

Christ is the only Head of the Church, and of the faith and religion of the same." After the repeal of the acts of Henry the Eighth and Edward the Sixth by the statute of 1 Philip and Mary, the title "Supreme Head" was never revived even by Parliament, much less by Convocation, and was especially rejected by Elizabeth. It forms no part of the teaching or institutions of the English Church to recognize the Sovereign as "Head of the Church." The assumption of it by the Sovereign and the ascription of it to him would be equally blasphemous.

The recent proceedings in Lord Penzance's Court have occasioned strange utterances on this subject from some who would otherwise have been supposed familiar with it. The one-sided object of the Court is amply sufficient to condemn it as a court of justice. The fact that its proceedings are confined to putting in force a moiety only of the decisions of a judgment in an undefended case, while other decisions of the same judgment are required to be obeyed by no bishop or clergyman of the Anglican communion, condemns it as Court of Law. But the existence of such a court by no means supposes a claim advanced by the Sovereign to the Headship of the Church, any more than it does the recognition of such a claim by the Church herself.

If the law can be interpreted in so many opposite ways as the judgments of the Privy Council would indicate, Convocation ought to be consulted in remodelling existing regulations. But that Parliament alone is entitled to enact laws and establish courts which have to do with the spiritual functions of the priesthood, just because some people imagine the Sovereign is the Head of the Church! This is the most monstrous fallacy we have ever met with.

THE MISSION FUND OF THE DIOCESE OF ONTARIO.

THE support of our missionaries generally was referred to by us last week, chiefly in reference to the Diocese of Toronto, although our remarks were intended to have a bearing upon the other parts of our ecclesiastical Province. The subject is one which has very justly awakened a large share of interest; for, on the proper and efficient maintenance of the funds established for this purpose, must depend in a great measure the extension of the Church among us, and even her very existence in many parts of the country.

The Venerable T. A. Parnell, Archdeacon of Kingston, has kindly forwarded to us a copy of the very able letter he has lately written to the Chairman of the Board of Missions in reference to the Mission Fund in the Diocese of Ontario, which we give on another page. In the letter he fairly states the difficulties to be contended with, and also proposes what he believes would be a remedy if adopted. It should at least be tried were it only on a small scale; and if found successful, which we have no doubt would be the case, it might be generally adopted in that

diocese, and also in others similarly circumstanced.

The Archdeacon calculates, from present indications, that the deficiency in the Mission Fund by the 1st of December, 1877, will be about \$4,500. As we stated last week, we learn from the circular of the Bishop of Toronto that this diocese alone has a deficit of about \$8,000. And we find that this unfortunate state of deficiency in Mission Funds is by no means peculiar to the Dominion; for we learn that the Church of the United States can also boast of a "distressing debt of \$75,000," owing by its Board of Missions, which they say "drags upon it," and for the liquidation of which a special effort is being made, the diocese of Pennsylvania alone having already contributed \$12,000. A heavy debt owing by a mission board is a serious matter, especially on this continent, where the rate of interest is so much higher than in England. We have heard of a debt of twenty millions sterling owing by one of the missionary societies there. It appeared to cause no very great alarm, and was subsequently liquidated by one or two spasmodic efforts, with the expressed intention, however, of contracting new debts as soon as possible. It was believed that the ability of getting into debt, for such a purpose, was an evidence of the Divine blessing bestowed on their efforts to extend their system. The case, however, is different here, for the reason we have just assigned; and it naturally causes some dismay when it is found that a considerable proportion of a particular sum raised has to be paid out as interest, instead of being devoted to the support of a number of missionaries.

The Diocese of Ontario, from the Venerable Archdeacon's showing, has a just right to feel considerable satisfaction from the fact that, so far, the annual contributions of the people have met the wants of the Diocese; and it is certainly remarkable that "*on no occasion, until at the last meeting of the Board, has an application for assistance been refused on the ground of want of funds.*" We would ask whether any other Diocese in the Dominion can give utterance to a similar statement; and from it we should be inclined to imagine that the Archdeacon has over-estimated the amount of deficiency to be expected by the 1st of December next; and, anything that may be said to the contrary notwithstanding, he has a perfect right to speak of the Diocese as a prosperous one, and to look forward to "a glorious future" that shall be "full of hopeful anticipations, which are sure to be realised, if we be only faithful to our trust."

The Mission Fund is justly referred to by the Archdeacon as the backbone of the Diocese, that it draws out the loving sympathy of our people, and proves their faith. And whether his estimate of the deficiency should turn out to be correct or not, it is undeniably certain that the present state and requirements of the Fund demand the putting forth of all the energy of the Diocese; and if it can be done, it is, no doubt, most desirable that the maintenance of the Mission Fund should be placed "on a more permanent basis than at

present;" although, unless a permanent local endowment for each parish can be secured, there must always be considerable uncertainty in the results realized.

We are glad that Archdeacon Parnell does not recommend giving up Missionary Meeting, especially in the rural districts, and substituting for them Mission Sermons or something of the kind; because in many parts they form the *only* available means of quickening the general work of the church in the neighbourhood, and also the *best* available means of cultivating feelings of sympathy and brotherhood with other parts of the Diocese.

The Archdeacon's plan, as will be seen in his letter, is for every clergyman having cure of souls to be required by Canon to call on every family or parishioner under his charge, and to ascertain how much each family or individual will give per week to the Mission Fund of the Diocese. Then the parish may be divided into districts, and a collector appointed to call monthly and receive the amounts subscribed, a treasurer being appointed to receive the monthly payments and to remit them to the Mission Board.

This arrangement has the merit of simplicity, and in all probability would be eminently successful. It may be tried in other Dioceses, without resorting to a cumbrous machinery to carry it into effect; and would materially aid the carrying out, where it exists, of the Mission By-law, to which we called the attention of our readers last week.

DIOCESAN CONFERENCES.

AMONG the evidences of renewed life and energy in the Church of England which have been so greatly multiplied during the past few years, not the least significant and useful is the Diocesan Conference.

Within a few weeks in the autumn of last year, conferences met in the Dioceses of Winchester, Oxford, Bath and Wells, Exeter, Chester, and Lincoln, and the Archdiocese of York.

Such importance has this movement obtained, that the Bishop of Lincoln (Dr. Wordsworth) delivered, at his last visitation, a series of addresses on the distinct characters and different uses of these bodies and synods, which were afterwards published in a pamphlet. In regard to the former, he says: "The questions of the Conference are of a more mixed character, such as concern the relation of the Church to the State; the tendency of Legislative measures affecting the Church; the maintenance of the Christian ministry; the sustentation of our sacred fabrics and their services; the building, the maintenance, and efficiency of our schools; the support of home and foreign missions."

The composition of these Conferences is two-fold. Part of their members, both clerical and lay, are representative, part are *ex officio*. The great number of clergy in the English dioceses renders it impossible that they should all have seats. The elected clergy number from 134 to 250. In some dioceses an equal, in other a larger, number of laymen are elected. The *ex officio* members are certain dignitaries, and men holding