spect to the report and resolution of Convocation, the Lower House felt that, with the pressure of other business, it would be impracticable to give them that ample consideration which their importance demanded, and, therefore, they begged that his grace would give them an opportunity for the future consideration of the subject. As to the resolutions on the subject of clergy discipline, he begged to observe that although they had been engaged upon them with great diligence, they had not agreed to the adoption of any resolutions; and he was requested to state to their lordships:—"That this house humbly represent to his grace the president and the Upper House that they have addressed themselves with all care and diligence to the consideration of the report on the discipline of the clergy which has been sent down to them for consideration this day, and with an earnest desire to come to a conclusion within the time prescribed; but that they have not been able to do so with any regard to that full and patient examination of the whole subject which has been justly recommended to them at the conclusion of the same report; and they humbly pray that further opportunity may be allowed them of considering with suitable deliberation that and the other grave matters submitted to them by their lordships."

Mr. Burchett, the actuary to the Lower House, then stated to their lordships that all the clauses had been agreed to, with verbal alterations, with the exception of the 8th, which was:—"That provision should be made for the bishop to hear certain cases in private, if he shall think fit and the accused party shall consent; and to pronounce sentence thereon." That clause they had not agreed on.

The Bishop of Oxford said he should like to hear the grounds for the omission of this clause.

The Prolocutor said the point had led to a good deal of discussion in the Lower House, and it had elicited a variety of opinions as to the inquiry being public or private, and there was a division of opinion upon it that had led to its omission.

The deputation from the Lower House were then requested to retire for a short time.

On the amendment of the Lower House, restricting the alteration of the rubric to the purposes of the division of services, being proposed,

The Bishop of Oxford said he was not prepared to say that there should be no future alteration of the rubric, as the adoption of this amendment would declare, and, therefore, he should like to have some conservation with the members of the Lower House, and to point out the difficulties to them, before they decided upon it.

The prolocutor and other members of the Lower House were again summoned.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (addressing the prolocutor) said they were anxious, in respect to the two amendments, to have a conference with the Lower House, particularly as they did not seem quite to understand the intent of the resolutions sent down by them. Those resolutions were not to give any opportunity of making alterations in the rubric, except what was required and comprehended in a third service.

The Prolocutor said that many were of opinion that an alteration of the rubric would lead to further changes.

The Archbishop of Canterbury said if the amendment were adopted, no change whatever, however small, could be introduced.

The Prolocutor thought that was not the intention of the Lower House, as it might be proper to introduce many others.

The Bishop of Oxford said if the two Houses of Convocation decided as a fundamental principle that every rubric should remain unalterable except for the purpose of making a new service, no alteration could be made hereafter. He wished to know if that was the intention of the Lower House in proposing the amendment, for, if it was, it would make it a fundamental principle that the House would not consent to any alteration in the rubric at any future time, however small it might, because they had pledged themselves by that amendment that there should be no alteration.

Archdeacon Grant (on being called on) said the difficulty in adopting their lordships' resolutions did not occur to his mind, but some members of the Lower House thought the adoption of them might open the door too wide for changes that might affect the ordinances of the church at large. There was, however, but one member of the Lower House (the Archdeacon of Gloucester) who was of opinion that the adoption of the amendment would preclude them from making any alteration in the rubric at any future time.

The Bishop of Oxford said if any alteration was required in the rubric, this amendment pledged them not to make it.

The Archbishop of Canterbury must demur to the amendment as it stood.

The Bishop of London thought it would not preclude them from alteration at a future time.

The Bishop of Oxford said, if the Lower House sent in a protest against any change that should affect doctrines, he would instantly adopt it.

The Lower House deputation retired; and, after a lapse of an hour, entered.

The Prolocutor said he was requested to state that, in the event of their lordships not agreeing to the modification proposed, under the peculiar circumstances of the lateness of the hour and the diminishing number of the House, they could not agree to the words suggested; and asked leave of their lordships to allow the matter of the alteration of the church rubrics to stand over for future consideration.

After a few words from the Bishop of St. Divid's,

The Bishop of Oxford begged leave to move that this House disagrees to the amendments of the Lower House, and gladly accepts the proposal respecting the alteration of the rubric, that its consideration shall be deferred to a future session.

The resolution was put and unanimously agreed to.

Mr. Dyke, receiver-general, then read the schedule of prorogation, and

Their lordships adjourned until the 29th of June.

LOWER HOUSE.—THIRD DAY.

The House assemhled in the Jerusalem Chamber, Westminster.

It was decided, the motion of the Rev. Dr. Peel (the Dean of Worcester), that at the next meeting a scheme should be laid on the table for the guidance of members.

