

On the arrival of the Missionary Bishop, the Committee, having under consideration the appropriation to the Constantinople Mission for the year 1850, came unanimously to the conclusion, that the removal of the Missionary Bishop with his family, had closed the Mission in Turkey, and rendered unnecessary any further appropriation of Missionary funds to that Station. But, inasmuch as it has been the habit of the Committee to make some appropriation to Missionaries who have returned to this country from their stations, they passed the following Resolutions, viz:—

“Resolved, That the sum of six hundred dollars, in addition to the sum of one hundred and fifty dollars already advanced, (being the amount of six months salary, from 1st January to 1st July 1850.) to be paid to the Rt. Rev. Bishop Southgate.”

From our English Files.

PROTEST of the Bishop of Exeter against the induction of the Rev. G. C. Gorham, to the Vicarage of Bramford, Speke.

In the name of the Holy Trinity, Amen.—We, Henry, by Divine permission Bishop of Exeter, having been commissioned by this venerable Court of Arches to bring into the registry of the same presentation made to us by Her Majesty Queen Victoria, as patron of the vicarage of Bramford Speke, in our said diocese, commanding us to institute the Rev. G. C. Gorham, clerk, bachelor of divinity, to the Church of the said parish, and to the cure and government of the souls of the parishioners of the same—which presentation aforesaid notwithstanding we have found it to be our duty to refuse to admit and institute the said Rev. George Cornelius Gorham to the said church and cure of souls inasmuch as it hath manifestly appeared to, and hath been adjudged by us, after due examination had, that the said clerk was and is not fit to be entrusted with such cure of souls, by reason of his having held and continuing to hold certain false and unsound doctrines, contrary to the pure Catholic faith, and to the doctrines set forth and taught in the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, and in the Book of Common Prayer, and administration of the Sacraments, according to the use of the said Church—against which our refusal to institute him, as aforesaid, the said clerk did prosecute his suit called duplex querela in this said venerable Court, and such suit was by the same, after due hearing, solemnly refused and rejected, whereupon the said clerk did appeal to the judgment of Her Majesty in Council, and Her Majesty in Council hath remitted the cause to this venerable Court, declaring that we, the said Bishop, have not shown sufficient cause why we did not institute the said George Cornelius Gorham to the said vicarage of Bramford Speke, and commanding that right and justice be in this Court done in this matter, pursuant to the said declaration,—do hereby, in obedience to the monition of this Court, bring into the registry of the same the said presentation—

Under protest, that whereas her said Majesty, before she remitted the said cause to this Court with the declaration aforesaid, did refer the same to the Judicial Committee of her Majesty's said Council to hear the same, and to make their report and recommendation to her Majesty thereupon; and the said Judicial Committee did accordingly hear the said cause, and make their report and recommendation, after hearing the same, that her Majesty should remit the said cause, with the declaration aforesaid; but such their report and recommendation was notoriously and expressly founded on a certain statement of the doctrines held by the said George Cornelius Gorham, as it appeared to them, the said Judicial Committee, which statement was in the terms following:—

“That baptism is a sacrament generally necessary to salvation, but that the grace of regeneration does not so necessarily accompany the act of baptism; that regeneration invariably takes place in baptism; that the grace may be granted before, in, or after baptism; that baptism is an effectual sign of grace, by which God works invisibly in us, but only in such as worthily receive it—in them alone it has a wholesome effect; and that without reference to the qualification of the recipient, it is not itself an effectual sign of grace; that infants baptised, and dying before actual sin, are certainly saved, but that in no case is regeneration in baptism unconditional.

