the libel, I suppose as a proof of the alleged levity and inconsiderateness, that I had never previously to my letter of resignation, consulted with any of my Brethren of the Presbytery. It is quite correct that I did not consult any one; but I desire to say with regard to this, that I think it extremely probable, that I would have consulted some of the members of the Presbytery, could I have done so conveniently.

Third accusation—"The profanation of the ordinances of religion."—With regard to this accusation, all I can do is to put the Presbytery in possession of the facts. The interval between my leaving Toronto and my letter of resignation, may seem to the Presbytery too short a term for such an important decision as that so lately made by me. I left Toronto because the duties were burdensome to me—because I have a native abhorrence of contention and strife—because I desired some leisure to devote to the education of my children—because I had, as I have still, an almost insuperable longing to live in the country, where I might prosecute certain studies, which, as matter of taste or inclination, I thought innocent enough. These were some of my chief inducements, in leaving Toronto, to take refuge at York Mills, where with the Government allowance, the sum that might be granted by the congregation, and the rent of my farm, I might be enabled to be useful, and as comfortable, with respect to external circumstances, as I had any care for: and I should certainly have been so, had it been my lot to continue there, for nothing could exceed the attention and respect of my congregation.

It was not until several weeks after my induction at York Mills, that the question about Church Government was accidentally raised in conversation with John Somerville, Esq.; after which I applied with some degree of earnestness to the enquiry, and persevered in doing so, up to the time of my resignation—in the meantime discharging, to the best of my ability, the duties of my office without intermission until then. If any objection can be made to the correctness of this statement, I have yet to learn what it is; and if the Presbytery can deduce from it any satisfactory evidence of my profaning the ordinances of religion, they are better judges than I am—I am utterly unconscious of any such profanation.

Fourth accusation—"The holding of the heretical and schismatical opinions, that no ordination of ministers is valid, but that conferred by, or in presence of a prelatical Bishop—that the Church of Scotland is not a church of Christ—and that the ordination of ministers in the Presbyterian church, is not authorized in the Word of God." With respect to the first of these, whether heretical or not, it is not my opinion. I would not say "conferred by or in presence of"—I hold that in every case of a valid ordination, one or more of the superior order of clergy (prelatical Bishops) must be an agent or the agents of such ordination. As to the second of these opinions, I hold it confessedly; and the third also, without any subtlety or reservation whatsoever.

I frankly acknowledge, that several circumstances combined to send me upon these important inquiries, with a degree of seriousness which otherwise might have been awanting. There was the unhappy state of the Church of Scotland at home, in whose protracted contentions, I could recognize little else than an ambitious struggle for authority, accompanied with a rebellious opposition to the laws of the land—there was the almost total want of sympathy on this subject, that subsisted between my Presbyterian brethren and myself—there was the long experience, the visible proofs which I had of the evils of disunion and insubordination resulting from the multitude of sects into which the Christian community of this country is split—where religious divisions are multiplied beyond numbering—where one christian hardly knows what another christian is—where every form of fanaticism springs suddenly into rampant life, and naturally allies itself with that part of the population that can least brook the restraint of salutary law. How mischievous then is it to perpetuate the hostility of sects—how sinful to prey upon their prejudice and ignorance—and how desirable, "beyond compare," "to see the dispersed of Israel gathered into one!"

If prompted by circumstances and considerations of this nature to an earnest enquiry, it should come to pass, as it has, that the Church of Scotland—while she professes to rest her whole structure and doctrine upon the Word of God—should appear to me manifestly to have no authority from that Word for the commission of her teachers—that the Episcopal form of Church Government is unquestionably authorized by the Word of God—and, that the strictest adherence to the ancient order of the Church of Christ is in visible harmony with the best interests of the people of this province—the richest blessing, in my opinion, which their posterity can derive from heaven,—I see no cause why the adoption of such opinions should be regarded by the Presbytery as criminal. With me, they are merely the assertion of the truth, and, I will take the liberty of adding, a very disinterested assertion of it.

No. V.

To the Editor of the Toronto Herald.

York Mills, 17th January, 1843.

Sir,—Regarding the proceedings of the Presbytery of Toronto, in which unhappily I have been so much involved, I have no desire to say any thing that may prejudice the reputation of the five members (of the thirteen of the Presbytery, exclusive of Mr. Ritchie and myself) by whom I have been deposed. I know that "calumniare fortiter et aliquid adherebit" is the first commandment in the decalogue of the wicked, and trust that these five members of the Presbytery have acted in their proceedings against me under the guidance of a holier law. Notwithstanding, one may be excused for saying that they acted discourteously in the affair of the conference, and that in giving their votes to the probation of a libel, for the greater part of the accusations contained in which it is impossible that any creature living could have the slightest evidence in contradiction to my own testimony, I say that in doing this one may be excused for charging them with inconsiderateness, and irreverence also, they five being a court, as they declared, of the Lord Jesus Christ. Nor do I admire their conduct in publishing "A full account of the trial of Mr. Leach, &c., in pamphlet form." These are things which I cannot but object to, although I have no objections to what they have since proposed and enjoined in their printed circular of the 13th December—"a day for solemn humiliation and prayer." Among other things, "to pray earnestly and perseveringly to Him, that He would carry forward a work of reformation and revival among ourselves and all the churches of the reformation, *even to their approximating more and more to a Scriptural model.*" I have no objections to this, notwithstanding that it enjoins a solemn supplication to the Almighty, that he would enable *them* to do the very thing for doing which they have harassed and libelled and deposed me, viz.—approximating more and more to a scriptural model.

William T. Leach.

A SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENTS FOR EPISCOPACY.

