

The Church Guardian.

Upholds the Doctrines and Rubrics of the Prayer Book.

"Grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity."—Eph. vi. 24.
"Earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints."—Jude: 3.

Vol. IV.—No. 14.]

HALIFAX, N. S., WEDNESDAY, JULY 19, 1882.

[One Dollar a Year.]

Our London Letter.

(From our own Correspondent.)

Not this year will see the sisters-in-law marriageable. The Bishops have defeated the Prince of Wales, and the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill has been rejected in the House of Lords by a majority of four. The Bishops came up in force, no fewer than seventeen of them voting against the measure, and the Bishop of Peterborough took the lead in opposing the bill. The nature of the pressure which they brought to bear upon the minds of the Peers may be judged from the fact that one noble Lord, who had been so long absent from politics that nobody knew him when he presented himself, and who has never voted for ten years, came up to help cast out the bill. On the other hand, the nature of the action taken by the Prince of Wales has been exaggerated. It is not true, as has been stated, that he issued a whip. I doubt if he sent out a single letter. He did no more than request certain of his friends whom he met at Epsom and at Ascot to attend and vote for the bill. He brought two of his royal brothers along with him, the Duke of Edinburgh and the Duke of Albany. The Duke of Connaught would have been present, but was indisposed. The total vote is much larger than it has ever been before, but the majority of only four against the bill is the same as threw out the measure in 1877, from which circumstances the opponents of the measure take great comfort. The Archbishop of Canterbury, by the way, did not vote at all. He excuses himself on the ground that the theological argument being no longer tenable, it is no part of the duty of the Episcopal Bench to resist the measure.

Mr. Bradlaugh's New Testament, which he so scornfully kissed in the sight of the whole House of Commons, and then flung upon the table of the House, is wanted. Mr. Bradlaugh is anxious to prove to a Court of Law that it was the Authorised Version and no mistake upon which he bestowed his dubious embrace; and Mr. Labouchere is about to move that an officer of the House shall carry it in safe custody to exhibit it to the judges. That book is likely to become historic. It must be preserved as carefully as a Breeches Bible.

Mr. Holman Hunt, the darling of the aesthetic school of English Art, is not yet among the masters for whose work dealers pay eighty pounds a square inch. His famous picture "Stray Sheep," which was exhibited in the Royal Academy in 1853, at the Paris Exposition in 1857, and again at Manchester in 1857, was sold at Christie's the other day for seven hundred pounds. It went to the Fine Art Society, and contrasted with the price paid for the same artist's "Light of the World," now in Keble College—ten thousand pounds—this is very disappointing. But the market value of Mr. Hunt's pictures has always been uncertain. There is his "Dolce far Mente," painted twenty years ago for Messrs. McLean. The artist got nine hundred guineas for it. Messrs. Agnew, the great picture dealers, bought it for nine hundred and fifty guineas, and sold it for one thousand two hundred. Six or seven years ago it came to the hammer, and was disposed of for two hundred and sixty-five guineas. Then it went to Birmingham, and was bought there for sixty-five guineas in February, 1879. There is nothing more uncertain than the value of a picture, except the value of the criticism bestowed upon it.

Pere Hyacinth has been again appealing to the English people. He has resumed those lectures to

Englishmen which he began two years ago, for the purpose of soliciting aid from English pockets for Catholic Reform in France. Somehow or other the Old Catholic Parisians does not take much in England. He is not Protestant enough for the Low Churchmen and the Dissenters, hardly orderly enough for the High Churchman, and not successful enough to command him to most Broad Churchmen. It is evidently not through him that French Romanism is to be reformed. Still his work is regarded with interest, and though his oratory is a little windy, he is certain to have an audience.

English admirers of President Garfield, the man who journeyed in his life from a log cabin to the White House, have now an opportunity of shewing their regard. Mr. E. A. Merritt, the United States Consul-General in London, has been instructed by the Department of State at Washington to open at the American Consulate, 53a, Old Broad-street, a subscription list towards the Garfield Memorial to be erected at Washington. A national hospital is to be founded to bear the murdered President's name. "It is designed to be as cosmopolitan in its philanthropy as was the kindly heart of him whose memory it will perpetuate in its outstretch of human sympathy—its doors to be open to all classes, creeds, and colours." The Americans have helped to memorialise Dean Stanley. They have helped to restore St. Margaret's Westminster, and it cannot but be well that we should help to give Longfellow a statue and to keep alive the name of "the honest President."