And whereas, the above-recited statement, on which the said Judicial Committee did so expressly found their said report and recommendation to her Majesty, was set forth by them as a just and true and sufficient statement of the doctrine held by the said George Cornelius Gorham, notwithstanding he had declared (A. 15) that ‘as infants are by nature unworthy recipients, being born in sin, and the children of wrath, they cannot receive any benefit from baptism, except they shall have been a preventer act of grace to make them worthy,’ and had solemnly re-affirmed the same (A. 70) when his attention was by us specially called thereto, in order that he might correct it if he thought fit; and notwithstanding that he, the said George Cornelius Gorham, had further declared (A. 19) of ‘baptised infants, who, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved, that therefore they must have been regenerated by an act of grace preventer to their baptism in order to make them worthy recipients of that sacrament.’ Again (A. 27) ‘the new nature must have been possessed by those who receive baptism rightly; and therefore possessed before the seal was affixed,—meaning thereby before baptism was given.’ Again (A. 60) ‘that filial state,’ (meaning thereby ‘adoption to be the sons of God’), ‘though clearly to be ascribed to God, was given to the worthy recipient before baptism, and not in baptism, manifestly contradicting thereby the said Articles of Religion, and the doctrine of the said Book of Common Prayer, as set forth in its offices of public and private baptism of infants and of confirmation, and especially in the ‘catechism or instruction to be learned of every person, before he be brought to be confirmed by the Bishop.’ Notwithstanding, too, that the Lord Bishop of London, who was summoned by command of her Majesty to attend the hearing of the said appeal, and who did attend the same accordingly, having been requested by the said Judicial Committee to read and consider the said report and recommendation before it was laid before her Majesty, did thereupon read and consider the same, and after such reading and consideration thereof, did say and advise the said Judicial Committee to this effect, that he could not consent to the said report and recommendation, because the said George Cornelius Gorham holds that remission of sins, adoption into the family of God, and regeneration, must all take place, in the case of infants, not in baptism, nor by means of baptism, but before baptism—an opinion which the said Lord Bishop declared to the said Judicial Committee appeared to him

to be in direct opposition to the plain teaching of the Church, and utterly to destroy the sacramental character of baptism; inasmuch as it separates the grace of that sacrament from the sacrament itself; which said heretical opinions so held by the said George Cornelius Gorham, and thus by the said Lord Bishop of London expressly brought to the notice of the said Judicial Committee, and the manifest contradiction of the said opinions to the teaching of the Church plainly pointed out, were nevertheless wholly omitted by the said Judicial Committee in the statement of the doctrine which appeared to them to be held by the said George Cornelius Gorham, on which statement they professed to found their report and recommendation to her Majesty as aforesaid.

“Now we, the said Henry, Bishop of Exeter, taking the premises into our serious and anxious consideration, and furthermore, considering that the judgment of Her Most Gracious Majesty in council on the said appeal was pronounced solely in reliance of the statement made in the report and recommendation of the said Judicial Committee, as being a just, true, and sufficient statement, do, by virtue of authority given to us by God, as a Bishop in the Church of Christ and in the apostolic branch of it planted by God's providence within this land, and established therein by the laws and constitution of this realm, hereby solemnly repudiate the said judgment, and declare it to be null and utterly without effect in foro conscientia, and do appeal therefrom in all that concerns the Catholic faith to the Sacred Synod of this nation when it shall be in the name of Christ assembled as the true Church of England by representation.”

“And further, we do solemnly protest and declare, that whereas the said George Cornelius Gorham did manifestly and notoriously hold the aforesaid heretical doctrines, and hath not since retracted and disclaimed the same, any Archbishop or Bishop, or any official of any Archbishop or Bishop, who shall institute the said George Cornelius Gorham to the cure and government of the souls of the parishioners of the said parish of Bramford Speke, within our diocese aforesaid, will thereby incur the sin of supporting and favouring the said heretical doctrines, and we do hereby renounce and repudiate all communion with any one, be he whom he may, who shall so institute the said George Cornelius Gorham as aforesaid.

“Given under our hand and Episcopal seal this 20th day of July, in the year of our Lord 1850.

H. EXETER.”

Communications.

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

To the Editor of the Church.

Sir.—My engagements have not hitherto allowed me time to notice what I must term the gratuitous and vindictive attack which you have made upon me in The Church of the 1st instant. I now ask the space which equity and usage accord to an assailed individual, to reply and refute your imputations.

You expend much wrath upon the authorities of the Wesleyan Body for desiring to remove the site of Victoria College from Cobourg to Toronto,—just as if that body had no right to establish or remove their College where they please, without the permission of The Church? And your wrath seems to be beyond restraint at the conduct of the same Body, in not persisting in avowed hostility to the Toronto University in the teeth of the fact, that a Legislative enactment has been passed for the express purpose of providing religious instruction and oversight for the students of the University. It is not, however, my present object to reply to your attacks upon others. Your angry effusion against the Wesleyan Body, seems to have been but the exordium of your personal attack upon me, which you commence in the following words:—

“We fear that that very Ministry who were so stoutly denounced by, and in their turn denounced Dr. Ryerson, have, with the hope of securing the public support, bought him, with the hope, with him, of securing a large and influential body of professing Christians. They may have found but a too venal sycophant; but we can tell them that they will fail in their ultimate end. We know that that gentleman has no more influence in his own denomination than he has in the Church.”

