

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
- Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée
- Covers restored and/or laminated/
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque
- Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur
- Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- Coloured plates and/or illustrations/
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents
- 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
- 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.
- Additional comments:/
Commentaires supplémentaires:

- Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur
- Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées
- Pages restored and/or laminated/
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
- Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
- Pages detached/
Pages détachées
- Showthrough/
Transparence
- Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression
- Continuous pagination/
Pagination continue
- Includes index(es)/
Comprend un (des) index

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

- 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

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

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

The Canadian Ecclesiastical Gazette,

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

VOLUME VII.

TORONTO, OCTOBER 1, 1860.

No. 19.

Ecclesiastical Intelligence.

DIOCESE OF TORONTO.

APPOINTMENTS.

The Right Rev. The Lord Bishop of Toronto has been pleased to make the following appointments:

"The Honourable John Hillyard Cameron, D.C.L., Q. C., to be Chancellor of the Diocese of Toronto.

"Samuel Bickerton Harman, B.C.L., Barrister-at-law, to be Registrar of the Diocese of Toronto.

S. B. HARMAN,
Toronto, 14th Sept., 1860. *Registrar.*

TORONTO, August 27th, 1860.

MY DEAR BRETHREN.—It is my intention to visit, for the purpose of holding Confirmations, your several Parishes, in accordance with the following list.

I remain, &c,
JOHN TORONTO.

APPOINTMENTS.

OCTOBER, 1860.			
Friday	19,	Grimsby.....	11 a.m.
"	"	Jordan.....	3 p.m.
Saturday	20,	Port Dalhousie.....	11 a.m.
Sunday	21,	St. Catharines.....	11 a.m.
Monday	22,	Grantham.....	11 a.m.
"	"	Niagara.....	3 p.m.
Tuesday	23,	Stamford.....	11 a.m.
"	"	Thorold.....	3 p.m.
Wednesday	24,	Port Robinson.....	10 a.m.
"	"	Mirritsville.....	2 p.m.
Thursday	25,	Drummondville.....	11 a.m.
"	"	Chippawa.....	3 p.m.
Friday	26,	Fort Erie.....	11 a.m.
"	"	Bertie.....	3 p.m.
Saturday	27,	Marshville.....	10 a.m.
"	"	Port Maitland.....	3 p.m.
Sunday	28,	Lake Shore.....	10 a.m.
"	"	Dunnville.....	3 p.m.
Monday	29,	Cayuga.....	11 a.m.
"	"	York.....	3 p.m.
Tuesday	30,	Caledonia Bridge.....	10 a.m.
"	"	Jarvis.....	3 p.m.
Wednesday	31,	Nanticoke.....	11 a.m.

A meeting of the Diocesan Board of Missions will be held in the Church Society's Room, King Street, Toronto, on Wednesday, the 10th inst., at 11 o'clock A.M.

By an error in the last annual report the names of Col. Beresford, J. Parsons, Esq., and the Rev. S. F. Ramsey, were omitted from the list of "subscriptions paid directly to the Parent Society."

The Rev. Mr. Alexander acknowledges the present of a handsome gown from the ladies of his congregation at *Ontario, Saltfleet.*

WIDOWS AND ORPHANS' FUND.

We beg to remind the Clergy that the collections on behalf of this Fund are appointed to be taken up in the month of October. The following is an account of the receipts and expenditure for the year ending 30th April last, as given in the annual report:—

Receipts for the year	£2127	3	3
Deduct investments, returned	1632	3	3
Total belonging to the year	£795	0	0
Amount paid out in pensions.....	£527	10	0
Taxes.....	13	7	7

COLLECTIONS UP TO SEPT. 25TH, 1860.

Collections appointed to be taken up in the several churches, chapels and missionary stations in the Diocese of Toronto, in the month of July, in behalf of the Mission Fund of the Church Society.

Previously announced	\$715.39
St. Paul's, Yorkville, per Rev. S. Givins	50.00
St. Paul's, Uxbridge	\$4.56
St. George's, Duffins' Creek	2.80
Greenwood	1.73
Per Rev. G. Viner.....	9.09
St. James', Orillia.....	3.85
St. George's, Medonte	2.10
St. Luke's, C. W. R.	0.75
St. Mark's, Oro	1.30
Per Rev. T. B. Read.....	5.00
Port Colborne, per Rev. J. Stannage.....	2.35
St. James's, Kingston, per Rev. R. V. Rogers	2.00
St. James's, Toronto, per Churchwardens	52.00

147 Collections amounting to\$611 83

THE BISHOP'S COURT.

The first session of this Court under the style of "The Court of the Bishop of Toronto," was formally opened on the 14th September, in the School House attached to the Cathedral Church of St. James, Toronto; and in another column will be found the *gazette* of the Honourable John Hillyard Cameron, D.C.L., Q.C., as Chancellor, and that of Samuel B. Harman, Esq., B.C.L., Barrister-at-law, as Registrar of the Diocese. The proceedings commenced by the Lord Bishop, in full canonicals, taking his seat as President of the Court, attended by the Rev. Henry James Grasett, B.D., Chaplain to His Lordship, the Venerable the Archdeacon of York, A. N. Bethune, D.D., the Honourable John Hillyard Cameron, Chancellor of the Diocese, and the Rev. Saltern Givens, Incumbent of Yorkville, and Rural Dean. Assessors named by His Lordship and S. B. Harman Esq., the Registrar, all wearing their Robes.

The Court being seated, the Registrar then read from His Lordship's Patent under the great seal of England, the powers vested in His Lordship to constitute His Court, and the Patents of appointment of the Honourable Mr. Cameron and Himself, under the hand and seal of the Bishop, as Chancellor and Registrar respectively. The Honourable the Chancellor then took the oaths of office and of supremacy, and signed his assent to the 39 articles of religion. The Court was then declared open, under the name of the Court of the Bishop of Toronto as aforesaid. The Registrar then mentioned that Articles had been instituted in the court, in the following cases, namely, against the Rev. Richard Lewis, Incumbent of Prescott, for conduct unbecoming a clergyman, and tending to bring scandal on the church; and against the Rev. Thomas Hickie of Onemee, for publishing certain pamphlets containing doctrines contrary to the articles of religion. The Court then adjourned to Wednesday, the 26th September, to meet in the Vestry of the Cathedral, and proceed with the trial of these cases.

Wednesday, 26th September.—The Court met at noon in the Vestry of the Cathedral: present, His Lordship the Bishop, attended by his Chaplain, the Rev. Henry James Grasett, B.D., the Honourable the Chancellor, the Rev. Saltern Givens, and David B. Read, Esq. Q.C., as His Lordship's assessors, and the Registrar. There were also a considerable number of spectators, among whom we noticed The Reverend Dr. Short of Port Hope, Dr. Lewis of Brockville, Dr. Lawder of Nanpsee, J. S. Lawder of Ottawa, H. C. Cooper of Etobicoke, W. S. Darling, W. E. Cooper, A. J. Broughall, and C. P. Emery of Toronto. On the opening of the Court, the case of the Rev. Mr. Lewis was called, the Registrar reading the articles exhibited against the Rev. Gentleman. Mr. Lewis was present, attended by his Counsel, Matthew Crooks Cameron, Esq., who then proceeded to address the court on the subject of the first plea put in by the Defendant, being one to the jurisdiction of the Court. At the conclusion of the argument of the learned Counsel, the Court adjourned to the following day to deliberate on this plea.

Thursday, 27th September.—The Court, constituted as yesterday, met at eleven o'clock. The Chancellor read the judgment of the Court on the objection taken to the jurisdiction of the Court, and which was overruled, with leave reserved to the Rev. defendant to appeal. The Court then proceeded to take evidence in the case, when a number of witnesses from Prescott were examined, being first sworn by the Registrar. The cross-examination was conducted by M. C. Cameron, Esq., and on the conclusion of the examination the Court adjourned. There were again a good many spectators present, and, in addition to those named yesterday, we noticed Col. Jarvis, Dr. Bovell, Emelius Irving, Esq., the Rev. Mr. Ambrey, &c., &c.

Friday, 28th September.—His Lordship took his seat at eleven o'clock. The Court being constituted as previously, Mr. M. C. Cameron, on the part of the Rev. Mr. Lewis, stated that he had not been able to procure the attendance of his

witnesses, who disregarded the subpoenas of the Court. He then proceeded to address the Court at some length on the charges exhibited against the Rev. gentleman, and the evidence brought forward. The Court then adjourned. Most of the gentlemen named above were again present as spectators of the proceedings.

Saturday, 20th September.—The Court met at one o'clock, the Chancellor at the instance of his Lordship the Bishop pronounced the judgment of the Court in the case of the Rev. Mr. Lewis, which was in substance as follows: The case against the rev. gentleman was considered proved with the exception of the words "false and malicious" contained in one portion of the charge. It contained an admonishment to the Rev. defendant, and condemned him in the costs of the proceedings, suspension to follow if such costs not paid within a month. Mr. M. C. Cameron applied for leave to appeal which was noted. The case of the Rev. Mr. Hickie was then called on, but the defendant did not appear personally or by counsel. The service of the notice on the Rev. gentleman to attend having been proved, and proof having also been adduced that he was the author of the pamphlets with the publication of which he was charged, the Chancellor read from the pamphlets, (the same being filed of record in the Court,) several passages denying the doctrines of the Holy Trinity, that one Blessed Lord had a reasonable soul connected with his body; the necessity of the Holy Sacraments, &c., &c.—the Court then adjourned to deliberate, and on re-assembling the Honourable the Chancellor by request of the Bishop read the judgment of the Court, by which sentence of deprivation was pronounced against the Rev. defendant, and he was further condemned in the costs of the proceedings. The Court then adjourned.

