

THE APPOINTMENT OF CANADIAN BISHOPS.

DESPATCHES FROM THE IMPERIAL GOVERNMENT.

Despatch, No. 2, of date 4th May, 1855, is from Lord John Russell, acknowledging receipt of the Address from the Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly, and stating that it would receive the attention of her Majesty's Government.

Despatch, No. 3, of same date, is from Lord John Russell, transmitting to Sir Edmund Head, copy of a letter with its enclosure, addressed by the Bishop of Toronto to Sir George Grey.

The enclosure is a long letter from the Bishop of Toronto, of the 20th January, 1855, accompanied by a Memorial addressed by the Clergy and Laity of the Western sections of the Diocese.

Despatch, No. 36, from Sir William Molesworth to Sir Edmund Head, is as follows:—

Downing Street, 24th September, 1855.

Sir, With reference to Lord J. Russell's Despatch of the 4th of May last, acknowledging an Address to her Majesty from the Legislative Council and Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled, praying for the repeal of such English Statutes as impede the meeting of the Clergy and Laity of the Church of England in Synod, and that the choice of Bishops may be left to the clergy and Laity of the Diocese.

I now enclose for your information a copy of a letter received from the Law Officers of the Crown, to whom the subject had been referred by his Lordship.

You will perceive from the terms of that letter the difficulties which must necessarily impede Her Majesty's Government in dealing with that subject, regarding as it does the rights and position of members of the Church of England, not in Canada only, but throughout the colonial possessions of the empire.

Her Majesty's Government will, however, not fail to take the whole question into their earnest consideration: and, notwithstanding the legal or rather constitutional objections adverted to in the letter which I now transmit, I am myself thoroughly persuaded that the desire for freedom of action and self-government on behalf of the church of England in Canada, is just and reasonable for the reasons specified in the Address and in your despatch.

For the present, however, further delay is unavoidable. And, as it appears to me that the division of the Diocese of Toronto is so much desired that it may be very inconvenient to postpone it until the general taxation is disposed of, I have to inform you that I have recommended to Her Majesty's Government to refer the subject to the law officers of the Crown, who will report to Her Majesty's Government on this important and delicate subject.

I have, &c., (Signed) WILLIAM MOLESWORTH.

The following is the enclosure referred to in the above despatch:—

DOCTOR'S COMMENTS, August 21, 1855.

H. MERVILLE, Esq. Sir,—We were favored with your letter of the 8th of May last, in which you state that you were directed by Lord John Russell, to transmit to us a copy or despatch from the Government of Canada, enclosing an Address to Her Majesty, for the repeal of such English Statutes as impede the meeting of the clergy and laity of the church of England in Synod, and that the choice of Bishops may be left to the clergy and laity of each Diocese, and you were to request that we would take the same into our consideration that the prayer of the address, or any part of it (notwithstanding the supposed statutory obstacles, referred to) could be legally granted by the Crown, if her Majesty should be advised so to do, or whether an Act of Parliament would be necessary for the whole, or any part of it, and if so, what should be the general force and scope of such Act. In compliance with your request, we have considered the question submitted to us, and beg to report:—

That the Address prays for the introduction and passing of an Imperial Statute for the repeal of all such statutes as impede the meeting of the clergy and laity in Synod, for the purpose of framing rules and canons. The propriety of introducing such a bill into the Imperial Parliament is a question not of law but of policy.

If such an act should be passed, it is obvious that the Royal Supremacy within the Colony would be most seriously and directly affected: nor is it possible to foresee all the legal or ecclesiastical consequences which might ultimately result therefrom.

The clergy might be legally empowered by royal licence to meet in Synod to make rules and canons; but in order to legalize a meeting of general assembly of the representatives of the clergy and laity, and to empower such an assembly to legislate upon the affairs of the church, an Imperial statute would be necessary.

The portion of the address which prays that the Synod may proceed to the election of their own Bishops might be practically carried into effect without the authority of Parliament, by Her Majesty issuing letters patent in favor of those reverend gentlemen exclusively who might be elected by the Synod; but this would be only a practical and indirect, and not a strictly legal, method of accomplishing the object of the address.

