

natural end in four or five years, (I prefer five as half a decade.) It is much less painful to elect a younger man in his place than to roughly oust him; and assuredly no one would desire he should retain the office when never again likely to perform its duties.

R. D.

SIR,—The action of the majority at the recent meeting of the Diocesan Synod held in Montreal has been largely commented upon in your columns, and no part of it has been more criticized than their exclusion of the Rev. Dr. Norman from the Provincial Synod. Permit me to make a few remarks upon the nature and consequences of their action in this matter. It is true that a list of names was distributed on the morning of the election among those who formed the minority, but this was only done in consequence of the warning they had received, to the effect that the supporters of the Theological College Bill intended to vote against every one of them. This plan was, therefore, pursued as a last hope to obtain some representation, however small, on the Provincial Synod and Executive Committee, and I have reason to believe that Dr. Norman and others of the minority did not use that ticket, but sent up a more comprehensive list of names; and, considering the relative numerical strength of the two parties, the majority had no need to resort to such ungenerous means to obtain all the places in the list of delegates. Further, if Dr. Norman's speeches and conduct during the Synod had shown any violent party spirit, his exclusion might be considered a legitimate punishment; but I am sure everyone who was present will agree that all his remarks were exceedingly temperate and courteous.

And then it must be remembered that Dr. Norman has been for some years an important official of the Provincial Synod. Such officials are supposed to command the confidence of the delegates of the whole of the Ecclesiastical Province. To exclude one from the Synod is, as far as I know, without a precedent, and is nothing less than the infliction of a very grave insult. Such officials ought to have their seats "ex officio" in the Provincial Synod in consideration of the weighty duties devolving on them, and ought to be freed from the possibility of rejection by a capitious and capricious majority, and this not only in consideration of their services, but on account of the serious inconvenience to the Synod, resulting from the possibility of frequent changes in the personnel of its officers.

Some years ago, by common consent, party voting was dropped. It has now been revived by the extreme Evangelicals, and I would ask any unprejudiced Churchman whether he considers the present delegation so representative a one as for the Diocese to be satisfied with it? Much has been written as to the influence which Dr. Norman might exercise in the Provincial Synod should the Theological College question come up in any form. Well, I know the duties of Clerical Secretary are far too arduous and engrossing to admit of his taking an active part in debate. His vote on any question would be the only effect his presence would produce. The exclusion of Dr. Norman has been cited as a sort of analogy to and retribution for the similar fate which befel the present Bishop a few years back. But the causes are not the same. Bishop Bond, at that time of course, was a prominent man, but not an official of the Synod, and his non-election was a mistake, and one much to be regretted by both parties. Dr. Norman's exclusion was deliberate, prompted by more than one motive and, as I have said, was unprecedented. What, also, can be said of the rejection of Dr. Davidson and Mr. Thomas, two of our most earnest and self-sacrificing laymen? What an ungrateful return has been made them for the time and thought which they have devoted to the interests of the Church. But such tactics always recoil on the doers of them, and I believe that

this instance will be no exception to the rule; rather do I expect that the promoters of the Theological College will find that the course which they have pursued will prove specially injurious to the prospects of the Institution.

I am yours faithfully,

"JUSTICE."

SIR,—A friend has sent me, somewhat late, a copy of the *Toronto Mail*, with the full report of the proceedings of the late Synod of Toronto. There is one matter in those proceedings of interest to the Canadian Church in general, on which one may remark without the reproach of intrusion into the domestic concerns of the Diocese. I mean the resolution adopted respecting the Revised Version of the English Bible. The resolution is as follows:—

"Resolved, That a memorial from the Synod of this Diocese be presented to the Provincial Synod at its next session, praying that the Provincial Synod shall consider the expediency of authorizing the use of the Revised Versions of the Old and New Testaments in reading the Lessons at Morning and Evening Prayer in all churches in this Ecclesiastical Province."

The *Mail's* report of the debate upon this resolution, though of course fuller than your space would permit, is necessarily very concise; probably, however, it gives a sufficiently fair idea of the line of argument presented by the several speakers. Those arguments—arguments in favor of setting aside our English Bible and putting a new one in its place—were not, as reported, very strong, and the debate was singularly brief for a matter of such surpassing importance. The resolution, nevertheless, was "adopted by a very large majority."

