

Supposing such an act to be obtained, rules regulating the details may be framed differing very little from those which regulate the church society. As the standing committee of the church society is the mission board, so the executive committee of Synod can perform the same function. This committee, hitherto nominated by the bishop, I would suggest should consist of twenty-four members—eight clerical members to be elected by the clergy, eight lay members to be elected by the laity, and eight to be nominated by the bishop—the dignitaries of the diocese being ex officio members. As the clergyman and churchwardens form a parochial committee under the church society's rules, so the clergy and lay delegates may form a parochial committee under an Incorporated Synod. Rules admitting associated members and requiring parochial meetings and reports may still be maintained, and an annual report be published by the secretary embodying the parochial statistical returns; and when the Synod meets for the purpose of legislation, the great annual public meeting may be held when the whole church is present by her representatives, and the cause of missions be especially advocated. As the Synod meets ordinarily but once a year, a greater discretionary power must of course be allowed to the mission board than is conceded by a church society which meets quarterly; but should necessity require it, the Synod may be called together twice a year. This, however, is not a matter of much consequence, as the Synod can lay down by-laws for the direction of the board and require a careful and elaborate report at each session. Sub-committees of the mission board, or independent committees of Synod, may be elected to administer any special funds or trusts of the church, such as widows' and orphans' fund, divinity students' fund, and the book and tract fund.

These details I merely throw out as suggestions, and to show that the incorporation of Synod will not change our aims nor our usual mode of business, but will give point to those aims and vigour to that business, rendering the work in hand more popular by making it more directly an emanation from the church itself. I disclaim all intention of dictation to the Synod, as whatever may be your decision I shall energetically strive to carry it out most effectively. Accordingly I now leave the matter in your hands, feeling that I have conscientiously endeavoured to arrive at a right conclusion and relieved myself from responsibility by plainly expressing my convictions.

TRINITY COLLEGE

My regret is exceedingly great that I feel bound to address you on a subject most embarrassing and painful to myself, but a sense of duty forbids my evading it. I mean the controversy that has arisen regarding Trinity College. I should gladly have avoided the topic did I not know that the interests of our Church University are of paramount importance, and that the members of the church have a right to look to their Bishop for such explanation as may satisfy their consciences, and calm their alarm. There is indeed something melancholy in reflecting on the fatality oftentimes of the best intentioned endeavours to do permanent good. Troubles arise when we least expect them, and certainly when Trinity College was established amid the congratulations and thanksgivings of churchmen, it was scarcely anticipated that within a few years a severe blow should be aimed at the institution by churchmen themselves, who would strive to damage its character by arousing party spirit against its teaching. The Venerable Prelate to whom we owe the existence of Trinity College is entitled to our prayerful sympathy on this to him so severe trial, but they who know him best will feel

