

To the Editor of The Church.

GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, N. Y. July 2nd, 1851.

MY DEAR SIR,—At the close of another Seminary year, the students of the General Theological Seminary deem it incumbent upon them to make some acknowledgement of your kindness in furnishing your paper for their Reading Room gratuitously.

I am, my dear Sir, respectfully, your obedient servt., WILLIAM E. ARMITAGE, Librarian of the Reading Room.

To the Editor of The Church.

DEAR SIR,—There were several typographical inaccuracies in my letter to the Hon. Mr. de Blaquiere, as published in "The Church" of the 3rd instant, but of which I will only ask the correction of one, viz: for the "13th and 14th Vic. chap. 29," read "13th and 14th Vic. chap. 49."

May I also beg that for "his late Majesty George the Fourth was pleased to endow the University of King's College," may be read "the Crown was pleased to endow the University of King's College, and to grant a charter to the same," &c.; the endowment having been the gift of George the Third, and the charter having been granted by George the Fourth.

I sent this correction after I had despatched my last letter, but it seems it did not reach you in time.

Faithfully yours,

July 4th, 1851. ARTHUR PALMER.

Dr The Church.

TO THE HONORABLE P. B. DE BLAQUIERE.

HONORABLE SIR,—According to promise, I proceed to state in this letter the reasons which oblige me to come to the conclusion that there is no satisfactory recognition of the principle, that religion is the basis of all sound education in the scheme of affiliation which you are desirous of bringing on the members of the Church of England in this Diocese, and which, on account of that fatal defect, they will not, I am persuaded as a body, ever be induced to adopt.

In order to guard against misconception, it may be well that I should state at the outset, what I understand this affiliation to mean.

"Affiliation," I conceive, means, that while the University of Toronto itself neither teaches religion, nor as a University, worships God, while it never once offers up a supplication for blessings nor ascription of praise,—all which, by the 28th and 29th Sections of 12 Vic. c. 82, expressly prohibited,—but devotes itself exclusively to instruction in secular learning; the various religious bodies in the Province shall have permission to establish, entirely from their own means, "each in its own way and according to its own views of religious truth," colleges in which religious instruction shall be given, that such colleges shall be recognized by the University of Toronto for that purpose, and shall moreover be empowered to grant Degrees in Divinity, which the University itself is prohibited from conferring.

Now, Sir, I learn from the public papers that you propose to ask the Legislative Council, or the Hon. Mr. de Blaquiere, to address His Excellency the Governor General with the view of declaring it to be the opinion of that House that the interests of the members of the Church of England would be best served by their becoming a party to the said scheme.

The members of the Church of England must surely be grateful to you for asking the Legislative Council to give its opinion as to what would be most conducive to their interests. Doubtless Roman Catholics and others, who do not belong to the Church of England, are more competent judges of what would be conducive to the educational interests of her members than they are themselves. And when a body so composed gives its opinion that those interests would be best served by affiliation with a University which confines its teaching to secular learning—to the exclusion of religion—that opinion will be so conclusive that it will be quite unnecessary to refer the matter, as you propose to do, to a Convocation of the Clergy and Laity; for, however strongly they may now feel upon the subject, the weight of authority which such a legislative decision will carry with it must be so overwhelming as to prevent the Convocation from being so presumptuous as to decide otherwise.

Before I proceed, let me further thank you for that passage in your intended motion, in which you propose that the Legislative Council shall assure His Excellency that "it anxiously wishes to see every benefit and privilege enjoyed by other denominations fully extended to the members of the United Churches of England and Ireland in this Province." Nothing can possibly exceed the liberality of this declaration; it is one which will doubtless impress every member of the National Church with the liveliest feelings of gratitude.

Sir, I have a higher opinion of the Legislative Council than you seem to entertain, inasmuch as I cannot think that that House will adopt an address which sanctions an exercise of arbitrary power, and pronounces an opinion upon a subject with which, in its legislative capacity, it must feel itself restrained from dealing, if not by incompetence, at all events by considerations of delicacy. As, however, the whole matter turns upon the question of affiliation, permit me to state some of the reasons which, in my judgment, render it impossible for the Church of England to take up the position which you wish her to assume, and to connect herself by an affiliated college, with the University of Toronto.

