

the meaning attached by different persons to the same words, and that in the absence of satisfactory evidence to the contrary, I am bound as a Christian gentleman to believe the Provost, who totally repudiates the errors attributed to him. Accordingly, I feel satisfied that I have taken a correct course, and am justified in my conviction when I find myself voting with Chief Justice Robinson, Hon. J. H. Cameron and Judge Hagerty, on a simple question of equitable treatment; and no mere clamour shall make me waver in the belief that the true way of strengthening our protestantism is to strengthen our Church of England principles, which I believe are honestly and truly held by those gentlemen who sit in the Council of Trinity College.

Foreign Ecclesiastical Intelligence.

EXTRACT FROM MONTHLY REPORT OF THE SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.

A letter had been received from Archdeacon Hellmuth, dated 21, Compton Road, Canonbury Square, Islington, Jan. 10th, 1862, enclosing a printed letter, addressed to him by the Bishop of Huron, setting forth the peculiar and pressing wants of the diocese of Huron.

The Archdeacon stated that the most pressing of the seven distinct objects, mentioned by the Bishop of Huron, was "the urgent and immediate wants of the theological College;" that the population of the diocese amounted to nearly half a million, and had increased nearly 80 per cent. in the last nine years: that there were in the diocese 18 counties and 188 townships, each township being ten miles square, and 66 of them being still unsupplied with clergymen: that since the consecration of the Bishop of Huron, four years ago, the number of clergymen have been increased from forty to seventy five; but that more than treble that number would be required to make adequate and due provision for the actual wants of the present population.

Towards the foundation of the proposed College, it appeared that nearly £3000 have been contributed by several friends, and promises had been received from others.

It was stated to the Board, that the Standing Committee had conferred with Archdeacon Hellmuth, and obtained from him further particulars. It appeared that in London, Canada West, where the new College was to be erected, the course of tuition of candidates for the holy ministry, during the same period of years, could be accomplished for about half what it would cost at Toronto, provisions being so much cheaper in that part of the west in which the diocese of Huron is situated: that the population was multiplying in the diocese of Huron more rapidly than in any other part of Canada, as the last census shows: that the late troubles in the United States have caused many families from the western states of America to settle in the diocese: and that the present requirements and future welfare of the diocese therefore demanded the immediate establishment of a College. The Archdeacon further stated, that the diocese had now an excellent opportunity of purchasing a most suitable building in London, with nineteen acres of land, the original cost of the building itself having been somewhat over £6000 currency, which could now be acquired, together with the nineteen acres of land, for about £3000 currency. The situation of the house in question is most central and healthy, commanding a fine view; and being within the city limits, the land will ultimately be most valuable in aiding the permanent endowment of

the College. Finally it was represented, that "by this time the Bishop, knowing that the Archdeacon has already collected more than £2500 sterling, equal to about £3000 currency, may have negotiated for the house known as the "Rideout House;" and that, in fact with the means already collected, if the positive promises of Christian friends in Liverpool, London, and elsewhere to aid this cause are taken into account, "it may be said that the College in question is in process of being commenced. Under all these circumstances," the Archdeacon added, "it is hoped the venerable Society will give its usually ready helping hand, as the College is positively necessary for the diocese, to which settlers from England, Ireland, and Scotland, as well as the United States of America, are now flocking in large numbers, owing to the fertility of the soil, the mildness of the winter in the west, and the cheapness of land and living."

The Standing Committee, having fully considered the application in all its bearings, gave notice that, at the next General Meeting of the Society on the 4th of March, they would propose that a grant of £500 be made towards this object, in order that the necessary operations contemplated may be immediately commenced.

CONVOCAION OF THE PROVINCE OF CANTERBURY.

UPPER HOUSE—WEDNESDAY, FEB. 12.

The Bishop of St David's—I think those who leave the Church of Rome for the Church of England are the least likely persons to exhibit any Romanising tendency. If they do incline to any extreme, it must be rather in the opposite direction.

