

TRINITY COLLEGE, TORONTO.
FACULTY OF MEDICINE.

At the examination held at the close of the Session 1853-4, the following gentlemen were declared prizemen.

Assistant Demonstrators of Anatomy, (Session 1853-4)	W. Hillier, and W. Hewat.
Anatomy and Physiology	W. L. Herriman.
Institutes of Medicine	Sen. F. Goodman.
Chemistry	Jun. J. T. McKenzie.
	Sen. W. L. Herriman.
Materia Medica	Jun. W. Lambert.
	Sen. J. Ryall.
Obstetrics	Jun. W. Lambert.
	Sen. W. L. Herriman.
Practice of Medicine	Jun. E. Goodman.
	Sen. W. L. Herriman.
Surgery	Jun. G. H. Corbett.
	Sen. W. L. Herriman.
	Jun. J. T. McKenzie.

The prizes will be distributed at the Meeting of Convocation in October next

JAMES BOVELL, M.D.,
Dean of Faculty of Medicine.

April 10, 1854.

Ecclesiastical Intelligence.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN THE COLONIES.

[From the Morning Chronicle.]

The Ecclesiastical Bills at present before Parliament will bear a general as well as a specific examination. The only Government measure is the "Colonial Clergy Disabilities Bill." It would, perhaps, be too much to call this an enabling Bill—all that it amounts to is that it removes, or rather negatives, a supposed disability. Inasmuch as certain doubts exist, this measure proposes to dissipate them. All that it aims at is to lay the ghost of an unsubstantial and shadowy suspicion; and it is, in this respect, a legislative curiosity, especially as contrasted with its predecessors of the sessions of 1852 and 1853 respectively. Its preamble is brief:—"Whereas doubts exist as to the rights of the bishops, clergy, and lay persons inhabiting the colonial possessions of her Majesty, and being in communion with the Church of England, in regard to the management of their internal ecclesiastical affairs; and whereas it is expedient that, under certain restrictions, they should be permitted to make regulations for the said management by agreement among themselves, be it declared," &c. This recital we conceive to be an improvement on that which ushered in Mr. Gladstone's Bill of 1852, which rested the doubts respecting the rights of the Colonial Church on the Tudor enactments. The present measure simply recognizes the existence, without saying anything about the reasonableness, of the doubts in question; and it certainly does not imply—which the Bill of 1852 did—that, by any operative construction, the Submission of the Clergy Act under Henry VIII. could possibly fetter the Australian Church of the present day.

After this cautious preamble follows the solitary clause:—"No statute, law, rule, usage or other authority of the United Kingdom shall extend or be construed to prevent the Metropolitan of any province or the Bishop of any diocese, in the colonies of her Majesty, together with his clergy, and the lay persons of such province or diocese, being members of the United Church of England and Ireland, from meeting together from time to time, for the purpose, at such meetings, of making or entering into any such regulations, agreements, or arrangements as local circumstances shall, in their judgment, render necessary for the management or conduct of ecclesiastical affairs within such province or diocese. Provided always, that such meetings, or the regulations, agreement or agreements that may be made thereat, shall not obtain any force or authority from the enactments hereby made."

The 2nd reading of the Colonial Church Bill was carried in the House of Commons by the large majority of 196 against 62.

THE SOCIETY FOR THE PROPAGATION OF THE GOSPEL.

✓ The Secretary, in a very satisfactory and perfectly conclusive letter to the Reverend Dr. Sadlier, Treasurer to the Society in Castleknock, takes up the charges made by the *Examiner* in full. We subjoin Mr. Hawkins's letter, with an earnest expression of the sorrow we feel that there should exist even the smallest amount of the violent *ultraism* which, on grounds either frivolous or mistaken, seeks to raise a popular prejudice against so noble a handmaid of Christ's Church as the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel has proved itself to be, by long services for which filial affection far and wide throughout the British dominions makes grateful acknowledgment, and the value of which it is impossible to compute.

From Rev. E. Hawkins to Rev. Dr. R. Sadlier.
✓ 79, Pall Mall, London, February 18, 1854.

REV. SIR,—As the object of my former letter was not to call in question your right to make any observations you thought proper on the principles or administration of the society, but to learn what precisely the charges were which I was told had been brought against us, and as you now inform me that you have advanced no charges, I can have no claim to see the letters which you addressed to the secretary of the Dublin committee. I am bound, however, to satisfy you in respect to certain matters touched upon in your letter to myself.