1. Any system of instruction in which religion is not an essential part, is an irreligious system. If the essence of the system be not an acknowledgement of God it is a Godless system;—it may tolerate religion—it may even, from motives of policy, require under special circumstances, certificates of some kind of religious observances or qualifications; but if these are not of the essence of the system, if they are mere expedients to secure support—expedients instantly put aside when adherence to them might have the effect of damaging the support they were adopted to conciliate—then, I say, that such a system is in the plainest sense Godless. And pray do not say of me as you did of the Bishop of the Diocese, that I am standing you and your University in thus expressing myself, for I mean to prove what I say.

That religion then is not an essential part of the system of the University of Toronto, is plain from the fact that it is expressly enacted that "no religious test or qualification is to be required of, or appointed for," any individual in the University. All attempt to establish such a qualification is by law prohibited, see 12, Vic. c. 82, sec. 29; and therefore not only students and scholars, and persons admitted to degrees, but also all

persons appointed Professors, Lecturers, Masters or Tutors, &c., are exempt from the necessity of having any religious qualification whatever. They need not even believe in the being of a God, much less in the doctrines of revealed religion. To use the words of the Trustees of the University of Queen's College Kingston, "as no religious test is required of the Professors, not even a belief in the existence of God, there is nothing in the Act to prevent Infidels, Atheists or persons holding the most dangerous and pernicious principles, from being intrusted with the instruction of youth at that time of life when evil impressions are most likely to be made upon their minds." This being the case, of what value is the By-law of your Senate, which makes the evidences of natural and revealed religion part of Moral Philosophy? Imagine Sir, a Hume or a Gibbon lecturing on the evidences of Christianity, and stabbing religion with an inuendo. And as the law of your University stands, let men of their talents, with the same principles, offer themselves for Professorships, and you would be acting illegally if you should reject them on account of their want of religious qualification, into which you are not permitted to enquire. Sir, I would rather not have the evidences of Religion read than that they should have such men as their Lecturers.

Again, in support of the charge of Godlessness, I adduce the clause of the Act above referred to, by which religious observances according to any form are interdicted within the University;—they are "not to be imposed upon the members or officers of the University or any of them." Really Sir, with the Act open before me I am amazed at the hardihood of that passage in the address which you tried to get the Senate to adopt, and in which you stated, "the Senate equally denies that any prohibition exists as to any form of prayer, or to any act of public worship; allowing to all, perfect freedom therein, and the utmost facility for conducting the same." If you meant by this, that they might have those privileges elsewhere, although not in the University, the subterfuge was, I must say, a very miserable one; for again, to quote the Trustees of Queen's College, "Not only is the teaching of Theology prohibited in the University of Toronto, but all forms of Divine worship, all public prayer, anything that can remind either Professors or Students of God and the duties we owe to him, of our responsibilities and obligations, is rigidly and peremptorily excluded."

In reply to what I have stated above, I may be referred to the Act 13h and 14th Vic. chap. 49, an Act which was passed for the purpose of endeavouring to remove certain doubts respecting the intention of the Act of the preceding Session; and this it proceeds to do by attempting to give something of a colourable religious character to the University of Toronto, in a manner which to a superficial reader may seem plausible enough, but which, when closely examined, will be seen to leave that University as essentially irreligious or Godless as it was before. It is quite true that the last-mentioned Act authorises the establishment of regulations by the Visitors or Senate "for the Undergraduates and Students attending upon public worship in their respective Churches, and receiving religious instruction from their respective Ministers, and that every facility shall be afforded by the Authorities of the University for such attendance on religious worship." All this is quite true; but remember that "no religious test or qualification" is to be required of any Student in the University. Suppose therefore a youth on being asked at his entrance to what denomination he belonged, should return the answer not unfrequently given in this country, "I do not belong to any," what can your regulations do then? you have no worship of God,—no common prayer,—no religious teaching in your University, and in spite of your regulations you train the poor youth in infidelity.

