

mously refusing to allow the dedication service to be held.

The English Church Union.

During the recent controversy in England, the E. C. U. has had to stand the fire of much adverse criticism of the acts and language of some of its individual members. The following generous testimony to the good work done by the Union, put forward by Canon Knox-Little, forms the best answer to much that has been said against the attitude taken up by Lord Halifax, the President of the Union. "I am glad that the Union stands its ground and is increasing, for its *raison d'être* is, as it has been, its unflinching loyalty to the Reformation settlement and its faithful defence of the rights and liberties of English Churchmen. I cannot but rejoice, too, at the wise and self-restrained attitude of the clergy. During the uproar there have been uncharitable attacks upon the most hard-working and devoted. If Englishmen are unfair in their heat and in their moments of misunderstanding, they recover calmness at last, and are ashamed of their unfairness. Many who did not know have learnt and are learning much. They learn what the Reformation Settlement is, and what it is for which we contend. They are learning what the real teaching of the Church of England is on such questions as Confession and Absolution, and the doctrine of Blessed Sacrament, and the Creeds, and that it is to that teaching that we adhere. They are learning that we are law-abiding Church of England men, and that we must contend for the liberties and heritage of our Mother. They are learning to attach a real meaning to the words they use—"I believe in the Holy Catholic Church." They are learning the fact of the continuity of the English Church. Above all they learn, that far from being lawless, we contend for spiritual authority, not Papalism or dominion or ipse dixits of individual bishops, but spiritual authority of those who are servants of the Church—more exalted servants—but still servants of the Church like ourselves. It is a glorious result of the long struggle we have been engaged in for so many years, that at last there is a glimmer of the dawn; at last men begin to feel that it would be impossible not only for Churchmen, but for anyone calling himself a Christian, to be guided in the doctrine, discipline, ceremonial of the Church of our Master, by even the best Privy Council or the best House of Commons, but only by the authority appointed by Christ Himself."

THE TORONTO SYNOD.

This year's Synod of the Diocese of Toronto was certainly of somewhat unusual importance in several ways. In the first place, we think the attendance was larger than in most previous years, and not only so, but it continued to be much larger until the end. Generally speaking the numbers are greatly diminished by Friday afternoon, but this year there was quite a respectable audience on Saturday morning. Speaking of the characteristics of the Synod, we note, as a prominent feature, the presidency of the Bishop of the

diocese. This is a matter somewhat difficult to comment upon. To praise is to imply a right to blame, besides which there might be an appearance of adulation in any words of approval that we might utter. As, however, his Lordship has received the commendation of two such eminent members of the Synod as Mr. Beverley Jones and Mr. Figgar, perhaps it may not be thought entirely out of place that we should also offer our humble tribute. One very serious matter in connexion with the Synod demands more notice than it has yet received. We refer to the acoustic properties of the building in which the Synod is held. When we say that this matter demands more attention, we do not mean that it has been ignored. Complaints, numerous and energetic, have been uttered, but nothing practical has been suggested, although all are sensible of the inconvenience. As a matter of simple fact, not one-half of the utterances of speakers are heard by the majority of the audience; and it is evident, without further remark, that a debate, in such circumstances, must be very unsatisfactory. If one could only be sure that the inaudible portions of the speeches were the unimportant or the superfluous, it would not matter, but no one can be sure of this, and it is a very serious consideration that the Synod may find itself committed to measures of which it has no knowledge. It is not quite easy to suggest a satisfactory remedy. In the first place, there is no other building so conveniently situated for the meeting of the Synod, and this is a more important matter than many might imagine. In the second place, experience has proved that several of the schoolrooms which have been used for Synod meetings are no better in this respect than St. James. If the truth must be told, the fault is not altogether with the building. Several of the speakers of the Synod were heard perfectly well, and this without any painful raising of the voice. Of course they were, more or less, practised speakers, generally clergymen or lawyers. But some of these learned gentlemen were imperfectly heard, and the majority of the speakers were scarcely heard at all by a large proportion of those present. It was several times suggested that the speaker should go up to the platform, but this was a step which few were inclined to take. There is one remedy which might be adopted, and that a very simple one—to have a rostrum or desk raised above the heads of the audience from which every speaker should be required to address the meeting. There would be a double advantage in such an arrangement. On the one hand, some might be deterred altogether from speaking when they had nothing of importance to say. This would be a very great gain. On the other hand, the elevation of the speaker and the position he would of necessity assume, would at least give him a chance of being heard. We have no great expectation of this suggestion being adopted. People go on grumbling year after year, and, although the remedy is comparatively simple, no one takes in hand to have it adopted. On one point there is some room for congratulation. Our impression is that there was less

of boredom in this Synod than has been usual. Of course there were bores, and they were tolerated, as is necessary in all deliberative assemblies, but they were less afflicting than they have been on former occasions. Some day it may be necessary to adopt a time limit, but it will be better if the present improvement continues and men gradually learn to limit themselves.

THE CANON ON DIFFERENCES.

Although the Canon on the settlement of differences between the clergy and their parishioners was confirmed by a great majority of the Synod, there is some reason to believe that its provisions are still imperfectly understood; and it may be well that we should clearly realize its intention and probable effect. In the first place, the Canon proposes no new inquisition into the character of the clergy. One might suppose from some of the remarks made during the debate, that this was the case. There is no necessity for any such measure. It is not merely that there are very few cases indeed in which the character of a clergyman comes into question; but the general law of the Church is quite sufficient for dealing with such emergencies. To propose any change in this respect would not merely be insulting to the clergy, but would reflect injuriously upon the Church. The Canon contemplates a very different case—the case of a clergyman and his parish being so unhappily united that his work is thrown away and the parish is in danger of being lost to the Church. That there are such cases no one can possibly deny; and it is to meet such cases that the Canon was passed. It would, however, be an entire mistake to imagine that the Canon would be brought into action in every such case. On the contrary, in the great majority of cases the Canon would be kept in reserve, as a last resort, in case the clergyman refused to give heed to the godly monitions of the Bishop. Such clergymen have existed—men who simply declined to consider any suggestion that they should make a change, who stood upon their legal rights, and declined to hear any arguments based upon their failure as parish priests. This Canon will give the Bishop power—as he certainly has the right—to investigate such cases. It is not to be supposed for a moment that the Bishop will take violent or precipitate measures. He will certainly try to ascertain whether such changes as may be necessary cannot be made quietly and with as little hurt as possible to the feelings of all concerned. But it will be clearly understood all through that the Bishop has in reserve the power of not merely ascertaining whether a clergyman is doing the work of the Church in his parish, but also of removing him if he is not doing that work. An objection to the Canon urged with great energy was, that it would be ruinous to a clergyman to have the Canon applied to him. But this objection proceeded on the assumption that the clergyman would resist every admonition of his diocesan, and compel him to have recourse to extreme measures. We believe that such a case would hardly ever occur. Dr. Langtry mentioned

in the S
settle
of the
known
operatio
as to th
brought
yond th
gratifyi
nmed
of the
clergy,
ing m
been m
suppose
or party
case. C
firmly
service
parochi
mentio
which
martyr
worked
they ha
have b
really
there a
and we
with th
the spe
Canon
the Bi
the rul
diocese
shadow
someth
the Bis
of then
the Ch

OUTLI

BY REV

1. Ch
is thine
without
Life
shadow
faults—
of God.
ful, so
nobility
i. A
words
1. Co
be mad
a burd
upon.
avoid
2. M
fices p
value.
(1) As
paid—f
respon
infern
"Wher
ii. T
in the
Cons
1. E
No de
ask, hi
of his