ber; and I consider that it should be used by us as a regular Annual Service. Whenever a day is appointed by proclamation of the Governor General, I should always wish that we should observe the same; but as it is only occasionally, in case of some more than ordinarily abundant harvest, that such an appointment is made, and as it is our desire to have an Annual Day of Thanksgiving, provision having been made in our Service for the occurrence of either ordinary harvests or abundance, I have no desire that, in this and subsequent years, the second Wednesday in October, shall be observed in this Diocese, as "a Day of Thanksgiving for the In-gathering of the Harvest," unless any other day shall in any year have been previously fixed by Proclamation. And I further desire that you will urge upon your several congregations at such service, the duty of making free and liberal offerings to God, for some special work of piety or charity, and I consider that there can be none more worthy of support, or more requiring instant help, than the Mission Fund of the Diocesan Church Society.

Copies of the Form of Prayer to be used on the occasion will be forwarded to you by my Secretary, the Rev. Canon Loosemore, Acting Secretary of the Church Society; who will also be ready to receive any communications intended for me during my absence, and will forward them to me in England.

To this, however, I will now add, that in consequence of the accounts which we have received during the last few days, of the increasing prevalence of the cholera in some parts of this continent, I have to desire that the prayers which we used during the season of last Lent on that subject may again be used at all the services of the Church. And, in conclusion, I most sincerely pray that God in his mercy will preserve us from any visitation of this fearful pestilence; and I return you all my best thanks for your kind expressions towards myself, and for your prayers and good wishes for the safety and happiness of myself and those connected with me.

I remain,
My Rev. and Dear Brethren,
Your faithful friend and brother in Christ,
F. MONTREAL.

A number of gentlemen waited upon the Metropolitan on Friday, at the vestry of the cathedral, and presented the following address:—

To the most Reverend Father in God Francis, by Divine Permission Lord Bishop of the Diocese of Montreal, and Metropolitan of Canada.

May it please your Lordship:—

We, the undersigned, lay delegates of the diocese of Montreal, and churchwardens of churches and chapels in the parish of Montreal, beg leave to approach your Lordship, on the eve of your departure for England, and to express our earnest wishes that the intended voyage may prove happy and prosperous, and result in renewed health and strength both to your Lordship and to Mrs. Fulford.

The opportunity which your Lordship's visit to your native land will afford to your Lordship and Mrs. Fulford of again seeing your nearest relatives and friends will no doubt prove greatly satisfactory, but we cannot but feel, that in the present momentous condition of the Church of England, of which we are all proud to call ourselves members, and of her relations with the various branches of the Church in the Colonies and dependencies of the Empire, and in the United States of America, your Lordship's presence in England may prove most fortunate for the interests of the Church in general, and of the branch to which we more especially belong.

In wishing you God speed, we beg to express our sincerest hopes, that before very long we shall again have the privilege and happiness of greeting your Lordship and Mrs. Fulford, on your safe return to this country, and that the church in this country, and the diocese in particular, Canada and this diocese in particular, which can so appreciate the wisdom, zeal, and Christian courtesy which have at all times characterized your Lordship's administration.

Signed by STRAHAN BETHUNE,
Chancellor of Diocese of Montreal, And the lay delegates to Synod, and the churchwardens of the churches and chapels in the parish of Montreal.

To which his Lordship made the following

REPLY;

Mr. Chancellor Bethune, and Gentlemen:
Sixteen years ago, on my first arrival at Montreal, an address was presented to me by the lay members of the Church, in which these words occurred, "As laymen we do not presume to enter into your Lordship's councils, but sensible of the great benefit which must result from

combined action and a good understanding between the clergy and laity, we respectfully tender you our cordial co-operation in all matters in which your Lordship may be pleased to require our services for the prosperity of the Church."

Mr. Gerard, who read that address, and most of the other leading and influential members of the Church who accompanied him on that occasion, have, in God's providence, been taken away from us by the hand of Death. You now are come forward to occupy their places. But these changes which have occurred in the members of our communion are far less striking than those which we can mark in the gradual unfolding and matured organization of the polity of the church in the diocese to which I belong.

In the address to which I now alluded, mention was made of the great benefit which must arise from combined action and a good understanding between the clergy and laity. Those who then spoke tendered to me their "cordial co-operation." I am bound to acknowledge, and I do it with much thankfulness, that I have, in various ways and on different occasions, experienced the fulfilment of that pledge. But most of all do we now see the development of the great benefits resulting from combined action and good understanding between the clergy and laity in the active and successful working of our diocesan and provincial synods, in connection with which the administration of the government of the church, in this province, and the regulation of its discipline, are established both in accordance with catholic usage and the acknowledgement of the law of the land.