You first refer me to a correspondence in the *Record* between the Bishop of Tasmania and the Rev. J. G. Medland. I have not seen that correspondence, but it is difficult to imagine that it can affect the society, which has no control over the Bishop of Tasmania, and neither has, nor ever had, any connexion whatever with the Rev. J. G. Medland.

That the Bishop threatened to report him to the society must, I conceive, be a mistake; and, undoubtedly if his lordship had done so, the necessary answer must have been that the society had no authority or jurisdiction in the matter.

You next refer me to the *Christian Examiner*. It was only last night that I saw a copy of that paper. You do not, of course, expect me to enter into a discussion of the theological views contained in the sermon of the Bishop of Michigan; but I may state, on the authority of the standing committee, that, while it has been the ordinary practice to publish the sermons preached at the anniversaries, the society has never held itself to be identified with the sentiments put forth in those sermons. I will add, that when the *Christian Examiner* says that the selection of the preacher is really made by the committee or secretary, he states that which is notoriously untrue. The archbishops have uniformly appointed the several bishops, in order of seniority; and the exception two years ago was made in compliment to the American Church, which had sent representatives to our jubilee at the archbishops' invitation. It would ill become me to follow the anonymous writer in his remarks about "Puseyite" and "Evangelical" bishops. If the writer be himself a man of Evangelical views, he should be reminded of a solemn injunction of the Gospel, "Judge not, that ye be not

judged." And if any have been misled by his misstatements, that the diocese of Toronto has been pampered, while that of Calcutta has been starved, I would simply refer to the financial statement just published, by which it appears that, for the year 1853, Calcutta received from the general fund £8,897, while Toronto received £3,152 13s.; and that of the Jubilee Fund, Calcutta received £8,000 for a new mission at Delhi, Toronto only £1,000 for the endowment of scholarships in its newly founded college. I will not venture to conjecture under what division of churchmen the *Examiner* might class Dr. Dealtry, the Bishop of Madras; I will merely state, that for his diocese there was expended during the past year £10,155, which is more than twelve times the amount of the grant to the diocese of Tasmania.

I cannot, without neglecting more important duties, enter more at length on a refutation of the *Examiner's* charges, but I will briefly say, in reference to his summary of them, that the first, loose as it is, and a mere *petitio principii*, has no reference to anything contained in what is properly the report of the society; that the second is too vague to be met, but that, if it implies the least sympathy for Romish errors or Romish practices, it is a calumny and a libel; that the third is inaccurate in its statement and unjust in its inference; that the little or no help which the Evangelical colonial bishops are said, in the fourth, to receive, is confuted by the fact, that out of the total amount [£56,000] granted last year to twenty-two dioceses, the three dioceses of Calcutta, Madras, and Melbourne, received more than one-third. The fallacies of the last statement are, perhaps, too patent to require exposure, but it must be obvious to the most ordinary mind that the increase of Romanism in Canada is owing almost entirely to the emigration of Irish Romanists.

I have thus endeavoured to correct some of the misstatements of the *Examiner*, though I cannot subscribe to the opinion that newspaper charges are to be considered true as long as they remain unanswered.

I am, Rev. Sir, your's faithfully,
ERNEST HAWKINS.

The Rev. Dr. Sadlier.

✓ The following extract is from a letter from Archdeacon Abraham to the secretary of the S. P. G. The extract, our readers will see, contains interesting illustrations of New Zealand Church life.

The Bishop expressed to the meeting very much what is so clearly enunciated as the Society's principle of action by yourself in the answer made to the North American Missions, and given in the Report of 1850. It told upon them most pointedly when he explained the sources whence your Society's income is so much derived, viz. "the savings of the poor;" and the wealthy merchants and shopkeepers winced under the fact that they were being supplied with the ordinances of religion by the weekly contributions of Ragged Schools to some extent.

The Bishop laid before them his Endowment Plan, whereby he proposes to endow every minister to the amount of half his income by means of funds contributed partly from the Parishioners, and partly from any resources he may have to meet them with, of course mainly relying on your kind and willing aid.

The great object of this half endowment is to make the Clergyman partially independent of his flock, and partially dependent; independent enough "to speak the truth and boldly rebuke vice," without fear of man; dependent enough to be made punctual and attentive to his duties.