In order effectually to legalize the election of Canadian Bishops, an Imperial Statute would be requisite, and considering that both the Archbishop of Canterbury and the officiating bishops exercise their episcopal functions in every consecration of colonial bishops, and under authority derived from the Legislature, but directly and immediately by commission from the Crown as a portion of the prerogative, the objections to introducing any Bill into the Imperial Legis-

lature to compel the consecration by other bishops of those who may be elected by the proposed Canadian Synod, without the royal authority, appear to us to be almost insuperable.

We consider it our duty to remark that although the Address states the Provincial Parliament has passed an Act "by which it is declared there shall be an entire separation between Church and State," yet that the Clergy Reserves Act (sent with the papers) only appears to do this, if at all, by way of recital, and in somewhat vague terms, and that in respect to the nomination and consecration of Bishops and their various officers, and the power and jurisdiction conferred upon and exercised by them by patent, the connection between Church and State cannot be legally said to be entirely separated in Canada.

With reference to what should be the general force and scope of an Act of Parliament, to carry into effect the prayer of the Address, we can only say that the force and scope of such an Act, in order to be effective, would necessarily extend far beyond those of any Imperial Statute as yet passed. It must authorize the meeting of a General Assembly, confer on it a permanent and corporate existence and constitution, and extensive ecclesiastical and legal power and jurisdiction, together with the means of enforcing its decisions and orders.

Such an Act must further provide for the election of Canadian Bishops by the Synod, their compulsory consecration by other bishops, and their investiture thereupon, with all the powers and jurisdiction hitherto conferred by patent.

We are, &c., (Signed) J. D. HARRIS, A. G. COCKBURN, R. BETHELL.

The following is despatch No. 39, from the Right Hon. H. Labouchere, to Governor Sir Edmund Head.

DOWNING STREET, Feb. 15, 1856.

Sir, With reference to Sir William Molesworth's despatch of the 24th September last, transmitting to you copy of a letter from the law officers of the Crown, explaining the obstacles which exist to compliance with the prayer of the address of the Legislative Council and Assembly of Canada, that a measure may be introduced into the Imperial Parliament to remove all obstructions that may exist, or be supposed to exist, under any statute now in force in Great Britain, to prevent the meeting of the Bishops, Clergy and Laity of the United Church of England and Ireland in Canada, in Synod; for the purposes therein specified, and I wish now to communicate to you the result of the further deliberations of Her Majesty's Government on this important and delicate subject.

It is undoubtedly plain from the opinion already communicated to you that it would be impossible to effect in a literal manner the whole of what is prayed for by the Address, without the assistance of Parliament. Nevertheless Her Majesty's Government have a strong feeling that the difficulties raised by that opinion against adopting the entire recommendation of the Canadian Legislature, ought not to be permitted to interfere with the meeting of the Clergy and Laity by representative bodies, for the purpose of making rules for the management of Church affairs, and having legal force in the nature of Canons, nor contravening any known law of the Church; but binding on those who make them in the same manner as similar rules generally speak in the communities of Christians not established by law. And they are by no means satisfied that for purposes so simple any statute and is necessary.

But there are strong reasons for thinking that, if Parliamentary legislation is not strictly necessary, it is highly inexpedient. On the one hand, all parties, as it appears, are anxious to preserve the unity of the Church of England. Even those who most desire the removal of the restrictions under which they conceive themselves to labor, seem to entertain no thought of separation as the final result. And yet, it would not be easy to frame a measure, and perhaps still more difficult to obtain the assent of Parliament to such a measure unfiltered, which should satisfy the wishes of the Canadian Legislature and realize the objects contemplated by that body, without affecting at least a partial separation of the Colonial and Mother Church, and encroaching on that supremacy of the Crown, which is at present the substantial bond of union. Unless I have altogether mistaken the spirit by which the members of the Anglican Church in Canada are animated, I greatly doubt whether they would not regret even the accomplishment of their own immediate wishes if attended with such a permanent result.

On the other hand, it would perhaps hardly less difficult to frame such a measure, of the nearest enabling character, without in some degree compromising the principle which regards legislation on the internal affairs of Canada as its own Legislature, and not that of the empire at large. However guarded the expressions might be, there would be danger of constituting within the Province a kind of corporate body, independent in some respects of the Provincial Legislature itself.