The above is a brief record of the proceedings of the Court, without, in any way touching on the merits of the cases, these we may allude to in a future article, and also consider further the constitution of the Court as instituted under the patent of the Bishop and the English Statute 3 & 4 Vic., chap. 86, commonly called "The Church Discipline Act," adopted by resolution of the Synod as the rule of guidance in the proceedings of the Court, so far as the same may be found applicable to the circumstances of the Diocese; we must not however leave the subject without alluding to the solemn and reverend decorum and order which characterised the proceedings of the Court.

ADDRESS TO THE PROVOST OF TRINITY COLLEGE.

We have been requested to publish the following address, which was presented a short time since to the Reverend the Provost of Trinity College, and at the same time to state that the fact of its not appearing before was owing to inadvertence.—

To the Reverend George Whitaker, M.A., Provost of Trinity College, Toronto:—

"REVEREND AND DEAR SIR,—Having learned with deep regret that the Lord Bishop of Huron has recently in his Synod at London made a serious charge against the religious teaching of Trinity College, and therefore against yourself in your office of Divinity Professor, we the undersigned, who have enjoyed the privileges of your theological instruction, wish, in the most positive terms, to express our conviction that the charge is entirely without foundation. We hesitate not to affirm that, in our experience, no so-called dangerous or un-Protestant views have ever characterised your lectures. With regard to your exposition of the Church Catechism, to which

special reference has been made, we wish to state that if we were called upon to say what lectures in the academical course were the most interesting and instructive, we should give the preference to those on the Church Catechism, involving, as they did, extensive spiritual proofs, a critical examination of the original languages, and copious quotations from the great divines of our Church, whose principles, we know, are based on the word of God, and the doctrine and practice of the Catholic Church in her present days as contained in her Book of Common Prayer, Articles and Homilies.

A number of questions were prepared by you upon such lecture delivered, and, at our own request, the use of these questions was afterwards occasionally granted to us. Answers to the questions were required of us *viva voce* at the succeeding lecture on the same subject; no written answers were either given or required from us, except at the periodical, or terminal examinations, when the same course was pursued as at other Universities. In conclusion, permit us to express our firm hope that nothing which has occurred will hinder the growth of our University. As for ourselves, we are determined, as far as may be in our power, to uphold, both by precept and example, the pure teaching of our ancient and spiritual branch of the Church, which we have received in Trinity College. We could desire that we may in our several spheres do this as faithfully and efficiently as we can testify that you have done in your capacity of Professor of Divinity. We remain,

Reverend and dear Sir,

Ever sincerely and gratefully yours,

Thos. T. Roberts, M.A., Curate St. Catharines.
Francis Tremayne, Jur., Incumbent of Milton.
J. G. Armstrong, B.A., Incumbent of West Hawkesbury.

James A. Preston, M.A., Incumbent of Stirling.
C. E. Thomson, M.A., Incumbent of Elora and Fergus.

S. J. Yankoughnet, M.A., and B.C.L.
W. E. Cooper, M.A., Second Assistant Holy Trinity, Toronto.

John Langtry, M.A., Incumbent of Collingwood.
E. W. Beaven, M.A., Incumbent of Matilda and Edwardsburg.

Thos. D. Phillips, M.A., Principal St. Catharines County Grammar School and Curate of Thorold.

A. J. Broughall, M.A., Classical Lecturer Trinity College, and Assistant Minister, St. John's Church, Toronto.

H. W. Davies, M.A., Assistant Minister Trinity Church, and Head Master Senior Grammar School, Cornwall.

J. J. Bogart, M.A., Assist. Minister, Prescott.
Geo. W. N. Higginson, M.A., Grace Church, Waterdown.

H. W. M. Murray, M.A., Barrister, &c., Toronto.

J. E. O'Reilly, B.A., Hamilton.
Fred Schofield, B.A., Barrister, &c., Ottawa.
G. W. White, M.A., Missionary, Camden.

H. C. W. Wethy, B.A., Toronto.
Charles J. Benson, B.A.
W. P. Atkinson, B.A.

G. B. Boyle, B.A.
Frederick Lampman, B.A., St. Catharines.
George B. P. Viner, B.A., Missionary in Pickering and Uxbridge

Stewart Houston, B.A., Missionary at Arthur.
J. S. Lauder, B.A., Rector of Ottawa.
W. H. Jones, B.A., Brockville.

J. McNaely, B.A., Carleton Place.
George W. G. Grout, B.A., Grimsby.
Donald J. F. MacLeod, B.A., Grammar School, Thorold.

John Hilton, Incumbent, Perrytown.

W. Fleming, B.A., Missionary in Roslin.
John Carroll, Incumbent of Gaaonoque.
Fran. R. Tane, Assist. Minister, Brockville.
A. Williams, B.A., Assist. Minister, Yorkville.
H. D. Cooper, B.A., Etobicoke.
C. J. S. Bethune, B.A., Cobourg.
John Wood, B.A., Omemece.
Charles Badgley, B.A., Quebec.
C. W. Patterson, B.A., Toronto.
Wm. H. Case, B.A., Hamilton.
Thomas A. Parnell, Incumbent, Mirrickville.
A. M. Patton, B.A., Seafort.
James Henderson, B.A., Yorkville.

Toronto, Sept. 8, 1860.

REPLY.

GENTLEMEN,

I have received with the highest satisfaction, your kind address to me, in which you bear your testimony to the manner and substance of my teaching on the catechism of the Church of England.

Such an address would, under any circumstances, have been most grateful to my feelings; but at the present time, when my teaching has been so grossly misrepresented, its value has been immeasurably enhanced.

You have said for me and for the College, that which I could not say for myself, and which none but yourselves were in a position to say; and your testimony acquires additional value from the fact that many of you have long since left the College, and have, since the breaking off of our mutual relation, been subjected to the influence of other minds, and sobered by the lessons of experience.

It is my earnest prayer that we may all in our several stations, be ever found faithful members of that Branch of the Holy Church to which we belong, and which is so signally indebted to the good Providence of Almighty God alike for purity of doctrine and for completeness of ecclesiastical order.

With a deep sense of obligation to you for your generous and affectionate expression of confidence, I am, Gentlemen,

Your very sincere friend,

Trinity College,
September 29th, 1860.
GEORGE WHITAKER.

TRINITY COLLEGE RESOLUTION.

(To the Editor of the Leader.)

CANTERBURY, ENGLAND,
August 28th, 1860.

SIR,—In the *Leader* of 30th July, which has been forwarded to me, I find in your remarks concerning the "Pastoral" of the Lord Bishop of Huron, the following statement:—"This opinion is not now uttered for the first time. It was promulgated at the meeting of Synod, when a high church minister, *disregarding friendly intimations*, challenged remark upon this subject."

As the individual who proposed the resolution upon which the Bishop's remarks were based, I feel called upon to deny the correctness of that portion of your statement which I have placed in italics. I do so because I would at once eschew the imputation of foolish indiscretion, or of irreverently "persevering" contrary to the expressed wishes of my diocesan.

The facts of the case, then, are these:—I have long been deeply convinced of the serious evils resulting alike to the Church and the cause of letters from the habit of establishing a host of feeble Diocesan Universities, into which the Church of the American Continent has unhappily fallen. I was therefore greatly desirous that

Trinity College, Toronto, should be recognised as the Church University of at least Canada West. At the same time, so far was I from wishing to enforce one phrase of theologic teaching, that I made several suggestions by which, as I trusted, the views of the Bishop of Huron might be met. Consequently, in December last, (I think it was) I brought a resolution *exactly similar* to that which has been the immediate cause of this unhappy controversy before the Church Society of the Diocese of Huron, the Lord Bishop being in the chair, it was seconded by Dr. Caulfield, (a gentleman who certainly would repudiate the idea of being thought a "high church minister,") and passed unanimously, the Bishop not making the slightest objection.

Having, however, had it intimated to me by a distinguished individual, deeply interested in Trinity College, that to give the resolution weight, it should also be passed in our Synod. I sent due notice that I intended to bring it forward to the Executive Committee, which is of course "presided over" by the Lord Bishop. It was printed by them along with other notices of business for the approaching Synod, and sent to every member, about a month previous to its meeting. In all this time I never received the slightest hint from his Lordship that it would be undesirable to bring it forward; had he done so, I imagine he knows me well enough to believe that I should at once have suppressed it; as I think it must be a very extreme case which makes it either wise or right to oppose any one's Bishop.

During the meeting of Synod, however, and just as the proper time had come in due course for bringing the resolution before it, the Bishop sent for me to speak to him, when I stepped up to his chair he whispered, "I cannot support you in that resolution," I replied, "I am very sorry for it, my Lord, but I suppose it will be best to go on with it as the notice has been given." He answered, "O yes, certainly." I can decidedly answer for the essential correctness of the above.

In speaking to the resolution, I was careful, as I had been in drawing it up, not to discuss the merits of Trinity College in its teaching, &c., but to confine myself to the one general question of the desirableness of His Lordship (I quote the resolution) "adopting such means as in his wisdom he might see good, as should tend to secure the hearty co-operation of all churchmen in support of Trinity College, Toronto," &c., &c.

Further, immediately upon the Bishop's open opposition, I begged leave to withdraw it; I did so out of consideration to those of my clerical brethren whom I had reason to suppose would desire to support it, as I had no wish to place them, by any action of mine on which they had not been consulted, in direct opposition to their Bishop, this, however, His Lordship declined, though in a very courteous manner, to permit.

Surely, then, I am altogether clear from the possibility of any just imputation either of rashness or discourtesy; indeed, with my deep conviction of the Sacred Scriptural and Anglo-Catholic teaching by which Trinity College is distinguished, I cannot but think, that in the opinion of most men, I should certainly have been justified in speaking and acting much more decidedly.

Yours, &c.,

ADAM TOWNLEY.

TRINITY COLLEGE.