On this characteristic passage, I have to make two or three remarks. The first is, whether a difference, several years ago, between some members of the present Administration and myself, respecting the facts and circumstances of a certain coup d'etat, requires or implies a difference on every or any thing else affecting the public weal, much less mutual individual hostility? And whether the attempt of The Church, to revive and perpetuate personal animosities from such an occurrence, is justified by any principle of political integrity, or is consistent with any dictate of Christian feeling?

Then, as to your imputation of bribery, it, of course, falls upon the Government as well as upon me. Political bribery implies political necessity, and is the forlorn resort of an administration, weak in power and vicious in principle, or of rival parties nearly balanced, and one or both without integrity or honor. Whether parties among us are in this state of equilibrium, or whether the Government is reduced to this extremity, in the midst of a Parliament, and with a majority of more than two to one in that Parliament, is a problem of easy solution. The absurdity of such an imputation, under such circumstances, is as palpable as the oddity of its conception by a journal which assumes, par excellence, to be the authorized exponent of that charity which “thinketh no evil.”

“To your imputation upon myself, of my being ‘bought,’ and of my being a ‘venal sycophant,’ I reply by referring you to the ‘correspondence on the School Law of Upper Canada,’ which has taken place between members of the Government and myself, and which has lately been printed by order of the Legislative Assembly. That correspondence extends over a period of more than four years, and will show whether, under successive administrations, I have compromised or concealed any opinion or recommendation which I thought important to the educational interests of this Province. The same correspondence will show, that, within the last year, I expressed my wish and intention to resign my office, rather than be an agent in a system which I believe a then recent act of the Legislature would denude of an avowed and positively Christian character. Now Sir, you, with your Bishop, have denounced the Toronto University as a ‘godless and infidel’ institution, and its system of education as ‘anti-Christian.’ Yet, Clergymen of your own Church have continued to act as agents in that ‘anti-Christian’ system, and have retained their situations and salaries as officers of that ‘godless and infidel’ institution. But

have you proclaimed them as ‘bought,’ and pronounced them as ‘venal sycophants?’ Yet, you apply these terms to me, in the teeth of the facts referred to, and without the shadow of reason to justify your assault.

Your concluding charge, Sir, is no less groundless than the one with which you commenced. I again quote your own words, as follows:—

“The awkward and infamous attempt to place himself over the College of the country, by the insertion of a clause in his Bill, requiring the highest seats of learning in the land to report to him (?) ought to secure to him the condemnation of every honest man in the Province—a clause which Mr. Hincks declared was in neither the original Bill nor in the last proof sheets! Who then would insert it but Dr. Ryerson? It is enough, one would suppose, to have over our Common Schools a man of no literary qualifications for the office, without the same individual forcing himself upon the Colleges.”

Your specific charge admits of a specific reply. That reply is, first, that Mr. Hincks never made the statement, respecting the “proof sheets,” which you attribute to him; secondly, that I had no more to do with the printing of the School Bill, than the Editor of The Church; thirdly, that what you impute to me as “infamous,” is only a famous calumny of your own propagation—fraternally joined as you are by the Examiner and North American—a triumvirate the natural affinity of whose elements and whose homogeneous character, are a sufficient illustration of its own spirit and principles, and afford another example of the truth of the adage, Les extremes se touchent.

It is true, the original draft of the School Bill was prepared by me, as directed by the Government; that draft was printed (by the Queen's Printer) without alteration, by the direction of the Government, and under the correction of the Law Officer of the Legislative Assembly. The draft of the Bill thus printed, was designed for private use—for the examination of members of the Government, and for consultations with other parties. That draft of the Bill did not contain the clauses which you designate as an “infamous attempt” on my part. The addition of those and several other clauses of the Bill as originally submitted by me, was the result of the examination and consultation referred to. The draft of the Bill as thus amended, was again placed, by a member of the Executive Council, in the hands of the Law Officer of the Legislative Assembly, and was afterwards (by order of the House) printed under his direction and correction. That officer can be referred to as to whether I had any thing to do with the “proof sheets” from first to last, and whether a single correction was made in them except by himself. Your imputation upon me, Sir, involves a direct charge of infidelity or inefficiency against the Law Officer of the Legislative Assembly, who is responsible for the correct printing of all such Bills, and in the characteristic conception of a mind distorted by jealousy or familiar with low and crooked intrigues.

