

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

Coloured covers/  
Couverture de couleur

Coloured pages/  
Pages de couleur

Covers damaged/  
Couverture endommagée

Pages damaged/  
Pages endommagées

Covers restored and/or laminated/  
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée

Pages restored and/or laminated/  
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées

Cover title missing/  
Le titre de couverture manque

Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/  
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées

Coloured maps/  
Cartes géographiques en couleur

Pages detached/  
Pages détachées

Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/  
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)

Showthrough/  
Transparence

Coloured plates and/or illustrations/  
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur

Quality of print varies/  
Qualité inégale de l'impression

Bound with other material/  
Relié avec d'autres documents

Continuous pagination/  
Pagination continue

Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin/  
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la marge intérieure

Includes index(es)/  
Comprend un (des) index

Title on header taken from: /  
Le titre de l'en-tête provient:

Blank leaves added during restoration may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming/  
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées.

Title page of issue/  
Page de titre de la livraison

Caption of issue/  
Titre de départ de la livraison

Masthead/  
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

Additional comments: /  
Commentaires supplémentaires:

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below/  
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	14X	18X	22X	26X	30X
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12X	16X	20X	24X	28X	32X

# The Canadian Ecclesiastical Gazette

OR CHURCH REGISTER FOR THE DIOCESES OF QUEBEC, MONTREAL, TORONTO, HURON, AND ONTARIO.

VOLUME IX.

TORONTO, APRIL 15, 1862.

No. 8.

## Ecclesiastical Intelligence.

### DIOCESE OF TORONTO.

#### HOME DISTRICT CLERICAL ASSOCIATION.

*Lloydton, April 4, 1862.*

The next meeting of the above association will be held on Wednesday, the 30th day of April, 1862, at the Scarboro' parsonage (Rev. W. Belt's.)

Holy Communion at 10, a.m.  
Chapter for consideration—ii. and iii. Revelations.

Subject for Essay—The Diaconate.

H. B. OSLER,  
*Secretary.*

#### NIAGARA RURAL DEANERY.

The clergy of the Niagara Rural Deanery are reminded that the next meeting of the Clerical Association will take place (D.V.) at Drummondville, on Wednesday, May 7th. Those of the clergy who intend to be present on the occasion, are requested to intimate their intention to the incumbent, the Rev. J. Flood, one week previous to the day of meeting.

Litany and Holy Communion at 9, a.m.

Evening service with sermon, 7 p.m.

Chapter for consideration—1 Tim. v.

Subject—"Ordination of Deacons."

CHAS. LEYCESTER INGLES,

*Secretary.*

Drummondville, April, 1862.

#### Died

On the 2nd inst., of diphtheria, at the residence of her brother, the Rev. R. H. Harris, incumbent of Brock, Grace, youngest daughter of the late Mr. James W. Harris, of the city of Cork, Ireland, aged 18 years.

#### COLLECTIONS UP TO APRIL 13TH, 1862.

Collections appointed to be taken up in January, on behalf of the Mission Fund, received since 28th March.

Previously announced.....\$699.96

St. James' Carleton Place additional ... .. 1.25

Per Rev. E. H. M. Baker..... 2.60

St. Mark's, Barriefield.....\$ 2.60

St. James', Pittsburg..... 1.10

McLean's school house ..... 2.50

Per Rev. E. C. Bower..... 6.20

Christ's Church, Scarboro'..... 4.50

St. Paul's, do..... 3.25

St. Judes', do..... 2.50

Per Rev. W. Belt..... 10.25

St. John's, Bowmanville, per Rev. Dr. MacNab..... 11.09

St. George's, Toronto, per Rev. Dr. Fuller..... 44.29

Goulbourn..... 1.00

Huntley..... 1.66

Per Rev. J. Godfrey..... 2.65

Kemptville, per Rev. J. Harris..... 4.62

Drummondville, additional per-Rev. C. L. Ingles..... 0.50

St. Peter's, Innisfil..... 2.00

St. Paul's, "..... 1.75

Orange Hall, Essa..... 2.25

Thornton..... 1.25

Per Rev. E. Morgan..... 7.25

St. James's, Toronto, per churchwardens..... 72.00

Glenallan..... 1.25

Kells..... 1.37

Alma..... 1.50

Houstonville..... 0.75

Rothsay..... 0.75

Per Rev. G. Nesbitt..... 5.62

St. Paul's, Mount Forest (omitted in March)..... 5.00

Grace Church, Arthur..... 2.10

Trinity Church, North Arthur..... 1.00

Per Rev. S. Houston..... 8.10

Lamb's Pond..... 2.20

North Augusta..... 3.15

Per Rev. F. Tremayne..... 5.35

Fitzroy Harbour..... 1.75

Packenham..... 1.50

Fitzroy, 9th Line..... 0.75

Per Rev. J. A. Morris..... 4.00

159 collections, amounting to..... \$883.13

#### ADVENT SUNDAY COLLECTION.

St. James', Toronto, per churchwardens..... 50.00

#### STUDENTS' FUND.

St. Mark's, Carleton Place, per c'hw'dus..... 1.00

Weston, per Rev. W. A. Johnson..... 15.00

St. Paul's, Yorkville, per Rev. S. Givins..... 28.00

Rockwood, per churchwardens..... 1.68

Dickenson's Landing, per Rev. R. Garrett..... 3.50

5 collections, amounting to..... \$49 18

#### PAROCHIAL BRANCHES.

Niagara District on ac., per Rev. Dr. Fuller..... 391.66

St. James' Carleton Place, on ac... 19 70

St. John's, Lanark, on ac..... 10.00

Per Rev. E. H. M. Baker..... 29.70

Brampton, per Mrs. S. Green..... 31.88

Pickering, per Rev. G. B. Viner..... 40.00

St. Peter's, Credit,  $\frac{1}{2}$  of subscriptions..... 24.72

Gore and Wellington District..... 2200.00

#### ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Rev. R. Arnold..... 5.00

Rev. W. M. Ross..... 5.00

Rev. E. H. M. Baker..... 5.00

Rev. T. Creen..... 5.00

Rev. Thomas Taylor..... 10.00

Rev. P. S. Warren..... 5.00

Rev. G. A. Anderson, for 3 years..... 15.00

Rev. T. P. Hodge..... 5.00

J. Magrath, Esq..... 5.00

#### HOME DEANERY.

*Toronto, 14th April, 1862.*

The conference for defining the boundaries of the several parishes and missions in this deanery, will be resumed on Thursday, the 24th inst., immediately after the adjournment of the preliminary meeting of the District Branch of the Church Society.

Those clergy and churchwardens of those parishes which have not yet reported what church property may belong to them, are respectfully requested to produce the titles, that they may be examined and recorded.

#### SALTERN GIVINS,

*Rural Dean, H. D.*

#### SIMCOE BRANCH OF CHURCH SOCIETY.

The Annual Meeting of the County of Simcoe Branch of Church Society will be held (D.V.) at the Parochial School House, Barrie, on Thursday, 24th April, 1862; when the report will be adopted, the officers for the year chosen, and any other business transacted which may be brought forward by any of the members. It is most to be desired that there may be a full meeting, both of the clergy and laity.

T. BOLTON READ,  
*Secretary*

### DIOCESE OF HURON.

#### PARIS AND BURFORD CONFIRMATIONS.

*To the Editor of the Ecclesiastical Gazette.*

DEAR SIR,

As you frequently complain of the want of parochial details, I send you a brief notice of the recent confirmations in Paris and Burford, on Wednesday and Thursday last.

The two years previous to my going home, there were confirmed respectively 17 and 30, and last Wednesday 23. It has been my happiness to have a considerable portion of those confirmed become communicants; and I trust that these last will prove no exception, many of them have been for years members of my Bible class, and nearly the whole under my special instruction for many weeks past, seeing nearly each one also alone in earnest personal conversation and prayer. Let me direct the attention of such of my clerical brethren as have not seen it, to an admirable and thorough tract, "Aid to Preparation for Confirmation," being the heads of a series of lectures, chiefly scripture references, by the Lord

Bishop of New Zealand, and Canon Selwyn, No. 587 of the S. P. C. K.'s catalogue.

On Wednesday not one of my candidates were absent, and displayed a deep seriousness of deportment; the congregation was good, the offertory collection was fair, and the sermon and address of the Lord Bishop of Huron earnest and practical. Altogether, myself and people I trust felt that we ought to be thankful and of good courage. The Rev. J. Padfield and myself read the service.

