

we have record is that held at Jerusalem upon the question which had been agitated with much heat, of imposing upon the gentile converts, the obligation to be circumcised and to keep the law of Moses. The deputation from Antioch were to address themselves to the *Apostles and elders* (or Presbyters), and the *Apostles and elders* came together, accordingly, for to consider of this matter. But we see that the multitude of believers were present, and that after the address of James, who appears to have presided, a voice was given, in the decision upon the course to be adopted to the church at large. It pleased the *Apostles and elders, with the whole church*, to send chosen men to Antioch with written instructions for the believers there, upon the subject in dispute. The authors of these instructions announce themselves, in the form of greeting by which the missive is headed, as the *Apostles, elders and brethren*; and they proceed to say, it seemed good unto us, i. e. to us the *Apostles, elders, and brethren* just mentioned,—being assembled *with one accord*, to send chosen men. Acts xv. 3, 6, 22, 23, 25. It does appear, therefore, that, while a distinctive place and character are preserved, in terms sufficiently marked, to the *Apostles and elders*, the body of believers, under the names of the *whole church and the brethren*, were associated in the transaction. To a similar effect is the testimony afforded in a passage from the writings of St. Paul. St. Paul certainly never leads us to lose sight of the estimation and reverent consideration of the Christian ministry. Yet we find that Apostle where he refers to a judicial proceeding, in the exercise of discipline within the infant Church at Corinth, declaring the sufficiency of a punishment which he describes as having been *inflicted on many*.

Some standing co-operation, therefore, of the laity in the conduct of matters ecclesiastical, appears to have been established, both under the law and in apostolic days under the gospel, as a sort of constitutional feature of the church.

I forbear from occupying your time (the saving of time being, upon the present occasion, an object of some consequence) by an investigation of precedents discoverable in the ages near to apostolic days, and shall content myself with the simple reference to what the learned Judge Hoffman of New York, whose work has, more or less, been made familiar among us by our being called to the duties of synodical action, has collected in the way of authority upon this subject, in particular as relating to the Church in the British Isles.

Upon the whole, then, we have been doing nothing new, nothing rashly experimental, nothing unsustained by ancient nor yet—for look at the progress and successful working of the church in the neighbouring republic—by modern principles and practice, in enlisting the help of our lay-brethren and inviting their active interest in the management of our church affairs. These affairs are their own affairs; for it is they who, with us, constitute the church—and why should they not have a voice in the deliberations and the administrative functions of that church? They will not, on their part, seek to usurp more than their place. The more familiar they are made, by their practical share in it, with the system of the church, the more intelligent and the more lively will be their appreciation of it; the better they will understand the necessity of preserving an inviolable regularity and a well balanced subordination in her associated proceedings. As we, on our side, are taught that we are not to lord it over the heritage nor to affect dominion over their faith, as we are ready, while we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus our Lord, to be their servants for Jesus' sake,—so they on theirs, will

not fail to remember that their teachers are set over them in the Lord and that they are charged, with reference to the pastoral office of the clergy and the maintenance of conformity to the regulations of the church, to obey them that have the rule, and submit themselves to those who watch for their souls as they that must give account. Never ought these principles to be lost sight of, from any desire of popularity for its own sake, or in accommodation to any prevalent notions of the day; for there will always be some reigning and favorite error, and it will always be part of the duty of the Church of God to testify against it. What we have to do in our synodical proceedings is to carry on, ministers and people, hand in hand, the system delivered down to us in the Episcopal Church of England; and while we forbear from pronouncing upon the case of bodies differently constituted, or decrying their efficiency and zeal, none of us, whatever position he may occupy, ought, from any false personal delicacy, to suffer, without seeking to prevent it, the distinctive principle of our own system to be either assailed or undermined—the principle, linked inseparably as a safeguard with the preservation of order, unity, stability and soundness in the church, that the supreme government of the church and the channel for the conveyance of ministerial power is found in the order of bishops. Men among ourselves, and good men, too, may be found seeking to discredit this principle, and teach others to sneer at it as an exploded notion; but does any man seriously and deliberately believe that the Ministry of the Church of England or any of her offshoots will ever, while the world lasts, be constituted and carried on upon any other principle than that which compelled the Episcopalians of America, at the close of the revolutionary war, to procure consecration in England for the men who were to hold and pass on the Episcopal office, and through that office to have the like transmitted for the other two orders of the ministry? Would not the very men who cry down these principles, or who shrink from asserting them be rather backward if it came to the point, to accept a ministry which would be fabricated, *de novo*, at the will of this or that self-constituted authority, to provide for the demands of the church? No, look in this very point of view, as well as in others, upon Zion, the city of our solemnities.—She is a tabernacle that shall not be taken down; not one of the stakes thereof shall ever be removed, neither shall any of the cords thereof be broken.

