

Episcopal Ordinations Vindicated, in which the point raised by the Archbishop's letter is clearly defined, and the exclusive validity of Episcopal Orders is demonstrated by evidence from Holy Scripture which we apprehend, it will not be found easy to controvert. But while leaving this theological question in the hands of those to whom it properly belongs to deal with it, we cannot bring our present observations to a close without making an appeal to the consciences of those among what is commonly called the Low Church party, who are, as we believe many, very many, of them are,—sincerely anxious for the promotion of true religion and for the welfare of our national Church.— Giving them credit for zeal, for earnestness, for personal piety, we would ask them to pause, before, through the blindness of party spirit, they become parties to the betrayal of the Church into the hands of the world. If there is no purely religious authority in the Church,—the authority vested in the Episcopate, derived in regular succession from the Apostles,—it follows that the Temporal Rulers, the Powers of this world, are the only authority to which, in matters of faith, men are bound to defer. This, indeed, is the position taken on behalf of the Church by the Archbishop; it is on this principle that his Grace acknowledged the *dictum* of Lord John Russell, as an all-sufficient evidence of qualification for the Episcopal office; on this principle that he recognized and abetted the jurisdiction of the Committee of the Privy Council in a controversy of faith; on this principle that he is opposed,—as his public declarations in his place in Parliament lead us to conclude that he is,—to the revival of the synodical functions of the Church. And there is no lack of time serving Churchmen, such as Dean Elliot, who stand forward without a blush in defence of the theory that there is no such thing as a Divinely-derived Spiritual authority; that in the Church and over her faith, no other authority is to be recognized but the temporal authority of the Crown.

Now, this theory, we contend, is at variance no less with the principles of the British Constitution, such at least, as they were when the relations between Church and State were fixed, than with the unchanging principles of the Catholic Church, of which our Church is, as she professes to be, a branch. It was never in this sense that the Crown claimed, or the Church conceded the Royal Supremacy over the Church. In claiming that Supremacy, the Crown distinctly recognized the Episcopate, its Divine origin and authority; all the Crown claimed was, that the regulation of the exercise of this Divine and spiritual authority within the realm belonged not to the Bishop of Rome, who had usurped it but to the Temporal Sovereign, as under God supreme within his dominions. And an obligation was not only implied, but distinctly expressed, to rule the spiritually by the spiritually; to respect that Divine and spiritual authority of the Church, and to give it free scope to exert itself for the promotion of true religion among the subjects of the Crown. To deny that Divine and spiritual authority, to make the Bishops and the Clergy the mere creatures of the Temporal Power, and even the creature of the Church subject to that Power, is to confound heavenly with earthly things, to render unto Cæsar the things which are God's, and to abolish a distinction, than which none is more strongly marked in Holy Writ,—the distinction between the Church and the world.

Communications.

[We deem it necessary to follow the example of the London Church periodicals, and to apprise our readers that we are not responsible for the opinions of our Correspondents.—Ed. Ct.]

To the Editor of the Church.

Sir—Although the tone of your observations on the letter which I took the liberty of addressing to you relative to Trinity College and the Toronto University, leaves me little to expect from your dispassionate consideration of the subject; it is such that I shall once again trespass on your columns for the purpose of putting your readers in possession of what I and others believe to be the truth.

I trust you will pardon me therefore, if for the sake of accuracy I quote your actual words as I may find occasion to refer to them—and first you say:—

"The Senator, seems considerably nettled at our allusion to the assumption of official style in recent documents proceeding from the Institution with which he is connected."

I respectfully require you to point out in what portion of my previous letter there is any indication of my being nettled—I rather think the "nettle" is on the other side.

"And departs from the question entirely in his observations. Our remarks were directed not to the title as he gives it, 'The Toronto University,' or 'The University of Toronto,' to which we know he is legally entitled, but to the use of the definite article only as a prefix. We refer him to the advertisements in the newspapers of this City and elsewhere, and he will find that the words 'THE UNIVERSITY' only are employed."

A little accuracy on your part would have prevented this difficulty. I now submit the sentence I referred to cut out of the Church newspaper, and beg you to reprint it exactly, thus:

"... what we see now very significantly styled in the official announcement, *par excellence*, THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO."

