

By this means these contentions may be ended, which I regret as heartily as yourself.

If my doctrine is approved, I shall be borne out in the judgment of Churchmen; if not, I am so far from wishing to render factions opposition, that I undertake to retract it, or resign my office of teaching.

Whether Mr. Knight and his friends will accept this challenge, remains to be seen.

Just on the eve of the consecration of the Bishop-designate of Lyttelton, New Zealand, it has been discovered that the present Bishop of New Zealand must first give his consent to the foundation of the See, as it is an invasion of his Diocese. The delay is to be regretted, but we are not sorry to have it so publicly acknowledged that even a Colonial Bishop has rights which an Act of Parliament and the Royal Supremacy cannot ride over. —*English Churchman*.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

LETTERS received to Wednesday, August 28, 1850: S. G. Murray, Esq., rem.; H. C. Hogg, Esq., rem. vols. 18 and 14; J. D. Willard, Esq., rem. vol. 14; W. Humphries, Esq., rem. for L. Oxby and self, vol. 14; Rev. J. Paddfield, rem. vols. 13 & 14; F. McAnany, Esq., rem. vol. 14; Mrs. Leveson, rem. for Miss Le Feuvre and self to end of vol. 14; Rev. J. McIntyre, rem. vol. 14; Rev. R. G. Cox, ad. sub. and rem. for Capt. Young and Seth Thora, vol. 14; Mr. Benson, rem. for Mr. J. Chamberlain, vol. 14; Chas. Brent, Esq., rem. for Dr. Melvin, Mrs. Ferns, Thomas Ashew, Esq., and Rev. H. Brent, all vol. 14; J. Emerson, Esq., rem. vol. 14; Rev. A. Mortimer, rem. vol. 14; Rev. L. S. Wood, rem. for Miss Ogden and self, vol. 14; Rev. F. Tremayne, rem. vol. 14; J. Holden, Esq., rem. vols. 13 & 14; Rev. A. Elliot, rem. vol. 14; W. Reynolds, Esq., rem. vols. 13 & 14; George McClean, Esq., rem.; Boyd Sylvester, rem. vols. 13 & 14;

NOTE.—As by far the largest portion of our subscribers desire the acknowledgment of their remittances to be made "in print," in *The Church* paper, it would be injudicious to give up altogether the publication of monies received; it has, however, been determined, with the desire to give every satisfaction to all parties, and to prevent the recurrence of any unpleasantness, that hereafter only the initials, with the residence, shall be given of parties remitting for this paper.

#### TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We are sincerely obliged to our Elora correspondent, for the hints which he has thrown out, many of which our own inclination would dispose us to adopt, and we must say that if the subscribers to newspapers would adopt his mode of making suggestions, editors would not have reason to complain of every subscriber expecting the paper to be written and compiled for his own special use.

## THE CHURCH.

TORONTO, THURSDAY, AUG. 29, 1850.

THE ARCHDEACON OF YORK will (D. V.) visit the following parishes and stations in the Home and Simcoe at the times undermentioned. The same course is recommended as at former visitations,—that the business of the meeting should be preceded by Morning or Evening Prayer:—

Oshawa .....	Monday, September 9, 6, A. M.
Whitby (rear) .....	Tuesday, " 10, 11, A. M.
Whitby Harbour .....	" 10, 6, P. M.
Pickering .....	Wednesday, " 11, 10, A. M.
do. (rear station) .....	" 11, 3, P. M.
Scarboro' .....	Thursday, " 12, 10, A. M.
do. St. Paul's .....	" 12, 2, P. M.
Markham Village .....	" 12, 6, P. M.
do. St. Philip's .....	Friday, " 13, 11, A. M.
Thornhill .....	" 13, 3, P. M.
York Mills .....	Saturday, " 14, 10, A. M.
Yorkville .....	" 14, 3, P. M.
Weston .....	Monday, " 16, 10, A. M.
Mimico .....	" 16, 2, P. M.
Etobicoke St. George's .....	" 16, 5, P. M.
Credit, Springfield .....	Tuesday, " 17, 10, A. M.
Streetsville, .....	" 17, 2, P. M.
Huronville Church .....	" 17, 5, P. M.
Chinguacousy, St. Mary's .....	Wednesday, " 18, 10, A. M.
Monro, St. Mark's .....	" 18, 4, P. M.
do St. John's .....	Thursday, " 19, 10, A. M.
Lloydton .....	" 19, 4, P. M.
Tecumseth .....	Friday, " 20, 10, A. M.
West Gwillimbury .....	" 20, 3, P. M.
St. Alban's .....	Saturday, " 21, 10, A. M.
Machell's corners Trinity Ch. .....	" 31, 3, P. M.
Newmarket, .....	" 21, 6, P. M.

