

LITCHFIELD DEACONS will have a character of their own if the Bishop's new regulations for their training and protection are carefully observed. A *monthly sermon* is all that they need compose; but the bishop must see it. Their duties are limited in regard to marriage, confirmation, catechising, preaching, &c. Study and examination form very important features in their *probation* for the priesthood.

ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS FOR DOORS seems a large sum, but that is what John Jacob Astor is going to spend on bronze gates for old Trinity Church, New York. Might have been much better spent, some will say; yes, and much worse! Let us be thankful when such magnificent private memorials are attached as an honour to the temples of the Most High. They are not unlike the alabaster box of precious ointment.

BARON HIRSCH is a personality who has a world wide reputation for his magnificent and princely hospitality and liberality—especially to his fellow Jews. He is disposed to use his colossal fortune almost entirely for the amelioration of the condition of his compatriots. Under the circumstances, the personal friendship between him and the Prince of Wales may become an important factor in future European questions relating to the Jews.

SABBATH-KEEPING IN CORNWALL.—The fisherman of St. Ives lately turned out *en masse* to oppose the landing on a certain Monday morning of fish which had been caught by the crews of 20 east country fishing boats the day before. The would be buyers of these fish were compelled ultimately to walk some distance to a point where St. Ives Sabbatarianism did not prevail. The Cornishmen were quiet but firm; they "knew the reason why."

THE BIBLE SOCIETY MEETING in London this year was made memorable by the "object lesson" of the presence and participation of the Archbishop of Canterbury and the President of the Wesleyan Conference, as well as the Duke of Connaught. The Royal Prince made an address, which produced a profound impression. He referred to the 120 million copies of the Bible circulated, and the value of meeting selfishness and scepticism "with the Bible in their hands." The Bible Society is chiefly under Church auspices.

IS SATURDAY A FAST DAY?—The Church of England appears to have decided in the negative, that day of the week being omitted where Fridays are so emphatically mentioned in the table of vigils, fasts and days of abstinence. Herein she is in accord with the ancient Italian archdiocese of Milan, and the Eastern Church generally in primitive times—and against the tradition of the Roman dioceses in Southern Italy, where Saturday has been regarded as a fasting day. The incident of the experience of Archbishop St. Ambrose of Milan—on a visit to Rome—is historical and conclusive as to the difference of custom, and his independence of Rome.

BISHOPS AND SUNDAY OBSERVANCE.—Recently the New York *Independent* made a specialty of recording the opinions of Bishops and bishops of all kinds on this question *apropos* of the proposed opening of the Chicago Exposition on Sundays. Of 22 R. C. prelates, just one-half favour the opening on Sunday, the other half being divided, indifferent, or doubtful. Out of 25 P. E. bishops,

22 are against opening on Sunday, 3 being doubtful. Other "bishops"—11 Methodist Epis., 4 United Brethren, 8 Evangelical Assoc., 5 African Methodist Epis., 3 Moravian, and 2 Coloured Methodist—all favour the closing. It may be noted that the French Canadian prelates support strict Sunday observance very strongly.

NORWEGIAN TEMPERANCE LEGISLATION. A correspondent of *The Mail* (C. Roles Bell) has drawn attention to the system pursued in Norway for regulating the issue of saloon licenses. For the 45,000 people in Bergen, only 12 saloons are provided. These 12 are leased to a company of respectable and responsible citizens. The saloons are run by 12 employees of this company, clothed in uniform. *One saloon, one glass of liquor*, is the rule, and a man who wants more must travel round town "considerable" before he manages to get drunk. But he does not manage to do so, however much he travels, because if he did the last saloon-keeper who gave him a glass would be heavily fined.

VENI CREATOR SPIRITUS!

So sings the whole Church this week in words that carry us back to the days of St. Ambrose, the great Archbishop of Milan in Northern Italy—words sung by the ordaining bishop over his kneeling priests (that are to be) in almost every part of the Church for so many centuries. What significance have they for the Church Catholic in these waning days of the 19th century, that the members of that Church love to make such words part of public worship at Whitsuntide? Nay, does not the tone deepen, does not the chord become more full of woven melodies, does not the very cadence become more solemn and emphatic as the ages roll on—in *sæcula sæculorum*, for ever and ever?