The Bishop of Oxford—I am glad that the Bishop of London has brought the subject before the house, because any careful, thoughtful discussion of it must tend in the right direction. I fully concur in the greater portion of his remarks. There are others on which I differ from him, but I think it unnecessary to go into such points of difference at any length. We ought, in the first place, to lay down the broad Catholic principles on which the Church of England acts, and to point out the difficulties which have arisen from legislation interfering with proper action upon those Catholic principles. If we are to set matters right, we must endeavour as much as possible to free the action of the church from the shackles which have been imposed upon her by legislation, in most cases accidentally and unintentionally. For instance, at the time when an application was made for the consecration of Bishops for the North American Church, the only difficulty in the way was, that by the Consecration Service of the English Church the person to be consecrated bishop was required to take the oath of allegiance, and must be a natural born subject. There was no intention of preventing the Church of England from sending out missionary bishops. If any legislation was needed, the simple course would have been a declaratory act that in the consecration service for bishops out of her Majesty's dominions it should not be necessary to administer the oath of allegiance, but a bill was introduced which, though intended to enlarge them, quite unintentionally placed a limitation upon the liberties of the English Church. This evil was increased when another bill was introduced to remove difficulties which existed as to the consecration of an Anglican Bishop at Jerusalem. That bill, which was intended to give facilities, placed a very injurious fetter on the action of the church. While there is little objection and some precedent of ancient times as to requiring that

the assent of the sovereign power of the country should be given in a formal way before bishops are sent to a distance, yet the form in which the licence is given is liable to the most extreme misconstruction, and creates an impression that the Church of England supposes either that the Sovereign is the fountain of spiritual authority anywhere, or can grant ecclesiastical jurisdiction out of his own dominions. Unhappily, the words used in the act are very ambiguous, and it ought to be so considered as to remove that ambiguity. Legislation has brought us into such a condition that it has become necessary to review our whole proceedings, and place the subject on a more intelligible footing. The practical point, therefore, which I conceive is of the greatest importance, is this—that in any legislation, as either affecting our brethren of the Scotch communion or any other, we should endeavour, as far as possible, first, to bring the practice of our church out of those accidents into the practice of the Catholic Church in the best times; and secondly, that we should endeavour to guard ourselves from any practical evils to which the peculiar circumstances of the times may subject us in acting on those precedents. Now, as to the priests of the Roman Catholic and of the Greek Church, there is no impediment of any sort to our admitting them at our discretion. There is no question concerning this. The practical difficulty, as I understand it, which is felt by some of my right rev. brethren as to acting upon the same principle with regard to the Scottish presbyters, is this—that whereas there is no danger of our being inundated by candidates for our livings or curacies from either Rome or Greece, there might be a practical difficulty from a large entrance amongst us of persons who, owing to the causes described by the Bishop of London, have lower qualifications than we desire in those who are ordained to our benefices and curacies. It seems to me that the whole satisfaction we need or can have is not a satisfaction with regard to the training of the presbyter in another branch of the church; but that there ought to be no powers created by law which they should have the privilege of using against us. Then we should be on a perfectly safe platform, and there need be no interference with the principles of the Universal Church. I mean that there should be no power in a patron to force upon us, by law, persons who come in in this way from any foreign branch of the church, through any Act of the Legislature creating freehold rights for patrons. We ought to recur, as far as possible, to the simple rule of the Catholic Church. Therefore, whilst we take away those most un-Catholic prohibitions, we should take away at the same time any legal powers for using that liberty against the commonwealth of the church of which we are in charge. It ought to be left to the Archbishop of the province and the bishop of the diocese to see whether the persons brought in are fit to hold the position they claim. As far as the simple question of sufficiency of theological learning is concerned, our power under the law is perfect, because every bishop has the right to examine any person who may be presented to him for a benefice, and to reject him if he sees proper; and there is no court of appeal to take cognisance of that decision, which is final on the part of the instituting bishop, and protects the church effectually from the institution of ignorant persons. Of course, such a power is supposed to be honestly exercised by the bishop. But, so far as the ground of ignorance is concerned, no court of appeal takes cognisance of the act of the instituting bishop. No doubt the case of our Scottish brethren is peculiarly hard, because the bar to their entrance was imposed as a simple political