(*By the Rev. John Sinclair, M.A.*)

We have traced the growth of the ecclesiastical constitution planted by the Apostles through three successive appointments of Church officers, Deacons, Presbyters, and Bishops; each order invested with distinct functions and privileges. We have seen that Presbyters have no authority from Scripture to ordain, but that all precepts on this subject are addressed to persons of Episcopal rank; and that no authority can be found in the word of God for Presbyterian ordination. We have brought forward Timothy, invested by St. Paul with Apostolic powers over the Presbyters of Ephesus; and Titus over those of Crete. We have remarked St. James, the kinsman of our Lord, fixed, by Apostolical nomination, in the diocese of Jerusalem, and exerting on that account peculiar influence in the affairs of the Church. We have referred to Epistles addressed in the Apocalypse by our Saviour himself, through St. John, to the governors of the Seven Churches of Asia, designating them as Angels; attributing to them powers of coercion and jurisdiction, eminently and peculiarly *Episcopal;* applauding some of them for the vigorous exertion of those powers, and reproving others for supineness or neglect. When, from the works of the Apostles, we proceeded onward to the writings of their immediate successors, we found the Apostolical institution of Episcopacy recognized and affirmed distinctly, fully, universally. We showed the same assertions in later ages concerning the Apostolic origin of Episcopacy, to be uniformly repeated without contradiction or hesitation, by a series of writers in every quarter of the ancient world; and not only to be persevered in by Catholics, but admitted also by Heretics. On the other hand, when we turned to the objections alleged by our own dissenting brethren, we found them resting upon erroneous assumptions, groundless suppositions or inventions, and misapplied quotations: on the unwarranted imposition of a modern sense upon ancient words; on the post-dating of ancient testimonies; on the excitement of unfounded prejudices and apprehensions; and what is worst of all, on the establishment of principles which would destroy the credit of all antiquity, and invalidate all ancient and external evidence to the integrity of the sacred canon. Lastly, we have demonstrated that Episcopacy, as an Apostolical institution, continued universally throughout the world to be the form of Church polity during fifteen hundred years: and that those reformers who first established another system, took that measure with reluctance; urged necessity alone as their excuse for the innovation; and expressed, in the strongest terms, their profound reverence for the ancient Ecclesiastical constitution.

THE CHURCH.

TORONTO, FRIDAY, JANUARY 27, 1843.

CONTENTS OF THE OUTSIDE.

As the subject of Church Government is now occupying a large share of public attention, we beg to invite all those who desire to investigate so important a subject, to the Lists of Books on Episcopacy, offered for sale both by *The Church Society* and Messrs. Rowsell, and advertised on our fourth page.

One hundred extra copies of this number have been struck off, and may be had by an early application.

In transferring the Report of the case of the Reverend Messrs. Leach and Ritchie, from the columns of the *Toronto Herald*, we are happy to express to the Editor of that Journal, our obligations to him for the very faithful and able manner in which he has executed his task. The remarks with which he introduces the various documents to notice are very forcibly and elegantly written, and in many instances he has anticipated our observations, and left us little or nothing to say. Although a member of the Church, and ever ready to defend her when attacked, or to promote her sacred cause, he has never mixed himself up with religious controversy, and has perhaps regarded the Church as one of our venerated national Establishments, rather than in its highest character of the only true Church of Christ in this Colony. This circumstance must certainly recommend the Report, as given in the *Herald*, to the favourable attention of many persons who do not, or will not, understand the very great and material difference between Presbyterianism and Episcopacy, and who think that because the Church of Scotland is established by human law, it ought therefore to be put on the same footing, and regarded in the same view, with the established Episcopacy of England.

Again thanking the editor of the *Herald* for the full and spirited manner in which he has placed before the public a case so interesting to the community at large, we proceed to transfer from the Toronto *British Colonist* of the 18th January,—a journal which is the organ of the Church of Scotland in this colony,—a few other documents connected with the case, in order that it may be presented to our readers as complete as possible:

Toronto, November 15th, 1842.

Reverend and Dear Sir,

I beg, through you, to tender to the Presbytery of Toronto my resignation of the charge at Newmarket, and to intimate my resolution of withdrawing from the Church of Scotland.—It is only respectful in me to state the grounds which have induced me to adopt this important purpose.

I am convinced that the Presbyterian government and discipline are substantially defective; that the voluntary principles which guide the church in this country, have a direct tendency to destroy order, to injure the usefulness, and to detract from the respectability of her clergy.

The Episcopal government, founded on the word of God, and handed down from Apostolic times, being free from such objections, I cannot conscientiously hesitate (in entering within her pale) to give my testimony to her purity and usefulness as the Church of of Christ.

Such convictions have pressed on me, not without great pain, and in carrying them into effect, I am satisfied that I am acting agreeably to the will of God, and for the best interests of my fellow creatures.

I am, Reverend and dear Sir,
Your faithful and obedient Servant,
(Signed,) Will. Ritchie.

To the Reverend
The Moderator of the Presbytery of Toronto.

The Presbytery having taken these letters into consideration agreed that Messrs. Leach and Ritchie should be dealt with in a christian and brotherly way; and appointed a committee of their number to meet them for this purpose. This conference between the parties took place on the evening of 5th December; and on the following day (December 6,) the committee made a report to the Presbytery, to which was [*sic*] appended certain questions put to, with the answers given by, Messrs. Leach and Ritchie. We omit the report of the committee, because it is embodied in the resolutions adopted by the Presbytery, at their meeting on the 7th December, which are given below, and we here insert the questions and answers:

The following questions, the 4th and 5th in the formula appointed to be put to ministers at ordination and admission, were read over:

4. Are you persuaded that the Presbyterian government and discipline of this church are founded upon the Word of God, and agreeable thereto; and do you promise to submit to the said government and discipline, and to concur with the same, and never to endeavour directly or indirectly, the prejudice or subversion thereof, but to the utmost of your power, in your station, to maintain, support, and defend the said discipline and Presbyterian government by Kirk Sessions, Presbyteries, Provincial Synods, and General Assemblies, during all the days of your life?

