

pondered. He considers the great want of the church to be unity of feeling and uniformity of action, and that the mission of the church could not be successfully carried on in any other way. Different bodies of Christians had tried different plans of unity. The Church of England had sought it by enforcing acts of uniformity. An exaggerated and false conception of Christian unity has come before us of late years with peculiar force, so that it has become to some extent a principle with too great an angle, so to speak. So false a conception indeed has arisen of Christian unity, though based on a natural feeling, that some have been led to secede from the Church of England and seek refuge from disunion in the Church of Rome, whose infallible head professes to secure the great desideratum. The dissenting bodies aim at making all other bodies like themselves, merely distinct and isolated segments without any visible unity. The Church of Rome, on the other hand, aims at nothing less than the subjugation of all Christian bodies to the enforced unity of its own imperious community, whose unity is not of conscience so much as of coercion. It became, the Bishop said, so much the more the duty of the Church of England to unite all her forces against her opponents, in the face of existing organizations of the most formidable character at work against her. He said she must create unity by greater and more interwoven intercourse amongst her own members, by giving up the isolation of her parochial clergy, which was produced by the parochial system pushed beyond due bounds. All this is entirely opposed to the true principle of Christian unity, which makes the Diocese and not the Parish the unit of the church. He stated that no spasmodic efforts of individuals, no association of party, such as church unions and church associations, could produce the required Unity. These only divide the church into two hostile camps, and do not unite it. He believes the remedy is to be sought in conferences of the diocese acting as one body. These are the most ancient organizations, for no period of church history could be found without them. He considered Diocesan Synods and Conferences a great evidence of the historical continuity of the church, and the earliest Fathers, Irenaeus and Tertullian, viewed them in this light. The Church at the Reformation contemplated the revival of primitive Synods, as we learn from the *Reformatio Legum*, though the Bishop's Visitation is the only permanent trace of any such attempt in England for three centuries. In the colonies the necessities of the Church have made synodical action almost universal; although Diocesan Synods among ourselves differ materially from anything found in the ancient church, in the unauthorized use of the Lay element. The primitive and pure Synods consisted of clergy only without any lay element as a deliberative body; but the Bishop of Winchester advocated the advice and co-operation of both Clergy and Laity.

THE CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY AND THE BISHOP OF COLOMBO.

The question between them simply resolves itself into this:—Should all the clergy belong to one church? or are the clergy and the native Christians to understand that they are under a kind of double government, nominally subject to the Bishop of the Diocese in which they reside, but really subject to the mandates of an irresponsible and voluntary society in England? However valuable may have been the services rendered to the church by such a society, and however much good it may have accomplished, so extraordinary an anomaly as that could surely never be contemplated by men in their sound senses! And yet something very like it seems to be entertained by the committee of the Church Missionary Society, judging from the resolutions they have passed upon the subject; and we believe they are very different from anything the men who originally started the institution would have put together. The second resolution states that when once a missionary has been licensed by a Bishop, the society has a right to expect that no succeeding Bishop shall withdraw the license without sufficient cause, nor assume to himself the management of any mission of the society, or of any part of it, or to transfer the charge of it without the consent of the society, to any other clergymen (!) Such a resolution as this is quite sufficient to show that the society has placed itself in a totally false position; and one which cannot be sanctioned by the church at large. All the maudlin talk about the years of labor, the work done, etc., is nothing to the purpose. The work of the church could never be carried on with so extravagant assumptions as those, on the part of individuals whose position in the church is purely a private one.

Nor is the cause of the unpleasantness anything directly to the purpose. Although even in this respect the Bishop appears from a testimonial (numerously signed under the circumstances) from his flock, expressive of thorough confidence in his Lordship, and alleging that "they believe the section which has excited the commotion is largely composed of Non-conformists; and further that the principle for which the Bishop is contending—that of the unity and coherence of the Church in the Diocese—is dear to the general body of the laity." Now this address is a most important element in the consideration of the Bishop's personal discretion in his conduct of the case. If the Bishop is sustained by his own people, we would indignantly ask what right has he to lend himself to the schemes of those who chiefly act in religious matters, with those who do not belong to the Church, and whose principles are at variance with her teaching? It is, as an English contemporary remarks, absolute nonsense to pretend that a clergyman is really under the control of

his Bishop, if that clergyman is to have absolute power "of nominating any lay agents he pleases who teach as they like, and conduct service as they like, under the nominal shelter of the Church of England, while, in fact, actively contravening her doctrines."

The Society in England may have done a great work and a good work, but it may at the same time have mistaken its position. The thing is much better managed in the Church of the United States. And in Canada, the steps we have taken, few in number and feeble in character perhaps, are nevertheless steps in the right direction; and may therefore expect, as far as they go, the blessing of the Head of the Church. In Toronto, we have inaugurated a "Society for the promotion of Canadian and Foreign Missions," the constitution of which has lately been arranged. In no case does the Canadian Society undertake to administer the Funds collected through it, but simply to collect and forward them. We are persuaded this is the correct principle to adopt; and therefore we are glad to see that the official "Declaration" states:—"This Society will, with the most lively satisfaction, resign the work which they are attempting to inaugurate into the hands of the Provincial Synod at the earliest moment at which that body will consent to assume it; trusting meanwhile that their voluntary organization may, by the blessing of Almighty God, prepare the way for a speedy recognition by our Canadian Church in her corporate capacity of the duty of putting her own hand to that great work of Foreign Missionary Labor which is so extensively prosecuted by the Sister Church in the United States." These expressions are scarcely applicable to "the Mother Church at home" at present; nor will they be until the work of Foreign Missions shall be undertaken by Convocation. The proper thing, in reference to the Church Missionary Society in England, will be for Convocation to undertake the Foreign Mission work; and the subject might very properly be selected for discussion at the Pan-Anglican Conference.

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CANADIAN AND FOREIGN MISSIONS.

The first annual meeting of this Society was held on the 21st ult., at the Synod Rooms, and adjourned to Monday last, when the Constitution and By-laws were finally revised and approved, and the following were elected as the officers and executive Committee for the current year—President, Rev. Rural Dean Givens. Vice-Presidents, Ven. Archdeacon Whitaker, Hon. G. W. Allan, and Mr. P. Paterson. Treasurer, Mr. E. M. Chadwick; Secretaries, Rev. F. W. Checkley, and Mr. Harry Moody; together with Ven. Archdeacon Wilson, Revs. Canon Morgan, Stennett, J. D. Cayley, Professor Maddock, A. J. Broughall, and Messrs W. Plummer, I. R. Cartwright, S.