

THE MONTH.

THE foundation stone of the Imperial Institute, says the *Times* of the 5th, was "yesterday 'well and truly laid' by her Majesty the Queen. The last of the great functions with which London celebrates the Jubilee has taken place, with all the success that the most sanguine could have hoped for."

At a Durham S.P.G. Conference the Bishop spoke of "the Imperial idea." Not only was this the Jubilee year of her Majesty, but it was also the centenary of the Colonial Missionary Sees.

A Liberal Unionist deputation from Oxford and Cambridge Universities was received at Devonshire House by the Marquis of Hartington.

The proceedings in both Houses of the Convocation of the Southern Province have been interesting. The Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol moved the following resolution :

That this House is prepared to give its full attention to the report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Courts and to the resolution of the Lower House submitted in the *articulus cleri*, dated July 6th, 1887, with a view, if possible, to legislation, which this House agrees with the Lower House is deemed to be desirable.

This was carried *nem. con.* The supplement to the Catechism, on which the Lower House has been engaged, will be duly discussed, we trust, before February. The growing influence of the House of Laymen is happily significant.

At the first meeting of the Board of Missions for the Province of Canterbury the Archbishop spoke of the objects of the Board.

With sincere pleasure we record the appointment of Archdeacon Bardsley to the See of Sodor and Man.

The valuable Charge of the Bishop of Oxford contains some passages of special significance just now on disobedience to law. The Bishop says :

I doubt whether it has been sufficiently noticed that the strategy of arraying public feeling against the enforcement of legal rights is widely extending itself, and with no promise of peace and quiet for our country in the future. The policy of the defendant in the Liverpool ritual case is not distinguishable in principle from that of the persons who refuse to pay rent in Ireland or tithes in Wales. The attempt in all these cases is to make the law odious by a display of personal suffering. That in Ireland and Wales there is often a sordid motive, accompanied by violent outrage, whereas at Liverpool there is only a passive resistance and disinterested endurance of a self-imposed penalty, must, no doubt, affect our moral judgment of the actors, but the identity of plan in principle remains. It is not difficult to recall other cases in which resistance to unpopular statutes has been organized, and, if it has not wholly succeeded, has made itself felt sufficiently to weaken the general authority of law. Is this a result which Churchmen should seriously desire to promote? Have we so entirely lost sight of our forefathers' reverence for order and authority as to allow ourselves to be ranked with those who are bringing all authority into contempt? These questions have not been answered. I do not think that they have even been seriously asked. It will, no doubt, be said that we ought to "obey God rather than men"—an obvious truth. But to obey man is sometimes the true way of obeying God. Disobedience to earthly authority is not, on the face of it, obedience to God; although in the heated atmosphere of controversy in which we now live too many persons act as if it were.

Father McGlynn, having been excommunicated for disobedience, denounces the Pope. In Ireland the Communist temper seems to be gaining strength.