

proof of episcopacy on the pastoral epistles." When I assented, he added, "and I suppose one of your strongest texts is that to Timothy, 'Lay hands suddenly on no man.' Now, I have satisfied myself that this does not refer to ordination. There are hints elsewhere that Timothy was a man of hasty temper, and St. Paul is warning him against that."

3. We have need, as legislators and pastors of American churches, to adapt ourselves with wise and benignant flexibility to the circumstances of our position.

Rites and ceremonies need not be the same and utterly like in all places, and the same is true of policies and administrations. Invention has its place in church work as in all other work. Enterprise in the sense of exploring new fields and re-adjusting our instruments should be the characteristic of all religious endeavor.

I might enlarge upon another problem which causes many of us the deepest anxiety, viz.: how to bring into play the energies of the rank and file of the Church; for the work is thrown upon the officers of the army rather than the privates. How to utilize the zeal and industry of the Laity, men and women in private station, scripture-readers, religious associates and the like, are serious questions.

There is a grave deficiency in your church as in ours. We are an army without the indispensable adjunct of an ambulance corps. There is no assured provision for the veteran when he becomes entitled to repose; none for the widow and orphan of such as die at the outpost. God only knows the grinding poverty, the friendless desolation which are allowed to come upon those who deserve well at our hands.

Among these things the attention of the church, which deputes me to bear to you her message of good will, has been specially directed to the matter of her public services.

For the last three years a committee of twenty-one persons, seven of each order, has been engaged in the revision of the Liturgy. Their instructions either explicit or implicit, were in substance, without disturbing the doctrinal status or the organic structure of the Prayer Book, to propose such changes as were needed for enrichment and for flexibility of life.

Its work has just been completed, and without seeking to conciliate any favor for it in advance, we have submitted it to the wisdom of the church, as our very unanimous recommendation.

We have not marred the old Prayer Book, but enriched it, partly by the restoration of treasures lost, such as the Magnificat and the Nunc Dimittis, and partly by added treasures from the old mines to which we owe our formularies.

We have made large provision for shortened services on week days, and given large discretion for services in the woods and in the cottage, in Sunday Schools and the like.

We have sought to differentiate the service, so that on a Christmas or an Easter day, for instance, we strike the key-note of the Incarnation or the Resurrection and hold it through all the services. We have sought to intensify the special character of many early days by suitable anthems and psalms.

Our attention was called to the growing neglect of the Sunday even-song. We do not pretend to offer any exhaustive explanation. But a partial remedy lay on the surface? so we have sought to beautify the evensong, to give it a character and to coin for it a blessing of its own.

I mention these things, not to bespeak your favor for them, but only to illustrate the conviction now working in the minds of your brethren, that our means must be fitted to the end in view. Not as antiquarians, or as partisans, or as doctrinaires, but in the light of ascertained needs and deficiencies, we seek to polish the old armour and to sharpen the long-tried blade.

At the conclusion of the sermon, which was listened to with deep attention, the Holy Communion was administered by the Metropolitan, after which the service was brought to a termination with the Benediction, and the procession returned by way of University street to Synod Hall, where the members dispersed.

#### AFTERNOON SESSION.

The members of Synod assembled at 2.30 in the St. George's School room, and at three o'clock, the Metropolitan and the members of the bench of bishops having entered, the proceedings were opened with prayer by the Clerical Secretary, Rev. R. W. Norman.

The Metropolitan, Bishop Medley, of Fredericton, N. B., occupied the chair, and there were also upon the platform their Lordships the Bishops of Nova Scotia, Ontario, Toronto, Montreal, the coadjutor Bishop of Fredericton, and the Bishop of Algoma.

#### THE METROPOLITAN'S ADDRESS.

The Metropolitan then proceeded to read his charge to the members of Synod as follows:—

Right Reverend, Reverend and Dear Brethren, and Dear Brethren of the Laity.

