

harvest thanksgiving services. The singing of the Psalms was a use against which the party held out for a long time, but the practice is now becoming very general. More frequent observances of the divinely instituted Sacrament of the Lord's Supper are also to be noted, to the great spiritual edification, no doubt, of those who remain to celebrate the memory of their Lord's Passion. The papers of the week inform us that in a leading Evangelical Churches in London the 'Three Hours' service will also be observed for the first time this year; and it is quite possible that before long many of the Evangelical clergy in Ireland will see their way to this most solemn commemoration of the events of Good Friday. For all these steps in steps in advance the Evangelical party have no reason to feel ashamed.

Living Church:

Easter was celebrated this year, by nearly all denominations, and the religious papers as well as the pulpits were full of it. Indeed the Easter festival may be considered as now completely established among Christians of all names, upon almost as firm a basis as that of Christmas. The following, from the pen of President Andrews, of Brown University, taken from *The Independent*, is doubtless true of many other leaders of thought among the Protestant denominations: 'Though brought up an ultra-Protestant, with a strong early prejudice against all non-scriptural observance in church, the writer has grown in spite of himself to think very favorably of following the ecclesiastical year. The habit is a prime aid to the preacher, greatly increasing, in the course of time, his knowledge of Scripture, and imparting to his sermons much variety and freshness which otherwise they would fail to exhibit. It is equally helpful to Christian devotion, subject only to the proviso needed touching all the externals of religion, that the spiritual end be constantly kept in view. Any exercise whatever that is performed in the name of religion, may doubtless sink to the level of a baneful formality, injuring rather than fortifying the spiritual life. It is part of our probation to use such adjuncts of religion instead of abusing them.

'I for one, love to witness the increasing regard which people have for Easter. It cannot but do good. Christians themselves are in no danger of reflecting too much upon the resurrection of Christ, and it seems to me that this momentous fact is brought home to us by the formal heeding of Easter more solemnly than in any other way. Beyond the good thoughts which the day intrinsically suggests, the celebration of it aids faith by connecting the religious life of to-day back to that of the earlier Christian ages. One of the worst mistakes of Puritanic Protestantism was the needless sundering of connections like this. It is worth our notice along with the above that Christmas and Easter are to multitudes of our fellow-men all about us, nearly the sole reminders of Christian truth. Thousands who never say or hear a prayer have at last a passing thought of Christ at these times.'

DIOCESE OF MONTREAL.

BOSCOBEL AND NORTH ELY.—The Lord Bishop of the Diocese on the 3rd instant gave his ever welcome visit to the Mission of Boscobel and North Ely, preaching in the morning and administering the Holy Communion at the latter place. His Lordship gave a few words of warm commendation to the North Ely congregation for the sacrifices they have made and will have to make for the thorough repairs which have just been completed in the interior of their Church, and considered that they had manifested admirable taste in the churchly changes effected. The congregations notwithstanding the incessant rain more than filled the pews, and benches from the schoolhouse opposite were

placed in the aisle. To the regret of all present his Lordship was labouring under a severe cold which greatly detracted from the volume of his powerful voice. The attendance at Boscobel Church was good, considering the disagreeable weather. Each of the Bishop's sermons sustained the close attention of all present, and all must have been impressed with the earnest and feeling manner wherewith his practical addresses were delivered.

BISHOP OF LICHFIELD ON THE ARCH-BISHOP'S JUDGMENT ON THE LINCOLN CASE.