The House then proceeded to discuss the following motion, which was proposed by the Rev. Mr. Seymour:—"1st. That the law of God, as revealed in Holy Scripture, for the Government of his church, and as witnessed by primivive antiquity, while it vests the authority and power to govern primarily in the spirituality, does not forbid—rather does it encourage them—to call and admit faithful laymen also to their counsels in synod, at such times and in such manner as they shall judge to be best for the welfare of the church. 2nd. That the circumstances of the present times suggest certain and urgent reasons why the church of England, in taking steps for the revival of synodical functions, should take advantage of this liberty, and should provide some more formal and regular opportunities than at present exist, whereat the counsel and co-operation of the faithful laity may be secured to the proceedings of Convocation."

The motion having been seconded.

The Rev. H. A. Woodgate proposed the following amendment;—"Whereas, owing to the suspension of ecclesiastical discipline as regards the laity, every inhabitant of England, whatever his religious persuasion or manner of life, is recognized by the law as a member of the church of England, and admissible to a full participation of its rights and privileges; and whereas dissenters have contended, both in Parliament and out of it, that dissent ought not to involve the forfeiture of such privileges, or of a vote in the management of the church: it is neither just nor expedient to entertain the question of the admission of laymen to the counsels of the church, until by the enforcement of ecclesiastical discipline, or by some other method, effectual means be taken to determine what constitutes a *bonâ fide* layman of the Church of England."

After a short discussion,

The Prolocutor put the amendment and the resolution from the chair, when the former was carried by a large majority.

The Prolocutor said the next business—in fact, the only business—they had at present before them was to proceed to the consideration of the following report, and he would suggest that each paragraph should be taken *seriatim*:—

"The committee appointed by Convocation to consider of an address to her Majerty, as to a measure for the better enforcing of discipline among the clergy, report:—

"1. That they have had various meetings, and, in obedience to the commands of the House, have taken into their serious consideration the matter referred to them.

"2. That they are unanimously of opinion that the present state of the law touching the discipline of the clergy is unsatisfactory, and that it needs amendment.

"3. That the great expenses and delays attending such proceeding, which amount frequently to a denial of justice, have not been removed by the recent Acts upon this subject.

"4. That the provisions of the last Act, which governs the present administration of the law, are inadequate for their purpose.

"5. That the preliminary inquiry under that Act savours too much of an actual trial, without its safeguard or conclusion; whilst it has been doubted whether those provisions which were intended to govern the actual trial could safely be used for its condnct.

"6. That the present provision for hearing and deciding final appeals is not such as to give general satisfaction.

"7. That it is highly important that these evils should be corrected.

"8. That in the judgment of the committee it is desirable that all causes against clerks, involving questions of heresy, or false doctrine, blasphemy, or schism, should be heard as they might have been before the passing of the Act 2d and 3d William IV., cap. 92, saving as regards the composition of the court of final appeal.

"9. That the Court of Arches should be empowered to receive *vivâ voce* evidence, and to hear and examine witnesses.

"10. That provision should be made for the bishop to hear certain cases in private, if he shall think fit, and the accused party shall consent, and to pronounce sentence thereon.

"11. That the machinery for conducting the preliminary inquiry by commission should be made less cumbrous.

"12. That provision should be made for the trial of clergymen before the bishop, or his official or commissary, assisted by a council of not less than four members, who shall decide all questions of fact. The said persons not to be named by the bishop himself, but taken by lot, or otherwise, as shall seem most expedient, either from the dean, canons, residentiary, non-residentiary, and honorary, and the rural deans of the diocese, or from a panel of beneficed clergymen elected in every archdeaconry for this purpose.

"13. That the greatest difficulty besets the due adjustment of the course of final appeals.

"14. That is appears to your committee of the greatest moment, whilst we maintain the just supremacy of the Crown, as the ultimate source of justice and redress to every subject complaining of wrong, whether in matters ecclesiastical or civil, to combine therewith security that ecclesiastical questions shall be decided by persons qualified by office and acquaintance with the course of law ecclesiastical to decide thereon.

"15. That it appears to your committee that the acknowledged difficulties which attach to this subject have been much increased by recent legislation, which almost accidentally transferred the hearing of these causes from the Queen in Chancery to the Queen in Council.

"16. They would suggest the expediency of considering whether the best solution of this question would not be to restore this jurisdiction to the Queen in Chancery; and to enable her Majesty, when any appeals shall be presented from the court of the province in matters ecclesiastical, in which any clerk in holy orders shall be a party, except in causes matrimonial or testamentary, to remit the cause for rehearing in the court of the archbishop, providing that there should sit, under the authority of the great seal, with the judge of the court, other ecclesiastical and common law judges, to hear and decide finally in the cause.

"17. Finally, your committee report, that they have felt it their duty to lay these conclusions before the Convocation, as what would form the fitting heads for an address to her Majesty, should one now be resolved upon by the Convocation.

"18. But they beg further to report their own conviction, that no such address should be adopted without a full and patient examination of the whole subject. And they would, therefore, respectfully suggest to the Convocation their opinion, that their report should be laid upon the table as matter for future consideration rather than immediate action."