At Burlington, also, where I was present, the service was gratifying, the church full, the candidates, so in number, were very many of them adults. The prayers, &c., were read by myself, and the Rev. W. Clotworthy.

The Church Society subscriptions, for the financial year just closing, are about \$70, which, under all the circumstances of depressions both ecclesiastical and secular, to which we have been subjected, is, I think, an amount that calls for gratitude; especially seeing the disgracefully small average of christian offerings in this country generally.

Faithfully yours,

A. T.

Paris, 6th April, 1862.

N.B.—One or two incidents connected with the Paris confirmation are perhaps worthy of special note, as teaching us not to despise the day of small things. I have for years had a fortnight Sunday afternoon service at our station, 1 1/4 miles from the church. The congregation being often very small, and it being a third service for me, I have often thought of giving it up, and yet two of my most promising candidates, a very respectable man and his wife, connected with the railway, but who, from circumstances, could scarcely ever get to the church. They were strictly correct, but connected with no religious body, though of Methodist professions, but their religious earnestness has been for some time on the increase, and now I trust and believe they will go on to know the Lord fully. So far as I may venture to judge, had this poor little service been abandoned, even on my return from England (as it was during my absence) the result in the case of Mr. and Mrs. — had been quite different.

The other case to which I allude is this: several months ago, I was called late in the evening to go and visit a farmer's wife, supposed to be dying, some miles from Paris. They are a family, I regret to say, making no religious profession of any sort, though I was pleased with the deportment of the mother and daughter, but also, the woe of our country is upon them, they are far from a place of worship, and the father, though well-to-do, is too intemperate and godless to send them to church. Well, here I met with an interesting young woman, who was visiting the family in their distress, she was the daughter of Irish and English parents, her father teaching a school near; I subsequently visited them, the result being the father took sittings in our church, here, is seldom absent, though he has to walk some three or four miles, is a constant communicant, and his daughter, after satisfactory examination, was confirmed last Wednesday. What may be the result of my visits to the family I was fetched to see, remains to be proved, but under the kind providence of "Our Father" my apparently accidental visit to those who were also aliens, not one amongst them being baptized, until I baptized the mother, was the means of bringing home those lost-strayed sheep to the dear fold of Christ.

A. T.

## DIocese OF ONTARIO.

ADDRESS OF HIS LORDSHIP THE BISHOP OF ONTARIO TO THE SYNOD OF THE DIocese, APRIL 9th, 1862.

My REVEREND BRETHREN AND BRETHREN OF THE LAITY—

I meet you to-day, grateful to Almighty God, for His goodness in enabling me to congratulate you on the completion of the work by which a new See and Diocese are constituted in this Province. A vexatious delay occurred in the issue of the Royal Letters Patent; a delay which has been of great injury to the Diocese, but one, which it is to be hoped will never occur again; as His Grace the Duke of Newcastle informs me, that he has taken measures by which the necessary formalities will for the future be abridged, and expresses regret for the inconvenience imposed upon this Diocese.

To-day, then, we meet together as an independent Diocese, to review the past and deliberate for the future; and may the Holy Spirit direct and prosper all our consultations, so that peace and happiness, truth and justice, religion and piety, may attend the efforts of the first Synod of the Diocese of Ontario.

Since we met together last June, the church in this Diocese has suffered a severe loss, in the death of one of the ablest and most respected members of the Synod. The melancholy death of Mr. David Ford has deprived me of a steady friend, the church of a consistent member, the Synod of a sound counsellor, and society of a good example. He was a member of the church not for appearance or fashion's sake. He had investigated her claims, and respected them, accurately. The duties he owed her he performed with punctilious care, devotional without hypocrisy, charitable without ostentation, and to the church faithful without bigotry. In him were conspicuous the graces of the christian gentleman, and affection for his memory prompts this tribute of esteem from his old pastor, in the presence of that Synod of which I had hoped God would have spared him to prove a valued member.

It may have occurred to you, my brethren, that this Synod would have been summoned with more propriety after the Easter vestry meetings, now so near, but I felt that no time should be lost in applying to the Legislature for some Act of Incorporation. The emergency indeed appeared to some members of the church in this city so pressing that they framed a petition to Parliament, requesting an Act of Incorporation for a Church Society of the Diocese of Ontario. I was not consulted as to the propriety of framing such a petition, but I was asked for my signature. This I refused to give, inasmuch as I think just cause of complaint would have been afforded to the Diocese were a few incorporated members of the Toronto Church Society to act in behalf of this Diocese. Indeed, I should have thought myself guilty of great presumption, and a disposition to carry measures with a high hand were I on my own responsibility to impose on the Diocese any species of incorporated society, without first calling a public meeting of churchmen, or advising with you, the true ecclesiastical legislature. What, therefore, I in my capacity of Bishop hesitated to do, I could not think of allowing private members of the church to succeed in effecting, as my aim has been to take no steps myself towards organizing an incorporated society without obtaining your sanction and support. It now becomes my duty to consult with the Synod as to the best course to adopt in applying to the legislature for corporate powers. Two modes of proceeding suggest themselves. First, to apply for an act of incorporation,

for a church society for this Diocese, similar to that possessed by other Dioceses. Notices did appear in the newspapers indicating that application would be made for such act of incorporation, and by whomsoever inserted, (and with whatever good motive,) they were not authorised by me. In fact I have grave doubts as to the expediency of our having such a society. Bearing in mind that our church is and must continue for generations to be a missionary church, and that therefore all our legislation must be made subservient to the great object of establishing a mission fund, and recommending the same to the 81,000 church members of the Diocese in the way most likely to prove popular and effective—with this in view, I think it a very serious question whether we should or should not deviate from the plan hitherto adopted in Canada of leaving to a church society the control and management of our missionary funds. It will scarcely be denied that such organizations as church societies would never have been thought of had the church possessed synodical rights from the beginning, in this province. It was the total absence of any machinery by means of which she could hold and manage her property in a satisfactory manner, that of necessity prompted the idea of a church society, which in some degree filled up a blank in our system, and has accomplished a considerable amount of good. But under our present circumstances the Synod seems to me perfectly competent to perform all the executive functions demanded of us, and needs no supplementary agent such as a church society. The question has been often asked, and I think answered satisfactorily, What, after a time, will be the functions of the Synod? When organization shall be complete and canons enacted, if the Synod do not manage the funds and temporalities of the church what will be its special province? If the church society takes the temporalities of the church into its care and the provincial synod regulate all the important church movements of a spiritual character, there is little left for the diocesan synod to perform. These views pressed upon me so strongly that two years ago I seconded a motion in the Toronto Synod, which was moved by the Rev. Dr. Patton, "That a petition be presented to the Provincial Parliament for an act of incorporation of the synod." An amendment was moved, "That the resolution be referred to a committee to consider whether such measures cannot be adopted under the constitutions of the synod and of the church society as shall provide for the harmonious working of the two bodies without the necessity of an appeal to the legislature, and if such measures cannot be adopted, then to apply for an act of incorporation if they shall deem it advisable." Under the special circumstances of the then Diocese, I did not think it prudent to press the motion. I was aware that, if the Synod obtained corporate powers, the church society would gradually become of less and less importance, and finally sink into insignificance, while I also felt that many in that Diocese were attached to an old institution, and timid as to change. Accordingly, the motion was withdrawn, and the amendment carried, the result of which is the present amalgamation of the two bodies by making members of the synod members of the church society also, during their year of office, on the payment of one dollar per annum—a privilege, however, of which few delegates have availed themselves.

