

over 30 preferred; she has a small private income, which she would be pleased to join to his. Would not object to going abroad. Write H., 35, Western Morning News, Plymouth. Doubts arise in the mind as to the genuineness of the advertiser and her offer. These being settled, if they can be, others will arise as to the legitimacy of the proceeding. We have certainly heard of marriages thus arranged turning out well; but it is rather a risk, and we can hardly recommend a cleric, whether over or under thirty (especially the latter), to reply.

Great Britain and the United States.

The following remarks by an English contemporary seem to us opportune and important: If it were not for the war, the abrogation of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty would have attracted more attention in England than it has done. For reasons which commend themselves to the British Government, Lord Salisbury has resigned the rights secured to this country by that document, which has been in existence since 1850. In the event of a canal being cut through the Central American Isthmus, Great Britain was to share its control with the United States. The new treaty signed the other day by Lord Pauncefote and Mr. Hay, and still to be submitted to the Senate, secures for the United States the absolute right to construct a canal through Panama or Nicaragua, the neutrality of which is to be guaranteed by Europe. The canal being open to the whole world under such a guarantee, it is doubtful whether Great Britain would have gained any advantage from a share in the dual control secured to it by the former treaty. But whether we might not reasonably have asked for a quid pro quo—the rectification of the Canadian frontier, for example—is another question. We are inclined to think that a solid advantage has been gained in the way of good-will. It is thought that our unconditional surrender of the old treaty rights is due to Lord Pauncefote, whose well known efforts to promote a friendly understanding between the two Governments lend colour to the belief. If we have not asked for the quid pro quo, we may at least hope for consideration when we press for a final answer concerning Alaska.

The New Bishop of Liverpool.

It is announced that Principal Chavasse, of Oxford, has been appointed Bishop of Liverpool, in succession to Dr. Ryle. The Rev. Francis James Chavasse, of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, graduated in 1869, taking a First Class in Law, and proceeded to the degree of M.A. in 1872. He was ordained in 1870 by the Bishop of Manchester (Dr. Fraser), to the curacy of Preston, Lancashire, so that he has some experience of the North, and from 1873-78 he was vicar of St. Paul's, Upper Holloway; in 1878 he became rector of St. Peter le Bailey, Oxford; and has been Select Preacher before the University, as also Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Exeter. Since 1889 he has been Principal of Wycliffe Hall, where he has established for himself and the hall, alike, a

great reputation. Lord Salisbury, recognizing the needs of this particular diocese, and the circumstances of the time, could not have made (writes a well-informed correspondent of the Westminster Gazette), a happier selection. Mr. Chavasse is a broad minded Evangelical, and one of the very few members of the party who are members of the Christian Social Union. He cannot fail to be a persona grata to the Evangelical party, while High Churchmen will certainly prefer a man of deep personal piety to a moderate and trimming member of their own school. We have reason to know that Mr. Chavasse was not one of those whose names were submitted to Lord Salisbury by Evangelicals in Liverpool, but that his claims were urged by men of light and leading in London. Mr. Chavasse is a man of distinct personality, a hard worker, and has the same influence among Evangelicals at Oxford as the Bishop of Lincoln had among High Churchmen. Liverpool is to be congratulated on the second Bishop who will make his mark, not only on the banks of the Mersey, but in the College of Bishops.

Clerical Stipends and Promotions.

The diocese of Niagara is to be congratulated on looking existing difficulties "square in the face," for this is at any rate, a preliminary to an amendment. At the last meeting of the "Standing Committee" of that diocese, a sub-committee presented a report on the important subject of clerical incomes, and incidentally of clerical promotions. Both subjects bristle with difficulties, and the Standing Committee of the diocese evidently felt that it would not be prudent to commit themselves definitely to the proposals of the sub-committee until the matter had been more carefully considered by the Church officials of the different congregations. In the meantime, we present the report for the consideration of our readers, because the general principles involved are, we fear, applicable to more dioceses than that of Niagara. At a time of great national prosperity, it surely ought not to be a matter of difficulty to place the minimum clerical stipend at the very modest figure laid down by the sub-committee. Unfortunately, our Bishops have not "a free hand" in these matters, and in order to sustain the Church life they are frequently compelled to accept local conditions of a very unsatisfactory nature. Whether it is wise to continue helping congregations that persistently refuse to advance in the matter of systematic giving, is a question that will no doubt engage the attention of the Synod when the question comes up for discussion. As to "promotion and removal," there can be no question whatever about its desirability. But how is it to be accomplished? Is the promotion to be based on seniority or success—one of the two must govern. Which shall it be? In the next place, having settled that seniority is to govern, it is obvious that appointments must be left absolutely in the hands of the Bishop. Probably this would prove the very best method in the long run, and it is the method most in harmony with our polity; but what

likelihood is there of its adoption by self-supporting congregations? We think that a step might be taken, by requiring congregations to supply their vacancies from the ranks of their own diocesan clergy. This method would help in some imperfect way to reach the end sought by the committee. However, as we have already said, the subject is, in almost any aspect of it, a thorny one.

The Presbyterian Review.

We wish to give a cordial word of welcome to the new start of the Presbyterian Review, made under the happiest auspices. It will have an able editor in the Rev. D. C. Hosack, M.A., and he will have thoroughly efficient support in his coadjutors, Professor Stringer, of Montreal, and Dr. McRae, of Collingwood. The business manager, A. Fraser, Esq., M.A., is one of the best-known journalists in Toronto.

THE BISHOP OF LONDON'S CHARGE.

When the occupant of the great See of London addresses a charge to the clergy and laity of his diocese, such an utterance is of more than local interest, even if the locality primarily considered is the largest city in the world. But still more serious is such a charge when delivered at such a time. It is a matter of satisfaction that this great charge has been received with something far stronger than acquiescence. Yet this has not been altogether unbroken, and it may be worth while to give a moment's notice—if little more—to some of the objections which have been urged against parts of the charge, leaving other portions of it for future consideration. In short, the Bishop is accused of making his appeal to the world instead of the Church, and the accusation is based upon such remarks as the following: "Certain tendencies within the Church were viewed with suspicion by the people at large. This suspicion, if unfounded, should be allayed by frank explanation. This explanation must have reference to the ground taken by the objectors—i.e., to their conception of the position and principles of the Church of England." Again: "Controversy, which disregarded facts . . . was not likely to lead to any profitable result. It began by disregarding the common consciousness." Again: "At the Reformation, men demanded that the ecclesiastical system should be in accordance with their knowledge, and with the sense of responsibility for their own life and actions, which passing events forced upon them." On the ground of these statements those accusations are made, and they are worth noticing, because they represent the kind of statement which is not unfrequently made by those who feel themselves in the minority. They remind us indeed of Mr. Matthew Arnold, who held that the majority were generally in the wrong, and ought to allow themselves to be governed by the wise minority, the elect. Well, do these people forget that every law, civil or ecclesiastical, that we live under, has been carried by majorities? What is the meaning of the principle that doctrines are stamped by the "con-

sent of the majority? "Securus J haps we sl the world ing the fa must rem Church h: people be We do no should be services o the repres the contr destroy th Church, dust off l much of l time, it i large ar Church, establishe present c properly Church l Church! been ob: moulding those wl ing that our serv who are use is n that sile with so energy such a and the surprise differen that, wi Christ should tion of

LIV

It is subject thorough case in done c regard speaki said to anothe dreadi shock: —and on th be d great these from "Mai seque know stone "The still no d