5. Do you promise to submit yourself willingly and humbly, in the spirit of meekness, unto the admonitions of this Presbytery, and to be subject to them, and to all other Presbyteries, and superior judicatories of this Church, where God in his Providence shall cast your lot; and that, according to your power, you shall maintain the unity and peace of this church against error and schism, notwithstanding of whatsoever trouble or persecution may arise, and that you shall follow no divisive courses from the present established doctrine, worship, discipline, and government of this church?

1. Mr. Leach's attention being called to said questions, and to the fact of his having, on three different occasions, answered them in the affirmative, besides answering similar ones at the time of his licensure, and to the clause of his letter to the Presbytery, of date 15th November, in which he says, "It was not until lately that I was enabled to devote any time to the important question of Church Government"—he was asked if he had any explanation to offer.

Mr. Leach declined making any statement in reference to the subject.

2. Mr. Leach being asked what works he had read on the Presbyterian side, since he entertained doubts as to the validity of his ordination, answered—He does not remember having read anything else than Campbell's Lectures, but that he had previously been acquainted with Anderson's Defence, and such of Hill's Lectures as bear on the subject.

Mr. Ritchie declined answering this question.

3. Do you consider the Church of Scotland to be a Church of Christ?

Mr. Ritchie answered—It is not.

Mr. Leach answered—It is a painful and mortifying fact that it is not.

4. Did you, after entertaining doubts, consult any of your co-Presbyters?

Answer of both—None.

5. Did you consider yourselves regularly ordained Ministers of Christ, on the Sabbath Day, (Nov. 13th) previous to your handing in your letters to the Presbytery, when you dispensed the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper to the congregation of York Mills?

Mr. Ritchie—Yes, I did.

Mr. Leach declined answering.

6. Do you consider the Church of Rome a true Church of Christ?

Both declined answering.

The above questions and answers having been read over to Messrs. Leach and Ritchie, they declared that their answers to these questions were truly stated.

(Signed) James Lambie,
Convener.

After some discussion, the Presbytery adjourned till the following morning, (December 7,) when they resumed the consideration of the case, and the course of procedure to be followed; and after mature deliberation, the following resolutions were adopted:

1. That in regard to the opinions on the important subject of Church Government, which Messrs. Leach and Ritchie severally avow as the principal reason for tendering to this Presbytery the demission of their charges, and withdrawing from the Church of Scotland, it does not appear that they have taken any due pains to inform their minds on the subject before adopting these opinions.

2. That in the case of Mr. Leach it seems to be too plain that he has acted in the matter of solemn vows and engagements made by him, first on the occasion of his being licensed,—and secondly, on the occasion of his being ordained,—a third time on his being inducted into the charge of the congregation of St. Andrew's Church, Toronto, and more recently on his induction to the charge of his present congregation at York Mills, either with insincerity, or with reckless inconsiderateness, inasmuch as that while, on all the occasions referred to, he declared before God and in the presence of his servants that he sincerely owned and believed the whole doctrine contained in the Confession of Faith to be founded upon the Word of God—and was persuaded that the Presbyterian Government and Discipline of the Church of Scotland are founded upon the Word of God and agreeable thereto,—he yet declares in his letter of resignation, of date the 15th November, that it was not until lately that he was enabled to devote any time to the important question of Church Government.

3. That it appears from the fact of Mr. Leach having administered the Lord's Supper to his congregation at York Mills, on Sabbath, the 13th November, taken in connection with the fact of his having written his letter of resignation on the morning of the 15th of the same month, that he must either have been chargeable with a presumptuous and profane intermeddling with the most solemn and peculiar functions of the Holy Ministry when he believed himself to be no Minister of the Gospel, or that he acted with a culpable rashness and suddenness in renouncing, so far as his letter goes, all the engagements first solemnly entered into, on his being licensed to preach the Gospel, and again and again solemnly renewed by him.

4. That Mr. Ritchie appears clearly chargeable with such rashness and suddenness in the renouncing of his solemn ministerial engagements, inasmuch as that while he assisted Mr. Leach in the dispensation of the Lord's Supper to his congregation on the occasion referred to, and preached to the same congregation on the 14th November, he yet wrote out his resignation on the morning of the 15th of the same month.

5. That Mr. Leach and Mr. Ritchie hold the heresy, which, from its effects both in these our own times and in past ages, appears to this Presbytery to be a malignant one, that the ordination of ministers in the Presbyterian church has no foundation in the Word of God, and the further heresy that the Church of Scotland is not a church of Christ.

6. That although Mr. Ritchie's conduct in many respects is far less criminal than that of Mr. Leach, it still appears that in several of the main points of the case he is equally culpable with Mr. Leach inasmuch as he declared at the conference which the Committee of Presbytery had with them, that he fully agreed with all that the latter gentleman had said.

7. That this Presbytery, while distinctly recognizing the general principle acted upon by the Church of Scotland, that demission, even when connected with the holding of erroneous views, does not, in every case, warrant deposition, do nevertheless find the conduct of Messrs. Leach and Ritchie, as set forth in the foregoing resolutions, and the errors held by them, to be of such a kind, as to forbid this presbytery to accept of their resignation, and demand that a formal process be instituted against each and both of them.

The presbytery having found that there was ground for libel in the case of Messrs. Leach and Ritchie, appointed Messrs. Rintoul and Bell, and Mr. Gale, of the Presbytery of Hamilton, who was present and had been invited to sit with the Presbytery, to be a Committee to frame drafts of the libels, and report to the Presbytery to-morrow.