ASCENSIONTIDE

has come and gone, climax of the Church's panoramic study of Christ's life, and Ascension Sunday breathed its special aspiration—in the same breath, with exultation of the Lord's "Great Triumph"—*send thy Holy Ghost to comfort us and exalt us!* Therein lies the key of the soul's position. Christ is gone, His work of atonement being done. He has laid the foundation of twelve precious stones Apostolic, Himself the tried corner stone of all, elect, precious above all. Another stage of building in the temple of human souls has begun, is going on; and it needs, it calls for this our mastering and over ruling supervision. So it sings—the stones cry out—"Come, Creator, Spirit, our souls inspire."

That is the result desired from the Sacred Presence we invoke. At baptism, confirmation, communion, on all solemn occasions of rites and ceremonies of public worship, in crises of family and private life, in personal supremè efforts of energy in the discharge of onerous duty—we need that "right judgment" to guide, that "evermore rejoicing" to keep us free and forceful. As time rolls, the ages accumulating, there seems an overburdening weight of experience in human life, an increasing need of the directing and sustaining power—something far more than human counsel can give. So—in this special "dispensation of the Spirit"—the Church's cry is increasingly justified and explained to the inner consciousness of all her devout and reverent members. She thrills with feeling while she sings "Veni Creator."

DIVORCE COURTS

It seems a curious anomaly that, in Canada, the decision of a matter lying at the very root of family and social life, should have been left so long to such a tribunal as is furnished by the Senate of the Dominion. If the senators were invariably, or generally, men of very advanced years, mature experience, and legal attainments, the anomaly would not be so glaring: there would seem to be a fitness in cases of this kind being tried before men of such character and standing. Perhaps some such ideal of our Senate was before the minds of those who were responsible originally for relegating this special class of cases to such a court. It cannot, however, be seriously contended any longer that there is actually this peculiar fitness of character in the constitution of our Senate. The difference between Senators and Commoners is not very obvious, and seems likely to become less so, as the exigencies of political issues become imperative. We may, therefore, safely conclude and assume that the Senate is not now, if it ever was, an ideal tribunal for the trial and decision of the delicate and far-reaching questions involved in applications for divorce.

IS THE PROCESS DETERRENT?

So many persons have been accustomed to argue. They assume that it is not desirable to give facility to the dissolution of the marriage tie, even for causes acknowledged to be justificatory. We can see little logic, and no use in such a line of thought: rather the contrary. It is putting the matter very much on the basis of papal dispensations—making them difficult and expensive, on the plea of curtailing their numbers. *Cui bono?* "For the benefit of the Pope," may be truly answered in the parallel cases: for as only wealthy people can afford to obtain dispensations, the papal treasury profits proportionately. Even this reason, this residuary benefit, cannot be said to exist appreciably in the case of Canadian Bills of Divorcement. True, Acts of Parliament are expensive to the applicants; but we cannot imagine that the senators profit—or the nation at large—to any measurable extent. The profit furnishes, at any rate, no adequate excuse for the process.

IF DIVORCE IS WRONG,

it should be prevented altogether, no matter what the pretext. If right, it should be facilitated, so far as right, without regard to difficulty or expense as deterrents. If those few persons who can afford a Canadian divorce or a papal dispensation have a moral right to it, so have all those poorer persons who cannot afford to apply under the expensive and difficult circumstances produced by existing barriers. A few years ago there was a great stir when a special Divorce Court was instituted in England; but people now recognize that the net result is a decided gain. We may rightly enough object to some of the legal causes for divorce at present; but we cannot but admire the machinery.

THE TIME HAS PASSED

when the cases of need in Canada were so few and far between as to render a special court not necessary. Judges should be specially singled out—from the existing bench, if you will—*ad hoc*, for this extremely difficult duty. They should be the very cream of the judicial material available: men of advanced years, large experience, grave character, legal training. Let all possible cases have a full and fair trial before such a court, in order that the solemnity and sacredness of the marriage bond may be fully published and emphasized