It was not very likely that any one should surmise that you only alluded to the words "THE UNIVERSITY." Was it not reasonable to read it as I and many others have done, "The University of Toronto," and to remark on it accordingly? But I most willingly admit on your explanation, that my remarks were inapplicable; and I am not prepared at present to defend the use of the words "The University," *per se*; though it is not improbable there may have been some good reason for thus employing them.

To proceed to your conclusions—

"1st. That the Chancellor, in his official capacity, has exhibited a strong feeling of jealous opposition to the Charter of Trinity College."

I can hardly compliment you on this sentence.—If you mean to repeat that the individual acts of the Chancellor, not merely unauthorized but repudiated by the Senate, or any other constituted authority of the Toronto University, implicates the University, I again peremptorily deny it as non-sustainable either by fact or legitimate inference. Perhaps the introduction of the words "in his official capacity" may have a meaning?—perhaps not. It would probably answer a good purpose if you would take the trouble to explain. In reference to my denial of the Chancellor having any authority from the University, for his acts of hostility to Trinity College, you say:—

"We maintain that the *onus probandi* lies with him, as we are not in a position to prove or refute it, not having access to the minutes to which he refers."

This is rather novel doctrine, and certainly so very new in the Church newspaper as to raise strange doubts in my mind. In my former letter you will find the following words:—"... on their minutes will not be found one solitary paragraph by which your insinuations and assertions—that in these proceedings the Chancellor was 'the exponent of the views' of the University; that 'the other constituted authorities' coincided with or supported him in these proceedings, ... can be supported." Do you really ask me to prove a negative? I maintain that the "*onus probandi*" lies with you. You began by making an assertion—I denied it, and stated that the Senate "refused to support or follow up these unauthorized proceedings of the Chancellor." You have no evidence of your assertion, and yet with the most extraordinary mock gravity you ask me to prove a negative!—"A Daniel came to judgment!—yea a Daniel!"

Your difficulties about the "minutes" are easily removed. Mr. Cameron, the Bursar of the University is authorised to give you or any accredited gentleman belonging to the Press free access to, and inspection of the minutes.

"2dly." I admit most freely that among twenty five members of the Senate a great diversity of opinion exists. Does this admission weaken in the slightest degree any assertion that I have made?—Does it justify or palliate any of your mistakes or erroneous assertions?

"3dly." We infer, that if the Chancellor did pursue the course we have pointed out *calicely unauthorized* by the Senate, that body has been guilty of a breach of faith to the public, in permitting him to hold an office, the authority of which he prostitutes to the gratification of his own personal feelings. And we cannot conceive that the Senate is so entirely devoid of power as not to be able to remove or displace that officer for such a flagrant breach of privilege."

"We infer"!! I have looked carefully at the Act, and beg to inform you that the Senate has no power whatever to remove or displace the Chancellor, so that the notion of the Senate being guilty of a "breach of faith" &c., is mere bunkum, utter nonsense. The Senate exercised the only power they possessed, in "refusing to support or follow up these unauthorized proceedings of the Chancellor." You have the power of consulting the Act, and thus ascertaining how far your inference is well founded.

Falstaff says—"your *if* is a great peacemaker—your readers would hardly say this of your *if*. I repeat, and challenge contradiction, that the proceedings of the Chancellor were altogether unauthorized by the Senate."

"4thly." We conclude that in the minds of some members of the Senate, "constituted as it now is," there does exist a feeling of hostility to Trinity College Charter."

This is certainly a *shrewd* conclusion, though not a new discovery.

"And lastly we maintain that they have exhibited this feeling in at least one overt act, e. g., the reduction of their fees for tuition."

This is one side of the story—I shall give you the other side, not for the sake of converting any partizan, but to place before the public the facts, and thus enable them to judge how far the foregoing attack is justifiable. A paid lawyer may tell his tale to a jury, but they, the jury, must judge from the evidence *actually brought before them*. Your assertion leads to an unpleasant impression as to where the "law" exists. But now to my version.

When the Medical Faculty of Trinity College was announced as going to work, their fees were placed at TWO DOLLARS for each course less than those of the Toronto University—(If our Senate has been guilty of an "overt act" in lowering these fees, the first overt act of aggression was committed by the Trinity College)—I pray you to mark, that this was done without any note, comment, or explanation! Here was *apparently* a challenge for competition, and an under-bidding for pupils. Could any one shut his eyes against the *apparently* palpable fact? Was this an "overt act" of hostility against the Toronto University?

