

occasion had there been the slightest difference between them on any point, although both were men of independent opinions. The Provost had his fullest confidence and esteem.

The Rev. Provost Whittaker observed, in the course of what was certainly the speech of the evening, that when any attack was made upon the theological teaching of the College, it was his teaching that was referred to. The real cause of that attack was not that his teaching was contrary to the doctrines of the Church of England, but because he would not suppress or evade any portion of those doctrines as given in the Articles and Prayer Book of our Church. There was no person who had more reverence for persons in high position in the Church, no person more unwilling to do or say anything that would appear like a reflection upon any one of them; but there were some occasions when one could only parry a deadly thrust by wounding his adversary, that it was his duty to defend the College, and, please God, he would defend it. (Great cheering).

This ended the proceedings.

Communications.

[The Editors do not hold themselves responsible for the opinions of their correspondents. Their columns will be open to all communications, provided only that they are of reasonable length and are free from personalities.]

To the Editors of the Canadian Church Press.

GENTLEMEN,—There can be no doubt in the minds of good and earnest men, of any class of doctrinal views, that the Bishop of Huron has seriously committed himself and his Diocese to self-dependence and isolation by his unhappy sectarianism and intolerance, and this in more than one instance.

But, perhaps, nothing has shown more clearly of what spirit he was, and I fear is, than the attitude which he has chosen to assume towards Trinity College; an institution which, centrally situated, was intended and calculated to be for the whole of Canada West, however sub-divided into Dioceses, a training school of godly and useful learning and discipline; whose theological teachings, as I can testify, who am one of its first students, have ever been based and built upon the formularies of our Holy Church, and upon them only; whose respected and beloved Professor of Divinity can be open to no charge, except, perhaps, that of too much impartiality, and too little obvious effort to impress his own stamp upon the opinions of those whom he so ably instructs. But there can be no doubt, that as men in Trinity College do generally think and read, to some extent at least, so, in spite of themselves sometimes, their narrow Geneva prejudices are gradually worn away, and, silently and happily influenced for good, they go forth to their Masters' work the advocates of the truth, and the opponents of every form of error. "*Sine illae lacrymarum.*"

The Bishop of Huron has earned for himself the unenviable distinction of standing forth before our open enemies, and our false friends, as "he that troubleth Israel"—the avowed antagonist of his predecessor, and older brother in the Episcopate. He may succeed in causing present embarrassment, but the ultimate consequences of such acts to himself will doubtless be such as ought to be feared by those who know the responsibility of a Bishop's office, and the weight which should attend a Bishop's official declarations. We can only hope and pray that His Lordship may be permitted to regret this ill-advised proceeding before its evil results are utterly beyond his control.

With regard to the statute referred to as giving the Chancellor power which the Bishops, or any one of them, ought to possess, I am not quite clear. Perhaps yourselves, or some of your correspondents, will explain its provisions. If it restricts to the Chancellor the power or the option of initiating disciplinary or doctrinal presentments against a professor or other officer, might it not have been better to have given that power to any fixed number of the council, or to any one Bishop? Is it necessary to constitute the Chancellor, who may possibly be a careless or indifferent churchman, a sort of grand jury to determine the advisability of further proceedings? But if it is merely a final appeal in matters of academic discipline and morals to the Chancellor's court, this is not what ought to be denied to any member of the University down to the humblest under-graduate.

But in either case the Bishop of Huron had a constitutional remedy in his hands, nor was it in the slightest degree necessary—while it was, upon every Christian and Ecclesiastical ground, unwise and unbrotherly to use untampered language—language calculated to wound the heart and weaken the hands of him who may justly be called the Apostle of the Upper Canadian Church, and the Parent of Upper Canadian Christian Education; and who certainly deserved at the hands of his younger brother—once his son—more deference and more Christian courtesy.

Yours faithfully,

Diocese of Toronto, St. Peter's Day, 1860.

M. A.

To the Editors of the Canadian Church Press.

GENTLEMEN,—Will you admit into your columns a few remarks on your Editorial of the 13th inst., on the subject of the proposed Hymnal?

Surely when the writer of that article expressed it as his opinion that "if the clergy are competent to write sermons, they might, as far as doctrine is concerned, be trusted to choose for themselves and their several congregations, some one out of the many collections of hymns which are now in use in the church," he must have lost sight for the moment of the result of such a liberty, which would undoubtedly be to flood the diocese with hymn-books of every type of theology and every degree of orthodoxy. We may be sure that if he regards it as doubtful "whether authority for such a proceeding be requisite," there are many clergymen who would take the benefit of the doubt, to introduce their own favourite hymn-book, without asking permission of any other ecclesiastical authority than perhaps their own churchwardens. How much would it enhance the difficulties which a clergyman of decided views has even now to contend with, to find, on entering a new parish, a hymnal in common use in the congrega-

tion, and perhaps a great favourite with many of them, of which as a whole he must entirely disapprove, and some of the most popular hymns in which he would not on any account give out!