Legislation in the Parliament of Canada would be open to neither of these objections. It could not impair the connection between the Anglican Church of the Province and the mother country, because any of its provisions which might involve some seeming and accidental derogation from the supremacy of the Crown, could not be considered as legally operative against those principles of general law, binding throughout the British dominions, on which that supremacy is founded. On the other hand the Canadian Legislature could, at its discretion, give legal effect to the ordinary proceedings of the Synod, so far as necessary; which it would be very difficult for Parliament to do, without infringing on the rights of that Legislature, by dealing with a strictly local subject. This seems the more essential, inasmuch as, although the Canadian Legislature has passed an Act declaring, or rather reciting, the separation of Church and State in the colony, (as I am reminded by that address,) yet those former Canadian Acts, which make provision for the management of the Church's temporalities, are, I believe, still in force. With these, the Synod ought no doubt, to be en-

abled to deal; they could not do so, except by Parliamentary or colonial enactment, and the subject is one which clearly appertains to the latter.

It is, therefore, the wish of Her Majesty's Government, that you should recommend the Canadian Legislature to enable the members of the Church of England, in the Province, to enjoy the freedom sought for, so far as the powers of the Legislature, according to the most reasonable supposition extend, that is to say, by empowering them to meet in the manner specified in the Address, and to form Representative bodies, and giving to the rules which may be framed by such bodies for the control of the church temporalities and the enforcement of discipline, so much of legal force as may be absolutely requisite. I am of course the advantages which might belong to a scheme under which the binding force of regulations should be simply voluntary; but the existence of prior legislation on the subjects referred to seems to render this impossible.

If such an act were passed in the Province, and either the operation of the act itself, or the proceedings of the meetings constituted under it, met with any well defined obstacles from existing Imperial law, then a difficulty would be clearly raised for removal by the interposition of Parliament here, which cannot be said to be the case, so long as the supposed objections are not easy to be understood, much less removed, from their very general nature, founded as they are only on vague opinions.

It would, however, be desirable, if the Act when framed was found to contain provisions appearing to you and your advisers to involve substantial difficulty, that you should reserve for the assent of the Crown.

Her Majesty's Government have been more induced to suggest this course by the fact that in the colony of Victoria, where similar inconveniences are felt by the members of the Church of England, the Legislature of that Province has come to their relief by passing a law of the very nature here indicated. It is entitled, "An Act to enable the Bishops, Clergy and Laity of the United Church of England and Ireland in Victoria to provide for the regulation of the affairs of the said Church," which it does by empowering the Bishop to convene an Assembly of the laicised Clergy and Laity, and making the acts of such Assembly binding on members of the Church, as regards their membership, and no further. The Assembly is further empowered to establish a Commission for the trial of ecclesiastical offences, but not to impose any penalty, except a suspension of removal from a Benefice, reserving existing rights of appeal to the ecclesiastical authorities at home. This Bill has received the sanction of Her Majesty's Assent, after much deliberation, the necessity for which was incurred by the defective character of part of its provisions.

With regard to the question raised in the Address of Bishops, the opinion of the law officers already communicated, states very distinctly the objects which exist to effecting this purpose by Parliamentary enactment. Her Majesty's advisers do not the less recognize in the case of community like that of Canada, the propriety of consulting the wishes of the members of the Church of England in this head. And they believe that the practical purpose which is sought to attain may be secured without the obvious inconveniences attendant on direct legislation for it, if they adopt the course of recommending her Majesty to be guided, as a general rule, in filling up any vacancy which may occur, by such representation as she may receive from the clergy and laity of the diocese duly assembled. I cannot distinctly disclaim, on the part of Her Majesty's Government, any intention or desire of placing the Church of England in a privileged or exclusive position in Canada. But they are most anxious to meet the wishes expressed by the Provincial Legislature, as well as by the Church of England, and to free its members from all unnecessary impediments to their own voluntary internal organization, and thus to put them on an equal footing with other denominations of Christians.

