# THE CHURCH.

TORONTO, FRIDAY, JANUARY 21, 1848.

CONTENTS OF THE OUTSIDE.


*First Page.*
Poetry.—Samuel's Prayer.
Church and State.
The Marriage in Cana of Galilee.
The Unchristian Legislature.
Church Building.
Church Services for the Epiphany.
The late "Pilgrim Fathers'" Celebration.
Perseverance.
*Fourth Page.*
The Apostolic Visit.
The Fruits of Equivocation.
The Orphan Boy.


### TO THE CLERGY AND LAITY OF THE DIOCESE OF TORONTO.

*Beloved Brethren in the Lord:*

The period having arrived when it is usual to announce one of the four Annual Collections provided for by the Constitution of The Church Society, I have fixed upon SEPTUAGESIMA SUNDAY,—being Sunday the 20th February next, for a general Collection in all the Churches, Chapels, and Stations, of this Diocese, in aid of the Fund for the support of Missions.

To the few who seem disposed to think that our appeals are too frequent, I would quote the result of my own experience, and that of all my Brethren who have entered heartily into this duty, namely—"That the practice of giving creates the inclination and habit of giving": and this will ever be the consequence where the love of Christ and the desire of his promises are the motives of our labours and of our gifts.

The influence of the Gospel in our more remote settlements, through the agency of Travelling Missionaries, is one of the leading objects of the Church Society; and every member of our holy Communion must be deeply impressed with the importance and benefit of aiding in promoting the ministrations of the Church to the more distant Townships of the Diocese, that it cannot be necessary to urge at any length so high and sacred a duty.

Ten Clergymen are at present actively employed in the different Districts of the Diocese, and receive an allowance from this Fund, besides an Interpreter, and Catechist,—creating an annual charge upon it of £464. 2s. 11d.; whilst it is in contemplation, as soon as the Clergymen can be furnished after the next general Ordination, to increase the number of Travelling Missionaries, and thus to augment the demand upon this Fund.

To meet the sum for which the Society is actually pledged for the present year, it appears from a statement furnished by the Secretary and Treasurer, that £179. 13s. 5d. will be required,—and this without taking into account the increase of Missionaries as proposed; and which it is most desirable to supply.

On these grounds I appeal on behalf of the Mission Fund to the never-failing liberality of the members of the Church in this Diocese; and I trust that her children in the elder parishes especially, who have so long enjoyed her Ministrations at little or no cost, will exercise a proportionate liberality in helping to furnish the consolations of religion to those amongst whom we have no other means of diffusing them.

I remain,
Beloved Brethren,
Your's very affectionately,
JOHN TORONTO.

Toronto, 12th January, 1848.

### DR. HAMDEN'S APPOINTMENT.

It is possible that, to some of our readers, the remarks which we lately made on the proposed elevation of Dr. Hamden (we adopt the *family* orthography of the name) to the Episcopate, may appear to be stronger than the circumstances of the case require. The best vindication of the tone which we felt it to be our duty to use will be found in the published, and therefore deliberately expressed, sentiments of the obnoxious divine. Now, in his *Bampton Lectures*, Dr. Hamden expresses himself as follows, in reference to some of the most vital points of revealed religion:—

THE TRINITY.—"The *dialectical* spirit . . . . . laboured to establish the Divine *Unity* amidst the Trinitary distinctions." . . . .—p. 128. "*Dialectical Science* . . . established that peculiar phraseology which we now use in speaking of the sacred Trinity as *three Person* and *one God*."—p. 130. "The *whole* discussion was *fundamentally dialectical*."—*B. L.* p. 104.

"Thus, too, they (the orthodox) *delighted* to speak of the whole Trinity as consubstantial."—p. 127.

"One fact is clear through all this labyrinth of variation which theological creeds have exhibited,—that there is some extraordinary communication concerning the Divine Being, in those scriptural notices of God, which have called forth the curiosity of thinking men in all ages. *To me it matters little what opinion has been prior*, has been advocated by the shrewdest wit or deepest learning, has been most popular,, most extensive in its reception. All differences of this kind belong to the history of the human mind as much as to theology."

THE ATONEMENT.—"It is of little purpose to urge the *natural placability* of the Divine Being. . . . . . *God*, no doubt, is *abundantly placable*. . . . But the fact is, that *we* cannot be at peace without some consciousness of atonement made. . . . Turn over the records of human crime. . . . . All concur in showing that, while God is gracious and merciful, . . . . *the human heart is inexorable against itself*. . . . *It* cannot forgive *itself*. . . . . This material and invincible difficulty of the case the Scripture Revelation was met by a parallel fact. It has said . . . . that, looking to ourselves we cannot expect happiness; and, at the same time, has fixed our attention on a *Holy* One who *did no sin*; whose *perfect righteousness* it has *connected with* our unrighteousness, and whose *strength* it has brought to the evil of our weakness. Thus Christ is emphatically *said* to be our atonement, *not that we may attribute to God any change of purpose towards man by what Christ has done*, but that *we may know* (*sic*) that we have passed from the death of sin to the life of righteousness by *Him*, and that our *own hearts* (*sic*) may not condemn us."—*B. L.* p. 251.

The bane of this *philosophy of expiation* was not that it exalted human agency too highly, but that in reality it depressed the power of *man* too low. It was no invigoration of the mind, no cheering of the heart to masculine exertion, in working out the great work of salvation, by exaggerated, yet noble views, of what *man* could accomplish.

ORIGINAL SIN.—"It is the same *philosophy* which has occasioned the distinction of Sin into Original and Actual; the term Actual expressing the *personal* development of that sin which is *conceived* antecedently to exist in the *common nature* of all men, and in each individual, consequently, as participating that common nature."—p. 233.

"How could it apply, it would be argued, to the case of the infant soul . . ? The *theorist*, not content with referring to the Redeemer's love, as the simple earnest of the blessedness of the little innocent, sought how to connect this fact with the universal need of redemption. It was to be brought, therefore, under the theory of original sin. This occasioned the introduction of the term *propagation* into the account of the origin of evil. If the corruption of nature descended by 'propagation,' then it would exist even in the guileless infant."—p. 221.