As three years have passed quickly away since we

last met in Synod, and each year calls more loudly upon us to "work while it is day," and that day short, so uncertain, full of terrible responsibility, you will pardon me, I trust, for setting before you this urgent question, what is to be the future of the ecclesiastic Province of the Canadian Church? I call it the Canadian Church, not for one moment forgetting that dear Church of England, in whose sheltering arms the earliest years of many of us were spent, but chiefly to call to your remembrance that no love for the old country, no union and communion with the Church of England in the Catholic faith can absolve us from a sacred and solemn trust for the good of Canada, for which we must give account when our privileges, our duties and our works shall be weighed in the balances of God's merciful but even-handed justice.

In years long passed, the first consideration seemed to be with most minds, what will England do for us? Now we have to face the just as serious question, what are we going to do for Canada? Here is our native land or our adopted country. Here will multitudes of our children settle, and become good or bad members of a great community. Whilst then we follow the footsteps of our fathers in honouring the throne, shall we not do our best to secure inviolate the privileges and blessings of the Church to our descendants? Shall we tamely see a wealthy congregationalism usurping the noble heritage of the Catholic Church, while multitudes who were once with us find no place in our churches, no interest in our hearts, and nursed by no tender mother's care within our fold, quietly, and to us imperceptibly, slip away from us?

For those who leave us because they were never told why they should remain with us, often become our bitterest foes, and learn to curse the very name of the mother who bare them but continually forget them.

You see at once that I speak not of our legal but of our spiritual position. Highly as we must esteem the might and majesty of law, the bulwark of our liberty, proceeding out of the throne of God most high, it is a higher honour to be trustees of the Church of Christ. "This one institution," says the Bishop of Durham, "is older than the English monarchy, than the English nation, the English law, the English literature. It is the same now in its essential character as it ever will be to the end of time. It is subject to vicissitudes, many and various; it has its triumphs and its defects; it has its seasons of error, sloth and degradation, as well as its seasons of enterprise, spirituality and zeal; for it is administered by human agents. But throughout there has been a sustaining power not of earth; a life which no antagonism of foe, and no recklessness of friend can extinguish, ever reviving, ever reasserting itself, ever breaking out in fresh developments." How earnestly should we strive that, as far as in us lies, not even a crumb of a heritage so precious should be lost! Our position in Canada to-day is a trying one. We live in the midst of a very whirlpool of diversities of belief, of bodies all vehemently asserting their position in the Church of Christ, one large and important section claiming to be the only representatives of the Catholic Church on earth, others denying this claim, but divided into various sects and parties, yet full of energy, proving the strength of their convictions by the fire of their zeal, honourably desirous to raise and maintain their position by institutions of learning and by all the other appliances which modern enterprise and ingenuity uses to increase its numbers and make itself a power felt and recognized in the body politic. We should do ill to overlook, we should do worse if we attempt to despise such efforts of Christian sentiment and earnestness. Even when we deem it misdirected, it is important for us to remember the peculiarity of our position. In some points we closely touch our neighbours, even whilst we seem most to differ from them. In others, whilst we seem to agree, we are forced to admit essential differences. For example, we entirely agree with the Roman Catholic brethren in all the fundamental doctrines of Christianity as set forth in the three great creeds, and asserted by the four first. (Bishop Jewel says) the six first general councils; we have no difference with them as to infant baptism, or the primitive origin of liturgies; many of our collects unaltered, or only slightly altered, are taken from sources which they honour alike with ourselves; had they been content to add no new articles of faith, and above all not to invent a new and impassable wall of partition between us, we might have dwelt in unity in one house; but as long as their additions to the primitive faith remain, union is impossible. And yet when any of them are disposed by conviction to join us, we do not make the way straighter than it is already. We neither re-ordain their priests nor re-confirm their catechumens, and we only call on such to renounce those errors which no primitive council enjoined and no primitive father taught. Thus we can say that union is at present impracticable, but not absolutely and forever impossible; impracticable while they continue in their comparatively new career, but not impossible if they would listen to