At a meeting of the Clergy of the Niagara District Rural Deanery, held at the residence of the Rural Dean, Thorold, on Monday, the 24th

Sept., 1860, the following resolution was proposed and unanimously adopted:

Resolved,—That in consequence of the late movements that have taken place in the Diocese of Huron, adverse to the interests of that noble institution, Trinity College, the pride of the Canadian Church and the especial glory of our reverend Diocesan, more particularly a pastoral lately issued by the Lord Bishop of that Diocese, calculated to mislead those unacquainted with the true character of our "School of the Prophets," and to excite groundless apprehensions regarding the soundness of the teaching of its Provost and other professors; therefore we, the Clergy of the Rural Deanery of the Niagara District, constituting the committee of the Church Society of the said District, feel it to be our solemn duty to avail ourselves of the present opportunity to declare our perfect confidence in the sound Protestantism of the Provost and other professors with respect to the erroneous tenets of the Church of Rome. At the same time we must express our profound regret that the Lord Bishop of Huron did not avail himself of the many opportunities that were afforded him of learning what the true teaching of Trinity College really is, before he committed himself to the violent assaults upon its reputation, and, by implication, upon the orthodoxy of gentlemen who compose its Council, which have given such pain and sorrow to the churchmen of this Diocese.

W. LEEING, Rector of Chippawa,
Chairman.

C. L. INGLES, M.A.,
Secretary.

THE BISHOP OF HURON'S PASTORAL.

THE BISHOP OF HURON TO THE CLERICAL AND LAY GENTLEMEN COMPOSING THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE DIOCESE OF HURON.

MY REVEREND BROTHERS AND BRETHREN,—

Your resolution requesting me to lay before the Diocese the proofs upon which I have formed the opinion which I expressed, concerning the teaching of Trinity College, Toronto, has been placed in my hands. In compliance with your request, I now proceed to redeem the pledge which I gave in my pastoral, of making known to the clergy and laity of my Diocese, the grounds of my opinion, whenever called upon to do so.

Some time after my return from England, in 1858, some graduates in Trinity College applied to me for ordination, and it became my duty to examine them. I perceived that the views of some of these gentlemen, more particularly concerning the character and doctrines of the Church of Rome, were not such as I had always entertained. I sought out the cause of this, and after a good deal of examination and enquiry, I was led to the conclusion that the views held by these gentlemen were traceable to the teaching to which they had been subjected, during their university course. The mode of teaching, as described to me, appeared to be highly objectionable, and the matter taught was in my view most dangerous to all students, more especially to young men preparing for the ministry. I shall now direct attention to these two points, the mode of teaching, and the things taught.

In order that I should not fall into any error concerning the mode of teaching in the University, I addressed, by letter, several gentlemen who have been connected with Trinity College, and I forwarded to each of them a list of questions, to which I requested candid and plain answers. The following are the questions and answers, from which you may form your own opinion, as to the

mode of imparting religious instruction to young men in Trinity College.

1. Was the attendance on the lectures on catechism compulsory?

2. Did the Provost at each lecture dictate questions and answers from his own manuscript?

3. Did the students write both questions and answers as he dictated them?

4. Were the students expected on the next lecture day to read the answers as the Provost had dictated them?

5. Did you ever know the Provost to lend his manuscript to a student to correct his notes taken down at lecture?

6. Are there any copies of the manuscript thus corrected handed down from class to class? And is the book familiarly known among the students as "The Provost's Catechism?"

7. Did the Provost ever express his disapproval of the use of these note books?

8. Are you aware whether a proposition to publish the manuscript was ever made by any one of the students, and what was the Provost's reason for disapproving of its publication?

The following answers are from a layman residing in the diocese of Toronto. The answers are numbered to correspond with the questions.

ANSWER 1.—Attendance on the lectures is fully as compulsory as on any other lecture prescribed.

ANS. 2.—Yes, it is the Provost's regular mode of proceeding to dictate questions and answers.

ANS. 3.—No; that would be impossible at the rate the Provost is accustomed to go on. One of the first things a student does after entering is,

(on advice) to secure a copy of the manuscript, which invariably corresponds, almost verbatim,

with that which the Provost uses, except in some instances it may not perhaps be so full. As each student enters the lecture room, he brings his own

or another's copy of the manuscript, which he places on the table before him, in the presence of the Provost, leaving it closed until the questions

dictated on the last lecture day are answered or disposed of. Then he opens his manuscript, and follows the Provost as far as he goes, marking, at the same time, if he notices any error or mistake.

Apart from this, he writes neither questions nor answers, nor does he take notes, which must be quite apparent to the Provost.

ANS. 4.—Yes; that is the plan pursued, and never, in my experience, did I witness an answer as recorded in these manuscripts, prove to be correct; but I have known other answers refused, when they did not suit the Provost's views, or, as he said, "were not the answers I gave."

ANS. 5.—No; but I have heard he did so; but whether he did or not, the perfect agreement of both proves that we have got a correct copy.

ANS. 6.—These copies now in use are positively correct copies of the Provost's, as far as they go. They are handed down from class to class. The freshman, for whose benefit the catechism is designed, either copies one for himself, or has one given him by some of the students who have preceded him. I have been asked repeatedly by the students, "How do you like the Provost's catechism?"

ANS. 7.—I have never heard him do so.

ANS. 8.—I don't know. These statements are perfectly true, and can be proved in the most solemn manner.

I now proceed to give the answers of a clergyman in the Diocese of Huron.

ANS. 1.—Attendance was compulsory.

ANS. 2.—The Provost at each lecture asked questions, evidently from his own manuscript, upon the notes which he had dictated at the previous lecture, and of course the answers had to be taken from his notes.

ANS. 3.—The students used every means to ac-

quire the answers which the Provost required, and when they found that they had not the exact answer in their manuscript, they took down the answer given by him.

Ans. 4.—The students were required to give correct answers, taken from the Provost's notes, to the questions asked by him.

Ans. 5.—Never; but he lent his questions sometimes.

Ans. 6.—There is a catechism, question and answer, in common use among the students, handed down from class to class, and familiarly known as "The Provost's Catechism."

Ans. 7.—Never that I know of.

Ans. 8.—I have heard the students speaking of wishing to have the catechism published, but I do not remember the Provost's objections.

The next answers are from a layman resident in the Diocese of Toronto:

Ans. 1.—Yes; the Provost required an excuse for absence on every occasion.

Ans. 2.—The Provost lectured from his manuscript, and asked questions on the next day for lecture. He has frequently said, when a question has not been answered satisfactorily, "that is not what I gave you." His questions were written as well as his lectures.

Ans. 3.—Some of them took notes; others would have their predecessor's books, and would only follow him while reading, and see that they were correct.

Ans. 4.—We generally answered in his own words, and if not, as nearly as possible.

Ans. 5.—He lent his questions on the catechism on one or two occasions, and his notes on the articles. I cannot answer positively as to his notes on the catechism.

Ans. 6.—The manuscript, with an exact copy of his questions, (as taken by Mr. Wm. Jones, now of Cambridge,) and the answers, as collected (answer No. 3) were handed down. When I entered in 1856, I procured a book from Mr. W. Jones, from which to copy a manuscript for myself. It was always spoken of as "The Provost's Catechism."

Ans. 7.—I never heard of any disapproval, either directly or indirectly.

Ans. 8.—I, on several occasions, have heard students propose to have it published, and the reply generally given was, "The Provost would not like it." Whether or not he was consulted, I cannot say.

The next set of answers is from a layman, now resident in the Diocese of Huron.

Ans. 1.—Attendance on the catechism lecture was compulsory.

Ans. 2.—The Provost read from his manuscript as a continuous lecture, but must have been aware that we had it either written, or took very few notes in the room, and both questions and answers were contained in his lecture, although not distinguished as such by him, being probably aware that we had both questions and answers before us.

Ans. 3.—The students had both questions and answers written before they entered the room, and only compared their's with the Provost's while he read.

Ans. 4.—The students were expected on the lecture day to answer the questions of the preceding lecture day in the substance, and as much as possible in the words given.

Ans. 5.—I never did.

Ans. 6.—Each Student of the first year either borrows, and copies a manuscript from the borrowed copy, or purchases from a student of the second or third year his manuscript.

Ans. 7.—I never heard him say anything *pro* or *con* in the matter.

Ans. 8.—I never heard any proposition of the kind, though it might have been made without my knowledge.

The following is an extract from a note received from a lay gentleman, residing at some distance: "I do not think the Provost has ever given both questions and answers to any student to copy, but I heard when I was at college that he lent his questions on one occasion, and that a copy was taken of them. Of course, as soon as the students had a copy of the questions which were to be put to them, they were able to form proper answers from the notes which they had taken down from the last or preceding lecture. I don't remember hearing any copy called 'The Provost's Catechism;' I have heard of 'The Provost's Questions,' meaning those questions which the Provost asks. I have heard that the Provost has been asked to publish a catechism, in order that the students might be saved the trouble of writing out copies for themselves."

The following answers are from a graduate of Trinity College, residing in the Diocese of Toronto:

Ans. 1.—Yes; it was placed precisely on the same footing with other subjects. Students absenting themselves from catechism, or any other lecture given by the Provost, were *obliged* to account *satisfactorily* to the Provost on the succeeding day, for their absence therefrom.

Ans. 2.—Yes; the Provost's mode of procedure was as follows: at his first lecture to freshmen, he read to us about thirty questions, (the number varied afterwards.) The next Friday, he questioned us on the matter of the preceding Friday, and read to us fresh questions and answers sufficient to fill up the hour.

Ans. 3.—The students had copies of the questions and answers written, either by themselves, or students who had previously graduated in Trinity College, and as the Provost *read his lecture* they compared their manuscripts with what he read, and made alterations in the references, (texts of scripture,) or any thing else in which there might have been a discrepancy. They were thus assured of perfect accuracy.