THE CHURCH FOR ALL CLASSES.

Extract from the speech of the Archbishop of Canterbury at the Church Building Society's meeting:—"Churches ought to be made accessible both as regarded the times of the services and as regarded the readiness of the officials to admit the poor. Every effort ought to be made with this object. He knew that a certain race of persons, who were very useful in their generation, and who had become historical from works of fiction—namely, the parochial authorities, and especially the beadle—considered in former times that it was rather their business to see that the church was not polluted by a low set of fellows, who might rub shoulders with the rich and respectable. Those days, he trusted, were gone by. He remembered that some years since—he had told the story before, but it was a long time ago, and was, perhaps, forgotten—he was consecrating a churchyard in the extreme north-west of London, and was rather surprised, because he knew it was a poor neighbourhood and there was a great number living close by, to see such a sparse congregation when he entered the church. The procession was formed, and they walked round the churchyard. When he came to the gate he saw a great official, who was the terror of the neighbourhood, standing with a large stick in his hand refusing admission to any one who could not pass as a well-to-do and respectable person. He (the Archbishop), filled with horror at what he saw, went to the spot in order to have the door opened to the public, but unfortunately the people, seeing him coming with the beadle, thought he was on his side, and fled in all directions. (Laughter.) Happily those days were past, and now the beadle—who was often a person one could not distinguish from an ecclesiastic—(laughter)—was willing to admit the people,

MR. GLADSTONE ON THE SUNDAY QUESTION.

Mr. Charles Hill, the Secretary of the Working Men's Lord's-day Rest Association, 13 Bedford-row, writes to the *Daily News* as follows: Mr. Gladstone's votes in 1855, 1856, 1874, and on the last division in 1877, have always been given against the Sunday opening of the national museums. Mr. Gladstone has not only always voted against Sunday opening, but he has on three occasions written or spoken on the Sunday Question as follows:

"In reply to a deputation on the museums Sunday opening in March, 1869, said: 'The religious character of the country. . . . From a moral, social, and physical point of view, the observance of Sunday is a duty of absolute consequence.' From his seat, as Prime Minister in the House of Commons, on the 18th April, 1871, he said: 'From a long experience of a laborious life, he had become most deeply impressed with the belief—to say nothing of a higher feeling—that the alternations of rest and labor, at the short intervals which were afforded by the merciful and blessed institution of Sunday, were necessary for retention of a man's mind and of a man's frame in a condition to discharge his duties; and it was desirable as much as possible to restrain the exercise of labor upon the Sunday, and to secure to the people the enjoyment of the day of rest.' In an introductory letter which he kindly wrote to a prize essay of mine, entitled 'Sunday, its Influence on Health and National Prosperity,' he states: 'Believing in the authority of the Lord's-day as a religious institution, I must as a matter of course desire the recognition of it by others. But, over and above this, I have myself, in the course of a laborious life, signally experienced both its mental and its physical benefits. I can hardly overstate its value in this view; and for the interest of the workmen of this country, alike in these and in other yet higher respects, there is nothing I more anxiously desire than they should more and more highly appreciate the Christian day of rest.'"

THERE is a power in the Church of God to arrest attention, to inform the unlearned, to convert the wicked, and to reanimate the spiritually paralyzed. The Church of Christ is not a monument of the past, but a prophet of the future; not a relic of the dead,—not a fossil of the pre-adamite period, but a nursery of the living.

PROGRESS OF CHRISTIANITY.

Sharon Turner, with great research and care, has prepared the following table of the progress of Christianity:

First century	500,000
Second century	2,000,000
Third century	5,000,000
Fourth century	10,000,000
Fifth century	15,000,000
Sixth century	20,000,000
Seventh century	24,000,000
Eighth century	30,000,000
Ninth century	40,000,000
Tenth century	50,000,000
Eleventh century	70,000,000
Twelfth century	80,000,000
Thirteenth century	75,000,000
Fourteenth century	80,000,000
Fifteenth century	100,000,000
Sixteenth century	125,000,000
Seventeenth century	150,000,000
Eighteenth century	200,000,000
Nineteenth century	300,000,000