

Mr. Gough, Mr. Ross, Edward Jones, Thos. H. Shneider, Mr. George Nelson, Hon. Robt. Jones, Mr. Bowman, Mr. Leggett, Isaac Cote, John Yule, Esq. Col. Austin, Mr. Walter Neadler, Mr. Garrigle, Hon. John Pangman, John McKenzie, Wm. McDonald, John Penner, Mr. E. Pangman, Mr. Wm. Bennett, John Armstrong, James Armstrong, Captain Fonnert, Jno. Bostwick, George Twanley, Mr. G. Shortley, Jos. Drake, Richard Bradford, Galloway Freligh, Mr. Geo. Allsopp, Wm. Colgan, Dr. Alexander, Mr. J. McDonald, Chas. Jones, John Upstone, Wm. W. Williams, Wm. Taylor, Robert Smith, James Irwin, Stephen H. Schuyler, Allan Munroe, Alex. Perry, D. S. Ramsay, Esq., T. D. Fulford, Esq., Wm. Rutherford, Charles Schneider, R. S. Robins, George Dickson, John M. Standish, O. Crossfield, Mr. A. Knapp, Daniel Westover, Mr. Taylor, Mr. Higginson, Wm. Baker, Dr. C. J. Butler, A. Torrington, J. Nolen, Mr. O. Warren, Wm. West, Amos Vaughan, Peter Hawley, Alex. Young, Major Campbell, Richard Carter, Wm. Dam pier, Dr. Smallwood, Geo. H. Monk, Esq.

Out of fifty-one officiating Clergymen in the Diocese, fifty were present, besides others from the Dioceses of Quebec, Toronto, and New York, amounting in all to fifty-eight.

The Clerical Secretary then read the minutes of the preliminary meeting, and the Honourable Judge McCord presented the Report of the Sub-Committee.

The latter, on the motion of the Rev. A. D. Campbell, seconded by the Rev. William Bond, was received. For the text of the resolution subsequently proposed and carried, we refer to the conclusion of the report of the discussion which took place upon them.

In moving the first of these, the Rev. Mr. Beaucroft said that it was with great diffidence that, at the request of his Lordship, he rose to move the first resolution. He did it with the hope that it would lead to a free expression of opinion from brethren and fathers present. All would agree with him in realizing the peculiar delicacy of the subject, which arose from our connection with the Mother Church, lest it should appear to interfere with her prerogatives. If ever we needed light from on High to be shed upon our counsels, it was at the present moment, when we were moving in a matter which was to affect not ourselves alone, but future generations. It would appear from the resolution that the strictest care was taken to guard against the idea that there was any wish to interfere with the doctrines of our Church. It was only asking for power to regulate matters connected with its government and discipline. Let us cling more closely to that Mother Church, of which it is our happiness to form an integral part? He would ask was there any ecclesiastical law in the colony?—It would be admitted that there was none. What then, should be done? He would suggest an application direct to the Provincial Legislature. He would ask only that we might be permitted to manage our own internal affairs—such an application would not be refused. It is a power granted to every voluntary association to receive, reject or expel. But the Legislature will ask to whose hands shall these powers be entrusted? He would reply to those of the Bishops, Clergy and Laity in Convention assembled. Such a body would honorably represent the Church—it would give the humblest member a voice in her affairs. It would differ from the Church Society, which was a voluntary association, of which those only might become members who could afford to pay annually the sum of five dollars. He thought that such a system as was proposed in this resolution would, in the matter of the government and discipline of the Church in the world. Our Church in itself and its energies could only be developed by admitting the laity to a full participation in the management of its affairs. The measure had been proposed by our beloved Diocesan, with full unanimity on the part of the Clergy; and he saw no objections to it other than those incident to human nature. Some might apprehend that it would prove an arena of strife and division. He knew that religious differences were generally the most bitter; but he trusted that the body of which the Convention would be composed, being members in full Communion with the Church, and followers of the Prince of Peace, would study the things that made for peace. It was a happy moment—he looked forward to it for years—to stand surrounded as he was by the Laity of the Church as now assembled. He had great confidence in the Laity, and felt assured that, if the Clergy would give them their full confidence, they would be heartily sustained by them. He had also faith in God—doing all that he could, he would entrust the vessel to the keeping of Him who had said that His Church should never be destroyed.