#### CONVENTION OF THE CANADIAN CHURCH.

We place before our readers in another column, some remarks in the *Colonial Church Chronicle* for August, on Mr. de Blaquiére's plan for establishing a Convention of the Canadian Church. The writer (under the signature of "D.") draws a very proper distinction between the objects of that gentleman and the mode by which he proposes to effect them.

We shall first notice the remarks of "D." on the mode which Mr. de Blaquiére adopted. He is right to a certain extent in saying that the chief objection on this head, was the want of courtesy to the Bishop. Upon this subject he "holds of course, that ecclesiastical authority emanates from the Bishop, and that nothing new ought to be completed without his sanction; and that it were well (?) to consult him from the beginning." We are surprised at this writer's views: for we should have thought that in a matter so vitally affecting all the interests of the Church, it was not only well, but an absolute duty to consult the Chief Pastor, who bears upon his mind "the care of all the Churches,"—who must from experience see the bearings of every part of a measure better than any third party, and whose own position and

means of governing his Clergy and people must be either advanced or impaired by the proposed measures. We are therefore actually amazed at the next sentence: "but we do not see that Laymen and Clergymen are absolutely precluded by this principle from proposing measures, or bringing them before any legislature of which they happen to be members, because they may not have previously consulted the Bishop." We feel assured that the considerations we have suggested, and they are by no means all, are sufficient to show any prudent mind that to attempt to propose or bring forward measures without consulting the Bishop is not only undutiful in a very high degree, but is absolutely unwise and impolitic; being calculated to prevent the measures themselves from being effectual for the purposes they were intended to accomplish.

We are surprised again that "D." should have made light of the objections to Mr. de Blaquiére's plan as "republican." He can know little indeed of Canada, if he is ignorant that this is an objection strongly felt by the majority of Churchmen; and we think our English critic might have spared his breath for some less doubtful purpose than weakening Canadian prejudices against republican institutions. They may by possibility be occasionally carried to extremes, but no Englishman ought to speak slightly of them; we depend on them, much more than he seems to be aware, for the integrity of the Empire. And indeed they are not mere prejudices: we see the ill-working of republicanism generally every day side by side with us; we find men desiring to insinuate its principles into all our Institutions: it is therefore not a prejudice, in any improper sense, to be jealous of every thing which comes from that quarter. And with regard to the particular institution of a *Convention*, we know by intercourse with American Churchmen, that many of them are dissatisfied with the very *republicanism* of it.

The writer again speaks of the "high sacerdotal principles taken against the Laity." We would not take up any principles against the Laity; but we would protect both Laity and Clergy from the results of an undue preponderance of Lay influence in the Church. We see the mischievous effects of that influence in England at the present day;—we know how pernicious in many respects is its influence in the United States at this moment; we know that in the Canadian Church, which will grow more and more to be supported on the voluntary principle, this influence must necessarily be strong from the mere power of the purse; and it is therefore not surprising that we should think it necessary to set up something on the part of the Clergy to counterbalance this influence, or be jealous of institutions which we fear may increase it. Any careful student of Church History must surely be aware that in most ages of the Church, the Lay influence has been a fruitful source of weakness, unholiness, and discord.

With regard to the "manner and temper" of the replies to Mr. de Blaquiére in this country, we are afraid our English critic is writing without being sufficiently aware of the circumstances. We respect Mr. de Blaquiére for his sincere regard for religion, for the purity and amiability of his private life, for the vigorous stand he made in the Provincial Parliament against the alienation of the Clergy Reserves: but we have yet to meet with the person who respects his judgment as a public man, or who knowing him, does not perceive in him an apparently incurable infirmity of understanding, which is always leading him to step beyond his province, to interfere in matters which he does not understand, and to form large plans, of which he could never have mastered the practical working, else he would never have proposed them. We do not know a person, again, who came into this Province with so many advantages, and who desiring to acquire influence (as he manifestly does), has acquired so little. We had much reason to believe that the whole of this movement originated or was tinged by personal displeasure against the Bishop in reference to particular transactions. We believe that it was pressed on,—not without communicating the plan to the Bishop (for we think this was done), but in opposition to his views and wishes. The plan had not even been proposed for general discussion by the clergy,—nor was any communication held with them on the subject. It is therefore not surprising that some little indignation should have been expressed at what was felt to be an act of unwarrantable interference on the part of a person who had no claim to interfere singly in so weighty and solemn a matter, involving the interests of the whole Church, and for centuries to come.

