

audience, which was highly respectable, (the hall being well filled) he called upon A SHADR. Esq., to move the first resolution. That gentleman then moved,—

"That the report now read be received and adopted, and that it be published for circulation in the diocese."

A. GREER, Esq., seconded the motion, and was ably supported by the Rev. JOHN McLEAN, M. A.

The second resolution was brought forward, and moved by J. KEFFER, Esq., as follows:—

"That this meeting desires to express its humble thankfulness to Almighty God for the measure of success which has attended the efforts of the society the past year."

This was seconded by P. ROSS, Esq., and supported by the Rev. J. GUNNE.

L. LAWRIE, Esq., moved the third resolution: "That the very favorable report which has reached us of the increasing prosperity of the great religious societies in the parent country calls for the devout thankfulness of all the members of the Church throughout the world, and should stimulate us to emulate such a noble example."

H. JOHNSTON, Esq., seconded the resolution.

The Rev. E. SULLIVAN, A. B., in supporting the resolution, dwelt with much force on the usefulness of Christian societies for spreading the gospel, particularising and warmly applauding their labors.

Hos. G. J. GOONHUR then moved the fourth and last resolution:

"That when we consider the vast and increasing population of this Diocese, now containing nearly half a million souls, and the very inadequate provision made for their evangelization, we feel it to be the imperative duty of the members of the church to put forth all their energies to advance the interests of the church society."

The Rev. F. H. SANDYS, D. D., in seconding the motion, applied himself with force and energy, in suggesting proper means to carry out the spirit of the motion, and thus advance the interests of the society, enlarging the sphere of usefulness, and adding unto Christ's kingdom such as shall be saved.

We regret our inability to make room for the entire speeches which the audience were treated to, for want of space.

A collection was taken up, and the benediction having been pronounced by His Lordship the Bishop of Huron, the meeting dispersed shortly after ten o'clock.

Foreign Ecclesiastical Intelligence.

THE RUSSIAN CHURCH.

(Copied from the Scottish Ecclesiastical Gazette.)

We find the following in the *Observateur Catholique* of 1st inst. :—

Archpriest J. Wassilieff, chaplain of the Russian Embassy, requests us to give publicity in our pages to a letter which he has recently addressed to M. Jacquemet, Bishop of Nantes, in answer to some unjust attack made by this Bishop upon the Russian Church. We have the greater pleasure in admitting the letter of Archpriest J. Wassilieff that it is quite suitable as regards form, and that moreover, it discloses some particulars, which will interest our readers, concerning a Church very little known in France:

Paris, March 12, 1861.

Sir,—A Roman Catholic has just sent me the *mandament* which you published in your diocese for Lent this year. The honorable man who made this communication to me had no other end than self information in view; for he is a sincere friend of the truth; he wished to know whether

or not to believe the accusations which you have made against the Church of Russia. His confidence in your Episcopal authority is great; yet your assertion appeared so strange to him that he could not help hesitating and wishing to have clear and positive proof. In fact, your assertion tends neither more nor less than to deny to our Church all faith and all Christian independence. According to your account, this Church would be willing to sacrifice her faith to the will of a temporal Sovereign.

I would fain believe, my lord, that such an accusation had not come from your Episcopal chair; but your words are too plain to be misunderstood, for you say:—"We in the higher classes (in France) cannot imagine a mind so weak as to be able to reply as in Russia. 'If the Czar thinks proper to change my creed and alter my religion, I am at his service.' In France this would be contrary to nature. Now, thank God, we are Frenchmen, and always shall be."

If the public mind were at this level in our country, there would be but small honour for the French in supposing themselves superior to the Russians, and I find it hard to understand why you so explicitly boast of being a Frenchman *for ever*. But I must make to you, my lord, a graver remark upon your national pride. Does not St. Paul teach, you as well as me, that there are in God's sight neither Greeks nor barbarians, since all, without distinction of race, are called to be the children of God, to form but one and the same family in Jesus Christ? Do you think that you enforce this truly Christian teaching when you call national prejudices into play; when you incite your countrymen to despise a people who bear upon their foreheads the sacred sign of Christ; when you call upon them to imitate the hypocritical Pharisee who congratulated himself on *being not as other men?*

I respect the liberty of private judgment; but do you not think that *the truth* ought to be, with every Christian, the invariable rule of all private judgment?