JUSTIFICATION.—Its original meaning (that of the word *merit*) is to be sought in its connexion with the ancient *theories* of justice. It is hence that it has been introduced into the account of justification. . . . The great Christian society was viewed by the *speculator* in its relation to God as its Governor and Judge. . . . It began to be considered what man has done, or could do, in the way of claim on the justice of God. Then the doctrine of Original Sin came into consideration on the one hand—that of the Incarnation and Righteousness of Christ on the other; and the estimate of merit was to be drawn from a comparison of what man now is, at once a fallen and a saved creature, with what he once was, when perfect from the hands of his Maker. From this comparison would result the conclusion, that man could have no *merit* whatever in the eye of God."—p. 245.

"Agreeably to this (Judaic 'notion' of God 'as a governor, dispensing rewards and punishments to men, as his subjects, according to the works performed in his service') Christ is 'the Lord our Righteousness,' or 'the Lord our Justice;' and the Apostle speaks of God having shown His *justice* in the act of *justifying* sinners through Christ."—p. 243.

NEW BIRTH.—"The doctrine of Transmutation was a vital principle in Aristotle's Philosophy. According to this doctrine, any object in nature might be transmuted into another. . . . I allude to it now only for the sake of illustrating the notion by which our Christian state, under the influence of Grace is described."—p. 191.

THE SACRAMENTS.—"*The general belief in Magic, in the early ages of the Church, may sufficiently account for the ready reception of such a theory of sacramental influence.* The maxim of Augustine, 'Accedit verbum ad elementum, et fit sacramentum,' appears to be in fact an adaptation of the popular belief respecting the power of incantations and charms to the subject of religion."—p. 315.

"We should observe the confusion of ideas prevalent in the early Church on the subject of Baptism. *The Church* was considered 'as the body of Christ.' The Church was also considered as 'the Mother of the faithful.' Hence, being baptized, or being made a 'member of the body of Christ,' or being 'incorporated' into the Church, became equivalent expressions."—p. 324.

Who, that carefully peruses these extracts, will hesitate to exonerate us, for using the most extreme terms, which language can supply, in denouncing the proposed elevation of their author to the sacred office of Bishop. The bare idea is enough to make the blood run cold. With a rationalistic flippancy, Dr. Hamden characterises the Catholic doctrines of the Trinity, the Atonement, Original Sin, Justification, and the Sacraments, as amounting neither more nor less than to *Theories, Speculations, Philosophies*, and *Scientific views!*

Is the man who could calmly enunciate such dismal heresies, and who, up to this moment, has put forth no retraction of them—is such a man qualified to perform Episcopal functions in the Reformed Anglican Church? Why Rome herself, darkened and error-stricken as she is, would loathingly exclude him from her pale. The Socinian alone could extend the right hand of fellowship to one possessing so germain a spirit.

Most thankful are we to learn that our Church is awake to the perilous position in which she is placed by reckless, and theologically unprincipled Statesmen. Every day witnesses the presentation of remonstrances against the threatened outrage. In the name of God, let the faithful persevere,—let protest be added to protest, so that, if the desecration be carried into effect, the Church may be free from the incalculable guilt which of necessity will attach to the act.

The petitions, we perceive, are not confined to the Legislative Assemblies of the Empire. Many of the Dioceses are memorializing their respective Bishops, and imploring them to take the matter into their solemn and earnest consideration. Already the call has been responded to, to a considerable extent.—"*Thirteen of the English Prelates have united in a formal protest against Dr. Hamden's nomination. Another Bishop has remonstrated singly; and the Archbishop of Canterbury has sent in a distinct appeal against the measure.*" This is as it should be. To her spiritual Fathers must the Church look at a crisis like the present. Lord John Russell may nominate, but he cannot consecrate. He may threaten to inflict the pains and penalties of a *præmunire*, but the same Jehovah who upheld Cranmer at the stake, and who nerved Ken and his noble brethren passively to defy the despotic James, will assuredly be with them in their refusal to sanction a grosser act of spiritual tyranny than ever was conceived by the demented Stuart.—No blacker page could be imagined in our Ecclesiastical Annals, than the one which should chronicle the names of those who *laid hands* upon the heretical Hamden.

### THE LATE REV. G. R. MOUNTAIN.

"We learn from the *Ecclesiastical Gazette*, for Nov., that an elegant and richly colored window has been erected in the Parish Church of Havant, Hants, to the memory of the late Rev. George Robert Mountain, Rector of that parish. The window consists of two compartments, in one of which is the figure of St. Peter, with the words over it from 1 Peter v. 2: in the other that of St. Paul, with the text, Phillippians i. 21. Underneath the figures an inscription in Latin, of which the following is a translation:—

"'To the glory of God, and in memory of His most faithful minister G. R. Mountain, who, for 20 years, was the zealous Pastor of this Church, this window was placed by his friends, Sir R. Grant, and G. A. Shawe. A. D., 1847.

"'Double honour is due to those who perform their duties so faithfully.—1 Tim. v. 17.'

"The latter part of the inscription refers to the fact that a font had been previously placed in the Church as a memorial to the same clergyman.

"A window has also been put up by the present Rector, in memory of his father-in-law, the late Bishop Alexander, of Jerusalem."

The late Rev. G. R. Mountain, who is the subject of the foregoing notice, was third son of the first Lord Bishop of Quebec, and younger brother of the Lord Bishop of Montreal. He was ordained Deacon by his father in 1819, and Priest by the late Lord Bishop of Winchester, by whom, after having been Curate for some time to his own eldest brother, the Rev. J. H. B. Mountain, D.D., at Hemel Hemstead, Herts, he was collated to the Rectory of Havant.