Never, I trust, will the peculiar Anglican stamp, the genuine Anglican character and spirit, (with whatever necessity for some partial adaptation to local circumstances,) be obliterated from our Colonial institutions. They are dear and most justly dear to our hearts; and fervently may we hope, and fully may we trust that the establishment of a Metropolitan Jurisdiction, in compliance with our petitions, and in conformity with the Anglican system at home and abroad, will tend to confirm and to perpetuate our close identity with the honoured institutions which have been passed to us from our fathers. But while we are charged in our Synodical capacity with the duty of carrying out the system of the Church of England in its integrity we must remember that there may be such things as discipline to be improved, deflection in practice and usage to be corrected—neglects to be repaired—and the full original intention of ecclesiastical provisions and the appointments to be recovered.

And here I might enlarge upon a variety of points of this nature—but we should open a wide field upon which it is impossible now to enter—for these observations must be drawn to their close, I will briefly *enumerate*, therefore, some

two or three examples in point, which ought, in my apprehension, to be kept in view, as subjects for correction gradually to be effected, as the time shall serve—such as the revival, in its proper efficiency, of the office of the Deacons and the employment perhaps of school-master deacons to continue in that grade; but never the admission to Holy orders of men engaged in trades or callings purely secular; or the restoration of rule and discipline in the admission of new or unknown comers to the holy communion, and of parties who present themselves to fill the office of sponsors, with reference to which test I presume that we are to have the advantage here of the action taken in convocation at home to adapt the 29th Canon to the altered circumstances of the church. And I think that we ought to take steps to turn better to our own spiritual improvement and the effective condition of the church, certain particular observances provided for that end, such as the set seasons for special objects, and among others the neglected Ember days, which suggest every where the prayers of the faithful at the times of ordination that we may be furnished with godly and able ministers of Christ. I will say nothing—for I must stop—respecting the recommendation of a closer attention wherever it is fairly practicable (to some extent I may be pardoned, perhaps, for stating that I have long ago enforced that attention within my own diocese), to the law laid down for us by the church that we should, for the mere reverence of feeling and edifying solemnity of effect, celebrate the sacrament of baptism and the ordinance of marriage within consecrated walls.

And now in this review of this whole subject, and of all its details, how can I more appropriately close than in words better than the words of man—words taken from a familiar Psalm of which I have already had occasion to cite another part, and remarkably in harmony with those of our text,—“O pray for the peace of Jerusalem; they shall prosper that love thee. Peace be within thy walls and plenteousness within thy palaces (plenteousness of grace and blessing within every sanctuary and every home of the church.) For my brethren and companions' sakes I will wish thee prosperity. Yea, because of the House of the Lord our God, I will seek to do thee good.” To which let us all add as the determined expression of our own inextinguishable attachments, the sacred pledge proclaimed aloud by priests and people, when the temple worship, after the captivity, was restored under Nehemiah, And we will not forsake the house of our God. Amen and Amen!

The holy communion was then celebrated, the Metropolitan Bishop reading the service, and Dr. Lewis, bishop elect of Ontario, the Offertory. His Lordship was assisted in the distribution of the elements by the suffragan bishops, the bishop elect and the Dean of Montreal.

At 3 o'clock the Synod assembled in the large school room of the Cathedral building. His Lordship, the Metropolitan Bishop presided, having the Bishops of Quebec and Huron on his right, and the Bishop of Toronto and bishop elect of Ontario on his left.

The roll was called by the Rev. Mr. Rogers, Secretary to the Bishop of Montreal, and the following members besides the five bishops were found to be present—

DIOCESE OF MONTREAL.

Clerical.—Very Rev. Dean of Montreal, Rev. J. Scott, D. D., Dunham, Rev. Canon Leach, D. C. L., Montreal, Rev. Canon Bancroft, D. D., Montreal, Rev. E. Du Vernet, Hemmingford, Rev. W. Anderson, Sorel, Rev. G. Slack, Milton, Rev. D. Lindsay, Frost Village, Rev. G. O'Grady,