But again I may be told, that no one shall be admitted as a Student of the University, or to a Degree therein, "without possessing such religious requisites as may be prescribed by the constituted Authorities of the affiliated College to which he belongs." Sir, this is only true of "any Candidate for Matriculation or for any Degree who shall, at the time of his application, be a Student in any of the different Colleges which shall be so far affiliated to the said University as to be entitled to appoint a member to the Senate thereof." Suppose that a young man at matriculation is not a member of any affiliated College, and that he never becomes one, where is his certificate of religious requisites? There is none, nor can he be required to produce any. He may be an avowed infidel go through the University, and even become a Graduate as such,—and that, not in spite of the system, as in the Mother Country, but with its full concurrence and acquiescence. For it is specially to be borne in mind that the Act last referred to, the object of which is to remove all doubts touching the Christian character of the University of Toronto,—contains the following exceptive clause, "Provided always that nothing herein contained shall extend or be construed to extend to empower the said University, by statute or otherwise, to compel any person to become a Student or Member of such affiliated College as a condition precedent to his being matriculated or admitted to any Degree in said University, or otherwise howsoever."

I have now shown you, Sir, that religion is no part whatever of the essence of the system of the University of Toronto; that on the contrary, within the University, religion is proscribed and interdicted in every possible way; that the teaching of theology is excluded; that the requiring or appointing a religious qualification even for the Professors is prohibited; and that the worship of Almighty God is forbidden;—in addition to all which the Ministers of Religion are declared ineligible to be appointed by Government to the Senate or to be elected by Convocation to the office which you now fill.

I have further shown you from your own act, that (even with your affiliated Colleges, and notwithstanding all the amiable professions about religion so ingeniously introduced into your declarative law for removing certain doubts as to the Christian character of your institution, and so to give it a colourable religious character,) the University of Toronto is at this moment, in the essence of its system, thoroughly and completely Godless; that a young man may enter it as an infidel, that he may continue in it as such, and as such he may take his degree without having ever heard a prayer offered up, and without one saving truth of Christianity being pressed upon his conscience.

any affiliated Colleges. Suppose then that a youth of the Church of England whom circumstances had made his own master was desirous of getting rid of what youth too often feels to be a burthen,—I mean daily religious worship and religious instruction,—he has only at his matriculation to decline to state the denomination to which he belongs, or whether he belongs to any, or if pressed further, he has but to say,—as the University of Toronto tempts him to say,—that he belongs to none, and thenceforth he hears from that University, directly or indirectly, no more of God, His worship, or His truth, than if no God existed. And such is the Institution which it is "slander" to call Godless! Such is the system with which the Church of England is required to affiliate!

Purposing to submit in my next letter some further reasons against your scheme of affiliation,

I have the honour to be, Honourable Sir, Your obedient humble servant,

ARTHUR PALMER, Rector of Guelph and Rural Dean.

To the Editor of The Church.

CHURCH UNION.

Co. Londonderry, Ireland, June 1st, 1851.

SIR,—Among the many interesting articles, documentary or original, with which your journal abounds, I have read few which convey to the parent country more painful information than the "Address from the Church Union of the Diocese of Toronto, to the Laity of the Church in Canada," published in your number of April 3d, of this year.

I have no occasion to enter into the general subject treated of in this remarkable paper, so just in its reasoning and unrefutable as to the facts it adduces. My business lies with a portion of it, in which the writers appear to have somewhat departed from their accustomed deference to the truth of history, and to a fair delineation of the events of our own days. The paragraph to which I refer contains the following assertion: "At this moment (1851) Canada presents the strange anomaly of men who, in common with ourselves protest against the errors of Romanism, yet leagued with the latter in open hostility to the only sure rampart against Romish aggression; and their united efforts are now directed to plunder the Established Church of the slender provision remaining for its temporal wants, in the hope of thereby destroying its spiritual efficiency."—So far I presume the writers to be fully correct in their very distressing statement. What follows is more questionable: "In Ireland the various dissenting bodies understood their true position and interests, and openly supported the Church in her struggle, feeling that if she fell before the assaults of Romanism, they must be overwhelmed in her ruins." Cordially do I wish that it were in my power to confirm the assumption contained in the above sentence. But nothing is more remote from fact. A few of the more eminent and educated of the Presbyterian ministers did indeed raise their voice in condemnation—"the holy was mute, acquiescent, or openly countenanced the injustice. In the former class stood, and still stands forth conspicuous and admired, the deservedly celebrated Dr. Cooke. Above the narrow bigotry of his fellows in the lofty spirit of the accomplished man; no less their superior in talents; refined by a constant association with the higher classes of society to which his attainments have ever given him a welcome access.—Dr. Cooke has been through life the consistent advocate of his own early unblighted motto, "PROTESTANT PEACE."—Others of his co-ministers may—some I am sure do, entertain similar sentiments, but these men do not utter or publish their opinions. He alone, by whom, as history will truly affirm, Ireland was preserved to the British Empire, when O'Connell tempted, and nearly successfully tempted the sectarian divisions and the disunion of classes in Ulster—defied the wily democrat and saved religion and loyalty; envy, misrepresentation, and opposition are now his reward.

