

## The Church Times.

HALIFAX, SATURDAY, MARCH 29, 1856.

## SERVICES OF THE HOLY WEEK.

THE usual Services of this sacred Season were held in St Paul's Church during the Week before Easter—Morning and Evening on each day, with a Sermon every evening on some of the most remarkable Prophecies of Christ in the Old Testament, according to the following arrangement:—

Monday—Rev. R. H. Bullock. Gen. III. 16.

Tuesday—Rev. E. Gilpin. Isaiah XLII. 1-4.

Wednesday—Rev. W. Bullock. Zech. IX. 9, 10.

Thursday—Rev. E. Maturin. Zech. XIII. 7.

Good Friday—The Bishop. Zech. XII. 10.

Easter Even—Rev. J. C. Cochran. Isa. LIII. 9.

We may observe that this is now the fifth successive year during which those Evening Services have been held in Passion Week—having commenced with 1852, the first year after the appointment of the present Bishop; and it is a matter of much encouragement and thankfulness to find that in every year they have been attended by large and attentive congregations, who appear to exhibit a peculiar degree of devotional feeling in the solemn services in which they are engaged on these occasions. The plan of the Lecturers has been, to consider each year, some one particular class of subjects appropriate to the season, under various aspects, and by a different Preacher, on each evening of the week, and thus it is hoped to render them conducive to the interest and edification of the people, by endeavoring to combine *unity of subject with variety of aspect and style*, while the great practical design is to direct the hearts of penitent sinners to the contemplation of "CHRIST UNCOVERED," in all the mysteries of His redeeming love, as the great Atonement for our sins, and the perfect example for our imitation.

We here subjoin an account of the subjects selected for the last five years, which were as follows:

1852. Events of the Holy Week.

1853. Seven Sayings of Christ on the Cross.

1854. Types of Christ in the Old Testament.

1855. Character of Christ.

1856. Prophecies of Christ.

The Holy Communion was administered in St. Paul's on Good Friday as well as on Easter Sunday, and there appears to have been a large number of Communicants in all the Churches of this Parish at the great Christian Festival. In St. Paul's there were 153 communicants on Easter Sunday, besides 91 on Good Friday, (many persons having communicated on both days,) in St. Luke's 140, and in the Bishop's Chapel 40 persons—making a total of about 400 Parishioners who were communicants at this holy season. Among them we are glad to record there was a considerable number of those who received their first communion on that day, consisting chiefly of those young persons who have lately been admitted to this blessed privilege by confirmation, almost all of whom have already united with their Christian brethren in this "heavenly feast."

May all these Communicants be indeed "living temples of the Holy Ghost"—and may they all "daily increase in God's Holy Spirit more and more, until they come into His everlasting kingdom."

## PARISH MEETINGS.

PARISH Meetings were held on Easter Monday, in the Parishes of St. Paul's, St. George's, and at Dartmouth. The meeting at St. Paul's was opened by the Rector with prayer. After this preliminary, Mr. Lynch, one of the Churchwardens, proposed that the Parishioners do proceed to the election of a Chairman, and that the Rector do take the chair, which being seconded, the meeting proceeded to discuss this novelty in Parish proceedings. It was contended by Mr. Ritchie, who seconded the resolution, and others, that the Act being silent as to who should be chairman, it was the right of the Parishioners themselves to appoint one; and it was urged as a reason for the exercise of this right, that the Rector not having signed the minutes of a previous meeting, occasion was given to the Bishop to lay aside, on the ground of informal proceedings, a Resolution of the Parishioners of St. Paul's, conveying their sentiments upon the formation of the Synod, to the meeting of that body in this City. In reply to this, the Archdeacon disclaimed any intention of acting against the wishes of his parishioners, or omitting to sign any such document when properly presented to him; on the contrary he should always consider it his duty to meet their wishes in this respect—but as the minutes were not signed at the meeting, and he had not even been asked to sign them afterwards, and the Resolution referred to

was taken off the books without his knowledge by the Churchwardens; if there were ground of complaint it was himself that had a right to complain that he had not been treated with proper respect in the matter. He conceived that he had a right to the chair at all such meetings, both by the law, and from the usage of more than eighty years.