assured that he will bear the blow with his usual undaunted firmness, and continue to devote his great abilities to remedying the evil that has befallen our University. Not Trinity College alone, but the whole church, has been affected by the recent agitation; never has a church enjoyed greater internal harmony than the church in Canada hitherto. Nothing marred the peaceful and happy intercourse of the great body of the clergy. Differences of opinion existed, but they were not boastfully obtruded, much less made a ground of offence. Men imbued with very different views regarding predestination have over been in the church for 1400 years, and the Canadian branch contained its share of such men, but no practical difficulty had arisen. Indeed there is no reason why trouble on this score should ever arise. Calvinism or anti-Calvinism can certainly be always detected in their respective adherents; they tinge more or less men's feelings, and sermons and tastes. But Calvinism is itself essentially impractical. The most rigid Calvinist will admit that though you believe in the fact that God has unalterably fixed your destiny from all eternity, yet it should not affect your conduct a whit; you are to demean yourself as though God had not done so; you are to "work out your own salvation in fear and trembling," as though this predestination were unknown or untrue. Hence a doctrine which leads to so little practical consequence may be held without causing offence. But alas! the less the practical difference, the greater the warmth in maintaining it, a warmth which has long existed in the church, but which through God's grace has been kept from developing itself into strife till the late attack on Trinity College, which has been denounced as a dangerous institution, in my candid opinion, ostensibly on the ground of its having a tendency towards Rome, but really because it has not a tendency towards Geneva. The attack on Trinity College is an outbreak of that party spirit which has affected the church since the time when Augustine gave to the world his daring speculations on God's predestination. In his old age when renouncing the Manichean heresy of his younger days, he propounded those stern doctrines which have since been welcomed by gloomy and ascetic minds, but which were unknown to the early Christians, and have never been received by the Church in the East. The great schoolmen of the Roman Church in pre-reformation times with great subtlety and didactical skill defended the tenets of Augustine, but the laity scarcely knew of the existence of such a belief, and at all events never acknowledged the necessity of acquiescence in it. What Augustine was to the clergy, Calvin became to the laity. He seemed to glory in startling the world in the dogmatic way in which he asserted the doctrines of predestined damnation and salvation, and by his powerful genius founded the reformation of France and Switzerland on this basis. The daring courage which knew no hesitation or difficulty captivated the imaginations of multitudes who viewed with wonder and accepted with joy the lucubrations of a man who seemed to have been admitted within the penetralia of God's providence, and who gave the result of his revelations with the authority of a confidant of heaven. His influence reached Britain, and his views though borrowed from Rome's greatest doctors, were eagerly adopted by Rome's most violent opponents, the Puritans, who were perhaps led to this strange alliance from consideration of the fact that the doctors of this school advocated the supremacy of the civil magistrate in civil affairs. The English Church however, reforming herself on the great principle of an appeal to God's word and a return to the practices of the first three centuries, rightly and naturally refused to adopt as a part of her creed

those subtleties which were never received by the eastern church, and only partially and recently by the western. From that day to this efforts have been constantly made to represent the Church of England as committed to a belief in Calvin's "horrible decree," but in vain. While history remains, the reader will be informed of the exertions made in this direction, even to the attempt to force on our church the Lambeth articles—a tacit acknowledgment that our articles do not go far enough to please Calvinists. During the commonwealth and the suppression of the church as established, Calvinism reached its highest stage of development, and after the restoration continued to exercise a remarkable influence on our church. During the 18th century, that dark age of the reformed Church of England, the harvest, the seed of which had been so widely sown, was reaped. The habit of viewing our salvation, as the predetermined decree of God the Father who elected a fixed and unalterable number from all eternity, by degrees drew men away from considering in its due significance the work of God the Son. The tendency in the human mind to disparage part of a system in proportion as it unduly magnifies another part, developed itself. As compared with God the Father's election of men to salvation irrespective of anything but his own arbitrary decree, the work of God the Son appeared of second rate importance, and gradually receded from view, till the result appeared in that widely spread Arianism and open Socinianism which disgraced the church in the last century. A reaction schism—Wesleyan Methodism—arose and served as a protest against Calvinism; attention was roused to examine what was till then lightly esteemed.—The Prayer Book of the English Church. Even Wesley commenced his religious life by an effort to illustrate the principles and practices of that book. The church roused herself to love and to good works. While no attempt was made to exclude any from the church on account of their Calvinism, it was agreed that all might work together for the good of Christ's church, especially as the prevalent views concerning God's decrees were admittedly not to influence action; we were to act as though God had not so decreed the number of the saved or damned, a strong proof one would imagine of the improbability of the doctrine. God does nothing in vain.

From this rapid review of the debate in the church respecting the subtleties advanced by Calvin, we detect the reason why the church framed its 17th article for the special purpose "of avoiding diversity of opinions," and was so far successful at the time that His Majesty's declaration informs us that "even in those curious points in which the present difficulties lie, men of all sorts take the articles of the church of England to be for them." While this is the case, and while we can all use the language of the Liturgy respecting our redemption by Christ, who made upon the cross, "by His own oblation of Himself once offered, a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world." So long as we can subscribe to the language of the 2nd article, that Christ suffered "to be a sacrifice not only for original guilt, but also for all original sins of men;" so long as we all believe that Christ Jesus "came into the world to save sinners," and that the word sinners is co-extensive with all human beings, so long as we are all persuaded of these truths and use the same formulae, it would seem that this well-meant and comprehensive system of the English Church should secure no members from being charged by each other with holding dangerous doctrines regarding election. Human nature, however, is not altered. Nothing