Clauses 1, 2, and 3 were agreed to without a division.

On clause 8, having reference to trials for heresy, schism, and false doctrine, being proposed,

The Prolocutor announced that their lordships in the Upper House had decided upon the following addition:

"That after the words '2nd and 3rd Wm. IV., c. 92,' in the eighth paragraph, be inserted the words—'Provided that every cause of correction of clerks shall be first brought to cognizance of the bishop; provided also that no appeal shall be made from the decision of the court of final appeal, in all cases of heresy, false doctrine, or schism, be constituted as is hereinafter proposed;' and that the remaining words, 'saving as regards the composition of the court of final appeal,' be omitted."

The first proposition of this amendment was struck out by the Lower House, and the remainder, with some modifications, was agreed to.

On number 9 being read,

The Prolocutor announced that it had been struck out by their lordships, such evidence, by a recent enactment, being now taken by the court.

On clause 10,

Archdeacon Sandford thought it should only apply to cases of gross immorality. He did not think it was right to give to any bishop such large power, for a kind-hearted bishop would gloss over such faults, while another kind of man might do an injustice.

The Rev. W. H. Cox held that private inquiries enabled tyrants to tyrannize, while weak men would blink at gross immoralities. Private inquiries were opposed to the genius and sound feeling of the English people, and he, for one, would oppose the clause.

The Rev. Chandos Pole thought that the clause was proposed for the purpose of preventing general scandal. It was only to be adopted in the case of accused persons consenting to that course.

Dr. M'Caul said that if a clergyman was attacked, and an injury took place in private, the stigma was more likely to remain than it would if the injury was public. He thought that the hushing up of a case would do more damage than a public inquiry.

The Rev. Mr. Massingberd pointed out that the clause was opposed to primitive practice and to the canons of the Council of Carthage.

The clause was ordered to be expunged.

Clause 11 was agreed to without discussion.

On clause 12,

Dr. Peel asked the Prolocutor whether he knew why deans were so specially exempted?

The Prolocutor replied that he did not.

The hon. and Rev. S. Best proposed the following amendment:—"That provision should be made for the trial of clergymen before the bishop or his official or commissary, assisted by a council of not less than ten members, who shall decide all questions of fact; the said persons not to named by the bishop himself, but taken by lot from a panel of capitular and beneficed clergymen, elected in every archdeaconry for this purpose."

The Archdeacon of Worcester seconded the amendment.

The original clause, after some verbal amendments, was passed.

Clauses 13 and 14 were agreed to.

On clause 15,

The Rev. W. H. Cox protested against it. He confessed that he did not know what it meant.

After some explanations from Chancellor Martin, the clause was agreed to.

On clause 16,

Archdeacon Denison moved that the following proviso be added to the resolution:—"Provided always that the four archbishops and the eight junior bishops of the dioceses of the Church of England and Ireland be *ex officio* members of the proposed final court of appeal, and that it be required that no fewer than eight of the whole number of twelve do sit for the hearing of any case."

The Archdeacon of Bath seconded the resolution.

Chancellor Martin proposed as an amendment:—"That a certain number of the archbishops and bishops be necessarily members of such court, and the presence of a certain number of such spiritual members shall be necessary to its proceeding, and that all lay members of such court shall be members of the Church of England."

Dr. Peel seconded the amendment.

Archdeacon Denison said that as he had no other object than to call attention to the general principle, he should be happy to withdraw his proposition in favour of Chancellor Martin's.

The Rev. J. H. Randolph thought it would be a very unjustifiable and unauthorized course to dictate to the civil power in matters of this sort.

Dr. M'Caul objected to the clause, because, as he had before stated, it tended to overthrow the Queen's supremacy, and was a denial of justice to those accused, by sending them back to that court from which they had appealed.

The Rev. Mr. Joyce said that his Majesty's judges, in 1711, decided that Convocation was a court of heresy for the province of Canterbury, and he contended that if the House set up any such resolution, they would be taking a very wrong step.

Mr. Chancellor Martin's amendment was then incorporated with the clause, which in that form was received.

The last paragraph of the report was agreed to without discussion.

Archbishop Throp (Bristol) moved the following resolution:—"That this House humbly represent to his Grace the President of the Upper House that they have addressed themselves to the consideration of the reports sent down to them to-day with their utmost care and diligence, with an earnest desire to come to a conclusion within the time prescribed; but that they have not been able to do so on the grave matters included in those papers, with regard to the full and patient examination of the whole subjects which have been justly recommended to them at the conclusion of the report on clergy discipline, and they humbly pray that they may be allowed further opportunity of considering with more deliberation the other matters submitted to them by their lordships."

The Rev. Chandos Pole seconded the motion, inasmuch as he thought that every member of the House ought to have ample time for the expression of his opinions upon so grave a matter.

