

The Church Times.

"Evangelical Truth--Apostolic Order."

VOL. 3. HALIFAX, NOVA SCOTIA, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 6, 1857. NO. 49.

Calendar.

CALENDAR WITH LESSONS.		MORNING.		EVENING.	
Day	Date	Scripture	Lesson	Scripture	Lesson
S.	Dec. 6	2 Sam. in Adv.	Isaiah 6	Acts 1	Isaiah 24
M.	7		27	6	28
T.	8		29	8	30
W.	9		31	9	27
T.	10		33	10	24
F.	11		35	11	26
S.	12		37	12	28

To ver. 20. b Begin ver. 30.

Poetry.

TRUST.

Trust ye the Lord forever; for in the Lord Jehovah is everlasting strength.—ISAIAH XLVI. 4.

Trust ye the Lord forever,
He will fail you never,
From the direst guilt He laveth,
From the deepest woe He saveth.
When the fiercest storm is raging,
He doth lead the power assuaging;
When the death-hall on us dwelleth,
His the word its night dispelleth.
When we near the gulph despairing,
He doth show His love repairing.
When in bud of life we flourish,
And do praise His wondrous nourish,
He doth wait of coming sorrow,
Life to-day and death to-morrow;
That we may His medicine borrow.

Trust ye in the Lord forever,
He will fail you never,
Naught is there His power tasketh,
He will give whoever asketh;
Asketh with a firm relying,
Feeling safe of kind replying.
For His sons His love ne'er sleepeth,
Constant watch and ward He keepeth,
Night and day no evil neareth,
Where His angel guard appeareth.
Them who tarry He impelleth,
Who refuse, His love compelleth;
Them who wander He returneth,
Gains by love His love who spurneth:
For the health of all He yearneth.

Trust ye in the Lord forever,
He will fail you never,
Lack ye wisdom, He supplieth;
Lack ye answer, He replieth.
Aro ye hungry, then He feedeth,
More He gives in hunger needeth;
Full and bounteous board He spreadeth,
On His guests all blessings sheddeth,
Ho thy resting-place when weary,
Ho thy Hope when earth is dreary,
Ho thy Light when grief-clouds lower,
Ho thy Peace when war hath power,
Ho the Salve thine eye that cleareth,
Ho thy Beauty that endareth,
Ho the Joy thy soul that cheereth.

Trust ye in the Lord forever,
He will fail you never,
He thy Sword of proof in danger,
He thy Home when care worn stranger,
He thy Calm no storm disturbeth,
He the Charm thy lusts that curbeth,
Ho thy Rock the floods that stayeth,
Ho the Bond thy debts that payeth,
His the Name thy soul foe dreadeth,
He the Way thy due foot treadeth,
He thy Truth no foe reproveh,
He thy Life no death removeth;
He thy Bliss all thought suspending,
He thy Robe all light transcending,
Ho thy Crown of life unending.

Trust ye in the Lord forever,
He will fail you never,
Ere the subtle venom harmeth,
He the lurking sting disarmeth,
He the wrong long-suffered righteth,
And who patient wait requieth,
Hope, then, though thy night be darkest,
Help is nigh ere yet thou markest;
Though at eventide is sadness,
With the morrow shall be gladness.
Trust, then, though thy mind disputeth,
Trust, then, though thine eye refuseth
He from out His hidden treasures,
Shall bring forth His unknown pleasures,
Thought of man not over measures.

—N. Y. Churchman.

Religious Miscellany.

AUSTRALASIA.

The Bishop of Sydney's Circular, published in the *Guardian* of Sept. 23, has called forth considerable expression of feeling, and a meeting was held in the parochial school house of Christ church with reference thereto on Monday evening, July 13.

The chair was taken by the *Rev. Canon Walsh*, who briefly explained the objects of the meeting, stating that he was desirous of obtaining the unbiased opinion of the laity whether they should take up the question of a Synod themselves or wait for Bishop Barker to obtain the opinion of Bishop Perry on the matter. It would be remembered that as far back as 1850 the six Bishops of Australasia expressed their opinions on the importance and necessity of establishing Provincial and Diocesan Synods for regulating the affairs of our Church. In accordance with these minutes steps were taken by Bishop Broughton in 1852 to give effect to the proposals of the Conference. The subject was brought before all the clergy and laity of the several parishes of the diocese. Having obtained a unanimous opinion in favour of synodical action, the Bishop took a voyage to England for the sole purpose of removing the obstacles to the assembling of such a Synod which then existed. His life fell a sacrifice to the undertaking. An Episcopal interregnum of nearly three years succeeded, during which period nothing was done. The vacant see was at last filled and for more than two years many of the clergy and laity have been looking forward to the opening of the subject afresh. Longer experience only showed the unsatisfactory nature of their present position. It was not improbable that the support now received from the State might soon be lost, and therefore they ought to be prepared by self-government and self-reliance to meet all emergencies as they arise.