Few men have been the instruments of producing a more marked and happy improvement in the spiritual well-being or in the order and good condition, generally, of a Parish: few have been more beloved by all classes: none was ever farther from seeking his own glory in all the benificence which he exercised or the good which he was permitted to effect. It is not intended, at this date, to enter into any details of his life and labours, which were brought to their close, in the 55th year of his age, in June, 1846; and these few remarks have only been drawn forth by the mention in the public prints of a second memorial to his honour, put up in his late Parish Church and recently completed. One testimony, however, may be noticed, among those which were rendered in his life-time, as having been of rather a *singalar kind*. His Church Wardens, upon one occasion, literally made it an *article of presentment* to the present Bishop of Winchester, that if his Lordship did not interfere to check him, Mr. Mountain woulk kill himself by his labours in his Parish.

### COLONEL PRINCE.

We are extremely sorry, for his own sake, that the Member for Essex should have felt and evinced so much concern about a matter which admits of a ready explanation. The asterisk, shewing that he was "unopposed," was omitted accidentally. Lest this should be the case with other returns, and the omission imputed to some paltry motive which only a high degree of irritation could lead any one to suspect, we intend to leave out this work of reference in our complete list next week. As to the expression "doubtful," it is the term, we believe, universally employed by the Press, both here and in England, to state when it is uncertain whether a Member of Parliament will support or oppose the Administration for the time being. We are not aware that it conveys reproach; and for ourselves we are free to confess—without pronouncing any opinion specially upon Colonel Prince's public character—that we do not think the worse of a man because he is not pledged to vote with a certain party.

### CHILDREN OF THE PILGRIM FATHERS.

At a dinner given in New York, on the 22d of December last, by the members of the New England Society resident in that city, in celebration of the anniversary of the Landing of the *Pilgrim Fathers*, the Roman Catholic Bishop, Dr. Hughes, sat at the right hand of the chair, and the health of Pope Pius IX. was drank with the greatest possible enthusiasm!!! This furnishes another proof, to the many already existing, that extremes meet.

### ANOTHER CONCESSION TO POPERY.

A fresh insult has been offered to the established faith of the realm—a new offering has been laid upon the shrine of that detestable liberalism, "the demon in raiment of light" to which the Christian character of the English nation is being sacrificed piecemeal. With mingled feelings of sorrow and indignation we read the following paragraph:—

"A circular has been issued from Downing Street, instructing the authorities in the Colonies to address the Roman Catholic Prelates in such Colonies by the title to which their rank in their own Church would appear to give them claim, officially styling them 'Your Grace,' or 'Your Lordship,' as the case may be."

Truly we are fallen upon dark days—each succeeding mail brings still gloomier testimony of the nation's downward progress to destruction.

A few weeks since, we were amazed and sorrow-stricken to find that even the vague and unsatisfactory test of a profession of Christianity, to which the House of Commons still clung, was about to be thrown over-board, and that the Jew—who by merely stating his faith in the most precise terms, would become amenable to the laws against blasphemy would soon be entitled to legislate for a Christian people.

This was succeeded by the account of the attempt (we still fervently trust that it may only prove an attempt) of Her Majesty's Ministers to thrust into the high places of the Church, a man branded with heresy by the solemn decree of his University—a heresy in which he still glories.

Now, forsooth, the ill-omened tidings reaches us—that the dignitaries of the Romish heresy are to be tricked out with the titles which belong exclusively to the Bishops of the Church throughout the British Dominions.

We are bound to obey the Government under which we are placed in all things lawful; but with a command such as that in the above paragraph, a true-hearted Churchman cannot comply, any more than the conscientious Jews could bow down to the golden image of Nebuchadnezzar on the plains of Dura.

The Jews were commanded to worship the emblem of Paganism, and by this order Churchmen are required to do homage to a corrupt religion, and insult their own pure faith, by giving to schismatics the titles which belong exclusively to their own spiritual rulers.

Where are those concessions to Romanism to end? We dread to look forward to the gloomy results of England's unfaithfulness to her high duties.

We have seen Rome, like her own haughty pontiff Sixtus V., while he sought the keys, deceitfully assuming the guise of feebleness, humility, and conciliation. Soon we will find her thundering forth defiance against all who dare to oppose her haughty strides.

### THE MACKENZIE PETITION.

The following nervous lines, suggested by the attempt to bring back MacKenzie to the Colony which he did his best to revolutionize, will remind our readers of Canning's poetry in the *Anti-Jacobin*. We allude expressly to the *Knife-grinder*, and the inscription for the cell-door of *Mrs. Brownrigg, the Prentice-cide*, both of which lyrics had no small effect in opening the eyes of the people to the danger and absurdity of republican theories.

Recal MacKenzie? Yes!—Why not? and thus
At once fill up the measure of disgust
Which men of loyal hearts cannot but feel,
To see the knaves who gull'd and woo'd poor fools
To foul rebellion—Lucifer's elite—
Brought back with smiles and favours—strange rewards
Of crime!
Recal Mackenzie? Yes! Why not?
Hast thou no aged honour'd Gentleman,
Whose hoary hairs you'd wish to see begrimed
With gore. And to whose wounds you'd wish denied
The pity of a dog? For these brave deeds
Your Mac's renowned—recal heroic Mac—
The patriot Mac, who, for his country's good,
Took to his coward legs to save his neck,
And rob the gallows of its own. Then go
Recal your poltroon exile stained with blood—
With Moody's blood—with arson and with theft—
With treason, anarchy and war—and then
Inscribe on Hochelaga's darkest page
The names of those who would recal her scourge.

## Communications.

[We deem it necessary to follow the example of the London Church periodicals, and to apprize our readers that we are not responsible for the opinions of our Correspondents.—ED. CHURCH.]

*To the Editor of The Church.*

My dear Sir,—I have heard you speak of the differences of views and feelings which in the present day are to be found amongst the members of our Church, in terms of the strongest rebrobation, and I am also aware that you consider it the duty of all earnest-minded men to strive and pray for that unity and good feeling which ought certainly to subsist among us. Knowing such to be your opinions, I can in some degree enter into the feeling of satisfaction with which you must have perused the communications of your correspondents "C. O. B." and "M. A.," for I think it is hardly possible to do so, without having the conviction forced upon us that we must be wonderfully of one mind, and must therefore be woefully hard pressed for a subject of controversy when we begin to fall out about the proper orthography of the man's title who discharges the important duty of hanging up the Parson's surplice.

