their recent campaign, whether in Cuba or in the Philippines. In the second place we cannot believe them so destitute of reason as to create difficulties in the way of the work which they have undertaken. The islands they have taken possession of, and they are bound to hold them and civilize them. When this is accomplished, they may then consider what they have next to do. But this need not specially consider the present generation, and certainly not the present generation of Canadians. We have the deepest sympathy with the work of the Americans on two quite clear grounds. In the first place, on account of the various peoples and tribes which are found in those Asiatic islands. There seemed no prospect of the Spaniards bringing them into a civilized condition. Whether that was the fault of their race, or of their religion, or of their form of government, we need not enquire. Now white men, especially men of our own race, have a very remarkable faculty of extending civilization and of making other peoples capable of being treated as civilized human beings. No doubt there are difficulties and recoils and relapses, but still the work goes on; and we can see no prospect possible for these wild peo-

ples, with so much of hope in it, as that they should become Americanized, receive civilization under that form. But we confess that we have another reason for wishing success to the Stars and Stripes in those regions. Americans and British are engaged in the same work. They are meaning to do that work in the same spirit, and largely by the same methods. It is a great thing that they should work side by side, and shoulder to shoulder. There is the least possible chance of any misunderstanding between them; and other nations will be less likely to meddle with them, when they are two and not one. It is sometimes said that all our interests, in colonizing and the like, are commercial interests, simply and solely. The best answer to such a reproach will be a consideration of the British methods. They claim nothing which they are not willing to concede. Who, then, are the rapacious colonizers—those who would shut out other peoples from their ports, their rivers, their stations? or those who would place no such restrictions? When this question is answered, there will be a complete reply to the silly and insincere accusation brought against our people.

#### LORD HALIFAX'S VIEWS.

The February number of the Nineteenth Century, which reached us too late for review until to-day, contains two articles interesting to Churchmen. The first is one by Lord Halifax, and forms an "apologia" for those who believing in the unknown continuity of the Anglican Church with the Church planted at Canterbury by Augustine, "maintain that she cannot be independent of, or indifferent to, the teaching of the rest of Christendom, or relieved from the obligation of those rules, regulations, doctrinal statements, and ritual observances which she has at any time laid for the guidance of her members, except in such definite and specific particulars as she has distinctly abrogated or altered them herself. In a word, that a Catholic interpretation is the only interpretation of which the formularies of the Church of England are really patient and the only interpretation by which they are bound." We do not propose to discuss the question of how far the XXXIX. Articles are susceptible of such interpretation where it is sought to add to or vary plain language used; we content ourselves with the consideration of the question of how far the plain language of Rubrics ought to be set aside or varied by reading into them extraneous considerations of alleged ancient Catholic practice. We think Lord Halifax is unfortunate in hitting upon "a celebration of the Holy Communion when there is no one to communicate with the priest," as a Catholic practice which he seeks to defend in the face of the plain directions of all the Post Reformation Prayer-Books, except, singularly enough, the present Prayer-Book of the Protestant Episcopal Church of America. Not only are the rubrics singularly clear, but the whole language of the most solemn parts of the office itself are inconsistent with such a celebration (and turn the use of solemn words into

a mockery). Then, the Confession is "to be made in the name of all those that are minded to receive the Holy Communion," followed by the Absolution, pronounced by the priest to the people. Absolution can only be pronounced after Confession, and to those who have confessed, who in this service are limited to those "that are minded to receive." At a "High Celebration," without communicants, unconfirmed choir boys repeat the Confession, can it be contended that they receive the benefit of the Absolution? In other words, does the priest pronounce Absolution to anyone but to himself alone! The wording of the "prayer of humble access," and of the precatory part of the Consecration is in the plural number: "grant us . . . so to eat, etc." "We receiving these Thy creatures of bread and wine." Is it not a mockery to use these words where only the celebrant is intending to receive? Can any ancient Catholic usage in vogue before the compilation of the Prayer-Book justify such a mockery of solemn words? If Lord Halifax is prepared to defend "solitary masses," he must pardon us if we advise our readers to adopt the safer guidance of the Bishops, who condemn such celebrations. Lord Halifax also censures the Bishops for condemning Reservation, while they do not condemn Evening Communion. Many of the English Bishops have, in charges to their clergy, deprecated the introduction of Evening Communion, but it is at least questionable whether any Bishop would be justified in forbidding it in his diocese. While the Rubrics against Reservation are couched in plain language, there is no Rubric which expressly or impliedly forbids Evening Communion, nor is there one word in the office for Holy Communion inconsistent with an evening celebration; and Lord Halifax is driven to read into the Rubrics "a point of discipline" (fasting communion we presume), "by which," (he says), "the whole Church of England in the sixteenth century was as strictly bound as the rest of Christendom, and one which she has never relaxed, except so far as corrupt custom can be held to relax universal rule." With all deference to Lord Halifax, we have never yet met with any reliable authority recognizing this ancient point of discipline as binding on the Church in this century, though a goodly number of eminent authorities, Pusey, Samuel Wilberforce, Walsham How and others have expressly taught that it is not binding. When we come to Lord Halifax's plea for the use of incense, as permissible, according to his reading of the "Ornaments Rubric," we are fain to ask His Lordship whether he can prove the use of incense at any time by such representative men as Keble, Pusey, Carter of Clewer, Butler of Wantage, Dean Church; and, if they did not show by their own practice that they considered its use desirable, why should its use be revived after centuries of disuse, against the opinion of all the members of the English Episcopate to-day? The other article, by Mr. George W. E. Russell on "Ritualism and Disestablishment," has more interest for Englishmen than for Canadians. Like pre-

vious articles by in the Churchman it is a somewhat Gladstone's Church his early writings Englishmen are when interpreted later years of has, in the Provi Church of Engl survive the blow Irish branch di reasonable peopl State gain by tl Church?" and ar ill-advised clergy the authority of sufficient justifi spoliation of tl Church, which wake of Disesta may gauge pub which took plac on the motion after the memb of reading Mr. shall aptly desc trifle "previous."

#### TWO IND

The vacant S have been filled spectively, of the Rev. G. A. a Scholar of was ordained a was appointed Calcutta, and to the Bishop In the year 18 Oxford Univer Lefroy is a Trin and took his d in the 1st clas was ordained past has been of the Society Gospel. For s member of the sion at Delhi, present head, Bickersteth of pointed exami of Lahore in

#### CHURCH

A layman in from the Rev Blyth's staff i following into "After leaving to 199 lectur Ireland, one were nearing audience. Th tures were de sion. Jerusalem, I v Blyth, in St. September 25 congregation. Dublin, and by Irish C the first time