

THE SPEECH

OF

THE LORD BISHOP OF AUSTRALIA,

IN

THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL,

UPON THE RESOLUTIONS FOR ESTABLISHING

A SYSTEM OF GENERAL EDUCATION :

ON TUESDAY, 27TH AUGUST, 1839.

SYDNEY :

PRINTED BY JAMES TEGG & CO., GEORGE STREET.

*Legislative Council,
Tuesday, 27th August.*

Present:—HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR; HIS HONOR THE CHIEF JUSTICE; RIGHT REV. THE LORD BISHOP; HON. MAJOR-GENERAL SIR MAURICE CHARLES O'CONNELL; THE HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY; THE ATTORNEY GENERAL; THE COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS; THE AUDITOR GENERAL; MR. CAMPBELL; MR. BERRY; MR. JONES; MR. BLAXLAND; MR. MACARTHUR; SIR JOHN JAMISON, K.G.V.; CAPT. P. P. KING, R.N.

The Order of the Day was moved for taking into consideration the Resolutions on the subject of Education, the draft of which was laid on the Table on Friday 23rd instant.

- (1.) That in the opinion of this Council, all Classes of the Community are entitled to equal assistance from the Public Revenue, in the establishment of Schools, or places of Public Education.
- (2.) That owing to the extreme dispersion of the population of this Colony, a system of Education to be effectual, should be as comprehensive as possible.
- (3.) That in the opinion of this Council, a system of Education may be established, that shall, at least, comprehend all Classes of Protestants.
- (4.) That if the Public Schools of the Colony be established upon principles essentially Protestant, some corresponding advantages ought to be secured for the Schools of Roman Catholics.

Question put, that the first Resolution be adopted.

THE
SPEECH OF THE BISHOP OF AUSTRALIA,
IN THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY,

I rise with unfeigned reluctance to express my dissent from this Resolution, or rather from these Resolutions. I refer to them in the aggregate, because in your preliminary remarks Your Excellency has described them as forming "one whole and entire scheme;" and stated that, if the first were agreed to, no one who voted for it but must, if he would act consistently, agree to all the others. But before I address myself to the present question, I will beg permission of Your Excellency and the Council to say a few words in explanation of a subject referred to by Your Excellency, namely, my accordance with the Protestant Dissenters in opposing the Irish System of Education in 1836; which appears to be considered as inconsistent with the course I am now pursuing. But I shall shew that it is not so. The circumstances were these:—On my arrival in this port in June, 1836, on the very day of my arrival, and even before I had landed, I was waited on by the late Reverend Samuel Marsden, then the Senior Chaplain, who explained to me the existing state of affairs with regard to the proposed Plan of Education. He informed me that it was regarded as the first step towards carrying on Schools without the Bible; and that not only among the Members of the Church but among all the Protestant Dissenters there prevailed but one opinion about the measure, and one determination to oppose it; and he conveyed to me their wish that I should

unite with them in that object. I took a few days to consider, at the end of which time I had an interview with the Dissenting Ministers. I explained to them most candidly and carefully what my views were. I told them that the question appeared to me to divide itself into two branches : in one of which I could go with them, in the other I could not go with them. So far as related to any combined attempt to defeat a measure which would or might have the effect of excluding the Bible from Schools, (and such I considered the effect of the Irish System) I was ready to engage in it with them. On the other hand, in support of any plan of education which should rest upon the principle of reading the Bible, but without note or comment, I could not unite with them. These terms were fully understood by the Dissenters, and agreed to by them. They did me the justice afterwards to admit, and indeed I believe it may be found upon record, that I had not sought them, but they me ; and that I had, before any proceedings was taken, explained to them the extent to which we might go unitedly, and where we must separate. So long therefore as the object was to prevent the establishment of Schools upon a system which would lead to the exclusion of the Bible, I went with them. When we came to the point of proposing a united scheme of education, I quietly withdrew, as I had previously stated would be the case ; because I was well aware that though we agreed upon the principle that the Bible should be read, we did not agree as to the principle upon which it should be interpreted. At the same time I told them that although I could not unite myself with their entire system, because it did not include all that I should think desirable, still if no doctrine adverse to the Church of England should be taught in their Schools, but the use of Prayers should be adopted in which the doctrine of the Trinity should be asserted or implied, I should wish them God-speed. This was in 1836 ; and I am at a loss to conceive what there is in all this inconsistent with my present position. I agreed with Protestants in general, then, upon one point ; I do so still. I differed from them, then, upon another point ; so I do now : and I cannot understand the argument which would infer that because I made common cause with them upon the former, I must of