Who would have thought of going to the Spelling-book for a test of orthodoxy! But these are strange days, Mr. Editor, upon which we have fallen, and some men are gifted with a singularly microscopic eye, by which they make discoveries undreamt of in the philosophy of the more obtuse.

I, for one, however, have no manner of objection to any gentleman, who feels controversially given, indulging his inclination to the full on any subject he shall see fit to choose—the more insignificant it is, the greater his *talent* in making much of it. If those gentlemen alluded to above are determined to blazon on their banner a man with his mattock, and if they are desirous that "Sexton, Sexton," shall now be the gathering cry of those who think with them, in the name of common sense let it be so. Let us throw "Sacristan" to the dogs, and treat the authority of Drs. Hook and Johnson as authority is often treated now a-days, only in the grave discussions and solemn protestations, by which this mighty and important object is to be attained, let us hope that "moderation and good feeling" will be more predominant than, I am sorry to say, appears probable.

Seriously and soberly, my dear Sir, is it not a cause for sincere grief, that your correspondent "M. A." should have allowed himself, in some moment of inadvertance, to indulge in the spirit manifested in his letter. I pray God that I be not uncharitable, but I cannot refrain from saying that, though not expressed in words, it is, I think, impossible to rise from the perusal of that document without feeling that it *really* contains a challenge to a miserable and unseemly controversy, upon a subject which none but a very morbidly sensitive mind would regard as of any consequence whatever; and that it virtually embodies a threat, that, if *to avoid* so unhappy and injurious a result, you were to decline giving it a place in your columns, you will immediately be denounced as "the organ of a party." Thoughts even more painful in their character can scarcely be repressed when reading the letter in question. And now I would ask how is "moderation and good feeling" to be maintained, or how are our differences to be adjusted, if we were all to adopt a similar course?

While expressing our various opinions in a manly, straightforward way, how earnestly should we pray to be kept from sinning against that charity which "THINKETH NO EVIL."

But for these painful features in the correspondence alluded to, the whole matter would only excite a smile, while at the same time it affords a pleasant glimpse of the comforts and satisfactions that fall to the lot of the Editor of *The Church*. Here, on the one hand, is "M. A." threatening you that if you fail to publish his letter he will denounce you as a Puseyite of the purest water.—While on the other I propose sending you herewith another communication, and if you demur giving it insertion in your paper, I'd advise you to have a care lest I be provoked to hold you up as a piece of prim Puritanism, disguised in a flimsy garb of very indifferent Churchmanship!!!

Lest "M. A." should read this letter and be induced by it to come down upon my unfortunate head with a regular extinguisher, I beg leave, ere I conclude, to point out to you and to him that nothing can be further from my intention than to hazard an opinion upon the SUBJECT of his letter—I merely venture to express a rather general feeling as to its TONE.

I remain, my dear Sir,
Very truly your's,
W. S. D.

Diocese of Toronto,
January 10th, 1848.

*To the Editor of The Church.*

The Park Farm, 11th Jan., 1848.

Sir,—In your paper of the 7th, you think proper to set me down as a "rather doubtful" M. P. P. You are right so far. I am "independent," and, unlike *bigots*, I vote according to my sense and conscience, after having heard both sides of the question fully argued. I have always shunned "PARTY," and always shall; and therefore I am always "rather doubtful." But, pray why omit the asterisk to my name, which shewed I was *unopposed?* I'll tell you why; because you, like many others of your way of thinking, despise the *English* Gentleman who has anything like *independence* about him, and you were vastly afraid that, from the fact of my having been elected by *acclamation, and without stirring from my house to visit a single voter, and without writing to a single voter, I should stand higher in public estimation* (which, God knows, I care not one straw for in such a country as this Canada is) than "The Church" would desire I should.

All I demand of you men of "The Press," is to do justice and report faithfully. I want no partiality or favour from any of you.

I remain, Sir,
Your obedient Servant,
JOHN PRINCE.

## Ecclesiastical Intelligence.

### CANADA.

#### DIOCESE OF TORONTO.

#### DIOCESAN THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE COBOURG.

The subject of the PRIZE ESSAY for the present year is as follows:—

"The Unity of the Anglican Church, in its relation to the Church Catholic, from the earliest times to the present day."

The KENT TESTIMONIAL PRIZE, (value £10 10s.) will be awarded to the writer of the best Essay on this subject.

The BISHOP'S PRIZE (value £5) will be given to the writer of the second best Essay on the same subject.

The PROFESSOR'S PRIZE (value Three Guineas) will be given to the writer of the third best Essay on the same subject.

Candidates for these Prizes must be Students of Theology now attending the Diocesan College, and the Essays will be required to be transmitted to the Theological Professor at Cobourg, on or before Saturday, the 20th May next. The names of the writers are to be sent accompanying in a sealed note, with a motto on the outside answering to the one affixed to the Essays respectively.

The Prizes will be adjudged at the conclusion of the Annual Examination, early in August next.

BARRIE.—The Rev. S. B. Ardagh has published in the *Barrie Magnet*, a letter to the Members of the United Church of England and Ireland, in the neighbourhood of Barrie, in which, after detailing the spiritual destitution which prevails in that neighbourhood, he calls upon them to subscribe towards the maintenance of an Assistant Minister; and so confident is he of the success of his appeal, that he has already secured the services of a Clergyman from the old country. Owing to a press of matter, we are sorry that we cannot transfer the appeal of the Rev. Gentleman to our columns, but we sincerely trust that it will be responded to in a satisfactory manner by his parishioners.

