

improbable, judging from a letter which appeared in our columns a little while ago. The canon proposes that those eligible to receive aid from that fund, as their turn comes round, shall receive such an amount, not exceeding \$400 per annum, as will suffice to bring up their income to \$1,400 in city and town parishes, and \$1,200 in country parishes. A question may arise as to the necessity for a distinction between the city and the country parishes, on the ground of the larger expenses of living in towns and cities. It is argued on the other side, that there are counterbalancing advantages in town parishes, such as in the matter of educational privileges. We rather incline to the idea that there should be no such distinction, although it is one of those questions, the solution of which must depend very much upon circumstances. We are also glad to see a notice of motion by Mr. Crombie, chairman of the General Purposes Fund, "That the sum of \$49.88, paid to the General Purposes Fund, as the assessment Synod expenses for the year 1874, on moneys contributed to the Shingwauk Home, be refunded, and the same carried to the credit of the said Home." There are one or two other questions to be brought forward which we reserve for separate consideration.

For the Ontario Synod, we observe specially among the business left over from last year, an important resolution, by Judge Jarvis, to the effect that the lay members of the Synod pledge themselves to contribute one-tenth of last year's income towards the support of the church in the diocese, and continue to do so yearly, hereafter; and also, will use their influence with their lay brethren, in their several parishes, to comply with this Scriptural duty. We cannot but regard the spirit of this resolution as one which must meet with general support and lead to valuable consequences. Systematic consecration of our substance to the church of the Lord, is a principle not yet fully recognized among us; and yet, it would appear to be essential to the extension of the ecclesiastical body, and also to the vitality and growth of religion among ourselves. The resolution would also make it incumbent on every Clergyman, four times in each year, to urge the duty, in a sermon, to his congregation. We almost incline to think it might be as well not to make the pledge too extensive as to time. It would appear to be one of those subjects which may very properly come up for consideration every year. It would be one of the most profitable subjects which could be brought before either clergy or laity—necessarily leading to the only principle respecting it which could claim to be Christian, namely, the entire surrender and absolute consecration of body and soul, property, talents, and time, to the honour and glory of Him who gave Himself for us. The fourth resolution, referring to a graduated scale of stipend for clergymen, according to length of service, is, as we have remarked, only an approximation towards a just appre-

ciation of claims which are universally acknowledged. An additional allowance for a married clergyman, and also for each child dependent on him for support, involves a principle of a totally different character, and commends itself on the ground that such an arrangement might enable the pastor to pay due attention to his flock, free from the distraction too often forced upon him when his family is not sufficiently provided for.

Among the new notices of motions, we observe one from Rev. H. Pollard, to the effect that Mission Churches in our growing cities and towns, when there are no endowments, have a strong claim for aid from the Mission Fund. There are often parishes which have been separated from wealthy congregations, and which are far less able to sustain the operations of the church among them than most of the so-called missions in the rural districts; and why they should not receive aid from a Home Mission Fund, we are at a loss to imagine. It may be urged that they ought not to have been separated from the mother parish until they would be known to be self-supporting. And, in some cases, there is no doubt that such an objection is founded on a correct principle. There are, however, other cases where a division of the parish is very desirable, and where, we imagine, some aid from a mission board would be as well bestowed as in any other direction.

A DIOCESAN CONFERENCE.

Among the subjects to be brought before the Toronto Synod is one which is calculated to lead to exceedingly valuable results. The Venerable the Archdeacon of Toronto proposes that Section 7 of the Constitution of the Synod be amended by substituting the words "in every alternate year" for the word "annually," after the words, "the Synod shall meet," and by the addition of the following words at the close of the Section: "In the years in which no meeting of the Synod is held, a Diocesan Conference shall be assembled at such time, and under such regulations as the Bishop shall appoint." The ordinary business of the Synod, so far as fresh legislation is concerned, can surely be transacted just as well in alternate years as annually. We are not in so very new a position as to require that our ecclesiastical arrangements should be altered every year. The committees could sit just as well for two years as for one. After all the efforts that have been made to infuse fresh blood into these acting bodies, we must confess that each successive batch is very like its predecessor. So that a fresh annual list involves rather an unnecessary amount of trouble as well as of excitement.

But, however great might be the self-denial to be exercised in making the Diocesan Synod biennial instead of annual, the question would arise as to the nature and amount of benefit to be derived from substituting anything else in the alternate years. Most of our read-

ers know something about the Church Congresses which have been held in England and in the United States. The benefit they have imparted to the Church in her active operations has been incalculable. Subjects of a practical character are introduced, papers are read upon those subjects, which are discussed and talked over, and the work of the Church, as well as her mission in the world, become thereby more thoroughly understood. All orders of the Church join in these valuable institutions, which are admirably adapted to promote a good understanding; and we believe we are safe in saying that none have ever been held that have not been attended with great benefit, in removing misapprehensions as to each other's motives and intentions, and in producing a firmer belief in each other's sincerity.

As a rule, subjects which involve direct theological controversy are rigorously excluded from Diocesan Conferences or Church Congresses; but yet benefit must result from them, and the probabilities be increased that the members of the Church will work together for the common good.

PRINCIPLES OF DISCIPLINE.

It is perfectly true that the greatest number of passages in the New Testament, which have any bearing on the discipline of the church, and the treatment of offenders, do exhort to patience, long suffering, gentleness, persistence of love in an endeavour, or rather a continued series of endeavours, to win back to Christ the erring members of the fold. The early Apostles of Christianity did undoubtedly give their main energies to the work of bringing men to Christ, and building them up in Him. Their time and energies were not spent in settling doubtful disputations.

And yet, with all this, we shall certainly go astray if we come to the conclusion, as some have done, that there is little or no recognition in the New Testament of church trials, church condemnation; "while the excommunication of offenders is neither mentioned by name, nor is it certain that the present, as understood at present, is referred to there." How such an opinion could be formed is hardly necessary to inquire.

And again, it may be perfectly true that the general principle of trust in God, and the future, and natural development of sin, is strikingly illustrated by Christ's forbearance in the case of Judas. He was worldly-minded, covetous, a thief: he aided in plotting the destruction of his Master, and accepted the price of his treachery from the chief priests. And yet Christ did not expel him; but with infinite tenderness He told him to do what he did quickly, veiling His meaning from the other disciples. When eagerly asked who should betray Him, He disclosed His knowledge to Judas, but to no one else; even in the very moment of His betrayal by His appeal, He sought to bring back the traitor to repentance, and a better mind. But, all being unavailing, Judas Iscariot was left to cast himself