This rule, my Lord, I am sorry to inform you, you have not respected.

Far be it from me to suppose that you have willingly trampled the truth under foot! The Church which I glory in belonging to has given me too high an idea of the Episcopate to allow me to believe that a man clothed with that sacred dignity, even in a different Church, could stoop to calumny. In case such calumny should be apparent, I should turn away my eyes, and, like Shem and Japheth, I should cast a veil over the nakedness of a father. I wish them to believe, my lord, that the error which you have committed is involuntary; I ought, however, to add that it is less excusable in a pastor than in laymen. That some journals should open their columns to such errors is not surprising; that they should persist, from party spirit, in maintaining them against proof to the contrary, does not astonish me; that the faithful, imbued with the statements made by these journals, should repeat, ignorantly what they have there learned, I can quite understand. But a Bishop! could any one imagine that he would blindly echo an error, propagated by those men who ought to receive instruction from him? Could any one suppose it above all when he speaks, by a mandament, and when, instead of expressing himself doubtfully, almost undecidedly, he takes the most positive and decided tone?

To justify your assertion, my lord, you will have to prove: either that our Church attributes to the Emperor of Russia a sort of infallibility in the decision of matters of faith; or else that, without admitting this infallibility, she is mean enough to consider herself obliged to obey blindly an authority which would teach error dogmatically.

On the first point, the doctrine of the Russian Church condemns you; on the second, her whole history arrays itself against you.

I will not do you the injustice to believe that you share a prejudice, too common in France, regarding the pretended popedom of the Emperor of Russia. You doubtless know the doctrine of the Russian Church on this point. I should not like to believe that your ecclesiastical studies are limited to the Romish Church, and that you have completely neglected to acquire any information concerning other Christian churches, for, in that case, your studies would have been more superficial than those of the simple priests of the Russian Church. With us, in truth, we are not satisfied with knowing the doctrine and the history of the Eastern Church; we also study the Romish Church according to its own memorials. Thus we can never commit a flagrant outrage by false accusation when we consider the questions which separate us from her. We know her doctrine; that is why we blame her on several points.

You must then, my lord know the doctrine of the Russian Church; you know consequently that she has remained faithful, with all the Eastern Church, of which she forms a part, to the primitive constitution of the Church Universal, a constitution which was respected by the Romish Church also during the first eight centuries; you know that she places doctrinal infallibility only in the Church, expressing herself by the body of her clergy and proving her faith *universal* and *permanent*; you know that she has always admitted the essential, fundamental distinction between the two powers; spiritual and temporal, that she has always 'rendered to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's'; you know that she only recognises one *Head* of the Church Universal, Jesus Christ, who governs her by his ministers, that is to say, by the Bishops with the assembly of the priests.

As for the Emperor, the Russian Church respects his power, which comes from God, like all power lawfully constituted; she obeys him in all temporal things, she enjoys his protection, but she does not acknowledge that he possesses any spiritual authority. The Russian Bishops, sole leaders of the flock committed to their charge, do not abuse their authority in order to engage in a struggle with the Emperor, whose faithful subjects they are; and the Emperor, a devoted and respectful son of the church, honors the spiritual authority of the Bishops without yielding up any of his prerogatives as head of the state. Perfect harmony is the result in Russia of the mutual respect which the two authorities have for each other, whereas, wherever the two powers are confounded in the person of one sovereign, we see only inevitable disorder and constant disturbances, unless the public mind has reached the last stage of degradation, the most absolute slavery.

Such must be, according to your mandament, my lord, the state of the public mind in Russia. You have undoubtedly mistaken the age and the country, in permitting such an assertion to come from your pen. You must have imagined that you were speaking of France under Charlemagne, who influenced so directly the change in the Nicene Creed: it has never been so in Russia; no Emperor has ever claimed the right to change the creed, or to regulate spiritual matters. You have then, at one blow, insulted a great Christian Church, and a good Emperor, a friend of France.

To justify your assertions, if you still do not take the better part, that of acknowledging your error, there remains to you but one resource, which is to pretend that the Emperor of Russia abuses his power to oppress the Church. But you must admit, at the same time, that the abuse