The Hon. Judge McCord remarked that as the law existed at present there was no authorized regulation by which the Church was to be governed, as all human institutions required to be governed. Whatever might have been the ancient practice of committing all authority of this kind to the hands of the clergy, it was evident that at present the laity were too important an element to be overlooked—that they were essential to the strength and success of any organization. It was well for the Church and for the Clergy themselves that the fact was acknowledged by the latter. For a law adapted to the circumstances of the case, it would be necessary to apply to the Provincial Parliament. Of course there was no intention to secede from the ecclesiastical rule of the English Church; but what was required was power to govern the Church here under that authority.

The Rev. Dr. Adamson asked if this would not make the Church in Canada an independent Church? The Hon. Judge McCord thought not. The Lord Bishop said, that his great difficulty since his arrival here had been to ascertain what position he occupied in Canada; with respect to the Church; that he really did not know the powers he possessed, nor their extent. By the patent he had received from the Queen, he had authority to appoint Chancellors and other officers, but where he to do so he knew it would be nugatory, for there was no law, for their government or guidance. It became absolutely necessary than to have some rules for the management of affairs, such as there would be some authority to enforce, and which members of the Church could be guided by. It had been consistent with practice for the Bishop to delegate certain power to parties with whom he could act in carrying out objects for the benefit of his Diocese, but at present he knew of no body of men to whom such delegation could be made, nor was there any law for them if it was made. It was then the object of this meeting to devise some means for constituting such a body as the Bishop could delegate any necessary powers to, for the performance of such duties as circumstances might lay upon him. Since he had come to the Diocese, matters had been brought before him, and matters were now before him, in which it was impossible for him to know how to

act, or what decision to arrive at, nor was he aware how any decision was to be enforced. He was not of course prepared to take any step which might even in appearance seem to militate against the authority of the Queen, to whom he was bound to submit, and rejoiced to submit, nor any thing of which the tendency would be to cast off the authority of the mother church at home. But really he did not see how far under present circumstances, we formed any portion of that church at all, except in unity of sentiment and love. In belief we were members of that church, but when we come to apply as practical men the powers which the mother church possessed we were entirely at fault. In resorting to the Legislature, therefore, he supposed we would desire it to give us power to do for all the members of the church here, what the church at home, as being by law the established church, could do there over all the people whether members of the church or not. We were not to ask any such powers, however, as the church in England possessed, but simply that the Bishop, Clergy, and Laity might be able to regulate their own matters as they might see for their benefit, and to do that which they ought to wish to effect.

Rev. D. Campbell said the motion affirmed only certain great principles, to carry out which legislative power is asked in favour of those whom it is to effect. The executive power would still be as it had been in the Bishop of the diocese.

Rev. Mr. Whitwell thought we had to guard more against the consequences of the measure than the measure itself. The discipline of the Church could be exercised, but where was the protection from the consequences. He mentioned an instance from his own experience in which the want of power was deeply and sadly felt. Witnesses might be summoned to testify against unworthy acts but how were they to be protected against prosecution for defamation.

Rev. Mr. Flanagan asked if the Legislature would grant a general law for managing our own affairs. Judge McCord said he thought not.

The Lord Bishop said, that in this case as in others relating to other affairs occurring all over the world, it was right that plans should be devised for effecting the purposes sought for, but whether we were to hit upon the right one now he would not take upon himself to say. Something, however, it was absolutely necessary to do, and that very meeting, and the agitation of the question, now begun would be hoped to do good.

(Some conversation ensued relative to matters of detail, which some of the speakers mooted.)

The Hon. Robert Jones then said, that he thought the lay members present should be put in possession of the nature of the action, which the contemplated law was to authorize. It might be that a body might be created which, having authority, might pass canons obnoxious to the interests of the laity, and where would the remedy be? There was also this other view that so long as the Church in the colony was dependent for support upon an extraneous body beyond it, the action of that created here could not be independent, for with the control of the purse would also be the influence of power. He would not be in favour of any measure which did not define the powers sought for, and the way in which they were to be exercised. He said further that the present meeting, comprising Clergy and laity, were now deliberating together, and it was intended they should vote together, and if they thought the wishes separately. Such was the case in Conventions in a neighbouring country and he believed in England.

The First resolution having then been carried, the second as given below was moved by the Hon. Mr. Pangman, and seconded by the Rev. Mr. Flanagan. Upon which an amendment was moved by Mr. James Armstrong, seconded by Capt. Fonnert.

Resolved.—That a petition be presented to Her Most Gracious Majesty, that it is desirable for the interests of Religion in this province, that the Clergy Reserves set apart for the Church, be vested in the Church Societies of the different Dioceses, under the following conditions:—That a certain amount of land shall be yearly sold at public auction on liberal terms of payment; and that the proceeds of the said sales be invested in the Provincial Funds; and that the said Church Societies shall be empowered to spend the interest only.