Our position, however, is totally different. We are here to-day to organize *de novo*. We have no artificial obstacles nor real difficulties such as the existence of a long established society, presented in the Diocese of Toronto. I feel, therefore, great responsibility, but at the same time a strong per-

suaſion that I ought to lay before you ſome reaſons why it ſeems adviſable that we ſhould apply to the legiſlature for an act, conferring on this Synod all the corporate rights and privileges poſſeſſed by any church ſociety incorporated in this province. And firſt, I would remind you that from the time ſynods were firſt contemplated, their incorporation was anticipated alſo. In the indentures made between the Church Society of the Diocèſe of Toronto, and the clergy who commuted their ſalaries in February, 1855, a clause was inſerted to the following effect.—“And in the event of the Synod of the ſaid diocèſe being legally inveſted with corporate powers, ſo as to be able to carry out the truſts aforeſaid, the church ſociety ſhall and will transfer and aſſign the ſaid commutation money, and any ſecurities in which the ſame may be inveſted, and all intereſt and proceeds then unappropriated ariſing therefrom, to the ſaid Synod, by whatever corporate name called, upon the ſame truſt and intereſt.” Hence it appears that the church ſociety and the commuting clergy conſidered it more ſatisfactory to all concerned, that proviſion ſhould be made (in caſe of the Synod receiving corporate powers) that ſo large an amount of money as the commutation fund ſhould be held and managed by the church through her repreſentatives in Synod, rather than by the church ſociety. Again, the expediency of the Synod managing the property of the church is acknowledged and the right to do ſo conferred by the ſtatute “enabling the church to meet in Synod,” which gives this Synod a *quasi* incorporation. It is enacted as follows:—“The biſhop, clergy, and laity members of the United Church of England and Ireland in this province may meet in their ſeveral diocèſes, which are now or hereafter may be conſtituted in this province, and in ſuch manner and by ſuch proceedings as they ſhall adopt, frame conſtitutions and make regulations for enforcing diſcipline, &c., “and for the convenient and orderly management of the property, affairs, and intereſts, of the church.” Thus you perceive that, my ſuggeſtion is one which has not been ſuddenly ſtarted, but that, on the contrary, the idea of incorporating the Synod was from the firſt contemplated.

I now proceed to give my reaſons for ſuggeſting that we ſhould apply for an act incorporating the Synod of the Diocèſe of Ontario. In the firſt place, we require ſtrong arguments to prove the utility of two organizations, when, to all appearance, one ſeems altogether ſufficient. There might be plauſibility in maintaining the utility of the diocèſe having two bodies working in different ways for the good of the church, if the two bodies had different fields of labour or were independent of each other. But a church ſociety cannot for the future be independent. It muſt obey the canons and yield to the expreſſed wiſhes of this Synod, for ſhould it diſobey, it would loſe the confidence of the church, and receive no contributions. Simplicity, therefore, will be gained and expenſe ſaved, by the employment of one well appointed and general machinery. In the ſecond place, it muſt be remembered that a church ſociety is a cloſe corporation, not a repreſentative body. It ſeems quite unreaſonable that all the funds of the church, including the commutation fund, which in our diocèſe will probably amount to \$300,000, ſhall be controlled and managed by a corporation which does not fully repreſent the church; the members need not be communicants, their only qualification being election by ballot, and the payment of \$5 per annum. But the Synod is a faithful and liberal repreſentation of the 81,000 lay members, and includes all the licensed clergy. A church ſociety, however uſeful in paſt times, and for

certain purpoſes, can lay no claim to be a repreſentative of the whole church, while the miſfortune is, that the church ſuffers by any failure of a church ſociety to answer public expectations. It is unreaſonably ſuppoſed that the receipts of the ſociety are the receipts of the church, becauſe in the opinion of the public, the church ſociety and the church are thought to be identical, an error which might perhaps have been avoided, had the name of the church *and* ſociety been originally adopted. In the third place, I am afraid to confeſs that the church ſociety has not answered reaſonable expectation in this portion of the former Diocèſe of Toronto. The ſociety, from whatever cauſe ariſing, is not popular in the Diocèſe of Ontario. In many pariſhes the very name of church ſociety is ſuppreſſed, and the annual parochial meetings are called miſſionary meetings. When we take into account the numbers, wealth, and intelligence, of the churchmen of the diocèſe, the ſmallneſs of the means contributed to meet the requirements of the ſociety, is unaccountable and diſheartening. It is agreed that this diſinclination to contribute has ariſen from diſcontent with the tendency of ſuch ſocieties to centralization, by means of which all management reſted with a few perſons in Toronto. If this be the cauſe of failure, then I fear the ſame reſult in the Diocèſe of Ontario. Similar jealousy of centralization in Kiſington will ariſe for the ſame reaſon on the part of diſtant miſſions on the Ottawa. But I cannot altogether attribute the unwillingneſs to contribute to the ſociety to centralization. It is eaſy to find pretexts for non-performance of duty, and church ſociety meetings largely partake of ſuch ingredients. Churchmen in Toronto cannot plead centralization as an excuſe, and yet out of the ſeven pariſhes in that city four appear, from the laſt report, as having remitted nothing from their parochial branches, one of them being the cathedral pariſh, probably the largeſt and wealthyeſt in Britiſh America. Again, the city of Kiſington could not have dreaded centralization, as funds ſubſcribed this winter were to be expended in ſalaries to miſſionaries in this diocèſe, and nothing more can be expected from the ſeveral parochial branches for another year, and yet the whole amount paid by the three congregations in this city amounts only to £76, of which £18 was contributed by the clergy. From theſe facts, I argue the unpopularity of a church ſociety.

Now, the vaſt miſſionary work before us cannot be done unleſs the whole church works as a unit. It is too ſolemn in its greatneſs to be thrown by us on the precarious charity of iſolated pariſhes, or allowed to be dependent on the popularity or unpopularity of a ſociety. The church expects every pariſh to do its duty. We need, then, an organization which muſt command the moral ſupport of every *bona fide* church member. The by-laws of a ſociety bind its members, and its members only, the canons of the Synod bind every church member. Rules directing the miſſionary work of the diocèſe which ſhall be enacted by the three branches of our Eccleſiaſtical Legiſlature, the biſhop, clergy, and the repreſentatives of our 81,000 members, challenge the obedience of every loyal adherent of the Church of England and Ireland. Any ſystem of miſſionary effort ſolemnly ratified in Synod, is co-extenſive with the whole church. No clergyman, nor layman, under ordinary circumſtances, can eſcape the reſponſibility of diſobeying Synodical law. I need not ſay how different an aſpect our organization will aſſume in the eyes of the diocèſe if we entruſt our miſſionary work, which is our very life, to a voluntary aſſociation *within the church, but itſelf not the church*. If, on the other hand, our Synod be itſelf our church ſociety, and

elect a miſſion board, and frame by-laws for its efficient working, thoſe by-laws become binding *in foro conſcientiæ*, and any pariſh which, without good reaſon, ſhall neglect to carry out the ſpirit of the church rules here enacted, will be liable, through its clergyman and lay delegates, to be interrogated as to the cauſe of its neglect at every ſeſſion of the Synod.

The only objection of any apparant force which has ſtruck me as capable of being urged againſt the incorporation of Synod, is the probability that very many worthy members of the church who would wiſh to have ſomething to do with the adminiſtration of her affairs, will be unable to do ſo, election to the Synod not being poſſible to all who would or could qualify themſelves for incorporated membership of a ſociety by the payment of \$5 per annum. To this I reply that the Church Society of the Diocèſe of Toronto, is, by its laws, prevented from having more than 300 incorporated members in addition to thoſe names mentioned in its charter, and I believe that at no period of its exiſtence has the ſociety had its permitted number of members duly qualified by the payment of their ſubſcriptions. But at the preſent moment this Synod is compoſed of fifty-ſix clergymen, and the lay delegates of 60 pariſhes, thus giving a total of 206 incorporated members ſhould the Synod be incorporated, while the probable increaſe in the number of our pariſhes will in a few years give us a liſt of incorporated members greater than that of any church ſociety in the province, with a further advantage, that theſe members will not be taken from any particular localities, but fairly diſtributed over the diocèſe.

I ſhall now recapitulate the advantages derivable, in my opinion, from an incorporated Synod. Firſt—A church ſociety will be quite unneceſſary, and thus ſimplicity will be gained in the adminiſtration of the church's temporalities, and a ſaving of expenſe will be effected in the ſalaries of ſecretaries and in printing. Secondly—The Synod, if incorporated, can manage the funds of the church as was contemplated by the Synod Act and the indentures made between the church ſociety and the clergy, but if unincorporated, a church ſociety muſt manage the funds of the church, while the Provincial Synod will probably legiſlate for its moſt important ſpiritual intereſts, and thus little or nothing of practical utility be left for the Diocèſan Synod to perform. Thirdly—The miſſionary efforts of the church will not be left to a voluntary aſſociation, but will emanate from the church herſelf, which, as a ſociety, is in Synod fully repreſented. Fourthly—The commutation fund is too large a ſum of money to be intruſted to a ſociety of church members not neceſſarily communicants, but it will be paid over to Synod if incorporated. Fifthly—A church ſociety has not hitherto ſucceeded in winning its way into the affections of the clergy or people ſo effectually as to warrant us in eſtabliſhing one without urgent cauſe, while there is a ſtrong probability that both clergy and laity will feel bound to co-operate with any ſystem of miſſions authoriſed by the Synod. Sixthly—All excuſes for withholding aid from a miſſion board conſtituted by Synod, on the ſcore of centralization, will be avoided, as all pariſhes will be equally repreſented in the Synod. For theſe reaſons, I venture to recommend that we petition parliament for an act of incorporation ſimilar to that given to any church ſociety heretofore in this Province, and that a committee be appointed to draw up ſuch a bill as we require, and that the members of the Synod who are alſo members of the legiſlature, be requeſted to procure its ſpeedy enactment.