Into these arguments I do not propose now to enter, but may possibly, with your permission, return to them again. But what struck me with surprise in reading the debate was the strange insensibility, as I view the matter, to the real conditions of the matter before them which characterized the remarks of all the speakers.

The resolution asks the Provincial Synod to authorize the use of the Revised Version in place of the English Bible in this Ecclesiastical Province. But what is this Revision, and what is the position in which it stands? What authority does it possess? What claim has it upon the allegiance of any reasonable Christian? What reason have the Church people of this country for believing that, be the revision ever so well done, they would be justified in relegating their old English Bible to obscurity and replacing it with this new book?

Let me briefly recall the history of this revision, and ask your readers to set clearly and distinctly before their minds the amount of authority it possesses. Its history is this. The Convocation of Canterbury, i.e., the Synod of one of the two Ecclesiastical Provinces into which England is divided, appointed in the year 1870 a Committee of its own members to undertake a revision of the English Bible. The revision which was entrusted to them to make was of a very different nature from the one which they produced; but that is not now in point. This Committee were empowered to call in the help of other persons "eminent for scholarship, to whatever nation or religious body they might belong." They did so, and besides put themselves into communication with American Biblical scholars, the result of which was that two corresponding committees or companies were formed in the United States for the revision of the Old and New Testaments. The revision of the New Testament was completed and reported to Convocation by the Committee in November, 1880, and that of the Old Testament in July, 1884.

Well, the work was completed, ushered in with a tremendous flourish of trumpets on the part of the Committee of Revisors. What was the result? Has the Church of England accepted the work and stamped it with her ap-

proval? Has she set aside the old Bible and put the Revision in its place? Has she authorized its use in her services? Has she taken the first step tending in this direction?

The answer is, No. The Convocation of Canterbury received the revision reported by their Committee, so far as approval is concerned, in absolute silence. The Convocation, on receipt of the Revision, formally thanked the Committee for their labors, and there the matter has rested. Not one word of approval of the book, much less authorization or sanction, have its friends ventured so far even to ask for in the Provincial Synod where it had its birth, and which is responsible for the work being undertaken at all.

But the Convocation of Canterbury, though a very important body, is not the Church of England, much less the English Church. There is the Convocation of the Province of York, the Provincial Synod of the other half (the smaller half, but a very vigorous and important half) of England. What is its position towards this Revision? Not more encouraging. The Convocation of York refused to take any part in the revision when it was proposed, or to make itself in any way responsible for it, and it is not to be supposed that it would anticipate Canterbury in its approval of it. A formal vote of thanks, carefully guarded so as to mean nothing, was, with a good deal of difficulty, notwithstanding the presence and advocacy of Bishop Lightfoot, piloted through the York Convocation, and there again the matter dropped.

But the Church of England is not the entire Anglican Church. There is the Church in Scotland, the Church of Ireland, the Church of the United States; what attitude have these great national churches of the Anglican Communion taken towards a work of such immense importance to them all as the revision of the English Bible? Here again we find absolute silence; not one of these bodies has made any sign. They have maintained that decorous reserve which surely was their only becoming attitude in the silence and inaction, I will not say of the Mother Church, but of that one Provincial Synod of the Mother Church upon which so far rests the entire responsibility for the revision.

And the same is true, so far as I know, of all the other religious bodies which make up our English-speaking Christianity. No one of all those bodies—Presbyterian, Methodist, Congregationalist, Baptist—has broken the silence.

Now, Mr. Editor, this silence, if not ominous, is certainly expressive. It shows one of two things—that the unanimous sense of English-speaking Christians throughout the world is either that the Revision is a failure, or at least that it would be unbecoming in any other section of the Church to interfere in a matter which belongs certainly in the first instance to the Church which took it in hand, until that Church itself has spoken.

What the verdict of English-speaking men, who are capable of judging, is with respect to the success or failure of the Revision, I am not now concerned to argue; but one thing is quite certain, that, whatever their verdict be, they agree in recognizing that their true, their only becoming attitude in this matter is that of waiting patiently and without interference until the religious body which is responsible for the Revision has made up its own mind upon its merits. And I think your readers will agree with me that the Synod of Toronto proposes to place the Canadian Church in a thoroughly false position when it asks our Provincial Synod to decide the question which the Convocation of Canterbury has not yet been able to decide, namely, whether the new Revision made by their Committee shall be authorized for use in place of the English Bible in the services of the Church of England.

HENRY ROE,

Port Daniel, P.Q., 27th July, 1886.