

was at the first propagation of Christianity communicated to ordinary Christians, without special qualification for ministerial services, (see Acts x. 44.) Now, if instead of "Bishops" we read "Christians" in the preceding extract, the argument will run thus:—"Have the Christians of which the Church is now composed seen Christ in the flesh? Do they possess the gift of inspiration? Do they work miracles, or can they by the laying on of hands confer miraculous gifts?" And, inasmuch as "these questions must be answered in the negative," the inference results, if we adopt as sound the argument which this contrast is made to yield when applied to Episcopal authority, that there are no Christians in the present day! And the comparison in question will just as fairly prove this, as that Bishops are not the successors of the Apostles, because they do not inherit their miraculous endowments; for these miraculous endowments, be it understood, were not limited to the Apostolic office and government,—which is all that Bishops claim,—as they were clearly unnecessary to a complete profession of the Christian faith.

"Why should the Apostleship be permanent," inquires Mr. Lillie, "when a full revelation is made, in the New Testament, of all that the Church requires to know, or Christ has thought it proper that she should know?" A conclusion of this kind would not only affect the preservation of the Episcopate, but would deny the propriety of instituting any government at all in the Church. Those who have been appointed to preside over Christ's mystical body on earth, may not indeed presume to originate doctrines; but they may, and do exert a very important influence in protecting and perpetuating, without injury, corruption, or innovation, "the faith once delivered to the saints," besides that they are invested with authority to arrange matters of discipline and to prescribe all ritual exercises and ceremonies,—a commission by no means unimportant, when we consider how deeply purity of doctrine is involved in the establishment of judicious regulations and appropriate liturgical forms.

It is impossible to imagine how long our opponents will be pleased to derive a fancied advantage from the circumstance which Episcopalians do not deny, that the terms "Bishop" and "Presbyter" are employed interchangeably in the New Testament. The fictitious argument must be marvellously popular with dissenters from our polity when it is constantly reiterated, as if the advocates of Episcopal superiority questioned, instead of admitting the correctness of the statement which is made, "What we have challenged our adversaries to do,—and what they have invariably evaded,—is to show that the Apostles did not possess and exercise powers peculiar to themselves and attached to the highest rank of the Christian Ministry; and that this distinctive power has not been perpetuated, and designed to be continued "to the end of the world."

We have already written so often and so copiously on this item of theological criticism, that we do not care to repeat the remarks which have been made on former occasions. The following observations, however, from the pen of that distinguished divine, the Rev. Charles Leslie, embody a luminous and scholarly exposition of the case:—

"If the Presbyterians will say (because they have no right to say any thing for or against) that the word 'Bishop' is a title of honor, and that every parish was at one time a bishopric, and that the Bishop of London, because the words *ἐπίσκοπος* and *ἀρχιεπίσκοπος*, bishop and primate, are sometimes used in the same sense; they may as well prove that Christ was a deacon, because he is so called Rom. xv. 22, *ἐπίσκοπος*, which we rightly translate a minister; and Bishop signifies an overseer, and presbyter an ancient man or elder man; whence our term of *elder*. And this is as good a foundation to prove that the apostles were elders, in the city acceptance of the word, or that our elders are all bishops and apostles, as to prove that presbyters and bishops are all one, from the childish gingle of the words.

"It would be the same thing if one should take to confront all antiquity, and prove against all the histories, that the emperors of Rome were no more than generals of armies, and that every Roman general was emperor of Rome, because he could find the word *imperator* sometimes applied to the general of an army.

"Or as if a commonwealth-man should get up and say, that our former kings were no more than our dukes now, because the title of *dux*, which is now given to dukes, was then given to kings.

"And suppose that any one were put under the penance of answering to such ridiculous arguments, what method would he take, but to show that the emperors were, same, and former kings of England, and generals of armies and dukes under them, and exercised authority over them."