the words of Jeremiah: "Stand ye in the ways and ask for the old paths, and ye shall find rest unto your souls." Turning to the other side, we might suppose that those who believe in the fundamentals of the Christian faith, and have fellow feeling for Roman doctrine, would have little to find fault with in the Church of England. But here we are met by very considerable differences, both in doctrine and discipline. The system taught in the Westminster confession varies widely from our seventeenth Article, which is thought by some to approach more nearly to Calvinistic doctrine than any other part of our prayer books. And what the Church unequivocally asserts, that "it is evident unto all men diligently reading the Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been three orders of ministers in Christ's Church, bishops, priests, and deacons," our neighbours peremptorily deny holding an apostolic succession of presbyters, but rejecting the rule and government of them by bishops. Yet so important a part of discipline do we deem this to be, that whenever any of them desire to join our ministry, we reordain them, which we do not to Roman Catholics; the exceptions to this discipline of ours (if any) being so extremely few and so clearly done out of policy, rather than of church-discipline, in times of extraordinary confusion, that the exception proves the rule.

A still greater hindrance to union is found in a large and important body of Christians, who not only neglect, but absolutely deny baptism to infants, which, according to our service, the words of our Lord manifestly enjoin, and which the customs of the church universally maintained and practiced for fifteen hundred years. And we are the more encouraged in our view by the fact that a very large proportion of those who are called by the name Baptists are never baptized at all, and die without baptism.

There is again another body which would appear, if we only consulted the writings or practise of their great founder, to approach us very nearly, and to be almost members of the Church of England. What could apparently be more decisive on this point than is repeated declarations, up to the day of his death, that he would live and die in the communion of the Church of England, and would neither separate himself nor allow any of his preachers to be separated from it. Other counsels, however, prevailed after his death, and we are fully justified, under present circumstances, in considering them as a Presbyterian body, making frequent use of such parts of our Church services as appear to them to be edifying.

Some, it is true, in every country since the Reformation, have sought refuge in the Church of Rome, from a despairing feeling on the question of union, or from a hope that where infallible teaching was promised all painful doubts in their minds must be for ever set at rest. But as history plainly teaches us that even infallibles do not always agree, we come to the conclusion that it is foolish to sacrifice our undoubted privileges and blessings and begin the Christian life again as if we had been even heathens, it is more than foolish—it is absolutely sinful. One such illustrious name is indeed in every man's thoughts, but as an example to deter, rather than to induce us to follow it. For, as has been well-observed by an old and long-tried friend, familiar with the whole course of life of that eminent man who left us, "the only great work that he accomplished was the revival of the Church of England. His work in the Church of Rome has been arduous, but its fruits have been inconsiderable; what was good has been preserved, and what was evil has been rejected."

Others again, from a desire to enlist all the forces of Christendom against the noisy myrmidons of unbelief, would place in abeyance all the distinctive doctrines and disciplines of our church to secure favor with those who are firmly rooted in doctrine and discipline of their own. Soft words it is thought break no bones. But soft words are not solid arguments, and it is very doubtful whether those who charitably and stiffly maintain their own cause are not more respected in heart by their opponents than those who would give to the sturdy oak the suppleness of the willow, and abandon what they have pledged themselves again and again firmly to retain.

May I not say, without fear of contradiction from those who think and pray seriously and charitably over the dangers of the times, that there is a vast difference between schools of thought within the Church, limited and bounded by the sobriety of the Prayer Book, and rival sects absolutely free to choose or to reject all ancient landmarks of the faith?

Such schools of thought, we have, it is true, but if we consider the subjects on which various minds are exercised, is it any wonder that we have them? Does even inspiration itself entirely exclude them? When we read in the Acts that "certain came from James," and taught a different doctrine from that of St. Paul, may it not have been only an exaggerated impression of what St. James really taught? If it had pleased God that the epistle written by St. James had contained the whole New