On the following day (December 8,) the committee reported that they had not been able to get the drafts of the libels completed; and the Clerk was instructed to have them ready by next meeting. The next meeting took place on the 13th December, when the Clerk produced drafts of the libels prepared, against Messrs. Leach and Ritchie, and the same having been read clause by clause, and duly considered, were sustained, and ordered to be signed by the Moderator and Clerk, which was done in the presence of the Presbytery. The libels, and the list of witnesses and documents to be adduced for proving the same, were then ordered to be served upon the parties in the usual manner, who were cited to appear before the Presbytery, on the 27th of December, to answer the same.

The libels are founded upon, and are an amplification of, (in technical terms or legal form) the resolutions of the Presbytery, adopted at their meeting of the 7th December, and which are given above. The witnesses adduced were, Messrs. John Ross, John Armour, and Alexander Gibb, York Township; and the documentary evidence, Act 10, Assembly 1711,—Certified Extract, Mr. Leach's ordination, by the Presbytery of Haddington; Extract, Mr. Ritchie's ordination, by the Presbytery of Edinburgh; Records of the Presbytery of Toronto; The Letters of Messrs. Leach and Ritchie, to the Presbytery of Toronto, dated 15th November; Printed Minutes of Synod, 1842; and the Report of the Committee of the Presbytery of Toronto appointed to deal with Messrs. Leach and Ritchie. On the day appointed, (December 27,) the Presbytery met; Messrs. Leach and Ritchie appeared, and acknowledged having been served with copies of the libels found against them, respectively. The libels having been severally read, neither party made any objection to the relevancy. Mr. Leach gave in a written defence, which was read; Mr. Ritchie stated that he had no written defence to give in, but that, in so far as Mr. Leach's case and his own coincided, he concurred in the defence given in by Mr. Leach,—and disclaimed all levity in coming to the conclusions at which he arrived. In each case, the parties having been removed, the Presbytery found the major proposition of the libels relevant; they also found the articles of the minor proposition relevant, and the parties having been severally called in, this sentence was intimated to them. The Presbytery thereafter met with Messrs. Leach and Ritchie in private, and found them unwilling to retract any of their former statements, and that they were resolved to abide by the position they had taken. At subsequent meetings of the Presbytery, the parties severally, upon the call of the Moderator, pleaded not guilty of the charges contained in the libels; and upon proof adduced, the Presbytery found the libels fully proven, and unanimously resolved to depose Messrs. Leach and Ritchie, from the office of the Holy Ministry, which, after prayer, was done in the most solemn manner.

A wide field of observation and remark is opened to us in the preceding documents; but as our space is limited, and as many of the topics alluded to have already been, and will continue to be, discussed in this journal, we shall select a few such points as seem to us most deserving of present notice.

In the first place, then, the Church of Scotland, as represented by the Toronto Presbytery, stands in an equivocal position as regards the Apostolical Succession. If the Presbytery discard such a doctrine, they place their body on a level with every Protestant sect; if they entertain it, and contend for a *Presbyterial*, instead of an Episcopal, Succession, they stand towards the other Protestant sects, in just the same attitude as the Church of England does towards every Protestant denomination in this Province.

What the opinion and practice of the Church of Scotland may be in this day, respecting a Succession, it is difficult to say. The Presbyterianism established by the law of the land in 1688-90 upon the ruins of Scottish Episcopacy, has of late years sadly degenerated from its former comparatively high estate, and, instead of promoting peace and subordination, has itself been torn with intestine feuds, threatening its dissolution, and been arrayed, in the worst spirit of the Solemn League and Covenant, against the repeated, solemn, and deliberate declarations of the law of the land. In the course of these events, many an ancient landmark has been lost sight of; many a concession made to the democratic influence; and many a standard opinion and practice discarded with a haste and violence, as unseemly as that of Jack, in the *Tale of a Tub*, when, in stripping off the gold-lace, he rent his coat from top to bottom. How it may have fared with the doctrine of Succession during all this turbulence, we cannot say with confidence; but that that doctrine was once maintained by the Presbyterians, in all its exclusiveness, there cannot be a shadow of doubt. Look into the history of the seventeenth century, examine the controversies between Episcopal and Presbyterian divines, and especially the proceedings of the Presbyterian Westminster Assembly, and you will see the Common Prayer prohibited under penalties, the Directory, the Presbyterian Form of Worship, guarded by fines and punishments, the power of the keys, and of excommunication claimed by divine right, the most severe denunciations against Independency and Dissent of every shade, and reiterated anathemas, in terms that make the blood curdle, against Toleration, which was pronounced "the grand design of the devil," "the abomination of desolation and astonishment."

Some of the harsher tenets just enumerated died away in the course of time; but up to a very late period, if not even now, the doctrine of Succession was maintained by the Kirk of Scotland. But that we may do justice to the Presbyterians we will here quote the language of one of their most celebrated living preachers, the *Rev. J. Cumming*, M.A., as we find it in the *British Magazine*, November, 1839, pp. 532-4:

> "All our old Scottish Divines, among whom the Gillespies occupy a prominent place, held Apostolical Succession not only to be the possession, but the high and happy privilege of our presbyters. In fact, I cannot but believe that the question of Apostolical Succession involves and includes the question of ordination or non-ordination. * * * But wherein do we differ about succession? In the Church of England it is generally supposed to descend in the line of bishops—and with us, in the line of presbyters. May it not be just as possible that *presbyters* may be the line, and bishops merely presbyters elevated and raised at, it must be admitted, a very early period, and from the expediency or necessity of the case, the bishop in fact having one of the elements of the presbyterate compressed in his person viz,—the element of jurisdiction and rule?"
>
> "*Union with Independents is utterly out of the question;* but union among churches is surely not impossible. By union I mean, not unanimity of opinion on *essential Christianity*, but on great elemental *ecclesiastical principles*.
>
> "Too many of that portion of the Church of England whose views are advocated in your Magazine mix up the Scottish presbyterian clergy, with the teachers and ministers of the various sects of Independents, Baptists, &c., and seem to consider that both are equally destitute of all claims to primitive churchmanship."
>
> "The Scottish presbyters differ from the ministers of the Independent and Baptist communities in the following important point. We hold a definition of a church totally different from them. We regard the church as a body, under its head, Christ, composed of many separate congregations of the baptized—all the congregations it may be, of a great nation—consolidated and controlled by a superintending or episcopal and all-embracing authority. We herein agree with you in the radical germ of a church, viz,—a body composed of many distinct and local congregations, governed and controlled by superior jurisdiction. The point of difference between you and us is, your holding that jurisdiction to be compressed in one—the bishop; and we, right or wrong, holding it to be lodged in assembled presbyters—the superior assembly reviewing and revising, if need be, the judgments of the inferior; the synod that of the presbytery: and the general assembly that of the Synod. It is this view that leads us to regard the Independents as Christians without a Church, *and to insist on the ordination of Independent ministers before they could hold a benefice or officiate in our communion.*"

And, in a pamphlet, entitled *An Apology for the Church of Scotland*, Mr. Cumming has maintained the same views:

> "There is not a clergyman in the Church of Scotland who would continue to hold his benefice with Independent ordination, and sure I am that there is not one who dares avow his preference of it; for against no form of Church government has the Scottish [presbyterian] church made a firmer stand than that of Congregationalism or Independency. *The orders of an episcopal minister are distinctly admitted and sustained by the [presbyterian] church of Scotland, but those of Independency are treated, and justly, as no right Scriptural ordination.* Indeed, apart from all considerations of ministerial succession, nothing can open so effectual a door to every extravagance in doctrine, and every arrogant assumption of fanaticism, as the plan of Independency. The man that conceives, justly or unjustly, that he has a call from God to enter on the ministry, has only to bring together a few as wild and well-meaning as himself, and, in a twinkling, be registered as the Rev. Mr. Such-a-one, minister of the church assembling in such a chapel, and in proportion to the success of such empiricism will be the rarity of learning and weight in the Christian ministry.****I hold the importance of ministerial succession from the days of the Apostles: *I claim it for my own beloved co-presbyters;* and I cannot see that because this *great truth* has been abused, it is to be trampled on and despised, as it has been by many who have plunged into the opposite extreme."

In *The Confession of Faith, &c. &c.*, printed by authority, (Glasgow, Orr & Sons, 1842), we find it stated that "ordination is the act of a presbytery,"—that "there is no example in Scripture that any single congregation, which might conveniently associate, did assume to itself all and sole power in ordination,"—and that "ordination is always to be continued in the Church,"—pp. 360, 361. Here is the assertion of a Presbyterial Succession, exclusive of Independency, plainly set forth. And in the same book of authority, (p. 370), in the *Directions for Family Worship*, the following caution is given: "Let no idler, *who hath no particular calling*, or vagrant person, *under pretence of a calling*, be suffered to perform worship in families, to or for the same: seeing persons tainted with errors, *or aiming at division*, may be ready (after that manner) to creep into houses, and lead captive silly and unstable souls."

We think that the above quotations establish the fact, that the doctrine of a Presbyterial Succession, exclusive of Independency and Dissent in general, is maintained by the Church of Scotland. Let that body then stand forth, and honestly avow this doctrine. This would be Christian courage. But, at one time, to make common cause with Dissent against the Church, to descend from its high ground, and fraternize with communities that it believes to be sects,—and, at another time, when engaged in controversy with the Church, to avow the doctrine of a Presbyterial Succession, which involves the charge of schism against all other Protestant sects,—is not a straightforward nor ingenuous proceeding. It is a wearing of two faces under one hood: it is a species of Protestant Jesuitism bespeaking a weak and untenable cause.

The proposition, hazarded at the conference, viz., "that the form of the Church of Christ, for three hundred years from its establishment, was Presbyterian,"—is one of those bold and groundless assertions which must always recoil upon those who advance them. It is quite at variance with the highest Presbyterian authorities, as we will instantly show:

> "It will be admitted by every person acquainted with ecclesiastical history, that the form of government which is called Episcopal has from very early times generally prevailed in the Christian Church. For although Bishops and Presbyters appear to be confounded in Scripture, and in the writings of the Apostolical Fathers, yet, in the second century, the name of Bishops was appropriated to an order of men, who possessed exclusively the right of ordination and jurisdiction, and who were the overseers of those whom they ordained. *And from the second century to the time of the Reformation, this order of men continued to exist almost in all parts of the Christian world, and was regarded with respect and submission both by the clergy and laity.* But the first reformers, who believed that the distinction between Bishops and Presbyters has no foundation in Scripture, [If he means the English Reformers, we deny the accuracy of this statement.—Ed. Ch.] and who wished to apply an effectual remedy to the abuses which appeared to them to have arisen in the progress of human ambition, from the practice of investing Bishops with powers superior to Presbyters, did not consider the antiquity or universality of that practice as any reason for its being continued."—*Theological Institutes. By George Hill, D. D. Principal, &c.*
>
> "*In the second century, it is very plain that a settled distinction in several respects obtained between the Bishop and his colleagues in the Presbytery*, for as yet they may still be called colleagues. Many titles, which before had been common to them all, came at length to be appropriated to him who was considered as their head, such as ἐπισκοπος, ἡγουμενος, προεστως, πρωτοκαθεδρος, προισταμενος, ποιμην, and some others."—*Lectures on Ecclesiastical History. By George Campbell, D. D. Principal, &c. Vol. i. p. 180.*