Other gentlemen argued in favor of the right of the Rector to take the Chair—and an amendment being proposed that the meeting do proceed to business, which was lost, a division took place upon the Resolution, which was carried by a large majority.

The Archdeacon then took the Chair, stating that he did so by the desire of the Parishioners, without however waiving the constitutional right to preside at all such meetings, which he considered belonged to his office as Rector of the Parish—and this expression of his views was placed upon the minutes at his request.

P. C. Hill and James Creighton, Esqrs. were elected Churchwardens.

The Churchwardens brought forward the Accounts of the Parish during the past year, and the expenditure for the present, and when the salaries of the Clergy came to be considered, Mr. Ritchie introduced a Resolution that the Meeting first ascertain from the Clergymen of St. Paul's, if it be their intention to take part in the proceedings of the Synod, or to be bound by its canons and regulations, or to carry them out within the Parish. Upon which Mr. Kinnear moved that the division of the Parish be taken into consideration. And Dr. Almon proposed that Delegates be appointed to attend the Synod. The supporters of the Resolution manifested considerable change of opinion. At former Parish Meetings, if we recollect aright, the Synod was condemned as an innovation upon the simplicity of Church government and Christian worship, and upon the ground of there being no necessity for it. Now the more influential of its opposers openly avowed that they were not opposed to Synods in the abstract, and would like to have them if they could be fashioned just to please themselves. The chief stumbling block appeared to be the power of veto vested in the Bishop. It was asserted that the veto did not exist except in one diocese in the United States, and only there in deference to the respect towards one old man. On the other side, it was argued that it would be unjust to fetter the consciences of the Clergy in the way pointed out—and that the resolution was a covert scheme to deprive them of their salaries if they did not return an answer exactly as the majority desired. Indeed this intention was openly stated by one of the newly appointed Churchwardens. It was also attempted to be shown that it was no part of the obligation of the Clergy to obey the summons of the Bishop to attend the Synod. A good deal of extraneous matter, entirely foreign to the subject, was also introduced, which it is needless to particularize. It was, however, shown that the Bishop held his office by a title that made it impossible that he could relinquish the exercise of the veto power, although there might be a question as to the modification of its exercise. But it was shown that the proper place for this discussion was the Synod, where, if the Parish had been represented, they would have had an opportunity of enforcing their views. Allusion was made to the exercise of arbitrary power by the Bishop of Newfoundland in his diocese, in enforcing contributions to the Diocesan Church Society, by one of the supporters of the resolution, as a reason for refusing the power of veto: when it was argued with much force, that the circumstance showed the necessity for a Synod and was an argument in its favor, inasmuch as if a Synod had been in operation there could have been no such arbitrary exercise of power. The resolution was eventually carried 22 to 14.

The motion for the appointment of delegates, was lost by a large majority.

A Committee, in accordance with Mr. Kinnear's motion, is to report upon the propriety of dividing the Parish.

The meeting adjourned till Friday.

We have only touched above upon the chief topics of discussion, in rather a stormy meeting, and as we do so from memory, if any thing important is omitted, we trust it will not be attributed to design. Our object is not to create excitement, but to state facts as they impressed themselves upon our mind, during the meeting.