necessity unite with them upon the last. I now proceed to the consideration of the Resolutions which Your Excellency has spoken of as embracing one whole and entire scheme. In submitting them to the Council on a previous day, Your Excellency was pleased to observe that there was nothing in them which was not also in your Minute on Education; but that there were some things in the Minute which did not appear in the Resolutions. This is indeed most true; for in the Minute but not in the Resolutions it is proposed, that a reduction should take place in the amount which is next year to be given towards the support of Schools in connexion with the Church of England; and that in four years, from the 1st of January next, the system of supporting such Schools at the cost of Government should altogether cease. I am sensible therefore that while the Resolutions (except the last which is practical) carry upon the face of them nothing more than, as described by Your Excellency "abstract propositions," yet taken in connexion with the declaration in the Minute and coupled with the vote which is in succession to be proposed for a diminished, and still-further-to-be-diminished, aid to our Schools, these Resolutions must be considered as involving a Bill of Attainder and Exclusion, so far, against the Church of England. For this and other causes I must oppose them. Your Excellency in bringing forward the Resolutions was also pleased to observe, that if you should fail of carrying your proposal for a comprehensive system, you would at all events take care that the blame should rest upon the right parties; who might also take the credit, if credit could be derived from such a source. I was concerned to hear this declaration from Your Excellency; because as Your Excellency had observed with regard to those Members of Council who had put their signatures to Petitions, that this implied their coming to the discussion with minds already made up upon the question, so it must appear that Your Excellency has no less conclusively made up your own mind upon the contrary side. The question before us is not in reality, although it may in terms, appear to be, whether a system as comprehensive as possible shall be established. If it terminated in affirming this as a naked proposition, there might be little debate or opposition. But the real question is in effect,

whether the system proposed by Your Excellency *be* thus comprehensive : and we come to the discussion of that question under a declaration of Your Excellency's determination, that unless, we decide in one particular way, that is, in accordance with Your Excellency's view, we must bear a stigma. A penalty this is which men in general do not love to encounter ; and the fear of it evidently may influence the decision of many in coming to vote upon this question. In my own case, my station, and the general turn of my mind, may set me above this. I neither dread censure nor covet applause for what I may do in the discharge of duty ; and with respect to my conduct in the present question, I am quite satisfied to abide the award of impartial posterity, whatever it may be. One circumstance affords me very great encouragement and support. It is this :—that if I now appear in opposition to a measure proposed by Your Excellency, it must be evident that this proceeds not from any habitual disposition to thwart the measures of Government. Your Excellency's predecessor, from whom I unhappily differed upon the same question, left this Colony I trust and believe, under a persuasion that I had never nourished such a sentiment. How indeed could it be justly imputed to me, when during a connexion, now of ten years duration, with the Executive Government, I am conscious of having always felt, and I hope have always shewn, the most cheerful and ready disposition to promote the views of Government, not to resist or impede them.

I trust it will not be imputed to me that I attribute any particular weight or importance to my own opinions. The attention which I claim is principally as the representative of others ; especially of those whose petitions, numerously signed, it has been my duty to present ; whose uniform prayer is this, that you will not reduce, or withdraw, the public aid which now enables them to have their children educated in the principles of the Church of England. I speak, I am sure, the sentiments of all these, and of many thousands more, in asking the Council whether they have considered what it is they are recommended to destroy, and what to substitute in its place ? You are recommended then to destroy a system of education which has subsisted from the foundation of the Colony,