"Therefore when we find it given in charge to Timothy, the first Bishop of Ephesus, how he was to proceed with his presbyters when they transgressed, to sit in judgment upon them, examine witnesses against them, and pass censures upon them, it is a most impertinent logomachy to argue, from the etymology of the words, that notwithstanding of all this, a bishop and a presbyter are the same thing; therefore that one text, 1 Tim. v. 19, is sufficient to silence this pitiful clamour of the Presbyterians, our English reformers, and our dissenting elders, who is the literal translation of the word *presbyter*, *καρὰ πρεσβυτέρου*, against a presbyter receive not an accusation, but before two or three witnesses; and then sit in judgment over all, that others also may fear. Now upon the Presbyterians hypothesis, we must say that Timothy had no authority or jurisdiction over that presbyter, against whom he had power to receive accusations, examine witnesses, and pass censures upon him; and that such a presbyter had the same authority over Timothy, which is so extravagant, and against common sense, that I will not stay longer to confute it, and think this enough to have said concerning the Presbyterian argument from the etymology of the words *bishop* and *presbyter*."

"We find in the Apostolical writings," continues Mr. Lillie, "no statement of the duties of any other officer (bishop), no description of the parties eligible to it, no distinct designation appropriated to it."

How completely at variance this insinuation is with the facts of the case may be easily ascertained from a perusal of the Epistles to Timothy and Titus; in which letters their capacity as superior overseers of their respective dioceses of Ephesus and Crete is manifestly implied and established by the injunctions delivered to them by St. Paul. These directions, the most of which are altogether unsuitable to the station of a mere Presbyter, may be classed under the following heads:—

INSTRUCTIONS TO TIMOTHY:

1. As to ministerial department, 1 Tim. iii. 2, &c.
2. Jurisdiction:
 - Over the people - - - - - 1 Tim. iv. 11.
 - Over widows - - - - - 1 Tim. v. 11.
 - Over the presbyters - - - - - 1 Tim. v. 19.
3. Inflection of ecclesiastical censures 1 Tim. v. 20.
4. Conferring of rewards on the elders 1 Tim. v. 17.
5. Impartial judgment - - - - - 1 Tim. v. 21.
6. Ordination - - - - - 1 Tim. v. 22.

INSTRUCTIONS TO TITUS:

1. As to ordination - - - - - Titus i. 5.
2. Cognizance and punishment of heresy - - - - - Titus iii. 10.
3. "All authority," - - - - - Titus ii. 15.

But it is asserted that all these powers and privileges were shared by Timothy in common with those who were no more than presbyters. To interpret by a supposition like this the commission to exercise judicial authority over the presbyters themselves, which is delivered in the injunction, "Against an *elder* receive not an accusation, but before two or three witnesses," would be equally rational and sensible with the observation, regarding any civil court of justice, that it was a mere accident, or at best only an arrangement for temporary convenience, that the judge was placed upon the bench, whilst the criminal stood arraigned at the bar!

Mr. Lillie refers to the assembly of the elders at Miletus, convened by St. Paul for the purpose of receiving his final exhortation; and, assuming the presence of Timothy on this occasion, goes on to say,— "If ever appointed Bishop of Ephesus it must have been before this, because Paul's first epistle to him, whence the notion of his being bishop is drawn, is universally acknowledged to have been written prior to this period." In the Bibles published with marginal references, the dates respectively of the Visitation at Miletus and the writing of the First Epistle to Timothy, are A.D. 60, and A.D. 65; which com-

position represents the epistle to be five years posterior to the assembly. If Mr. Lillie, before he ventured to make this gratuitous assumption touching the chronology of these two events, had borne in mind the argument in the *Horæ Pauline* of Archdeacon Paley, in which we cannot doubt he will fully concur, he would hardly have hazarded an affirmation like this. In the chapter on St. Paul's First Epistle to Timothy, the statement of Paley is as follows:—"Since the leaving of Timothy behind at Ephesus, when Paul went into Macedonia, suits not with any journey into Macedonia recorded in the Acts, I concur with Bishop Pearson in placing the date of this epistle, and the journey referred to in it, (see 1 Tim. i. 3), at a period subsequent to St. Paul's first imprisonment at Rome, and consequently subsequent to the era up to which the Acts of the Apostles brings the history."