The resolution was agreed to.

Archdeacon Denison moved that there should be added to clause 8, "That such provision be without prejudice to any question concerning judicial privileges which may belong to the provincial synod in matters of final appeal."

The Rev. Mr. Joyce seconded the resolution.

Dr. M'Caul thought that, if the House attempted to make itself a court of heresy, Convocation would soon find itself at an end.

Archdeacon Grant thought it very unadvisable that such an addition should be made to the clause. There were no powers in Convocation in reference to heresy and false doctrine; therefore for the House to ask a continuance of what it did not possess was simply absurd. By a late Act of Parliament such cases were transferred to another court.

Archdeacon Denison denied that the existence of Convocation, or the continuance of its powers, depended upon any Acts of Parliament.

Archdeacon Denison's motion was then put to the vote and negatived.

The Prolocutor, accompanied by the Dean of Worcester, Archdeacon Harrison, Archdeacon Denison, and others, proceeded to the Upper House, where they had a long conference with the bishops. After the lapse of an hour, they returned, and

The Prolocutor announced that their lordships could not accede to the alterations which the Lower House had made in the resolution come to by the Upper House in reference to proposed changes in the Prayer Book.

The Archdeacon of St. Alban's proposed that the House should express its concurrence with the resolution come to by their lordships' House.

Dr. Peel seconded the resolution.

Archdeacon Denison was sorry to be obliged to dissent. He objected to the alteration in the rubrics, for he was sure the church would ere long have cause to regret such a course.

After a very earnest discussion, Archdeacon Grant's motion was lost.

Dr. Wordsworth proposed, that, in consequence of the late hour of the evening, and the diminished number of the members, the House should request permission to defer any further consideration of the question of rubrical changes until next session, in the event of their lordships still declining to accept the modifications proposed to their resolutions.

The Rev. W. H. Cox seconded the resolution, which was carried unanimously.

The Prolocutor then proceeded to the Upper House, and on his return intimated that their lordships declined to alter their resolution, and expressed their regret that any difference should have sprung up between the two Houses. At the same time their lordships willingly acceded to the request that the Lower House should postpone any further consideration of the question until next session.

The proceedings were then adjourned at twenty minutes before seven until the 29th of June.

BLAMING THE CLERGY.

The September number of *Frazer's Magazine* closes an article on the "Church among the tall Chimneys," with some sensible remarks on the disposition to hold the clergy responsible for everything:—

"The fault of the clergy! Where are the clergy? How glibly do such expressions come from the lips even of men who, by precept and example, are undoing all that the clergy are attempting to do! There is not a grovelling penny-a-liner who cannot, after rising in the morning with a drunken headache, inquire on any exhibition of popular ignorance, 'Where are the clergy?' There is not a mob-mouther, as he mounts his tub after thrashing his wife and starving children, who cnanot ask, 'What is the use of the clergy?' There is not a graceless, upstart member of 'the house,' who cannot, after leaving his heartless frivolities, exclaim with well-feigned astonishment, on any appropriate occasion, 'What are the clergy doing?' There is not a lazy, negligent manufacturer, who cannot, after refusing his five shilling piece to the national school, wonder, in the midst of a tumult, 'What have the clergy been about?' The clergy have not done everything, it is true—but they have done much."

The same sort of temper is showing itself in this country. One class of men, looking at the evils of society—its ignorance, poverty, and crime—until the scene is quite too much for them, lanch forth heir denunciations upon the clergy for the unarrested growth of these moral deformities. Another class holds the clergy responsible for the infidelity and isms of the day. The opposite extreme censures them for exerting too much influence. So they go. Whichever way the pendulum swings it is sure to hit the clergy. Now, it might assist the ideas of sundry people to remember, that the clergy have a specific work to do, viz.: to preach the religion of the Bible. They are set apart to this task, and it is foolish to judge them as to what they do or do not, outside of their immediate vocation. If they neglect the offices of the pulpit, let them be condemned; but we apprehend that no such charge can be substantiated against them in athis country. Taken as a body, they are here a most laborious, earnest, faithful profession. They have done more to elevate the character of the American community, to advance its education and virtue, to diffuse sound principles of piety, than all other agencies combined, and at this day we oweour pesition, in great part, to their self-denying exertions. If the world does not get better fast as we could wish, there is no sense in carping at them about it. It would be wiser to recollect how much worse it would be buto for their zeal and industry.—*New York Times.*

LETTERS RECEIVED TO MARCH 14.

Mrs. L., Belleville, rem.; W. H. B., Quebec, (much obliged); J. G., Woodstock, N. B., rem., Vols. 17 and 18 for J. K.; S. J. S., Gagetown, N. B. rem. (much obliged); J. M., Port Burwell, rem. (the paper sent); Rev. C. P. R., Sherbrooke, *The Church* paid to 31 Jan. 1855, *Gazette* to Dec. 11, 1855; Rev. W.B., Scarboro'; Rev. J. R. T., Milford, rem. for P. C., to July 31, 1855; M. W., Port Elmsley, rem to July 31, 1855.