Supposing such an act to be obtained, rules regulating the details may be framed differing very little from those which regulate the church society. As the standing committee of the church society is the mission board, so the executive committee of Synod can perform the same function. This committee, hitherto nominated by the bishop, I would suggest should consist of twenty-four members—eight clerical members to be elected by the clergy, eight lay members to be elected by the laity, and eight to be nominated by the bishop—the dignitaries of the diocese being ex officio members. As the clergyman and churchwardens form a parochial committee under the church society's rules, so the clergy and lay delegates may form a parochial committee under an Incorporated Synod. Rules admitting associated members and requiring parochial meetings and reports may still be maintained, and an annual report be published by the secretary embodying the parochial statistical returns; and when the Synod meets for the purpose of legislation, the great annual public meeting may be held when the whole church is present by her representatives, and the cause of missions be especially advocated. As the Synod meets ordinarily but once a year, a greater discretionary power must of course be allowed to the mission board than is conceded by a church society which meets quarterly; but should necessity require it, the Synod may be called together twice a year. This, however, is not a matter of much consequence, as the Synod can lay down by-laws for the direction of the board and require a careful and elaborate report at each session. Sub-committees of the mission board, or independent committees of Synod, may be elected to administer any special funds or trusts of the church, such as widows' and orphans' fund, divinity students' fund, and the book and tract fund.

These details I merely throw out as suggestions, and to show that the incorporation of Synod will not change our aims nor our usual mode of business, but will give point to those aims and vigour to that business, rendering the work in hand more popular by making it more directly emanation from the church itself. I disclaim all intention of dictation to the Synod, as whatever may be your decision I shall energetically strive to carry it out most effectively. Accordingly I now leave the matter in your hands, feeling that I have conscientiously endeavoured to arrive at a right conclusion and relieved myself from responsibility by plainly expressing my convictions.

#### TRINITY COLLEGE.

My regret is exceedingly great that I feel bound to address you on a subject most embarrassing and painful to myself, but a sense of duty forbids my evading it. I mean the controversy that has arisen regarding Trinity College. I should gladly have avoided the topic did I not know that the interests of our Church University are of paramount importance, and that the members of the church have a right to look to their Bishop for such explanation as may satisfy their consciences, and calm their alarm. There is indeed something melancholy in reflecting on the fatuity oftentimes of the best intentioned endeavours to do permanent good. Troubles arise when we least expect them, and certainly when Trinity College was established amid the congratulations and thanksgivings of churchmen, it was scarcely anticipated that within a few years a severe blow should be aimed at the institution by churchmen themselves, who would strive to damage its character by arousing party spirit against its teaching. The Venerable Prelate to whom we owe the existence of Trinity College is entitled to our prayerful sympathy on this to him severe trial, but they who know him best will feel

assured that he will bear the blow with his usual undaunted firmness, and continue to devote his great abilities to remedying the evil that has befallen our University. Not Trinity College alone, but the whole church, has been affected by the recent agitation; never has a church enjoyed greater internal harmony than the church in Canada hitherto. Nothing marred the peaceful and happy intercourse of the great body of the clergy. Differences of opinion existed, but they were not boastfully obtruded, much less made a ground of offence. Men imbued with very different views regarding predestination have ever been in the church for 1400 years, and the Canadian branch contained its share of such men, but no practical difficulty had arisen. Indeed there is no reason why trouble on this score should ever arise. Calvinism or anti-Calvinism can certainly be always detected in their respective adherents; they tinge more or less men's feelings, and sermons and tastes. But Calvinism is itself essentially impractical. The most rigid Calvinist will admit that though you believe in the fact that God has unalterably fixed your destiny from all eternity, yet it should not affect your conduct a whit; you are to demean yourself as though God had not done so; you are to "work out your own salvation in fear and trembling," as though this predestination were unknown or untrue. Hence a doctrine which leads to so little practical consequence may be held without causing offence. But alas! the less the practical difference, the greater the warmth in maintaining it, a warmth which has long existed in the church, but which through God's grace has been kept from developing itself into strife till the late attack on Trinity College, which has been denounced as a dangerous institution, in my candid opinion, ostensibly on the ground of its having a tendency towards Rome, but really because it has not a tendency towards Geneva. The attack on Trinity College is an outbreak of that party spirit which has affected the church since the time when Augustine gave to the world his daring speculations on God's predestination. In his old age when renouncing the Manichean heresy of his younger days, he propounded those stern doctrines which have since been welcomed by gloomy and ascetic minds, but which were unknown to the early Christians, and have never been received by the Church in the East. The great schoolmen of the Roman Church in pre-reformation times with great subtlety and didactical skill defended the tenets of Augustine, but the laity scarcely knew of the existence of such a belief, and at all events never acknowledged the necessity of acquiescence in it. What Augustine was to the clergy, Calvin became to the laity. He seemed to glory in startling the world in the dogmatic way in which he asserted the doctrines of predestined damnation and salvation, and by his powerful genius founded the reformation of France and Switzerland on this basis. The daring courage which knew no hesitation or difficulty captivated the imaginations of multitudes who viewed with wonder and accepted with joy the lucubrations of a man who seemed to have been admitted within the penetralia of God's providence, and who gave the result of his revelations with the authority of a confidant of heaven. His influence reached Britain, and his views though borrowed from Rome's greatest doctors, were eagerly adopted by Rome's most violent opponents, the Puritans, who were perhaps led to this strange alliance from consideration of the fact that the doctors of this school advocated the supremacy of the civil magistrate in civil affairs. The English Church however, reforming herself on the great principle of an appeal to God's word and a return to the practices of the first three centuries, rightly and naturally refused to adopt as a part of her creed

those subtleties which were never received by the eastern church, and only partially and recently by the western. From that day to this efforts have been constantly made to represent the Church of England as committed to a belief in Calvin's "horrible decree," but in vain. While history remains, the reader will be informed of the exertions made in this direction, even to the attempt to force on our church the Lambeth articles—a tacit acknowledgment that our articles do not go far enough to please Calvinists. During the commonwealth and the suppression of the church as established, Calvinism reached its highest stage of development, and after the restoration continued to exercise a remarkable influence on our church. During the 18th century, that dark age of the reformed Church of England, the harvest, the seed of which had been so widely sown, was reaped. The habit of viewing our salvation, as the predetermined decree of God the Father who elected a fixed and unalterable number from all eternity, by degrees drew men away from considering in its due significance the work of God the Son. The tendency in the human mind to disparage part of a system in proportion as it unduly magnifies another part, developed itself. As compared with God the Father's election of men to salvation irrespective of anything but his own arbitrary decree, the work of God the Son appeared of second rate importance, and gradually receded from view, till the result appeared in that widely spread Arianism and open Socinianism which disgraced the church in the last century. A reaction schism—Wesleyan Methodism—arose and served as a protest against Calvinism; attention was roused to examine what was till then lightly esteemed.—The Prayer Book of the English Church. Even Wesley commenced his religious life by an effort to illustrate the principles and practices of that book. The church roused herself to love and to good works. While no attempt was made to exclude any from the church on account of their Calvinism, it was agreed that all might work together for the good of Christ's church, especially as the prevalent views concerning God's decrees were admittedly not to influence action; we were to act as though God had not so decreed the number of the saved or damned, a strong proof one would imagine of the improbability of the doctrine. God does nothing in vain.