The passage (1 Tim. iv. 14), which, compared with 2 Tim. i. 6, is supposed by some to intimate the conjunction of presbyters with St. Paul in the ordination of Timothy, is subjected to the following acute and searching criticism:—"Conjunction or association with, and not consent or concurrence, is the meaning of *κατά*. Besides, the pressing of this argument will overthrow the parties who use it, because it is not with the presbyters, but with the laying on of their hands, the preposition is joined, which will make the hands, or the laying them on, the concurring party, not the presbyters themselves."

We believe that the reflexion in the first clause of this paragraph will not be disputed by Episcopalians, so far as it relates to the idea of "conjunction or association" on the part of the presbytery. The force of the Greek preposition certainly conveys the impression that the presbyters were concerned with the Apostle, as the presiding officer, in the performance of this ceremonial, and that there was a joint action of the first and second orders of the Ministry, though the inherent power of ordination resided in the first alone. As to the second clause of the extract we have quoted, we have nothing to object but that it demands from us the modest avowal, "Davius sum, non Cædipus."—It might assist us to a clear apprehension of the "significant prægnans," which the writer of this sentence evidently supposed to exist in it, were it possible to illuminate our minds in regard to the nice distinction drawn between the use of their hands by certain individuals, and the accompanying disposition of the will on the part of the individuals themselves!

Of Mr. Lillie's patristic authority one case will suffice for a specimen of the whole. "In the earlier ages of the Church, presbyters exercised the same privilege or performed the same duty, as even Ignatius himself acknowledges implies." We know of no evidence to support this declaration but Mr. Powell's dismembered and perverted extracts, the dishonesty of which has been already fully exposed. But if any one, in a devout and honourable spirit, will study the Epistles of Ignatius in order to discover the bearing of his testimony, he will perceive that he presses earnestly upon all the Churches to whom he wrote, the indispensable obligation of a strict obedience to their respective bishops; that the laity should submit themselves to the presbyters and deacons, and to the apostolical college under Christ; and that the presbyters and deacons, as well as the laity, should obey their bishop as Christ himself, whose person he represented; that, therefore, whoever kept not outward communion with his bishop did forfeit his inward communion with Christ; that no sacraments were valid or acceptable to God which were not celebrated in communion with the bishop;—with a multitude of other precepts and admonitions which might be quoted from these valuable letters, declaring, in language the most unequivocal, the diocesan superiority of Episcopal regimen and control. But what does Mr. Lillie mean by the expression, "*even Ignatius himself*;" does he really concede the opinion that Ignatius was a bishop? But adds Mr. Lillie:—

"Gieseler notices it as remarkable how long this notion of the original identity of bishops and presbyters was retained, and that every Roman general was emperor of Rome, because he could find the word *imperator* sometimes applied to the general of an army."

"Or as if a commonwealth-man should get up and say, that our former kings were no more than our dukes now, because the title of *dux*, which is now given to dukes, was then given to kings."

"And suppose that any one were put under the penance of answering to such ridiculous arguments, what method would he take, but to show that the emperors were, same, and former kings of England, and generals of armies and dukes under them, and exercised authority over them."

"Therefore when we find it given in charge to Timothy, the first Bishop of Ephesus, how he was to proceed with his presbyters when they transgressed, to sit in judgment upon them, examine witnesses against them, and pass censures upon them, it is a most impertinent logomachy to argue, from the etymology of the words, that notwithstanding of all this, a bishop and a presbyter are the same thing; therefore that one text, 1 Tim. v. 19, is sufficient to silence this pitiful clamour of the Presbyterians, our English reformers, and our dissenting elders, who is the literal translation of the word *presbyter*, *καρὰ πρεσβυτέρου*, against a presbyter receive not an accusation, but before two or three witnesses; and then sit in judgment over all, that others also may fear. Now upon the Presbyterians hypothesis, we must say that Timothy had no authority or jurisdiction over that presbyter, against whom he had power to receive accusations, examine witnesses, and pass censures upon him; and that such a presbyter had the same authority over Timothy, which is so extravagant, and against common sense, that I will not stay longer to confute it, and think this enough to have said concerning the Presbyterian argument from the etymology of the words *bishop* and *presbyter*."

"We find in the Apostolical writings," continues Mr. Lillie, "no statement of the duties of any other officer (bishop), no description of the parties eligible to it, no distinct designation appropriated to it."