and to which the second and third generations from the original Colonists are indebted, almost wholly, for the Christian knowledge and principles which they possess. The ground assigned for such destruction is that the system is bad; that it is in fact no system; that it is expensive, and not comprehensive. Depreciate the system as you will, it nevertheless *is* a system; though, under so many disadvantages, it may have been imperfectly wrought: and I experience no shame in acknowledging that in our Schools there are practical defects, which my days and nights have been spent in anxious consideration how to remove.— It is easy to turn round upon us, and to say that the Schools have defects. I know they have defects. But in making this admission, I must ask upon what principle it can be justifiable to make such defects the grounds of a Bill of Attainder in our case, and in another case to propose even more than a Bill of Indemnity? Let me with great respect enquire, whether your Excellency has ascertained that there exists more of system, or less of defect, in the Schools now supported at the public expense for the Roman Catholics, than in those for the Church of England? I have never been in the former of course; and know nothing whatever of their actual condition. But I have still so much confidence in the real merit of our Schools, that I am ready to bring them to this test. It may easily be done. Within a short distance from this Council-Chamber there is a School of each description, conducted under the same roof. If it be your Excellency's pleasure to depute a Committee of this Council to take them unexpectedly and unprepared, and to examine thoroughly into the system and condition of each, I am prepared to abide by their Report, even though there should not be a Member of the Church of England upon the Committee: and I am further willing to have the same test applied, if your Excellency pleases, to every parallel case of Schools throughout the Colony. I do not suggest this for the purpose of drawing invidious comparisons; but to illustrate the degree of unfairness that there would be in altogether proscribing and exterminating one system of education upon the account of alleged defects; while another system in which, I am confident from the nature of

things, the same defects do, and must exist, is to be established upon a firmer basis than ever.

Let the defects in our Schools be what they may, they are not attributable to the system of education pursued in them; but to the difficulty, a difficulty enough to break the heart of any man who has the charge of them, of finding persons qualified to conduct them, generally speaking, as they ought to be conducted. And how is it proposed to remedy this under the new and comprehensive system? Truly, by the expedient of voting at once £3000 towards the establishment of three Schools only; and £600 for the salaries of the expected Masters. Indeed, Sir, at the same rate, we too could have established Schools, to which few defects should have been imputable. But no such munificent generosity has ever been exercised towards us. I have before me the account of expenditure for Church of England Schools for ten years, from 1828 to 1837; the account for last year I have not: but if it were included, I am certain it could not alter the average, which, for the ten years referred to, amounts to somewhat less than £2700 per annum. We have not had £3600 to bestow upon three Schools: but not more than £2700 for the maintenance of more nearly forty than thirty. And this sum includes not only salaries to Masters and Mistresses, head money for such as required it among the 2000 children whom we are educating, and repairs of all the buildings: but we have actually erected at least, twice as many School-houses as it is proposed to provide out of the much larger sum now placed upon the estimates. As to the expensiveness of the present system therefore, I am satisfied that is a point upon which the new one will gain nothing by comparison. It will surely not be wonderful if Schools, which are to cost £1200 each to begin with, should be in some particular respects, an improvement upon those of which the average annual cost in our hands, has been but £75; or at the utmost, £80. Place us upon one footing as to expenditure; and in the towns I will engage that more children shall be taught, and be better taught under the system of the Church of England than upon that of the British and Foreign School Society: and in country districts, even though you go to a much greater ex-

pense, you will neither assemble more children, nor give them an education better suited to their station and prospects in life, than we have been doing for so many years. Depreciate our Schools, I say, as you please; still I do stedfastly maintain that as places of Christian and moral instruction, their positive utility is great and manifest. Within these few days I heard fifteen enumerated, now heads of families in one town, who had been brought up in one School, under one Master; besides many others not in an equally independent rank of life. Give me leave in illustration, to mention a circumstance which happened not long ago to an old and approved Clergyman; who going on a Sunday to the house of an individual in the district which he now occupies, almost beyond the limits of civilized life, found there the mother of a very numerous family, I think ten or eleven children prepared herself to repeat, and bringing her children to repeat to him those lessons of devotion which she had learned twenty years before, and upwards, in his School on the Hawkesbury. These are not solitary instances, similar ones may be produced from every part of the Colony. In this manner, by means of these Schools, the seeds of religion have been scattered to an extent which few perhaps are aware of. I shall always contend that this Council will commit a grievous error if it shall consent to the execution of the sentence against them without more certain evidence as to the positive degree of merit which they may claim; and as to the defects also with which, in comparison with other similar schools, they may be charged. What attempts have been made to obtain that information? As to myself, I declare that not a single question has been asked by any one. Is this fair? is it decorous? is it suitable either to my station in the Church or to the exertions which I have continued during many years for the improvement of these Schools? Have questions been put to any of the clergy under whose management they are? not to my knowledge. In this very town, you have one truly venerable man, who during 30 years has been daily conversant with the practical superintendence of the Schools connected with his Church. Has reference been made to him? I believe not any. We feel, therefore, that

we are regarded, or at least are treated, as we were but if intruders and usurpers who have been too long tolerated, and who ought now to be too well satisfied with only having the charge of these mismanaged Schools taken out of our hands, and transferred to those who, as was justly said on a recent occasion, have "a plan for teaching morality without religion, and religion without a Creed."

