

Episcopal order. We therefore hold it to be our duty, in compliance with the resolutions of a meeting convened by the Archbishop of Canterbury on the 27th of April last, to undertake the charge of the fund for the endowment of additional Bishops in the Colonies and to become responsible for its application.

"On due consideration of the relative claims of those dependencies of the Empire which require our assistance, we are of opinion, that the immediate creation of Bishops is much to be desired in the following places:—New Zealand, the British possessions in the Mediterranean, New Brunswick, Cape of Good Hope, Van Diemen's Land, Ceylon.

"When competent provision shall have been made for the endowment of these Bishops, regard must be had to the claims of Sierra Leone, British Guiana, South Australia, Port Phillip, Western Australia, Northern India, Southern India.

"In the first instance, we propose that an Episcopal See be established at the seat of Government in New Zealand, others having been already made which appear to obviate all difficulty as to endowment.

"Our next object will be to make a similar provision for the congregations of our own communion, established in the islands of the Mediterranean, and in the countries bordering upon that sea; and it is evident that the position of Malta is such as will render it the most convenient point of communication with them, as well as with the Bishops of the ancient Churches of the East, to whom our Church has been for many centuries known only by name."

Such was the project—a large and comprehensive one undoubtedly—which eighteen years ago was set before the great body of the Church of England. Let us now as succinctly as possible state the results.

The Declaration proclaims the necessity of a Bishop for New Zealand, and in the same year a Bishop was consecrated. There are now in those islands a Metropolitan Bishop and four Suffragans.

The Declaration shows the need of a Bishop to visit the chaplains and congregations of the Church of England in the Mediterranean, and in 1842 the Bishop of Gibraltar was consecrated to this work.

New Brunswick was separated from Nova Scotia, and formed into the Diocese of Fredericton in 1845. For the Cape of Good Hope not one, but four Bishops have been appointed, and this Diocese too has been formed into a province.

A Bishop has been sent to Van Diemen's Land, and another to Ceylon; and so the claims of the first list drawn up by the Archbishops and Bishops were abundantly satisfied within four years of its publication.

The next five provinces mentioned as requiring the superintendence of resident Bishops, viz., Sierra Leone, British Guiana, South Australia, Port Phillip (Victoria,) and the Western Australia have long since been erected into bishoprics. Rarely, therefore, if we stopped at this point, has any great scheme been so rapidly and so fully carried out as that for the creation and endowment of additional Colonial Bishoprics. But much more has been done than was originally contemplated; and the best way of showing this is by appending a table of the Dioceses which have been constituted since the Declaration was signed on Whit-Tuesday, 1841.

New Zealand	1841
Gibraltar	1842
Antigua	1842
Guiana	1842
Tasmania	1842

Fredericton	1845
Colombo	1846
Capetown	1847
Newcastle	1847
Melbourne	1847
Adelaide	1847
Victoria	1849
Rupert's Land	1849
Montreal	1850
Sierra Leone	1850
Graham's Town	1853
Natal	1853
Mauritius	1854
Labuan	1855
Christ Church, New Zealand	1856
Perth, West Australia	1857
Huron, Canada	1857
Wellington, New Zealand	1858
Nelson	1858
Waiapu	1859
Columbia	1859
Brisbane, Australia	1859
St. Helena	1859

Thus, then, within eighteen years between the Declaration which was signed on Whit-Tuesday, 1841, and the consecration of the Bishops of Brisbane and St. Helena on Whit-Tuesday last, twenty-eight additional bishoprics have been founded in the colonies and dependencies of the British Crown—a number, that is of new sees, exactly equal to the total number of English and Welsh Dioceses.

We may perhaps take another opportunity of tracing the beneficial consequences of this great movement, in the increase of the settled and missionary clergy—the establishment of schools—the marking out of parishes—and the settlement in many of the dioceses of a regular Church constitution and government by a synod consisting of Bishop, Clergy, and Laity.

It will not, however, have escaped attention, that while bishoprics have sprung up with such wonderful rapidity in the various provinces of our great colonial empire, the wants of India, both North and South, though prominently set forth in the Lambeth Declaration, remain to the present day unsatisfied.

