

A CHARGE

DELIVERED IN

CHRIST-CHURCH CATHEDRAL,

FREDERICTON,

SEPTEMBER 13th, 1865,

AT THE TRIENNIAL VISITATION,

BY

JOHN, BISHOP OF FREDERICTON.

McClary

PUBLISHED AT THE REQUEST OF THE CLERGY PRESENT.

SAINT JOHN, N. B.:

WM. M. WRIGHT,

DESPATCH PRINTING AND PUBLISHING OFFICE,
PRINCE WILLIAM STREET.

1865.

A CHARGE

DELIVERED IN

CHRIST-CHURCH CATHEDRAL,

FREDERICTON,

SEPTEMBER 13th, 1865,

AT THE TRIENNIAL VISITATION,

BY

JOHN, BISHOP OF FREDERICTON,

PUBLISHED AT THE REQUEST OF THE CLERGY PRESENT.

SAINT JOHN, N. B.:

WM. M. WRIGHT,

DESPATCH PRINTING AND PUBLISHING OFFICE,

PRINCE WILLIAM STREET.

1865.



REVEREND AND DEAR BRETHREN,—

IF at our former Visitations I have met you with anxiety from the loss of valued brethren, or other trying circumstances, much more do I now feel the weight of the burden laid upon me when our infant Church is subjected to a heavier trial, and the great question of the personal attachment of our scattered and disjointed members is daily before us. It would ill become one who has been spared so long to preside over you, to be distrustful of God's gracious providence, which has, in so many instances, watched over us. But I may be pardoned for feeling a great fear, lest through our negligence, the blessings which have been hitherto secured to our flocks by the liberality of our fellow-Churchmen at home, should now, in some degree, be lost to us.

I may remind you that, on three several occasions, first in a charge delivered in the year 1856, again in the year 1859, and still more pointedly in 1862, I brought before you, and through you before the laity generally, the necessity of adopting speedily some well considered measure to meet the difficulty which was sure to come upon us. I showed you, from the unquestionable experience of our brethren in dioceses bordering on your own, and equal to it in wealth and population, that the voluntary system had failed to secure for their pastors an adequate support, and that a very small number of clergy, in proportion to our own body, was maintained in these dioceses. I dwelt at length on the misery of abandoning our missions, and of exposing our flocks to the ravages of infidelity, or to the pernicious teaching of those whose doctrines and discipline we cannot approve.

In my last charge I entered at length on the duty of contributing to so worthy an object, and endeavoured to reply to such objections as might be urged against the contribution. Unhappily, the history of Church-endowment seems to be the history of individual enterprize and affection, rather than that of a general duty recognized by all the members of the Church. As far as my knowledge extends, the endowment of churches in England belongs to past generations, rather than to the present; and most men, (with some few splendid exceptions,) are content to contribute to build churches, leaving the pastors to be provided for as they may. I mark this great failure of Churchmen in all parts of the world; and it is the more noticeable in England, where, in the great majority of parishes, the continuous services of the Church are provided for by the abundant liberality of past ages. The notion that such liberality is to be ascribed to the powerful influence of the clergy, to the fear of purgatory, or even to other less worthy motives, which, as a general rule, I greatly doubt, only reflects, if true, the more severely on those who profess to be influenced by a purer zeal, and to be delivered from all superstitious fear. If our religion be purer, if our motives be higher than those of others, why are not our works of mercy more large and liberal? If the terrors of purgatory no longer compel us,

why does not the love of Christ constrain us? But the members of the best endowed churches sit by in careless indifference, content to enjoy all the assistance which either the Crown, or other benefactors, have bestowed on them, receiving an income adequate to secure for them the services of an able and intelligent pastor, and practically disowning the duty of ministering to the spiritual needs of those who are too poor, too scattered, and often too thoughtless, to be able to provide fully for themselves. That warning which the inspired writer gives to the indolent, may well be addressed to the spiritually indifferent in our own days:—"Go to the ant, thou sluggard, consider her ways and be wise; which having no guide, overseer, or ruler," prompted only by the secret working of a heaven-imparted instinct, "provideth her meat in the summer, and gathereth her food in the harvest." Small and unintelligent as she seems to the unobservant eye, she is not content to live from hand to mouth, and make no provision for the future. She lays up in harvest a wise store for the winter. She provides for the future wants of a numerous and orderly population. And observe the contrast:—"Yet a little sleep, a little slumber, a little folding of the hands to sleep"; a little more indifference to our real wants, and our real dangers, and the necessity of strenuous and combined exertion, "so shall thy poverty come as one that travelleth," swiftly, speedily, and before you expect it; "and thy want as an armed man." The pressure of the evil thou mightest have averted shall be upon thee, when thou shalt be both defenceless and secure. And the fear is, that so it may be with us. Whilst we sleep, spiritual poverty will wake, and the enemy will come in like a flood before our defences are raised, or our preparations completed. The answer to which admonition, I presume, is, that we are all labouring to promote this object by means of our Diocesan Church Society, and that the effects of this labour are everywhere felt in the diocese. But the rejoinder to this answer is, that the sums contributed to the Society do not in any degree answer to the incomes men receive from professional sources, and from commerce. Comparing what is wasted by intemperance and extravagance, what is spent on the luxuries of life, especially on house-building and house-furnishing, even in rural districts, with the sums given to the Church Society, the amount is miserably small. In some years, men are blessed with an unusually large and signal success. Then one would like to see a more abundant contribution of a permanent kind. And a few might combine to effect the endowment of a parish, which is poor, and unable to supply its own wants.*

*To shew how far we are, as yet, from bringing the duty home to every Church-man, I observe that the Church Society's Report for 1865 gives a list of about 400 subscribers in St. John, including Portland and Carleton. This would give us about 2,000, if we suppose the 400 to represent heads of families, which in many cases they do not. But according to the census, there are 8866 Church people in St. John; so that less than one fourth of the number are subscribers. And no doubt the observation would apply to other places in the Province.

The matter, however, now presses on us in a way that must be met one way or the other. Either we must rise to the emergency, and surmount the difficulty, or we shall be crushed by it.

Having been requested by the Committee appointed by the Diocesan Church Society, to endeavour "personally to see the Committee of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and if possible, bring the long pending negotiation relative to its grants to this diocese to a close." I lost no time in repairing to London, and was enabled to be present at the June meeting of the Committee of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. I found that the grants made to all the Colonies had already been the subject of repeated discussion, and that the terms of our future relations had been virtually settled by the Report of a Sub-Committee, all members, I believe, of the General Board. These terms, modified slightly, so as to be somewhat more favourable to us, were adopted unanimously by the General Committee, and have since been sanctioned by the Board, and are as follows :—

1. After January 1, 1866, no missionary on the Society's list, in this diocese, is to draw directly on the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, but on the Church Society of the province, for his salary.

2. In lieu of the present stipends paid by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, the Society entrust to the Bishop and the Church Society the sum of £2,860 stg., leaving it to them to arrange with the clergy as to the sums to be paid to them.

3. This sum of £2,860 is to be continued undiminished for the next three years, i. e., till January 1, 1869.

4. In addition to this sum, the Society charges itself with pensions to two clergymen and seven widows, amounting to £550 per annum, so long as these pensioners live.

You may naturally expect from me some remarks on this determination of the Society at home.

1. It is useless to discuss the question whether the former terms offered by the Society in the year 1861 were, or were not, more favourable than the terms offered to us in 1865. It is sufficient for me to state distinctly, that those terms were accepted unanimously by us at the Annual Meeting of our Church Society; that the acceptance of the terms was plainly announced to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and that the negotiation fell through; not from any fault or tardiness on our part, but because we never could obtain from the Committee the names of the clergy, and other pensioners, whom we were expected to pay, with the sums to be paid to them. In that case, we certainly cannot charge ourselves with any want of readiness to discharge our duty to the Church. What I now state to you has been more than once brought under the notice of the Committee of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, but no notice whatever has been taken of it.

2. I am, however, of opinion that if so great a change in our relations

to the Society at home be necessary or desirable at this time, that there are advantages which cannot be overlooked in having the whole sum placed at our disposal ; because in the case of deaths, the Church here will be better able to decide how the money shall be employed ; and should any death occur during the next three years, we shall so far obtain a temporary advantage to the fund from it.

3. At the same time, it is only fair to ourselves that I should publicly state, what you no doubt must all see to be the disadvantages to the missionaries, of such a scheme.

