

the reluctance with which he commenced proceedings, and of the absence of all harshness or any feeling of animosity against so obstinate an offender. The Archbishop felt that he could not, as chief ecclesiastical ruler in the Province of York, allow one of his clergy to go on poisoning the wells of salvation, by persistently teaching doctrines at variance with the truths of the Bible and Christianity.

Mr. Voysey is supported by a Committee headed by the Dean of Westminster, who are collecting money to pay his expenses. The Archbishop therefore felt it right that if the prosecution was abandoned, 200*l.* should be paid by Mr. Voysey towards the expenses he had occasioned. But the second and most important condition involved an undertaking on the part of the accused clergyman, that he should not accept preferment in a Church whose teaching he contravenes.

Both of these conditions are declined; and he appeals to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. We are pleased that he should thus challenge the decision of Supreme Court of Appeal. It would not have been satisfactory to the Church had his offence against her laws been left in any manner of doubt.—*Record.*

SUFFRAGAN BISHOPS.—The question of the style, title and dignity of the new Suffragan Bishops has been under the consideration of the Crown and in another column will be found the decision at which the Government have arrived, after consultation with the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, and a reference to the Bishops of both provinces. It would seem that the formal title of each Suffragan is to be "The Bishop Suffragan of * * *." They are to sign themselves by their Christian names and surnames, adding the title as above defined—"Bishop Suffragan," say of "Canterbury," "Lincoln," or "Lichfield," as the case may be. Territorial title, as of Dover or Nottingham, &c., are not permitted, and they are to have "no prescribed district" in the diocese to which they are temporarily attached. The style of the suffragan is to be "Right Reverend," and they are to be addressed, not as "My Lord," but as "Right Reverend Sir." The title of "My Lord and Lordship," as given to Indian and Colonial Bishops, arose, as is well known from an unintentional mistake in the patent of the first Bishop of Calcutta, which it was thought worth while to correct. That irrepressible humourist, Sydney Smith, long ago pointed out some of the ridiculous consequences that were likely to arise from the indefinite multiplication of *Lord* Bishops returning home in poverty without any provision for the needless burden of the Baronial dignity thrust upon them. The Duke of Newcastle declared his wish to withdraw this incumbrance in all future Colonial patents, but found himself hampered by the fact that Lord Clarendon, when Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, had admitted Roman Catholic Prelates at his Court as "My Lords" and "Your Grace"; and that Colonial Governors had followed this example, in the dependencies over which they presided. The accumulation of this difficulty is, however, to be henceforth avoided in the case of the new Episcopal Suffragans.

It is added that "no place or precedence is to be formally assigned to them save only when they are present for the performance of any official act by the appointment and on behalf of the Bishop of the diocese," when of course they represent the prelate in whose name they act. Any other arrangement would be out of place, as the Ecclesiastical Commission under which a suffragan acts may be summarily revoked by a stroke of the episcopal pen, so that a suffragan will be in one sense more helpless than a curate. It will therefore better comport with the personal dignity of an Archdeacon thus temporarily elevated to perform episcopal duties that he should hold his own rank as to place and precedence.

These arrangements are made under the direction of the Act of Henry VIII., but they point out the anomaly attendant on the suffragan system, which was abandoned three hundred years ago. It is not said whether they are to be "Fathers in God," or whether they are officially to act "by Divine permission." The *Daily News* regards the whole arrangement as a novelty tending in the direction of "the Voluntary system," and towards the extinction of Parliamentary bishops.—*Record.*

SUNDAY INTELLIGENCE.
JUDGMENT—SUPERIOR COURT.
Montreal, April, 1870.

Before His Honor Mr. Justice MACKAY.
DAVIDSON, Petitioner vs. G. B. BAKER, Defendant.

MACKAY, J.—The *requête* of petitioner in this matter asks that Baker, the Defendant, be held to have illegally usurped the office of lay delegate for Christ Church, Sweetsburg, in the Synod of the Diocese of Montreal, and to be guilty of unlawfully holding and exercising said office; that he be ousted from it; that the decision of the majority of the Synod against Petitioner Davidson be declared illegal; that the petitioner be declared to have been duly elected as lay delegate to said Synod from Christ Church, and that the Synod be ordered to reinstate him as such lay delegate. The petition sets out with stating the Synod's incorporation; it then proceeds to state an election in March, 1869, at the Easter meeting at Christ Church, Sweetsburg, at which election petitioner was duly elected as lay delegate to the Synod; that he received from the Incumbent Chairman at the meeting a certificate of his election; that he presented it at the Synod, in May, 1869, and claimed to take his seat; that the Committee to report on certificates passed upon his and approved it, and put his name upon the roll of delegates; that thereafter, a motion, supported by affidavits, was made by a lay delegate, that the name of Petitioner should be struck off the roll, and the name of Baker substituted for it; that the chairman ruled this to be out of order; but upon an appeal from the chair, the majority of the Synod maintained the motion, and Baker then and there was admitted, and the petitioner excluded from the Synod, etc. The defendant, Baker, by his answer, defends the action of the Synod, and claims that at the Vestry Meeting at Sweetsburg, he (Baker) was elected; that he had the majority of votes, and the chairman so declared at the time, but afterwards acted to the contrary and gave petitioner, his son, the certificate; that at the Synod the chairman could not prevent the Synod disposing of the question as to whether Davidson or Baker had the right to sit; that clause number two, of the Synod constitution, relating to qualification of delegates, is illegal and void.