#### THE CHURCH SOCIETY OF THE DIOCESE OF TORONTO.

Collections made in the several Churches, Chapels, and Missionary Stations throughout the Diocese of Toronto, towards the fund for the support of the Widows and Orphans of the Clergy in this Diocese:—

| | | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Previously announced in No. 155, amount... | | 425 | 9 | 9½ |
| MacGillivray,—per Rev. H. C. Cooper ...... | | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| St. Mary's Church, Chinguacousy | £0 15 3 | | | |
| St. John's do., Gore of Toronto... | 0 4 3 | | | |
| —per Rev. G. S. J. Hill........................ | | 0 | 19 | 6 |
| St. Paul's Church, Newmarket ... | £1 8 3 | | | |
| Christ's do., St. Albans ............ | 1 0 9 | | | |
| Trinity do., Whitchurch............ | 0 11 0 | | | |
| —per Rev. G. C. Street...................... | | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Station at Mr. Phair's Brock, per Rev. R. Garrett | | 0 | 3 | 2 |
| St. Stephen's Church, Vaughan ... | £0 13 9 | | | |
| St. Philip's do., Markham ......... | 0 16 3 | | | |
| —per Rev. V. P. Mayerhoffer.............. | | 1 | 10 | 0 |
| Trinity Church, Barrie............ | £4 0 6 | | | |
| Church at Shanty Bay ............. | 0 13 10½ | | | |
| —per Church Wardens....................... | | 4 | 14 | 4½ |
| 155 collections, amounting to......... | | £436 | 16 | 10 |

T. W. BIRCHALL,
*Treasurer.*

Toronto, Jan. 20, 1848.

The Treasurer also begs to acknowledge the following monies received:—

| | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|
| From the Ven. A. N. Bethune, D. D., Archdeacon of York, his Life Subscription... | £12 | 10 | 0 |
| Donation from S. L., per J. Joseph, Esq., being the 3rd donation from the same party | 25 | 0 | 0 |
| From the Midland District Branch, per the Rev. T. H. M. Bartlett | 21 | 11 | 0 |
| From the Rev. G. C. Street, collections made on behalf of the Mission Fund............ | 1 | 5 | 9½ |
| From the Scholars in the Sunday School of St. Stephen's Church, Vaughan ......... | 0 | 1 | 6 |

#### THE VISITATION OF THE ARCHDEACON OF TORONTO.

Dr. Bethune, the amiable and talented Archdeacon of this portion of the Diocese, officially visited this village on Monday, to examine into and controul the conduct and proceedings of the secular officers of Trinity Church. His visit was alike desired and gratifying to all parties. The last occasion on which he similarly was present in Galt, the congregation assembled in the Township Hall; it consisted of very few persons; no edifice was then built for the performance of public worship according to the ritual of the Church of England; nor was there either sufficient means or wealth for the support of a resident Clergyman. Now the aspect of affairs was widely different. Within five short years a church had been built—a neat, a decent, nay even an elegant and commodious edifice—its interior had been fitted up in a style of modest convenience most suitable and becoming; a Clergyman was set apart for the pastoral superintendance of the congregation, who, from their increase of numbers, were enabled fully to provide for his maintenance in comfort and respectability; and were also, by God's blessing, so far in advance of their necessities, as to be able to spare a portion of their means for the decent ornament of the House of God, and the more perfect and satisfactory performance of divine worship. From the liberality of some of the members, all this had been accomplished without incurring debt; indeed, all the arrears which had accumulated in that shape were swept off the last year, by Messrs. Dickson and Shade, and room thereby made for the liberality which had this year enabled the congregation to pew the church, provide a splendid organ, establish and perfect a choir; and add such other comforts and conveniences as render the Church of the Holy Trinity in Galt a pattern and model for other places.

The ven. Archdeacon having called up the churchwardens—Messrs. John Davidson and Henry McCrum—addressed them at some length on the satisfactory manner in which they had discharged their duties; and the gratification he felt in being enabled to report to their Diocesan the rapid progress of the Mission of the Rev. M. Boomer in this District. Nothing could be more gratifying to him, or more encouraging to their amiable pastor, than to find the good work entrusted to his hands, so full of the Almighty's blessing as to exhibit a progress unparalleled as it was unexpected. He entreated a thorough reliance upon God in all their doings, and he ventured to prophesy that such would not result in aught but peace on earth, and good will to all; whilst it would encourage every one who heard him to proceed onward in the race of life in thorough confidence that he was the object of a Redeemer's care, and that all he could do for his church, his pastor, and himself, was but a poor return for the infinite affection he himself had experienced.

At the conclusion of the Archdeacon's address, the Church Society held its annual meeting. The Report, which was read by Mr. John Davidson, announced a gratifying increase both in the number of members and list of subscriptions, the latter amounting to nearly £34, including a donation of £5 from Wm. Dickson, Esq.

The following Resolutions were passed unanimously:—

Moved by Absalom Shade, Esq., seconded by Mr. Jas. Craig, That the Report now read be adopted.

Moved by Dr. Bethune, seconded by Dr. Richardson, That the measure of success that it has pleased God to vouchsafe to this Association during the past year, as well as the flourishing condition of the Church Society in general, demand our devout and grateful acknowledgements to Him whose blessing alone giveth the increase.

Moved by Mr. McMurray, seconded by Mr. Merigold, That this Association is impressed with the conviction that the supply of the ministrations of our holy religion to the members of the Church in this District, depends, under God, upon the labours of the Church Society, and the manner in which that important institution shall be sustained.

Moved by Dr. Seagram, seconded by Rev. Mr. Palmer, That influenced by a deep sense of the duty incumbent on every true churchman, to do all that in him lies to advance the cause of evangelical truth and apostolic order, and of the blessing which it is calculated to diffuse throughout the community at large, the members of this Association pledge themselves to renewed exertions to increase the efficiency of this branch of the Church Society, and to enlist their fellow churchmen in its ranks.