I have no doubt that every missionary in the province paid in whole, or in part, by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, feels his security somewhat impaired by so great, and, as some may think, undesirable a change in the mode of payment. When the older missionaries, thirty or forty years ago, embarked in the service of the Society, the offer which was made to them was, that on their ordination, and after proceeding to the then Diocese of Nova Scotia, they would receive £200 stg. a year from the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and that the people would be called on to pay £50 a year, and to provide a parsonage house. After some years service, without, as far as I can discover, any fault alleged on the part of the missionaries, this income was reduced 25 per cent. This they regarded, very naturally, as a breach of faith ; nor am I able to state on what grounds the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel professed to justify it, unless it be that the Parliamentary grant of £16000 a year had been withdrawn from them. The £16,000 fact is undoubted : and the missionaries submitted to the reduction. But they will, no doubt, feel themselves still more hardly used by the present change ; because, though there is no reason to doubt, that, for the next three years, their income will be secured without any very serious reduction, yet, should they live beyond that period, and the Society at home should contemplate another still larger reduction, they may be exposed to great embarrassment.

Be this as it may, it would, no doubt, have seemed more like a business transaction, carried out on principles accepted by all men of probity in their dealings with one another, that the Society at home should have continued to fulfil its engagements to all those missionaries who remained in its service until death, to whom at the time when they entered that service, no hint was given that the offer of salary was limited and temporary. No man, after twenty or more years of faithful labour, likes to be turned adrift, and the responsibility he was led to think would never be denied shifted to other men's shoulders ; whilst we freely admit, that, in all cases, where the Society's engagements with a man entering the ministry, was only for five or ten years, it is at perfect liberty to free itself from all advances at the end of the definite time proposed and accepted by both parties to the engagement. This determination of the Society will press with special hardship on those, whose failing health, after many years exposure to a severe climate,

renders them incapable of long and continuous exertion. They might well suppose, that the small pittance granted to them, (and it is small in every instance,) would be gratefully continued, rather than parsimoniously denied, and that the sharp edge of reduction would not be turned on the weakness of their few declining years.

Much of this is no doubt owing to the persevering efforts of a few zealous members of the Committee, bent on withdrawing all aid to the North American Colonies, at all hazards, and aided in this resolve by the profound ignorance which everywhere prevails among educated Englishmen of our place, our usefulness, our feelings, and our interests; and by the conviction entertained by many at home that it is necessary, as they more pithily than compassionately express it, to turn the screw on, and to screw us hard, or we shall do nothing for ourselves.

Considering that during the time I have presided over you, the number of clergy has increased twofold, the contributions to the Church Society sixfold, and the contributions of the laity to the support of the clergy and other Church objects have also largely increased, whilst in almost every town the Society at home has withdrawn its assistance, and the provincial laity have taken the burden on themselves, it cannot be said with justice that we have done nothing to help ourselves. That we have done all that it is our duty to do, or that there are no supine and inactive members among us, I am very far from affirming. But this I may without fear of contradiction assert, that in the endowed Church of England, there are few parishes which so much require the assistance either of an endowment, or of benevolent Christians not residing in the parish, as the scattered country missions in New Brunswick.

The great question, however, now before us, as it is before all men in daily life, is, what is to be done? And how shall we best prepare ourselves to meet the difficulty? The clergy may be divided into four classes.

1. Those who receive no support whatever from the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, or who receive it in the parishes which might exert themselves to relieve the Society at once from the contribution. In some of these parishes the laity have as great a burden laid upon them as they can discharge for the maintenance of their own clergy, and we cannot reasonably look to them to help us. In a very few, where the endowments are considerable, we naturally and reasonably hope both for assistance and advice in the present emergency.

2. The second class of clergy consists of six only, who were ordained and taken into the Society's list before the year 1833. These clergy, according to the terms now offered by the Society, are entitled to a salary of £150 stg. per annum, to a retiring pension of £100 stg. for life, on their obtaining a certificate of approval from the Bishop, and to a pension of £50 stg. per annum for their widows, should they leave widows surviving. They were, with few exceptions, ordained upon the Society's title, in which these terms were distinctly set out.

It would be a shameful breach of faith if these terms were not com-

plied with. In no one of these cases is the clergyman in possession of a well endowed parish; in every one of them he has laboured for more than thirty years on a small income; and in no single instance are his private means sufficient to support him. If the block sum now granted to us were continued till the death of these clergy, there would be no difficulty in our complying with the same conditions; but if it be reduced, I see a great difficulty and a manifest injustice in the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel throwing upon our shoulders the support of clergymen, and of the widows of deceased clergymen, who were sent out to North America long before the Diocese of Fredericton existed, and with whom a precise and definite compact was made at the time of their ordination, the terms of which, on the part of the clergymen, have been diligently observed. Against this I have strenuously protested, and shall continue to do so at every fitting opportunity.

3. The third class of clergy is more numerous, and consists of those who have neither retiring pension nor pension for a widow secured to them by the terms of their agreement with the Society, but to whom it was never intimated, when they received holy orders, that the engagement with the Society was only for a limited period. Some of these clergy have been connected with the Society for nearly thirty years, and were ordained by the then Bishop of Nova Scotia. I regard their case as a hard one. They have no prospective advantage from pensions to themselves or their widows; they are labouring, many of them, in very poor missions; they have committed no offence for which they ought to be deprived of their salaries; and the Church Society, with its present amount of income, is unable to make up so large a deficiency.

4. The fourth class consists of clergy to whom it has been intimated by the Society, that the engagement made with them was only for a limited period. There is no injustice in the Society adhering to its expressed determination in their case. But it is no doubt an equal hardship to deprive them of their means of subsistence, and it would be a vast injury to the Church to abandon the missions which they serve.

The most practical method of meeting the difficulty before us appears to me to be this. The sum promised to us for the next three years is £2,860 stg. This leaves a deficiency of £37 10s. stg., withdrawn during the half year ending June 30, 1865, to January 1, 1866; and £400 sterling to be withdrawn in the year 1866, minus the sum of £150, being Dr. Thomson's salary, which is included in the sum of £2,860. We have therefore £287, 10s. stg. altogether to provide for annually, or about £345 currency. This must be raised before the end of the next year, or such portion of it as will enable us to pay the missionaries from January 1, 1866, to July 1866, when the Church Society meets; and I think it not at all beyond our means to raise this sum by supplementary subscriptions, or augmented subscriptions to the Church Society for the next three years. We must remember that if this is

not done, the deficiency must fall somewhere. Either the loss must be divided equally amongst the existing clergy, or two or three of them must be deprived of their incomes altogether. It will however become a matter of absolute necessity to consider in detail the wants, and the ability to contribute, of all the parishes in the diocese which receive pecuniary aid from the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and to insist, as a matter of justice to the rest, that their contributions shall be made proportionable to their means; or that they will, within a certain period of time, lose the benefit of religious services.

We must also be prepared to take into review, and calmly and impartially consider the whole question of Church missions within the diocese; what missions may be made (with proper energy on the part of the parishioners) self-supporting; what places require urgently our help, and where, if we are obliged to withdraw altogether, our withdrawal will be attended with the least injury. On these points it will be our object to obtain and to impart the fullest information.

I must not pass over the important question of a general endowment fund. It is evident to me, and will appear equally plain, I should think, to many others, that a sum of money invested for this purpose, which might without difficulty have been raised, would have served us effectually at this crisis. But the opportunity was lost, and I know not whether now it can be recovered. I should be more inclined at the present time to advise you to press the duty of local endowments in all cases where it is possible. Much more might be done in this way than the fainthearted and timorous imagine. You have all seen the Cathedral spring into existence; you have known a heavy debt wiped away, and a hearty support given to the clergy in it; why should not each separate pastor in his own sphere begin an endowment for his own mission, or add to the small glebe which, in many cases, has begun to yield a limited and scanty support? A general fund seems, indeed, more magnificent, but a parochial endowment interests a larger number of persons in its behalf; and men are often found to give or bequeath money to the parish where their lives have been spent, when they would give nothing to a general fund under the control of a committee. No delicacy need be felt in urging that from which we shall, personally, derive little or no benefit, and which will tend to secure to the laity those privileges which they have so long enjoyed. Nor need you be deterred by any objections to subscribing for the benefit of posterity, or by any other of the thousand excuses for covetousness, which some will ever make. If there be those among us who profess to think the yoke of the clergy hard, I can tell them that the yoke of practical atheism and irreligion, and even of some forms of religion, is much harder than our own. History ought to convince them that those who drove out the clergy at the time of the great rebellion, and brake that yoke asunder, soon found themselves compelled to bear severer burdens, and were very glad, after a few years' experience, to take

the clergy back again. Put the matter before your people in as plain language, as conciliatory a manner, and as frequently as you can, listening to every reasonable objection, and furnishing a reasonable answer, and something will be done. For I cannot help saying, that if we had been thoroughly in earnest about the Endowment Fund when it was first proposed, it would not have so entirely fallen to the ground.

