

will only say, therefore, that we trust all parties will see the Lord's guiding hand in this result, and that the still vacant church will soon be directed by the same good Providence to an equally able and suitable man.

---

**Rev. J. G. Baylis.**—Zion Church, St. John, N. B., is about to become vacant by the removal of its pastor, the Rev. J. G. Baylis, to Danville, Q. Our esteemed brother leaves regretfully, and carries away with him the warm affection and confidence of the people there; but the climate affects his health so injuriously, that it has become absolutely necessary for him to leave. He enters upon his new sphere almost immediately.

---

**Yarmouth, N. S.**—The Rev. A. Burpee has resigned his charge of the Church in Yarmouth, and has been on a visit to friends in Philadelphia, and, rumour has it, is looking over into the green pastures of Congregationalism in the United States.

---

**Rev. B. M. Frink**, formerly of Magog, Q., has resigned the pastorate of the Central Congregational Church in Portland, Me.

---

**Rev. J. M. Smith**, formerly of Southwold, Ont., has removed from Sabula to Monona, Iowa.

---

[The following notices of Canadian Ecclesiastical bodies were unavoidably crowded out of our August number.—Ed. "C. I."]

**The Anglican Synod of Toronto** has had a very angry and excited meeting, the ill-feeling having been occasioned chiefly by the affairs of the Church Society. It is pleasant to think, however, that the conclusion was somewhat more peaceable, and that the unseemly controversy, arising out of the charges preferred by Mr. W. H. Boulton against the Hon. J. H. Cameron, is at last at an end. The motto of the Synod is henceforth to be, "Let us have peace." The amalgamation of the Church Society with that body (just effected,) it is to be hoped, will secure that result.

The question of patronage also created lively, and perhaps on the whole, healthy discussion, not a few of the members maintaining *the right of the people* to a voice at least, in the election of their ministers.

Rev. Mr. Carry said it was no innovation to give the people some voice in the choice of their clergyman. He appealed to history in this matter, and history told him that in older times the people of the Church of England chose their own Presbyters. It was easy to say that they were tending towards democracy, but the fact remained that the Bishop might say to him, go to a mission and stay there. But if the people did not choose to pay him, what was he to do?

On the other hand, Provost Whittaker thought nothing could be more unfortunate for a congregation than to have any say in the appointment of their minister. If other bodies, who have this system at work, are regarded, it is at once seen that it does not work well. For the very parties who have been most instrumental in putting a man into a charge, too frequently turn round on him and abuse him, just because he does not adapt himself to their particular fancy.

Sadly true, indeed, sometimes; but perhaps so shrewd a man as Provost Whittaker is reputed to be, can tell us whether, in such cases, it is the *system* or the *people that work it*, to which the blame attaches? We could point to instances, moreover, not far from Toronto, both east and west, where clergymen remain in charge, and have done so for years, in opposition to the well-