How completely at variance this insinuation is with the facts of the case may be easily ascertained from a perusal of the Epistles to Timothy and Titus; in which letters their capacity as superior overseers of their respective dioceses of Ephesus and Crete is manifestly implied and established by the injunctions delivered to them by St. Paul. These directions, the most of which are altogether unsuitable to the station of a mere Presbyter, may be classed under the following heads:—

INSTRUCTIONS TO TIMOTHY:

1. As to ministerial department, 1 Tim. iii. 2, &c.
2. Jurisdiction:
 - Over the people - - - - - 1 Tim. iv. 11.
 - Over widows - - - - - 1 Tim. v. 11.
 - Over the presbyters - - - - - 1 Tim. v. 19.
3. Inflection of ecclesiastical censures 1 Tim. v. 20.
4. Conferring of rewards on the elders 1 Tim. v. 17.
5. Impartial judgment - - - - - 1 Tim. v. 21.
6. Ordination - - - - - 1 Tim. v. 22.

INSTRUCTIONS TO TITUS:

1. As to ordination - - - - - Titus i. 5.
2. Cognizance and punishment of heresy - - - - - Titus iii. 10.
3. "All authority," - - - - - Titus ii. 15.

But it is asserted that all these powers and privileges were shared by Timothy in common with those who were no more than presbyters. To interpret by a supposition like this the commission to exercise judicial authority over the presbyters themselves, which is delivered in the injunction, "Against an *elder* receive not an accusation, but before two or three witnesses," would be equally rational and sensible with the observation, regarding any civil court of justice, that it was a mere accident, or at best only an arrangement for temporary convenience, that the judge was placed upon the bench, whilst the criminal stood arraigned at the bar!

Mr. Lillie refers to the assembly of the elders at Miletus, convened by St. Paul for the purpose of receiving his final exhortation; and, assuming the presence of Timothy on this occasion, goes on to say,— "If ever appointed Bishop of Ephesus it must have been before this, because Paul's first epistle to him, whence the notion of his being bishop is drawn, is universally acknowledged to have been written prior to this period." In the Bibles published with marginal references, the dates respectively of the Visitation at Miletus and the writing of the First Epistle to Timothy, are A.D. 60, and A.D. 65; which com-

position represents the epistle to be five years posterior to the assembly. If Mr. Lillie, before he ventured to make this gratuitous assumption touching the chronology of these two events, had borne in mind the argument in the *Horæ Pauline* of Archdeacon Paley, in which we cannot doubt he will fully concur, he would hardly have hazarded an affirmation like this. In the chapter on St. Paul's First Epistle to Timothy, the statement of Paley is as follows:—"Since the leaving of Timothy behind at Ephesus, when Paul went into Macedonia, suits not with any journey into Macedonia recorded in the Acts, I concur with Bishop Pearson in placing the date of this epistle, and the journey referred to in it, (see 1 Tim. i. 3), at a period subsequent to St. Paul's first imprisonment at Rome, and consequently subsequent to the era up to which the Acts of the Apostles brings the history."

The passage (1 Tim. iv. 14), which, compared with 2 Tim. i. 6, is supposed by some to intimate the conjunction of presbyters with St. Paul in the ordination of Timothy, is subjected to the following acute and searching criticism:—"Conjunction or association with, and not consent or concurrence, is the meaning of *κατά*. Besides, the pressing of this argument will overthrow the parties who use it, because it is not with the presbyters, but with the laying on of their hands, the preposition is joined, which will make the hands, or the laying them on, the concurring party, not the presbyters themselves."

We believe that the reflexion in the first clause of this paragraph will not be disputed by Episcopalians, so far as it relates to the idea of "conjunction or association" on the part of the presbytery. The force of the Greek preposition certainly conveys the impression that the presbyters were concerned with the Apostle, as the presiding officer, in the performance of this ceremonial, and that there was a joint action of the first and second orders of the Ministry, though the inherent power of ordination resided in the first alone. As to the second clause of the extract we have quoted, we have nothing to object but that it demands from us the modest avowal, "Davius sum, non Cædipus."—It might assist us to a clear apprehension of the "significant prægnans," which the writer of this sentence evidently supposed to exist in it, were it possible to illuminate our minds in regard to the nice distinction drawn between the use of their hands by certain individuals, and the accompanying disposition of the will on the part of the individuals themselves!

