

did not enter into Canon Woodgate's feelings.

The Rev. Dr. JEBB remarked that there was so much to be said on both sides that he felt very great difficulty. There was a great deal of force in what fell from Canon Woodgate. At the same time he should be very loth indeed to stand in the way of supplying what was an acknowledged want in the church. He fully coincided in the objections of Archdeacon Denison on the learning of the clergy. They stood in great jeopardy from the want of a sufficiently high standard of learning in the clergy, and he might also say that, from the habits of the clerical body at present, they were running great risk of the laity treading on their heels, and occupying the places that the clergy ought to occupy as theologians and as ritualists. He saw that the measure proposed implied the absorption into the ministry of the church of men of high position and of intellectual character and having other qualifications, and he could not help thinking that, unless there was great care taken on the part of the clergy to bring themselves up to the mark which was required at present, they would find themselves in a lower position than before. With regard to the paragraph in the report, he object to the term "new agency," believing that this agency was not new. He believed that there was always something analogous to this in the church. The officers of the church which St. Paul enumerated he thought implied that there were then some readers in the church, whether they called them catechists or evangelists, or by whatever other name they were called; and therefore when they restored it they were not to affirm any proposition that they were altering the organization of the church in any way, but merely reviving in substance that which had existed in the church from ancient times.

After some discussion as to the wording of the paragraph, it was eventually agreed to in the following form:—

From these and other considerations, we are of opinion that whatever increase may take place in the number of persons admitted to the Diaconate, a supplemental agency is also required, which shall be in accordance with our present ecclesiastical system.

The house then proceeded to the consideration of paragraph 6, and a discussion took place on the sentence, "That want no longer exists"—the want referred to being of persons duly qualified in respect of learning for admission into holy orders.—Sir George Provost and Archdeacon Denison objected to the expression, and the latter declaring that it was not true.

Dr. JEBB suggested that for "religious service," in the last sentence, should be substituted "religious offices or duties." He wished to guard against its being assumed that the laity had a right as such to perform any strictly religious service in the church. He could not discover any precedent in the ancient Church of the laity performing religious duties without they were employed in the Church in ancient times, their duties were limited to the reading of the Holy Scriptures, and that was only in a very limited degree. It was sometimes the privilege and the duty of the laity to perform divine service in the absence of the clergy, as in hospitals and some other places, were the head of the establishment was bound to read prayers and the Litany, there being no clergyman present to perform the duty,—but not in churches.—Mr. Masingberd had adduced as an instance of the apparent sanction of the Church to the employment of laymen in the regular service of the Church, the fact that in certain cathedrals the Litany was said or sung by laymen, but the Litany differed from the other services in this way. It has been always the custom to have the Litany