But I must proceed now to another question of practical importance to us all.

You have been informed of the nature of the late decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the question between the Bishops of Capetown and of Natal. And you may have read with astonishment that the decision affects the whole Colonial Church, and that when her Majesty was advised to issue letters patent to bishops about to reside in colonies possessing independent legislatures, she exceeded the powers vested in her by the constitution ; and consequently, that these letters patent did not carry with them all the powers supposed to belong to them. This decision need not, however, take us entirely by surprise, as I have been informed, for some years past, by high legal authorities in the province, that it would not be safe to trust for coercive jurisdiction to the power supposed to be given by the letters patent to myself, or to rely upon their authority in this respect, in the courts of law. Happily for me, and for us all, the question has never been raised. It may, however, afford reasonable ground for astonishment, that those who are learned in the law, and were called in specially to advise her Majesty in the exercise of her powers, should never have been able, or should never have taken the trouble to ascertain precisely the extent of those powers ; and should have allowed the Queen's name to be used, and her Majesty's seal affixed to documents which the highest legal functionaries judicially pronounce to be defective. Still more surprising is it, that the same learned and acute functionary, who informs the world of the defect of these letters patent, should himself have drawn them up, only a few years since, for the benefit of the Metropolitan See of Capetown ; thus pronouncing sentence, not so much upon the Bishop, as upon his own acts. Such a decision, however, does not, as it appears to me, deprive us of any power that is specially important. In considering its effects upon the Bishop of the diocese, upon the clergy who are placed under his supervision, and on the laity to whom it is his duty to minister, we must recollect that if bishops, in legal acceptance, be " creatures of law," this is nothing more than all persons are, who are subject to the laws of their country. But this is only one part, and not the most important part of our office and function. The law may or may not entrust us with certain legal powers, which we are bound faithfully to use, according as " this realm " has imparted them to us ; but if the realm, or the Sovereign who represents the realm, have no such power to impart, we have not the special legal power her Majesty assured us that we had—that is all. No fault or

neglect of ours has forfeited the power we were supposed to have. We never sought the power. It was voluntarily offered; and now we are told, that when it was offered, it was not in the Sovereign's power to give it. We leave that question to be settled by those who ought to have known better than to offer the advice. But it is admitted by all that the Queen has power to issue her mandate for our consecration. That mandate was issued. The consecration was duly performed. The spiritual power vested in us of ordaining men to feed Christ's flock, of confirming the young, of governing and feeding the flock, of correcting and punishing "according to such authority as you have by God's word," was by the Archbishop of the province, with other com-provincial bishops, then and there committed to us. This is the authority we most value; this is the commission on which we have acted for twenty years past, and on which, as long as life and health are spared us, we shall continue to act; and no Judicial Committee can deprive us of spiritual powers, which no such body was empowered to entrust to us. Legal questions, arising out of a difficulty not made by our own misconduct, but by ill advice of others, we need not fear, nor even anticipate; and we feel assured they will do us no harm. They will settle themselves, should circumstances arise which render a settlement necessary. But even as regards the temporal question, the position of the Bishop of this diocese is safe in several important points. The Duke of Newcastle, late Colonial Minister, in his letter to Sir P. E. Wodehouse, K. C. B., dated 4th February, 1864, affirms, that "he is aware of no reason for supposing the letters patent to be invalid otherwise than as they may assume to grant coercive jurisdiction." The confirmation which, it is said, the letters patent required at the hands of the colonial legislature, has been given in a great number of Provincial Acts to his title, and to his corporate powers. By virtue of those Acts, which cannot be repealed without subverting the whole course of law, he holds lands in trust to the Lord Bishop of Fredericton and his successors for ever; his consent as Bishop of the diocese and under the aforesaid title is made necessary to the sale of lands, he is constitutionally and legally the head of the Diocesan Church Corporation, and nothing is wanting which the letters patent were supposed to confer, but coercive jurisdiction. But it may be observed, that coercive jurisdiction is necessarily the exception, not the rule of the Bishop's proceedings. No wise bishop would desire to coerce, when he could persuade; nor would he rush headlong into law, when he could possibly avoid it. And even as regards the letters patent, take them at their best, it was obvious that their language was, in certain respects, ambiguous; that several matters necessary to the due regulation of a criminal court were not provided for by them, and that the whole question of criminal proceedings at law, and appeal after decision, was so intricate, uncertain, and expensive, that if I ever had any enemies in the province, they would never have had more signal occasion to rejoice

than that, on the strength of the letters patent, I should have erected a legal court, and sought to establish legal decisions of my own. Into that difficulty, though often urged, and sometimes even provoked, I have, by God's good providence, never been permitted to fall. I have, by His merciful help, endeavoured to administer spiritual discipline, and to punish the disobedient and criminous, and have, I thank God for it, succeeded without courts of law; and though there have been cases, in which persuaion and admonition have failed, yet in those instances, and they are very few, no letters patent, no court of law, much less my own court, would have given me any help whatsoever. Though therefore some timorous and mistrustful persons, forgetful of God's good providence, and of the promises of care and protection made by the great Head of the Church to his ministers, have taken alarm at the recent decision, and have come rashly to the conclusion that the powers of the Colonial Episcopate are all swept away, that bishops are without title, mission, or jurisdiction, and that their powers are altogether placed in abeyance, they will speedily find themselves mistaken. The Church of England in all parts of the world, within the Queen's dominions, has too deep a hold, morally and spiritually, on the affections and consciences of its members, to lead them to wish the power and authority of its bishops, when exercised within reasonable limits, to be destroyed or even diminished. All honourable men among the clergy will agree, that no decision of the Privy Council, narrowed as it is to a single point of law, can absolve them from their solemn oaths of canonical obedience to the Bishop, or render null and void all their subscriptions and declarations. These oaths and subscriptions are a contract which the clergy have voluntarily entered into, and cannot now conscientiously set aside; and the principles laid down by the Judicial Committee in the case between the Bishop of Capetown and Mr. Long, clearly show that whatsoever partakes of the nature of a contract, will be held binding by the law, and may even yet be enforced, where it is made evident that a contract has been made, and that acts have been committed subversive of the contract voluntarily undertaken. Nor would the rightminded laity of the Church, I am persuaded, willingly see the clergy set free from all engagements to their Bishop, and the Bishop deprived of all power to be an effectual overseer of their conduct. Every layman who has well considered the subject, knows that the Bishop is entrusted with reasonable and limited power for the protection of the laity in matters of faith. If he may not ordain but under certain restrictions, if he is bound to require certain oaths, subscriptions, and declarations, he is only fulfilling the promises made at his own consecration, and the rules set him by the Church for the common benefit of all; rules which are the result of long experience, the fruit of ages and wise consideration, which are the framework of our spiritual society, and preserve it from being carried about with every wind of doctrine. The terms "Gospel," and "preaching the Gospel," which some would