I am aware that an answer is still to be expected from you to that portion of Sir William Molesworth's despatch, which relates to the division of the Diocese of Toronto. But on the whole, I have thought it advisable not to delay my present communication on that account.

You will make known the contents of this despatch to the several Bishops of the United Church of England and Ireland in Canada.

I have, &c., (Signed) H. LABOUCHERE.

CHURCH INTELLIGENCE. GREAT BRITAIN.

From the London Guardian. We are happy to be able to state, on the highest authority, that there is not the slightest foundation for a rumor which we have met with in various quarters, of the perversion from the English Church of the son-in-law and daughter of the Lord Bishop of Oxford. We fear that a bad intention may be detected in the industry with which this falsehood has been circulated.

A correspondent who gives his name, assures us that the report of the Rev. Mr. Weguelin's perversion to Rome is "entirely false." We copied the statement from a Brighton paper.—Record.

Last Thursday night the Bishop of Lincoln finished his course of Lent lectures on the parable of "The Prodigal Son," which his lordship has been giving every Thursday night at St. Peter at Arches Church, Lincoln.

The Rev. Peter Marshall, Curate of St. Philip's Hulme, has been appointed Organist Secretary to the National Society for the diocese of Manchester; and the Rev. J. H. Blunt, Curate of Over, St. Ives, Hunts, for the dioceses of Ely and Peterborough.

On Sunday the Bishop of Jamaica held a Confirmation at All Saints' Church, Knightsbridge; the Bishop of London being unable to undertake the duty. On Thursday next, the Bishop of Oxford will hold a Confirmation for his lordship at St. James's, Westminster, at four o'clock. The other arrangements for the diocese are as follows:—April 11, St. Mary-lebone; April 15, St. Andrew's, Holborn; April 16, St. John's, Hoxton; same day, St. Luke's, Chelsea; April 17, St. Mark's, Clerkenwell;

April 18, St. Helens, Bishopsgate; same day, All Saints, Marylebone; April 19, St. John's, Westminster; April 22, St. Peter's, Pimlico; April 23, St. John's, Hackney; April 24, St. Francis; April 25, St. Mary's, Wyndham-place; April 28, St. Martin-in-the-Fields; April 29, Brompton; same day, St. Giles in-the-Fields; April 30, St. Paul's, Knightsbridge; Sunday Whitechapel; May 2, St. John's, Bishopsgate; May 3, Kensington; May 5, Islington; May 6, Stepney; May 7, Christ Church, Newgate-street; May 8, Pall Mall; same day, Christ Church, St. George's-in-the-East; May 22, St. George's, Hanover-square; May 23, Highgate; May 24, Hampstead; May 25, Fulham; May 27, Ealing; June 1, Greenwich; June 3, Charlton; June 6, Lewisham; June 12, Hammersmith.

THE POLICE BILL.

From the Hamilton Gazette. A BILL for the purpose of establishing a Provincial Police for this Province is now before Parliament, and in a short time, in all probability, will be the Law of the land. Some excitement has been got up in this city, in consequence of the action taken by the City Council at a special meeting last week, called for the purpose of considering the subject. At that meeting a committee was appointed to report at the next sitting of council, and this report has been circulated in an expression of opinion combative of the Bill, while we know that some members voted for the appointment of the committee, for the purpose of preventing a useless discussion at that time, as the whole subject would have to be gone into at the next meeting.

In regard to the principles of the Bill itself, by some it has been condemned in toto, as subversive of the liberty of the subject, and similar arguments have not been wanting to prevent the passing of the Bill through the House. We however are of opinion that the Editor of the Globe, who has taken a prominent part against the Bill, is shooting at an empty game, and cares not so much for the destruction of the Police Bill as he does for the overthrow of the present Government, trusting to the chances of war for a share of the spoils.

That any body of men, knowing the working of the Police throughout the different Municipalities in the Province, should conscientiously, and on principle, oppose the passing of an Act establishing a Provincial and uniform Police system, we can hardly bring ourselves to believe,—its usefulness being so apparent, and its want so detrimental to the interests of the Province as well as every Municipality.