The Church.

TORONTO, THURSDAY, MARCH 15, 1855.

NOTICE.

The Bishop of Toronto begs to inform his brethren the Clergy of the Home and Simcoe Districts that he intends to Confirm at their several Missions and Stations during the month of May next.

For the Church.

ON THE UNPOPULARITY OF RELIGIOUS TRUTH.

No. VII.

EVANGELICALISM (SO-CALLED).

The reformatory movement of the Wesleys having been turned aside, and, to a great extent, neutralized and rendered indirect in its influence upon the Church, by those causes to which we adverted, it was still urgently necessary that the spirit of true religion should be revived within her borders, and that her members should be taught to comprehend more clearly the great doctrines of the Faith.

In the time of this great need, He who is the Church's Head showed that He had not forsaken her, notwithstanding all her provocations; for by the influence of His blessed Spirit He quickened into earnestness the souls of those men who are claimed as the fathers of what is now known as "the Evangelical School."

It is impossible to consider dispassionately the state of the Church in those days without feeling acutely how urgently she needed to be awakened from spiritual slumber; and this must be conceded, although we may be disposed to contend that the number of worthy and excellent clergymen to be found among "old-fashioned High Churchmen" was even then greater than is popularly supposed.

The common impression certainly is, that, with the exception of the Evangelical party, the whole body of the clergy were in spiritual darkness. But it is easy to see how this impression became general. Such men as Romain and Venn, Scott and Newton, Simeon and the Milners, adopted a system of theology, the *tendency* of which has ever been to dispose those who hold it to doubt very seriously whether their brethren can be true Christians unless they can pronounce their peculiar Shibboleth.

When, therefore, they observed diligence and excellence among the ranks of the old High Church party, they were led by the very earnestness which marked their character as reformers to give way to the tendencies of the theological system which they had adopted, and set down as "legality" and formalism what may in many cases have been the fruit of sound, though perhaps not very fervent, faith—a very remarkable instance of which may be found in the second chapter of Simeon's life. Hence, although perhaps there were (so to speak) seven thousand in Israel who had, no more than themselves, bowed the knee to the image of Baal, yet these men, with perfectly good conscience, declared themselves to be the only advocates of the truth; and the multitude have taken that declaration upon trust.

If all this, however, were fully and freely conceded, it does not alter the fact, that at the time when these men arose the Church greatly needed reformation. The movement of the Wesleys had resulted in the throwing off of a numerous and energetic sect, leaving the body from which it separated very much as it was before, as to anything like a general and hearty acknowledgment and reception among *individuals* of the great doctrines of grace and the duties of a holy life.

While the need of reformation is thus a fact confessed, another fact which must be as readily conceded is, that the men now alluded to were the Reformers of their day. They were led by various means to deep views of the spiritual feebleness and corruption of man's nature—to sincere self-abasement for their own personal sins and shortcomings—to humble and undivided reliance upon the all-sufficient merits and atonements of our blessed Lord—to earnest waiting in the use of divine ordinances for the influences of that Holy Spirit who out of weakness can make us strong. In this renunciation of themselves and of their own righteousness, and this simple looking to the Cross, they found a goodly portion of rest and blessing for their souls, and a measure of strange and hitherto unknown strength against the power of inbred sin and the force of outward temptation.

Aroused into earnestness themselves—awakened thoroughly from spiritual slumber, and animated with love to the souls of men through love to Him who had redeemed them with His own most precious blood, these men went forth and—after their manner,—declared these blessed truths, and to a people in deep spiritual poverty they preached the unsearchable riches of Christ.

And what was the consequence? It was what under similar circumstances it ever has been. The great mass of the laity (who are now in certain quarters regarded as the bulwarks of the truth), under the leading of such of the clergy as were favorable to the erroneous faith and the defective practice which then prevailed, were violent in their opposition against those who were scoffingly spoken of as "new lights." They were regarded as enthusiasts—madmen—methodists. Their teachings were derided; their words and actions misrepresented; their motives maligned; and themselves treated often with rudeness, and occasionally with something very nearly allied to persecution.

To prove all this we have only to refer to the memoirs of these men, which are to be found in almost any library, where we shall meet with an account in detail of the various trials which they had to encounter from the spirit of opposition which prevailed around them.

