

was UNCONSTITUTIONAL, the tendency of which is always to create anxiety, bordering on distrust. The next move in the drama was

ILLEGAL.

At the Synod of 1876, the matter was again brought forward, and a motion submitted for consideration. Afterwards an amendment was moved, not to the motion, for the principle involved was different, and therefore it could not be an amendment to it; but to the unconstitutional proceeding of 1875. This is very clear, for the first words of the amendment are,—That clause 2 of the Canon of 1875 be struck out, and the following substituted. (See Synod Journal, 1876, page 43.) The assertion that the action of 1876 was illegal is proved by official documentary evidence, for no act could be legal which was based upon another at variance with constitutional law. How, then, does the matter stand? The Canon regulating the surplus previously to 1875 is still in force, and not only have the clergymen who were recipients of \$200 per year a legitimate and legal claim, but all others who would be entitled to be placed upon it up to the present date. That they can make their claims good must be evident. Strange to say that in the midst of confusion, the *negative* vote was not taken, but the DOXOLOGY was sung. We leave it with our readers to judge whether such proceedings in the Church's legislative assembly, do not necessarily tend to destroy Diocesan interest and confidence. No wonder the clerical deputation system should, as the lay official declared, "become a failure," and lay subscriptions