Moved by Dr. Moffat, seconded by Mr. P. Jaffray, That the thanks of this Association are hereby given to the office-bearers for the past year; and that the same gentlemen, with Messrs. J. Davidson, Senr., Dr. Moffat, and P. Jaffray, constitute the Committee for the ensuing year, and that the Treasurer and Secretary continue in their respective offices.—*Galt Reporter.*

### ENGLAND.

#### PROTEST AGAINST THE APPOINTMENT OF DR. HAMPDEN TO THE BISHOPRIC OF HEREFORD.

"My Lord,—We, the undersigned Bishops of the Church of England, feel it our duty to represent to your Lordship, as head of her Majesty's Government, the apprehension and alarm which have been excited in the minds of the Clergy by the rumoured nomination to the See of Hereford of Dr. Hampden, in the soundness of whose doctrine the University of Oxford has affirmed, by a solemn decree, its want of confidence.

"We are persuaded that your Lordship does not know how deep and general a feeling prevails on this subject, and we consider ourselves to be acting only in the discharge of our bounden duty both to the Crown and to the Church, when we respectfully but earnestly express to your Lordship our conviction that if this appointment be completed, there is the greatest danger both of the interruption of the peace of the Church, and of the disturbance of the confidence which it is most desirable that the Clergy and laity of the Church should feel in every exercise of the Royal supremacy, especially as regards that very delicate and important particular, the nomination to vacant sees. We have the honour to be, my Lord, your Lordship's obedient faithful servants,

"C. J. London, C. Winton, J. Lincoln, Chr. Bangor, Hugh Carlisle, G. Rochester, Rich. Bath and Wells, J. H. Gloucester and Bristol, H. Exeter, E. Sarum, A. T. Chichester, J. Ely, Saml. Oxon.

"To the Right Hon. the Lord John Russell, &c."

"Chesham-place, Dec. 8, 1847.

"My Lords,—I have had the honour to receive a representation signed by your Lordships on the subject of the nomination of Dr. Hampden to the See of Hereford.

"I observe that your Lordships do not state any want of confidence on your part in the soundness of Dr. Hampden's doctrine. Your Lordships refer me to a decree of the University of Oxford passed eleven years ago, and founded upon lectures delivered fifteen years ago.

"Since the date of that decree, Dr. Hampden has acted as Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford, and many Bishops, as I am told, have required certificates of attendance on his lectures before they proceeded to ordain candidates who had received their education at Oxford. He has likewise preached sermons, for which he has been honoured with the approbation of several prelates of our Church.

"Several months before I named Dr. Hampden to the Queen for the See of Hereford, I signified my intention to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and did not receive from him any discouragement.

"In these circumstances, it appears to me that should I withdraw my recommendation of Dr. Hampden, which has been sanctioned by the Queen, I should virtually assent to the docrine that a decree of the University of Oxford is a perpetual ban of exclusion against a Clergyman of eminent learning and irreproachable life, and that in fact, the supremacy which is now by law vested in the Crown, is to be transferred to a majority of the members of one of our Universities.

"Nor should it be forgotten, that many of the most prominent among that majority have since joined the Communion of the Church of Rome.

"I deeply regret the feeling that is said to be common among the Clergy on this subject. But I cannot sacrifice the reputation of Dr. Hampden, the rights of the Crown, and what I believe to be the true interests of the Church, to a feeling which I believe to be founded on misapprehension and fomented by prejudice.

"At the same time I thank your Lordships for an interposition which I believe to be intended for the public benefit. I have, &c.

"J. RUSSELL.

"To the Right Rev. the Bishops of London, Winchester, Lincoln, &c."

#### TO THE RIGHT HON. LORD JOHN RUSSELL.

London, Dec. 10, 1847.

My Lord,—I had last night the honour of receiving your lordship's letter of the 8th inst., addressed to myself, in common with the other Bishops who had presumed to represent to you their apprehensions of the evil consequences which must be expected to result from the nomination (if persisted in) of Dr. Hampden to the vacant see of Hereford.

As the remonstrant Bishops have now, for the most part, returned to their several dioceses, it is not possible for them, within any reasonable space of time, to meet together for the purpose of making a common reply to those parts of your lordship's letter which may seem especially to demand reply. I therefore feel it due to your lordship, no less than to myself, that I should state frankly, and without waiting for communication with others, the reasons which compel me to withhold my assent from the arguments which you have addressed to us.

Your lordship is pleased to remark, first, on our "not having stated any want of confidence on our own part in the soundness of Dr. Hampden's doctrine.'

My lord, in abstaining from such statement, we took that part which, I venture to submit, manifestly was most becoming.

We had hardly a right to obtrude upon you, unasked, our opinion on that point; for such opinion would have been only that of individuals, whereas the judgment on which we rested our representation was the judgment of a body eminently qualified to judge, and accustomed, in the best times, to be listened to on such subjects with respect and attention by all. But, my lord, as our silence in this particular is considered by your lordship as an omission which lessens the force of our representation, I will not, myself, be silent any longer; I hesitate not, therefore, to state, that I have no confidence in the soundness of Dr. Hampden's doctrine.

"The decree of the University to which we referred, passed," as your lordship truly observes, "eleven years ago; and was [illegible] "upon lectures delivered fifteen years ago."

Why was it, your lordship seems by implication to ask, that the long interval of four years was suffered to elapse between the publication of the offensive doctrines and the decree which condemned them?—For a reason which I venture to think your lordship will, on reflection, deem quite sufficient to explain, if not to justify, the delay.

During those four years Dr. Hampden was in no position specially and immediately connected with theological teaching; his errors, therefore, however grave, were not so formidable as to demand the unusual interposition of the University, as a body, to vindicate the sacred truths which he had impugned.

If it be asked why the lesser and ordinary tribunal—the Vice Chancellor's Board—was not resorted to, I frankly answer that I do not know. It may have proceeded, and probably did proceed, from the natural, perhaps culpable, reluctance of men in authority to exercise that authority penally against one of their own number, and from the unwillingness of men not in authority to place themselves, without any special call, in the invidious and painful position of public accusers.

At the end of these four years, however, the state of things was greatly altered. Dr. Hampden had ceased to be in the comparatively private station which he had before occupied. He had been appointed to the highest chair of divinity in the University of Oxford. His influence, therefore, on its theological teaching, and on the future character and usefulness of the University, could not but be dreaded and deprecated, and the duty of resistance to that influence had become most manifestly, most imperatively urgent. Accordingly, the heads of the University are understood to have presented in the highest quarter, through his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, their strong objections to the appointment; and our then most gracious Sovereign King William IV., was generally believed to have expressed his desire that the appointment should not be completed.