Assertion, we are well aware, is neither proof nor argument, and therefore we will give some instances of the present defective system. It happens to be within our own knowledge, that some time since a party was charged with a most revolting and capital offence, and the case having been gone into before the Magistrate, a Warrant for commitment was drawn out, and handed to a regular Constable to take his man to court,—no sooner did the culprit ascertain what was going on, than he quietly made his escape, and although he remained in the neighborhood for a long time, no constable or constables could be got that would venture to arrest the man;—the whole neighbourhood was kept in a state of excitement, until at length the man deliberately conveyed himself across the lines. Again the culprit made his appearance, and the magistrates applied to a neighbouring Municipality for a constabulary force able and willing to enforce the Laws of the country,—as a great compliment a number of constables were sent to the spot, but they also failed in securing the Bird, not being able perhaps to stay long enough. Thus for something like a year, the ends of justice were defeated, a man charged with one of the highest crimes on the Calendar, let run at large, and the neighborhood kept in constant dread in consequence.

Now it is plain to the most casual observer, that were there a Provincial Police Force in existence at the time, such an occurrence as the one above cited could not have happened, for, if necessary, a body of fifty men would have been concentrated on the spot to carry out what justice demanded. Again, it is not a fact of "public notoriety," that there is not a single Municipality in the Province whose constabulary force is not controlled by local influence, often preventing the discharge of an important office, in a proper and efficient manner. Need we cite instances to support this,—it is not in the recollection of our readers, that but a few months since, in the very capital of Canada, a long and bloody riot took place, involving the destruction of a large amount of property, and although the whole constabulary force was present, next morning not a single rioter was identified by the Police. Could such a state of things exist with a Provincial Force, free alike from the influence of party, as well as of private individuals whose interest it would be to sway them to their purpose,—or else bring such influence to bear in the corporation which would issue in certain services being dispensed with.

This Law now before Parliament we look upon as one of the utmost importance, involving as it does the welfare and safety of the inhabitants as well as their prosperity, and all party or local feeling should be at once discontinued and put down, and if there are any objectionable features, or clause that can be improved upon, let our corporation make such suggestions, and we have no fears for the result. But it is pitiable to see men who ought to weigh well their words before giving them utterance, stand up and denounce such a wise measure as one sapping the liberties of the people,—if they thereby mean, that it will sap the liberties of the rogues and vagabonds that infest our land, then we will agree with them; but that any honest man has cause to fear it, that we totally deny.

It is no doubt in the recollection of many of our own inhabitants, that some years ago, in this city, the hand of the incendiary set fire to a Block of Buildings every night for a week, and only failed once in carrying out his design. It will also be recollected at various other times that robberies were committed night after night, and that neither the burglar, nor incendiary were ever caught. Now we do not mean to say that our Police did not do their duty as far as they were able, but from not having a Provincial organization, the efforts were all vain and fruitless. We might give numerous individ-

ual cases of the total inefficiency of the present system,—and even of murderers walking away to prison a day after committing the most awful of crimes, and although large rewards were offered both by Government and individuals, for their apprehension, it failed to arrest the progress, although they were seen in the Province long after.

Having given the above facts, every one which is within our own knowledge, we trust no bogheart of expense or expediency will cause the Government to give up such a wholesome law,—the tendency of which is to mark and watch every bad man in the whole Province, preventing him from doing wrong and violence. Such a Law is only a terror to evil doers.

SEPARATE SCHOOLS.

From the Hamilton Gazette. Mr. Editor, Your very just remarks on Separate Schools in last Thursday's issue arrested my attention, and it behoves the Clergy to look well to the inevitable consequences of the present Presbyterian Infidel Theory,—the fruits of which, are already too apparent in this City; and should Churchmen continue to neglect their duty,—the position of the Church in this Province will be similar to that in the neighbouring Republic, where being brow-beaten by superstitious fanaticism on the one hand, she is contained by the "powers that be" on the other. Such a lamentable and unworthy position may be avoided, if the Church at her solemn meeting do to be held in Toronto, gird on her armour and stand firm for the training of her children—in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.

That such may be the result, is the prayer of your Obedt servant, A CHURCHMAN.

Hamilton, April 11, 1856.