That there are still many difficulties connected with the general state of the Colonial Church, and its relation to the Mother Church in England, we must be fully aware. The Earl of Carnarvon, the present Colonial Secretary, in a very able and thoughtful speech, delivered very recently in the House of Lords on this question, spoke of it as the most difficult subject he would, have to deal with, and as a most important one. I have full reliance that in his Lordship we have a Minister who is both able and willing, as a man of talent, a religious man, and a good churchman, to deal with it in a right temper and spirit.

If my services, while in England, can be of any use in assisting towards the settlement of this matter, they will be gladly given. And I know that I shall be acting in full accordance with your desire, to be the humble artist legal connection that binds us to the mother church and devout, in every possible way, to testify our love and veneration for her, and our determination to live in the closest bonds of spiritual and ecclesiastical unity that can be maintained between us.

For your very kind expressions and good wishes towards Mrs. Fulford and myself, we return you our very sincere thanks.

I wish you and those dear to you every good gift and blessing, and commending you to the mercy and grace of God.

I remain,
Yours very truly,
F. MONTREAL.
3rd August, 1866.

On Friday evening His Lordship the Bishop and Metropolitan took his departure by the Quebec boat en route for England, and was accompanied to the wharf by a number of friends.

DIOCESE OF HURON.

The Huron correspondent of the N. Y. Church Journal says of the Venerable Archdeacon Hellmuth's appointment:—

The rectory of London, the patronage of which, like the rest of our few endowed rectories, is in the Bishop, he has given to the Ven. Archdeacon Hellmuth, D. D., Principal of Huron College. This last he will of course have to resign, and will be made Dean of the Cathedral, the Archdeaconry is also vacant. On whom it will be bestowed I have not heard. The appointment of Dr. Hellmuth will, I hope and think, be beneficial to the very important Diocese in London. He is a man of great energy, of ample means, which so far as he has shown every disposition to use for the Church and his Master. The living itself is not worth very much at present, not more than sufficient for an able curate, and two could be well employed there. Then, too, the new Dean and rector is a great lover of order and consistency, so that I am in hopes that having nothing to prevent it, devoting his whole time and energies to his Cathedral and parish, the services will be more frequent and full, and the parish, generally energetically and conscientiously looked after, its important position. It is to be the model parish of the Diocese both for Church order and holy earnestness.

England.

DR. COLENSO AND THE S. P. G.—The Times contains a long letter signed "J. W. Natal," and dated "Bishopstowe, Natal, May 4, 1866." It adds but scantily to the facts already before our readers, and is indeed, from beginning to end a bitter attack on the "S. P. G.," from whose Organizing Secretaryal he stepped into the Bishopric. The principal subject-matter of the complaint is the withdrawal (already known) of the Rev. A Tonnesen's stipend, because of his admission to the Bishop. Dr. Colenso talks largely about the "express rules of the Society," "ordination vows, "lawful bishop," and so forth. But the very details bring out the fact that he is deserted and repudiated by the general body of the clergy. He attacks the "Natal Committee" of the S. P. G. as "simply a convenient arrangement for exhibiting to the English mind at home an appearance of duplicity that in reality placing the several brands in this diocese in the hands of Mr. Gray," "Vicar-General," and plainly insinuates that its unanimity is the result of "the check-string of the Gospel propagation Society."

The Churchman gives the following suggestions as to the Ritual controversy:—

"We trust that councils of peace will prevail, and that every one will remember that, after all, they are holy things about which they are striving and that it should be a strife of love. A controversy between children contending who shall contribute the most towards the support of a parent, ought surely to be a friendly one, and of this is not the nature of the controversy it ought to be. We trust, too, that ultra-Ritualists will not be encouraged to look upon themselves as martyrs. Some who are not themselves so "advanced" are ready to compare themselves to the Apostles preaching a new religion, and like them that they must expect persecution. We protest against this. The Apostles never rode roughshod over the prejudices of those with whom they had to deal. When the lawfulness of a line of action was unquestionable, St. Paul did not think it wrong to yield a point for the sake of expediency or the conscience of weaker brethren. In matters on the legality of which opinions were greatly divided would he have been ready to urge his own ground for consolation?"