Ans. 4.—Most assuredly they were; for I recollect that on one occasion, a student of my year expressed the answer in a manner which varied, by *two important words*, from that dictated by the Provost on the preceding Friday, and was corrected for it. I remember the more distinctly as every student who took pains with it, used to repeat it with literal accuracy.

Ans. 5.—I understood, by report among the students, that the Provost did at one time lend his manuscript to a student, and I always considered that this was the origin of the almost stereotyped accuracy of our manuscripts.

Ans. 6.—Yes; generally a student, after his previous examination in the second year, at which time he passes his third and last examination in the catechism, either gives, lends, or sells his manuscript catechism to junior students. In my case I obtained the loan of a manuscript catechism, and copied it out. It is familiarly known among the students as "the Provost's Catechism."

Ans. 7.—Never to my knowledge.

Ans. 8.—No; but I often wished, for my own convenience, that it had been printed and published, as the copying of it entailed a great deal of unnecessary labour upon me, and wasted much precious time, in fact, I thought it on the whole a very strange proceeding.

I have stated fully my objections to this mode of teaching in my pastoral; I need not here repeat them.

This manuscript, known as "The Provost's Catechism," with the questions copied or corrected from his own manuscript, lent for that purpose, and the answers taken down carefully from his own lips and corrected from time to time, has

been handed down from class to class, and has even been bought and sold by the students. I have not given the names of those gentlemen from whom I have received the above answers to my questions, but I can obtain permission to do so if necessary, and shall lay the original documents, together with the letters which accompanied them, before any member of the Synod appointed for that purpose. There was but one gentleman to whom I applied who expressed a wish "not to be implicated in the matter." I have therefore not made any use of his communication.

I now proceed to lay before you the teaching which I characterize as "dangerous in the extreme." I have heard when examining graduates of Trinity College, statements which they have reported as made to them, either in the course of lectures, or in conversation with the Divinity Professor. Some of these I took down at the time I heard them, such as the following, that "the Church of England lost at the Reformation some things which were in themselves good and tended to edification" that "justification was an impermanent subject to introduce before a congregation, as there was not one man in ten thousand who was not already justified." These and like statements I have heard from gentlemen who have been students in the University. I do not here dwell upon them; I come to the consideration of documents which I shall quote, and I think when these documents are well weighed, and compared with the articles and formularies of our Church, they will abundantly establish the conclusion to which I have come, that the teaching in Trinity College is dangerous.

I have now in my possession five copies of the catechism, which has been for years in the hands of the students of Trinity College, and which graduates of the University declare contains the questions of the Provost, corrected from his own manuscript, with the answers taken down carefully from his own lips. I have collected these five copies, and their agreement is such as must convince any one that either they all had their origin from one copy, or that they were reported with wonderful fidelity from the lips of the lecturer.

The following are specimens of the dangerous teaching contained in this catechism:—

On the article, "Born of the Virgin Mary," we find the following questions and answers:—

Ques.—What is the Hebrew form of the name Mary?

Ans.—Miriam.

Ques.—What does that signify?

Ans.—Exaltation.

Ques.—What signification, then, had it as borne by the mother of our Lord?

Ans.—The exalted position resulting from her having given birth to the Redeemer of the world.

Ques.—Who is the first recorded possessor of this name?

Ans.—Miriam, the sister of Moses and Aaron.

Ques.—Show that she may be regarded as holding a position under the old dispensation, typical of that which Mary held under the new?

Ans.—Miriam was an instrument in bringing the Israelites into the promised land, and Mary was an instrument in bringing mankind into the Kingdom of Glory (or Heaven.)

Ques.—What was the belief of the early Fathers respecting the virginity of Mary?

Ans.—That she continued a virgin ever after.

Ques.—On what grounds did it rest?

Ans.—Some suppose that the mother of such a son could not be mother of another.

Such teaching as this I regard as a dangerous tampering with a false doctrine of the Church of Rome, directly leading to idolatry. It will, I

doubt not, be said by some that Pearson, in his "Exposition of the Creed," teaches the same thing. Even were this the case, still I would consider the teaching as dangerous in the present time, when there is, especially in the minds of the young, such a hankering after the errors and superstitions of Rome; but Pearson does not teach that the Virgin Mary had a *divinely appointed type under the law*; neither does he teach that she was an instrument in bringing mankind into the Kingdom of Heaven. He says: "As she, Miriam, was exalted to be one of these who brought the people of God out of the Egyptian bondage, so was this Mary exalted to be the mother of that Saviour, who, through the red sea of his blood, had wrought a plenteous redemption for us, of which that was a type." In the questions and answers of the catechism, the undue exaltation of Mary is pushed far beyond what Pearson says upon the subject, and we see the germ of that full-blown superstition which, in its most revolting form, meets us in the late letter of the Pope to the Canadian Bishops. I fear such teaching for our young men. If they are taught to believe that Mary is typified in the law, they may soon conclude, with Bonaventure, that she is to be found in the Psalms, and thus be led to look upon the idolatrous honour done to her in the Church of Rome as natural and right.

On the article, "The Communion of Saints," I find the following questions and answers:—

Ques.—With whom have the saints communion? Prove from Holy Scripture.

Ans.—With God the Father, &c., and with God the Son, &c., and with God the Holy Ghost, &c., and with the holy angels, &c., with all the saints of the Church Militant, &c., and with all the saints departed, &c.

Ques.—Wherein does communion with saints departed consist?

Ans.—In union of affection, involving on our part reverential commemoration and imitation, and on their part interest on our behalf, and probable intercession with God for us.

I will add here a letter lately received from a clergyman who some years since graduated in Trinity College. "I will now endeavour to state, as well as I can remember, things which struck me as particularly strange in the Prorost's doctrinal teaching. I cannot remember the exact words. I can only give the impression they left on my mind at the time. In lecturing on 'The Communion of Saints,' he certainly gave us to understand, while discoursing on the interest the saints took in our spiritual welfare, that he thought that they pleaded with God for us. He did on one occasion make use of these words or words very like them, 'This is one of the losses which we sustained,' or 'Things which we lost at the Reformation,' and I have a very strong impression upon my mind that it was when speaking of prayers for the dead. He always spoke of baptismal regeneration as if all divines received the doctrine in its strongest sense, without ever hinting that there was a far more evangelical view of it taken by many eminent divines in our Church. When young men are thus taught, in the creed we profess to believe, that the saints departed take an interest in our spiritual welfare, and probably intercede with God for us, the transition is easy to 'Holy St. Dominick pray for us.' Can we regard that man as a sound-hearted member of the Church of England, as she now is, who has learned that the same Church, at the Reformation, lost certain valuable practices, which, of course, it would be our duty, if possible, to have restored?

On the article "Remission of Sins," in the creed, I find the following questions and answers:—

Ques.—How is remission of sins granted under the Gospel?

Ans.—In baptism past sin is forgiven, whether original or actual, in the case either of infants, or adults duly prepared by faith and repentance.

Ques.—How is it granted after baptism?

Ans.—On repentance.

Ques.—In what mode is redemption declared and sealed to the penitent?

Ans.—It is declared in the authoritative absolution, and sealed in the reception of the Holy Communion.

Ques.—Prove from Holy Scripture.

Ans.—"If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins."—1 John I, 8, 9. "To whom ye forgive any thing, to whom I forgive it, for your sakes forgive I it, in the person of Christ."—2 Cor. II, 10.

The evident intention in quoting this passage from the 2nd Epistle to the Corinthians, is to justify the statement that the remission of sins is declared "in the authoritative absolution" mentioned in the answer to the preceding question. Contrast the mode of granting remission of sins set forth in this catechism with the mode enunciated so clearly in the eleventh article of our Church, "we are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by faith, and not for our own works and desertings; wherefore, that we are justified by faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely is expressed in the homily of justification." This mode of teaching the remission of sin, in baptism, sealed by the reception of the Lord's Supper, and declared by the authoritative absolution of the Church, is not that which God has revealed in His Word, and which our Church teaches in her formularies, her articles, and her homilies. If baptism, the supper of the Lord, and the authoritative absolution, take away sin and seal the pardon of the transgressor, then the Church of Rome is right, and our forefathers were unjustifiable schismatics in separating from her communion.

Concerning the sacraments, I find in the catechism the following questions and answers.—

Ques.—Of what sacraments does the catechism treat?

Ans.—Of two only as generally necessary to salvation, baptism and the Lord's Supper.

Ques.—What is implied by these restrictions of the term?

Ans.—That the term sacrament may be more widely applied to mean any holy rite.

Ques.—Where, then, lies the error of the Roman Church in making seven sacraments?

Ans.—In drawing no due distinction between the two great sacraments and other holy rites.

Ques.—The sacraments are said to be generally necessary to salvation; what is meant by generally?

Ans.—Generally here means *universally*: i. e., to all men. The sacraments are necessary, not to God, as instruments whereby he may save us, but to us, as God's appointed means of salvation, the channels in which his grace flows to us. (Laud)

Ques.—Give an instance of a sacrament or a holy rite ordained by Christ himself, which is not generally necessary to salvation?

Ans.—Orders.

Ques.—What rites does Rome class with the two great sacraments?

Ans.—Confirmation, penance, orders, matrimony, and extreme unction.

Ques.—What is to be observed concerning confirmation?

Ans.—Confirmation was in early times part of the sacrament of baptism; it became separated from it in three ways, &c.

Ques.—What concerning orders?

Ans.—This rite was appointed by Christ, and was accompanied by an outward sign, but the grace bestowed is not personal, but official, and there is no promise of the remission of sins.

Ques.—What respecting penance?

Ans.—In early time, those who were subject to ecclesiastical penalties were required to confess their sins, and after having been separated from the Church, were admitted by the laying on of hands. (This rite is not attended by the remission of sins.)

Ques.—What respecting matrimony?

Ans.—In this rite, there are outward signs, but no spiritual grace, and no promise of the remission of sins.