Surely, too, the writer must for the moment have forgotten the peculiar manner in which the mind is affected by the frequent repetition of a statement of doctrine whether true or false, and the influence which a hymnal must thus have in forming the opinions of a congregation. If there be error in the sermon, upon many in every assembly it produces but little effect—entering at one ear and coming out at the other—as the saying is; while those who listen to the preacher with attention are, to a certain extent, upon their guard, being often cautioned to "Search the Scriptures, whether such things are so," and to compare the statements they hear in the sermon with the authorized formularies of the Church; and the error, if occasionally repeated, is clothed in different language and stated in a different connection. But with a hymnal in common use the case is otherwise. If there be error contained in it, that error is not only pronounced in the ear,—it is presented before the eye, it is pronounced by the lips, it is recommended by the charm of the accompanying melody, it becomes the utterance of the mind and of the heart. Watts' and Wesley's Hymn-Books have served to fix the respective opinions of those divines in the minds of the congregations which use them, in a degree not less than that in which the use of the Liturgy of the Church has served to impress catholic truth upon the congregations of our own communion. Hence, as it appears to me, the great importance of discouraging the introduction of any new hymnal, unless known to embody catholic doctrine, and to have been prepared and put forth by competent authority.

Neither must the practical inconvenience of having a number of different hymn-books in use in the same diocese be overlooked; the expense thus entailed upon persons travelling or removing from one congregation to another; the inconvenience arising from want of familiarity with the different hymn-books thus required; the absence of those pleasant and very dear associations which cling around hymns to the use of which, in public worship, we have long been accustomed.

Much more might be written on the subject. I trust, however, that the reasons I have advanced are sufficient to show that it would be more advisable to recommend the continued use of our own present hymnal, meagre and imperfect as it is, until it can be superseded by a better, put forth by authority, than to countenance the introduction into the diocese of a variety of hymn-books, the use of which would interfere very seriously with the uniformity of public worship.

Fort Erie, 20th June, 1860.

Yours, very truly,

A. A.

To the Editors of "The Canadian Church Press."

GENTLEMEN,—I know not when I was more pained than on reading to one of the Toronto papers a brief account of the discussion in "The Synod of Huron," on Dr. Townley's motion regarding Trinity College. At first I felt that the remarks there attributed to the Bishop of Huron, were carelessly reported, and then that if His Lordship really gave utterance in Public Synod to such sentiments, that it must have been after having been goaded on by some rash attempt to force from him, a full and uncompromising sentiment of approbation to the College and its system. I would fain hope that this last was the case, as I have reason to think that His Lordship really spoke what has been reported. Distressing indeed is it to think that one in the position which he occupies, should have ventured in so authoritative a manner to impugn the character of so noble an Institution. Could he, gentlemen, have given his expressions sufficient thought? Can he know what is taught within the walls of Trinity College? Can he be fully aware that by speaking as he then spoke, he has given the enemies not merely of the College, but of the Church, occasion to blaspheme? Could he have sufficiently considered that he was calling in question the ripe, clear, and sound judgment of his former Diocesan, and now senior brother, on the Canadian Episcopal Bench? Can he be sufficiently aware of the kind of teaching, its character and tendencies, at Trinity College? Truly evangelical and scriptural as it is. I could wish that His Lordship of Huron had been present at the late meeting of our Synod, when the Provost of Trinity College introduced his intended "Canon," on the election of Bishop. Would he, think you, after so able, so lucid, so eloquent an address as the Provost then delivered, one which perfectly riveted the attention of the entire Synod, and called forth unbounded expressions of admiration and thankfulness even from those who are supposed to differ from him on points of Theology, and also from those who could not vote with him: would His Lordship, I say, have been prepared, ready and willing, to make such rash and unbrotherly remarks regarding the College, and the teaching therein, as are ascribed to him in the report of his Synod. I could venture upon expressing an earnest hope that by some means unknown to me, His Lordship of Huron could be induced to reconsider his views, and if not wholly change them, yet so modify them, as in some measure to do away with the false, yet sadly erroneous impression he has been the means of raising, against an establishment having for its primary object the training of men to go forth and preach the unsearchable riches of the Gospel, and also the giving to the ranks of the various worldly professions, men imbued with a sound education, sanctified with a religious and truly scriptural training.

Yours obediently,

A CHURCHMAN.

Diocese of Toronto, June, 1860.

"Lastly, and above all, let me say remember the wide difference between trying to set an example, and living so as to be an example. The difference is indeed unspeakable, both as regards others and as regards ourselves. The acts which we do directly to set an example, and the words which we speak to enforce it, are comparatively few and powerless, when set beside the multitude of daily acts, looks, and words affecting others, which, as I said at first, are always flowing forth on others from our Spiritual and moral being. Our real influence upon them for good, depends on the Spiritual efficacy of this perpetual, unconscious exhibition and imparting of ourselves to them. Nor is the difference less as it regards ourselves. To seek to be indeed a saint and so to bless others, will lead to our salvation, to seek to seem to be a saint, even for the holiest purposes, is pretty sure to end in our damnation."—Bishop of Oxford's Ordination Address.