consider sufficient to decide every question, and secure the flock against unfaithful shepherds, are far too vague, and admit of too many different interpretations, to guard against error. For who is to decide what the Gospel is in each special case? Is the decision to be left to the flock over which the pastor presides? As there is never likely to be a case of a congregation perfectly unanimous, the majority would decide, and the minority would be left unrepresented; and the whole system of Church doctrine and discipline, which is now guarded by the rules enforced by the Bishop, would fall into a modified congregationalism, our flocks being so many separate units, having no bond of union, no security for a continuance in the faith, no tie to keep them together. It may possibly be objected, that the possession of the Scriptures is sufficient for this purpose. But as all Christians enjoy access to the sacred records, yet most widely differ, it has been found practically, that no denomination is without some collateral security for the maintenance of their own tenets. Whether it be the traditional system of Roman Catholics, the Westminster Confession, the deed of Conference, the Baptist Union, or the Church of England Articles and Subscriptions, there is sure to be some test, and some authority to enforce it. Those who reject Episcopacy have a stringent way of their own, a power felt, if not openly acknowledged, to act upon the consciences, and often on the temporal concerns of men; and if they act wisely in so doing in their generation, and according to their views, we should certainly act most unwisely in diminishing the power of any bond which enables us to act together, so as to preserve the trust committed to us. For we claim to be trustees for the faith once delivered to the Saints. The dogmatic teaching of our liturgy and articles, no less than the solemn protests contained in them, require of our clergy distinct guarantees that our teachings will be in accordance with the truths there set forth; and the Bishop acts as the representative, so to speak, of the other trustees, to enforce the guarantee of fidelity to the trust. Even should the general tendency of the late decision, or the mode in which it was expressed, be supposed to lean towards the weakening of the bonds of faith, and the removing the line of demarcation between belief and unbelief, we should, I think, act wisely in not ascribing too much importance to it. Certainly, we should not give it a moral significance, which the framers of the decision manifestly disclaim. It is a legal construction, narrowed to the smallest point, and not affecting the merits of the case, of a penal statute; it forbids nothing that the Scriptures and the Church require of us as articles of faith, and only allows doubts to be entertained, or hopes expressed, without penal consequences, but without affirming the legitimacy of these doubts, or the reasonableness of these hopes; and it is to be specially noted, that the points affected by that decision, are those on which the articles of our Church supply us with no definition, and are less positive than on most doctrines of our faith.

Far be it from me to say one word, which should appear, even by implication, to weaken the confidence of any in the inspiration of Holy Scripture; yet candour obliges me to admit, that the popular view of inspiration as often goes beyond the facts of the case, as the doctrines propounded by the essayists fall within, or ignore them. For the notion that the English version of the Bible, in every syllable and letter of it, is as much the dictation of the Holy Ghost, as the Commandments written by the finger of God on tables of stone, certainly is not in accordance with fact. We can only recommend it as a faithful and successful attempt, manifestly blessed and honoured by God, to convey to the English mind the sense of that Word, which by its profound depth of meaning, its manifold aspects of thought, its singular method of preservation, and the difficulty of interpreting rightly the two chief languages in which it was originally written, transcends all power of translation, and leaves the ordinary reader in ignorance of much of the force, and occasionally of the meaning of the idiomatic expressions of the original. Recognizing, as we may fairly do, our English version as one of the most successful and accurate representations of the Word, we must allow that, in numerous places, it admits of amendment; and we should be slow to frame theories of inspiration, when we know that these theories will be practically applied by thousands, not to God's Word itself, but to our English representation of that Word. We are thankful for the widespread and general conviction of all Christians in all Churches, that the Old and New Testament taken together, are true and infallible guides to purity of morals and soundness of faith, and may be implicitly trusted to lead us aright in the way to salvation. So far even a Roman Catholic will probably go with us, reserving to himself the question into which I need now enter, as to what is the true source, and who is the proper interpreter of Scripture. And so far the Scripture itself points to our conclusion, when an inspired writer declares that every Scripture inspired by God, is profitable for religious "doctrine, reproof, correction, instruction in righteousness." But on several other very important questions the Bible gives us no information whatever. It does not tell us, what is nevertheless an undoubted fact, that for three centuries after Christ's ascension, the canon of Scripture was not precisely and accurately formed; that wide differences existed as to the authorship of particular books; that the precise number of the sacred books was finally agreed upon by the voice of the Church, not made known to us by any inspired person; that many and important variations occur in the manuscripts of the New Testament, which no inspired author can help us to settle; that an important difference is found in the chronology of the Hebrew, Septuagint, and Samaritan texts of the book of Genesis, which still remains unsolved; that other chronological difficulties wait for a solution, and that in regard to the Scriptural account of the creation of our present world, we neither have sufficient information at what point of time the inspired narrative begins, nor has

there been yet produced an interpretation in all respects satisfactory, which leaves no doubt that the author of the book of Genesis was inspired by God to teach mankind the system of the world, as indicated by the researches of modern science. Yet after making allowance for all these difficulties, which it is worse than useless to ignore, or deny, how wide is the difference between the reverent admission, that the right conclusion on many points is a complicated and by no means easy task, and the hazardous and irreverent speculation, which deprives the whole body of the sacred volume of all historical truth. Science itself is in its infancy, as regards the development of the mundane system ; and it might reasonably be expected, that, with our very imperfect information, our interpretation of the Scriptures, and our deductions from Nature, would be found at times to clash. But on the truth of the main facts connected with religious truth, the whole system of Christian doctrine rests. If these facts are denied, our belief in the doctrine fails. Whereas in regard to the connection of the Bible with scientific discovery, it is frequently a traditional interpretation, or a misunderstanding of what the Bible requires us to believe, or to take for granted, that is overthrown. The Scripture rests on moral evidence peculiar to itself, and independent of the deductions of the philosopher. The reception of one part of the volume by the whole Jewish nation, and of both Testaments by the Christian Church, the originality, purity, and sublimity of its moral and religious teaching, its depth, its penetration into the heart of man, its power over his conscience, its consolation of his woes, its exhibition of sin in all its baseness, and of the Saviour in his transcendent loveliness and greatness, its prophecies amply fulfilled in the history of the past, its miracles abundantly attested by contemporary witnesses, and confirmed by their analogy with God's work in the heart of man, its undesigned coincidences, and the simple, sincere, and blameless manners of the writers of a life such as no men ever conceived but the four Evangelists, such as no man ever would have dreamed of, had he not seen it before his own eyes, such as no man ever led but Jesus of Nazareth, this evidence, in part, capable of being understood and felt by the most simple, as a whole, appealing with accumulated force to the understandings of the wisest, is sufficient for our conviction, without a logical precise theory of inspiration, which would exclude all imperfections in the transmission of the writing, in the language, in the secular knowledge of the inspired writers. Of this one thing I feel assured, as of my own existence, that we must not frame a theory of inspiration first, and go to the Bible for texts to confirm it, but we must take the facts of the case as we find them in the Bible, and not determine for ourselves apart from those facts, what the Almighty ought to have done, in order to impart to mankind so much of divine truth as He saw fit to impart by the imperfect medium of language, and by the assisted, yet even then imperfect medium of men. I say imperfect medium, because, though the control of inspiration

enabled the sacred writer to communicate divine truth, his natural understanding remained fallible, and the inspiration was limited to himself—not continued to his hearers or readers; and his thoughts are given to mankind in a language not their own. And then as to the other still more awful subject, which was brought under the notice of the Judicial Committee, the denial of the eternity of future punishment, a few cautions may not be improperly given to you on this occasion.

All the reverence, self-distrust, and humility possible to a Christian mind is too little, when we enter upon so fearful a subject as the just judgments of Almighty God. Who, or what are we, that we should question His decrees, or interpose our weak replies against the execution of His final sentence? Yet in proportion as we feel, that in His presence every mouth must be stopped, and every tongue plead guilty before Him, in the like degree should our reverence guide us to beware, lest like the friends of Job, we curse those whom God hath not cursed, and narrow the conditions of His mercy by a merely human and mistaken interpretation of His words. "Mercy," says a sacred writer, "rejoiceth against judgment." "Yet have I left me seven thousand in Israel," was the reply of the Almighty Judge, when the stern prophet could not count one faithful follower. To consign unknown millions to perdition for not believing in that of which they have never heard—to speak of their lying hopelessly in everlasting torments, without a pang, without a tear—to think with remorseless indifference of the inevitable perdition of the vast majority of souls plunged into eternal fire irrevocably, after this short life, from the beginning of the world to its end—and of the few, the very few, whom Infinite mercy would stoop to save, or Infinite justice would permit to any share in His own endless bliss—surely this is not the spirit of Him who came from Heaven to seek, to save, to suffer and to die; this is not the ransom shed for every sinner, the blood freely given in behalf of the wanderer and the lost; these are not the bowels of that compassion which is infinite, which brings in the lost child with tender gratulation, and celebrates with holy songs not his fall, but his recovery. Yet we admit in simple, unquestioning faith, the truth of those most fearful words, "Depart ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." We can think of no limitation of these words, which would not equally limit the blessedness of the saved, and make heaven, the reward of faith and obedience, a place of security from which many a soul might still more terribly fall. Neither can we play and trifle with the word "everlasting," for we are met with an equally awful declaration from the same lips. "Fear Him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell: where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched."