I refer, thus, to the actual condition of our Schools, only in common justice to those who have had the management of them; and that an impression may not be propagated abroad, that they are filled with nothing but defects. On the contrary, I may challenge contradiction in saying, that considering the state and character of this Colony generally, until within the last two or three years, and taking into account, that these Schools, as I have shewn, have been carried on at an annual expense of not more than £75 or £80 each, more good, yes, incalculably more good, has been done than could reasonably have been expected; and the Schools themselves, at this moment, are for the most part in an effective, improving, and highly creditable condition. But these statements I do not bring forward with any intention of thereby meeting the argument, which is principally urged against them. I am aware that this must be met upon other grounds; because, if these Schools could be shewn to be ten times as respectable and efficient as they are, it would still be objected that they are exclusive; they are not such as we want; we must have comprehensive Schools. I must venture, however, so far to differ from Your Excellency, as to think, that the mere circumstance of exclusively teaching the doctrines of the Church of England, is not in itself a sufficient ground for forbearing to recommend the continuance, or rather, for recommending the discontinuance, of public support. If, indeed, it shall be proved, that her administration has been corrupt or negligent, or that she has not satisfactorily used the privileges which have been granted to her, the Church cannot then complain if it be withdrawn. This, I admit, might furnish ground for depriving the Church of England of State-support; but not so the charge which is now put forth, that the Church

applies that support in teaching her own doctrines to her own Members. On the contrary, I maintain, that according to the principles of the Constitution, she is entitled to look to the Government for the fullest measure of aid and encouragement; and that such aid and encouragement, as may have been extended to her, ought not to be withdrawn, except upon proof, that by unfaithfulness she has rendered herself no longer worthy of it. The pillars of our constitution are the Bill of Rights, the Act of Settlement, and the Coronation Oath; all of them recognizing the right of the Church of England to special protection and encouragement. Do we live here, then, under a part of the Constitution, or under the whole? Under the whole, most assuredly: and therefore I argue, that we live where the Sovereign is under a solemn obligation, through his or her Representative, to watch carefully over the interest and welfare of the Church. It rests, I am aware, with this Council to determine whether it will grant or not such means as the Crown, through its Representative, may recommend, for enabling the Church to establish her own principles; but this does not dissolve the obligation resting upon the Crown, at least to propose the grant of them. The image which must offer itself to the mind of every constitutional lawyer, and indeed of every man, at all conversant with the laws upon which the Sovereignty of England is established, is that of an authority raised up to be the Defender of the Faith, within no narrower limits than those to which the authority itself extends. I say this under a full and perfect recollection of the changes which have been introduced, within a few years, into our political administration; the effect of which is, that a man's religion is no longer, as it used to be, the criterion of his fitness for office and trust. But I deny that the effect, either intended or actual, of those changes has been to subvert the original foundation of our Constitution; which is the union of Church and State. Those changes were admitted, not only with the implied, but with the express, acknowledgment of all parties, that they were not intended to alter the fundamental principle of the Constitution, which requires that the Sovereign must necessarily be in communion

with the Church of England; and bound by every obligation, human and divine, to give it the fullest measure possible of the royal encouragement and support. I will not so much affront the memory of those great men, who projected and conducted the Revolution of 1688, as to argue upon the supposition, that they limited their anxieties to the mere soil of Britain. No: the object which they had in view, was to ensure the possession of truth and the enjoyment of liberty to the subjects of Britain; and their reason for connecting the throne so inseparably with this faith, was their persuasion, that this faith was most consonant with truth and most friendly to liberty. They could not be guilty of such an inconsistency as that of confining their anxieties to any one portion of the dominions of the Crown. No, Sir, they plainly meant, the tenor of all these oaths and enactments makes it evident they meant, that wherever the Crown and the Church should be found together, exercising their respective functions, that is, throughout the whole extent of the British dominions, there also the Crown should be found the friend and protector of the Church. Such are the principles of the English Constitution. Emphatically, I say, such *are*; because, thanks be to God, it has not yet been repealed. I am compelled to express myself thus, though it may appear a deviation from the direct question, in consequence of an observation which fell from Your Excellency at our last Meeting, that the possession of any privilege, distinction or advantage, by one particular portion or class in the community, must lead to its being regarded with jealousy by all others, finally, with hatred, and so to its ruin and destruction. With the utmost respect for Your Excellency, I must think, that this is virtually to abjure the principles of the projectors and conductors of the Revolution, who were distinguished by the name of Whigs, and who never did admit or act upon such a principle, with regard to the Established Church. And I must say, that if we, abandoning their principles, should ever be induced to legislate upon the assumption, that exclusive privileges have necessarily the tendency and the termination which Your Excellency imputes to them, and that men have such absolutely equal rights, that these are infringed whensoever