The question of lowering all the fees in the Toronto University had previously been the subject of discussion among the members of the Senate—and when brought before that Body, was not adopted without considerable opposition. The reduction was not made on account of the under-bidding of the Medical Faculty of Trinity College, but on broader and more important grounds; and I beg to inform your readers that many of our body maintain, that with the present endowment, there should be no fees at all, but that the University Instruction should be free to all, without any expense to the Student; others again, contend that this principle is erroneous. This, by the way. Again, justice would have dictated to you to inform your readers that the corresponding fees in Trinity College have since been reduced—whether below those of the Toronto University or not you will perhaps enquire and tell us.

If, following the example of Trinity College, he styled an "overt act" of hostility on the part of the Toronto University, we shall require a new explanatory dictionary of the English language.

I will not trespass any further at present, but shall, most assuredly, trouble you again should I find in your columns any statement calling for further remarks.—Praying you to pardon anything in the foregoing which may appear incongruous or harsh.

I have the honor to be, Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,

ONE OF THE SENATE

OF THE TORONTO UNIVERSITY.

Toronto, Oct. 18, 1851.

To the Editor of the Church.

Sir,—My attention has been called to an editorial article in the Church newspaper of the 2nd instant, in which I find an attack upon myself as virulent and abusive as it is truthful. You metamorphose me into an officious and relentless opponent of an University Charter to Trinity College, and then thoroughly abuse me for it; when the fact is, I never did one thing, or said one word for or against granting such a Charter to Trinity College on either side of the Atlantic. It was an affair of the Church of England in this Province, which affected the rights of no other religious denomination; and I am not in the habit of interfering, in any way whatever, in matters connected with the internal affairs of any Church of which I am not a member.

I arrived in England last autumn after the Lord Bishop of Toronto's departure for Canada, and therefore after the close of his correspondence with Lord Grey; and I did not return to Canada until June, after the close of the Bishop's correspondence with His Excellency Lord Elgin. I could not, therefore, have opposed the Bishop's application either in England or in Canada, as you allege.

It is true, that in my first interview with Lord Grey, some time in November, his Lordship inquired of me

as to Toronto University. My reply was, that the act modifying it had been strongly objected to on religious grounds, by the Wesleyan Methodists as well as by the authorities of the Church of England; but that the authors of the act had not intended to proscribe religious instruction; and to remove all doubts on the subject, and meet the religious feelings of the Canadian people, a bill had been introduced and passed during the then recent session of the Legislature, expressly recognizing the principle of religious education, and providing for the religious instruction and oversight of students in the University in the same manner that it had been provided for in respect to student-teachers in the Provincial Normal Schools, to which no religious persuasion in Canada had taken exception, and in the carrying out of which all had co-operated. At this Lord Grey evinced much satisfaction, but expressed his surprise that he had not before heard of this amended act, and wished to know if I could furnish him a copy of it, as he had not received any of the acts passed by the Canadian Legislature at its (then) late session. I promised to do so. His Lordship asked me as to the views of the several religious denominations in Canada, in regard to the Toronto University as now established. I told him, that as it was established upon the same principle, in regard to religious instruction, as the Provincial Normal School, to which no religious body objected, I thought it would be approved by the religious denominations of the country generally—that the Synod of the Free Church of Scotland in Canada had expressed its satisfaction with the religious principles of the amended University act—as had the Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada. That there were but two denominational colleges in Upper Canada with University powers—Queen's College, at Kingston, established by the Church of Scotland in Canada, of whose views of the amended Toronto University Charter I knew nothing; and Victoria College, established by the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada, the Conference of which, at its last session had adopted a resolution expressing its approval of the Christian principles on which the University was now established, and its readiness to co-operate with it so far as related to Victoria College, provided it could be removed to Toronto, by such a disposal of the buildings and premises at Cobourg as would not involve too great a sacrifice, and would be approved of by the Wesleyan body generally. At Lord Grey's request, I furnished him with a copy of the resolutions which had been adopted by the Wesleyan Conference in respect to the amended Charter of Toronto University, as also a copy of the act thereof, or rather the printed bill which had become an act.