Is it safe to teach young men thus to regard the so-called sacraments which the Church of Rome has added to the only two appointed by Christ? and not as our Church plainly teaches concerning them in the 25th article. Those five commonly called sacraments are not to be counted sacraments of the Gospel, being such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the Apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the scriptures, but yet have not like nature of sacraments, with baptism and by the Lord's Supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God." Our Church does not speak of two great sacraments, leaving us to infer that there are lesser sacraments, and that the Church of Rome, in adding to the sacraments appointed by Christ, has only erred in not making a "due distinction" between the two great sacraments and other holy rites or sacraments. Neither does our Church trifle with her members by using the word generally when she intended to express "universally." When we add to this that these young men who are thus taught in the first year of their university course, to toy with the sacraments of the Church of Rome, are further instructed that the recipient of the bread and wine in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper partakes of the "glorified humanity" of the Son of God, I think it will be acknowledged that the teaching is dangerous in a very high degree. Moreover, in this catechism, our Lord's words, recorded in the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel, are repeatedly quoted, as spoken concerning the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, as in the following answers:—

Ques.—Prove from Holy Scripture that the Lord's Supper is generally necessary?

Ans.—"Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat of the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you."—John vi., 53.

Ques.—What words of our Lord show this?

Ans.—Our Lord speaks of the spiritual benefits which should certainly flow from eating his flesh and blood, of which benefits the wicked cannot be thought to partake.—"Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood dwelleth in me and I in him."—John vi., 54, &c.

Ques.—Prove from Holy Scripture that the Holy Eucharist sustains the spiritual life imparted by Baptism?

Ans.—"Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, you have no life in you."—John vi., 53.

In these questions and answers, taken from different parts of the catechism, the student is unhesitatingly taught to interpret the words of our Lord, in the sixth of John, as spoken concerning the sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

Commentators of the Church of England since the Reformation, and some Roman Catholic divines have interpreted the sixth Chapter of St. John's Gospel as having no reference whatsoever to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and one of the latter has asserted that "the Universal Church has understood this passage, ever since its promulgation, to mean spiritual eating and drinking by a living faith."

One of our most eminent reformers, when combating the doctrine of transubstantiation, thus expressed himself concerning this passage: "Christ in that place of John spake not of the material and sacramental bread, nor of the sacramental eating (for that was spoken two or three years before the sacrament was first ordained,) but he spake of spiritual bread, many times repeating, 'I am the bread of life which came down from heaven,' and of spiritual eating by faith, after which sort he was at the same present time eating of as many as believed on him although the sacrament was not at that time made and instituted. And therefore he said, 'Your Father did eat manna in the desert and died; but he that eateth this bread shall live forever.' Therefore, this place of St. John can in no wise be understood of the sacramental bread, which neither came from heaven, neither giveth life to all that eat. Nor of such bread could Christ have then presently said, 'This is my flesh,' except they will say, that Christ did then consecrate so many years before the institution of His Holy Supper."—*Cranmer*.

I cannot, therefore, think it sound divinity or good Protestantism to teach that in the sixth chapter of St. John, our Lord refers to the oral reception of the elements in the sacrament, and not to the *spiritual participation of his body and blood, by faith*; such teaching I must consider "dangerous in the extreme."

I have thus laid before you, from authentic sources, some of the teaching to which I object. The impressions conveyed to my mind by the examination of graduates of the University, I cannot of course convey to yours. The mode adopted by me to ascertain the character and effects of the teaching in Trinity College is that which common sense dictated, and which my position required me to adopt, namely, to examine the pupils. It would be quite impossible to write all I have learned in this way, but the result has been a deep-seated conviction that a large proportion of tares is mixed with the seed sown in the minds of the young men educated in the institution. In some, I know, these tares have not taken root, but this is to be attributed to the fact that their minds were pre-occupied by the good seed which had been previously sown by the care of their parents or pastors. Whether this has always been sufficient to prevent the growth of the tares, I cannot say.

Before I conclude this letter, which is the last I shall address to you on this subject, I would briefly advert to one or two passages in my late pastoral.

The resolutions of the committee, which were said to have been transmitted to me, were never received, they never came into my hands.

When the statute which has been the subject of discussion was read at the Council, I *strongly objected to it*, stating, at the same time, that if we could always depend on having a Chancellor like the gentleman who now so worthily occupies that position, there could be no objection to leave some discretionary power with him, as all knew that he would act wisely and justly, but that such discretion could not be safely intrusted to every person who might hereafter be elected Chancellor of the University.

With reference to my reasons for not appearing at the meetings of the Corporation, they are

stated by me in my letter to the Bishop of Toronto, and occupy a paragraph of that letter.

It is very unfortunate that when the corporation of Trinity College undertook to state from my letter the grounds on which I declined to take my place at the corporation, they should have selected part of a sentence in the middle of the paragraph, and overlooked those portions of the same paragraph which immediately precede and follow that part of a sentence which they selected. The letter is now before the public, and any one who will take the trouble to analyze the paragraph referred to will find that there are three grounds for my refusal to attend the corporation of Trinity College. The first and chief reason which I quote in my pastoral is contained in the words, "*as I cannot in my soul approve of the theological teaching of Trinity College, I believe that my appearing to sanction this teaching would be a positive evil.*" The second is in the following words:—"Were I to go to the Council, as you say would be the wiser and more honorable course, and enter my protest against the teaching which I condemn, no good result could follow, (as I could not expect to effect a change in the teaching of the University)." The words which I have included between brackets are the only portion of the paragraph noticed by the Corporation, and they state *this as the ground* of my refusal to attend the meetings of the Council, whereas these words constitute an inferior member of the sentence, and do not express my reason for not attending the meetings of the Council. The third reason assigned in the paragraph is; "And the melancholy picture of a house divided against itself would be presented; to avoid this, I have heretofore kept aloof from the University, and I am still satisfied in my own mind, that it is better for me thus to act than to introduce discussion into the Council, and thus to render patent the differences which unhappily exist among us." With these three reasons thus plainly before them, the Corporation of Trinity College selects an inferior member of a sentence in the middle of the paragraph, and asserts that in that part of a sentence, without reference to the context, is contained the ground stated by me for refusing to comply with the request of the Bishop of Toronto to take my place at Council.

This letter was written as a "private communication" to the Bishop of Toronto, but it is evident it was laid before the corporation, as it is referred to in their document of the 29th June. In that letter, while I declined to take my place at the council (for the three reasons assigned,) which was the thing the Bishop urged me to do, I stated in the most emphatic way, "*I cannot of my soul approve of the theological teaching of Trinity College,*" and I hoped and expected that his Lordship would have asked me to particularise in what this teaching consisted; to my regret and surprise he did not do so, and therefore, I could not arrive at any other conclusion than that which I have stated in my pastoral.

But discussions on these minor points are unimportant, and are of no real interest to the public. The teaching of Trinity College is that which concerns the community. From what I have written above, all may judge of this for themselves. The documentary evidence which I have adduced is but a small part of the information which I have obtained in my examination of the graduates of the University. Some, perhaps, may not see the danger I apprehend, and may think it quite safe to send their sons to the institution; but I feel assured that many will concur in opinion with me, that it is not wise or safe to subject young and inexperienced minds to such teaching, even though great names be quoted in favour of it.

In conclusion, I would say, that as no one can

now misunderstand my attendance at the council of Trinity College, and as "the melancholy picture" which I wished to avoid has been made patent to all, I shall take into consideration the expediency of appointing five gentlemen as members of the corporation, and of endeavouring, in my place there, to effect those changes in the institution which will render it such, that I may be able conscientiously to recommend it to others, and avail myself of it for the benefit of my diocese.

I remain, my reverend brethren and brethren,
Your faithful friend and brother in the faith,
August 29, 1860. BENJ. HURON.

TRINITY COLLEGE.

At a meeting of the Corporation of Trinity College held on Thursday, September, 27th, 1860: (Present: the Hon. and Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Toronto, the Hon. Sir John Beverley Robinson, Bart., Chancellor of the University, the Reverend the Provost of Trinity College, the Rev. the Vice-Provost, the Reverend Professor Hatch, Professor Bovell, M.D., the Hon. G. W. Allan, the Hon. Mr. Vice-Chancellor Spragge, James M. Strachan, Esq., the Hon. Mr. Justice Hagarty, D.C.L., James Lukin Robinson, Esq., Samuel Bickerton Harman, B.C.L., the Hon. John Hillyard Cameron, D.C.L., the Rev. T. B. Fuller, D.D., D.C.L., the Reverend William McMurray, D.D., D.C.L., the Rev. S. Givins, the Reverend J. T. Lewis, LL.D.)

The Lord Bishop of Toronto made the following communication to the meeting, "I beg leave to lay on the table a letter which I have received from the Reverend the Provost of Trinity College, in vindication of his religious teaching in the College from an attack which has been made upon it by the Bishop of Huron, and also the printed letter upon it by the Bishop of Huron to the Executive Committee of his Diocese, in which that attack is continued. I lay these papers before the Council not doubting that it will appear to them on their consideration, that the Provost in regard to those things which he admits that he has taught, has successfully defended his doctrine by reference to Holy Scripture, and the Book of Common Prayer, and to those venerated Divines, whose writings are of the highest authority in our Church."

The Bishop then called upon the Provost to read the following letter:—

MY LORD,—I have prepared, in reply to the letter addressed by the Lord Bishop of Huron to the Executive Committee of his Synod, a full statement of my teaching on the points objected to by his Lordship, together with authorities from approved writers of the Church of England; but, independently of this more elaborate reply, I think it necessary to give a brief answer to some of the comments of the Bishop on the manner, matter, and tendency of that teaching. As respects the manner, I can add but little to the statement which I made in my letter of the 28th of July, which was published in the daily papers, and which I here transcribe.