Yet we dare not limit, as some have limited, the mercies of the Most High.

We mourn over those scenes in primitive history, when savage mobs tore heresy to pieces with carnal weapons, and rival councils consigned

their opponents with equal indifference to eternal flames. But we can call to mind, a time, (to speak of things nearer home,) when good and holy men among ourselves, full of love and of good works, the authors of a great revival of godliness in England, confined salvation to the very few elect christians, apparently of their own stamp and way of expression. For the Papist, the Greek, the ignorant heathen, scarcely even for the merely moral Christian, was the least hope of salvation to be found. We have seen also men of an opposite school dwelling so exclusively on the tenet, "*extra ecclesiam nulla salus*," and so limiting the bound of covenanted mercy to their own Church, that it seemed impossible for a dissenter to be saved; and even now so wide-spread are the agencies of Puritanism, so rigorous and unbending its decrees, that we see daily, that unless we use its shibboleth, subscribe to its chosen means of doing good, quote the well-known text in the one conventional manner, and narrow God's Word and our understanding to the small channel of one favorite phrase, we are still considered "natural men," ignorant of justification through the righteousness of Christ; and we are gravely exhorted to read our Bibles prayerfully, as if that Bible were not life and death to us, and prayerful study of it had not been the main business of our lives.

God be thanked, the spirit of intolerance has somewhat died out among men, and their convictions partake of a wider spirit of charity. Taught by experience of those fruits of the Spirit, which no unbiassed reader of the Scriptures can mistake, they now admit and hope better things of each other. They can believe that Christ loves the soul of a Papist as dearly as he loves the soul of a Protestant; they can hope that His spirit is searching among all men, in all countries and in all ages, for souls capable of salvation, and is manifesting His light to faithful and obedient hearts, born with every conceivable difference of intellect, of education, of religion, and of hope. And though there is but one way of salvation through the merits of Christ Jesus, they trust that millions may be saved, to whom no kindly tongue has ever told the way, to whom life was an overshadowing cloud of darkness, ignorance, and sorrow: or who sought the aid of many physicians to heal their sin-stricken souls, yet "never were bettered, but rather grew worse." Then as to the case of that vast majority of mankind, baptized, or unbaptized, who die in infancy, whilst we have no right to question the value of baptism, even to an infant, nor dare we say that a compliance with Christ's holy ordinance confers no special privilege on a member of his body, of which an unbaptized infant, dying without baptism, may possibly not be a partaker; yet who will dare to say that the gates of eternal mercy shall be shut on any to whom God has given life, and from whom He took that life before it developed into choice of good and evil; or that the heart of that Saviour which burned with indignation against those who would have spurned helpless babes from his feet, will not open the everlasting arms to embrace them all, and

shield them from the accuser's clamour by his all-justifying blood?

In estimating, then, the moral effect of this judgment of which we have spoken, if in some respects it seem to lean away from faith, let us recollect that it must not be regarded as a theological judgment. Its authors must speak legally, and cannot speak theologically. All *obiter dicta* of the presiding judge, seeming to have a theological bias, we are at full liberty to discard, and the narrowness of the construction is fully borne out by the very words of the Judgment. "If the book, or these two essays, or either of them as a whole, be of a mischievous and baneful tendency, as weakening the foundation of Christian belief, and likely to cause many to offend, they will retain that character, notwithstanding this our Judgment." Most certainly; and the Judgment itself is as nothing, compared with the general, growing verdict of honest and impartial minds on the whole great question. And this verdict will grow. The minds of men are not tied to courts of law, nor is their faith bound up in legal judgments. The strength of the Church lies not in courts of law, even if we could deprive every essayist of all temporal means of subsistence. Even then we could not quench the light of reason, nor by such means re-kindle the torch of faith. The great lesson, it seems to me, is to keep out of the courts as much as is possible; and while I would never shrink from a bold, manly confession of what we believe, I think painful experience convinces us, that it is better to meet the adversary and crush his arguments, than to cite the adversary that we may crush his person. In this contest no man need be at a loss for learned and substantial replies to everything that has been advanced. But then I think we must admit, after all said and done, that on the degree of inspiration, and the mode of inspiration, we must expect honest and faithful men to differ. If in regard to the person of our Lord, so great a difficulty exist in understanding, still more in explaining, how Jesus increased in wisdom, and how in the Son of Man, who is in Heaven, "dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily": we need not deem our faith in danger because men differ on the question of the extent of the limitations of the divine and human element in the inspired writer. It is easy to say every word, every syllable, every letter in the Bible, is the dictation of God; and it is as easy to reply: In what one precious manuscript are those syllables and letters to be found?

Again, as to eternal punishment, whilst we hold, as I hope we all shall hold, in childlike simplicity to the simple, severe truths of our Saviour's words, we must not forget the wide differences among holy and good men in various ages, as to the persons of necessity included in God's eternal displeasure.

I have detained you longer on these points than I could wish, but you will agree with me that one cannot over-estimate their importance, and it becomes each one of you to think deeply upon them, to search out all the evidence on the subject to which you can find access, that

you may be prepared for the objections made to Christianity on these and such like topics, and may not be unmindful of the difficulties which attend the solution of such questions. The worst answer you can possibly give, because the answer which will have the least weight with candid and intelligent minds, is to beg the whole question by claiming for yourselves a special illumination of the Holy Spirit in answer to prayer. The Holy Spirit was promised to the Apostles to "guide them into all the truth." But into what truth were they to be guided? Into that truth which their Master had revealed to them, and which they were to communicate to others. But as this truth is now contained in the Scripture, and taught by the Church, it is manifestly presumptuous for any individual minister to claim a direct illumination from above, when all his brethren have the same Bible open to them, and the same throne of grace to apply to for help. Unless he can show that they never read the Bible which he studies, and never pray to the same Father to whom he offers his prayers, he has no more claim to a spiritual illumination than they have; and in practice it is very often found, that a claim of this description is little else than a thin veil drawn over self-conceit, and a cloak to conceal ignorance. "Give attendance to reading," "meditate on these things," "give thyself wholly to them," are directions given by an inspired Apostle to his son Timothy; and "bring with thee the books," is the request offered for his own use, showing how much need St. Paul thought there was of study, and how little he relied on special illumination, to the neglect of it.

But I must pass on to other topics, which I cannot in justice omit on the present occasion. We must all anxiously consider what is the present position, and what will be the future of the Colonial Church. We cannot believe that we are one of those plants which our Heavenly Father has not planted, and which will therefore be rooted up. Imperfect as our work has been, it is the child, we hope, of too many prayers and tears, to be lost. Even as to the connection between the province and the parent country, one cannot but feel the deepest anxiety. Every visit to England confirms my fear that the profound ignorance of the masses in England, even of educated people, as to our geographical position, our separate existence, our feelings and our efforts to sustain ourselves, is doing us incalculable harm. A knot of determined politicians are bent on the severance of the colonies from England: whether they believe it, or not, they reiterate the notion of our uselessness, and our inordinate expense to England. Their words are heard by men immersed in business, who care nothing about the subject, and a vague idea possesses them that some taxes will be spared, some commercial benefit obtained by the severance. Religious truth is the last question asked by any one on this subject, and loyalty may shift for itself. Yet does England deal with itself as she professes to deal with us? Where are the richly-endowed parishes, where are the rich men in these parishes, many of whom are abundantly able to support their clergy

without impoverishing themselves, who would willingly sacrifice their endowments, given by the benefactors of past ages, and throw themselves generously and venturesomely on the voluntary system? When we are told to trust to the liberality of our rich farmers, how is it that we see no such experiment made on the richer agriculturists of Bedford, Buckingham, and Norfolk? Why is it that in wealthy London churches have been built with so scanty an endowment, that the clergy scarce know how to live? Yet no one thinks how the missionary in a large district of fifty miles in length is to live. "Fifty miles," cries the incredulous Englishman, "are not the acres of fifty miles sufficient for his support?" Much more than sufficient, if you "give him tithes of all." But totally insufficient, if the majority of the farmers on these fifty miles profess another religion, if he finds few of his flock settled in any one place, if the quantity of acres is no measure whatever of their ability to help him. These truths are not known to Englishmen in general; they have no notion whatever of the rough work of a New Brunswick missionary.