10 and 20 Vic., cap. 121 and 122, cap. 139, enable the members of the Church of England and Ireland to meet in the meeting of Synod and the adoption by it of a constitution, &c., followed this 22 Vic., and the second clause of such constitution states who may be lay representatives, and how elected.

2. The lay representative shall be male communicants of at least one year's standing, of the full age of twenty-one years, and shall be elected annually at the Easter meetings, or at any vestry meeting (specially called for such purpose by incumbents, after due notice on two Sundays), held by each minister having a separate cure of souls, and all laymen within the cure, of twenty-one years or upwards, entitled within such cure to vote at vestry meetings, or who hold pews or sittings in the church, though not entitled so to vote, who shall have declared themselves in writing to be "members of the United Church of England and Ireland, and to belong to no other religious denomination," shall have the right of voting at the election.

And in clause 5 the certificate of election is given as follows:

"This is to certify that at a meeting held this day for the purpose of electing delegates to represent this congregation or parish in Synod, being the parish or mission of _____, a communicant of one year's standing, and of the full age of twenty-one years, was elected by the laymen of this congregation, who have a right to vote at such election, by virtue of their having, in accordance with the second clause of the constitution of the Synod of this diocese, declared themselves in writing in a book kept for that purpose, to be members of the United Church of England and Ireland, and to belong to no other denomination, and being qualified otherwise under the provisions of said clause.

And such election shall be considered and taken as sufficient proof of the election; and such lay delegate shall continue in office till his successor is appointed."

And article 3 of the rules and order of proceedings reads as follows:—

3. After this prayer the Clerical Secretary shall call over the roll of the Clergy, to be furnished by the Bishop, and mark the names of those in attendance; and the Secretary shall call over the names of the several parishes, missions or cures, when the certificates of the representatives having been presented, shall be examined by the Secretary and a Committee of two to be named by the Chairman for that purpose; and where found satisfactory, the names shall be recorded and read by the Secretary.

The petitioner received the formal certificate of election from the Incumbent of Sweetsburg. Much should be presumed in favour of such certificate and the returning officers act, to be presumed true and honest; that certificate was such presumptive evidence of Davidson's right to the office of lay delegate, that upon its approval, 11th of May, 1869, by the Committee, and his name being recorded by the Secretary he ought to have been admitted to the Synod. The certificate so approved ought to have been held by the Synod then and there sufficient proof of Davidson's election. The decision of the Chairman of the Synod was right; the over-ruling of it was wrong, and so was the erasing petitioner's name from the roll of delegates, and the inserting of Baker's instead of it.

The case has been presented not only on what was done in the Synod, but petitioner and defendant have also gone upon the merits of the election at Sweetsburg, and we see exactly all that passed there 29th March, 1869. The meeting was a curious one, and the Incumbent presiding at it, because perplexed a little by what took place, was unsettled a little as to what to judge and do. Six at the meeting voted for Baker (if we include himself); three voted for Davidson. The other five were not holders of pews or sittings, and had no title. How different is it with Abraham Pickle and the others! As to these, could any of them maintain action against anybody as for disturbance to their possession thereof—i. e., of pew or sitting (under the Temporalities Act)? I think not.

The chairman at the election registered Thomas Cotton as a delegate to the Synod, and Baker as "elected by those who had no right to vote," and Davidson elected by those entitled to vote. (Two delegates were to be elected.) No proclamation or declaration of the result was made.