It was never, we believe, contemplated that these sees, thus formally proclaimed to be necessary for the welfare of the Indian Church, should be endowed in the same way as those in British colonies—by voluntary contributions. Such a proposition, while it might have been regarded as an imputation on the liberality of the great East India Company, would have been open to objections as an unreasonable demand upon the pockets of English Church people.

But other difficulties also stood in the way. An Act of Parliament would probably be required for the sub-division of the present Indian Dioceses. According to the scale of Indian salaries, an endowment, five or six times the amount of what is thought sufficient for a British colony, would be required for an Indian Bishopric. But, even if an adequate endowment were provided by private subscriptions, the same mode of appointment which is allowed for a Colonial See would hardly be approved where the subordinate clergy would consist in chief parts of chaplains nominated by the government. These objections, not, we trust, insuperable, are supposed to have delayed, at least, the required additions to the Episcopate in India. But one See has, it is understood, been virtually promised for the North-West Provinces. Another, surely, is required for the Punjab; and whatsoever difficulties may stand in the way of such a measure, it will be impossible much longer to overlook the claims of that remarkable mission-ground of Tinnevely for a Bishop of its own.—*Colonial Church Chronicle.*

GENERAL SYNOD OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN NEW ZEALAND, AND ADDRESS OF THE BISHOP.

(Continued from Gazette Sept. 17th.)

The first of these is in the appointment of clergymen. This power might, I think, be well vested in a Diocesan Board, composed of the Bishop, as chairman *ex officio*, and two clergymen and two laymen, elected by the Diocesan Synod. It might be a standing instruction to the Board, upon the vacancy of any cure, to call for a deputation of the parishioners, and to concur with them in making a new appointment; or, if the two parties shall be unable to agree, than to refer the question to the Board of Appointment acting in behalf of the General Synod. If the new appointment should involve the removal of a clergyman from a parish to which he is already engaged, then a deputation also from that parish should be invited to attend. It ought, I think, to be a valid ground of objection on the part of any parish to the removal of their clergyman, that he is maintained by them at the full scale of income to which he is entitled. Parishes ought not to be allowed to compete with one another for popular clergymen, by holding out inducements of greater emolument. All such practices are contrary to the nature of a spiritual office, and degrading to the clerical character.

The second duty of the Diocesan Synod which I will mention is to provide for the maintenance of the Clergy; and on this point a general uniformity of system is also desirable. A few fundamental principles have always been kept in view in the Diocese of New Zealand, and I would recommend them to your consideration, as already tested by many years' experience.

1. That the maintenance of the Clergy should be supplied partly from endowment funds, and partly from voluntary contributions.

2. That the incomes of the Clergy should be regulated by an equitable scale.

3. That a Clergyman maintained at the full scale of income be expected to give his undivided services to the work to which he is appointed.

4. That no Clergyman be considered as permanently located in any parish in which the parishioners do not supply that portion of his income which depends upon voluntary contributions.

I believe that I may appeal to several of my brethren here present to confirm my statement, that this system, after many difficulties, is now being carried out in several parishes with great regularity.

The third duty of the Diocesan Synod will be to establish a tribunal for the trial of all charges against clergymen, or other office-bearers of the Church. In the case of a Clergyman, I would recommend that the tribunal be composed of the Bishop, three clergymen, and one lay assessor. In the case of a lay office-bearer, the number of clergy and laity might be reversed. The forms of procedure for all such Diocesan tribunals ought, I think, to be prescribed by the General Synod. The appeal from the Diocesan tribunal to the Board representing the General Synod, has already been spoken of.

The fourth duty of the Diocesan Synod will be to define parishes. But the General Synod ought to lay down the principle upon which parishes are to be first defined, and afterwards, if necessary, divided from time to time. The parish should resemble the sheepfold, in having boundaries well marked and known for the time being, but easy to be removed. We must strictly guard against the introduction of a system in which, from a jealous respect for the rights of property, fifty or even a hundred thousand souls have been left under the nominal charge of one Clergyman.