From this rapid review of the debate in the church respecting the subtleties advanced by Calvin, we detect the reason why the church framed its 17th article for the special purpose "of avoiding diversity of opinions," and was so far successful at the time that His Majesty's declaration informs us that "even in those curious points in which the present difficulties lie, men of all sorts take the articles of the church of England to be for them." While this is the case, and while we can all use the language of the Liturgy respecting our redemption by Christ, who made upon the cross, "by His own oblation of Himself once offered, a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world." So long as we can subscribe to the language of the 2nd article, that Christ suffered "to be a sacrifice not only for original guilt, but also for all original sins of men;" so long as we all believe that Christ Jesus "came into the world to save sinners," and that the word sinners is co-extensive with all human beings, so long as we are all persuaded of these truths and use the same formulae, it would seem that this well-meant and comprehensive system of the English Church should secure no members from being charged by each other with holding dangerous doctrines regarding election. Human nature, however, is not altered. Nothing



is more wonderful than our slowness in learning toleration. A comparison of our church with the reformed continental churches will show that ours is the only protestant reformed church that has made any way since the reformation. When Luther died the reformation had gained an ascendancy in Europe, to which it has never reached since. The reformed principles of England's Church, though sometimes under a cloud, have never retrograded, and to-day they stand more exalted than ever. May not this, under God, be attributable to the wise comprehension that distinguishes her? A great church cannot have narrow tests. A happy characteristic of our church is the slight interference with the private opinions of her members, and however varied may be those opinions, it is consolatory to know that men are never so good or so bad as their opinions. "Who can doubt it?" says John Wesley, "while there are Calvinists in the world, assertors of absolute predestination? For who will dare to affirm that none of these are truly religious men? Not only many of them in the last century were burning and shining lights, but many of them are now real christians, loving God and all mankind. And yet what are all the absurd opinions of all the Romanists in the world compared to that one, that the God of love, the wise, just, merciful father of the spirits of the blest, has from all eternity fixed an absolute, unchangeable, irresistible decree that part of mankind shall be saved, do what they will, and the rest damned, do what they can." Our great business is clearly to refute, instead of attempting the useless task of frowning down opinions probably absurd but certainly harmless, neither interfering with the daily duties of life, nor preventing the holders of them from conscientiously using our formularies. The most we are entitled to expect from the vaunted enlightenment of the times, is "to think and let think," for it is vain to hope that we shall obliterate opinions which divided the Latin doctors for 1000 years after Augustine—which drove Luther to write his violent book on free will, concerning which the divines of the council of Trent wrangled in vain, and the Synod of Dort enacted its useless anathemas, in short, opinions which divide two great protestant denominations—Methodists and Presbyterians.

Now, the teaching of Trinity College has not been Calvinistical. Hence I believe the denunciation of its theology. No pains are taken to bias the students in favour of the doctrines of absolute decrees, nor do the lectures probably tend to repress a love of didactical subtleties regarding free will and reprobation. Because of this absence of Calvinistic theories the College is charged with a tendency towards Romish error, though as we have seen, a belief in predestination to life or eternal death, is quite compatible with communion with the Church of Rome. That the specific charges of dangerous teaching, which are urged, are not the real cause of the attack, appears from the facts stated in the last charge of the Lord Bishop of Toronto, namely, that Trinity College was opposed by some through the whole of its progress before any Professors were appointed, and from the fact that the charges themselves are so wretchedly unsupported by good evidence. From the readiness and easy way in which the controversy glided into its natural channel, namely, a debate on the subject of Calvinistical Churchmanship, I infer that there must have been a foregone conclusion against the College, and a determination to urge at once objections that seem doubtful rather than wait for the chance of more substantial ones hereafter.

I shall not refer to the mode in which the agitation was first set in motion before an oppor-

tunity was offered to the Council of redressing any supposed wrongs or remedying any alleged false teaching. I had the honour of being a member of the Council of Trinity College, and to my utter amazement the first intimation I had of anything having been laid to the charge of the College was information gleaned from "the Globe" newspaper. On this grievous treatment I shall not dwell, but proceed to give you my reasons for having expressed, by my vote in the Synod of Toronto Diocese, my confidence in the teaching given in the College. It was my good fortune to have had personal intercourse with many of the Graduates of Trinity College, and I naturally inferred that if the teaching of the College had been so dangerous, some traces of the danger incurred and the errors embraced would be visible. But I found those men by no means imbued with extreme views, and remarkable for sober mindedness and the avoidance of all novelties in religion. This inconsistency with the charges against the Professors who had instructed them, I of course remarked, and judging of the tree by its fruit, I required strong evidence before I condemned the Provost. Another consideration which held me back from giving too ready credence to the charges laid against the Provost was the fact that all the Divinity students who applied for Holy Orders were examined and approved by the Rev. H. Grasett, a gentleman of views I believe identical with those held by the opponents of Trinity College. I never could for a moment endure the supposition (which was the only alternative) that the examining Chaplain was dissatisfied with his candidates for Holy Orders, and yet presented them at the most solemn occasion of their lives, as "apt and meet for their learning and Godly conversation to exercise the office of Priest duly to the honour of God and the edification of His Church." The supposition is so odious that my apology for alluding to it is the fact that the Rev. Mr. Grasett being examining Chaplain, inspired me with confidence that extreme views in a Romish direction were not apparent in the Divinity Students, and this helped to make me suspicious of the truth of the charges against the Divinity Professor. It became my duty, however, to examine into the evidence itself, and to my surprise and sorrow I find that it is made up of second-hand extracts supplied from an Apocryphal Catechism by anonymous and disaffected students. Here I would observe that when such grave charges were laid against the Provost, the proper course to adopt would have been to present him for unsound teaching in the Bishop's Court, or to have transferred the case by letters of request to the Court of the Metropolitan. We should then have had the names of the witnesses, who would be examined on oath: we should have been able to satisfy ourselves of their integrity and the animus of their opposition to the College; we should have seen whether their witnesses agreed together or whether they could not be contradicted by others, who, forming as they do the great majority of former Divinity Students, have come before the public in a more manly way and over their signatures denied the truth of the charges against the institution. I therefore acted wholly in a spirit of fairness which will ever prevent my considering a man guilty till he be proved so. I went to the meeting of the Council of Trinity College, held last February, for the purpose of taking the whole question into consideration, with my mind made up to no course but that of trying a fair and critical investigation into the charges against Provost Whitaker. The Lord Bishop of Huron moved a resolution which in my mind would have had the effect of condemning the Provost unlearned. The Chief Justice of Upper Canada moved in amendment to the effect that

we refrain from condemning the Provost, till we had the charges in writing. I seconded the amendment, which was carried by the votes of all the members of the Council except the members from Huron Diocese and that of the Rev. Mr. Grasett. During the conversation that ensued on the motion before the Council the Lord Bishop of Huron openly and manfully declared that he did not charge the Provost with having taught any thing heretical nor anything contrary to the doctrines of the United Church of England and Ireland, but he did charge him with teaching doctrines dangerous in the extreme. On this admission, the council felt more than ever convinced of the propriety of acting with great caution, and refraining from condemning the Provost without formal trial. It was finally arranged that the charges against the Provost should be put in writing, and submitted to him for inspection and reply, and the feeling of the council which I share, is in favour of submitting both charge and reply to the Metropolitan of Canada, who should associate with himself the Bishops of British North America, exclusive of Upper Canada, and that the decision of these arbitrators be final. I regret to say that the proposal to submit the question to such arbitration was not favourably received by the members from the Huron Diocese, who refused to abide by such an award. This seems to me the more unreasonable, because the Lord Bishop of Huron once proposed to submit the whole case to the Bishop of Rupert's Land for his decision, and also because the council of Trinity College, composed largely of laymen, would naturally feel incompetent to decide so nice and intricate a point as would be involved in the examination into doctrines dangerous in the extreme, yet not heretical nor contrary to the doctrines of the Church of England.