HAMILTON HOTEL CO.—Mr. Robinson introduced a Bill in Parliament on the 8th instant, to enable the Hamilton Hotel Co., to increase the Capital Stock and for other purposes, and Mr. Freeman introduced a Bill for the construction of the Hamilton Water Works.

FRESHET IS IN GROUND.—Owing to the melting of the snow, the creek running through the village gradually rose on Tuesday, until by the pressure, Benson's dam gave way, and a torrent of water bearing large pieces of timber, &c., rushed along, carrying away the King Street bridge and the bridge on Charles Street, including many houses, and sweeping away much valuable property. The loss is estimated at over \$5,000.

Yea let the Church, both Clergy and Laity, pray that human passions may be still, and that the Wisdom from on High may guide all her decisions. Let us not rush into decisions, which angels might tremble to undertake. As to matters of doctrine, reason, antiquity, scripture, and the church, all proclaim that in these the initiative at least must rest with those to whom a dispensation of the Spirit and a vocation of holy study have been committed. On this subject we beg to refer our readers to a thoughtful article on "The Synod" taken from the last number of our able and scriptural cotemporary "The Churchman's Friend."

THE CHURCHMAN'S FRIEND.

We much regret to notice the following in the London, (C. W.) Herald. "Mr. Lawson" (one of the newly elected lay delegates,) "stated his intention to vote against the veto of the Bishop, in the Synod." Why was this intimation thus publicly stated? Are the very functions of the Episcopate,—which is either directly an office of the Holy Ghost, or our impious assumption,—to be made the subjects of discussion in a quarrelsome vestry meeting? We do sincerely hope it was no electioneering declaration; but we wish we could forget the unfortunate coincidence that Mr. Lawson is, and we believe has been for many years past, the Rector's Churchwarden, and that the Rector has been loudly spoken of as Bishop by a portion of the Church, the tendency of whose peculiar views does but too evidently chime with the popular wish to lower the distinctive spiritual character and authority of the priestly and episcopal offices. At all events we consider such a declaration, to say the least, under all the circumstances as peculiarly unfortunate.

If we think right to be Presbyterians, let us openly and honestly become such; but as we value the blessing of a God of Truth do not let us betray our Master with a kiss! Either the Episcopate ceased with the St. Timothy and Titus, or the Epistles of those holy men are to be the models of action for all succeeding prelates. And does any man after reading those Epistles in conjunction with the Acts of the Apostles, deny that as long as Apostles or Bishops existed in the Church, their voice was not to be final in matters of doctrine and discipline? Again were the Bishops who exercised this undoubted authority in the martyr-days of the Church mere unhalloved usurpers? What, sire, are our Bishops to be mere ordaining machines? If so, make haste and choose those who are least esteemed amongst you for so degraded an office.

But if He who sent them made no mistake, or was guilty of no exaggeration when He said "As the Father has sent me, so send I you," beware, as you will answer for it to the great Head of the Church, how you venture to whisper one word that shall tend to take from them one iota of that authority with which He has invested them.

And why in the name of all that is holy should you wish to do so? Is the individual whom, as we trust under the direct guidance of the Holy Spirit, you have chosen as the wisest, the holiest, and the most self-denying of the ambassadors of Christ, to be the chief overseer of His Flock, is such an individual not likely to have the most mature and holiest judgment amongst us. And then what is a blasphemous mockery when he was declared to be invested with "the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Bishop"? If not, surely it is an insult, yea, a rejection of that Eternal Spirit, to refuse His Chief Overseer the principal voice in the affairs of His Own Church!

The Church.

Hamilton, Friday, April 18, 1856.

THE SYNOD AND EPISCOPAL VETO.

A friend asks us whether we consider the learned Bingham as an authority as to the degree of lay influence exercised, in more primitive days, in the election of Bishops. We answer, unquestionably, as to the correctness of the facts which he adduces. But at the same time we confess that we cannot think the conclusions which he draws from those facts are always equally certain. Bingham wrote at a period, about 1700, when the State had rivalled the Papacy in the unhalloved grasp with which it had invaded the rights of the Church, both lay and clerical, inasmuch that in the appointment to the sacred office of the Episcopate, to be distinguished by oligarchical episcopate, in politics and latitudinarianism in religion, were recommendations far more telling than holy learning or pious zeal. It need not therefore be a matter of surprise, that in his eager desire to defend the rights of the Church, alike against the priestly dominations of Rome, and the scornful oppressions of a coldly indifferent monarch and a profane aristocracy, the learned and earnest Bingham should have taken an extreme view of the ecclesiastical rights of the laity. Indignant that his holy mother should be trampled upon by either priest or prince, what marvel if for a moment he was almost ready to entrust her interests solely to the care of "the multitude of them that believe?"