Our friends, far and near, will be glad to learn that we have survived the shock of the St. George's resolution, and are still sound, wind and limb. It is really wonderful what freaks some twenty or thirty self-important individuals think themselves privileged to commit, when they meet together. We violated no principle of legitimate discussion in the observations we made, which were wholly

in self defence; and as Christian gentlemen, if "the powers that be" in St. George's, though themselves aggrieved, they should have been satisfied with a reply to meet the provocation, and no more. We have no desire whatever to disturb the happy ideas which they entertain of their own impeccability, and we only hope that in future they will so conduct themselves, that all the world may think of them as highly as their "Opinion," shows they think of themselves. That day will come perhaps, when they listen less to prejudiced and interested individuals, than to enlarged views of what is for the Church's best interests, and when they are able to see in the united action of all her members, a sure guarantee for their own usefulness, and her strength and prosperity.

To prove that the remarks were not called forth by any ill feeling we publish the resolution itself:—

"Having read a paragraph in the *Church Times* of Saturday, the 22nd of March, inst., reflecting upon our respected Rector in the management of our Parish,

*Resolved*, It is the opinion of the meeting that the said paragraph is not only a gratuitous insult to our Worthy Rector but to the Parish—and that the remarks therein set forth are totally false."

We feel bound to apologise to our readers for again troubling them with "Cura," but we cannot allow a flagrant perversion of our words, which appears in his last composition, to pass unnoticed and unrebuted. But first we have to announce that he has declared himself to be a Clergyman having a Parish, and it will be remembered that we concluded, from his evident jealousy of the Laity, that he was interested in maintaining the independence of a clerical oligarchy. We pity the flock who have him for a guide, if the following extract from his letter is a specimen of his ordinary mode of reasoning and teaching, for he quotes from an article of Feb. 9, the following sentence,—"Common sense would lead us to the conclusion that the Diocesan Synod should be summoned by the head of the Diocese, and the National by the head of the nation;" and adds, "Indeed! the head of the nation is not then the head of the Church in a Diocese." Again, after this extraordinary specimen of logic, he proceeds with a charge of Romanism, quoting from Mr. Newman, and treating the paragraph as a proof of "Romanistic" tendencies. *Cura* doubtless trusts to the fact, that the exposure of his falsehoods is not likely to be seen by the majority of those who read his letters in the *Church Witness*, and that the original is not within their reach, for if he had given the latter part of the sentence quoted by him, the perversion of its meaning would have been manifest to all.

For the benefit of those who are unable to refer to the article, we repeat the argument. *Cura* had stated that the Canons implied the necessity of the Royal authority for holding a Synod. We replied that the National Synod, or Convocation, was mentioned and upon his assertion that there is no distinction between National and Diocesan Synods in this respect, we rejoined, "he is bound to prove this, for common sense would lead to a different conclusion," and we gave our reasons for this in the following words, purposely omitted by him in his quotation, "inasmuch as the subjects with which the former (the Diocesan) may deal are much less important than those proper to the latter, (the National) an inferior authority may suffice for assembling them." We are quite willing to abide by the judgment of any person educated or uneducated, except *Cura* himself, as to the possibility of inferring from this sentence by any legitimate process, that "the head of the nation is not the head of the Church in a Diocese." And this may be made plain enough to satisfy even *Cura's* weak mind if we substitute Parish for Diocese thus: a Parish Meeting should be summoned by the head of the Parish, but the National Synod by the head of the Nation. Could this be twisted into a denial that the head of the Nation is also head of each Parish? We repeat then, that common sense leads to the conclusion that a Parish Meeting should be convened by the Rector, as head of the Parish, a meeting of several Parishes, or Diocesan Synod, by the Bishop as head of the Diocese, and a meeting of several Dioceses, or a National Synod, by the Queen as head of the Nation. Any one who can discover Romanism, or any infringement of the Royal Supremacy, in this, is welcome to do so, but "poor layman" as we are, we flatter ourselves that we can understand the meaning of a plain sentence, and are quite sure that we should be heartily ashamed of ourselves, if we could invent, or in any way assist in giving currency to, such perversions as pervade *Cura's* letters.

We are able moreover to announce that the Synodical movement in the Colonies has advanced another step, and has been again approved by the Crown, for the Bill prepared by the Melbourne Synod to