I have now laid before you the state in which this unfortunate agitation rests, and assure this Synod that I shall watch over the teaching of Trinity College and its other interests as carefully and impartially as is possible. I was brought up in a theological school which gave no uncertain sound regarding Romanism, yet I was not taught the theory of churchmanship exclusively Calvinistical; on the contrary, in Trinity College, Dublin, one of the test books was the work of Archbishop Lawrence, proving the articles of the church of England non-Calvinistical; and I may add that the text books of Trinity College, Toronto, are used in Trinity College, Dublin. I am as jealous as is possible for me to be for the sound teaching of our youth, for their receiving such an education as will help them to resist Romanism in all its varied guises, but I affirm that I have been unable to detect in the teaching of Trinity College any tendency towards such error. I believe the Provost of the College to be a well-learned and pious man, who desires to train up the youth under his care in the old fashioned tenets of our standard divines, who wishes to show the exact point of difference between the churches of Rome and England, not so much in his own point of view as in that from which they are viewed by those to whom we owe the existence of our reformed faith, the martyrs and confessors of England's church. I shall say no more, lest I seem to prejudice a case which still may require a judicial decision, but I cannot conclude without expressing my belief that the Provost has not had such fair treatment as the teacher of any common school might justly claim from a Board of Trustees, that of "having his accusers face to face." The accusations, so far as they have appeared in print, are perhaps familiar to you. I shall not comment on them further than to say that the point in those accusations depends on

the meaning attached by different persons to the same words, and that in the absence of satisfactory evidence to the contrary, I am bound as a Christian gentleman to believe the Provost, who totally repudiates the errors attributed to him. Accordingly, I feel satisfied that I have taken a correct course, and am justified in my conviction when I find myself voting with Chief Justice Robinson, Hon. J. H. Cameron and Judge Hagerty, on a simple question of equitable treatment; and no mere clamour shall make me waver in the belief that the true way of strengthening our protestantism is to strengthen our Church of England principles, which I believe are honestly and truly held by those gentlemen who sit in the Council of Trinity College.

### Foreign Ecclesiastical Intelligence.

#### EXTRACT FROM MONTHLY REPORT OF THE SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.

A letter had been received from Archdeacon Hellmuth, dated 21, Compton Road, Canonbury Square, Islington, Jan. 10th, 1862, enclosing a printed letter, addressed to him by the Bishop of Huron, setting forth the peculiar and pressing wants of the diocese of Huron.

The Archdeacon stated that the most pressing of the seven distinct objects, mentioned by the Bishop of Huron, was "the urgent and immediate wants of the theological College;" that the population of the diocese amounted to nearly half a million, and had increased nearly 80 per cent. in the last nine years: that there were in the diocese 18 counties and 138 townships, each township being ten miles square, and 66 of them being still unsupplied with clergymen: that since the consecration of the Bishop of Huron, four years ago, the number of clergymen have been increased from forty to seventy five; but that more than treble that number would be required to make adequate and due provision for the actual wants of the present population.

Towards the foundation of the proposed College, it appeared that nearly £3000 have been contributed by several friends, and promises had been received from others.

It was stated to the Board, that the Standing Committee had conferred with Archdeacon Hellmuth, and obtained from him further particulars. It appeared that in London, Canada West, where the new College was to be erected, the course of tuition of candidates for the holy ministry, during the same period of years, could be accomplished for about half what it would cost at Toronto, provisions being so much cheaper in that part of the west in which the diocese of Huron is situated: that the population was multiplying in the diocese of Huron more rapidly than in any other part of Canada, as the last census shows: that the late troubles in the United States have caused many families from the western states of America to settle in the diocese: and that the present requirements and future welfare of the diocese therefore demanded the immediate establishment of a College. The Archdeacon further stated, that the diocese had now an excellent opportunity of purchasing a most suitable building in London, with nineteen acres of land, the original cost of the building itself having been somewhat over £6000 currency, which could now be acquired, together with the nineteen acres of land, for about £3000 currency. The situation of the house in question is most central and healthy, commanding a fine view; and being within the city limits, the land will ultimately be most valuable in adding the permanent endowment of

the College. Finally it was represented, that "by this time the Bishop, knowing that the Archdeacon has already collected more than £2500 sterling, equal to about £3000 currency, may have negotiated for the house known as the "Rideout House;" and that, in fact with the means already collected, if the positive promises of Christian friends in Liverpool, London, and elsewhere to aid this cause are taken into account, "it may be said that the College in question is in process of being commenced. Under all these circumstances," the Archdeacon added, "it is hoped the venerable Society will give its usually ready helping hand, as the College is positively necessary for the diocese, to which settlers from England, Ireland, and Scotland, as well as the United States of America, are now flocking in large numbers, owing to the fertility of the soil, the mildness of the winter in the west, and the cheapness of land and living."

The Standing Committee, having fully considered the application in all its bearings, gave notice that, at the next General Meeting of the Society on the 4th of March, they would propose that a grant of £500 be made towards this object, in order that the necessary operations contemplated may be immediately commenced.

#### CONVOCAION OF THE PROVINCE OF CANTERBURY.

UPPER HOUSE—WEDNESDAY, FEB. 12.

The BISHOP OF ST DAVID'S—I think those who leave the Church of Rome for the Church of England are the least likely persons to exhibit any Romanising tendency. If they do incline to any extreme, it must be rather in the opposite direction.

The BISHOP OF OXFORD—I am glad that the Bishop of London has brought the subject before the house, because any careful, thoughtful discussion of it must tend in the right direction. I fully concur in the greater portion of his remarks. There are others on which I differ from him, but I think it unnecessary to go into such points of difference at any length. We ought, in the first place, to lay down the broad Catholic principles on which the Church of England acts, and to point out the difficulties which have arisen from legislation interfering with proper action upon those Catholic principles. If we are to set matters right, we must endeavour as much as possible to free the action of the church from the shackles which have been imposed upon her by legislation, in most cases accidentally and unintentionally. For instance, at the time when an application was made for the consecration of Bishops for the North American Church, the only difficulty in the way was, that by the Consecration Service of the English Church the person to be consecrated bishop was required to take the oath of allegiance, and must be a natural born subject. There was no intention of preventing the Church of England from sending out missionary bishops. If any legislation was needed, the simple course would have been a declaratory act that in the consecration service for bishops out of her Majesty's dominions it should not be necessary to administer the oath of allegiance, but a bill was introduced which, though intended to enlarge them, quite unintentionally placed a limitation upon the liberties of the English Church. This evil was increased when another bill was introduced to remove difficulties which existed as to the consecration of an Anglican Bishop at Jerusalem. That bill, which was intended to give facilities, placed a very injurious fetter on the action of the church. While there is little objection and some precedent of ancient times as to requiring that

the assent of the sovereign power of the country should be given in a formal way before bishops sent to a distance, yet the form in which the licence is given is liable to the most extreme misconstruction, and creates an impression that the Church of England supposes either that the Sovereign is the fountain of spiritual authority anywhere, or can grant ecclesiastical jurisdiction out of his own dominions. Unhappily, the words used in the act are very ambiguous, and it ought to be so considered as to remove that ambiguity. Legislation has brought us into such a condition that it has become necessary to review our whole proceedings, and place the subject on a more intelligible footing. The practical point, therefore, which I conceive is of the greatest importance, is this—that in any legislation, as either affecting our brethren of the Scotch communion or any other, we should endeavour, as far as possible, first, to bring the practice of our church out of those accidents into the practice of the Catholic Church in the best times; and secondly, that we should endeavour to guard ourselves from any practical evils to which the peculiar circumstances of the times may subject us in acting on those precedents. Now, as to the priests of the Roman Catholic and of the Greek Church, there is no impediment of any sort to our admitting them at our discretion. There is no question concerning this. The practical difficulty, as I understand it, which is felt by some of my right rev. brethren as to acting upon the same principle with regard to the Scottish presbyters, is this—that whereas there is no danger of our being inundated by candidates for our livings or curacies from either Rome or Greece, there might be a practical difficulty from a large entrance amongst us of persons who, owing to the causes described by the Bishop of London, have lower qualifications than we desire in those who are ordained to our benefices and curacies. It seems to me that the whole satisfaction we need or can have is not a satisfaction with regard to the training of the presbyter in another branch of the church; but that there ought to be no powers created by law which they should have the privilege of using against us. Then we should be on a perfectly safe platform, and there need be no interference with the principles of the Universal Church. I mean that there should be no power in a patron to force upon us, by law, persons who come in in this way from any foreign branch of the church, through any Act of the Legislature creating freehold rights for patrons. We ought to recur, as far as possible, to the simple rule of the Catholic Church. Therefore, whilst we take away those most un-Catholic prohibitions, we should take away at the same time any legal powers for using that liberty against the commonwealth of the church of which we are in charge. It ought to be left to the Archbishop of the province and the bishop of the diocese to see whether the persons brought in are fit to hold the position they claim. As far as the simple question of sufficiency of theological learning is concerned, our power under the law is perfect, because every bishop has the right to examine any person who may be presented to him for a benefice, and to reject him if he sees proper; and there is no court of appeal to take cognisance of that decision, which is final on the part of the instituting bishop, and protects the church effectually from the institution of ignorant persons. Of course, such a power is supposed to be honestly exercised by the bishop. But, so far as the ground of ignorance is concerned, no court of appeal takes cognisance of the act of the instituting bishop. No doubt the case of our Scottish brethren is peculiarly hard, because the bar to their entrance was imposed as a simple political