Finally, in regard to the clauses which are the pretext for your “infamous” charge. I know the whole design of them by members of the Government and myself, was to have a complete statistical view of the educational condition of Upper Canada, in every department, laid before the public in some annual document, and did not contemplate giving me the slightest authority over any College in the country. In my annual School Reports for the last three years, I have given all the information which could be collected, respecting all the Colleges, Academies, Grammar and Private Schools in the Province; and in the blank forms of reports sent out annually by me to local Superintendents of Schools, columns have been provided for inserting these various items of information. But who, besides The Church and the other triumvirate, will say that I have attempted to place myself “over” these institutions in endeavouring, from year to year, to obtain statistical information from them, so as to present a just and attractive résumé of the educational state and facilities of the country. In the neighbouring States, every College and Academy, as well as school throughout each State, that receives a farthing of public aid, is required to report annually to some designated Department of the Government, according to a form prescribed by it, and that Department is required to make a general report to the Legislature. But no one, where the practice has long obtained, has ever been ignorant enough to suppose that these institutions being required to report to a Public Department certain annual statistics, were, therefore, in the slightest degree, under the control of that Department. The moment I saw certain members of the Legislative Assembly (such as the “Member for Norfolk”) so far imbued with the spirit of The Church as to give a bad interpretation of the objects of the clauses of the School Bill in question,—an interpretation as alien to my feelings as it was injurious to me personally. I expressed a wish to have them withdrawn; being satisfied that all these misguided attempts of minds trained up in the school of exclusiveness and egotism to obstruct the widest diffusion of knowledge in Canada and of Canada, would easily yield to a nobler influence, “without any such exposure of myself to the shafts of prejudices or envy, or the cavillings of ignorance or faction.

In conclusion I have to thank you for your commendation on the ground of “no literary qualifications”—knowing from the spirit of your journal and your discussion on the admission of certain Presbyterian Clergymen to the Convocation of the Toronto University, that no man can be a Christian, a Scholar, or a gentleman, unless linked in the chain of your succession, and trained in the dialectics of your school. A similar commendation on my first appointment to office, nearly six years since, was of essential service to me, even in England. A Clergyman of the Church of England happening one evening to hear my name mentioned, came to me and asked me if he was correct in hearing my name called thus and so, and if I were from Canada. I replied in the affirmative, on which he reached out his hand, and expressed much pleasure in meeting me—remarking that he had recently read an article respecting me in The Church Canadian newspaper, and that he thought I must be deserving of especial respect to be attacked in the manner I had been in The Church.—The same Clergyman afterwards invited me to his house; and through him, I formed acquaintances with Clergymen and others, the remembrance of which is grateful to the feelings of my heart at this hour. I doubt not but the present attack of The Church will confer a similar obligation upon me in the estimation of that very large portion of the members of the Church of England whose respect and good will I think it a privilege and an honour for any man to enjoy.

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

E. RYERSON.

Education Office,
Toronto, Aug. 17, 1850.

(To the Hon. P. B. DeBlaquiere)