"It is my duty to lecture the students of the first year on the catechism of the Church of England. For this purpose I have compiled a manuscript which I read and explain to the class. The students are expected to take notes of the lecture, and to answer questions on the next day of attendance. In order to save time and to observe due method in my questioning, I have prepared, for my own use, a book of questions, omitting or adding questions at my discretion, when I use it. The only written result of my lectures which I require or wish, is a summary of them in the

note-books of the Students. The contents of these books I *never* see, nor can I hold myself responsible for them. I am, however, given to understand that it is the practice of some of the students to write down the questions which are addressed to them, and to reduce their notes into the form of answers to these questions. This practice I disapprove, and it is well known that I do not consider it to be a legitimate mode of registering the information given in the lectures. Some years ago I consented, more than once, to place my book of questions in the hands of students, on their plea that it would assist them to complete or correct their notes. I know also that the note-books have passed from hand to hand in the college, but so far from encouraging this, I have urged young men to trust, if not exclusively, at all events, mainly, to their own recollection and record of what they hear. My wish is further, that in replying to my questions, the students should give, in their own language, for the most part, the substance of what they have been taught. Of course there are instances in which substantial accuracy can be secured only by keeping close to the exact terms in which the instruction was conveyed.

I beg, therefore, to observe that no manuscript known by the name of "The Provost's Catechism," or by any other name, is placed in the hands of any student entering the University, far less is any student expected to learn it."

The statement which I here made is fully borne out by one of the Bishop's own authorities. He says, "I do not think the Provost has ever given both questions and answers to any student to copy, but I heard when I was at College that he lent his questions on one occasion, and that a copy was taken of them. Of course, as soon as the students had a copy of the questions which were to be put to them, they were able to form proper answers from the notes which they had taken down from the last or preceding lecture. I don't remember hearing of any copy called 'The Provost's catechism.' I have heard of the 'Provost's questions,' meaning those questions which the Provost asks. I have heard that the Provost has been asked to publish a catechism, in order that the students might be saved the trouble of writing out copies for themselves." It may, however, be well that I should now do publicly, what I should long ago have been most ready and willing to do privately, give answers of my own to the series of questions which the Bishop of Huron has addressed to his informants. This then I proceed to do.

Q. 1.—Was the attendance on the lectures on catechism compulsory?

A.—Undoubtedly it was, and no hint has been thrown out that it was not so.

Q. 2.—Did the Provost at each lecture dictate questions and answers from his own manuscript?

A.—Certainly not. I put questions to the students at the opening of each lecture, on the subject of the preceding lecture, to be answered by them *vis à voce*. Consequently the statement that questions were read at the first lecture is absolutely untrue.

Q. 3.—Did the students write both questions and answers as he dictated them?

A.—Since neither questions nor answers were dictated they could not be written by the students.

Q. 4.—Were the students expected on the next lecture day to read the answers as the Provost had dictated them?

A.—As the answers had neither been dictated nor written down, they could not be read.

Q. 5.—Did you ever know the Provost to lend his manuscript to a student to correct his notes taken down at lecture?

A.—I have no recollection whatever of having lent my manuscript, nor is the correctness of my recollection in this particular disputed by the informants of the Bishop of Huron, but I did lend a book containing my questions. It is particularly to be noticed that these questions have no answers annexed.

Q. 6.—Are there any copies of the manuscript thus corrected handed down from class to class? And is the book familiarly known among the students as "The Provost's Catechism?"

A.—I believe that a manuscript containing my questions, with answers framed from the notes of my lectures, was compiled, soon after the opening of the College, without authority, by one of the students, and has been repeatedly copied; but I had no knowledge of the existence of such a book, until I was informed of it in July last by Dr. Borell, who received his information from the Bishop of Huron. I have never seen such a book, and know of its existence only by report.

Q. 7.—Did the Provost ever express his disapproval of the use of these note-books?

A.—I did frequently express disapproval of the servile use of the note-books of others, conceiving however that they contained merely an analysis of my lectures. Had I known what these note-books are said to contain, my disapproval would have been expressed more strongly; and when I lent my questions, which I have not done for some years, I cautioned students not to avail themselves of them for the purpose of reducing my lecture to a catechetical form.

Q. 8.—Are you aware whether a proposition to publish the manuscript was ever made by any of the students, and what was the Provost's reason for disapproving of its publication?

A.—I was never asked to publish my manuscript on the catechism.

These facts I consider to be of great importance. 1st.—So far as they relate to the mode of teaching, which, had it been conducted by dictated questions and answers, I should, with the Bishop of Huron, regard as very objectionable, and without precedent at home. 2nd.—Because the fact, that answers to the questions were not dictated, materially affects the authority of the manuscripts from which the Bishop of Huron derives his information. It should be remembered that at the time at which the Bishop issued his pastoral of the 21st of July I was in utter ignorance of the contents of these manuscripts, and consequently most anxious not to be held in any way responsible for them: and it must be evident to any reasonable man that I cannot justly be made answerable for the terms in which young men, little versed in Theology, have thought fit to give expression to my teaching.

In the next paragraph of the Bishop's letter he speaks of information derived by his Lordship from candidates for holy orders, respecting my opinions as expressed in my lectures or in private conversation. I must indignantly protest against the production of any such hearsay evidence; and the special instances brought forward by the Bishop, respecting "the losses sustained at the Reformation," and "the impertinence of preaching on the doctrine of justification," I meet with a flat denial of their truth. In the same way I meet the letter of a clergyman quoted by the Bishop, in which mention is made of prayers for the dead, a practice against which every Theological student of the College must know that I have repeatedly and strongly urged every argument both from Scripture and from reason.

To proceed to the Bishop's specific objections. 1st.—Concerning the Virgin Mary. The Bishop

says, "such teaching I regard as a dangerous tampering with a false doctrine of the Church of Rome, directly leading to idolatry. I positively deny that my real teaching is in any degree open to this censure, and I most confidently appeal to the Theological students generally, in proof of the assertion that I have ever strongly condemned those grievous errors of the Church of Rome which assign to the Blessed Virgin any other place, in the economy of human redemption, than that of a humble yet most honoured instrument in the hand of Him, who made her thus instrumental by causing her to be the mother of the Lord. In my lectures on the articles, I have argued against the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, from our Lord's words, "Yea rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep it," by showing that, if that dogma were true, then *Mary would enjoy an exclusive spiritual privilege, to which the hearing and keeping of the word of God could advance no other human being.* I have often said that the one error of Mariolatry constituted, in my opinion, an impassable gulph between the Church of Rome and our own.

The answer which the Bishop of Huron cites on this subject is: "Miriam was an instrument in bringing the Israelites into the promised land, and Mary was an instrument in bringing mankind into the kingdom of Glory (or Heaven.)" For this answer, as being incorrect, I am in no way responsible, and I object to it altogether, both in respect of Miriam and in respect of Mary. I consider the latter clause to be open to very dangerous construction, as it might be understood to imply some past or permanent ministry of the Blessed Virgin tending immediately to the salvation of mankind.

In explanation of my own view, I would say that I claim Bishop Pearson as a recognized authority in our Church, and his work on the creed as an unexceptionable text-book. Pearson then says "As she (Miriam) was exalted to be one of them who brought the people of God out of the Egyptian bondage, so was this Mary exalted to become the mother of that Saviour, who, through the Red Sea of His blood, hath wrought a plentiful redemption for us, of which 't' it was but a type." In my manuscript I find the following words: "The sister of Moses and Aaron, coupled with them by the prophets as a joint leader of Israel from Egypt, (Micah VI. 4,) and thus answering, in some typical respect, to the place which Mary bore instrumentally in the means of human redemption." These words are taken from Dr. Mill's analysis of Pearson, and are taken advisedly, as expressing distinctly and guardedly the Bishop's meaning. For these words only, then, can I consent to be responsible, nor can I suppose that any candid person would object to them as not correctly representing the meaning of the original author.

I trace the typical resemblance of which Pearson speaks only in the earlier recorded events of Miriam's life, when, watching the infant deliverer "to see what would become of the child," she occupies in respect of him a position analogous to that of Mary as the guardian of our Lord's infancy; and again, when leading the song of triumph at the Red Sea, she celebrated the beginning of God's temporal deliverance, as Mary celebrated, in her Eucharistic Hymn, the beginning of His great redemption.

The Bishop next quotes from the manuscript he has used, yet without any special remark, two questions and answers relating to the belief of the early Church respecting the perpetual virginity of the mother of our Lord. In my manuscript I find only a reference to a passage in Bishop Pearson which I here transcribe: "We believe the mother of our Lord to have been not

only before and after His nativity, but also for ever, the most immaculate and blessed Virg.:" and again "the peculiar eminency and unparalleled privilege of that mother, the special honour and reverence due unto that Son, and ever paid by her, the regard of that Holy Ghost who came upon her, and the power of the Highest which overshadowed her, the singular goodness and piety of Joseph to whom she was espoused, have persuaded the Church of God in all ages to believe that she still continued in the same virginity, and therefore is to be acknowledged as the ever Virgin Mary"—Pearson on the Creed, vol. I. p. 272, Oxf. 1820.

To this testimony of Bishop Pearson may be added those of Archbishop Cranmer, Bishop Latimer, Bishop Hooper, Bishop Jewel, Dr. Hammon, Bishop Bull, Bishop Beveridge, Bishop Wilson and Bishop Z. Pearce, which I shall give in full in my longer letter, some of these writers maintain the perpetual virginity as a reasonable and pious opinion, while others contend that it is a necessary doctrine proved by Holy Scripture. I should be disposed to take the ground occupied by the former, and I trust that their authority together with that of those who adopt the stricter view of the matter, will protect me from the charge of dangerous heresy or disgusting folly.

Respecting the Bishop's objection, under the heads of "the intercession of saints," I would again confidently appeal to the students of the College as to the character of my teaching, and I must indignantly deny the justice of the Bishop of Huron's insinuation as to its tendency. No man can be more heartily convinced than I am of the presumptuous impety of the practice of the "invocation of saints."

