

were only human accidents of it. These however the State could take away, and it did so, leaving the old established Church absolutely penniless. But its brief existence, even in poverty and destitution, was an offence. The fire of persecution from the State did its worst, but it was not able to destroy it. Further Acts of Parliament were passed, by which its worship was forbidden in any of the small churches and chapels which it then possessed, and was permitted to be practised only in the clergyman's private-house; and even then, the number of worshippers allowed to meet together was limited. More than four persons besides the family were not permitted to worship together at the same time. The penalty upon the officiating minister for transgressing this law was six months imprisonment for the first offence, and *transportation for life* beyond the seas, for the second! Such was the condition of the old Church of Scotland up to nearly the close of the last century, while the Presbyterians were allowed to possess all the privileges, all the liberty, and all the endowments.

In spite, however, of all that was perpetrated against this ancient witness for the truth, it never failed to preserve unbroken the Episcopal Succession, and the priesthood never died out. When its cup of suffering was full, four Bishops and forty-two priests remained where, a hundred years before, fourteen Bishops and Archbishops, and a thousand clergy, ministered to the people of Scotland as its established Church. But this poor, oppressed, persecuted, though pure branch of Christ's Church was able to exercise her spiritual powers in a way that her wealthy and powerful sister in England was unable to do. When in the year 1784, just a hundred years after the disestablishment of the Church of Scotland, Dr. Seabury went to England to seek, for the United States, Episcopal consecration from the Archbishop of Canterbury and the English Bishops, who were very reluctantly compelled to inform him that it was not in their power to grant it: he thereupon sought consecration at the hands of the Scottish Bishops. And, *not in a Cathedral, for they had none; not in a Church, for the law prohibited Episcopalianism in Scotland from worshipping in a Church*; but in an upper chamber in the city of Aberdeen, three Scottish Bishops met—the Bishops of Aberdeen, Moray, and Ross—and consecrated the first Bishop of what is now the great and flourishing Church of the United States, at the very time when the severest penal statutes were in force against the Church of which these three were Bishops. The Bishops of the Scottish Church also consecrated Bishop Luscombe in 1825 for the benefit of Englishmen in Paris; afterwards they consecrated a Bishop for the Orange River Territory, when obstacles occurred to his consecration by the Archbishop of Canterbury. And in 1874, when the Government refused to obtain the Queen's license for the Archbishop of Canterbury to consecrate a Missionary Bishop of Madagascar, Bishop Kestell-Cornish was consecrated by the Scottish Bishops in St. Paul's Church, Edinburgh. Disestablished and disendowed, the

venerable Church of Scotland was able to make use of powers which the Established Church of England was not permitted to exercise.

#### IS THE DIOCESAN SYNOD A FAILURE?

WE do not mean to ask whether Diocesan Synods, as we have them in this country have failed to extend the borders of the Church, and give efficiency to her ministrations; for these are only some of the objects supposed to be aimed at in the institutions to which we refer. A principal intention of those who first proposed the formation of such assemblies is understood to have been to endeavour, as far as possible, to popularize the government of ecclesiastical communities, in such numbers, and spread over such tracts of country as may be found most convenient, in assembling together the members or their representatives in certain central localities. And the benefit expected to be gained is to interest the masses more fully in Church work, to secure their co-operation, and to ensure an entire satisfaction with such arrangements as may be made in furtherance of the objects of the organization;—it being supposed by many people who fix their attention more upon theory than upon fact, more upon what things ought to be than upon what they really are, that these regulations and laws in which, directly or indirectly, every member of a community has had something to do, must give very general satisfaction. This, however, every one has had plenty of opportunity to discover, is a great mistake.

In seeking an answer to the question at the head of this article, if we connect it with the former among the objects to which we refer, the reply must be that Diocesan Synods, constituted as we have them here, are an entirely new institution in the Church, and have not been long enough in existence to enable us to determine whether they will ultimately be successful in promoting her extension and efficiency or not. In regard to the latter object supposed to be kept in view, that of securing a general satisfaction among those who have been most forward in invoking their aid, there are several circumstances of very recent occurrence which bring us to the conclusion that of all the miserable failures that have ever taken place, that of our Diocesan Synods must take a foremost rank. Of course no one will pretend for a moment that our practice in this respect has a New Testament sanction: and, consequently, we know not what has become of the doctrine:—The Bible, and the Bible alone, is the religion of— etc. Nor have we met with any one who, after the deepest research into all the nooks and corners of primitive Christian life in the early centuries of its existence, can venture to claim a discovery of the slightest trace of it in Imperial Rome, in the classic groves of Hellas, in the sacred soil of Palestine, or among the deserts on either side of the land of Egypt. It is an *innovation*, a purely modern invention belonging entirely to the age in which we live. And we say it belongs to the age, because it is especially the product of two such

dissimilar and distant parts of the world as New Zealand and North America, and was never known in the Church till after the American War.

We were led to direct our attention to this subject by several circumstances connected with the late meeting of the Synod in Toronto; and from finding in connection with that meeting that those who are accustomed, the most frequently, to invoke aid from the sentiments of the masses entertain so large an amount of dissatisfaction at the results of their appeal. And now, again, comes a most astounding piece of intelligence from the Diocese of Montreal, which seems to be perfectly unaccountable. We give some particulars under the head of Diocesan Intelligence; and we must confess that the circumstances there referred to have led us to think more seriously than ever upon the constitution of our Diocesan Synods and the measure of success to be expected from them. If there were any among us who entertained a whole-souled faith, that is one absolutely perfect and complete, in the organization of the Primitive Church as we have it in the New Testament, the estimate thereof being corroborated by very early and very sufficient testimony, such men would as little expect the Divine blessing upon our human and wordly attempts to improve upon the Divinely revealed model, with the repeated efforts to patch our bungling substitutes for that model, as they would expect to gather figs from a bramble bush. And without a blessing from the Head of the Church, the most finished and the most beautifully perfect arrangements we may make must be utterly futile; while, on the other hand, when we have the aid of the Lord of Hosts, which could only be secured by our best endeavours to carry out His plans and not our own, we have no need to resort to the wretched policy of pandering to the tastes or inclinations of men who might be useful members of the Church and might assist in extending her borders, but which they refuse to do unless upon terms they think proper to dictate.

The indignation meeting which took place in Montreal is a perfectly unique specimen, hitherto, of what now we must expect to become a more frequent occurrence, as a natural outcome from our Diocesan Synods. There are several remarkable features about it. It would appear that in the Provincial Synod, the Dean of Montreal is understood to have something like a prescriptive right to a seat, and that the clergy whose business it was to elect the clerical delegates, did not elect the Dean. But we feel inclined to ask, If the Dean had a right to be a member of the Provincial Synod, why should the Montreal Synod elect him at all? Or, if an election was necessary, and it was their duty to perform that important business on behalf of the Dean, how is it that the said duty is not mentioned in the Canons of the Diocese, or at least in the address delivered by the Metropolitan, the Bishop of Montreal? In England the Queen issues a *conge d'elire*, and forthwith the Dean and Chapter of a cathedral are bound to elect a nominee of the Crown for a vacant bishopric; but we cer-