Of Mr. Lillie's patristic authority one case will suffice for a specimen of the whole. "In the earlier ages of the Church, presbyters exercised the same privilege or performed the same duty, as even Ignatius himself acknowledges implies." We know of no evidence to support this declaration but Mr. Powell's dismembered and perverted extracts, the dishonesty of which has been already fully exposed. But if any one, in a devout and honourable spirit, will study the Epistles of Ignatius in order to discover the bearing of his testimony, he will perceive that he presses earnestly upon all the Churches to whom he wrote, the indispensable obligation of a strict obedience to their respective bishops; that the laity should submit themselves to the presbyters and deacons, and to the apostolical college under Christ; and that the presbyters and deacons, as well as the laity, should obey their bishop as Christ himself, whose person he represented; that, therefore, whoever kept not outward communion with his bishop did forfeit his inward communion with Christ; that no sacraments were valid or acceptable to God which were not celebrated in communion with the bishop;—with a multitude of other precepts and admonitions which might be quoted from these valuable letters, declaring, in language the most unequivocal, the diocesan superiority of Episcopal regimen and control. But what does Mr. Lillie mean by the expression, "*even Ignatius himself*;" does he really concede the opinion that Ignatius was a bishop? But adds Mr. Lillie:—

"Gieseler notices it as remarkable how long this notion of the original identity of bishops and presbyters was retained, and that every Roman general was emperor of Rome, because he could find the word *imperator* sometimes applied to the general of an army."

"Or as if a commonwealth-man should get up and say, that our former kings were no more than our dukes now, because the title of *dux*, which is now given to dukes, was then given to kings."

"And suppose that any one were put under the penance of answering to such ridiculous arguments, what method would he take, but to show that the emperors were, same, and former kings of England, and generals of armies and dukes under them, and exercised authority over them."

"Therefore when we find it given in charge to Timothy, the first Bishop of Ephesus, how he was to proceed with his presbyters when they transgressed, to sit in judgment upon them, examine witnesses against them, and pass censures upon them, it is a most impertinent logomachy to argue, from the etymology of the words, that notwithstanding of all this, a bishop and a presbyter are the same thing; therefore that one text, 1 Tim. v. 19, is sufficient to silence this pitiful clamour of the Presbyterians, our English reformers, and our dissenting elders, who is the literal translation of the word *presbyter*, *καρὰ πρεσβυτέρου*, against a presbyter receive not an accusation, but before two or three witnesses; and then sit in judgment over all, that others also may fear. Now upon the Presbyterians hypothesis, we must say that Timothy had no authority or jurisdiction over that presbyter, against whom he had power to receive accusations, examine witnesses, and pass censures upon him; and that such a presbyter had the same authority over Timothy, which is so extravagant, and against common sense, that I will not stay longer to confute it, and think this enough to have said concerning the Presbyterian argument from the etymology of the words *bishop* and *presbyter*."

"We find in the Apostolical writings," continues Mr. Lillie, "no statement of the duties of any other officer (bishop), no description of the parties eligible to it, no distinct designation appropriated to it."

How completely at variance this insinuation is with the facts of the case may be easily ascertained from a perusal of the Epistles to Timothy and Titus; in which letters their capacity as superior overseers of their respective dioceses of Ephesus and Crete is manifestly implied and established by the injunctions delivered to them by St. Paul. These directions, the most of which are altogether unsuitable to the station of a mere Presbyter, may be classed under the following heads:—

How completely at variance this insinuation is with the facts of the case may be easily ascertained from a perusal of the Epistles to Timothy and Titus; in which letters their capacity as superior overseers of their respective dioceses of Ephesus and Crete is manifestly implied and established by the injunctions delivered to them by St. Paul. These directions, the most of which are altogether unsuitable to the station of a mere Presbyter, may be classed under the following heads:—

INSTRUCTIONS TO TIMOTHY:

1. As to ministerial department, 1 Tim. iii. 2, &c.
2. Jurisdiction:
 - Over the people - - - - - 1 Tim. iv. 11.
 - Over widows - - - - - 1 Tim. v. 11.
 - Over the presbyters - - - - - 1 Tim. v. 19.
3. Inflection of ecclesiastical censures 1 Tim. v. 20.
4. Conferring of rewards on the elders 1 Tim. v. 17.
5. Impartial judgment - - - - - 1 Tim. v. 21.
6. Ordination - - - - - 1 Tim. v. 22.