The amendment was lost, and the second resolution carried by a large majority.

Major Campbell, in seconding the 3rd resolution, expressed the pleasure he felt in doing so; he felt some pain, however, that the measures now taking, of leaving the Church to itself here, had been called by some gentlemen a casting of us off. It was only such a casting off as the parent did, who, after rearing and educating his sons, until they arrived at years of discretion, told them to go into the world to shift for themselves. He had himself a family, and such he could tell them was to be his treatment of them; but that was not to be called a casting off, neither was the withdrawal of the aid of the bountiful society referred to.

The Lord Bishop, in reply to a question, said that the Society was beginning to cast us off, by increasing its bounty in the Diocese. It had never paid so large a sum towards the Church in this Diocese as in the past year, and if its aid were to be drawn from older settlements which ought to be able to help themselves, it was only that larger sums might be at its disposal for other and more destitute places. It had offered a grant of £1000 sterling a year for endowments, in sums not exceeding £150 sterling to any one locality, paying to the locality an equal amount raised by it for endowment of the church established in it.

After some other matters had been disposed of, the Lord Bishop closed the meeting with prayer.

RESOLUTIONS. Moved by the Rev. Mr. Bauderoff, seconded by the Hon. Judge McCord—

Resolved.—That it is the opinion of this meeting, that in consequence of the want of any Law Ecclesiastical for the government of the United Church of England and Ireland in this colony, and the acknowledged difficulty of carrying into effect any efficient system of church discipline, it is imperatively necessary that a body should be formed with power and authority to frame and enforce laws and regulations for the government, discipline, and internal management of the church; such powers, however, in no manner to extend to matters of truth or in any way interfere with, or alter doctrines, or forms of worship, and that such body shall consist of Bishops, Clergy and Laity, meeting together in such manner, and exercising such functions and duties as may be hereafter by law authorized.

Resolved.—That a Committee be now appointed and instructed to communicate and consult with the sister Dioceses in this Province on this important measure,

so as to secure their active co-operation in our efforts, and report at a future meeting of the Clergy and delegates now assembled—and that the following be the Committee to co-operate with the Lord Bishop in giving effect to the foregoing resolution:—Hon. Judge McCord, Major Campbell, Hon. George Moffatt, Rev. Dr. Bethune, Rev. Dr. Leih, Rev. A. Digby Campbell.

The second resolution was then proposed, as follows:— Resolved.—That this meeting cannot separate without recording its deep and lively interest in the final and satisfactory settlement of the question of the Clergy Reserves, which from time to time is brought up as the fruitful source of discord in this Province, and which it appears Imperial Legislation has been unable to set at rest. In the event of any new legislation in the matter, whether in the Imperial or Provincial Parliament, or both, this meeting earnestly hopes that such alteration may result in an equitable division of the lands themselves, and their surrender to, and management by their respective recipients without other control.

The next resolution was moved by the Rev. M. Townsend, seconded by Major Campbell, as under:—

Resolved.—That this meeting wishes to express its lively satisfaction at the accounts received of the success which, during the past year, has attended the commemoration of the third semi-centenary Jubilee of the Society for the propagation of the Gospel; and while recording its deep sense of the long continued and liberal assistance which the Church in these times has received, and is still receiving, from that Society, entertains a well founded hope, that, encouraged by such support, the members of the Church in the Diocese will be stirred up to increased efforts, and more active exertions in the spread of true religion, and the maintenance of the Clergy.

ENGLAND. (From the Irish Ecclesiastical Journal.)

COLONIAL CHURCH SOCIETY.

DEAR SIR,—A Society has been recently established in London, which calls itself "The Colonial Church and School Society." I have seen something of the very mischievous results of the meddling of this society in the diocese of Newfoundland, and therefore, I trust you will permit me to call the attention of its supporters to them.

This society has recently been formed by the junction of two societies—the Colonial Church and the Newfoundland School Societies. You exposed, some years ago, in your Journal, a gross breach of faith on the part of the former society, which occurred in its dealings with the late venerable Bishop Inglis, in the diocese of Nova Scotia. Of the Newfoundland School Society it would, I think, be unfair not to state that it did a great deal of good in former years, in establishing schools (when it confined itself to a legitimate object, and worked in harmony with the clergy and people, not presuming to supersede the missionary priests, as it now attempts to supersede the Bishops.)

