

White, J. A. Morris, R. Lonsdell, C. Bancroft, J. Flanagan, J. Irwin, Hon. Judge McCord, T. B. Anderson, Esq., S. C. Bagg, Esq., Colonel Wilgress, W. F. Grasett, Esq., H. Bancroft, Esq., W. McCrae, Esq., Captain Maitland, Dr. Holmes, J. S. Roles, Esq. After Prayers,

The Minutes of the last Meeting were read and confirmed.

A letter from the Rev. R. Lonsdell was read respecting the fencing of the Church "lot" at Longneuil. At the suggestion of the Board, Mr. Lonsdell engaged to procure the necessary information as to the expense, &c., and forward it to the Lay Committee, in order that they may report at the next Meeting of the Central Board.

A letter was read by W. F. Grasett, Esq., from the Rev. J. Johnston, respecting a proposal for the building of a Parsonage House at Aylmer and the purchase of a Glebe.

Moved by W. F. Grasett, Esq., seconded by S. C. Bagg, Esq., and

"Resolved—That the above letter be referred to the Lay Committee."

The Secretary reported that a new supply of Books had been received.

The Meeting was then closed with Prayer.

DIocese OF TORONTO.

ANNUAL MEETING OF THE CHURCH SOCIETY.

On Wednesday, 15th June, the Annual Meeting of this Society took place at the St James' Parochial School House. The Lord Bishop of Toronto in the Chair.

The attendance was greater than we have seen on most other occasions. Among those present we noticed the Venbles. the Archdeacons of York and Kingston, the Revds. Messrs. Dixon, Patton, Ardagh, Kerr, Lett, Lewis, Cronyn, Hill, Geddes, McMurray, McGeorge, Rev. Provost Whitaker, Cooper, Green, Scadding, Parry, Irvine, Boomer, McKenzie, Givins, H. Osler, Ritchie, J. L. Osler, Tremayne, Armstrong, Lauder, Wilson, Dewar, Pentland, T. Greene, Ingles, Shanklin, Brent, Townley, Leeming, Darling, Evans, Boswell, Blake, Short, Sanson, Plees, Fuller, Palmer, Merritt, Baldwin, Marsh, Neiles, and the Hon. Mr. Goodhue, Messrs. Arnold, Harman, Allan, Hagarty, Bovell, O'Brien, Dixon, &c.

The proceedings having as usual been opened with prayer by the Bishop, His Lordship said that before commencing business, he wished to direct their attention to one or two matters of deep interest to them. Since they had all read the very able reply of Sir John Pakington to Sir William Molesworth, on the subject of the Clergy Reserves, they had learned that the Derby ministry had been overthrown by the most extraordinary political combination which had ever occurred in British History; and on the organization of a new ministry, they found a change in the Imperial Policy had taken place upon the Clergy Reserve question. The unusual rapidity with which this change was followed up in England, scarce sufficed to enable us to hear of its existence here, much less to summon the members of our Church to express any opinion thereon, collectively or scarcely even partially. Still, however, all that was possible to be done had been done. A Petition to Parliament had been prepared, and was despatched from this on 12th March last, which, though it arrived too late to be available in the House of Commons, yet was, though hardly, available for use in the House of Lords, where the present Archbishop of Canterbury, who was friendly to its prayer, promptly supported it, but no impression was made thereby. From the brevity of that document and the short time allowed for its preparation, many strong points were omitted, and under these circumstances he had drawn up a letter addressed to the Duke of Newcastle. His letter was dated the 19th March. It reached London in time to be printed and circulated, but despite all efforts, the rights and privileges guaranteed to us by the most sacred pledges were likely to be sacrificed; evil counsels prevailed, and whilst we lament the result it is consolatory

to know that never was there a cause more triumphantly debated. But might prevailed against right, and past promises went for nothing. When we come to dissect the debate we discover that the most revolting proceedings took place, proceedings which in the end must prove most disastrous in their results. He alluded particularly to the fact that nine out of nineteen of the Bishops who were present on that occasion voted for the destruction of the temporal support of that Church which they were sworn to preserve, and the handing over three Dioceses covering an extent almost as large as Europe to the tender mercies of the Church of Rome. (Hear, hear.) Under these circumstances, he thought it was only just that members of the Church both lay and clerical should have an opportunity of meeting to discuss what they should do in defence of their rights, and for this end he contemplated holding a conference of the clergy and laity, between this and the month of October, to consider the state of the Church. In the meantime the subject would have their full deliberation, and then by acting with unity and determination they would have nothing to fear. (Hear.) This conference is desirable on other grounds. In the last year Mr. Gladstone had brought in his bill for the regulation of the Colonial Church, but from the importance of the subject it was wisely postponed to this. Sir John Pakington, aware of the necessity of some such measure, addressed a letter to the Colonial Bishops upon the subject, drawing their attention to the suggested Legislative changes. He had received a copy of that letter, and not supposing it likely to have come under the consideration of the House in the November session of the Imperial Parliament, he had sent it accompanied by a circular addressed to the several rural Deans, with a request that they might ascertain the views of the laity and report thereon. This had elicited much useful information. He had also solicited the valuable aid of the Hon. the Chief Justice, and from his and his own united deliberations they had been enabled to forward to England a report which had been more than favorably received by the Archbishops and Bishops, and Colonial Bishops then in London. Some such provisions as the Bill of Mr. Gladstone called for, will be most likely introduced by the Lords should the Bill come before them this session, and he had reason to believe, would be passed without opposition. For these reasons he had postponed the conference which he had contemplated; but should this measure not then have come to maturity, there were other grounds which called for an early assemblage of the Church in Canada, an assembly now admitted not to be unlawful. Under these circumstances it was contemplated that they should meet. He would now allude to the probable division of the Diocese. He for his own part acquiesced in that division, but claimed to be heard as to the details of such a change. He hoped to die in harness, (hear, hear,) but the rapid growth of the Diocese was rendering the labor beyond the strength of any one man. Therefore the necessity of a division of the Diocese was recognized, and Kingston was fixed on as the name of the new see; another was also suggested in October, 1850, and would, no doubt, in time take effect. In conclusion we would only say that he again cherished the hope that the proceedings of the meeting would be conducted with that courtesy and forbearance among the members which had ever distinguished the proceedings of this Society. His Lordship then sat down amid much applause.

The Secretary then read the very able and lengthened report of the Society, which gave a most gratifying and interesting account of its progress during the past year, but its length totally precludes it from our columns.

The Ven. ARCHDEACON of Kingston, then proposed the first resolution—

Resolved 1.—That the Report now read be adopted, and printed with the Treasurer's Account under the direction of the Secretary and the Auditors.

Rev. H. PATTON seconded the resolution.

The Rev. C. C. BROUGH moved the second resolution, which was seconded by the Rev. Mr. KERR—

Resolved 2.—That this meeting desires gratefully to acknow-