The certificate granted to Davidson by the Chairman, was so granted, what he believed to be required by the Constitution, Article 2, above quoted. This article is said by defendant to be contrary to 2 Vic., cap. 139, and therefore illegal. But this must not control absolutely; it is to be taken with the 19 and 20 Vic., cap. 121; following the 22 Vic. is the Constitution of the Synod, and these three taken together control. The Temporalities Act 14 and 15 Vic., cap. 176, has also to be considered to a certain extent, and it makes against defendant and his voters in a way, e. g., as settling what is meant by holding a pew or sitting; the 2nd section of this Act enacts as follows: "That all pew-holders in such churches or chapels, whatever, holding the same by purchase or lease, and all persons holding sittings therein by the same being let to them, * * * after the passing of this Act by the Corporation of such church or chapel, and holding a certificate from such Corporation at such sitting, shall form a Vestry, &c." It is said, too, with some force, that the Act of Incorporation of the Synod of Montreal referred to, in enacting as follows: Sec. 2. The said Incorporated Synod shall have power from time to time to amend, repeal or alter the present Constitution, Canons, Rules and regulation of the aforesaid Synod &c., * * * but until so amended, repealed or altered, the Constitution, Canons, Rules and Regulations of the said Synod presently subsisting and in force shall be and continue to be the Constitution, Canons, Rules and Regulations of the Corporation aforesaid created by this Act," and so it has, and I think the Constitution valid and binding.

The act of the Public Officer with his testimony and the other evidence of record, that is, in favour of Petitioner, is stronger than the evidence of defendant, and makes a good case for petitioner, whose petition is, therefore, maintained; the defendant is declared guilty of the usurpation charged against him by Davidson, and must be ousted; the petitioner Davidson is declared

to have been duly elected and entitled to his seat as delegate for Christ church aforesaid; the Synod proceedings against Davidson complained of, were unreasonable at the time they took place, and were and are illegal and are over-ruled, and order must go to the Synod to admit the petitioner Davidson, as a lay delegate from Christ church, Sweetsburg, and re-insert his name as such, in place of the defendant, Baker's in the roll of delegates; the whole, with costs, against defendant.

THE REVISION OF THE BIBLE.

Mr. G. H. Davis, Secretary of the London Religious Tract Society, writes to the *Daily News*: "Permit to me state that the Religious Tract Society is now publishing a Bible which may tend to allay the fears of many as to a new translation. 1. It shows that the old and the new may be combined. It retains the divisions of chapters and verses, while printed in paragraphs and sections. It gives the authorized text, but introduces the more important readings established by modern research into the margin and amended translations within brackets in the page itself. It confines both readings and rendering such as have the sanction of the best authorities, avoiding those which are either conjectural or of no moment to an English reader. 2. It shows that churchmen and dissenters may combine in the production of a new translation, for it is the actual production of a committee of both. 3. It proves that no great innovations need be apprehended. Experience acquired in the preparation of this Bible leads to the conviction that hundreds of apparent improvements will be rejected when subjected to the deliberate judgment of many minds, leaving the New Testament, except in a comparatively few passages, very much what it now is. I enclose a copy of the New Testament. Two parts of the Old Testament have only as yet been issued.

"As a shield against all error, as a sword repelling every foe, as a magnet attracting to all good, let me now present the Word of God. Ascend this rock, and you may defy all surging waves of evil. The fortress is impregnable. At this momentous crisis, such counsels press to the forefront. The aged, worn-out world, to be tottering to its end. Old foundations are crumbling. There is, indeed, much stir and bustle; but amid all this restlessness, the thoughtful eye discerns weakness, decrepitude, senility. The main distemper is want of reverence for Scripture. Poor dotards dream that they possess some inward light far brighter than the rays of heaven. Pride scorns to sit, as Mary, at the Saviour's feet. Conceit denies that God is wiser than the creature man. It is free thought, we are told, to handle Scripture as some mocking cheat; it is brave reason to ridicule old truths, sanctioned by centuries of faith, and hark with the reverence of ages.

"Young men, spurn these deluded drivellers. Surely your honest minds will scorn them. They exhibit, as bright discoveries of their wit, nonsense culled in exploded schools of sceptic thought. They crouch as slaves to bygone infidels, and reproduce the oldest blasphemies. Believe me, there is no new deceit. The father of lies has long since done his worst. He may repeat, but can no more invent. Their utmost genius is to dress anew the dolls with which old deists trifled. Turn from them as you would be saved, and give all reverence to the dear old Bible. Worthy it is, indeed, of all your confidence and all your love. Fix deeply in your minds that it is God's authoritative voice speaking from his highest throne. Be assured that every word, in its first form, came from the Holy Ghost. This is the motto written on its brow,—'All Scripture is given by inspiration of God.' If this be true, then all is true. If it be false, the whole foundation of the fabric sinks, and faith totters without a resting-place. But the witness is true. Cling, then, to the Book, as the sure anchor of your hopes. Let no one rob you of life's dearest treasure. The noblest intellects have counted it to be their highest wisdom to do homage to its supremacy. From age to age the holiest of earth's sons have reposed with joy beneath its shade, and gathered fruit to life eternal."—*Dean Law's Tract for Young Men.*