INSTRUCTIONS TO TITUS:

1. As to ordination - - - - - Titus i. 5.
2. Cognizance and punishment of heresy - - - - - Titus iii. 10.
3. "All authority," - - - - - Titus ii. 15.

But it is asserted that all these powers and privileges were shared by Timothy in common with those who were no more than presbyters. To interpret by a supposition like this the commission to exercise judicial authority over the presbyters themselves, which is delivered in the injunction, "Against an *elder* receive not an accusation, but before two or three witnesses," would be equally rational and sensible with the observation, regarding any civil court of justice, that it was a mere accident, or at best only an arrangement for temporary convenience, that the judge was placed upon the bench, whilst the criminal stood arraigned at the bar!

Mr. Lillie refers to the assembly of the elders at Miletus, convened by St. Paul for the purpose of receiving his final exhortation; and, assuming the presence of Timothy on this occasion, goes on to say,— "If ever appointed Bishop of Ephesus it must have been before this, because Paul's first epistle to him, whence the notion of his being bishop is drawn, is universally acknowledged to have been written prior to this period." In the Bibles published with marginal references, the dates respectively of the Visitation at Miletus and the writing of the First Epistle to Timothy, are A.D. 60, and A.D. 65; which com-

position represents the epistle to be five years posterior to the assembly. If Mr. Lillie, before he ventured to make this gratuitous assumption touching the chronology of these two events, had borne in mind the argument in the *Horæ Pauline* of Archdeacon Paley, in which we cannot doubt he will fully concur, he would hardly have hazarded an affirmation like this. In the chapter on St. Paul's First Epistle to Timothy, the statement of Paley is as follows:—"Since the leaving of Timothy behind at Ephesus, when Paul went into Macedonia, suits not with any journey into Macedonia recorded in the Acts, I concur with Bishop Pearson in placing the date of this epistle, and the journey referred to in it, (see 1 Tim. i. 3), at a period subsequent to St. Paul's first imprisonment at Rome, and consequently subsequent to the era up to which the Acts of the Apostles brings the history."

The Editor of the *Christian Guardian* evinces a very comprehensive philanthropy, and has apparently as much interest and anxiety to spare for questions regarding the Offertory, Surplice, &c., in the Church of England, as for the concerns of the "Book Steward" and the more weighty matters of a "Revival," within his own connexion. We must not disturb him in this enlargement of kindness, further than to observe that our recommendation of the recently published work of the Rev. Dr. Beaven, referred simply to it as a Manual of Devotions for Youth at school. Upon any prefatory remarks, as not necessarily connected with the main object of the work, we neither offered, nor meant to give, any opinion. If there should be any peculiarity in the sentiments or reasoning exhibited in those remarks, the Reverend compiler of the work is as able to explain or defend them as any other person can be; and it is certain that if the little Manual we took upon us to recommend be faithfully used, there would be little need of laying down any special rules as to the proper conduct of children under injury or affront.

Our Travelling Agent has commenced his collecting tour Westward, and will visit the several stations of the Home, Niagara, Gore, Wellington, Talbot, and London Districts, as far as the Town of London.

Communication.

To the Editor of The Church.

Rev. Sir,—In the *Statesman* of the 19th inst. I observe the Editor, Mr. Gowan, the Member for Leeds, in his anxiety to justify his conduct upon the University Bill introduced into the House of Assembly by Mr. Draper, has become the opponent of the Church of England, although I had hitherto considered him one of its supporters. He has, moreover, in my opinion, endeavoured to mislead the public, by introducing into that paper an Address of the Upper Canada House of Assembly to the King, passed in December, 1831, soliciting His Majesty to place at the disposal of the Legislature the School Lands, amounting to 539,217 acres, to be applied exclusively for the purposes intended by His Royal Father, &c. &c. If that Address would prove that the Conservative House of Assembly, by which it was proposed and adopted, contemplated depriving the University of King's College of the lands with which it had been previously endowed, and which were then under patent to the University, and could not be revoked by His Majesty any more than by any private individual. When that address was adopted, no attempt was made to deprive the University of what had been so graciously bestowed upon it.