—In the Lords, the usual movement for a revision of the Liturgy has been made by Lord Ebury, with the usual result. The Metropolitan and Earl Russell both set themselves so decidedly against it, that there was obviously no hope of affecting anything, and the whole matter came to nothing in a very little time. Archbishop Longley has said now so often that he would not countenance a touching off the Liturgy; that, as his sanction of the movement is almost indispensable to any prospect of success in it, the yearly effort of Lord Ebury seems quixotic in the circumstances.

THE RITUALISTIC CASE AND OPINION.—As considerable interest is felt in the opinion being obtained by the English Church Union on Ritual, we may state that the lengthy case has been prepared with great care and fairness (mainly, we believe, by the Rev. T. W. Perry,) and has the great advantage of setting forth both sides of the question. The following are the questions submitted to the Queen's Advocate, Sir Fitzroy Kelly, the Solicitor-General, Dr. Deane, Q. C.; Mr. J. D. Coleridge, Q. C., Mr. Prideaux, Mr. Hansen, and Mr. J. Cutler:—

"Having regard, therefore, to the preceding documents; and especially to the language of the Judicial Committee, in Liddell v. Westerton, that the Ornament Clause, the Act of Uniformity of 1559, and the successive forms of the Rubric on Ornaments in the Prayer-books of 1559, 1604, and 1662, all obviously mean the same thing, that the same dresses and the same utensils, or articles, which were used under the First Prayer-book of Edward the Sixth may still be used, and also to the ancient Canons of the Church of England, which have been held in Court to be still law by 1 Eliz. c. i, except where they have been expressly repealed—

"You opinion, as full and as definite as possible, is therefore requested upon the legality or otherwise of using the vestments and practices mentioned under the following heads, viz.—

"1. The vestments prescribed in the First Prayer-book of Edward VI., for use by the minister in celebrating the Holy Communion—namely, a white alb plain, with a vestment [i. e. chasuble] or cope. The assisting minister also wearing albes with tunicles.

"2. The placing of two lighted candles on the Lord's Table at the time of the celebration of the Holy Communion or upon a ledge near to it, not for the purpose of giving light but for the signification that Christ is the true Light of the World.

"3. The burning of incense in any way, or in such manner as it was employed and for such uses as it was put to in the second year of King Edward the Sixth—viz., in censers and for censing persons and things in the course of the service, especially during the celebration of the Holy Communion, either by the officiating minister, or by others authorised by him.

"4. The adding 'a little pure and clean water' to the wine after it has been poured into the chalice in readiness for consecration, as prescribed in the Prayer-book of 1549.

"5. The use of unleavened or leavened bread in the form of wafers or in any other shape varying from the customary way in which bread ordinarily eaten is employed for the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

"6. The singing of hymns, introits, or anthems—(i.) at the beginning of the Communion Service; (ii.) after the officiating minister has read 'one or more of the Offertory sentences as he thinketh most convenient in his discretion;' (iii.) during the pause for the bread and wine, that he may with the more readiness and decency break the bread before the people, and take the cup into his hands;' (iv.) after the Prayer of Consecration, during the Communion of the clergy and people; and lastly, at the end of the service.

"7. Processions in churches, either generally or on festivals or special occasions, with or without the accompaniment of banners, cross, and singing.

"In asking this opinion it is desired to call the attention of Counsel to the fact, that there is no wish to urge, much less force, upon unwilling clergy or people obedience to a rubric which for a very long period has been neglected, or to imply unfaithfulness on the part of those who do not follow its directions. The object is simply to ascertain what liberty it concedes to those clergy who desire to conform to it by employing the ornaments and usages which were, it is believed, used under the First Prayer-book of Edward VI.; and who wish to avail themselves of such liberty in the mode of conducting Divine service as (being not contrary to law, or to that interpretation of the rubric above quoted, as given in 1857 by the ultimate Court of Appeal in Causes Ecclesiastical) is found to be most edifying to their people."

Although the opinion is not finally settled, we understand that on the question of vestments the opinion is unanimous in favour of their legality; on that of wax lights the majority is favourable, as also with regard to the use of wafer bread. The majority are against the use of the mixed chalice, and they unanimously condemn the custom of censing persons or things. With regard to the introduction of hymns they hold them to be within the law before and after the service. In the minority, we believe, will be found the name of the Solicitor-General and Mr. Coleridge.—John Bull.

