

expression has been given to the desire, as one ground for making that movement, of getting away from certain distinctions or certain usages in the Cathedral Church, against which perhaps no overt and pointed attack has been aimed, but upon which perpetual little droppings^{*} are contrived to fall, so as to wear a channel for the entrance of discontent. It would carry me much too far to enter here into the examples in detail; and I shall, if it please God, have other and more enlarged opportunities of following up some notion which I have taken of the subject, though sorry indeed to have my time occupied with any such argument. I will only observe that even the faint and feeble approach which we are able to make to some seamy, reverent and orderly practices, whether in the interior arrangements of the Church itself or the manner of distributing and conducting the services, which were delivered to us by our Reformers and which have prevailed from the time of the Reformation in every Cathedral or Collegiate Church in England and Ireland, and are now carried into the remotest Colonies of the Empire, where Cathedrals have been established,—even our adoption of old English usages which have been uninterruptedly kept up at home in every Parish Church and Chapel throughout the land, which are received in all our Colonies, which are to be witnessed every where in the Episcopal Church of the United States and all over this very Diocese, and our neglect instead of our retention of which would properly be the subject of remark,—even these are things from which it seems that English Churchmen want to get away; and advantage is taken of the fact that many among us have not seen what is done in England and elsewhere as just stated, to make them believe that we are doing something new and strange, which ought to be viewed with the suspicion of some dark ulterior design,—even the very candlesticks upon the Communion-Table, (to take one specific instance,) which formed part of a magnificent present of Church-Ilate (to which they are always an appendage in Churches of a certain class,) made to our Cathedral, together with costly Church Furniture and Church-Books, by the venerated old king George III. very nearly half a century ago, and have been in use ever since, are ill-omened novelties from which it is now found out that we ought to get away, and the hand of the Bishop must open the door that we may do so. My brethren, I am well aware that these prejudices, wherever and however they may originate, may be communicated to the minds of good and humble-minded Christians, who are entitled to be treated with the utmost tenderness and consideration. But we should endeavour to remove them from such minds—for they ought not to exist among us.—We do not want to contend about things indifferent in themselves—they need not, ought not to be the subject of discussion at all—they are only made to begin over-captious opposition—but we cannot displace or alter them, one after another, at the demand of every fresh objector who may start up to-day or to-morrow. Objections of this class are either mischievous or childish. They are but the revived echo of the old cry against the organ and the surplice; they are of the same family and kindred with the old denunciation against the wickedness of eating mince-pies at the season of Christmas, with the old characteristics of a party who did not rest till they accomplished the overthrow of the Church Establishment and the Throne. We talk a great deal about the light of the 19th Century, and we really, in plain language, ought to be ashamed of all such nonsense as this, and to be able to keep our people together in the bonds of faith and love, whom it is attempted to disperse or to distract upon any such grounds.

I will only add one word under this head, which is, that while offence is taken if, within the Church of England, we keep up certain usages connected with the honor and worship of God, which have been just above noticed, nobody, so far as I have ever heard, finds fault with dissenters for a new ambition to build their places of worship in a style of architecture which nevertheless is drawn from the very depth of the ages in which Romanism was in the ascendant; and that both Presbyterians and Independents, within the British dominions, have very peaceably been permitted to fill the walls of their houses of prayer with stained windows, of which they delight in the rich effect.

V. If, as it has been endeavoured to shew, the wants and the circumstances of the Parish do not justify the establishment of the proposed Chapel, the proposal ought, of course, to fall to the ground. But supposing that the case were otherwise, a great stress is laid in some quarters upon the assumption that the Clergyman who is to serve it must be subject to the approval of the Bishop.

It is proper to explain how this matter stands.

If it is supposed that the formal allowance of the Bishop implies the approbation, in his judgment, of the individual selection, so that no person would be engaged but such a person as he would choose or recommend, himself, this is a supposition entirely differing from the fact. The Bishop does not and cannot claim any such power whatever (except in cases where the appointment is in his own hands.) No clergyman can officiate in the Diocese without his licence under the Episcopal seal—but this amounts to very little more than a fitting and necessary security against the employment of improper Ministers in the Church, the rejection of whom would rest upon the ground of physical or moral unfitness or palpable unsoundness of opinion. In such a spirit of liberty as is compatible with the essentials of the Faith, and the grand features of her polity and worship, as set forth in her formularies, and in consecration to that infirmity of our nature which produces so much variety in our views of things, the Church leaves, upon some points, a certain latitude of opinion to her Ministers, and there are men whose consciences permit them to take rather more. Thus there are parties, unavoidably, within the bosom of the Church herself, professing alike to adhere to her standards, and sometimes but too hotly contending for their respective peculiarities. And there are extreme parties, and within those extreme parties, individuals who are, if the expression can be used, *extremes* still. There are men on one side, (although we are in no danger of seeing any of them here,) who would even be for bowing to the altar and lighting wax tapers, as a matter of devotion, in the day-time; and there are men on the other, whose hearts are far more with those who have separated from the Church and by that separation condemned her, than with the Church herself, to whom, under her divine Master, the allegiance of those hearts is due: men whose endeavours are bent to break down the fences of authority and order, and to assimilate the Church, by strained and unwarrantable expedients, to certain unequivocal characteristics of dissent. It is, (and it would be very easy familiarly to illustrate the fact,) a very possible case that a Bishop, acting under those limitations which are wisely and properly imposed upon his powers, could not be justified in refusing a licence to a clergyman whose special merit, nevertheless, in the eyes of the patron or patrons by whom he is presented, would be his known opposition to the views of the Bishop, and his determination to go to the extreme verge in the manifestation of dissenting predilections which is possible for him while remaining in the Communion of the Church at all: and who might even have been singled out expressly as a fitting instrument to counterwork and to disturb, within the sphere of his influence, not intended to be confined perhaps to its regular bounds, the train of affairs in the Diocese where his lot might be cast, which had been encouraged by its governing authorities and carried on by its Clergy.

In the exercise of the Episcopal discretion, there is a wide and marked difference between the case of licensing a clergyman presented by a Patron to a preferment in the Church, already existing, and that of becoming a party to the framing of a new provision for public worship.

In this Diocese the number of Clergy has been, in about a dozen years, nearly trebled under its present administration: and it is perfectly well known that the principle has been followed of steering

^{*} Gutta cavat lapidem, non vi sed sæpe cadendo. These remarks will apply to many other points.

† This, of course, is not meant to convey an objection against the adoption, in our own Churches, of a style of architecture, which in itself is beautiful and in their perfectly appropriate. The adoption of Gothic architecture no more connects us with Romanism than the adoption of a Grecian order, connects us with the worship carried on in the temples of heathen Greece.