Such is the substance of my incidental conversation with Lord Grey on the subject of Toronto University, and such are the circumstances under which they occurred; and during the whole of which I never thought of the Bishop's application, or of Trinity College, and did not hear one word respecting the one or the other. Nor had I any idea that Lord Grey, in the enquiry he made of me, had any reference to what might have been stated in correspondence between the Bishop of Toronto and his Lordship. It appears Lord Grey had imagined that there were more than two University Colleges in Upper Canada, besides Toronto University, and that my mention of but two conveyed the idea that the others had been abandoned. That the error on this point existed in the mind of his Lordship, and was by mistake attributed to me, is obvious to every person of common sense and candour acquainted with the subject—as I could not have been ignorant on a matter so patent to every body, and could have had no motive or reason whatever under the circumstances to exaggerate the number of University Colleges in Upper Canada, even had I been as capable of doing so as you assume.

Lord Grey only alludes to me in reference to the character of Toronto University, and Canadian views entertained as to the principles on which it is now incorporated, but not in reference to Trinity College; nor could any answers which I made to his Lordship's inquiries have been referred to in connexion with Trinity College, had not the Lord Bishop of Toronto, (as it appears by his printed correspondence,) based his application for Trinity College Charter upon the false issue, that the Canadian Government and Legislature had robbed the Church of England and avowed infidelity in Education,—thereby putting it out of the power of the authorities either in England or Canada to accede to his request without condemning themselves. And I, because I answered questions put to me by Lord Grey respecting Toronto University, am abused by *The Church* for meddling with the Bishop and Trinity College! It is not the first time that the Bishop has put the interests of the Church of England upon a false issue—placed its best friends in a false position—and thereby done more real injury to that Church than the most powerful of her avowed opponents. The Bishop has done the same thing in his last Triennial Charge (published in *The Church* in May last) charging infidelity upon the whole common school system which I have endeavoured to introduce. To the misrepresentations of that charge, on matters peculiarly relating to my department, I yet owe a corrective reply. For the Lord Bishop to do his utmost to defame and degrade the Educational Institutions of the country because he is not the director of them, and to sever the Church of England from them, and array it against them, because they are not the exclusive agencies of that Church, is, in my opinion, as unpatriotic to Canada as it is suicidal to the legitimate influence and future prospects of the Church of England—a Church whose well-being I desire only second to that of the one with which I am more immediately connected.

You have alluded in terms of gratification to the movement making by the Wesleyan body to endow Victoria College; but you represent that movement as one of disapprobation and hostility against the Toronto University. In the official address announcing and expounding that movement, you will find an expressed approval of the Christian principles on which the University is established; and that address, which I believe has been approved by *The Church*, as well as by the *Daily Patriot*, was suggested by myself, and in behalf of the objects of which several members of the Victoria College Senate—all approvers of the Christian principles of the Toronto University amended Charter, subscribed £51 each.

But while I have said this much in regard to the Christian principles recognized and avowed in the amended Charter of the Toronto University, I do not wish to convey the idea that I have any unfriendly feeling in regard to the energetic and liberal efforts which have been made to establish Trinity College; not that it should be denied powers, or privileges, or assistance, which may be enjoyed by the College of any other religious persuasion in Upper Canada. Nor do I wish to be considered the apologist of the past or present character of Toronto University. I believe that had the money which has been expended and profligately in connexion with that hitherto feeble, but most expensive institution during the last ten years, been

expended in aid of several Colleges, four times the number of young men would have been better educated, and ten times the educational and moral benefits would have been conferred upon the people of Upper Canada. But it cannot be forgotten, that as long as Toronto University was an appendage and agent of the Church of England, the Lord Bishop of Toronto and *The Church* protested against a stipend of the endowment being given to Victoria, or Queen's or any other College in Upper Canada, and advocated the unity of the endowment as strongly as the authors and advocates of the present amended University Charter—only that now all religious persuasions are placed upon equal footing, and the religious instruction of their youth *equally* provided for. But it appears that the Bishop would not be satisfied with sharing equally with other denominations in regard both to the University endowment and all other civil and religious rights. Had he avowed and acted upon that doctrine twenty-five years ago, it would have been an unspeakable blessing to Canada, religiously, educationally, civilly, and socially, and, I think, an equal blessing to the Church of England herself.