Still, we should look at the matter in another light. "Even the very hairs of our head are all numbered." God's gracious providence is now preparing for us a severe trial. And as no trial happens without his foresight, both of the necessity, the use, the gracious end for which He permits it, let us all look at it in this aspect. Murmuring will not help us to bear it. Even a heathen's words are full of Gospel truth, if we apply them right, "*O passi graviora, dabit Deus his quoque finem.*" If we bear our trial humbly, if we cast all our burden on the Lord, if we exert ourselves unanimously and manfully to do our duty to the Church, and to each other, surely we shall not be suffered altogether to fall. But then the clergy must, in this present crisis, remember how great a responsibility is laid upon them. Every man amongst us must take his share, and those who are most able must help to bear the burdens of others. No narrow party spirit, no disparagement of others, no fault-finding behind one another's backs, no petty squabbling in the newspapers, will do the Lord's work and business in this day of trial. Back to back, shoulder to shoulder, we must strive together for the faith of the Gospel, if we mean the Church to stand, not always requiring of others that they view all things exactly in the same aspect with ourselves, but ready to sacrifice our pride, our self-interest, and all our littleness for the general good.

We do not know whether any Imperial Act will be passed to "quiet the titles," as we call it, which have been disputed, and set at rest pressing questions respecting the government of the Church. But of this we may rest assured, that whatever Act be passed, it will be of a very general character, and will avoid detail as much as possible, to ensure its passing, and that details will be left to us to settle among ourselves. My strong conviction is, that reliance on English lawyers and statesmen, is resting on a broken reed, and that we must apply to

our local legislatures for whatsoever help we want. And the experience I have had of colonial legislation warrants me in saying, that I do not believe our legislature would refuse anything reasonable, if we are agreed among ourselves. I cannot, in twenty years, remember one instance, in which any benefit was withheld from the Church, that could fairly have been expected, when the Church was unanimous in the demand; nor any wrong suffered by the Church, which was not due to the secret or avowed cabals and strifes among Churchmen themselves.

You might then, I think, now fairly and impartially consider, whether you think the state of the Church requires, or does not require, synodical action. You have all before you the recorded acts of those colonial dioceses, in which synods have been duly held for several years. You must be more or less familiarly acquainted with the synodical proceedings of our brethren in the dioceses of Canada and Nova Scotia; you are as competent to form a judgment as myself, whether you suppose these assemblies to work beneficially to these dioceses or no. Of one thing you must be persuaded, that no additional autocratic power is given to the Bishop by calling together a synod. I am inclined to allow some weight to the objection of those who oppose the veto of the Bishop, that he presides in the synod as chairman, makes addresses, influences these assemblies by his presence and vote, and after the debate he can veto the proceedings, if he pleases. It must be admitted that his power is very limited, for he can never propose any measure which may not be stopped by others. Still, I should be desirous of removing every obstacle to union, and whilst I should desire to retain the veto, I should not insist on being present, or in voting. But some synodical assembly seems almost necessary, if any discipline is to be exercised. The Church Society is not a legally constituted body for this purpose. It has no power to exercise any disciplinary powers, and all it can do is to grant or to withhold the money entrusted to its care, and this only for one year at a time. I may mention two facts which show us the very anomalous and unsatisfactory position in which we are placed. The two houses of convocation in England have agreed to petition the Queen for liberty to alter the 29th canon, and the license has been granted. But supposing the new canon formed, it is extremely doubtful if it extend to the colonies. With the same general consent the terms of subscription in the 36th canon it is proposed to alter, but the late Lord Chancellor gave it as his deliberate opinion, that this alteration would not extend to the colonies. Are we then bound by the new canons, or are we not? Nobody seems able to tell us, and nobody seems willing to tell us. Our misfortune is, that we are suffered to be bound by the penalties of the law, but what the law is, nobody professes to know. Under this painful deficiency of information, it seems the most idle dream that ever entered into any man's mind, to lean on the old theory of our established Church, and to resort for help to

English statesmen and English lawyers. Distracted by appeals from colonies differently situated, opposed and thwarted by political opponents, and bound by precedents which have no force or application in our case, they seem unable to help us if they would, and often unwilling to help us if they could. England herself seems to be undergoing a wonderful revolution in religious matters, and the connection between the State and the Church to be loosening every year. Why then should we cling to ancient traditions which cannot have place in this new society in which our lot is cast, instead of endeavouring manfully to help ourselves? Self-help is the title of a valuable little work which everyone should read, and it must be the motto of all who mean to stand, though I need hardly say that as Christians and Churchmen, our help is in the Name of the Lord, who made heaven and earth. I can only then recommend the fresh consideration of this question to your serious thought; and I shall say no more than that I shall ever be ready to work heartily with you for the common good, with a synod, or without a synod, as you may determine. Upon you, and upon the laity of the diocese, the responsibility of this grave question must mainly rest.

There are a few points of ritual observance on which I wish to say a few words. The Church has expressly appointed that baptism shall take place in time of public service, after the second lesson, and has, as you all know, assigned two reasons for her injunction, "that the congregation then present may testify the receiving of them that are newly baptized into the number of Christ's Church; and that every man present may be put in remembrance of his own profession made to God in his baptism." These are injunctions so pious and charitable, that you cannot be justified in neglecting to comply with them; and the more so, as you have all, without exception, promised and set your hands to a subscription so to minister the sacraments as this Church and realm hath received the same; a subscription and promise which cannot be annulled by any decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. I hope, therefore, that after this admonition, the slovenly practice which prevails in some parishes, of administering baptism after the congregation have departed, will be abandoned. I must also enjoin upon you as a matter of duty, that you do not mutilate the marriage service. Chanting a portion of the service, singing a hymn, or even celebrating the Holy Communion at the time of marriage, are not enjoined by the Church; nor need I say anything on that part of the subject. But the mutilation of the service is directly contrary both to the letter and the spirit of the book of Common Prayer; and if it be more agreeable to light and frivolous minds, it must give offence to the more earnest and attached members of our Church. In the Cathedral, where the service has never been mutilated, I do not believe a single instance of offence has occurred. In these matters, the clergy by needless scruples, and by making light of their duty, often create the offence which a more simple and straightforward obedience would tend

to remove. And now before I conclude this address, let me not fail to point out to you the duties which seem to be peculiarly incumbent on the clergy at the present crisis of our affairs.

Trial, my brethren, brings out of each man whatever of good or evil is in his nature. It is the fire that reveals the dross, consumes the stubble, and purifies the gold. It is certain, therefore, that this fire of our trial, will manifest to ourselves and others, the depth or the shallowness of our characters, the reality or the unreality of our minds. More seriousness, more devotion to our work, more private and more public prayer, seem specially required of us; not prayer by fits and starts, with a frantic and spasmodic violence; not prayer for unity, whilst we practice disunion; not exhortations to holiness, whilst we disparage and devour one another; not a love of fault-finding, not a "binding of heavy burdens grievous to be borne;" not a captious and litigious spirit, not the selfish cry, that the "weakest must go to the wall," the poorer clergy are to be sacrificed, while the better provided look on with indifference, but an earnest, simple-hearted desire to promote the general good, which must commend itself to all loyal members of our Church, and for the rest, calm trust in God. "He will deliver us in six troubles, yea in seven there shall be no evil touch thee."

