

deemer—"Feed my lambs," *cannot* in the vast majority of cases receive more than the shadow of observance, if even so much.

These are the consequences of the lack of labourers which we complain of. The importance of fully apprehending those consequences must be my excuse for so long an introduction.

We are now to inquire what prospect there is of remedying this state of things. The remedy, I think, cannot be found while we continue to follow strictly our present system of employing none in Ministerial duties but persons of Academical education. This is easily demonstrated. The existing number of Clergy fully doubled would not more than meet our positive wants. Undoubtedly, so large an increase, or even much less, would create a wonderful feeling of relief, and for some time would put an end to all complaining; but it would not more than meet actual wants; and we are now considering not how a temporary relief may be obtained, but in what way a full and permanent provision may be made for the work of the Ministry, for the edifying of the Body of Christ. Now, let me ask, is there the remotest probability of increasing twofold the present relation of the number of the Clergy to the Laity, within the next fifty years? I see none judging from the past history of the British Provinces and the American Church.* We know that but a small proportion of our present clergy are entirely supported by the people—not more, perhaps, in this Diocese than *one-third*, and in the newer Dioceses, and in those of Eastern Canada, a still smaller proportion. Yet we are straitened to do so much. But if our numbers were doubled, then *four-thirds* of the Clergy would have to be supported by voluntary contributions—i. e. the Church would have to raise a sum not very far from *four times* what it does at present. And can it be believed that there is any likelihood of this being done? Oh, that the hearts of our people were enlarged—for then it could; but to bring about the high state of spiritual cultivation and productiveness required for this, the means themselves are wanting. Any very serious advance, in the *proportion* of religious contributions, we are not justified in speedily expecting—much less their *quadrupling*.

Can we do nothing, then? or nothing that will render our available resources more effective for good? Despair, certainly, is no part of our creed, and should be no part of our practice. If we find our present system not

* The official reports of all the Dioceses to the General Convention of 1859, show that at that time about 1400 parishes enjoyed the full services of one or more Clergymen; 300 parishes had only half services, or less; leaving about 400 parishes vacant! And though both Clergy and Laity have increased since 1859, the proportions have probably not changed, except perhaps, for the worse, by the removal of so many pastors from the parish to the camp. During the 15 years, from 1841 to 1859, our parishes, pastors, and people were just about doubled, while the candidates for Orders increased in less than half the same ratio. When to keep pace with the growth of the church, they ought to have been 400, they were less than 300! From 1830 to 1840, our Clergy increased at the rate of 10 per cent. per annum. But from 1850 to 1860 the rate of increase was less than 4 per cent. per annum!

From Report of "Society for the increase of the Ministry."

meeting the requirements of the Church, should we not bethink ourselves of going back to first principles, and ask ourselves, *Are we doing the Lord's work in the Lord's way—or in our own?* For God's work, He has Himself created agencies, and prescribed the manner in which they are to be used. Now the chief agency for the perfecting of the saints, for the edifying of the Body of Christ, is the *Holy Ministry*—itself a Divine gift, and its powers given of God. This is a treasure not to be impaired, but to be jealously guarded. If any part of this agency, or any of its powers should be lost, the fault is ours; for the Divine Author of the ministry intended it to endure "till we all come to a perfect man." Of this the Church of England is fully convinced as a *theory*. Witness her Ember prayer: "Almighty God, the giver of all good gifts, who of thy *divine providence* hast appointed *Divers Orders* in Thy church." Witness the whole Ordinal—Witness the countless volumes of polemics which maintain the three Orders of Bishop, Priest, and Deacon, against all sectaries. *We have the Ministry*—but have we it as God intended it should be used? In several points I believe we have not. I shall confine the following observations to the Order of Deacons. This order we have but do we use it *orderly*?

To answer this question we must inquire what are the *duties* and *powers* belonging to this Order. Now this inquiry is fully met by the Ordinal of the English Church in the following words: "It appertaineth to the office of a Deacon in the Church where he shall be appointed to serve, to assist the Priest in divine Service; and *specially* when he ministereth the Holy Communion, to help him in the distribution thereof, and to read Holy Scriptures and Homilies in the Church; and to instruct the youth in the Catechism; in the absence of the Priest to baptize infants, and to preach, if he be admitted thereto by the Bishop. And furthermore, it is his office, when provision is so made, to search for the sick, poor, and impotent people of the parish, to intimate their estates, names, and places where they dwell, unto the curate, that by his exhortation they may be relieved with the alms of the parishioners, or others." In this statement our Prayer Book is a perfect daguerreotype of primitive doctrine and usage. The learned investigations of the most competent and trustworthy explorers of Christian antiquity, through of different Schools of doctrine, such as Neander, Bingham, and Suicer, conduct us to the same result, tallying completely with our Ordinal. They represent the Deacon as not allowed to celebrate Baptism (ordinarily) or the Eucharist, nor to preach (in our modern sense.) The preaching so frequently ascribed to them was of a literal sort—the giving of public notices and directions in Divine Service. they instructed Catechumens, they read the Gospel, they assisted in the celebration of the Sacraments, and they had the management of the temporalities of the Church entrusted to them in a great degree. But to teach publicly, they were not allowed. Only in "cases of exigence," says Bingham, they might read the Homilies of the Fathers.

We boast of antiquity—are our Deacons after this ancient model? Emphatically, No! The