

almost every doctrine set forth in these formularies, has given rise to the case of the Bishop of Salisbury against Dr. Rowland Williams, upon which the judgment of the Court of Arches has not yet been pronounced.\* This case brings up many painful thoughts, when we consider that for several days the question was gravely discussed whether a clergyman of the Church of England may with impunity hold and teach, that the Bible is an expression of devout reason—that it is the written voice of the congregation—that the Church is as much inspired as the Bible—that certain parts of the Sacred Canon may be repudiated—that prophecy may be entirely denied—that the narratives of Scripture may be treated as myths—that the incarnation may be spiritualized—that a sinner is not justified for the merits of our Lord Jesus Christ by faith. In one word, that the entire system of doctrine set forth in our Book of Common Prayer may be called in question with impunity. Let us pray that wisdom from on high may be imparted to those who may be called to give the final judgment in this important suit; that as in the Gorham case, so also in this, we may have a clear decision from which there shall be no appeal, and that the doctrines of our Church concerning the inspiration of God's word, and concerning the justification of the sinner only for the merit of our Lord Jesus Christ by faith, may be vindicated, and that it may be made apparent to all that the Articles of our Church speak an intelligible language, and cannot be treated with contempt or explained away with impunity.

Since we were last similarly assembled, some important changes have been effected in the Church in Canada. The Diocese of Toronto has been divided, and another Diocese has been added to the four which previously existed in this Province. We have every reason to hope that the increase of the Episcopate will, in this instance, as in all similar cases, be attended with an increase in the zeal and energy of the members of our communion included within the

\* Since this charge was delivered, the judgment of Dr. Lushington, the Judge of the Court of Arches, has reached this country. We find that Dr. Williams has been condemned on the first six charges brought against him by the Bishop of Salisbury—that he is also condemned on the seventh, which is to be "reformed"—that the eighth charge was rejected with a strong censure contained in the following words: "For this reason, though I think Dr. Williams' opinion militates against one of the most important doctrines held by the most venerated divines of the Church, I cannot come to the conclusion that the Articles of religion or the Liturgy have in this respect been violated." The ninth charge is rejected on the same ground, but the teaching is pronounced by the learned Judge "very erroneous," but is "not deemed to come within the condemnation of the law." The tenth and eleventh charges are rejected on similar grounds. The twelfth charge is to be "reformed," but it is substantially admitted; it relates to the atonement, and the Judge thus expresses himself concerning it: "I think such declaration is inconsistent with and contrary to the thirty-first Article. The thirteenth charge was withdrawn. The fourteenth charge was rejected. The fifteenth charge, concerning justification by faith, is admitted as "wholly inconsistent with the 11th Article." The sixteenth charge was admitted; the 17th charge was rejected; and the Judge, in conclusion, thought it desirable to give leave to appeal to Her Majesty in Council." The judgment in the case of Fendall v. Wilson was delivered at the same time, it is in many respects similar to that in the case of Dr. Williams. Both these cases are now to be brought before the Privy Council. Never were more important issues submitted to this august tribunal. We wait with prayerful expectation the final judgment of this the highest Court in the realm.