It is necessary for us all to recollect that the trial through which we are passing demands from us an increase of theological learning. It is, no doubt, hard for a missionary in this province, labouring amongst a population so scattered, to devote a regular portion of his time to study. The calls upon him are both incessant and irregular, and if he could find time, he may allege that he cannot find means to purchase books. Much assistance, however, has been given you in this respect, by the foundation of our Cathedral library, and by the establishment of deanery libraries, through the liberality of the associates of Dr. Bray. I could wish that the clergy who are not living at a great distance from Fredericton, made more use of the Cathedral library. But I fear that the ephemeral publications which engender a perpetual craving after ordinary news, most sadly interfere with our love of solid reading. Unquestionably, you cannot be sound interpreters of Holy Scripture, you cannot inform and raise the minds of your people, you cannot be prepared to meet the objections raised everywhere to Holy Scripture, and to the liturgy of our Church: you cannot, in short, be wise and faithful dispensers of God's holy Word, unless you are careful and diligent students. And a right understanding of the Scriptures involves so many questions of exegetical criticism, of geography and history, and of doctrinal accuracy, that you expose yourselves to the contempt of mankind around you, if you are wholly ignorant of these things. It is of no use to declaim against the spirit of the age, or to fancy yourselves raised into a position superior to such considerations; the age will reason, will criticize, will advance, whether we will or no, and we must endeavour to keep pace with its advances, as far as they are in a right

direction. There is no surer sign of weakness than pretended contempt, either of the past or the present labours of mankind. For God's providence is ever working, not only in nature, but in the minds of His creatures, and increasing intelligence and observation of His works, is one of those precious gifts of God, which we should esteem and value rather than depreciate. It is also of great importance to us to distinguish between "the faith once for all delivered to the Saints," which in its great fundamental varieties cannot change, and our understanding of these truths, which is liable to fluctuation and to progress, or decline. And the vast field of interpretation of Scripture admits of many conclusions differing from each other, yet compatible with general soundness of faith. When we see what the Bible in terms dogmatically asserts called in question, our path is more easy, and our duty plain; but in many questions, on which the Scriptures have pronounced nothing certain, we should be very slow to condemn as the fruit of unbelief, what more learning in ourselves might show us to be the result of long and patient research. For these and other like reasons, I would urge upon you all, both the elder and the younger clergy, a more careful and systematic reading both of the Old and New Testaments, in their original tongues, of sound works of divinity, of which there is an abundance in the present day, and of books which convey secular knowledge. You need not be afraid that you will ever become mere students; but my fear is, that you may become mere talkers—that in the absence or neglect of reading, even the little theological knowledge you once had may fail you, or degenerate into that empty verbiage, which is never so pitiable, as when it is associated with a claim to high and exclusive spirituality. No man knows what he can do in the way of reading, till he has made the attempt systematically. Map out your time into regular portions, get hold of some portion of knowledge before the world has had time to intrude, or in the long winter evenings; cease to thirst after that unprofitable, worse than unprofitable gossip, which is the bane of all our communities, and the ground of half our suspicion and distrust, and your minds will be improved, whilst you are placing yourselves daily in a better position to improve others. But the clergyman who reiterates the same discourses which his flock has perpetually heard, or teaches them nothing, but the same truths constantly insisted on as the only way to salvation, and not varied as the Bible itself varies its instruction, must either send his hearers to sleep, or must breed up a generation of ignorant and narrow-minded fanatics, ready to condemn every advance in knowledge as an error, and to brand with heresy every liberal and ingenuous mind. Into these mistakes many are in danger of falling, and I therefore caution you, that study and learning, under the blessing of God, are the surest preventives. I may also say a word on Sunday School instruction. As the common schools of the country are in no degree under the clergyman's control, nor are any definite religious principles taught in them, it is of great

importance that you should enter personally into all the details of your Sunday Schools, that you should admit none to be teachers but those who are sound members of our Church, and if of age, communicants ; and that you should select suitable books for use in the school, illustrative of the catechism and liturgy of the Church, and that you should insist that the catechism is thoroughly learned and explained to every child capable of understanding it. And I would recommend a larger and more special instruction to be given to all young persons to be confirmed. It would be far better that the number should be somewhat smaller, than that they should come ignorant of those very privileges on their appreciation of which the use of confirmation to them depends. For this purpose classes of instruction in the catechism and liturgy would be most valuable,. And as a far greater strain will now be put on the resources of our Diocesan Church Society, I do not think it probable that you will obtain much help from it in the way of books. This is another matter in which we shall have to help ourselves.

And now, my brethren, let me close this address with a few words of parting admonition to the clergy and laity.

In the present trial of our infant Church, how much, my brethren of the clergy, must depend upon your personal conduct. Though it be very certain that the laity ought to esteem your office more than your persons, yet you must see how little the office is valued when the man is despised. You ought to consider that it is not eloquent preaching, it is not intellectual eminence, it is not easiness and good nature, it is not a talent for business, it is not running to and fro about the country, it is not social position, which will earn for you the power to influence mankind for good. All the earnest love of souls, all the guilelessness and simplicity, all the fervour of devotion, all the goodness of heart, all the humility and charity, all the wisdom and tact that can be acquired is scarce sufficient for your duty ; and without such graces you will too often labour in vain. Keen eyes are watching your every action, and swift tongues repeating every word. The enemies of religion rejoice in your halting, and excuse their own vices by every bad example among you. And every vice in a clergyman's family assumes a magnitude altogether disproportioned to the offence. But above all, do not bite and devour one another. Never is a clergyman so obnoxious to censure, so certain to be wrong as when he gives publicity to the errors of his brother, and strives before the unbelievers. And I grieve to say it, but I believe it to be the experience of every bishop, that of all the troubles that happen in a diocese, it is generally found that the clergy have been at the bottom of the strife ; and if they would be quiet, and each man mind his own business, the laity, with few exceptions, would give little trouble. How soon will division about things indifferent cease to be of importance in our eyes, and we shall all be called on to give account of the way in which we have fulfilled the great duties of our ministry.

But I must not omit to admonish the laity of the Church, as its appointed leader.

You, my brethren, have the destinies of the Church committed to your care. And I fear many are not half awake to the responsibilities of their position. For a long time they have been leaning upon others. They have not taken up the cause of the Church, as a body, with any generous ardour, any heartiness, as if they loved it, and cherished it as their own flesh. They dole out a miserable pittance, a bare existence, to the clergy, but it is done by fits and starts, not as it is needed. And instead of the whole mass of Church people contributing according to their means, a few are called on again and again, known to be liberal givers, and some of the richest people in our communion give miserably little.

Every one may now know, from the changes made in our position by Churchmen at home, that you must either endeavour to build up the Church in the poorer parishes, or the services of the Church will be, must be withdrawn. And the sin of that withdrawal will certainly lie at your door. And without some local endowment it never has been found that the voluntary system can stand the strain laid on it in poorer places.

People make great and magnificent promises when they desire a clergyman's services, and under the pressure of their pledge they do something considerable the first year; but as soon as the novelty is past, they get tired, find or seek occasions of offence, diminish and then withdraw their subscriptions, and finally the clergyman is starved out, the services are ended, and religion is driven away. That this lamentable end may not be seen amongst us, we must, as a body, be more zealous. I can do no more than lay the matter once more plainly and faithfully before you, praying earnestly that God may incline your hearts to hearken to words, I trust, of truth and soberness, and to act as becomes the members of a communion which has it in its power, whenever the members generally have the will, to be an instrument in God's hands of the greatest good to the province and people of New Brunswick.

APPENDIX.

THE following important paper has been prepared by Chief Justice Parker, and I have his kind permission to print it.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN NEW BRUNSWICK.

EXTRACT FROM JUDGMENT IN THE COLENZO CASE.

"WE apprehend it to be clear upon principle, after a colony has received legislative institutions, the Crown (subject to the special provisions of any Act of Parliament) stands in the same relation to that colony as it does to the United Kingdom. The United Church of England and Ireland is not a part of the constitution in any colonial settlement."

As New Brunswick had a legislature at the time of the appointment of the Bishop of Fredericton, it is important to examine how far the legislature have recognized the Bishop, his diocese, and his corporate character.

The late decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the Colenzo case, has led to some rather flippant conclusions from it, in its application to colonial bishoprics; and so far as it affects New Brunswick, the judgment, no doubt, negatives the existence of coercive jurisdiction. But as none such has been exercised or set up, we remain pretty much as we were *de facto*, and may derive benefit from the question of the *de jure* being settled without our interposition.

Some particulars, however, as to the legal *status* of the Church of England in this province ought to be known in England, where there is too great a tendency to ignore the proceedings of the local legislatures, and to assume that our venerable Church is, in our colonies, looked upon with disfavour, and enjoys *no status* whatever.

The Province of Nova Scotia was constituted in about the middle of the last century: what is now New Brunswick being then an integral part of it, and known as the County of Sunbury. A contribution was granted to it, and its first legislative assembly was holden in October, 1758, and representatives sent from Sunbury as well as the other counties of Nova Scotia.

On the termination of hostilities between the old colonies in America and the mother country, and the acknowledgment of their independence in 1783, it was deemed advisable to divide Nova Scotia into two provinces, and to furnish a home in the new province for a large body of loyalists, who were anxious to preserve

their allegiance, and to live under British institutions. Among them were many of high character, education, and standing.