any privilege is established, which does not extend to all and is not approved by all, I am tolerably certain that, though the application of this may begin with the Church, it will not finish with it ; but we shall find that, instead of resting under the shade of the monarchy, we are fast advancing, and even far advanced, towards the institutions of a republic ; and I greatly fear also, a republic without religion.

But, Sir, I am under a strong persuasion that there is a fallacy involved in the employment of the term *comprehensive*. It is conceivable, and indeed it would not be very difficult, that a system should be devised involving no principle in opposition to what is believed and held sacred by Christians or Mahometans, Jews, Deists, or Pagans, and which should include much which all of them assented to. Now this would seem to be the very acme of comprehensive systems. It may be regarded, indeed, as their *ultimate ratio*, as the mathematicians term it ; the limit towards which they all tend, until between it and them the difference is less than any that can be assigned. I lay it down therefore as undeniable, that I am entitled to argue the properties of all such systems from observation upon that which is their natural termination. Would any Christian then, truly such, consent to participate in such a comprehensive system, merely because it proposed nothing to which he could object, and only prohibited his affirming or teaching what he believes to be true ? Assuredly not. A Deist or a Heathen might assent ; indeed, the philosopher Hume commends the Heathen, at the expense of Christians because they did indulge such liberal sentiments : but I question whether an honest Mahometan or Jew would comply. From this you will perceive how possible it is to give to a system the name comprehensive, according to the principle contended for in these Resolutions, while its real effect would be to exclude all who had any conscience, and those especially whom you would be bound in the first instance to consider. The system now recommended as comprehensive, is acknowledged to fail to a great extent as it cannot take in the Roman Catholics ; and I trust I shall satisfy you that unless you are prepared to disregard, not only the constitutional principles which I have expressed, but also the tenets

of the English Church and the feelings of all its Members, you must admit in their favour also, an exception similar to that proposed for Roman Catholics, by granting them separate Schools. The Church of Rome does not assert even that all her tenets and doctrines are contained in Scripture or derivable from it. She is therefore naturally less anxious that the Scriptures should be generally read; and she has made it an article of discipline (of discipline, observe, not of faith) not to put the Bible in the vulgar tongue into the hands of children or of the unlearned. Because she has made this an article of discipline, which may be varied or repealed whenever the superiors of the Church so please, you propose that the Church of Rome shall have separate Schools, in which she shall be at liberty to teach her own doctrines in all their plenitude without hindrance or interference. But when we ask why then is the Church of England to be denied a similar privilege, the answer is, because there are Schools to be established upon "essentially Protestant principles." It seems to be thus argued: Schools upon essentially Protestant principles may at least comprehend all classes of Protestants; but the Members of the Church of England are a class of Protestants; therefore, these Schools may comprehend the Members of the Church of England. On behalf of the Church of England I raise my voice against any such conclusion. We have a right, first of all, to enquire, what are the "essentially Protestant principles" here intended. Let a definition of them be given; otherwise there is danger in assenting to them. "*Dolus latet in universalibus.*" Protestant, as I observed the other day, is in itself but a negative term; implying only that the holder of it does not acknowledge the assumed supremacy of the Bishop of Rome, and therefore is not a Member of that Church. But this principle, though essentially Protestant, is I think insufficient to form the basis of a comprehensive system, because it affirms nothing as to the tenets which may be actually adopted. Another principle, which may perhaps be meant as essentially Protestant, is, that nothing shall be required of any man to be believed as necessary to his salvation except it be contained in or may be proved from Scripture, and that the reading of the Scripture should be free and open to

