

## THE MONTH.

PARLIAMENT adjourned on the 13th until November 6th. Mr. Ritchie's Local Government Bill, a really great achievement, and Mr. Goschen's Conversion Bill, represent very successful labour. The three Special Commissioners appointed under the Members of Parliament (Charges and Allegations) Bill have met and settled the preliminary proceedings. Mr. Parnell is going to bring an action for libel against the *Times*, in Scotland.

The Oaths Bill has been read a third time in the House of Commons. Mr. Bradlaugh has shown readiness to meet reasonable objections.

The Royal Commission on Elementary Education has presented its final Report. The *Guardian* says: "Its appearance cannot, we fear, be regarded as marking in any sense the close of a controversy. Rather, it will hereafter be regarded as the beginning of strife. The assailants on opposite sides of the compromise of 1870 have now taken up their several positions, and it only remains for those who regard that compromise as on the whole the best that can be devised to make as stout a fight as they can in defence of it."

The third Lambeth Conference<sup>1</sup> was brought to a close by a special service at St. Paul's Cathedral. The sermon (of great power) was preached by the Archbishop of York.

To the See of Oxford, vacant by the resignation of Bishop Mackarness, has been translated Dr. Stubbs, Bishop of Chester.

The Bishop of Lincoln's case came before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, Sir Horace Davey, Q.C., and Dr. Tristram, Q.C., appearing for the petitioners. The Lord Chancellor said their lordships were of opinion that the Archbishop had jurisdiction in the case. They were also of opinion that the abstaining by the Archbishop from entertaining the suit was a matter of appeal to her Majesty. They desired to express no opinion whatever whether the Archbishop had or had not a discretion whether he would issue the citation. Their lordships would humbly advise her Majesty to remit the case to the Archbishop, to be dealt with according to law.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The Bishop of Liverpool writes to the *Record* touching the Encyclical Letter. The Bishop says: "One glaring defect, however, in the Encyclical I cannot refrain from deploring. That defect is the conspicuous absence of any reference to the 'unhappy divisions' about the doctrine and Ritual of the Lord's Supper which are at this moment convulsing the Church of England, and will certainly bring on disruption and disestablishment unless they are healed. The existence and formidable nature of these divisions it is vain to deny. To my eyes they are of cardinal importance, and appear to require far more attention than the condition of the Scandinavian or Greek Churches, or the Old Catholic movement. Some expression of humble regret for these divisions, some strong desire for properly-defined conditions of peace, some proposal to attempt the restoration of godly discipline and the creation of satisfactory Ecclesiastical Courts, some bold declaration that, with the utmost degree of toleration, our Church will never re-admit the mass and auricular confession, or go behind the Reformation—a few plain statements of this kind would have immensely improved the Encyclical, greatly strengthened the Church of England, and cheered the hearts of myriads of loyal Churchmen."

<sup>2</sup> The assessors present on the second day were five (thus corresponding in number to the committee who were hearing the case)—namely, the Bishop of London (Dr. Temple), the Bishop of Ely (Lord Alwyne Compton), the Bishop of Salisbury (Dr. Wordsworth), the Bishop of Manchester (Dr. Moorhouse), and the Bishop of Sodor

In an able article the *Record* says :

The decision of the Privy Council that the Archbishop of Canterbury has jurisdiction to entertain complaints of ecclesiastical offences made against Bishops, and consequently that he is bound to consider and deal with the representation recently preferred against the Bishop of Lincoln for superstitious practices, is without doubt the most important event in the long Ritual struggle which has happened for many years past. After very elaborate argument on behalf of the complainants, the Bishop of Lincoln declining to be represented and so not being heard, the Judicial Committee . . . have remitted the case to the Archbishop with a direction that it must be dealt with according to law. Their Lordships have followed what is practically the unique precedent of *Lucy v. Bishop of St. David's*. In that case, which happened soon after the Revolution, Bishop Watson was proceeded against for simony and other grave offences, and ultimately was deprived of his Bishopric by the Archbishop of Canterbury ; but before that end was reached, the Bishop tried every conceivable means of defence, and took every possible objection to the jurisdiction of the Court that tried him, appealing to the Common Law Courts, moving repeatedly for Prohibitions, and in fact anticipating completely the ingenious policy by which of late years the English Church Union has sought to procure immunity for illegal ritual. . . . It is being asked with some eagerness what is the next step? Has the Primate a veto? Can he refuse to issue the citation which would bring the suit formally before him? The veto is a statutory invention which does not apply to this jurisdiction over Bishops, but whether the Primate possesses any, and if so, what discretion to proceed or to refuse to proceed, is a matter on which it would be rash to speak hastily. . . . It seems most probable, therefore, that in one shape or another the merits of the case against Bishop King will be investigated, and that the long-deferred desire of the Church Association to make a Bishop amenable to law will be accomplished.

We record with regret the decease of the Very Rev. J. W. Burgon, Dean of Chichester. In an admirable sermon in the Cathedral, referring to the lamented Dean, the Bishop of Chichester said :

"I should deem it little less than presumption to say anything in the nature of eulogy towards one better than myself, but this I firmly believe, he lived very near to God. He was a faithful and most attached member of this branch of the Church, which, by the signal mercy of God, stands prominent and stable in the land. In this respect, as indeed in most other respects, he was in perfect accord with his predecessor, Dean Hook, whose name and services must be treasured with profit not only in this city and diocese, but throughout the Church of England at home and abroad. I do not compare the two men, for they had very different gifts and qualities, but they agreed in their views of the true position of the Church of England, which is at once Reformed, Protestant, and Catholic ; Reformed and Protestant as purged from error and superstition ; Catholic as adhering to the faith once delivered to the Apostles, and as reflecting the voice of antiquity. Both held this doctrine, not as a mere matter of speculation and opinion, but as a truth for which, if needs had been, they would either of them have bled and died. There could never be a doubt as to Dean Burgon's sincerity. It was written in his very looks, and it found expression in his words and in his writings on all occasions. . . . From the earliest days of his ministry he gave himself wholly to that great work ; he prepared himself by careful, unwearied, and methodical study to be a teacher of others. He had many tastes, many accomplishments which might have carried away a less resolute man, but with high ideas of duty he was content to use his life for this one thing, and, true to his course and to the service of his Lord, he lived laborious days—yea, and spent laborious nights—in the study of His sacred Word. No part of his character was more remarkable than his intense reverence for the Word of God. He might take to himself the words of David, when he said, 'Lord, what love have I unto Thy Word ; all the day long is my study in it.'"

The Dean's paper on "The Days of Creation," in *THE CHURCHMAN*, will be fresh in the recollection of many of our readers. He had promised us some recollections of Egypt, and a supplementary paper on the Revised Version ; but his health, owing to excessive application, had been for some time failing. We pay our tribute of deep respect.

---

and Man (Dr. Bardsley). The members of the judicial committee were the same as before—namely, the Lord Chancellor (Lord Halsbury), Lord Hobhouse, the late Lord Chancellor (Lord Herschell), Lord Macnaghten, and Sir Barnes Peacock.