Sir, the whole of England was up in arms this time last year (and with good reason) to resist the arrogant attempt of the Pope to supersede the English bishops; but is not this attempt of a self-constituted and irresponsible committee in London, to supersede the functions of the Bishops, even more outrageous?

The object of the third General Law of the Society is as follows, viz., "The selection, appointment, removal, and field of labour of all the agents, together with the amount of their respective salaries, shall rest entirely with the Committee of the Society."

Now, I would remark, that it was against a rule of the Church Missionary Society, precisely, I believe, similar to this, that the present Bishop of Calcutta had to protest, when he went out to India, as his Lordship found, by experience, that such a rule was incompatible with the exercise of his authority, and of proper discipline in his diocese, and the rule was in consequence altered.

This society has agents in the colonies, superintendents, as they are called, and these agents are, of course, in remote colonies, plenipotentiaries of this bishop-superseding committee in London; without consulting either with the bishop of the diocese, or the missionary priest of any district, they are to find schools or discontinue them, to appoint masters or dismiss them. I do not, indeed, see anything in their rules to prevent them from appointing a missionary priest in any district in any one of the colonies, in opposition to the priest licensed by the bishop, if they thought fit to do so. The committee, indeed, profess, as was stated by their agents to the Bishop of Montreal (see some admirable remarks on this subject, in a Pastoral Letter of the Bishop of Montreal, recently printed by Rivington, London) that they do not wish their superintendents to interfere with the arrangements of the bishop except in extreme cases—i. e. they do not require these itinerating metropolitan deacons to control the bishops unless they behave themselves very badly!

"Nec Deus interit, nisi dignus vindice nodus incidit."

The result, however, of the rules and working of this society, as I observed it in Newfoundland, is this—an imperium in imperio is established in a diocese; if a missionary or schoolmaster is censured by his diocesan, or if a schoolmaster is censured by the missionary, he immediately tries to form a party, puts himself under the protection of this superintending agent, and defies his bishop. Surely we are all of us sufficiently schismatical in our natural propensities, and there is no great danger in the present day of bishops or priests exercising despotic tyranny over their dioceses or parishes, and therefore, a society in London, to patronise insubordination in the colonies is not a necessary, nor likely to be, a very useful one.

Besides the evil resulting in the colonies from the formation of this new society, it is much to be feared that the very wicked and mischievous reports circulated, in order to damage the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, that it is encouraging Puseyism, spreading Romanism, &c., are to be traced to the desire to increase the funds of this new society. The Propagation of the Gospel Society not only does not, but cannot, encourage any peculiar opinions in the Church. It has been for one hundred and fifty years, is now, and must continue to be, unless the whole Church of England and Ireland falls into apostasy, spreading throughout the colonies the doctrine and discipline of the Reformed Catholic United Church of England and Ireland.

I am, dear Sir, yours faithfully,

H. P. DISNEY.

The Globe, Balliver, Athboy, 22th Dec. 1851.

(a) A similar breach of faith, on the part of the Newfoundland School Society obliged the bishop of that diocese recently to decline to act with it.

THE TITLE DEIPARA. A valued correspondent having lately drawn attention to this subject, and made some just remarks with respect to the risk incurred in the heat of polemical argumentation, of advancing, unconsciously, heretical statements on which the Church has many centuries ago, pronounced her judgment,—it may be well to bring forward somewhat more prominently the real question involved in the title Θεοτόκος, or Deipara, as applied to the Blessed Virgin.

Let Hooker be the exponent of this momentous doctrine:—

"If we should say that the person of a man in our Saviour Christ was the subject of these things, this were plainly to entrap ourselves in the very snare of the Nestorian's heresy, between whom and the Church of God there was no difference, saving only that Nestorius imagined in Christ, as well a personal human substance, as a Divine, the Church acknowledging a substance both Divine and human, but no other personal subsist nce than divine, because the Son of God took not to himself a man's person, but the nature only of a man." "In Christ, therefore, God and Man, there is (saith Paschasius) a twofold substance, not a twofold person, because one Person extinguisheth another, whereas one nature cannot in another become extinct."—Lib. v. 52

"Let us therefore, set it down for a rule or principle so necessary, as nothing more, to the plain deciding of all doubts and questions about the union of natures in Christ, that of both natures there is a co-operation often, an association always, but never any mutual participation, whereby the properties of the one are infused into the other."—Ibid., p. 53.