Those who were opposed to King's College, urged that as much of an endowment had been given to it out of the Crown Reserves, for which 225,944 acres, part of the 539,217 acres, had been taken back by the Crown, His Majesty having the 225,944 acres, and other lands, still at his disposal, should appropriate the whole of the reservation of 539,217 acres, originally intended for Grammar Schools and a University, to Grammar Schools alone.

It would appear, however, that the address did not go so far as this, but merely asked His Majesty to place at the disposal of the Legislature exclusively for the purposes intended by His Majesty George the Third, which would of course include the University. But this last was not the intention, because all the members who supported the address knew the University was endowed out of the Crown Reserves, and claimed nothing more for it. The address would appear, therefore, rather inconsistent with the object it was intended to accomplish; but it was so worded in order to procure as unanimous a support as possible, and I believe all the friends of the University were so carried away by the address, that they did not see justice, and desirous that the public should not be deceived upon the facts connected with the University question, I have hastily prepared this communication, which I desire to be inserted in your valuable and extensively circulated paper.

A CHURCHMAN.

Cobourg, 6th May, 1845.

Ecclesiastical Intelligence.

CANADA.

DIOCESE OF QUEBEC.

Amount of Collections in Christ Church, from Easter, 1844, to Easter, 1845; and the manner in which the same has been appropriated:—

Total amount collected	£571 4 6
Sermon for Church School	£36 8 4
for Isle of Aran	16 14 10
for Church at Phillipsburgh	10 2 4
for Society Promoting Christian Knowledge	42 2 0
for Lord Choir	34 12 11
	£140 0 6
Am't. collected for Poor Fund	431 4 0
	£571 4 6

Paid away in the following manner:—
For Wood for the Poor, distributed in quarter doses, £63 10 3
For Bread and Meal 19 9 3
For Coffins and Digging graves 22 4 7
For Boots and Shoes 7 14 6
To Dorcas Church 14 0 0
For Sandwich 18 12 0
Superintendent 37 10 8
Orphan Asylum 14 15 0
Ladies' Benevolent Institution 6 5 0

Paid to 110 indigent persons, principally Widows with children, and infirm persons 181 13 7
Balance to the credit of Poor Fund on the 1st April, 1845 45 17 5

Amount expended £431 4 0

—Montreal Courier.

From our English Files.

LORD ASHLEY AND THE MANUFACTURERS.—Lord Ashley had a handsome testimony from the millowners in Mr. Brotherton's ingenious acknowledgement, uncontradicted by any one, that the noble lord's reforms hitherto had proved as beneficial to the employers as to the employed, a fact, indeed, sufficiently obvious to the eyes of all who are conversant with the manufacturing districts. This and the most interesting letter from a working mechanic, "describing the factory labourers as elevated to a higher order of beings within 20 years," read by the noble member for Dorsetshire, must afford him great encouragement in his glorious cause, and present an irresistible argument to the legislature to follow a leader at once so zealous and so circumspet. It is plain that the great work of social improvement is in irresistible progress—not in this trade or in that—but it was reproachfully thrown up to Lord Ashley, in all pursuits (probably the highest) which he has carried out to his lordship; and this has been the work of Michael Thomas Sadler, Esq., and Lord Ashley, in less than 15 years. St. James's Chronicle.