But even the expression of the royal wish having been found to be in vain, the University was compelled to have recourse to its own unquestioned powers of judging in such a cause, and to take those steps which might not only lessen the power of mischief in the professor's teaching, but should also vindicate its own character before the world.

Such, my lord, is, I believe, a brief history of the decree to which the remonstrant Bishops referred your lordship.

But, you add, that "since the date of that decree, Dr. Hampden has acted as Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford, and many Bishops, as I am told, have required certificates of attendance on his lectures from candidates for holy orders, who had received their education at Oxford."

My lord, that "the University of Oxford has ever required certificates from any persons under its authority of attendance on Dr. Hampden's lectures," I have never before heard; nor, till I had the honour of receiving your lordships's letter, have I had the slightest reason to believe.

With regard to the course taken by Bishops in this respect, I may be allowed to say that it had been the universal rule of every diocese in England to require the certificate of attendance on the Regius Professor's lectures for a very long period before that chair was filled by Dr. Hampden. If any Bishops abstained from revoking that rule, although a professor was appointed whom they might greatly disapprove, it would not much surprise me; nor should I think that they thereby precluded themselves from the right of testifying their adverse judgment of him on any grave occasion, as the present must pre-eminently be held to be.

Be this as it may, if any of the remonstrant Bishops are justly open to this remark (I know not that any of them are), I am not in the number. Immediately after the passing of the academic statute in question, I deemed it right to inform Dr. Hampden, as, doubtless, if he has made any communication to you on this head, he has informed your lordship, that I could not regard him as a safe guide to students in theology, and could not therefore require certificates of attendance on his lectures from candidates for holy orders. I made this communication in terms as little offensive to Dr. Hampden's feelings as I could devise; and I had the satisfaction of receiving from him, if my memory does not deceive me, an acknowledgement to that effect.

That "Dr. Hampden has likewise preached sermons, for which he has been honoured with the approbation of several Prelates of our Church," I most unhesitatingly believe on the authority of your lordship; but the relevancy of such a fact to the matter now in question, in any but an infinitesimal degree, I must profess my inability to perceive.

Your lordship proceeds to say, "Several months before I named Dr. Hampden to the Queen for the See of Hereford, I signified my intention" (not, I am confident, to the See of Hereford, for that see was not then vacant, nor likely to be vacant, nor to the next see which might be open—for another has been since open, to which Dr. Hampden was not named; and more than one eminent person is known to have had the offer of it from your lordship; but, it may have been that you signified your intention of naming Dr. Hampden to some see, at some time or other) "to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and did not receive from him any discouragement."

My lord, your lordship will, I am confident, pardon my inquiry (for the question is manifestly most important to the fair understanding of the merits of the case)—Did you ask his Grace whether he thought Dr. Hampden a fit person to be recommended to a bishopric? If you did not ask his opinion, few persons will be at all surprised that he abstained from giving it.

Your lordship better knows than I can presume to guess what are the relations between his Grace and yourself—what your habits of consultation with him on this and kindred questions. But thus much I must say, that unless these relations be most intimate, these habits most unreserved, it would seem to be almost a matter of course that our aged Primate, one always distinguished by his delicacy and reluctance to obtrude, without absolute necessity, the expression of any opinion adverse to the interests of another—it would seem to me, I repeat, a matter of course, that his Grace should forbear to tell your lordship that your intention of recommending Dr. Hampden at some period, which might never arrive during the continuance of your lordship's power of recommending, or during his own valuable life, would involve you in the difficulty of having named a person whose appointment would be regarded by the Church at large as an act either of wanton insult or of official recklessness beyond all precedent.

After all, it is satisfactory to see, on the authority of your lordship's own words, to how small dimensions the swelling statement at first made of this matter has at length dwindled. The story—which was put forth in a tone only not official, and circulated by those who spoke as on the authority of your lordship—that the Archbishop had given "his cordial assent" to Dr. Hampden's appointment to the now vacant See of Hereford, turns out to be nothing more than that the Archbishop gave "no discouragement," when, several months before the See of Hereford was vacant, you signified to his Grace your intention of naming Dr. Hampden, at some time or other, to some bishopric or other.

And the importance even of this intimation of the Archbishop's supposed "assent" to Dr. Hampden's appointment, small as it is, sinks into absolute insignificance—or rather, is converted into something much more nearly resembling "dissent"—when it is stated, on authority too respectable to admit of question, that your lordship actually received a letter from the Archbishop some days before that of the Bishops, in which his Grace apprised you of the ferment which the announcement of Dr. Hampden's promotion was exciting in the Church, and of the certainty of legal steps being taken in order to defeat it.

My lord, I have said that the appointment of Dr. Hampden is an act "beyond all precedent." And this, I believe, is strictly true. Never before was any person recommended by the Crown to a bishopric against whom there stood a formal legal judgment affirming the unsoundness of his doctrine. This is the real, the special distinction of his case. Short of this, indeed, one or two instances, not dissimilar, occur to me while I am writing.

The first is the case of two persons nominated by King James II., in the year 1686, to fill the sees of Chester and Oxford; and I would rather give the case in the words of Burnet than in my own:—

"Cartwright was promoted to Chester. The See of Oxford was given to Dr. Parker. These two persons were pitched on as the fittest instruments that could be found among the clergy to betray and ruin the Church."

My lord, I most unfeignedly disclaim the slightest intention to insinuate that such is your object in naming Dr. Hampden, or that he would be a fit instrument for such a purpose. I believe you both to be utterly incapable of anything so dishonourable. But the preceding inapposite words are necessary to introduce what is, I submit, really apposite:—

"Some of the Bishops brought to Archbishop Sancroft articles against them, which they desired he would offer to the King in Council, and pray that the mandate for consecrating them might be delayed till time were given to examine particulars; and Bishop Lloyd told me that Sancroft promised to him not to consecrate them till he had examined the truth of the articles, which were too scandalous to be repeated. Yet, when Sancroft saw what danger he might incur if he were sued in *præmunire*, he consented to consecrate them.

