

reprinting of the foreign copyrighted works. Those are, however, but incidental and secondary considerations. A question of much practical importance to Canada is that of the manner and extent to which our own book trade will be affected. We see no reason to doubt that the reciprocal arrangement, if made between Great Britain and the United States, must apply to the Dominion. The United States will be sure to demand this, and it is very unlikely that the Mother Country, which has thus far withheld its sanction from our own Copyright Acts, will readily consent to depart from the principle hitherto maintained, that its Copyright Acts hold good throughout the Empire. Canadians, as lovers of fair play, cannot justly complain if their publishers are deprived of the power of reprinting American works without consent of authors or publishers, and also of the privilege of buying "pirated" reprints, on payment of a ten per cent. tax at the Custom House for the benefit of the author. It will, however, be a very great hardship if the Canadian publisher is bound hand and foot and left to be crushed between the upper and nether millstones of the reciprocal British and American copyrights. If both hold good in Canada there will evidently be small chance for Canadian republication of the books of either country, save by the aid of an almost prohibitory tax on those of both, in which case the cure would be even worse than the ailment. The Imperial Government is said to be now consulting with the various colonial authorities with reference to the granting of certain powers in regard to treaty-making asked by the latter. It may be hoped that, amongst other concessions, the Imperial Government will see the fairness of permitting Canada to make her own copyright arrangements with regard to both the Mother Country and the United States, thus giving her a chance to adopt such measures as will favour the republication of both British and American books in this country.

WHETHER the Messiah craze which is creating so much dangerous excitement among the Indians of various tribes and localities in the United States culminates in the horrors of Indian war and massacre, or not, and whether the ghost dances give rise to trouble with our own North-West Indians, or not, this episode in Indian history contains material for profitable reflection for the people on both sides of the line. One of the most suggestive features of these strange demonstrations is the apparent incongruity between cause and effect, or rather between the reported teachings of the semi-mythical Messiah and the results which they produce on the Indian mind inflamed by them. Although nothing definite seems to be known about the character or locality of the so-called Messiah, all accounts agree in representing his teachings as eminently peaceful, and yet their first swift effect seems to be to stir up the passion for war and revenge. However strong his faith in the supernatural agencies by which his deliverance is to be wrought, the Indian enthusiast seems quite indisposed to wait the tardy movements of those agencies, or to leave to them to avenge his wrongs and vindicate his righteous cause. There is nothing new historically in the appearance of such a wave of religious excitement among a superstitious or semi-barbarous people, but it is only when such excitement acts upon a slumbering sense of wrong and outrage that it can threaten the peace of the community or nation. Herein, it seems to us, is the lesson for the nation which now finds it necessary to hurry military re-inforcements to the Indian reserves, and to face the possibility of a series of petty but still terrible struggles. Is it not a shame and reproach that a nation which boasts itself the freest and most enlightened on earth has, during a century of marvellous growth and prosperity, utterly failed either to civilize the aboriginal tribes, or to satisfy their sense of justice, or in any way so to attach them to its people and institutions as to prevent the perpetuation of a rankling sense of wrong and passion for revenge, ready to be set on fire by any passing excitement? We say nothing of recent shameful violations of treaties, such as the immense shortages in the supplies of provisions promised by the Government, or of such glaring but characteristic mistakes as the recent discharge for purely political reasons of some of the most capable and trustworthy agents on the reserves, and putting in their places new and inexperienced men. These are but special items in the long catalogue of crimes against the Indian, which have made the present danger possible. Happily the Canadian, or perhaps we should rather say the British, mode of dealing with the Indians has been far more just and honourable, our neighbours as well as

the Indians themselves being judges, than that of the great Republic, and we have consequently much less to fear from their revengeful impulses. And yet it is true of the majority of our own Indians as of theirs, that they are yet in a state of ignorance and barbarism, such as makes them ready dupes of any scheming adventurer, or half-crazed impostor, who may choose to operate amongst them. The United States is at length becoming sensible of its long injustice and folly, and is taking measures for the universal education of the Indians, and for conferring on them the rights of citizenship. The new policy, if fairly carried out, can hardly fail to render the repetition of such an alarm an impossibility a score of years hence. Our own Government is, by means of various agencies, doing a good deal for the education of the young Indians, but, although money is freely spent, we have not yet boldly grappled with the question of universal, compulsory education, short of which all methods and schemes are radically incomplete and defective. Is it not too clear for argument that the time has come when neither nation should be content with any scheme or policy which aims at anything short of making the next generation of Indians intelligent and self-reliant men and women, sharing all the duties and rights of citizenship?

REFERRING to the horrible revelations which have been made concerning the Stanley expedition, we expressed the opinion last week that this should be the last of such purely volunteer enterprises, and that the Government of a civilized people should find some means of preventing a repetition of such atrocities by subjects of the nation. We are glad to see that the London *Spectator* takes in effect the same ground, maintaining that all African explorers should be placed under "a system which shall make the statute, 24 and 25 Vict., cap. 100, which we had overlooked, and which would have made Jameson liable to trial, practically operative. If it cannot be done without appointing a Protector of the Negroes in each port, with judicial powers, it must be done that way; but we should think it sufficient to invest each Governor of a settlement and Consul-General with that function." We do not recall the provisions of the Act referred to, but the outraged sentiment of the nation will, we can scarcely doubt, compel some action of the kind suggested for the governing of future expeditions. Meanwhile, it remains to be seen whether Parliament will acquiesce in the conclusion of Lord Salisbury, that the Government has no power to enquire into the conduct of, at least, the British officers who have achieved so unenviable a fame in connection with the Stanley expedition.