To the question and answer quoted by the Bishop I have no objection to urge, as my manuscript contains the words "and probable intercession with God for us," though not in the form of question or answer. I will only notice that the introduction of the word "probable" shows that prayer on the part of the departed for the church on earth is not inculcated as a necessary doctrine, proved by holy Scripture, but is spoken of only as a pious opinion, not contrary to it.

In reply to the Bishop's objection I have to state that the great writers of our Church, in controversy with Rome, have always carefully distinguished between *the prayers of saints departed for us and our praying to them*. The latter they justly denounce as a presumptuous and superstitious practice, and as an invasion of the prerogative of Almighty God: the former they allow to be a probable and reasonable belief. They distinguish also between *general and particular intercession*, showing that the former implies *no present knowledge of our condition on the part of saints departed*, but merely a *recollection of earthly friends*. When I speak of *the saints departed*, I mean "the spirits of just men made perfect," not assuming that it is possible that we should have any certain knowledge of the individuals who constitute their body, which knowledge must be assumed by those who approve or practice the "invocation of saints."

I can by no means admit that the transition is easy, from the belief that saints departed offer general intercession for the Church on earth, to the use of the invocation "Holy St. Dominick pray for us" and I consider the admission that such a transition is easy most perilous to the true faith. I subjoin an extract from a letter addressed by Bishop Ridley to the martyr Bradford, shortly after his condemnation. "Brother Bradford, so long as I shall understand thou art in thy journey, by God's grace I shall call upon our heavenly Father for Christ's sake to set thee safely home, and then, good brother, speak you, and pray for the remnant which are to suffer for

Christ's sake, according to that thou then shalt know more clearly.—See vol. III, p. 370 of Fox's Acts and Monuments, folio, London, 1681. If Bishop Ridley is to be accounted a dangerous heretic for the adoption of this language, I am well content to share his disgrace.

Respecting the remission of sins I appeal to Bishop Pearson, his words are—

"And therefore the Church of God, in which remission of sin is preached, doth not only promise it at first by the laver of regeneration, but afterwards, also upon the virtue of repentance; and to deny the Church this power of absolution is the heresy of Novatian."

In these words the writer claims for the Church the power of absolving the penitent, *not the power of absolving any transgressor whatever*, as the Bishop of Huron implies. Dr. Mill, in his analysis, adds the means which the Church employs in the exercise of this power, and speaks of remission as declared in the authoritative *absolutions* (not *absolution*) pronounced by the ministers of the Church, and sealed in the reception of the Holy Communion. The whole weight of the Bishop of Huron's objection lies in his suppression of the word "penitent." True repentance, which cannot exist apart from true faith in Christ, is presupposed, as the indispensable qualification of the recipient of the pardon, which God is then asserted to bestow in the Church, this, the *authoritative*, yet simply *ministerial*, absolution of the minister, which takes effect, not at his (the minister's) pleasure, but according to the genuineness of the repentance of those to whom it is administered. In special cases, of rare occurrence, the minister is indeed called upon to pronounce an absolution, which is judicial as well as ministerial; yet here again, the absolution is contingent, and cannot take effect except upon those who *truly* repent and believe.

Respecting the sacraments, as his Lordship has recognized the Homilies as one of the authoritative formularies of our church, I would submit that every detail of my teaching to which his Lordship objects, is to be found in the Homily on Common Prayer and Sacraments. I shall enter into this matter at much greater length in a letter which I am about to publish, and will here merely observe that in speaking of Penance, Matrimony, &c., it was my purpose to indicate some one or more points in which each of the five so-called sacraments of the Church of Rome falls short of the definition of a Sacrament given in the Catechism of the Church of England. It being an undoubted historical fact that the word "Sacrament" was applied in early times, not to seven rites or holy things, but to things innumerable of such nature, it is most important not to rest the pre-eminence of the two great sacraments of Christ, upon a vain attempt to restrict to them a term of human invention not found in Holy Scripture, but on their distinctive dignity as being ordained by Christ Himself, and as being the only outward signs in the use of which our spiritual life is communicated and sustained.

In order, however, to maintain as far as possible, a verbal distinction between the two great sacraments and other holy rites, a distinction which has not been made by the appropriation to those sacraments of a distinctive name, I should, in practice invariably use the word "sacrament," of baptism and the Lord's Supper *only*, and I should reprove any young man under my care for applying it to any other rite. So far am I from teaching the students of Trinity College to "toy" with the so-called sacraments of the Church of Rome.

The Bishop also complains that the words "generally necessary to salvation," are thus explained in the manuscript which he has used, "Generally here means universally, generally i. e.

to all men." In my manuscript I find these words "generally necessary, not to God, as instruments whereby He is to save; but to us, as God's appointed means of salvation, necessary generally, that is, to all men." I do not use the word "universally," and if I err in my interpretation of the word "generally," I err with Dr. Hammond, Bishop Nicholson, Bishop Beveridge, Bishop Wilson and Dr. Nicholls, as I shall show by quotations in my longer letter. I have been accustomed also to show how this general necessity is limited, by reference to the language used respecting the Sacrament of Baptism in the service for the baptism of adults, "whereby ye may perceive the great necessity of this sacrament, where it may be had." If this explanation of the meaning of the word "generally" be not satisfactory, I should be glad to learn what interpretation of the term will meet at once the theory of the objector and the requirements of common sense.

There are but two other points in the Bishop of Huron's letter now remaining to be considered. On these I must touch very briefly, reserving the more full reply to them for my longer letter. They are these, the Bishop's objection to Mr. Procter's statement that every faithful recipient (not the recipient, as the Bishop states) of the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper partakes of the glorified humanity of the Son of God, and his Lordship's objection to my reference to St. John VI. 53, to prove the necessity of the Lord's Supper. In reply to the former objection I am prepared to show that Mr. Procter's teaching is fully confirmed by great divines of our Church, and among the rest by Archbishop Usher, whom I now proceed to quote, yet was it fit also, that this head should be of the same nature with the body which is knit unto it; and therefore that He should so be God, as that He might partake of His flesh likewise. "For we are members of His body," saith the same Apostle, "of His flesh, and of His bones." And, "except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man," saith our Saviour Himself, "and drink His blood, ye have no life in you." "He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in Me, and I in him." Declaring thereby, first, that by His mystical and supernatural union, we are as truly conjoined with Him, as the meat and drink we take is with us, when by the ordinary work of nature, it is converted into our own substance; secondly, that this conjunction is *immediately made with his human nature*.—Usher's Works, vol. IV., p. 608,—(see also page 617.)

Respecting the Bishop's objection to my quoting the sixth chapter of St. John, I will only state that while a difference of opinion exists among divines as to interpreting the language of the sixth of St. John, directly of the Lord's Supper, or of spiritual feeding in general, all who hold the former opinion, and most of those who hold the latter, would alike agree in urging from this chapter the necessity of the Lord's Supper as the great mean of Divine appointment, whereby the act of spiritual feeding is performed, and the benefit thence resulting received.

The passage which the Bishop quotes from Archbishop Cranmer, is by no means hostile to my application of the text in question. Writing against Garliner, and against the error of Transubstantiation, he argues that our Lord did not speak in this chapter of sacramental eating, but of spiritual eating, two acts which he conceived His antagonist to regard as almost identical, but which he regarded as distinct. It does by no means follow however, that Cranmer did not look upon sacramental feeding as being, after the institution of the Lord's Supper, a necessary condition of spiritual feeding. A quotation, which I shall give in my longer letter, will go far to prove that he did so. Both objections appear to be

raised for the purpose of throwing upon my teaching a vague suspicion of a leaning to the error of Transubstantiation. This suspicion may, I believe, be completely met by the following extract from my manuscript on the Catechism. "The body and blood of Christ which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper." "Verily and indeed, no less truly because *not corporally*: 'by the faithful,' the wicked cannot receive 1 Cor. x. 21. St. Augustine's saying "the wicked eat 'panem Domini,' but not 'panem Dominum.'" Our Lord speaks also of spiritual benefits which should certainly follow from eating His flesh and drinking His blood, of which benefits the wicked cannot be thought to partake. St. John vi. 54, 56."

If any man supposes that a person who thus teaches, can countenance in any degree the doctrine of Transubstantiation, I confess myself incapable of arguing with him.

In conclusion, I wish to observe that the present controversy is very likely to convey to the public in general the impression that, if false doctrine has not been taught in the College, yet at least undue prominence and exaggerated importance have been given to matters of very secondary moment. Your Lordship is well aware that it is not my teaching, but the Bishop of Huron's strictures on it, which have given this prominence and importance to the matters in question. I do not say this by way of complaint, but simply in self-defence, and for the purpose of abating a not unreasonable prejudice. The objections are for the most part based on a few short and scattered clauses, not one of which I am prepared to retract, but which I should be very sorry to have made the principal or even prominent topics of my teaching.

I have the honor to be,

My Lord,

Your Lordship's obliged and faithful servant,

GEORGE WHITAKER.

Trinity College,
Sept. 27th, 1860.

The letter of the Provost having been read, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

Moved by the Hon. G. W. ALLAN, seconded by S. B. HARMAN, Esq.,

Resolved,—That this Corporation, having heard the reply of the Provost of Trinity College to the letter of the Bishop of Huron, bearing date August 29, 1860, desire to express their entire satisfaction with the explanations offered; the charges advanced against the Theological teaching of the Institution in that letter.

Moved by the Hon. Mr. Justice HAGARTY, seconded by the Hon. J. H. CAMPBELL,

Resolved,—That this Corporation feel it incumbent upon them to express their unfeigned surprise and regret at the course which has been adopted by the Lord Bishop of Huron to obtain evidence against the Theological teaching of this Institution.