"[An accident happened in the action that struck him much. When he was going to give the chalice in the Sacrament, he stumbled on one of the steps of the altar, and dashed out all the consecrated wine that was in it; which was much taken notice of, and gave himself much trouble, since he was frightened by so mean a fear.]"—*Burnet, History of his own times.* Oxford, 1823, vol. iii. p. 136–8.

Such, my lord, is the first—precedent shall I say? or warning? It is for your lordship to decide; and in forming your decision you will, I doubt not, remember that Sancroft is not now in the see of Canterbury, nor James II. on the throne of England.

The other is that of Bishop Hoadley, of which I am more apprehensive that your lordship may think it worthy of being followed.

Against this prelate, a notorious latitudinarian, "and something more," the Lower House of Convocation, in 1717, prepared a representation to be presented to the Archbishops and Bishops sitting in the Upper House, "that with much grief of heart they had observed that the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Bangor hath given great and grievous offence by certain doctrines and positions by him lately published," the tendency of which they proceeded to set forth in the form of articles.

Before this representation could be brought into the Upper House, the Convocation was prorogued by a special order from the King, and was not permitted to sit again. The accused prelate was not long afterwards transferred to the see of Hereford, (what a complete and happy precedent!) and subsequently, in due succession, to Salisbury and to Winchester.

My lord, if the conduct of the Minister of George I. on that scandalous occasion be not adopted by you as a precedent, show that you repudiate it. Take that step which is due to justice, to the rights of the Church, and to the conscience of every Churchman. Withdraw the recommendation which you have so inconsiderately made; or, if you persist in it, refer the writings of Dr. Hampden to the judgment of the Church in Convocation.

If there are objections to that course, devise some other. Let these writings be judged by a provincial council of the Bishops, assisted by such divines as her Majesty shall be graciously pleased to name; or devise some other tribunal of any kind, provided it be fair and competent; but do not, as you value your own good name, or the honour of your Sovereign, or the Church, and, it may be, of the State also; for the welfare of the State, rightly understood, is, and ever will be, bound up indissolubly with that of the Church—do not persist in your unhappy career—make not what is as yet only an indiscretion—and revocable as such—make it not a crime, aye, and I dare not forbear adding—a sin.

But I return to your lordship's letter.

You proceed to say to us, "Should I withdraw my recommendation of Dr. Hampden, I should virtually assent to the doctrine, that a decree of the University of Oxford is a perpetual ban of exclusion against a clergyman of eminent learning and irreproachable life."

My lord, I doubt not the learning nor the excellent moral character of Dr. Hampden. But these qualifications have no connection whatever with the merits of this case. Is Dr. Hampden unworthy of confidence as an exponent of Christian truth? The University of Oxford, judging from his published writings, has solemnly decreed that he is; and, because he is, that University has deprived him of certain functions hitherto attached to his office of Professor of Divinity. Is it of less moment that there be confidence in the soundness of the doctrine of a Bishop than a Professor? Is heterodoxy less mischievous in a judge than in a teacher of theology? My lord, it cannot be necessary to remind you that a Bishop, as such, and by the essential, indefeasible right and duty of his office, is empowered, and is bound, to judge of the doctrine preached and taught by every clergyman under his charge.

The judgment of the University, therefore, ought to be a "ban of exclusion" (from the office of a Bishop at least) against Dr. Hampden, so long as it remains in force—in other words, until it shall be either repealed, or washed away, or proved to be unfounded.

The first of these three modes has been tried, but the attempt signally failed. The University, six years after the decree passed, was moved to repeal it, and that, too, under circumstances peculiarly favourable to the success of the motion—when, from causes too notorious to need to be recited, a strong reaction had arisen, and prejudice had taken a course most favourable to Dr. Hampden. Yet, even then, the motion of repeal was sternly rejected by a majority, much smaller, indeed, than that which had originally enacted the decree (474 to 94), but large enough to evince abundantly the unaltered and unalterable judgment of the University—it was 330 to 219.

Your lordship says, however, "it must not be forgotten, that many of the most prominent among the original majority have since joined the communion of the Church of Rome."

My lord, if by "the most prominent" ought to be understood the committee, who openly sat for the purpose of devising measures for vindicating the University from the evils which might be expected to result from such a selection of the King's Professor of Theology—and who, as being "the most prominent" in the contest, received the formal thanks of bodies of clergy throughout England, too numerous to be recounted—of these, one indeed has fallen, to the consternation and grief of all who knew, or had heard of, his high faculties. The others, thank God, still stand rooted and grounded in faith and love.

But, my lord, supposing that those of the majority who have lapsed may be truly stated to be "many," (I know not in any sense that they are), will your lordship, or will any honourable man, venture to say that, abstracting their names from the list even of the smaller majority, the result would not be to leave that majority still large,—still more than sufficient amply to stamp the decree with the impress of the general judgment of the University?

But I have intimated that the stain of the judgment may be washed away. My lord, I wish this had been done long ago by the only person who is able to do it—by Dr. Hampden himself. The judgment may be washed away by his retracting the errors against which it was directed. But this is a course which Dr. Hampden has refused to take. In a published letter of his to the Archbishop of Canterbury, dated January 23, 1838, he thus writes:—"I retract nothing that I have written; I disclaim nothing."

My lord, I honour Dr. Hampden for thus writing; so long as his opinions are unchanged he cannot retract; but so long as he does not retract, he cannot reasonably expect the position from which those opinions exclude him. If in his teaching during eleven years, as Regius Professor, or in any of the valuable sermons of which your lordship writes, he had either expressly or virtually withdrawn what was justly censurable in his earlier writings, I, for one, should not have been found in the list of remonstrants. Yet I frankly own that I should, even in that case, still bear in mind, and with hearty assent, a saying of King George III., which was strongly marked by his characteristic practical good sense. When his Minister recommended