

## THE MONTH.

PARLIAMENT met on the 6th. Lord Salisbury made an announcement as to the proposed operations off the coast of Zanzibar against the Arab slave-dealers.

In the debate on the Education Vote, Sir W. Hart Dyke declared that the settlement of 1870 will not be interfered with. The Tithe Bills are again dropped.

At a very remarkable Unionist gathering (Sir G. H. Chubb in the chair) an address from 864 Non-Episcopalian Ministers of Ireland was presented to the Prime Minister and Lord Hartington.

Archdeacon Sumner, we gladly note, is to be Suffragan-Bishop of Guildford.

On Sunday, the 11th, the Most Rev. the Archbishop of Dublin (Lord Plunket) preached in Sheffield in aid of the Spanish and Portuguese Missions; and on the following day addressed a drawing-room meeting at the residence of Archdeacon Blakeney.

In an article on the prosecution of the Bishop of Lincoln for unlawful ritual, the *Record* says:

The Evangelical position in this very grave business must not be misunderstood. They are not in any sense responsible for the prosecution. It has been launched without consultation, so far as we can ascertain, with any single Evangelical leader. Whatever else it is, it is not the work of the Low Church party. The prosecution being thus set on foot, it is useless now to inquire what, if the advice of the responsible leaders had been asked, that advice would have been. The die is cast, and, profoundly as all wise men must feel the gravity of the step that has been taken, no one has any right to demand from us an abstract opinion on what is now the purely academic question of the advisability of litigation in Church matters. But what Evangelical Churchmen and moderate men of all schools do feel very strongly indeed is the wrong which the Bishop of Lincoln has done to the Church of England by laying himself open to this prosecution. He knew when he accepted an English Bishopric, with its great position and income and its inevitable connection with the State, what would be required of him. He knew that much which could be passed over in a private position must cause the gravest embarrassment in the high office he was undertaking. He must be supposed to have weighed his responsibilities and to have counted the cost. Unless he was willing to exercise the self-restraint which official prominence always demands, and unless he was content to sacrifice his own tastes sufficiently to keep within the law, it was his duty, according to the most elementary and commonplace code of honourable and fair conduct, to decline a position the conditions of which were to him impossible. Dr. King did not do this. He took all that the Church could give him of profit and influence, and in return has involved himself, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and, in a degree, every Churchman, in a turmoil of which no one can see the issue, and the results of which may be felt far into a future generation. His reckless and, we must add, most disloyal indulgence in all sorts of Ritual practices seems simply childish, although very mischievous, and disentitles him to the sympathy which is asked on his behalf from Churchmen. He has provoked a dangerous crisis; he has done it with his eyes open, and with the deliberate design of destroying the Reformed basis of the Church. That is why we can give no support to Archdeacon Denison's declaration, but shall remain independent, though profoundly anxious, onlookers at the impending strife.