They naturally supposed that a gentleman in the position of the Provost would be safe from any charge of unsoundness until personally referred to for an admission or denial of hearsay statements. Had the charges been denied by the accused this Corporation could not properly have objected to the right of his accusers to proceed to collect evidence relevant to the charge.

Apart from the theological bearing of the case, this Corporation desire to express their decided opinion as to the unprecedented manner in which grave charges have been publicly advanced, against the soundness of the teaching of this College, by one in whom the law has vested large powers to enquire into and reform any thing erroneous, but who has not attempted to exercise this power in a constitutional manner.

APPOINTMENT OF A METROPOLITAN.

THE LETTERS PATENT, OF HER MAJESTY, UNDER THE GREAT SEAL, APPOINTING THE LORD BISHOP OF MONTREAL AND HIS SUCCESSORS IN THAT SEE, METROPOLITANS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN CANADA.

VICTORIA, by the Grace of God, of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, QUEEN, Defender of the Faith;

To all to whom these Presents shall come, Greeting.

[After recounting, in the preamble, the circumstances connected with the original appointment of a Bishop of Canada, (the Bishop of Quebec,) and mentioning the manner in which the Bishopric of Montreal was at first constituted, by the subdivision of the Province into separate Dioceses, the Letters Patent proceed to state:—]

*** And whereas we did thereby will and grant that the said Bishop of Montreal should be a body corporate, and did ordain, make and constitute him to be a perpetual corporation, and to have perpetual succession; and that he and his successors should for ever thereafter be called, and known by the name or title of the "LORD BISHOP OF MONTREAL;" and that he and his successors, by the name and title aforesaid, should be able and capable in the law, and have full power to purchase, have, take, hold and enjoy lands, messuages, lands, rents, tenements, annuities and hereditaments of what nature or kind soever, in fee and in perpetuity, or for a term of life or years, and also all manner of goods, chattels, and things personal whatsoever, of what nature or kind soever; and that he and his successors, by and under the said name or title, might prosecute, claim, plead and be impleaded, defend and be defended, answer and be answered, in all manner of Courts of us, our heirs and successors, and elsewhere, in and upon all and singular causes, actions, suits, writs and demands, real and personal and mixed, as well spiritual as temporal, and in all other things, causes and matters whatsoever; and that the said Bishop of Montreal should and might for ever thereafter have and use a Corporate Seal, and the said Seal, from time to time, at his and their will and pleasure, break, change, alter or make anew, as he or they should deem it expedient;—and we did thereby further ordain and declare that the said Bishop of Montreal and his successors should be subject and subordinate to the Archbishop of Canterbury and his successors, and we did further will and ordain that every Bishop of Montreal should take an oath of obedience to the Archbishop of Canterbury for the time being, as his Metropolitan, which oath should and might be ministered by the said Archbishop, or by any other person by him duly appointed or authorised for that purpose, and we did further expressly declare that the said Bishop of Montreal, and also his successors (having been respectively by us, our heirs and successors, named and appointed, and by the said Archbishop of Canterbury canonically ordained and consecrated, according to the form of the United Church of England and Ireland) might perform all the functions peculiar to the office of Bishop within the said Diocese of Montreal, and we did thereby declare the spiritual causes and matters in which the aforesaid jurisdiction might be more specially exercised, as in and by the said letters patent, on reference thereto being had, will more fully appear:

And whereas the said Francis Fulford, Doctor of Divinity, having been first duly consecrated, became and was, and still is, the Bishop of the said Bishop's See and Diocese of Montreal.

And whereas the numbers, both of Bishops and Clergy and Laity, of the United Church of Eng-

land and Ireland, in our Province of Canada, have of late years greatly increased, and are increasing:

And whereas there now are four separate Sees, Dioceses and Bishoprics duly erected and constituted in the said Province—that is to say, the Bishopric of Quebec, the Bishopric of Toronto, the Bishopric of Montreal, and the Bishopric of Huron—whereof one is the said Diocese and Bishopric of Montreal:

And whereas we have been graciously pleased to give our royal assent (which was duly proclaimed in Canada, on the twenty-fourth day of May, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and fifty-seven) to a certain Act theretofore passed by the Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly of the said Province of Canada, entitled "An act to enable the members of the United Church of England and Ireland in Canada to meet in Synod," in which said Act (amongst other things) provision is made for the Bishops, Clergy and Laity of the said United Church of England and Ireland, in their several Dioceses, for certain purposes therein mentioned, and also for the meeting of the Bishops, Clergy and Laity, members of the said United Church of England and Ireland, of the said Province, in General Assembly, within the said Province, by such representatives as shall be determined and declared by them, and for their framing in such General Assembly a constitution and regulations for the general management and good government of the said Church in the said Province, as by the said Act, reference being thereto had, will more fully appear:

And whereas we have received three several petitions from the Bishops, Clergy and Laity, in Synod assembled, of the several Dioceses of Quebec, Montreal and Toronto, praying that in order to enable the Bishops, Clergy and Laity of the said Church in Canada to have the full benefit of the provisions of the said Act, we will be graciously pleased to take such measures, or cause such measures to be taken, as may be necessary in order to appoint one of the Bishops of the said Church in the said Province to be the Metropolitan, that so the necessary powers may be vested in him for holding and presiding over the General Assembly of the Church in the said Province:

Now, therefore, we do will and ordain that the said Right Reverend Father in God, FRANCIS FULFORD, Doctor of Divinity, now Lord Bishop of Montreal, and his successors, the Bishops thereof for the time being, shall be and be deemed and taken to be Metropolitan Bishop in our said Province of Canada, subject nevertheless, to the general superintendence and revision of the Archbishop of Canterbury for the time being, and subordinate to the Archbishop of the Province of Canterbury:

And we will and ordain that the said Bishops of Quebec, Toronto and Huron respectively, shall be suffragan Bishops to the said Lord Bishop of Montreal and his successors:

And we will and grant to the said Lord Bishop of Montreal, and his successors, full power and authority as Metropolitan of Canada to perform all functions peculiar and appropriate to the office of Metropolitan within the limits of the said sees of Quebec, Toronto and Huron, and to exercise Metropolitan jurisdiction over the Bishops of the said Sees and their successors, and over all Archdeacons, Dignitaries, and all other Chaplains, Ministers, Priests and Deacons in Holy Orders, of the United Church of England and Ireland, within the limits of the said Dioceses:

And we do by these presents give and grant unto the said Lord Bishop of Montreal and his successors full power and authority to visit once in-

five years or oftener if occasion shall require, as well the said several Bishops and their successors as all Archdeacons and Dignitaries, and all other Chaplains, Ministers, Priests and Deacons in Holy Orders, of the United Church of England and Ireland, resident in the said Dioceses, for correcting and supplying the defects of the said Bishops and their successors with all and all manner of visitatorial jurisdiction, power and coercion:

And we do hereby authorise and empower the said Lord Bishop of Montreal, and his successors, to inhibit, during any such visitation of the said Dioceses, the exercise of all or of such part or parts of the ordinary jurisdiction of the said Bishops or their successors, as to him, the said Lord Bishop of Montreal, or his successors shall seem expedient; and during the time of such visitation to exercise, by himself or themselves, or his or their commissaries, such powers, functions and jurisdictions in and over the said Diocese as the Bishops thereof might have exercised if they had not been inhibited from exercising the same:

And we do further ordain and declare, that if any person against whom a sentence, judgment or decree shall be pronounced by the said Bishops or their successors, or their commissary or commissaries, shall conceive himself to be aggrieved by such sentence, judgment or decree, it shall be lawful for such person to appeal to the said Lord Bishop of Montreal or his successors, provided such appeal be entered within fifteen days after such sentence, judgment or decree shall have been pronounced:

And we do give and grant to the said Lord Bishop of Montreal, and his successors, full power and authority finally to decide and determine the said appeals:

And we do further will and ordain that in case any proceedings should be instituted against any of the said Bishops of Quebec, Toronto and Huron, when placed under the said Metropolitan see of Montreal, such proceedings shall originate and be carried on before the Lord Bishop of Montreal for the time being, whom we hereby authorise and direct to take cognizance of the same:

And whereas we, having fully considered the premises, are graciously pleased to comply with the prayer of the said petitions in this behalf, and, in accordance therewith, to appoint the Lord Bishop of Montreal and his successors to be Metropolitan Bishop and Metropolitan Bishops in and over the said Province:

And we do further will and declare, that it shall be lawful for the said Lord Bishop of Montreal, as such Metropolitan, and for his successors from time to time, at their discretion, to hold and preside over the aforesaid General Assembly and General Assemblies in the said Province of Canada; and in all other matters and for all other intents and purposes whatsoever, save and except as is hereinbefore expressed, we do hereby confirm and declare valid and subsisting the hereinbefore partly-recited Letters Patent, dated the eighteenth day of July, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and fifty, and in the fourteenth year of our reign:

And lastly, to the intent that all things afore-

said may be firmly holden and done, we will and grant to the aforesaid Francis Fulford, Doctor in Divinity, that he shall have our Letters Patent, under our Great Seal of our United Kingdom, duly made and sealed:

In witness whereof we have caused these our Letters to be made patent.

Witness ourself at Westminster, the ninth day of July, in the twenty-fourth year of our reign

By warrant under the Queen's Manual,

C. ROMILLY.

SUBSCRIPTIONS RECEIVED TO OCT. 1.

TO END OF VOL. VII.

R. H. B., Mono Mills; Rev. H. B., Nicolet;
Rev. G. M., New Carlisle, (to No 12 vol. 8)

THE

Canadian Ecclesiastical Gazette

IS PUBLISHED TWICE A MONTH,

BY HENRY ROWSELL, TORONTO.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION:

7s. 6d. per annum; from which a discount of 2s. 6d. is allowed if remitted (postage free) within one month from commencement of the volume.

ROWSSELL & ELLIS, PRINTERS, KING ST. TORONTO.