But we think that a careful examination of ancient usage will show that it was the approval of the multitude of the faithful as to the general character and acceptability of the individual proposed for Bishop, rather than any accurate judgment on their part, as to his peculiar and especial fitness for that high and virtually important office. Indeed the very tumultuous and irregular manner in this approval or disapproval which was at times manifested, precludes the idea of its being the result of holy and prayerful consideration on the part of the multitude; and this at the time, while as yet the Episcopate was usually filled by holy and self-denying men.

Indeed a careful examination of Bingham himself, will give sufficient evidence that it was to the decision of the clergy that the Church ever looked for ultimate safety in the selection of her Prelates. And so completely was this the case, that the ultimate decision, as to who should be Bishop, rested rather with the laity nor yet with the inferior clergy, but with the Provincial Bishops and the Metropolitan; and their decision was final!

While as to Synods, their laymen seem to have been unknown. We are not now stating our opinion but a fact, that thus it was in the early Church. What we would have our Provincial Church learn from this fact, is not to exclude the laity from our Synods, but to pause and think, and pray!

Yea let the Church, both Clergy and Laity, pray that human passions may be still, and that the Wisdom from on High may guide all her decisions. Let us not rush into decisions, which angels might tremble to undertake. As to matters of doctrine, reason, antiquity, scripture, and the church, all proclaim that in these the initiative at least must rest with those to whom a dispensation of the Spirit and a vocation of holy study have been committed. On this subject we beg to refer our readers to a thoughtful article on "The Synod" taken from the last number of our able and scriptural cotemporary "The Churchman's Friend."

THE CHURCHMAN'S FRIEND.

We much regret to notice the following in the London, (C. W.) Herald. "Mr. Lawson" (one of the newly elected lay delegates,) "stated his intention to vote against the veto of the Bishop, in the Synod." Why was this intimation thus publicly stated? Are the very functions of the Episcopate,—which is either directly an office of the Holy Ghost, or our impious assumption,—to be made the subjects of discussion in a quarrelsome vestry meeting? We do sincerely hope it was no electioneering declaration; but we wish we could forget the unfortunate coincidence that Mr. Lawson is, and we believe has been for many years past, the Rector's Churchwarden, and that the Rector has been loudly spoken of as Bishop by a portion of the Church, the tendency of whose peculiar views does but too evidently chime with the popular wish to lower the distinctive spiritual character and authority of the priestly and episcopal offices. At all events we consider such a declaration, to say the least, under all the circumstances as peculiarly unfortunate.

If we think right to be Presbyterians, let us openly and honestly become such; but as we value the blessing of a God of Truth do not let us betray our Master with a kiss! Either the Episcopate ceased with the St. Timothy and Titus, or the Epistles of those holy men are to be the models of action for all succeeding prelates. And does any man after reading those Epistles in conjunction with the Acts of the Apostles, deny that as long as Apostles or Bishops existed in the Church, their voice was not to be final in matters of doctrine and discipline? Again were the Bishops who exercised this undoubted authority in the martyr-days of the Church mere unhalloved usurpers? What, sire, are our Bishops to be mere ordaining machines? If so, make haste and choose those who are least esteemed amongst you for so degraded an office.

But if He who sent them made no mistake, or was guilty of no exaggeration when He said "As the Father has sent me, so send I you," beware, as you will answer for it to the great Head of the Church, how you venture to whisper one word that shall tend to take from them one iota of that authority with which He has invested them.