The "anomaly of men, who, in common with ourselves, protest against the errors of Romanism, yet are leagued in open hostility to the only sure rampart of defence against Romish aggression," is probably more notorious now in Ireland than has ever been our lot to witness. It is wholly impossible to exaggerate the amount of bigotry and animosity with which the major portion of the Presbyterian Ministers assail the doctrines and ritual of the Church of England. No less zealous are the laity of the inferior ranks in labouring by every means to alienate the people from the Established Church—bribes, schools, gifts, threats of exclusive dealing, &c., &c., have become the universal practice. One of the most distinguished ministers, the Rev. Dr. Edgar of Belfast, pushed disingenuousness to the miserable extreme of absolutely ignoring the very existence of the Clergy of the Established Church in the Province of Connaught. This candid tourist visited during the year 1848, the far West of Ireland; the object of his excursion was to ascertain the progress of famine, and also of the means resorted to for its relief, &c., &c. On these topics he was sufficiently explicit—excepting that he omitted to make mention of the unexampled labours, munificence, and self denial of the Clergy of the Church of England, many of whom—immensely his superiors in education and manners, honoured this rustic brother by the kindest hospitality. His published narrative is the evidence on which these assertions rest; but the principal cause of that melancholy hostility to the Church of England springs from a source beyond our expectations to alter. The Presbyterian Ministers of Ireland, alike in name only to their fellow worshippers in Scotland—are no longer what they were. In my own memory the ministers of that persuasion frequented the tables of the wealthy, the accomplished, and the great, as respected guests.—That association so much to be desired has passed away;—the vast majority of the Presbyterian Ministers of Ireland are now drawn from a class inferior to the alumni of Maynooth. The very small farmers, the cottiers, and retail dealers, furnish exclusively the candidates for Presbyterian orders—throwing out the sons of the merchant and gentleman of moderate fortune, who indeed it must be admitted, have for the most part embraced the Episcopalian profession of Faith. From the very low caste to which they now belong arises naturally the political and social doctrines which they inculcate. Envious of their Scots fellow-ministers—reviling where they cannot rival—comrades and confederates of the needy agriculturalist or dealer, humbled and mortified, trampled on whenever it is thought expedient so to do by the refractory of their own congregations, irritated by insult and by the sense of individual powerlessness for good. The Presbyterian Ministers of Ireland are essentially a discontented body, and will undoubtedly remain so until they enjoy much more than at present of pastoral independence—and the still higher security of a fixed ritual. Some of these uneducated bigots decline entering our churches on the

positively says "that the three went away." But not so. I think the sacred writer expressly states otherwise, &c. that the LORD, who has all through, as we have seen, been spoken of as one the "three," remained "yet" with Abraham. How is it possible then to misunderstand that in ver. 22 by the term "the men" is there meant that it was the other two only who then proceeded on their way?