Also the two great foreign champions of Presbyterianism, Blondel and Salmasius, agree with Professor Hill and Dr. Campbell, in assigning a much earlier date to the origin of Episcopacy, than that allowed by the Presbytery of Toronto. We are indebted to the Rev. John Sinclair's unanswerable "Vindication of the Episcopal Succession," for the following important quotations:

> "The followers of Blondel are commonly obliged to make concessions point by point as represented in the text; but their great master foresaw at once, that unless he gave his prime Presbyters a very close resemblance to Bishops, his system would be beset with difficulties that he might be unprepared for, (*improvisis difficultatibus, Præf.* p. 7.) He affirms, therefore, that prime Presbyters existed in the Church from the very beginning, under the auspices of the Apostles. He allows that they not only had a constant precedence, but exercised *authority* over the Presbyters; declaring that the right of presiding without the right of exercising authority, is an absurdity unworthy of a child to mention: (*pueris ludibrium*, p. 37.) He declares that Bishops were not elected to their office by the Presbyters, but succeeded by seniority, and held the station for life. He calls their jurisdiction a peculiar pre-eminent power (*singularis quædam et exsors potestas:*) a power in which they could have no colleagues, but successors only: (*Præf.* p. 35.) He calls his prime Presbyter a prince or captain of his brethren (*fratrum* ἔξαρχος). He admits that our Saviour, in his Epistles to the seven Churches of Asia, addressed the prime Presbyters, and made them responsible for the conduct of the Churches under their primacy, or prime Presbyterian jurisdiction. (*Præf.* p. 6.) And finally, he concedes that the presbyter acquired Episcopal prerogatives towards the middle of the second century, at Jerusalem, A. D. 135 or 136, at Alexandria, A. D. 143, and at Rome about A. D. 140. In short, Blondel explicitly declares that he is no *Aerian:* and labours no point more anxiously than to vindicate St. Jerome (whom he follows) from the charge of maintaining the Aerian heresy.—*See especially his Preface*, p. 59.
>
> Salmasius next to Blondel, the most learned supporter of Presbyterian discipline, and the most frequently appealed to by Anti-episcopalian writers, thinks it necessary to admit the still earlier origin of Episcopacy, and repeatedly declares that Bishops existed from the beginning, the Apostolic age alone excepted. *Sciunt rem esse antiquissimam, ut duo hi ordines in ecclesiâ fuerint distincti, episcoporum et presbyterorum, si excipiantur apostolica tempora.* (*Walo. Messalin.* p. 7.) Mentioning elsewhere (p. 181,) the change from the Presbyterian to the Episcopal form of polity, he dates it after the death of the Apostles, Peter and Paul, *post Apostolorum Petri et Pauli obitum;* and though he adds, *haud statim*, not immediately, yet we can hardly suppose that he refers to any period later than the death of St. John; though he certainly would not allow that the change took place under the sanction of that Apostle. For further passages to the same effect, see pp. 117. 119. 144. 177. 248. 283. 419.

And in an excellent tract by Bishop Wilson, of Calcutta, published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, we find the subjoined quotation, to the same effect, from the writings of Robert Hall, the eminent Baptist:

> "In regard to Episcopacy," says Mr. Robert Hall, "it appears to me entirely a human, though certainly a very early invention. It was unknown, I believe, in the Apostolical times; with the exception, probably, of the latter part of John's time. But, as it was practised in the second and third centuries, I should have no conscientious objection to it. As it subsists at present among us, I am sorry to say I can scarcely conceive a greater [abuse]. It subverts equally the rights of pastors and of people, and is nothing less than one of the worst relics of the Papal Hierarchy. Were everything else what it ought to be in the Established Church, prelacy, as it now subsists, would make me a decided Dissenter."

Here all the questions are conceded—Episcopacy is allowed to have existed in the time of the Apostle John—The Episcopacy of the second and third centuries (which is all we contend for) is not objected to. And the able and excellent R. Hall's nonconformity merely rested on what had nothing to do with the question of Episcopacy, the excessive authority, as he conceives, of the bishops of the present day. Yet, he says of one even of them, known to him by reputation, "He has not been injured by promotion; he is the same man as a Bishop that he was as the laborious parish priest; to such a Bishop we may apply the Apocalyptic title, 'an Angel of the Church.'"—*R. Hall's Works.*

We have, we think, adduced authorities, which cannot be rejected by Presbyterians, sufficient to show that Episcopacy is admitted by its ablest impugners to have been established in the first half of the second century,—the "three hundred years" of the Presbytery of Toronto to the contrary notwithstanding.—Churchmen, however, know that the origin of Episcopacy is much earlier, nay is apostolical, and consequently divine. They affirm, in the language of the Prayer Book, that "it is evident unto all men diligently reading the Holy Scriptures and ancient authors, that *from the Apostles' time* there have been these orders of Ministers in Christ's Church; Bishops, Priests, and Deacons."

An intelligent friend, who was present at the Open Court, held on the 27th December, has furnished us with the following notes of what, amongst other things, was said by two members of the Court:

"*Mr. Rintoul.*—Episcopal ordination was a heresy which unchurched not only the Kirk of Scotland, but all the Reformed Churches.

"The silence of Messrs. L. and R. to the question concerning the Church of Rome, showed that the doctrine of prelacy was akin to popery.

"*Mr. Bell.*—Prelatical ordination was a malignant heresy.

"He considered prelacy akin to popery, and ranked papists and infidels together."