And why in the name of all that is holy should you wish to do so? Is the individual whom, as we trust under the direct guidance of the Holy Spirit, you have chosen as the wisest, the holiest, and the most self-denying of the ambassadors of Christ, to be the chief overseer of His Flock, is such an individual not likely to have the most mature and holiest judgment amongst us. And then what is a blasphemous mockery when he was declared to be invested with "the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Bishop"? If not, surely it is an insult, yea, a rejection of that Eternal Spirit, to refuse His Chief Overseer the principal voice in the affairs of His Own Church!

The Church.

Hamilton, Friday, April 18, 1856.

THE SYNOD AND EPISCOPAL VETO.

A friend asks us whether we consider the learned Bingham as an authority as to the degree of lay influence exercised, in more primitive days, in the election of Bishops. We answer, unquestionably, as to the correctness of the facts which he adduces. But at the same time we confess that we cannot think the conclusions which he draws from those facts are always equally certain. Bingham wrote at a period, about 1700, when the State had rivalled the Papacy in the unhalloved grasp with which it had invaded the rights of the Church, both lay and clerical, inasmuch that in the appointment to the sacred office of the Episcopate, to be distinguished by oligarchical episcopate, in politics and latitudinarianism in religion, were recommendations far more telling than holy learning or pious zeal. It need not therefore be a matter of surprise, that in his eager desire to defend the rights of the Church, alike against the priestly dominations of Rome, and the scornful oppressions of a coldly indifferent monarch and a profane aristocracy, the learned and earnest Bingham should have taken an extreme view of the ecclesiastical rights of the laity. Indignant that his holy mother should be trampled upon by either priest or prince, what marvel if for a moment he was almost ready to entrust her interests solely to the care of "the multitude of them that believe?"

But we think that a careful examination of ancient usage will show that it was the approval of the multitude of the faithful as to the general character and acceptability of the individual proposed for Bishop, rather than any accurate judgment on their part, as to his peculiar and especial fitness for that high and virtually important office. Indeed the very tumultuous and irregular manner in this approval or disapproval which was at times manifested, precludes the idea of its being the result of holy and prayerful consideration on the part of the multitude; and this at the time, while as yet the Episcopate was usually filled by holy and self-denying men.

Indeed a careful examination of Bingham himself, will give sufficient evidence that it was to the decision of the clergy that the Church ever looked for ultimate safety in the selection of her Prelates. And so completely was this the case, that the ultimate decision, as to who should be Bishop, rested rather with the laity nor yet with the inferior clergy, but with the Provincial Bishops and the Metropolitan; and their decision was final!

While as to Synods, their laymen seem to have been unknown. We are not now stating our opinion but a fact, that thus it was in the early Church. What we would have our Provincial Church learn from this fact, is not to exclude the laity from our Synods, but to pause and think, and pray!

THE WESTERN DIOCESE. To the Editor of the Echo. Mr. Editor:— There is one portion of the communication of your correspondent "Evangelicus," in the last number of your paper, on which, with your permission, I would wish to say a few words. He speaks of the apple of discord having been thrown among us by those who consider the Church newspaper as their organ. If by the "apple of discord," he means the opinion expressed by many of the Clergy and Laity, as to the propriety of having, as our future Bishop, a Clergyman unconnected with the present Diocese, I am inclined to think he is mistaken in attributing it solely to the supporters of the Church paper. In saying this, I am not speaking unwisely, as we are informed by a communication which lately appeared in the London Herald, signed "A Western Presbyter," that "a Clergyman unconnected with this Diocese."—I quote his own words, and he evidently appears to be writing on behalf of a comparatively numerous and influential party, both among the Clergy and Laity, and one too decidedly evangelical,—he tells us there, that a Clergyman unconnected with his Diocese "and therefore," he says, "it may be presumed the more fitted for its impartial governance) of eminently popular talents, and well known as an able, zealous, and devoted champion of the Church of Protestantism, had been previously mentioned as one peculiarly eligible to fill the same See"—viz, that for the western portion of the present Diocese. From this communication we learn that there is a party, it would appear, among the Evangelical Body in our Church, and also that it is by no means despicable in point of numbers and influence, who are desirous of having a Clergyman as our future Bishop, who is entirely unconnected with the Diocese over which he may be called to preside—and why? because they conceive that he will thereby be "more fitted for its impartial governance." Now this, Mr Editor,