disability, because at the period they were considered, and probably many of them were, disloyal subjects. Unluckily, in the day of their enfranchisement, Lord Chancellor Thurlow inserted in the enfranchising act the disabling clauses under which our brethren are still labouring. The question which has been alluded to about their eucharistic service is an unfortunate one to come in in connection with the question of enfranchisement, for this reason—the sense of honour and truth, as well as the natural affections of those who care for any particular portion of the service, is alarmed and excited to opposition, nay even oppugnancy, when it is made in any sense the condition of granting them a great boon—that they should strike any thing out of their service-book. I regret the two questions being raised together, because I wish the Scottish Church were free from that canon, and that alteration of the service, which, in my judgment, was an unfortunate one, and which I suppose my right rev. brethren, in common with myself, when we are travelling in Scotland, feel quite unable to take part in. Indeed, it was once my own case to refuse to do so. But I think it would be insufferable for the Scotch Church to be dealt with as if the dropping of the service was to be a condition of those very unjust statutes being removed. The peculiar difficulty is this—that a very large proportion of our own Church believe that Office to be not strictly and thoroughly consistent with ours; and therefore there is a feeling of danger attaching to the idea of admitting persons who are liable to use an Office which they deem to be not strictly consistent with our own, to subscribe our Articles and profession of faith as if they did agree altogether with them. If, however, the Scottish Church in its wisdom thought fit to drop that Office, I for one should greatly rejoice. For what I am most anxious about, in legislating upon the subject, is that there should not be the introduction of a great number of conditions, but that we should fall back upon the great truth which our church acknowledges, that the commission of the Episcopate throughout the world is a common one, and therefore the certainty of the orders of priests and deacons given by the Episcopate, whilst we take care that in admitting such priests and deacons we admit nothing that is opposed to the doctrine and discipline of the church. Practically I do not feel that the difficulty would be very great. I agree with the Bishop of London in the wisdom of not moving for the appointment of a committee; because as the matter is to be discussed in Parliament, the existence of such a committee might give rise to difficulties in the minds of sound Churchmen in dealing with an Act of Parliament.

**THE BISHOP OF LLANDAFF**—The Bishop of London has introduced to our notice a very important and extensive question. Upon the general subject it is not my intention to say one word. The few remarks which I have to make will have reference solely to the Church in Scotland. I should be extremely sorry if it were thought that I entertain towards the clergy or laity of the Church of Scotland any other than the most brotherly feelings, and the most hearty desire for its prosperity; for in any thing which would tend to promote the prosperity and welfare of that church, so far as I could conscientiously do it, I should be glad to concur. At the same time I cannot shut my eyes to the fact that, if we adopt this measure, proper as it may be theoretically with regard to the Church of Scotland, yet under existing circumstances it would be producing what no doubt is extremely valuable in itself, at the expense of the danger of creating an element of discord amongst ourselves. The

Bishop of Oxford has observed that it is unfortunate that the question of the Communion Service should have been mixed up with this question of the admission of the Scottish clergy into the Church of England; and I admit that it is most unfortunate. But, on the other hand, I cannot myself see how it is possible to discover the one question from the other. My right reverend brother the Bishop of London says he does not know why the Scottish form of Communion Service was introduced. I think that an explanation of the fact will be found in the "Preface to the Scotch Communion Service," published by the Rev. J. Skinner, son, I believe, of Bishop Skinner, who therein distinctly states that Archbishop Laud urged upon the Scotch prelates that there should be an entire conformity between the services of the two churches; but that the Scotch prelates refused on the special ground of a desire to maintain their national independence. That, I think, is the reason originally given. Since then the Scottish Communion Service has been altered by persons whose names were not likely to recommend it to a large portion of the Church of England; but that this is still the ground of the introduction of the Communion Service is clear from the 21st Canon of the Church of Scotland; because that canon, quoting the twentieth and the thirty fourth of our Articles, "that not only the Church in general, but every particular or national church, has authority to ordain, change, and abolish the ceremonies or rites of a church ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying"—goes on to say that the Episcopal Church in Scotland, availing herself of this inherent right, had long adopted and very generally used a form for the celebration of the Holy Communion by the name of the Scotch Communion Service. I take, it therefore, upon the authority of that canon, as well as the statement of Skinner, that the service was adopted and is retained on the ground of national independence. At the same time, however, I am of opinion that there is a great mistake committed in thus quoting these Articles of the Church of England in justification of that claim, because those Articles speak simply of the authority of a national or particular church to ordain, change, and abolish the ceremonies and rites of the church. Now, if this were merely a matter of ceremony or rite—if it referred only to the question whether, in administering the Lord's Supper, you are to stand in front or at the north side of the table, or adopt this or that particular dress, I think it would be idle to say that any national church might not have perfect freedom in making such ordinances as it might think fit. Whether the idea is correct or incorrect, I do not now undertake to say; but, as the Bishop of Oxford has candidly admitted, the fact is that there is a deeply rooted feeling in the minds of a large portion of the English Church, that there are differences that are essential, both in the way of omission and in the way of particular expressions, between the two services. I cannot, therefore, but feel a deep conviction that, however we may wish to strengthen the bonds of union between ourselves and the Scotch Church—a result which I most heartily desire—if we make ourselves parties to a measure of that kind so long as those differences are believed to exist, we shall be throwing an element of discord, of which we cannot see the result, into the midst of our church; and I am sure we have quite enough already in that respect to contend against. Now, the opinion of Archbishop Laud being such as I have stated, I hope the members of the Scotch Church will think over the matter, for although they may refuse to take a hint from those who object to their Communion Service, and think that Archbishop Laud was wrong in

the suggestion he made, still it may have some influence, if it go forth from this room that we consider it would be a great help towards furthering the object which they desire, if a concession was made on their part in reference to this subject. If there be no real difference between the two churches, and if they wish to attain the great boon they express their desire to attain, why should they, merely for the sake of a feeling of national independence, retain the service? On the other hand, if there be a real difference, then, of course, they cannot be surprised if many persons in the Church of England entertain the feeling that they certainly do upon the subject. The Bishop of London has stated that during the eighteen years he had been in the habit of attending the Church in Scotland, he never heard this service more than once, and that he thinks it would be readily given up. But another of our right reverend brethren, who is quite as closely connected with Scotland, as the Bishop of London, and I believe I may venture to say quite as well acquainted with the subject, is of opinion that the Bishop of London is too sanguine in the view he takes of this matter, and that there is a stronger feeling of affection lurking in the minds of the Scotch Church for this particular service than the Bishop of London imagines to be the case. Whether it be so or not, of course, I am not in a position to say. It is a matter of some importance, and it ought to be borne in mind, in considering this subject, that the late most excellent and venerable Dr. Low, Bishop of Argyll, was himself desirous that the Communion Service should be given up, and the same recommendation, if I mistake not, has recently been made by the present Bishop of Argyll. If such a concession were made, then the whole difficulty as respects this objection would be at an end; but until that takes place, I think we should be purchasing what we all earnestly desire, a closer union with the Church of Scotland, at two high a price.

**THE ARCHBISHOP**—There is by no means a universal feeling prevalent in Scotland in favour of the union now spoken of. The fact is, there is a considerable number of members of the Episcopal Church there who are opposed to the introduction of that which is recommended to us. They feel that the views of those with whom they disagree are so much inclined towards the Romish Church that they keep separate from them. I should be happy to see unanimity on the question, but Scotch Episcopalians seem to be so much divided amongst themselves, and to be influenced by so many jealousies, as to render that very improbable, at all events at present.

**THE BISHOP OF LONDON**—Before the subject drops, I should like to make one remark in order to prevent any misunderstanding. I assumed, in what I addressed to your lordships, that there was no doubt whatsoever about our right to admit persons ordained by the Roman Catholic Bishops as priests and deacons; and that is the practice of the Church of England. But in case of any misunderstanding on the subject, allow me to draw attention to a clause in the 3 and 4 Vic., c. 33, and which has been supposed by some authorities to make it illegal to admit persons in Romish orders to offices in the Church of England. In that act, which is intended to relax the disabilities resting upon the Episcopal Churches of Scotland and America, I find these words:—

"Be it enacted that any incumbent or stipendiary curate who, without the production of such written permission, or renewed permission, as aforesaid, shall allow any bishop or priest of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Scotland or in the United States of America, or who shall allow any deacon of either of such churches, or any other bishop, priest, or deacon, not being a bis-



hop, priest, or deacon of the United Church of England and Ireland, or of any of her Majesty's foreign possessions, to officiate in any church or chapel of which he is incumbent or curate, shall for the first offence be liable to be called to appear."