The *Solemn League and Covenant* which is still *printed by authority* among the Catechisms, and Confession, &c. of the Kirk of Scotland, pledges all those who assent to it to "endeavour the *extirpation* of Popery, *Prelacy*, (that is, Church-government by Archbishops, Bishops, their Chancellors, and Commissaries, Deans, Deans and Chapters, Archdeacons, and all other ecclesiastical Officers depending on that hierarchy,) &c. &c. &c. that the Lord may be one, and his name one, in the three kingdoms;" and Messrs. Rintoul and Bell seem thoroughly imbued with the spirit of that rebellious and intolerant Declaration. We are not here going to argue the question of Episcopacy, or to defend the tenet of Episcopal ordination,—maintained as it is at this present day by the immense majority of Christians,—from the stigma of heresy: but we will just observe that, while the Church of England repudiates Scottish Presbyterian ordination, and any other Presbyterian ordination, her greatest writers place a wide difference between the Kirk of Scotland which wilfully threw off the divine ordinance of Episcopacy, and those foreign Churches which are represented,—whether correctly or not, we do not say,—to have sought after a reformed Episcopacy, Calvin sharing in this desire, but in vain. The true and only Church of Christ in Scotland is the Reformed Catholic Episcopal Church. Scottish Presbyterians, as Mr. Cumming says of the Independents, are "Christians without a Church." There cannot be two churches in Scotland; and an Act of Parliament, though it may establish and endow Presbyterianism, cannot impart to it a divine character.

With reference to the treatment of Messrs. Leach and Ritchie, by their former brethren, it has certainly been outrageous, wanton, and vindictive. When they were taking a step, which had been taken by such men as Archbishops Leighton, Tillotson, and Secker, by Bishop Butler, by Sir Walter Scott, and Mr. Marshall—we mean the rejection of Presbyterianism and the adoption of Episcopacy: when they wished to go quietly and noiselessly out from the Presbyterian communion: when nothing was alleged against their moral character: why were they not permitted (as Mr. Marshall, as Mr. Sibthorp, as *hundreds* of Presbyterian teachers who in the United States have at various times applied for Episcopal ordination, were permitted) to follow out their convictions in peace, without being harassed by a vengeance, which seems to have been exercised for the purpose of intimidating other Presbyterian ministers from embracing Episcopacy, should a closer examination into the subject impress them with a belief of its divine and exclusive claims? If the object of the Presbytery was to "set such a mark upon them, as to prevent the Church from receiving them into her ministry," it will, we believe, signally fail: for Messrs. Leach and Ritchie, we repeat it, have not been charged by the Presbytery with any moral delinquencies: the only charge brought against them (in reality) is that of having renounced Presbyterianism for Episcopacy: and *that*, of course, is no disqualification in the eyes of the Church. If there be anything known to the Presbytery, adverse to the character of Messrs. Leach and Ritchie, they are bound, in Christian honesty, to communicate it to the Bishop of Toronto, should his Lordship consent to ordain them. But if the character of Messrs. Leach and Ritchie be open to no censure from the Presbytery, let there be an end to all backbiting and underhand insinuations against them. They have both long stood before the world, enjoying all the reputation which Presbyterian sanction could give them, and, up to the moment of their resignation, they formed part, and that not the least learned part, of the Presbytery of Toronto. Mr. Ritchie is most respectably connected, both in Scotland and in this country; and, though less known in this Province, than Mr. Leach, we have heard him spoken of, by those acquainted with him, as a well-educated gentleman and an eloquent preacher. Mr. Leach has lived for years in this city, extolled, by the greater part of his congregation, as a model of ministerial excellence and ability, and respected by Churchmen, long before they knew his inclinations towards Episcopacy, as a preacher of peace, a faithful (though, he must pardon us for saying, not a duly commissioned) teacher of the Gospel, a learned divine, and an ardent lover of the British Constitution in Church and State. Is such a character to be forfeited, because he has become an Episcopalian? About the year 1638, when Presbyterianism was trampling upon Episcopacy in Scotland, *all* the Bishops were accused of simony, incest, fornication, adultery, Sabbath-breaking, drunkenness, and gaming, yet those of them, *without any exception*, who submitted to the new presbyterian church-government, were entrusted by the Assembly with the charge of parishes. (*Bp. Russell's Church in Scotland*, ii. 191.) Is the order of things to be now inverted, and are Messrs. Leach and Ritchie, uncensured as Presbyterians, to be stigmatized the moment they become Episcopalians? Above all, are improper motives to be imputed to Mr. Leach, for seeking admission into the Ministry of a Church, which, in this Province, has but two or three cures equal in point of emolument, to that which he so long held in this city, and which, had he been so minded, we believe he might have retained to this day?

The conduct exhibited by the Presbytery of Edinburgh towards Mr. Marshall, between whose case and that of Messrs. Leach and Ritchie there is a complete substantial resemblance, was very different from that manifested by the Presbytery of Toronto. Mr. Marshall's letter of resignation appeared, more than a year ago, in this journal, but that it may be compared with the letters of resignation of Messrs. Leach and Ritchie, we here reprint it:

Presbytery of Edinburgh.—The ordinary monthly meeting of Presbytery was held on Wednesday, the Rev. Mr. Bennie in the chair.

RESIGNATION OF THE REV. MR. MARSHALL

The Moderator having intimated that a letter had been put in his hands from Mr. Marshall, of the Tolbooth Church, the subject of which was painful in many respects, asked the Presbytery if it was their desire that it should now be taken up. This being assented to, the Clerk read as follows:—

"Edinburgh, 29th Sept., 1841.

"Rev. and Dear Sir,—My confidence in the form of Church Government established in this country having by recent events been very much shaken, I have felt it incumbent on me solemnly to consider its nature and scriptural foundation, and the result of this investigation has been a conviction at variance with the vow I took at ordination—'that the Presbyterian government and discipline of this Church are founded on the Word of God, and agreeable thereto, and that to the utmost of my power I will maintain, support and defend the said discipline and Presbyterian government during all the days of my life.'