said or sung by more than one person—sometimes by two, three, four, and sometimes by five persons. But that was a representation of the voice not of the individuals, but of a certain order of persons in the Church. At the same time he was inclined to think that the singing of the Litany by laymen looked very like a corruption. It was a practice that never existed except in two or three cathedrals, as Lincoln, Exeter, and Lichfield, where the lay clerk assisted the reader; but in St. Paul's and in Hereford, which based its practice upon that of the metropolitan cathedral, the custom was for the Litany to be sung by persons in holy orders. It was possible that the contrary practice might have grown up from the Litany being considered more in the light of a song or psalm than an order of prayer, but in general it had been sung by the clergy, who in former times formed the grater part of the choir, as they ought to do at the present day. On the cessation of the minor orders at the Reformation there was no distinction between the two elements of the choir, the clerical and the lay. In Salisbury he believed that distinction was kept up longer than at any other cathedral. Originally it was not the custom to have the formularies of religion recited by any but Deacons, but afterwards, when choirs were reduced, the Presbyters were very few, and the Deacons diminished in numbers, the custom arose of delegating the duty to persons not in holy orders. The precedent was, nevertheless, a dangerous one, and he did not think it wise to follow it. It appeared to him that whereas part of this service was restricted to the Presbyters, the other, which was the response or supplication, should be delegated to laymen; but if they went back to the primitive Church they found no precedent whatever for the practice of employing laymen to recite or sing the Litany. In the rubric there was an express provision for the priest to say certain things, and for the people to say certain things, as, for instance, after the Lord's Prayer; and the occasion of this was probably to be found in the practice of the Greek Church, of introducing certain short supplications at intervals during the service. He, however, very much objected to following the precedent of the Oriental Churches by delegating any part of the service to laymen. It had been said that in the last revision a rubric was purposely altered, in order to allow laymen to read certain Lessons. He believed that was the case, but it was also matter of record that those particular Lessons had been read by laymen, under certain circumstances, ever since the Reformation. In the colleges, and in some of the cathedrals, as Rochester and Lichfield, the custom of having the First Lesson read by a layman had been continued up to a few years ago; but he did not believe that it had ever been the practice for laymen to read the Second Lesson, and if it did exist any where it was a corruption. They read in Archbishop Grindall that it was the custom for the lay clerk to read the Epistle; and in the last revision he (Dr. Jebb) believed it was so intended. But the rubric said, "The minister shall read," showing that the word minister was at that time of a more extended application than to persons in holy orders. He had spoken of his own cathedral, Hereford, which retained many of the ancient practices, and by its statutes followed the example of the cathedral of St. Paul's. There they had two bodies of minor clergy,—viz., the Minor Canons and the Vicars Choral. These were formerly distinct bodies, although now they were very much amalgamated; and the vicars choral was supposed to represent the lower order of the clergy, and the custom was for one of these two bodies to sing the Litany, and the other to read the

recited portions of the service. Besides these they had Sub-Deans, which in the statutes of Hereford were described as lay clerks, commonly called "Sub-Deans," and it was remarkable that no part of the service except that of joining in the choir in singing was ever assigned to them.

The Rev. F. C. Masingberd thought the point was one which it would be well to leave open. In colleges and some other places laymen were employed to read the service, but it was a question whether it would be proper to allow the divine Offices of the Church to be read by a laymen when any clergyman was present.

Ultimately the paragraph was adopted with the verbal alterations suggested.

The committee then proceeded to consider paragraph 7; on the proposition of Sir GEORGE PROVOST it was agreed to omit the words "on the ground of erroneous teaching or immoral conduct." The expression "being subject to ecclesiastical jurisdiction," were also struck out as unnecessary.

Sir GEORGE PREVOST suggested that instead of being left to the nomination of the incumbent, it should be "or of the clergyman in charge of the parish."

Canon HERVEY was of opinion that the appointment should be left in the hands of the incumbent and the Bishop. There might be instances in which a misunderstanding might arise between the incumbent and the curate, who might insist upon the retention of a Reader who did not possess the confidence of his superior. He hoped the passage would be expunged altogether, or words inserted which would provide that nobody should be nominated contrary to the wishes of the incumbent.

The Rev. H. MACKENZIE thought "the incumbent or his legal representative" would answer all purposes, and he would propose an amendment to that effect. It might be that the clergyman was non-resident, and it would be most unfair to empower him to interfere with the hardworking and faithful curate so as to paralyse his arm. A large latitude ought to be allowed to the person who really did the work.

The Rev. H. RANDOLPH was of opinion that they had no right to ignore the rights of the incumbent, and it would, therefore, be better to leave the passage as it stood.

The Rev. H. MACKENZIE's amendment was then put, and upon a show of hands the number were—for the amendment, 11; against, 15; majority, 4.

The amendment was consequently rejected.

The Rev. L. ACLAND moved the omission of the words "with the solemnity of a public service in the church," on the ground that it would be constituting a fourth order in the Church, and would require the preparation of a special service.

Lord A. COMPTON opposed the amendment, which was rejected without a division; as also was an amendment by Lord A. COMPTON, that the service should be "without the imposition of hands."

The paragraph, as amended, was then agreed to. The concluding paragraph of the report was agreed to without discussion.

Dr. WORDSWORTH then moved that the report should be framed into a representation, and carried to the Upper House.

The motion was seconded by Archdeacon MOORE, and unanimously carried.

THE
Canadian Ecclesiastical Gazette
IS PUBLISHED TWICE A MONTH,
BY HENRY ROWSELL, TORONTO.