A RITUALISTIC FREE CHURCH.—The accuracy of the opinion expressed recently in the Record of the Report of the Committee of the Provincial Convocation of Canterbury on the subject of Ritualism has received quasi-authoritative confirmation. We pointed out that the conclusions of the Committee were no better than a timid compromise recommendatory as such as condemnatory of the practices under consideration, speaking with bated breath and trimming a half-way course throughout. Our language was perhaps scarcely strong enough for the occasion, if we may judge from the comments on the Report in some other quarters. The Guardian heard the Report as the embodiment of ecclesiastical wisdom, and exhaust itself in laudation of its wise and temperate moderation. The more outspoken Churchman, writing as a ritualist for ritualists, warmly recommends its party to accept the Report and make it the key of their position. It points out that in doing so they would have nothing whatever to give up except probable censers and wafer-bread. In all other respects it considers the ritualistic position to have been greatly strengthened by it, and that if the party take their their stand on this Report, making after their own characteristic manner the most of its admissions and the least of its prohibitions, they will stand on impregnable ground, and beneath the shield of its authority may defy all their enemies.

In so speaking it is the evident object of the Churchman to moderate the zeal of the more ardent members of the party, and by pointing out a defined position within

the Church prevent the secession which is evidently looming in the distance. It would be a great mistake to underrate the strength of the extreme Ritualists and fail to appreciate the lengths to which they are evidently prepared to go. In all great crises there are always men who, either from want of sagacity or sheer defect of moral courage, cannot or will not see the danger beforehand. This is evidently the case with no small number of our Bishops, if we may judge by the miserable exhibition in the Upper House relative to the recent work of the Rev. O. Shipley. We have pointed out the extreme character of this book, and its open defiance of all legitimate authority. Yet a copy of it was presented to Convocation by the Bishop of Oxford, and accepted by the members of the Upper House, with such terms of complimentary courtesy as if the book had been as wise as it is foolish, as dutiful as it is extravagant and extreme. We are told that their Lordships had not read the book. But there are times when carelessness is criminal. At such a time no man, whatever be his dignity or station has a right to praise a book which he has not yet read. Indeed the higher his dignity and station the more melancholy it is that their weight should be so lightly and rashly used. But so it has been throughout. Ritualism and ritualists have been petted and caressed and complimented, treated with such weak and amiable indulgence, regarded as such models of correct Churchmanship, that the movement has acquired a character likely to shake the Church of England to her foundations. A secession from her pale and the establishment of a ritualistic Free Church becomes every day more probable, we had almost said more certain, should the pending decisions in the courts of law be adverse to the movement party. We do not mean that we anticipate permanent injury to the Church from such a result. If a disease comes to a crisis, it is far better and safer that the poison should be expelled, than that it should be allowed to corrupt the very heart of the Church. But we do think, that the secession will be much wider than our Bishops appear to anticipate. We earnestly warn them that we have not to deal with the extravagance of a few foolish clergymen, but with a considerable body of laity likewise. In many cases the laity are the active instigators of the evil. A no inconsiderable number of congregations exist up and down the country where the educational influence of "high ceremonial" has done its work only too fatally, and where the entire body of members may be expected to secede together. We doubt whether there is vitality of principle enough for a permanent success, but great mischief may be wrought for a time. Certain it is, that whatever importance such a movement may possess, will be owing to the weak indulgence and compromise of our rulers. Had the law, where it is clear, been firmly maintained from the first, the movement would never have obtained its present proportions. But it has been pampered into strength, and will surely sting the breast that has nursed it.

When the crisis actually arrives several diverging paths will probably be adopted. It is likely that some will hesitate in taking the final step, and will think it wisest to submit. Another portion will probably apostatise to the Church of Rome, and in so doing will only carry out the legitimate tendency of their principles. But a third, and perhaps the largest portion may be expected to shrink from both of those alternatives and to establish themselves as a Free Church.

Should this take place, what will be the position of these congregations? We reply that it will be the position of rank unmitigated Dissent. On no theory save the theory of dissent could even an apparent justification be alleged. No Council name, no Church forms or ceremonies could hide the naked fact of the dissent. No mere total or positive contradiction to the principles asserted in the Tracts for the Times, and professed by extreme High Churchmen, can be conceived than would be involved in such a secession. No more monstrous inconsistency will ever have been exhibited to the world. The existence of the Church as an outward and visible polity, the authority due to her as being the impersonated will of God and the channel and depository of the grace of Christ, the identification of this Church during all ages by an apostolical descent of office regularly transmitted from the days of the apostles, the subordination of the individual will and individual action to the corporate body, the incommunicable sanctity of holy orders, and the awful gift of reading this visible body of Christ by which are the most distinctive principles of the school. All these elements are asserted as a class of men for the Church of England. A rigid submission to the divinely constituted authority of the visible National