The commission to Thomas Carleton, Esq., the first Governor of New Brunswick, bears date August 1784. It was opened by him at St. John on November, 20, 1784, and he assumed the government, aided by a very efficient council, the members of which were named in the commission, and several ordinances were passed and grants made. The Supreme Court, with four judges, and having the jurisdiction of the Common Law Courts at Westminster, was also constituted by the King, and sat for the first time in April 1785. The Legislative Assembly met for the first time, January 3d, 1786.

From October 1758, to November 1784, New Brunswick continued under the government and legislature of Nova Scotia, and the Acts of Assembly remained in force, some until superseded by new Acts on the same subjects, and others until 1791, when by an Act of the New Brunswick Assembly, (31 Geo. 3 c. 2.) it was declared that "no law passed in the General Assembly of the Province of Nova Scotia, before the erection of the Province of New Brunswick, should be of any force or validity within the province: provided that the Act should have no retrospective force or operation."

By an Act of the Legislature of Nova Scotia, passed at its first session in 1758, (32 Geo. 2, c. 5,) it was enacted that "the sacred rites and ceremonies of Divine Worship, according to the liturgy of the Church established by the laws of England, should be deemed the *fixed form of worship amongst us*; and the place wherein such liturgy shall be read, shall be respected and known by the name of the *Church of England, as by law established.*"

By the Act 33, Geo. 2, c. 2, the Parish of St. Paul's, in Halifax, was constituted, and the last section of the Act enacts "that all ministers of the Church of England, not conforming themselves to the rules prescribed by the canons of the said Church, shall be subject to the penalties named therein, and none other: any law, usage, or custom to the contrary notwithstanding."

Such was the state of the law relative to the Church of England when New Brunswick became a separate province. *No Bishop had then been appointed in any of the North American Colonies*, the Bishop of London being the only recognized diocesan. The attachment, however, to the Church of England was great, a large portion of the Loyalists being members of the Church, and several of its early clergy having had churches in New York, New Jersey, and New England.

We are not, then, surprised to find among the first Acts of the Legislature of New Brunswick, in 1785, 26 Geo., 3 c. 4, "An Act for preserving the Church of England *as by law established in this province*, and for securing liberty of conscience in matters of religion." The first section of this Act provides that "no person shall be capable to be admitted to any parsonage or other ecclesiastical benefice, or promotion whatever within the Province of New Brunswick, before such time as he shall be ordained according to the form and manner by law established in the said Church of England"; and the second section provides "that every person having any ecclesiastical benefice or promotion within the Province, not having some lawful impediment to be allowed and approved of by the Governor or Commander-in-Chief for the time being, shall perform service once a month at least."

It may be well here to mention that it was customary by the Royal instructions accompanying the Governor's commission in the old colonies, as it was to the Governor of New Brunswick, and prior to the legislature they formed part of the constitution, to require the Governor to give all countenance and encouragement to the exercise of the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Lord Bishop of London in the respective provinces, excepting only the collating to benefices, granting licenses for marriage, letters of administration and probates of wills, which are expressly reserved to the Governor for the time being.

In 1787 the Bishopric of Nova Scotia was constituted, and the Bishop exercised episcopal jurisdiction over New Brunswick till 1845, when the Bishop of Fredericton was appointed by letters patent under the Great Seal of Great Britain.

By the Charter of the Madras School, dated August 23d, 1819, "the Lord Bishop of Nova Scotia, holding and exercising episcopal jurisdiction in and over the Province of New Brunswick, or the Bishop holding and exercising episcopal jurisdiction for the time being," is made one of the members; and by an Act of Assembly, 60 Geo., 3 c., 6, this charter is expressly confirmed.

The charter of the College of New Brunswick, passed under the Great Seal of the United Kingdom, as was contemplated by previous Acts of the Legislature, see 4 Geo. 4, c. 33, dated December 15, 1827, makes the Bishop of Nova Scotia, or the Bishop for the time being of the diocese in which the town of Fredericton may be situate in any future division or alteration of the said then present diocese of Nova Scotia, the visitor of the College. This charter was expressly recognized by Act of Assembly, 9 and 10 Geo., 4 c., 29: and all the property of the College which preceded it, constituted by provincial letters patent, was transferred to the new College corporation, of which the King was declared to be the founder. This Act has since given place to a new Act, 22 Vic., c. 63, which constitutes the University of New Brunswick, and transfers all the property of the College to the University. The Lieutenant Governor of the province is made the visitor, and there is to be no professor of theology or religious test. This Act was specially confirmed by Her Majesty in Council, January 13, 1860, and the Bishop has ceased to have anything to do with the University. The governing body consists of a senate, all of whom are laymen, and one is president.

Act 16 Vic., c. 4, incorporating the Diocesan Church Society, and the Act 26 Vic., c. 32, recognizes also the Bishop as the Lord Bishop of Fredericton; and the mortgage to him by the Church corporation of St. John, does the same. Several other Acts contain a similar recognition of the Bishop, e. g., 4 Vic., c. 3, 11 Vic., 44 and c. 45, 12 Vic., c. 56, 13 Vic., c. 14, 16 Vic., c. 47 and 49, 17 Vic., c. 46, &c. All these Acts refer to the Lord Bishop of the diocese, making his assent necessary to the transfer of lands of the Church corporations.

Act 17, Vic. 11, recites as follows: "Whereas the Right Reverend John Medley, Doctor of Divinity, Bishop of the Diocese of Fredericton, is seized in fee simple to HIMSELF AND HIS SUCCESSORS forever, of a lot of land in Fredericton.

Act 9 Vic., c. 69, recites a grant from the Crown of part of the Church green, to the Right Reverend John, the Lord Bishop of Fredericton, and his successors, for the purpose of erecting thereon a Cathedral, and no other building.

The Revised Statutes passed in 1854, although they repealed the Act, 26 Geo., 3, c. 4, recognized the Church of England, though not as the Established Church, and reenacts several provisions of the old Act, and that the rectors hold the glebe in like

manner as glebe lands are held in England, although the fee is in the Church corporation of the parish. Our Acts always use the term the *Church of England*, and not the United Church of England and Ireland, as the union in 1800 did not affect its statutes.

These several legislative provisions recognize the Church of England, the rectors of the parishes, the Lord Bishop of the diocese, his corporate capacity, and the latter Act also the Cathedral, and most distinctly recognize the Lord Bishop of Fredericton, Dr. John Medley, to be the Bishop of the diocese.

There are some Acts of Assembly bearing upon the subject not referred to in the preceding paper.

1858. 21 Vic., c. 58. The Church corporation of Chatham, authorized to sell ferries by and with the approbation of the Lord Bishop of the diocese.

1869. 22 Vic. c. 35, "An Act to regulate the sale and disposal of Church and glebe lands of the Church of England in this province." This Act says that every conveyancer shall receive the sanction of the Lord Bishop of the diocese signified by his being a party thereto, and executing the same. Several sales have taken place.

1858. 22 Vic., c. 54. Diocesan Church Society Amendment Act, recognizes the Bishop of Fredericton.

1864. 27 Vic., c. 28. An Act to enable the Church corporation of Woodstock to convey certain lands for the use of Canterbury. Section 1 enacts that half the lands shall be conveyed to the Bishop of the *Diocese of Fredericton*, to be held by him and his successors for ever. 2. The said Bishop is to appoint one of the Arbitrators, and the land is to be conveyed to the Bishop. 4. The conveyance to be made to the Bishop of Fredericton. 5. The Bishop and his successors are to hold the land in trust.

R. P.

I desire, also, to call attention to the following extract from the Judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, in the case of *Long, v. the Bishop of Capetown*, which are important :—

"We think that the acts of Mr. Long must be construed with reference to the position in which he stood, as a clergyman of the Church of England, towards a lawfully appointed bishop of that Church, and to the authority known to belong to that office in England; and we are of opinion, that by taking the oath of canonical obedience to his lordship, and accepting from him a license to officiate, and have the cure of souls within the parish of Mowbray, subject to revocation for just cause, and by accepting the living of Mowbray under a deed which expressly contemplated as one means of avoidance the removal of the incumbent for any lawful cause, Mr. Long did voluntarily submit himself to the authority of the Bishop to such an extent as to deprive him of his benefice for any lawful cause, that is, for such cause, as (having regard to any differences which may arise from the circumstances of the colony) would authorize the deprivation of a clergyman by his bishop in England."

This, it will be seen, is altogether irrespective of the letters patent.