We are told, for instance, by Mr. Simeon himself that on his appointment to Trinity Church, Cambridge, "the people almost universally put locks upon their pews, and would neither come to church themselves nor suffer others to do so. . . . . I put in then a number of forms, and erected in vacant places, at my own expense, some open seats, but the churchwardens pulled them down and cast them out of the church. To visit the parishioners in their own houses was impracticable, for THEY *were so embittered against me* that there was *scarcely one* who would admit me into his house. In this state of things I saw no remedy but faith and patience." A little farther on he says, "The opposition thus formed continued for many years. . . . . I determined to establish an evening lecture, but scarcely had I established it before the churchwardens shut the church doors against me. On one occasion the congregation was assembled, and it was found that the churchwarden had gone away with the key in his pocket. I therefore got a smith to open the doors for that time, but did not think it expedient to persist under such circumstances."—(Life of Simeon by Carus, Am. Ed. p. 26). The result was, that he was on the week days excluded from his own church; and in order to find an opportunity of instructing those who were disposed to attend his ministry, he had to hire a small room in his parish and meet them there.

We find that after thirty years labor in the parish of which he was incumbent, he was still exposed to bitter and unfounded complaints which were laid by a considerable number of *laymen* before a bishop who appears to have been only too well disposed to second their malignant intentions—and we find at the same period, a strong disposition on the part of "the Heads of the Houses" at Cambridge, to fail in with both bishop and parishioners, in the endeavor to thwart his efforts for good. (Simeon's Life, pp. 186–189.)

The history of the Venns—both father and son—shows very clearly that they were in a greater or less degree exposed to the same trials; and we all remember how the most intimate friends of Joseph Milner at Hull became so embittered against him, when he began to preach distinctly the doctrines of repentance towards God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, that when they met him in public, they would cross the street in order to avoid him, or refuse to return his ordinary salutation.

Before Scott was himself awakened to real earnestness, we find in his sentiments and conduct towards his neighbor John Newton at Olney, a very remarkable indication of the feeling that prevailed against the reformers of that day, even among the clergy and the ranks of the better informed classes (see his life). He looked upon him as a broacher of *novelties*—an enthusiast and a bigot, who, though too contemptible to be crushed by logic, was nevertheless, too excellent to be withered by scorn.

Here, then, we submit is abundant evidence of the soundness of those principles which we seek to establish as (in their appropriate place) criteria of truth. At the time when the leaders of the so called evangelical school arose, the faith which *popularly* prevailed in the church was most erroneous and defective. It consisted for the most part in a strong conviction that if a man paid some attention to public worship—partook three times a year in the Holy Communion—and was guilty of no very great and scandalous offences, he was safe for eternity. Miserably, erroneous and defective as such views unquestionably were, they were nevertheless in great favour with the multitude; and when the Reformers of that day arose and, with earnest spirits and unanswerable arguments, proved the utter groundlessness of such opinions, showing that without a true repentance and a lively faith, leading to holiness of life, men could have no hope of salvation, they immediately experienced the inevitable fate of religious reformers—viz., misrepresentation, calumny and persecution; and thus they found that unadulterated truth in the things of God excites the bitterest enmity of the human heart.

In our next article we propose to consider some of those leading causes which rendered the (so called) Evangelical movement less satisfactory in its results than could have been desired. And, since the Church is an organized body instinct with life, the very law of vitality impels her constantly to strive to throw off whatever is dead and evil; and hence the failure, or at all events the incompleteness, of that earnest-hearted movement entailed upon her the sad necessity of yet further reformation—not in her own teachings, but in our appreciation of them, and in that holy practice which is the only legitimate fruit of sound opinion.

W. S. D.

FUNERAL OF THE LATE MRS. SANSON.

It was our painful lot to announce in our last the death of Mrs. Lett: the no less melancholy duty now devolves upon us of recording the departure from amongst us of the beloved wife of the Rev. A. Sanson.

The funeral, which took place on Monday last at 12 a.m., was attended by a large number of sorrowing friends of the deceased, both lay and clerical, some of the latter acting as pall-bearers on the occasion. The body was conveyed from the Parsonage to Trinity Church, where the first part of the service was read by the Rev. H. J. Grasett, B.D.,—and from thence to St. James' Cemetery, where the service was concluded by the same officiating clergyman.

It has pleased God in his providence, to lay of late an afflictive hand on the ministers at the altar, that *they* should in their turn stand in need of the consolations of religion, who have so abundantly administered unto others! to make trial of their faith and patience under the most distressing circumstances in which Death summons his victims! Not the least painful feature in these recent bereavements is, that in either case, a young family is left to deplore the loss of her whose parental care cannot be supplied on earth. How consoling then is the living assurance which the devout mourner lays to heart, that these little ones are the Saviour's peculiar charge, that the good Shepherd himself restrains gently within the fold these tender lambs of the flock, lest they be devoured by the wolves of the earth! that the Divine husbandman trains up these tendrils of the vine, shielding them alike from the exceeding sunshine and nipping frost of their experience in the world! Aye, and while the insatiate grave hides from our view the honored relics of the beloved dead, the ear of faith recognizes the consoling declaration of Him who is the resurrection and the life.