We have thought it right to make these remarks in reference to the strictures of this English writer, because we think he has been writing without any adequate knowledge of Canada, or the Canadian Church. Certainly he cannot have much acquaintance with our own Bishop, else he could never have counselled Mr. de Blaquiére to move one step forward in his plan, until he had obtained his consent to taking it up, and the assistance of the practical sagacity and long experience of our Diocesan in regard to every detail of it. And we are sure that if the Bishop absolutely declined to confer with Mr. de Blaquiére on the subject, the judgment he formed will certainly be justified by the event.—

Not that we suppose him altogether averse to the discussion of any plan,—but that we are sure he would have sufficient reasons to justify him in declining to mature a plan in conjunction with Mr. de Blaquiére at the present period.

Having thus endeavoured to justify ourselves and others against the censures of this writer,—we now come to his treatment of Mr. de Blaquiére; and we think it will appear that it is really much more severe than our own.

He says, "Mr. de Blaquiére's Act is drawn too much on the appearance of the legislature founding a Church; it declares that the Church shall be of three orders, Bishops, Clergy, and Laity; it provides for the appointment of new Bishops, for the election of bishops in future, for diocesan conventions consisting of all the clergy and a layman from each vestry,—the Bishop being president, and having only a casting vote; for triennial conventions, the bishops, clergy, and laity debating and voting separately; for trials of clergy, in a manner which we do not thoroughly understand, and seems rather clumsy; for trials of bishops, by the triennial convention: there are provisos against alterations of the Liturgy, well intended, but not, we think, well devised; and that nothing in the Act shall be held to make the Church dominant, which is only reasonable; and the powers given are in various ways restricted in a manner which cannot but necessitate a recurrence to the Canadian parliament, on occasions when perhaps it may be most inconvenient." This, let it be remembered, is almost the entire substance of the Bill. Besides giving this account of the Bill, the writer favours us with his opinion as to "a better course," which he thinks Mr. de B. "ought to have pursued:" and what is this? He should have "confined himself to obtaining for the Bishops of Canada, such collateral sanction as the State can give, for the assembling their Clergy and Laity, in general diocesan convention, and making all laws that might be requisite for the good government of their Church; subject to the authority of their ecclesiastical superior, the Archbishop of Canterbury.

Now if the course which "D." advises had been pursued, it will be seen that there would have been nothing in Mr. de B.'s bill about the three orders of Church Assemblies,—no regulation as to the appointment of new dioceses, the election of bishops, the diocesan conventions, the triennial conventions, the trials of the Clergy and Bishops; in short, almost the whole Bill would have been dispensed with. We think this is pretty severe censure in a quiet way.

But "D." not only makes short work with the details of Mr. de B.'s Bill, he condemns the very principle of it.

After laying down the principle that "Church authority is derived from the Episcopate," he goes on to say: "As it is, he seems to draw his authority from the Colonial Legislature—which we cannot admit any more than the Imperial Parliament, to have inherent power to establish Churches, or to make their laws. We should have thought it was even more palpable in Canada than here; that it behoved Churchmen to stand aloof, maintain their right, and ask for power to deal with their own discipline."

After giving us thus practically his opinion of Mr. de B.'s judgment, by annihilating his details, and condemning his principle, it is rather amusing to find him saying in the end, "we hope he will persevere, and put his plan into such a shape as to obviate the reasonable objections of Churchmen." We do not know what may be the state of Mr. de B.'s nervous system; but we confess if we had been demolished in this unsparing way, we should have had very little stomach for looking at our plan again, even for the laudable purpose of putting it into such a shape as to obviate the reasonable objections of Churchmen; by throwing its principle overboard, and constructing new details. That will be a much more difficult thing to do than "introducing into Canada the constitution of the Church that prevails in the United States, with some modifications suited to the monarchical character of our institutions."

But if Mr. de B. has the nerve, we have no objection. Our object has been long since attained, viz: the prevention of any hasty, ill-considered act of the Colonial Legislature. Before the measure can be brought forward again, our Bishop will be amongst us; and all the consideration and discussion that can be carried on under his eye, will but prepare the subject the better for any decision his calm and sound judgment may pronounce upon it: and when he has pronounced, we are sure that the bulk of his clergy and laity will feel satisfied that he has pronounced aright.