Then follow the penalties. These words, it has of late been argued, do in their plain grammatical sense include persons ordained by Roman Catholic Bishops as well as others. But if the matter were investigated, it might turn out that that is not the true interpretation to be put upon the clause.

**THE BISHOP OF LINCOLN**—I think that the difficulties which are felt with respect to the admission of the Scottish ordained clergy to full privileges in the Church of England have been understated by both the Bishops of London and Oxford; and with regard to the difficulty arising from their possibly defective education, some words which fell from the Bishop of London might be taken to mean that in the Church of England restrictions have been removed of late years, and that the qualifications required in candidates for holy orders are less strict than formerly. The very reverse is, I believe, the case. Some years ago there were many more literates, persons without any University degrees, than at the present time. I have received a letter from a Bishop presiding over a populous diocese, in which he states that in his last ordination there was a number of graduates from Cambridge and Oxford, and but one literate, which he says is exactly the reverse of what it used to be formerly. The reason why there would be more danger or difficulty in receiving clergymen from the Episcopal Church of Scotland than colonially ordained clergymen, arises from the proximity of the two churches; the probability being that many of the persons so ordained had found some difficulty in getting ordained in this country, and had gone to Scotland for the purpose of being ordained, and then coming back to England. There are in Scotland a number of churches requiring to be served, the endowments of which are so small that it appears disgraceful to the liberality of the Episcopalians in Scotland. Served, however, those churches must be, and thus the choice of the Scotch Bishop is reduced to a very narrow limit indeed. The consequence is, that persons who would not think of going to Scotland to reside and minister in that church, might go there and get ordained, and then come back with a view of bettering their position in the Church of England; and the difficulty in rejecting clergymen when appointed to a benefice is very great. With respect to the difference of the Scotch Communion Office, the grounds of the feeling which exists in that respect have been scarcely fully stated, nor is the strength of that feeling distinctly understood. It is quite true, as has been stated by the Bishop of Llandaff, that Bishop Laud strongly recommended the Scottish Bishops of his day to accept the Communion Service of the Church of England as then established; and it is quite true that when they declined to do so—on the ground principally that they wished to have an independent existence—he unwillingly drew up an Office for them, which was adopted at that time; but as the present Scotch Service is neither that of Edward VI. nor that which was drawn up for them by Laud, but an entirely different one, altered in many important points, and drawn up by some who dissented from our Church, Nonjurors, in that precise form and manner, because they wished to embody therein their opinion as to the defects—or, as they termed them, the errors—of the English Communion Service; it has, therefore, been regarded as a standing protest against the

Communion Service of the Church of England. Looking at it in this light, it can be no great matter of surprise that there is an unwillingness on the part of many members of the Church of England to receive at once into equal communion those who not merely entertain a different opinion with reference to the most solemn service of the church, but are also bound to hold it of primary authority by a Canon passed as recently as 1838. The explanation, indeed, given of this enactment is, that whereas the Office had fallen into disuse in a great many of the congregations of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, and it was not desirable to enforce it upon every occasion, the bishops were content to pass a canon declaring its primary authority, and then to allow each congregation in ordinary worship to use the service it thought fit. Still, there it stands upon the statute-book, a solemn ordinance of the Church of Scotland, although an Office which history teaches us was drawn up as a protest against our own, which is thought to contain passages altered most injuriously for doctrinal purposes, and in order to make a distinct difference between the two services. The ground of dislike or distrust may be also stronger, because in the Church of Scotland there is not the same difficulty with respect to altering its canons as we labour under; and if there is any disposition to remove an obstacle to the hearty and cordial union of the two churches, they have it in their power to do it at any time they please. It is said, indeed, that the Scotch Communion Office is never used at all in three of the dioceses, and used regularly in a comparatively small number of churches in the others, and, if so, it would seem that the Office is retained rather as a symbol than an office—rather to express an article of faith than because it is available for practice. I feel strongly what the Bishop of Oxford urged, that there would be an inconvenience in requiring as a condition of removing the existing disability that the service should be given up; but I think we ought to suggest to our brethren of the Scottish Episcopal Church, or rather we ought to entreat them of their own free will, carefully and deliberately to inquire into the matter, and to repeal that canon before they come to the legislature and ask it to remove the disabilities under which they labour.

**THE BISHOP OF OXFORD**—The Bishop of Lincoln has said that he thought I had undervalued the difficulties of the question. I am most anxious that nothing should go forth which would seem to imply that I undervalue what I consider as the great evil of the existence of that Office, which is a point upon which I entertain feelings quite as strong, if not stronger, than my right rev. brother.

**THE BISHOP OF LINCOLN**—Your expressions with respect to the Office were as strong as could be. I was speaking of the difficulties arising from want of education. Both points were mixed up together.

**THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY**—The discussion has been diverted from the one point which alone was, I think, raised by the Bishop of London with regard to the Church in Scotland. In a great portion of that speech I entirely concur, and it is in my opinion very unfortunate that we have diverged from the line of argument which he took. The Bishop of London prudently avoided the discussion of the differences between our Liturgy and that of the Scotch Church. That is a matter with which, to my mind, we have nothing to do in determining the question whether we should help our brethren in Scotland to obtain a removal of their present disabilities. We are able to apply to the solution of it a precedent. The right line of conduct seems to be clearly marked out for us by the way in which we receive the clergy of the

Greek or the Roman Catholic Church. We require them to give us certain pledges that they agree with us in doctrine. And if we obtain the same securities from the clergy of the Scotch Church, what can we want more? Unless, therefore, we are prepared to say that we act improperly with regard to the clergy of the Greek or Roman Churches—and I am sure that this is far from being the opinion of my right rev. brother—it would be inexcusable in us to wish to maintain the present harsh line of exclusion with regard to the clergy of the Scotch Church. There is also another reason why I am most anxious that these questions with regard to the Scotch Office should not be discussed by us. If we import into any proposals we may make to help them to obtain a removal of their disabilities, such a condition as the giving up of their office, we should possibly raise up feelings in Scotland which would only aggravate our difficulties, and increase any differences which may exist between us. I am sure that your Grace must feel that the difficulty of making any such change would, under any circumstances, without any pressure from us, or irritating interference on our part, be very great, and that even if all the Bishops of the Church of Scotland agreed to give up this office, there would be still an exceeding difficulty arising out of the affectionate attachment of many members of the Scottish Church to it. With regard to the danger which might, it has been said, arise to our church from the alleged imperfection in the education of the clergy of the Church of Scotland, I have two things to urge. The one is, that the remedy must ever be in our own hands. Our duty in all cases of great ignorance is plain, and we should not shrink from the discharge of it, nor seem to seek protection against it in the disabilities created by an act of parliament. I should be very sorry that it should go forth to the world that we, the Bishops of the Church of England, feel ourselves incompetent without the aid of the state to make provision against such an evil. The other point is this. If it be true that the candidates for ordination in Scotland are oftentimes in gross ignorance, and so very inferior to those who seek ordination at our hands, freedom of communion between the two churches would tend to lessen this difference. The difference, if it exists, arises, I should suppose, mainly from the exclusion of clergymen of Scotch ordination from ministrations in our more highly favoured Church of England. I will only add that I am persuaded that when this matter is fairly considered, you will find it impossible to withstand the force of the argument of the Bishop of London, that it is unreasonable to place the clergy of the Church of Scotland under greater disabilities than those which are laid upon the clergy of the Greek and Roman Churches.

**THE BISHOP OF LINCOLN**—I don't think that any one has spoken of the Scotch Episcopal Church as containing persons of gross ignorance, or used any thing like such strong terms. It must be borne in mind that the evil that is feared has not arisen, and there is not at present any temptation for incompetent persons to go there and offer themselves.

(To be Continued.)

SUBSCRIPTIONS RECEIVED TO END OF VOLUME 9.

Rev. A. M. Toronto; Rev. J. P., Vaudreuil; Rev. W. M. M., Orillia, (to No. 6, Vol. 10); Rev. J. S., St. Mary's.

ROWSELL & ELLIS, PRINTERS, KING ST. TORONTO.