"She is not dead, but sleepeth."

The *London Quarterly Review* for January. Contents: Fires and Fire Insurance—Life of Dalton—Atomic Chemistry—Psychological Inquiries—Clerical Economics—The Open Fireplace—Provident Institutions—Campaign in the Crimea—Corsica—The Conduct of the War.

DIOCESE OF TORONTO.

THE CHURCH SOCIETY OF THE DIOCESE OF TORONTO.

COLLECTIONS MADE IN THE SEVERAL CHURCHES, CHAPELS, AND MISSIONARY STATIONS IN THE DIOCESE, TOWARDS THE AUGMENTATION OF THE GENERAL PURPOSES FUND OF THE CHURCH SOCIETY, APPOINTED TO BE TAKEN UP IN JANUARY, 1855.

Brought forward.....	£142	18	6
Yorkville, per Churchwarden.....	£11	5	5
Belleville, per Rev. J. Grier.....	2	17	7
Brock, per Reverend R. Garrett.....	1	0	0
St. Peters, Tryconnel, per Rev. H. Holland, ...	2	0	11
St. Luke's Ch., Camden, £0 8 9			
Baker's School House, 6 3			
Tiner's School House, 1 3			
Red do. do. 1 3			
per Rev. Paul Shirley,...	0	17	6
94 collections, amounting to.....	£161	2	5
Warwick, additional, per Rev. J. Smyth.....	£0	2	6

ANNUAL DONATIONS AND SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Rev. Wm. Ritchie.....	£1	5	0
Rev. Thos. Leech, 1st instalment.....	1	5	0
Rev. A. H. R. Mullholland.....	1	5	0

T. S. KENNEDY,
Secretary.

Correspondence.

To the Editor of the Church.

REV. SIR,—In my last communication I opened the subject of the relative position of the clergy and laity in the election of bishops, exhibited some of the differences of opinion on the subject amongst the authorities, gave the opinion of Bingham, who has very fully discussed the subject, and examined some of his quotations. I proceed in my present letter to bring forward and examine other of his quotations.

The next are from the Greek Church; in which we are told that St. Chrysostom was called to the see of Constantinople by the Emperor Arcadius ψηφίσματι κοίνῳ δμοῦ πάντων, κλήρου τε καὶ λαοῦ, "on the joint vote of all together, both clergy and laity," and that Eustathius of Antioch, half a century before, was elected ψήφῳ κοίνῃ "by the joint vote" of the bishops, clergy and all the people.

In these instances, and especially at the election of St. Chrysostom, it is not only evident that the laity had an equally substantive voice with the clergy, but it would appear likewise that the clergy and laity must have voted as one body δμοῦ πάντων. This certainly is quite unlike any plan by which the clergy should decide first and then submit their judgment to the laity, for their ratification or rejection. In the case of Eusathius nothing is said of their mode of voting, but only that bishops, clergy and laity united in voting for the election of Eustathius; and as we have already seen that by the practice of the Church in those days the function of the bishops was to decide finally on the individual to be chosen, it shows that we cannot conclude from any mere mention of a *joint* vote of clergy and laity, that they voted as one body. To come to such a decision there must be something else, as in the case of St. Chrysostom.

Bingham gives three other quotations bearing directly on this subject, and that from writers of the Western Church in each of which rules are laid down for the election of a bishop, by bishops of Rome of the 4th and 5th centuries; professedly giving their directions according to the ancient and canonical practice of the Church.

The first, which is from Siricius, directs that a person shall be made bishop, "si eum cleri ac plebis vocaverit electio," "if the choice of the clergy and laity shall have called him forth." The second (from Celestine) that "cleri, plebis et ordinis consensus et desiderium requiratur," "the consent and wish of the clergy, the laity and his own order (*i. e.*, the bishops) should be required." The third (from Leo), that "ipse omnibus praeponatur, quem cleri plebis que consensus concorditer postulaverit," "that he should be preferred to all others, whom the consent of the clergy and laity shall have harmoniously demanded." Here again we see that the consent or choice of the laity was equally necessary with that of the clergy and even of the bishops; but we have no further light as to the manner in which they were consulted: nor does it appear to have been looked on as a matter of importance. Indeed there is another passage from Leo which shows this very strongly. He says, in a case in which a metropolitan had undertaken to appoint a bishop on his own authority, that "expectarentur vota civium, testimonia propulorum, honoratorum arbitrium, electio clericorum," "the votes of the citizens should be waited for, the testimony of the populations, the judgment of the honourable classes, the choice of the clergy." Here it is evident that the arrangement is purely accidental, for the mass of the people are introduced after the citizens and before the honourable classes, and the clergy are mentioned last; which arrangement certainly could not be intended to specify the order in which they should be consulted, and only confirms the statement I have made, that it does not appear to have been regarded as important. Indeed, if this order had indicated the order of choice, it would certainly have shown that the clergy were not consulted until all the rest had given their votes. The passage is likewise observable as showing that we must not rest on the use of the word *testimonium* in the passage from St. Cyprian in my first letter, as though it *necessarily* implied the recommendation of the clergy *prior* to the election by the laity: for in the passage of Leo we evidently have the words "votes, testimony, judgment and choice," used promiscuously and without any distinction.