But this surely becomes an absolute certainty when we find in the following chapter, where the narrative is continued, that "there came two angels to Sodom 4th. Bp. Patrick, also objects to one of these angels being considered as Jehovah, because he says, then another of them must be also: for he is called also by the name of Jehovah, Gen. xix. 24." But I think that the Right Rev. Prelate is mistaken; for that the periphrasis addressed in that verse is the very same who

was naturally left with Abraham. Note first that in the last verse of the eighteenth chapter it said "And the LORD went his way, as soon as he had left communing with Abraham; and Abraham returned unto his place." Now this phraseology is exactly such as would be proper, if it were one of the angels still in His human form, with whom the Patriarch had been conversing; they had remained by the way-side in earnest converse when the two inferior messengers went on their way, and as soon as the Patriarch's supplication ended, "the LORD went his way," which according to the tenor of the narrative, was as naturally after His companions, as Abraham's way was naturally to "return." Had this on the contrary been a revelation of Jehovah to the Patriarch connected with the three angels, the phrase here used at its close, would have been the least proper one imaginable; nor is there, to the best of my recollection, anything approaching to such a conventional mode of speech used with respect to the Lord Jehovah in any other place. I judge, therefore, that it is here used because on this occasion He condescended to appear and act as man, and after the manner of men went on his way" after His two companions.

Note, further, in proof of this view of the subject that from the 16th verse of the following chapter the style of the conversation between the angels and Lot altogether changes. Previous to that the two angels are always spoken of, and speak in the plural number, and of themselves as being "sent" by the LORD; but in that verse there is an intimation that Jehovah was personally present, for it is said "the LORD (Heb. Jehovah) being merciful unto him." Now I am of course aware, that this may be said to be only a common expression of the Divine goodness, manifested in this instance through the ministration of the two angels, and to this I might agree, did not the mode of addressing the angels immediately change. Lot no longer addresses two but one; so also the style of the historian is altered, he begins again to speak of one as the chief, who also, as before, speaks with divine authority. Thus in verse 17 it is stated, "he (no longer they) said, escape for thy life;" and in the 23 verse, "And he said unto him, see I" (not we) have accepted joined the two angels, about the time that they were leading Lot and his family from the devoted city.—And thus I meet the difficulty of Bishop Patrick, since it appears plain, to me, that the same three that appeared to Abraham were now, as they stated to him they were, in Sodom, and that therefore it was Jehovah, as the Almighty Chief of the three, though still in human form, whom Lot addressed, and who is thus spoken of in the 24 verse, "Then the LORD (Heb. Jehovah) rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the LORD (Heb. Jehovah) out of heaven."

In conclusion I will only add that one of these three personages was the son of God, or language is used, which I must think, would be blasphemous from which Bishop Patrick would give from Theodorici Halespin, is surely most unsatisfactory. God gives his honour to another, nor do I think that there is a single instance in Scripture, where by a plain and fair interpretation, it can be even reasonably expected that any creature, not even the angels, save the Lord Jehovah—the Divine Angel of the Covenant, is permitted to use such Divinely authoritative language.

If I have succeeded in so far confirming the popular interpretation of this celebrated chapter, as to strengthen the confidence of the humblest member of Christ in the plain meaning of the Book of God, and therefore deepened his conviction of its infinite value as the rule of practical godliness, I shall be thankful.

Yours faithfully, A. T.

To the Editor of The Church. REV. AND DEAR SIR,—In the Annual Report of the Church Society presented to the meeting held in London on 18th June, and which has been since published in the Church newspaper, there is the following passage: "It is much to be regretted that more favourable reports have not been presented from the several Parochial Committees in the Home and Simcoe District."

However much this expression of regret may be due with reference to other Parochial committees, I do not conceive that the one in which I have hitherto taken part, is at all entitled to it. The amount, I believe, collected on behalf of The Church Society fell very little short this year, of that of the year previous; and when it is considered that the members of the Church in this township, have been called upon to subscribe in half of their Minister's salary, the very slight diminution in the subscriptions to the Society should not be assumed as "unfavourable." Besides the Annual contributions, we have incurred within the last sixteen months the following outlays:—

Land for endowment	£125 0 0
Fencing church yard	12 10 0
Parsonage House	150 0 0
Church at Bradford	150 0 0
	£437 10 0

So that taking into consideration the poverty of some of our members and the other adverse circumstances, I may, with all humility, submit, that we do not occupy the position in the report, we might have expected. I remain, Rev. and dear Sir, Most faithfully yours, THE PARSONAGE, WEST GWILLIMBURY, June 28, 1851. ARTHUR HILL.

The Secretary of the Church Society informs us, that a report was sent in with the remittance made by the Simcoe and West Gwillimbury Parochial Association, with which our Rev. correspondent is connected. (Ed. Ch.)