TRANSPORTATION OF FISH BY RAILROAD.—The seas that surround Great Britain, "that principal gold mine of the British Empire," which has been the work of Michael Thomas Sadler, Esq., and Lord Ashley, in less than 15 years. St. James's Chronicle.

multiplied, and in this way will be extended broadly the basis of the naval power of England, concurrently with a great increase of the comfort of her people. We can see no gap in the chain of causes and effects; but we repeat it,—this is a benefit from railroads foreseen by few, if by any.—*Ibid.*

THE SLAVE TRADE.—Zealous advocates as we have always been of the abolition of the Slave Trade, the measure just brought in by government for its prevention by a more stringent blockade of the whole line of African coast has our full approbation. The late regretted Sir Thomas F. Buxton, proved by at least five modes of investigation altogether various and distinct, that 250,000 negroes are annually torn from Africa, for the supply of the Portuguese, Brazilian, or western slave markets alone. He demonstrates that for every 10 negroes who reach Cuba or the Brazil, 14 are destroyed by disease. He shows that the Slave Trade, in the middle passage between Africa and America, subjects 120,000 more to the powers of slavery; and murders under every form of torture 255,000 more. To these must be added 100,000 victims of the Mahometan slave trade, constituting a total annual loss of Africa of 475,000. "The Slave Trade," says Sir T. F. Buxton, besides its living victims, requires a daily sacrifice of one thousand lives." We need not add a word to this fearful sentence of the great and good deceased philanthropist.—*Cambridge Advertiser.*

CRUELTY TO ANIMALS.—We noticed in our last week's *Cambridge Police* report the laudable step taken by the society for the prevention of cruelty to animals, in prosecuting through the intervention of Mr. Litchfield, of Cambridge, all flagrant cases of brutality to the dumb creation, which may be brought before the magistrates. We have before expressed our regret that some of the various societies for the protection of animals have not resorted to the very obvious step of employing an agent here before, and we regretted to be obliged to attribute the neglect to the mutual jealousies, rivalries, and dissensions, which are rife between the three existing societies for the prevention of cruelty to animals. But, "better late than never." Besides the appeal to humanity and Christianity, the subject of animal protection is intimately connected with the most important question of the day, the moral education of the people.—Throughout the whole scriptures, the protection of animals, even to the mother bird sitting on her young is solemnly enjoined. It has been justly said that the "infant who begins by learning to be kind to the brute, will not be long in learning to be kind to his fellow-men." If we can but get the child to be kind to the brute, we can get him to be kind to his fellow-men. Animal cruelty prepares for murder and discipline for the scaffold. Abate it and the periodical crimes that disgrace the calendar will be abated. Its abatement and abolition will go hand in hand with one of the great hopes of Philanthropy—the mitigation of capital punishment.—*Ibid.*

GRANT TO MAYNOOTH.—The inquiry which Protestant England now has to make, is not what the Irish Parliament did in 1793, under the peculiar circumstances of that period, when, in consequence of the French war, the Continental education of Irish Priests was no longer practicable, but whether it is at liberty now to become the nursing mother of Romanism; whether it is a work upon which, as a nation, she can invoke the blessing of God, whether, while she teaches her own children to view with alarm the slightest approach to Popery, she can conscientiously assist in facilitating the approach of others to the same. If she can do so, she will not be guilty either of deliberate hypocrisy or deliberate treachery. There really does not appear to us to be any middle course in this business. The more we reflect upon it, the more firmly we are fixed in that conviction. If Popery be a true religion, why are Protestants? Why have we renounced it? Why do we keep aloof from it? Why do we profess to be true to our religion? or what comes to the same end for our argument—if we sincerely believe that it is not, why do we seek to commit the sin of aiding in its propagation? Let those who believe in its truth perform the duty which that belief imposes upon them—let every means in their power be diffused, if it be so, that it is the duty of a sincere Roman Catholic, as it undoubtedly is, it cannot also be the duty of a sincere Protestant. There we take our stand. Indeed, we would say to the sincere Protestants, copy the example of sincere Roman Catholics, and be gracious alike of that country, meaning by the term, we call for no persecution. We simply desire that Popery should be left to look after itself.

They who think that this proposed augmentation of the grant, or the contemplated measures for promoting academic instruction in Ireland, will have the effect of conciliating the Roman Catholics, and will be the means of bringing about a union, contentment and satisfaction, will find themselves miserably deceived. The only satisfaction, the only satisfaction, of which Romanism is susceptible, lies in one word—supremacy. It can patiently wait its time—it can calmly wait its opportunity—it can silently carry on its own work—but it never loses sight of its one great object. Bind it with a chain of a thousand links—strike