Another class of quotations is brought forward by Bingham to show the manner in which the voting was conducted. The first are from Ambrose, Augustine and Eusebius, stating particular instances in which the whole assembly joined in acclamations of approbation or disapprobation. I have examined the passages; but I can find nothing in them which gives any information as to any separate vote of the clergy; much less whether they voted before or after the laity. The most detailed case is that in which St. Augustine procured the election of his successor during his lifetime, and himself gives the particulars of the meeting. From it we learn that it was a joint meeting of clergy and laity; that he stated his reasons for wishing to have a coadjutor, and proposed one of the clergy for the office; that the name was received by the unanimous acclamations of the assembly; and that he had a record of the proceedings taken by the notaries of the Church, from which record the account is given. Bingham gives other examples of the same kind, together with a quotation from St. Chrysostom *on the Priesthood*, in which he complains of the evil temper of the people of Antioch, the disposition to bring forward candidates for the priestly and episcopal offices from mere private and personal motives, and the accusations which were brought against those whose names happened to be mentioned as candidates.

I cannot, however, perceive that these examples prove anything as to the form of proceeding, excepting as they rather tend to show that both clergy and laity met and voted together; certainly they do not afford any evidence of their voting separately. At the end of this branch of the subject Bingham quotes the *Ora Romanus*, or Roman ordinal, as showing that the custom had grown up for the clergy and people of the diocese, after the forma election, to subscribe a document to be forwarded to the metropolitan, in which the fact of the election was attested by the names of the clergy and people: "Ut omnium nostrum vota in hanc electionem convenire noscatis, huic decreto canonico promptissima voluntate singuli manibus propriis roborantes subscripsimus:" (That you may know that all our votes united in this election, we have most readily subscribed this canonical decree, confirming it individually with our own hands). This document is stated to proceed jointly from the clergy and people. It certainly does not preclude the possibility of a separate election by both clergy and people, nor even the prior nomination by the clergy, and concurrence or rejection on the part of the people; but it harmonizes better with open voting in the same assembly. Indeed there is a form of ordination, of A. D. 600, in Martem *on the Rites of the Church*, (not alluded to by Bingham), which is evidently founded on the *Ordo Romanus*, and which directs that the election should be an open one, in which the clergy and laity should vote together. The passage is as follows: "Sepulto episcopo, conveniant in unum majores ecclesiae: primum clerici, deinde probabilus laici: et facto scrutinio, invocato Divino Nomine, abjecta personarum acceptione, communi voto parique consensu, quem sanctiorem et utiliorem invenerint, eligant;" which I understand as follows: 'When the late bishop has been buried, let the principal persons of the Church assemble in one body, the clergy first and then the respectable laity, and when they have made a scrutiny and called on the name of God, let them, without respect of persons, by a joint vote and by equal consent, choose that person whom they find most pious and useful.' One might be disposed from this passage to conclude that there was a prior nomination by the clergy—viz., from that part which speaks of "the clergy first, and then the respectable laity:" but such a conclusion is forbidden by the direction that the electors, "conveniant *in unum*," should "meet together *in one body*," and that the election should be made "by joint vote and *equal* consent;" which would seem to exclude any privilege in the election possessed by the clergy above the laity. The language which raises the question, as to a prior meeting of the clergy, will be easily understood when we consider that this is precisely the kind of language which is applied to the meeting of a synod, when the clergy are directed to *enter the church first*, and then the elected laity. And if we take that explanation, which is the only one consistent with the context, we shall see that the two bodies assembled in one place—the clergy entering first, and the laity afterwards—and that when assembled they voted together and in each other's presence, and that each had an equal voice in the election. The "scrutiny," no doubt, was an open investigation of the character and qualifications of those who might be named for the office, the word being a common one in that application.

There can be but little doubt that this mode of election was the one which generally prevailed in Europe at the date of this form. After the election was made, it was communicated to the metropolitan in the manner above stated, and he proceeded to make arrangements for the consecration of the person then elected.

I purpose, please God, to return to the subject at a future day.

JAMES BEAVEN.

The *Christian Guardian* quotes a protestant prophet, one Dr. Wilson, a Presbyterian, to the effect that the Western Powers are to be victorious in the present war, which is also to be the last "before the universal peace of the Millenium." There is good news for the millers as well; for according to the same authority "flour will be $15 to $20 per barrel before it will be $5 again." All this, the prophet clearly deduces from Scripture, so there can be no doubt about it.