

verity. It will set up in three provinces of Ireland, not, I am happy to say, in the province of Ulster, Roman Catholic ascendancy, and, I venture to think, enlightened Roman Catholics will object to that quite as much as we do. You may say that this is a very strong indictment, but I venture to say it is a true one, for there is not one single thing which I have stated about the Bill which the bill itself does not give facility to carry into effect, and you may be quite sure that those who would be called upon to administer this Bill would carry it out to the bitter end. Besides all this, the Bill itself is bristling with dangers—dangers to the Empire at large, dangers to this country in particular, dangers to our own dear Church. Surely, then, it is the duty of this great assembly, representing, as it does, the voice of The Church of Ireland, to enter their solemn protest against it. Surely it is the duty of every loyal man in the country to use every legitimate means in his power to prevent it passing into effect. I have been told—and many of you have doubtless been told the same thing—that there is not the slightest use protesting against it or passing any resolutions, because Mr. Gladstone and his Government will not pay any regard to them. But we say there is a use in reversing the conditions that put Mr. Gladstone and his Government into power by a small majority on a wrong issue. And I have such an opinion of the good sense of the English people, and their hatred of injustice, and their dislike to tyranny, that I feel sure on the first opportunity that that they have of exercising the franchise they will take good care not to hand over their fellow subjects of Ireland to be victims to this criminal enactment. Our duty is plain—to use every legitimate efforts to resist it. But whilst we do so, let us all, as Christian brethren, remember that our strength is not in ourselves, but in the power and wisdom and the mercy of that Almighty God who overrules all things for His own glory, the prosperity of this country, and the care of His Church.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

The consecration of three Bishops for the Church of England in the Colonies, in Westminster Abbey, on the 25th of March (the Festival of the Annunciation) is an incident worthy of note, more especially as two of them, the Bishop of Columbia and the Bishop of Qu'Appelle, were for dioceses within this Dominion. The third consecration was that of the Rev. Dr. Swaby, as Bishop of British Guiana.

THE Rt. Rev. Dr. Perrin, the new Bishop of Columbia, on the Pacific Coast, is an Oxford man, who graduated in 1870 from Trinity, and after ten years, faithful work at St. Mary's Southampton, became Vicar of St. Luke's, and held that position until his appointment by the Archbishop of Canterbury—upon reference made to him by the Synod of the Diocese of Columbia,—to that See. Our English exchanges speak highly of the new Bishop. He had the reputation of being one of the hardest working and most popular Incumbents in the town, and is also said to possess remarkable organizing power.

THE Rt. Rev. W. J. Burn consecrated, as above mentioned, as Bishop of Qu'Appelle, was born in 1851 and graduated B.A. from St. John's College, Cambridge, in 1874; was ordained deacon and priest in 1874-1875 respectively, by the Bishop of Ely. His first curacy was at Chesterton, Cambridgeshire, from

whence he went to St. Paul's, Jarrow, where he remained until 1881, when he accepted the living of St. Peter's in the same place, holding it until 1887, when he resigned it, to the sorrow of his parishioners, with whom he was very popular. In St. Paul's parish there was a population of 12,000, and his parochial duties were necessarily very arduous. He is said to be a gifted preacher, and has conducted Missions, Retreats and Quiet Days for Clergy and Laity; his pastoral work being characterized by intense earnestness and strong sympathy, endearing him to all with whom he has come in contact. At the time of his appointment he was Vicar of Coniscliffe, Darlington, Eng.

It would seem that both the Dioceses of Columbia and Qu'Appelle are to be congratulated upon the choice made by His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury in their behalf. So far as we have observed, the appointments have been well received in both Dioceses, though there have been expressions of dissatisfaction in other quarters with the policy of applying at all to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and of introducing priests from England to fill Bishoprics in Canada. Not, as we understand, that such appointments have not been in the past satisfactory and beneficial to The Church, but that the time has come when the priests of the Church of England in Canada have a right to expect advancement, and are qualified for such positions. Whilst we share to some extent in this feeling, we are, nevertheless, not averse to appointments from the Mother Church, and believe that in most cases such a course is of greater benefit to The Church in this country than would be the advancement of our own clergy. We give in our Contemporary Church Opinion the views of *Church Bells* on these objections.

THE Archbishop of Canterbury has shown that his memorable words at the Congress in Wales in regard to the connection between The Church there and in England, and his assertion that the latter would stand by the former in case of attack upon it, were sincere. Acting with the Archbishop of York, he has called a meeting of the Convocations of the Provinces of Canterbury and York, in regard to the attack upon The Church in Wales, through the so-called Welsh Suspensory Bill, lately introduced into the British Parliament. Strong opposition has been manifested to it, and our English exchanges are full of articles against, and of reports of meetings held in opposition to, it. The last number of *Church Bells*, one of the most moderate of papers, speaks of it as "this worst amongst many bad Gladstonian schemes," and affirms that "Non-Conformists and Churchmen unite to say that the measure is an unjust one, and that they will not have it..... Churchmen are thoroughly awake and blazoning forth in all directions, as is meet and wise, the iniquity and robbery of the Wales Suspensory Bill."

Canon Knox—Little expressing his regret at not being able to be present at the Central Council of the Diocesan Conference held in the third week of March last at Westminster, in re-

gard to this Bill referred to it as having "not even the advantage of straightforward robbery but was sneakish and underhand and so, utterly unworthy of Englishmen"; and he pointed out that (1) Church property is not national property (2) that if it is right to pillage one religious Corporation such as the Church of England, it must be right to pillage all; and that, therefore, if there is to be disendowment, then Wesleyans, Roman Catholics, Baptists and Congregationalists and all other religious societies ought to have their property seized if the State is to act fairly." Undoubtedly the tide is rising rapidly against this iniquitous measure and we trust that it will receive no uncertain condemnation.

The proposed Home Rule Bill for Ireland has more of a political aspect although the relationship between Church and State and of attacks upon one and other are so intimately connected, and so close that it is difficult to separate them at all times. We are led to believe oftentimes through telegrams which appear in the secular papers, that the supporters of Home Rule for Ireland are almost entirely predominant and that opposition to it comes from a mere handful of persons. It is only necessary, however, to refer to the English papers themselves, both secular and religious to find how widespread and intense is the feeling of opposition to this, another of the "worst amongst many bad Gladstonian schemes." We give in another column some remarks of the Archbishop of Dublin touching this Home Rule Bill, and Churchmen and members of other religious bodies (all classified under the name "Protestant") express the strongest and most determined opposition to the Bill, and the gravest fears as to the result to Protestants, should it be carried. The "News" of London, Eng., referring to it says:

From all parts of Ireland come announcements of gatherings to express and to record the unanimous and unalterable resolution of the Irish Unionists to resist the Disruption Bill by all means at their command. The agitation into which the country has been plunged has at least one good effect—it must bring home to the most careless and the least observant of British Separatists the pregnant fact that all classes and all orders of Irishmen, save the priest-ridden peasantry and their Fenian antagonists stand absolutely united against the policy which the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom has borrowed from the Land League, "Home Rule" to Ireland's need, not "Home Disunion."

The death of Bishop Horden of Moosonee adds another to the long list of The Church's saintly and heroic leaders who have passed to their rest. Few have so long faithfully and self-denyingly laboured in behalf of the Church under more untoward circumstances than the late Bishop Horden, and his name ought ever to be held in reverence and loving remembrance. An unfinished and touching letter from him under date January 5th, 1893, appears in the last number of the "News" of London, Eng. We hope to be able to give it in our next number. It shows marked nobility and devotedness of Christian character.