'You will no doubt expect from me some reference to the weighty judgment which has been delivered by the Archbishop of the province since the time of our last Synod. It is important for us to remember not only what it is, but what it is not. It is not an injunction, nor even a direction, as to the kind or amount of ritual observance with which the Holy Sacrament may most fitly be celebrated. It simply rules that certain ritual acts, with reference to which charge had been made against one of the English Bishops, are not forbidden by the written law of the Church, nor contrary to the customs of the Church in earlier generations; and that, as regards others of those acts, there is no such sanction. Nothing whatever is said or implied as to the propriety of adopting universally the ritual which is thus permitted, but it is of course intended that those which are not permitted should everywhere be abandoned. It is quite possible that upon certain of these points a different opinion may be entertained by individuals among the clergy, and the Archbishop does not claim to be infallible, even when speaking *ex cathedra*; but to an ordinary mind the presumption is strongly in favour of the accuracy of a judgment arrived at after the most careful inquiry by the Archbishop and his Assessors, aided by the counsel of experts both in ecclesiastical law and in Church history, rather than of contrary opinions pronounced for the most part anonymously or by persons with no special claim to authority in the columns of the newspaper press. The confidence, and in some cases the arrogance, with which such opinions are expressed, does not tend to a favourable estimate either of the learning or the humility of the writers. I have, therefore, no hesitation in expressing my earnest desire that the rulings of the judgment may be loyally and cheerfully obeyed by us all. But even supposing for a moment that the Archbishop and his Assessors, with all the resources at his command, had been mistaken in some of their conclusions, is there one of them that can, in the slightest degree, affect conscience of any individual clergyman? It might fail to commend itself to his judgment, it might seem to him to impair the dignity or the symbolism of his ritual, it might wound his æsthetic sensibilities, but could any reasonable man believe for a moment that it could affect the validity of the Holy Sacrament, or that it could be displeasing to Almighty God or injurious to the spiritual welfare of His people? And, if not, how infinitely small would be the loss, compared with the danger of imperilling the peace of the Church by dissension and division about things not essential. Through long years of disquietude and contention the Church has been hungering and thirsting for peace; peace, not for our own comfort, but peace that we may more clearly hear the Master's voice and more freely do His holy will; and now that in the great mercy of God a judgment has been delivered which seemed likely to secure for us a prolonged cessation from strife and debate in the matters of ritual, it is difficult to over estimate the tremendous responsibility of those who, on one side or the other, for causes which to say the least are comparatively unimportant, are fanning the flames of discord,

so as not only to hinder grievously the work of the Church, but to give occasion to her adversaries to rejoice.—*Charge 1891.*

THE WIFE'S SISTERS MARRIAGE BILL.

A short summary of the history of this unworthy attempt to tamper with the Marriage Laws of England, a Law received as part of the Christian Tradition from the Church of God, may be of use to our members at the present time. We take the facts mainly from a schedule prepared by the *Marriage Law Defence Union*.

In 1849 a Bill was introduced in the Commons by Messrs. Wortley, Denison, and Masterman, to legalise 'marriage between a Man and the Sister of his Deceased Wife, or between a Man and the Daughter of the Brother or Sister of his Deceased Wife.'

In 1850 a Bill was introduced by the same worthy trio to legalise such unholy Marriages only in the case of a Wife's Sister, and not, as in 1849, with a Wife's Niece.

In 1855 Messrs. Heywood and Headlam took the cause in hand, and introduced a Bill legalising Marriage both with the Wife's Sister and with the Wife's Niece.

In 1857 and 1858 Viscount Bury, Mr. Schneider, and Mr. Monckton Milnes introduced this Bill, omitting the Wife's Niece.

In 1859 they re-introduced their Bill, still omitting the Niece, who never again appears upon the scene.

All these five Bills passed the Second Reading in the House of Commons, and the three which inconsistently excluded the Niece, and confined themselves to the Sister, passed all stages in the Commons, and went up to the Lords and were rejected there.

In 1861 Messrs. Monckton, Milnes and Baxter, re-introduced the Bill of 1859, and for the first time the House of Commons rejected the Measure on its Second Reading by 177 to 172. It is noteworthy that this victory in the Commons was on the first occasion on which the question was fought after the formation of E. C. U., in 1859.

In 1866 Messrs. Chambers, Thomson, Hankey, and Morley re-introduced the Bill, and again the Bill was thrown out on the Second Reading by 174 to 154, a majority of 20.

In 1869 Mr. Thomas Chambers and Mr. Morley brought in the Bill again, and carried it on the Second Reading by 243 to 154.

In 1870, 1871, and 1873, the Bill passed through the House of Commons; in 1875 it was thrown out on the Second Reading by 171 to 142.

In 1883 Lord Dalhousie introduced a similar Bill in the House of Lords, and carried it through its second Reading; but owing to the splendid opposition organised by Churchmen, it was thrown out on the Third Reading by 145 to 140.

A Resolution in favour of the measure was carried this year by 280 to 111.

In 1888 the Bill was reintroduced, and passed its Second Reading by 262 to 205.

In 1890 Mr. Herbert Gardner, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Burt, Mr. Jesse Collings, Mr. Kelly, brought in a Bill, which passed its Second Reading by 249 to 184.

And now, in 1891, Mr. J. Kelly, Mr. O. V. Morgan have fathered the Bill, and carried it through its second reading by 216 to 169—a considerably reduced majority.

The moral of the whole story would seem to be that Churchmen must determine to persevere in their opposition to this miserable piece of one-sided, unprincipled, class legislation, as long as its supporters continue to bring it forward. If they do this there is nothing to fear. What the Church has resisted for 40 years and more she is strong enough to resist for another 40 if need be.—*Church Union Gazette.*