#### THE LAMBETH JUDGMENT.

THE recent judgment of the Archbishop of Canterbury in the case of the Bishop of Lincoln is of interest in a special way to the whole Anglican Communion; but it is not without interest to those other communions which have either derived their existence from the English Church, or have grown up beside it. Anyone can see that almost every Christian denomination in Great Britain, the Colonies, and the United States has been in no small degree affected by the three great religious movements which have taken place in the English Church during the last century and a half; and many persons are hoping that the time may not be far off when approaches may be successfully made towards the re-union of Christendom, or at least of its reformed portions.

The Archbishop's judgment has already been charged with compromise. It is not, we are told, the utterance of men who are simply endeavouring to ascertain what is legal: it is rather a kind of eirenicon, giving something to each side, in the hope that both will be thankful for such mercies as they receive, and will henceforth be at peace.

When we say that we see no evidence whatever of any such intention, we are writing from an absolutely neutral point of view, without any wish to favour either party; but with a simple desire to understand the grounds on which the judgment has been given, and to discover whether those grounds are justified in law or in history.

Our readers are probably aware that the Archbishop and his assessors have given several decisions at variance with those previously put forth by the Privy Council. We say the Archbishop and his assessors; because all the five bishops associated with his Grace agreed with him on every point save one, and on that one point there was only one dissident. When we consider that these five men were of different schools—High, Low and Broad, as

they are called—this agreement is certainly very remarkable.

The decisions at variance with those of the Privy Council are those which (1) justify the use of lighted candles at the altar, even when they are not wanted for purposes of lighting, (2) the singing of the *Agnus Dei* in the Communion Service, (3) the taking of the Ablutions after the Celebration. Besides, it is held that water and wine may be mixed for the Sacrament of the Altar, although not during the service—ritually, as it is called; and, further, that the Eastward Position may be taken not merely at the Prayer of Consecration, but throughout the whole of the Communion Service, whilst Bishop King is censured for hiding the manual acts from the people. The only point in which there is an absolute condemnation of the Bishop is in regard to his making the sign of the cross in saying the Benediction and the Absolution.

The Archbishop justifies the departure from the decisions of the Privy Council, on the grounds that fresh historical information had been furnished, and that he, being compelled to try the case, was bound to give his decision according to the facts and arguments presented before him. Certainly the Church Association will have no right to complain of his doing so, since they practically forced him to judge the case.

It will be observed that one main point of difference between those who represented the Church Association in this and other cases, and their opponents, had reference to the question, whether omission implied prohibition. It was argued by Counsel for the Association that wherever any rubrical direction is omitted in later editions of the Prayer Book, it was intended to prohibit the practice or act which had hitherto been ordered; and it would appear that the Privy Council took this view of the case. On the contrary, the representatives of the Ritualists contended that where a thing was not absolutely forbidden it was allowed.

Both contentions were palpably absurd. It might easily be shown (to anyone who was open to conviction) that a good many ceremonies, concerning which directions were no longer given, were intended to be left optional. It was equally clear, in other cases, that when the order to do a certain act was removed, it was intended that it should be omitted. So long as these extreme views were taken by the combatants, it was quite obvious that no agreement could be arrived at. The Archbishop and his assessors have taken the more moderate and wiser course of viewing every practice in the light of history, and ascertaining how far, on the one hand, a change of expression led to a change of practice, and, on the other hand, how far any changes of practice resulted from a change of law or from mere disuse. Our readers will be able to refer to the arguments and authorities connected with the judgment; and we can assure them that, apart altogether from the ecclesiastical issues, they will find the document to be one of great interest.

There can be no doubt that the Archbishop has, in various respects, corrected the *obiter dicta* of the Privy Council, whatever opinion may be entertained of the judgment, in whole or in part. For example, when the Privy Council condemned the ritual mixing of the water and wine in the Holy Communion, they went on to remark that it was hardly worth while considering whether the mixing in any other way was lawful, as this would not be a matter of interest to anyone, and so they condemned the mixing altogether. These were truly astounding statements to anyone who knew either the customs of the early Church or the practices of the English clergy since the time of the Reformation; and the Archbishop comments upon them in a very complete and convincing manner. As far as we can judge, his decision is absolutely right and is justifiable in every point.

With regard to the Eastward Position, the Church Association has obtained a confirmation of the decision, that the manual acts at consecration must be seen; but they have also got something that they did not at all expect, namely, the sanction of the Eastward Position during the whole of the service. If our readers will remember that the "North Side" of the Holy Table meant the side, not the end, of the Table, when it stood East and West, they will see the ambiguity of the phrase, and understand that the North End or the Western Side may each plead for tolerance.

As regards Lights, it is much to be hoped that the clergy will not, to any great extent, use the liberty accorded by the judgment, since the lighting of candles in the day-time would be widely offensive; and the Archbishop seems to throw out some such suggestion. At the