But the more we reflect upon the matter, the more clearly does it appear that the course taken by Mr. de B., and in which he is partially sustained by "D." was altogether wrong. Supposing the former gentleman had succeeded, and had carried his Bill through both branches of the Legislature, and had even obtained the Royal sanction, what would have been the effect of it? Could the Act have worked itself. Could it have worked at all without the concurrence of the Bishop, Clergy and Laity of the diocese? Would the Laity generally have been disposed to accept a Constitution for their Church, framed by a Legislature composed of

persons of all denominations,—and in which the other denominations bear so large a proportion to the whole? As "D." most correctly says, "we cannot admit the Imperial Parliament to have inherent power to establish Churches or to make their laws. We should have thought it even more palpable in Canada than here; that it behoved Churchmen to stand aloof, to maintain their right, and ask for power to deal with their own discipline, and all that relates to the strengthening and improving and extending the institutions of the Church within their own communion."

But even though the Laity, or a considerable portion of them, were disposed to acquiesce in this assumption of power on the part of an alien body, how could the scheme work without the Clergy? If they would not meet and act, what would become of Mr. de Blaquiére's Act? And was it likely that they should desire to carry out a scheme in which no authority in the Church had concurred?—a scheme concocted by a single Layman, and attempted to be imposed upon them by the aid of a power alien from the Church and constantly acting in opposition to her?

But it will be said, as it has been said by the Rev. W. Bettridge, "our Bishop, Archdeacon, and the great body of the Clergy have given their opinions and advice," and it is not likely that they will refuse to act under a system they have already approved.

To this the reply is, 1, that the system, although in many respects the same, is not actually the same; 2, that the system already discussed was not imposed upon the Church from without, but grew up within it, and was in its own hands to modify as circumstances might direct; 3, that the Clergy were not aware when they proposed to assemble in Convocation under that system, that they had not a legal right so to do; 4, that there can be little doubt that the very Clergy, who then concurred in that scheme, would now see some things in it strongly requiring modification.

We feel sure therefore that the clergy would not have attempted to work Mr. de Blaquiére's Act.

But, even supposing both laity and clergy had consented, what could they do without the Bishop? We do not now ask, *ought* they to do anything without the Bishop, but *what* could they do without him? They might profess to make laws; but laws cannot go into effect without the action of the highest executive officer. And if he refused to see to the execution of laws so made, as assuredly he would and ought, else he would be unworthy of his high commission from the Great Head of the Church,—the result would be either nothing absolutely, or nothing but schisms and inextricable confusion.

What then is the result? Why that we may discuss as much as we please; but that if action is to be taken here, it must be by consultation with the Bishop, and with his full concurrence and consent, or it will be a failure. Meanwhile we have very little doubt that our Diocesan is himself in communication with those in England who are promoting some general measure applicable to all the Colonies, and that (as usual) we shall find in due time that he has not been unmindful of the enduring benefit of the Church. And we should very much prefer that what is done should be done in England, not for one Colony but for all, and where of course advice will be had from many Colonial Bishops before any thing is decided. In this way there will be little danger of the one-sided legislation which we should be almost sure to have here; respect would be had to the Constitution of the Church of England, and to that of the Primitive Church; whilst the modern experience of the Church in America and of that in Scotland would not be forgotten, but would be regarded in its due place and measure.

#### DR. RYERSON'S LETTER.

We alluded in our paper of the 1st instant, to some circumstances of a public nature in connexion with Victoria College, and in which the public have a deep interest. Dr. Ryerson has sent us a long and characteristic letter, purporting to be a reply to our remarks, which we published in our last number.

If Dr. Ryerson had given an explanation, or answer, to those parts of our article in which the public feel some interest, it would have been more creditable to himself, and satisfactory to us, than the course which he has chosen to pursue.

Dr. Ryerson charges us with "angry effusions against the Wesleyan Body." We made no attack on the "Wesleyan Body," nor can any portion of our remarks be construed into any thing disrespectful towards them. This is a stereotyped manoeuvre of Dr. Ryerson's. Whenever his venality or tergiversation are exposed, he gets up the cry, the "Wesleyan Body" are attacked, thus assuming that he himself is the "Wesleyan Body." This is truly a rather refined specimen of modest assurance.

The "joining" of ourselves with the *Examiner* and *North American*, is so awkwardly introduced into Dr. Ryerson's letter, that we more than suspect that it was done to afford him an opportunity to introduce a French quotation, which, for the first time, we find him thrusting into his words.