"Episcopal Government I believe to be not only expedient, but, being coeval with Apostolic times, to have had the sanction of those who were divinely authorized to plant and model the Christian Church.

"With such sentiments I cannot remain any longer a minister of the Church of Scotland, and though in the prospect of leaving a Church of which I have been a minister for more than 20 years, of separating from a congregation to which I am tenderly attached, and of casting myself and family on the Providence of God, I feel deeply affected, and have endured a conflict of mind that has done considerable injury to my health, still integrity and truth compel me to make the sacrifice; and though I know, Sir, that you and my brethren of the Presbytery, will disapprove of the step I have taken, yet I trust you will believe I have acted conscientiously, and will receive my assurance, that it is my heart's desire and earnest prayer to God, that you and they may increasingly be blest, and be made more and more blessings to those among whom you labour.

"I am, Rev. and Dear Sir, yours very truly,
(Signed,) "James Marshall."

Mr. Marshall, immediately on the above being read, rose, and begged to say a few words in connection with his communication; he spoke, however, in such a low tone of voice that it was with difficulty we could make out what he said. He was understood to say, that so far from being influenced by any worldly considerations in taking the step he had done, he had the prospect of himself and his family being cast abroad upon the world with no other dependence than upon the bounty of God's providence. To some it might appear strange that such a change of sentiments had taken place at his time of life, but it was not difficult to explain the cause. *Before he was licensed to preach the Gospel he had paid some attention to the subject of Church government; but he could not say he had done so impartially, for all his feelings and prepossessions were enlisted on the side of Presbyterianism. Soon after he became a preacher of the Gospel, he was called upon to take charge of a parish, and from that time up to a recent period Church Government had never been thought of by him. The reason of this was, that his time and attention had been solely taken up with his parochial duties, and would have been so all his life had not recent events led him to the consideration of the matter.* As he now felt that his sentiments were inconsistent with the stringent vow he had taken on ordination to defend to the utmost of his power the Presbyterian Church and its discipline, he was thus under the necessity of retiring from the Church of Scotland. He could conscientiously say he did so not only without feelings of bitterness or anger, but with the full resolution to cherish towards its ministers and its people the warmest feelings of brotherly love.

The remarks of the *Herald*, especially on the point of Mr. Leach's alteration of opinion and consequent inability to maintain his Presbyterian vows, are put with such an energetic and comprehensive brevity, as to leave us but little to say on that head: and other matters, most unfairly misrepresented by the Presbytery, in their Libel, are set in their clear and proper light by Mr. Leach, in his Defence. Even were it not so, we have trespassed, on this occasion, far beyond our usual editorial limits; and, though the subject is one of vast importance and interest, we must hasten to a close. We will but say, in conclusion, that we rejoice in this open discussion of the relative claims of Episcopacy and Presbyterianism, and but express our firm belief, that many other unauthorised ministers, in various denominations, will soon be led to discover the invalidity of their commission to preach the Gospel, and to seek for admittance into our pure and reformed branch of the one Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church.

Canadian Ecclesiastical Intelligence.

FIRST
ANNUAL REPORT
OF THE
NIAGARA DISTRICT BRANCH OF THE CHURCH SOCIETY OF THE DIOCESE OF TORONTO,

Presented at a General Meeting of the Branch Association, assembled at Niagara, on Wednesday, January 4, 1843.

REPORT, &c.

In presenting (what may be called for the sake of convenience) The First Annual Report of the Niagara District Branch of the Church Society of the Diocese of Toronto, the District Committee would desire to express their devout acknowledgments to the "Author and Giver of all good things" for the measure of success which He has graciously vouchsafed to this Branch of the Society, and would fervently pray that He may be pleased so to inspire the hearts of His people with love to Himself, and so to bless the future operations of this Society, that the result may be the wide and extensive diffusion of sound religious knowledge, the building up of the members of Christ's mystical body in their most holy faith, and the salvation of many immortal souls, to the honour and praise of His holy Name.

So recent has been the formation of this District Branch, and so many retarding circumstances are apt to occur—almost unavoidably indeed—at the first carrying into effect any great object, that an elaborate detail of great and extensive operations cannot reasonably be expected on the present occasion. Your Committee, therefore, proceed to lay before you simply and briefly what has been done; and they are led to regard it as a happy omen of future good, for which they "thank God and take courage."

On Thursday, July 7, 1842, a Public Meeting was held in this place for the formation of a District Branch of the Diocesan Church Society, which was numerously and respectably attended, and at which the Lord Bishop of Toronto presided. Various resolutions were unanimously passed, and an excellent feeling pervaded the meeting.

At this meeting the District Officers were appointed; consisting of the Chairman, the Rev. William Leeming, senior Clergyman; a District Committee for the management of the affairs of the Society, composed of the Clergyman and Churchwardens of each parish; a Treasurer, Henry Mittleberger, Esq., and two Secretaries, the Rev. A. F. Atkinson, and Rev. T. B. Fuller. A Lay Committee, for the purpose of co-operating with the Lay Committee of the Parent Society at Toronto, in the objects expressed in resolutions 15 and 16 of that body, was also appointed, consisting of the following gentlemen: Hon. James Kerby, Samuel Street, James Cummings, John Mewburn, George Keefer, Sen., Henry C. Ball, Hon. Robert Dickson, Thomas McCormick, Robert Melville, George Ball, George Adams, William Hamilton Merritt, John Clark, George Rykert, Elias S. Adams, James W. O. Clark, William Nelles, J. McLean, and Agnew P. Farrell, Esquires, with power to add to their number.

An impetus being thus given to the good cause in the chief town and parish of the District, measures were shortly after adopted for holding a series of public meet-