What the Toronto University may become, or may be made, is problematical. It has given practical and melancholy proof that it is not a large endowment that makes an University worthy of, or adapted to, the wants of the country. If the expectations of the authors and supporters of the amended Charter should be disappointed, and the University become what you allege it is, "the despised of all denominations," it will be chiefly, if not exclusively, owing to the spirit which has dictated and which pervades the communication inserted in the last *Church*, signed "One of the Senate of the Toronto University," which clearly emanated from a high officer in the University, and in which the author makes gratuitous attacks upon his fellow-members, and shoots the arrows of dark insinuations against the newly appointed members of the Senate, not of his own religious persuasion, who have much more reason to apprehend hostility from him against their Churches than he has to insinuate hostility on their part to his; and several of whom I know, including myself, had not the remotest idea of being appointed to the Senate, until they were applied to on the part of the Government for their consent to undertake that service—occupying, therefore, a position very different from that of their anonymous assailant who may have long been thriving upon University abuses; and, (to use his own words) by "most nefarious proceedings," striving to perpetuate wrongs upon those same religious persuasions whose representatives he now wantonly insults.

I have the honor to be, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

E. RYERSON.

Toronto, Oct. 13th, 1851.

Colonial.

The Royal Mail Steamer *Lord Elgin* met with a serious accident, on her passage down from Kingston, on the 11th inst. Her walking-beam fell through into the cabin upon the breakfast table, doing a good deal of injury. It was miraculous that no person was injured. She was towed down to Lachine.

ACCIDENT.—On Saturday evening, about 5 o'clock, while George E. Gurnett, Esq., our Police Magistrate, was riding along King Street, his horse stumbled near to the corner of York-st., and came down. Mr. Gurnett's face was cut severely. We are happy to say that he is doing well.

A MAN KILLED.—On Saturday, James Boyle, a laborer, was engaged in undermining a brick wall at the Gas Works, when a man named George Sweeney came up, and commenced conversing with him. They had been in conversation only a few minutes, when about 20 feet of the undermined wall suddenly fell, killing Sweeney on the spot, and inflicting several serious injuries on Boyle. Deceased was unmarried.

MELANCHOLY ACCIDENT.—About noon on Monday last, Maurice Beaulieu, of St. Denis, an old man of 96 years of age, while crossing the St. Hilarie and Belair Bridge, on the St. Lawrence and Atlantic Railroad, was overtaken by a long line of sand-cars, propelled by an engine, and was killed on the spot. The poor old man was deaf, and was unconscious of the approach of the train or the attempts made to stop the engine.

DREAFFUL ACCIDENT.—A fatal accident occurred on Tuesday afternoon last, at the Garrison. Whilst a soldier of the 23rd Regiment, Welsh Fusiliers, was cleaning a gun, being ignorant of its being loaded, it went off, and lodged the contents in the head of a soldier who was in a room adjoining, by passing through the partition, and causing instant death. An inquest was held, and a verdict returned according to the circumstances, "accidental death."—*London Times*, C. W.

PLEASING TESTIMONIAL.—We have just seen a splendid Gold Pencil Case, and Sleeve Buttons, presented to our worthy and indefatigable fellow-citizen Mr. Robert Symes, J. P., by Martin Benedict, Esq., of New York, one of the gentlemen who were attacked with Asiatic Cholera, while sojourning at Sword's Hotel, in the beginning of last month. We learn that Mr. Symes very kindly took this gentleman to his own residence, whilst still labouring under the effects of the Cholera, and procured medical and other assistance until he was sufficiently recovered to return to his home in the United States. The above articles were tendered to, and accepted by Mr. S. as a token of the deep gratitude of Mr. Benedict for the polite attention which he received during his illness at Quebec.—*Quebec Mercury*.

The new steam factory recently erected by Mr. Mountjoy, in London, have been destroyed by fire. The premises were insured for the sum of £1000.

The Hamilton Spectator is soon to be issued daily.

The Engineers of the Great Western Railway are now in Galt, making the necessary preparations for commencing operations on the Road. A Railroad Office will be established here forthwith, and the Engineers will remain there until the winter to superintend the operations. A fortnight's notice will be given the inhabitants, of the day when the works will be formally opened by the Directors; and the labours of the ensuing winter will be chiefly confined to excavating the deep cutting at Mr. John D. Campbell's and the immense works near Fairchild's Creek.—*Galt Reporter*.