

would create no injury to any other clergyman, and if acted upon also by the diocese of Toronto, would be calculated to effect a considerable amount of benefit that would be mutual. The two dioceses, although now made as separate and distinct as those of Nova Scotia and Huron, still appear to feel very closely allied to each other. The arrangement proposed is, that clergymen of Toronto and Niagara when exchanging shall take the same place on the commutation list as was held by the clergymen with whom they exchange, provided that the same privileges are extended to the clergy of Niagara by the Diocese of Toronto. As far as it goes the by-law is so reasonable that it can scarcely fail to meet with success. A vote will have been taken upon the subject before this article meets the eyes of most of our readers.

The other part of the by-law will still further commend itself to every one. It provides that if the Toronto Synod shall agree to make the same alteration, clergymen removing from Toronto or Algoma to Niagara shall not be required to pay any fine or charges in order that their families may participate in the Widows' and Orphans' Fund. The ridiculous system of requiring the payment of a fine, as it is curiously termed, on the removal of a clergyman into the Diocese of Toronto, is a custom derived from the relic of a barbarous age, and ought to have been long ago laid aside. Instead of it, the amount of the annual payment ought to vary according to the age of the clergyman at the time he begins his connection with the fund, none being allowed to enter after a certain age. The present arrangement in that diocese would require the fine to be paid by a young clergyman on removing from another diocese, whereas it is not demanded from an old clergyman ordained in the diocese. Those entering the diocese are, we may imagine, supposed by the present by-law to be older than those ordained in it, although oftentimes they are much younger. The *fine* system is, however, clung to with remarkable tenacity, notwithstanding its manifest unreasonableness.

#### THE CHURCH AND MISSIONARY SOCIETIES.

THE difficulties which have arisen in Ceylon, arising from the independent action of the Clergy of the Church Missionary Society and the proceedings of the Bishop of Colombo consequent thereupon, have resulted in a conference of the Bishops of the Province of India and Ceylon, held at the Palace, Calcutta, on the 7th and 8th of March, 1877, and a series of resolutions passed on the occasion. The subject appears to have been considered in England and elsewhere from two totally different standpoints—the one regarding the Church as a Divine Institution, having an organization, an authority, and a government of a Divine origin, coming to us through an Apostolic channel; and the other, apparently regarding the organization and management of the Church as matters which may be altered at pleasure, and made to suit

the varying feelings, sentiments, and aims of particular individuals or self constituted societies, with little reference to the authority to which the Church herself owes her origin. The Bishop of Colombo appears to have acted upon the former principle; the Clergy of the C. M. S. appear to have been influenced by the latter.

As the result of their conference, the Bishops of India and Ceylon expressed their high appreciation of the great and important work done by the Missionary Societies which have voluntarily labored in her name. And in view of the revival and extension of the corporate work of the Church, they feel the necessity of considering and more accurately defining the relation of these societies to Diocesan organization. They consider, also, that the employment of lay agency should receive the attention of the whole church. With commendable wisdom the assembled Bishops do not desire finally to determine on these important questions, but pledge themselves to bring them before the respective dioceses, and to take steps to obtain the opinions of the Metropolitans, Suffragans, and dioceses of the other parts of the Anglican Communion; and further, to have them brought before the Pan-Anglican Synod. Should this and kindred subjects receive the serious attention of that Assembly at its next meeting, we have no doubt that one of the most important objects it could possibly have will be answered.

But in the meantime, and pending these several steps to be taken, the Bishops have resolved: "(1) That the Bishop of every diocese is, in the last resort, responsible for all teaching given and all work done within his diocese in the name and under the authority of the Church. (2) That in accordance with this principle every appointment to the discharge of spiritual functions in the Church ought to be made with due recognition of the ultimate right of the Bishop to be consulted on such appointment, and to exercise a veto upon the same. (3) That it follows from the same principle, that like recognition ought to be accorded to the ultimate right of the Bishop to be consulted with regard to any change in the management, order of service, or place of worship of any congregation."

Now these are important resolutions, involving the whole question between the Bishop of Colombo and his clergy; and we must confess that, taking into consideration the origin and constitution of the Church as we have them given in the New Testament, and her subsequent history, we do not see to what other conclusion the Bishops could have come. The question is one which demands an early settlement, and should not be left to a single Bishop to work out for himself, as difficulties may arise, but should be determined, as far as practicable, by the whole Church. And there is no middle course. Either the principle adopted in the resolutions of the Bishops must be recognized, or the Bishop of a diocese must be regarded as a mere machine, with no other business, authority, or power than to confirm young people, ordain the clergy, and in all other

respects carry out the injunctions of others—that is to say to do as he is bid.

At a subsequent conference held on the 9th and 12th of March other collateral subjects were considered by the assembled Bishops. On the subject of the consecration of churches, they resolved that "the idea of consecration implying that the person or thing consecrated is thenceforth wholly and permanently given up and dedicated to sacred purposes, no building can be in the proper sense of the term consecrated, unless the site and the building are, at the time of consecration, legally conveyed and given over to the Church for ever."

Such being the true idea of consecration they resolve that, "no church which is intended to be a permanent consecrated building should be built upon a site, the title to which is in any way insecure or of a temporary character, and every care should be taken for legally securing the site before the building of any church is commenced."

And further, inasmuch as buildings, the title of which is insecure, cannot be permanently dedicated and consecrated, and as it is the law of the Church that such buildings if used for public worship should be licensed by the Bishop, that "no building should be used habitually, nor except under pressure of necessity, even occasionally, for the celebration of the Holy Communion, without his licence or permission."

Expression was also given to a desire for a system of Synodical action, both Provincial and Diocesan, and engagements were made for ascertaining the feeling of the clergy and laity in their respective dioceses in regard to the constitution of diocesan Synods.

It was also agreed that in case of a revocation of licence, it would be desirably that opportunity should be afforded to any clergyman to submit "his case to an informal Court held by the Bishop, the Bishop undertaking, in that event, to recognize the right of appeal to a similarly informal Court held by the Metropolitan, whose decision shall be held to be final."

These subjects, which were considered at the conference of the Bishops of India and Ceylon, assembled for that purpose, are of the greatest importance in the present state of activity in the Church, and it is to be hoped that they will receive an early and satisfactory solution.

#### BELLEVILLE CHURCH TROUBLES.

THE opponents of the Rev. Mr. Burke have begun to vent their unchristian spleen against him and his supporters by the publication of the most profane satires upon the meeting which they lately held to express their sympathy with the Rector in his trials, and upon the address to his congregation which he delivered at Easter, and which was couched in the language of Christian moderation. To the closing words of this address, "you know how I have been misrepresented, persecuted, maligned, but you do not know how I have suffered; God knows it," the sneer of the silly satirist is as follows:—"But as I was