The *Chief Justice* then rose, and in an able speech declared himself in favour of the immediate establishment of a Synod without waiting for the Bishop to consult the Bishop of Melbourne. Having recapitulated former proceedings as related by the chairman, his Honour referred to the Declaration of the Clergy in 1852, and the petition submitted to the Queen drawn up by Bishop Broughton, a man of great experience, great caution, and great capacity of thought. The Declaration commences thus:—

"We are of opinion that there are many questions of great importance to the well being of the Church in our province, which cannot be settled without duly constituted provincial and diocesan Synods. Tolerably plain this, tolerably good authority. It then goes on to state that the functions of Synods are 'to consult and agree upon rules of practice and ecclesiastical order, within the limits of the province or diocese, and to conduct the process necessary for carrying such rules into effect.' In short, it declares that a Synod has power of legislation. In considering these questions, a discussion arose whether the power of the laity should be limited to temporalities only—and whether the clergy and laity should deliberate as separate bodies—or whether they should meet and deliberate together, and vote separately. On some such grounds a general meeting of the laity was held in the Royal Hotel, and an opposition to the plan of the Bishop was raised; but the opposition was confined entirely to matters of detail. In the report of this meeting we do not find that anything was uttered unfavourable to the principle of a Synod. The general and united opinion of the Church of England in this colony was in favor of a Synod; the object of the petition was to enable the clergy and laity to 'pass such regulations, rules, or canons, as might be necessary, fit, and convenient for the honour of Almighty God, the good and quiet of the Church, and the better government thereof; to be observed, fulfilled, and kept by the Bishop and his successors, by the whole clergy of the diocese, and all other persons being members of the said Church.' Thus this petition shows that the same opinion of the necessity of obtaining for the Church powers of legislation, maintained in the Conference of 1850, was also maintained without abatement in 1852. We may infer from what has since taken place that the Bishops have not changed their opinions. Thus, when St. Paul's College was established, in the view of possible difficulties, it was determined to effect a union of sentiment on certain terms. The Bishops of New Zealand and Newcastle thought it desirable that the warden and other clergy connected with St. Paul's College should be placed under the same ecclesiastical discipline as the other clergy

of the diocese, and it was accordingly agreed that they should be subject to the rules and laws of the Synod as soon as it should be established. Hence we find the following among the fundamental laws of that college, a rule to this effect. I merely quote this to show that in the year 1853—that is one year after Bishop Broughton's departure, the Bishops of New Zealand and Newcastle still contemplated the idea of an early establishment of Church government by synodical laws. The next step in the matter of a Synod was taken by the Bishop of Melbourne, and at his instance an act was passed by the Legislative Council of Victoria in 1854, to authorise a Synod, and aid it with Legislative powers."

In one point the Chief Justice could not concur with the Melbourne Synod. They declared they had no sympathy with the Canadians in desiring to have the election of their own Bishop. He did not desire that the appointment of their Bishop should remain with the Crown. On this question he had a very strong opinion:—

"I consider it one of the chief advantages of a Synod that we should have in it a body with full powers to make and validate such election. I do not imagine that any evil, but rather much good, would result from our electing our own Bishops. I have no fear that it would create unseemly jealousies among the clergy. I believe that it would tend greatly to elevate the standard of clerical qualifications in general, and would open a field of laudable ambition to men of energy and high character."

Synods had been established in three out of the six dioceses whose Bishops met in 1852, in Melbourne, Adelaide, and New Zealand; in Tasmania the first step had been taken, and in Sydney and Newcastle alone had nothing been done. They had the precedents of other colonies before them, sanctioned by the Archbishop of Canterbury. What could the Bishop of Sydney learn from going to Melbourne or Adelaide? The whole of the proceedings at the Synods of these dioceses had been published. He would not convert them, and he could obtain no advice that he did not already possess. The idea of a Synod had been suggested in 1850, and since examined and canvassed in all its bearings, and there was really no reason why it might not at once be carried into effect:—

"How can it be said that the consideration on the subject is premature? What end or objects can be gained by merely asking us the question whether we shall yet longer delay? We are already the last. Can we be more than the last? Will there be dissensions? What harm? Are there not dissensions now which are painful to contemplate? Are there not discussions painful to hear, and which would not exist if a Synod existed? There is at least this advantage in a Synod, it would enable us legitimately to express an opinion that a Bishop may be wrong without encountering suspicions. I do not understand why Bishops are so sensitive on this point. They are not infallible. They are as liable to err as other men, and why they should object to hear it said I really do not know. The office of a judge is not less important or less responsible than that of a Bishop. The lives, the property, the happiness or misery of numbers of their fellow citizens, from year to year, hang on their decisions; yet it is not an insult to a judge to say, you are wrong in your judgement, you are mistaken in your facts. It is no discredit to him to say that he has erred. His station, or character, or authority, are not injured or impaired by criticism; yet one cannot impugn the opinions or judgment of a Bishop without being considered guilty of sin. And why this? Simply because there is no authorised means of discussing his opinions; no legal standard by which they may be measured and adjusted. Hence the errors of Bishops remain unredressed—the ranklings which they engender remain—much mischief is done, which a Synod would either prevent or remove. A Synod would not weaken the influence of a Bishop; it would strengthen it."

Without wishing to enter into questions of detail, his Honour expressed himself in favour of giving the Bishop a veto on the proceedings of a Synod, in the same way that the Queen has a veto:—

"I would not give the Bishop a place in the