

corporate life of the Church through the want of support of Convocation, and, in consequence of this, the weakness of Convocation in the presence of the nation. The remedy for much of this he conceived to be the extension of diocesan conferences of clergy and laity under their respective Bishops. Such conferences were already in existence as working institutions in twenty, if not in twenty-three, dioceses out of the thirty in England and Wales. If they were made universal, and the same Church subjects were debated simultaneously in them, and the results tabulated and presented to Convocation, that body would have before it the wants and wishes, not of the clergy only, but of the clergy and laity throughout the country. Its decisions, if wisely based on these, would command greater respect with the Legislature than they now did. Only seven dioceses had not, in some sense, practically adopted diocesan conferences. Amongst these was London. Difficult as it might be, from the peculiar circumstances of the diocese, to adopt it there, the Archdeacon ventured to propose a systematic scheme, the main features of which were described in the *Guardian* some few weeks ago. It had been submitted to the clergy of his seventeen rural deaneries. Thirteen had approved of it and considered it practical as to its chief design and principles; one desired further consideration; one approved of it, and desired a Synod in the first instance; two disapproved, alleging the unwieldiness of the diocese. Of course, there was considerable variety of opinion as to the details. His colleague, the Archdeacon of London, approved the design, and was at that moment recommending it to his own clergy. The Archdeacon of Middlesex now laid it before his lay brethren, and concluded somewhat thus:—'We want our provincial Synods—i.e., our Convocations, to be supported. They are not sufficiently supported at present, because they are in their nature clerical, and take little cognizance of the laity. Let us not strive at present for diocesan Synods, or assemblies of clergy only; but for diocesan conferences, or assemblies of clergy and laity united, and regularly and representatively convened and ordered by the Bishops. These, while they contain within them elements of a Synod, give the laity that voice and interest in the Church's counsels which are theirs, not merely by right, but upon the ground of practical utility. *They will not trench upon matters of faith and doctrine, but willingly leave these to the clergy.* When properly directed, the clergy and laity have no separate objects, and will not quarrel one with the other. They are rivals, and can be rivals, in nothing except as to whether of the two orders can do most for God and for his Church.' The recommendations of Archdeacon Hessey deserve the attention of the Church in Canada.

A meeting was recently held at the Bishop of London's residence, to promote the interests of the London Diocesan Deaconesses' Institution. The duty undertaken by the deaconesses is to work in certain parishes,

under the direction of their clergy, and in order to give due authority and encouragement, they are formally commissioned by the Bishop of the diocese. Among the means of increasing the usefulness of the deaconesses mentioned at the meeting, several speakers urged that they should receive some training in the art of nursing, and as this could now be easily provided in connection with one of the nursing associations, the hint will doubtless be acted upon. It is important to bear in mind—remembering the recent debates in the Canterbury Convocation upon Sisterhoods, that the deaconesses' work has already received Episcopal Sanction, and thus, as Mr. Berdmore Compton explained, the office is one which may be said to be fully authorized by the Church. On the view of Mr. Atkinson, of Dorking, that the deaconess should receive a stipend, there will be a difference of opinion, but in any case there seems no reason why, in a day when women of all classes are, often from necessity, seeking active and remunerative employment, the Church should not enrol them among her paid workers.

A meeting of those interested in the Society for promoting Christianity among the Jews, was recently held in Edinburgh. The Right Rev. the Bishop, who occupied the chair, expressed his sympathy with the claims of the society, and hoped that it would be better supported than it had hitherto been in the diocese. The Rev. Dr. Teape, as diocesan secretary, explained the efforts that had been made in the diocese during the year. The total amount received by subscriptions had been small. He referred to the efforts of the missionaries, and read extracts from letters he had received from Smyrna and Jerusalem. Rev. J. M. Eppstein, writing from Smyrna, spoke of the ignorance, infidelity and superstition of the Jews there, of their readiness to argue points of difference, and of the efforts made to reclaim them. Mr. Chaplin also reported that at Jerusalem the girl's school especially was in a flourishing condition, the number of Jewish girls being greater than at any previous period. The Rev. C. G. Ashwin, in giving an account of the society's operations, said it was a significant fact that all abstract objections to their work resolved themselves into two directly opposite and anti-Christian dogmas—(1) that the Jews were too bad to be benefited by the Gospel, and (2) that they were so good that they did not need the Gospel. He pointed out that the conclusions to which these propositions led were that the blood of Christ did not cleanse from all sin; and that if a man was moral, cultivated, and refined, he did not need the Gospel. The society was connected with no -ism whatever, but existed for the purpose of bringing before the Jewish people the evidences of Christianity. By its instrumentality the New Testament had been translated into Hebrew, and more than 100,000 copies circulated among the Jews in various parts of the world. After remarking that the computed number of Jews in Great Britain was 80,000, the speaker said the Society had 37 mission stations and 145 missionaries. Mr. Ashwin

then gave an account of the work of evangelisation which is going forward among the Jews in London, Manchester, and the north of England, and also alluded to the amount of good that was being done by missionaries on the Continent. 152 baptisms had taken place in London, Liverpool, Königsberg, Dantzic, Hamburg, Berlin, Cracow, Vienna, Warsaw, Kischeneff, Paris, Smyrna, Morocco, and Abyssinia. Poland had recently been reopened to their missionaries. Whatever views might be entertained in connection with recent events, there was no doubt whatever that the Emperor of Russia had carried out his promise of helping their missionaries in every way possible. He had been instrumental in bringing copies of the gospel amongst the Jewish soldiers who had been engaged in the war.

THE SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

ACTIVE love in the Christian system is the sure fruit of the Faith which is at the foundation of the whole. A boundless charity which exercises itself in distributing goodness and truth everywhere, although it has not for one of its features a fancied recognition of these attainments where they have no existence. Some people imagine they are practising all the charity the Gospel requires when they have no bigotry, no exclusiveness, no attachment to any one creed, party, sect, or religion more than another. They fancy they possess superior enlargement of soul to other men because they entertain an equal indifference to all the vanities of human opinion on religious subjects, and entertain no special regard for any particular ecclesiastical organization. But there is in this no advantage conferred on our fellow men; there is no bestowment of any gift; there is no exercise, therefore, of Christian charity. Such a principle would be easy to embrace, and would involve no sacrifice, no self-denial. By those who are indifferent, concessions are easily made to any imaginable extent; but there can be no great liberality in sacrificing truth, especially in cases where no real attachment to truth is experienced. In the Apostle John we find the greatest zeal for the maintenance of what he terms "the truth"; and in St. Paul we find that exactly in proportion as he became attached and devoted to "the truth as it is in Jesus" he manifested an increase of his benevolence and self-denying exertions. He had a deeply settled conviction that his business with men was not in complimenting them with a pretended candor, and was convinced that genuine enlargement of charity is best shown by imparting to them some gift, some benefit they do not already possess, rather than in telling them they were all going on in the right way, and that they and he would ultimately meet at the same goal. In reality, nothing can be more cruel, however it may be varnished with the gloss of liberality, than the attempt to explain away the most clear and awful sanctions of Divine truth, when we are expressly assured that while "he that believeth and is baptized