"To gather, therefore, into one sum all that hitherto hath been spoken touching this point, there are but four things which concur to make complete the whole state of our Lord Jesus Christ—His Deity, His manhood, the conjunction of both, and the distinction of the one from the other, being joined in one. Four principal heresies there are, which have in these things understood the truth:—Arians, by bending themselves against the Deity of Christ; Apollinarians, by maiming and misinterpreting that which belongeth to his human nature; Nestorians, by rending Christ asunder, and dividing him into persons; the followers of Eutyches, by confounding in his person those natures which they should distinguish. Against these there have been four most famous ancient General Councils:—The Council of Nice, to define against Arians; against Apollinarians, the Council of Constantinople; the Council of Ephesus, against Nestorians; against Eutychians, the Chalcedon Council. In four words, ἀληθῶς, τέλει, ἀδιαιρέτως, ἀσυγχύτως—the first applied to his being God; and the second to his being man; the third to his being both, One; and the fourth, to his still continuing in that One, both—we may fully, by way of abridgement, comprise whatsoever antiquity hath at large handled, either in declaration of Christian belief, or in refutation of the aforesaid heresies."—Ibid., p. 54.

The Church of God, then, acknowledges in Christ "no other PERSONAL subsistence than Divine; or, as the Athanasian Creed expresses it, the Incarnate Son of God is "One altogether, not by confusion of substance, but by UNITY of Person." The question, therefore, is, Who was that PERSON who was born of the Virgin? IN NATURE, He is "God, of the substance of the Father, begotten before the Worlds; and MAN, of the substance of his mother, born in the world;" so that (in the words of our second Article) "two whole and perfect NATURES, that is to say, the Godhead and the manhood, were joined together in one PERSON, never to be divided." Hence it is, therefore, that the Church of God has ever held against Nestorius, that the PERSON to whom the Virgin gave birth was essentially DIVINE; and this fact the Church has embodied in the term Θεοτόκος, or, to use its Latin equivalent, Deipara.

But here let us turn to another of the master, minds of our Church. Bishop Pearson, in his comment on the article of the Apostles' Creed, "Born of the Virgin Mary," having observed that the "blessed Virgin is the Mother of Jesus, in the language of the evangelists; and by Elizabeth, particularly, the Mother of her Lord, as also by the general consent of the Church (because he which was born of her was God) the deipara," adds the following pregnant observations:—

"This name was first in use in the Greek Church, which, delighting in the happy compositions of that language, called the Blessed Virgin Θεοτόκος. Although Θεοτόκος may be extended to signify as much as the Mother of God, because τίςτιν doth sometimes denote as much as γεννᾶν, and therefore it hath been translated deigenitrix, as well as deipara; yet those ancient Greeks which call the Virgin Θεοτόκος, did not call her μητέρα τοῦ Θεοῦ."—Notes in loc.

It appears, then, that his title concerns the PERSON of our Blessed Saviour, and that alone. To confer it upon Christ's human parent for the sole purpose of honouring her, is, no doubt, the corrupt abuse of the Church of Rome; let us beware, however, lest by denying the title on account of the abuse, we may even, in semblance, call in question one of the chief verities of the Catholic faith, the oneness of the PERSONALITY of Christ.

From our English Files.

CHARACTER OF SIR ROBERT PEEL.—Nature had combined in Sir Robert Peel many admirable parts. In him a physical frame incapable of fatigue was united with an understanding equally vigorous and flexible. He was gifted with the faculty of method in the highest degree; and with powers of application, which were sustained by a prodigious memory; while he could communicate his acquisitions with clear and fluent elocution. Such a man, under any circumstances and in any sphere of life, would probably have become remarkable. Ordained from his youth to be busied with the affairs of a great empire, such a man, after long years observation, practice, and perpetual discipline, would have become what Sir Robert Peel was in the latter portion of his life, a transcendent administrator of public business, and a matchless master of debate in a popular assembly. In the course of time the method which was natural to Sir Robert Peel had matured into a habit of such expertness that no one in the despatch of affairs ever adapted the means more fitly to the end; his original flexibility had ripened into consummate tact; his memory had accumulated such stores of political information that he could bring luminously together all that was necessary to establish or to illustrate a subject, while in the House of Commons he was equally eminent in exposition and in reply; in the first, distinguished by his arrangement, his clearness, and his completeness; in the second, ready, ingenious, and adroit, prompt in detecting the weak points of his adversary; and dexterous in extricating himself from an embarrassing position. As an orator, Sir Robert Peel had perhaps the most available talent that has ever been brought to bear in the House of Commons. We have