Sir.—Lately standing in your place in Parliament, you stated that as a member of the Church of England it was your conviction it would not be for the benefit of the Church to have a University of her own. You are aware that this is not the conviction of the Bishop, who is allowed to be a person of keen discernment, and of good practical wisdom; nor of the great body of the Clergy, who are men of habitual reflection, and must in the nature of things be conversant with matters of this sort; and that it is not the conviction of a very large majority of the laity, is evident, from the manner in which the call of the Bishop to subscribe for a University of our own, was responded to. The annals of benevolence furnish but few instances to equal it.—That you are a person of distinguished virtue I doubt not, but—in face of the above facts—I cannot believe, that modesty is your most distinguished virtue. Because you are a Churchman you seem to think that all your speculations concerning the Church must tend to her good. This by no means follows. The heaviest blows which have been given to the Church in this province, have been given by Churchmen. They have stabbed her to gratify their cupidity or their lust for power. You are disposed to laud the University, I suspect, merely because you are its Chancellor.—That a person of your high character, should accept an office which was rejected by one of our Judges, and which on account of the ill savor which a University so constituted sent all over the province, there was great difficulty in getting any respectable person to fill—surprises me not a little. Let us look for a few moments at the facts of the case. The University was once ours. We were asked to surrender our Charter, in order to make a few alterations to meet the popular prejudices,—we surrendered it—the alterations were made—the University went into operation, and worked well for years—then we were by an Act of the Legislature thrown suddenly out. Do you approve of this? It is impossible. You are too good a man to approve of such a base, such iniquitous legislation. There is such a thing as justice, there is such a thing as honour, and every man of justice and of honour, must look with indignation and scorn upon the authors of it. The Church was thrown out—for what? To make room for infidelity. Observe the language of the Preamble in the University Act—to enable it (the University) to accomplish its high purpose, it shall be entirely free in its government and discipline from all Denominational bias.—That is that there may be no diversity of opinion expressed upon any minor point of religion, there shall be no religion at all. “The Chancellor is not to be a Minister, Ecclesiastic, or Teacher, under, or according to, any form or profession of religious faith or worship, whatsoever.” He may be a Pagan, but he may not be a Christian teacher. “There shall be no Faculty of Divinity.” All the Professors may teach the nature of false religion, but they may not say a word upon the true. “No religious Teacher can be a Professor or member of the Senate.” The Professors and Senators may be Infidels, they may be profigates who shew contempt for any thing sacred, but they must not be Christian Teachers; lest by Christian virtues and Christian example, they injure the youth of the Province! The Senate are restricted from making any statutes, rules and ordinances repugnant to the laws or statutes of the Province, but there is no attempt to be made to put down irreligion or blasphemy. All the Professors were to remain till removed, but the Professors of Divinity—as it would seem from the vileness of his calling—must be kicked out at once.—God is not to be worshipped in the University. His name is not to be invoked, His authority never to be referred to, duties may be taught without any allusion to Revelation, opinions may be freely expressed on all subjects—but not a word of God, of the divine law or the accountability of any human being. Such is the character of the University of which you are Chancellor, and which you would have us members of the Church of England to sanction! Oh tempora O mores. I Sir tell you freely that believing as I do the Bible to be divinely inspired, and that I am to be guided by it in all my conduct, and in the education of my children amongst the rest—and much as I love literature and science—I would just as soon think of sending my daughter to a brothel to be taught some useful branches that some of its inmates might know, as I would send a son of mine to study at a University where all religion is excluded. In a University where God was worshipped, and where on all fitting occasions duty was enforced by motives drawn immediately from the Bible, I saw the difficulty of restraining the passions of the youths by whom I was surrounded—but how soon would such difficulty become insurmountable if the worship of God were discontinued and the Bible were to become a proscribed book! Not to teach the existence of God is to deny His existence, not to teach the obligation to keep His law is to annul it, not to speak of the world to come is to make it seem all a dream.

The Hon. Mr. Baldwin saw the indignation of the religious public wake up, and in order to soothe it down if possible, he passes an other act, to have affiliated Colleges. He, good man! at their own expense will allow each Denomination to have a Divinity Hall somewhere—not on the University grounds—but not ten miles off, and the privilege of conferring Degrees in Divinity. This is wonderfully kind of him! And because somewhere within ten miles, only not near enough to be heard by any of the youths of the University, praying and christian teaching are carried on—the University thereby becomes a religious institution!!! In this age of wonders are any telegraphic influences calculated upon which may connect the College with the University? There must be something of this sort as there is no other conceivable way in which otherwise Divinity Halls, most of them now probably—cottages built on sites away from the University grounds, where they may be had cheap can have any effect; I endeavour to be serious whilst I am writing, but I assure you Sir, it is with difficulty I can maintain my gravity whilst thinking of these Divinity Halls, and of their conferring Degrees. We have laughed at American Degrees, but how must we laugh at the idea of a Divinity Cabin, with one Professor and from ten to fifteen pupils issuing Degrees. You may say that the Methodists will have a respectable Hall as the Government is to buy Victoria College at a liberal sum.—I acknowledge it. But the very act of corruption will produce effects which Mr. Baldwin does not seem to have dreamt of. The Government may buy the leaders of the Methodists, and those of another Denomination or two, but unless we make equal advances of a pecuniary nature to all, the war-whop will be heard throughout the whole Province, and after the Methodists have the money with which they are to build in Toronto, they will be amongst the first to raise the cry in behalf of all Denominations from the greatest to the least. Expediency and necessity will compel them to this. A short time will shew that the attempt to conceal the hideous nature of