all. Sir, I am a Protestant, and do most sincerely believe and cordially embrace this principle. But if you would so apply it as to compel me, or the Church of England in whose person I now speak, to make common cause in the business of education with all who profess to hold it, we must redouble our claim to the title of Protestant by protesting again most solemnly against such violence done to our consciences. We must then take part with the liberals and infidels of France, many of whom, Benjamin Constant for example, holders of no religion, yet, from political feeling, claimed somewhat ostentatiously the name of Protestant. We must then fall in with the Socinians of Geneva, with the Rationalists and Neologians in Germany; with the disciples of Dr. Priestly in England, and with the followers of Jacob Abbott and Dr. Channing in America; all of whom I believe class themselves among Protestants. But will Your Excellency, born and bred in the Church of England, be the patron of a system which can be comprehensive only by compelling her to forswear her Apostolical origin and principles, and reduce herself to the level of those who among them have contradicted I believe every sacred principle? Let us have some definition of "essentially Protestant principles" which shall exclude these and other heresies, or permit us boldly to declare the truth in opposition to them; and we may then be in a situation to contemplate with less alarm the proposal to unite with an association which renounces all Church formularies, and forbids the inculcation of any particular Creed. I need not have gone to those extreme cases; for even between ourselves and those who on many points accord with us in doctrine, there is still a difference in principle as to the mode of interpreting Scripture, which leads to differences of opinion respecting the nature and effect of the Holy Sacraments, the office of the ministry, the constitution and authority of the Church, and other grave and serious points; and forbids the possibility of our combining with them without the suppression of that which according to our views forms part and parcel of Divine Truth: and it has passed even into a Proverb, that *suppressio veri est suggestio falsi*. I agree most fully, as I suppose all Protestants do, that nothing is to be required as an Article of belief necessary to salvation

except it can be proved by Scripture. But if *this* be meant as the "essentially Protestant principle," that all the necessary Articles of Belief can be made out by any man or any child reading the Scriptures, and being examined in their language, without reference to anything else, then, though this may be a favourite principle among Dissenters, it is not nor ever has been held by the Church of England, nor by any of her chief divines*. It happened to me, Sir, to be brought up in a School founded by Archbishop Cranmer, and afterwards in a College of which Bishop Ridley had been the master; and I may therefore be supposed to have directed more than ordinary attention to their opinions. Neither of them held that opinion as to the sufficiency of reading the bare text of Scripture. Neither was it held by Jewell, our great Apologist, nor by Chillingworth, the most acute of controversialists; nor, so far as I am aware, by any of first-rate name, repute, or authority among us. Certainly no such principle has ever been asserted by the Church of England itself in any of her formularies. If indeed she had believed that the exercise of private judgment upon the bare text of Scripture, without reference to any thing beside, was sufficient to guide all men to an acquaintance with the truth, with what consistency could she have adopted the antient Creeds of the Church, and have only appealed to Scripture to confirm them? How could she have drawn up Articles of Faith to be positively subscribed to by some, and not to be contradicted by any of her Members? above all, how could she have appointed a Catechism setting forth all necessary points of belief and the doctrine of the Sacraments, to be learned by every child before it came to be confirmed; and positively making the obligation of teaching it a part of the duty of every Sponsor? How then can it be contended that the Plan of educating children where no Creed or Catechism is allowed to be introduced or taught, is not opposed to the principles of the Church of England? I maintain, and have always expressed my persuasion,† that it is adverse to her entire system; it is subversive and destructive of it. To compel us to send

* See Appendix (A). † See Appendix (B).

children to Schools in which that prohibition of teaching them our proper doctrines forms the fundamental regulation, will be as contrary to our principles as to require the Roman Catholics to send their children to a School where the Scriptures are to be commonly read. I will take the highest and most unquestionable authority to shew that such is the essential, and indeed I may say peculiar, principle of the British and Foreign School Society; so that no two systems can be more positively opposed than that which it prescribes, and that which the Church of England has laid down. I will refer to the authority of the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Lord John Russell, who upon presenting by command of Her Majesty, on the 12th of February last, Papers connected with Education, expressed himself in these terms:—

“Those who had of late years undertaken the task of Education, had acted either on behalf of the established Church, or of the particular sects to which they belonged; or on behalf of a Society of which he had been many years a Member—he meant the British and Foreign School Society, which did not profess to teach children the principles of any particular Christian Sect. There was a broad distinction, then, as to the mode of conducting the Schools, between the parties who established Schools in connexion with the Church, and with the British and Foreign School Society. As he understood, the Church of England, not only the ecclesiastical but also the lay Members, contended that they could not unite in any plan of education not immediately under the superintendence of the parochial ministers; which did not make the Catechism a necessary part of the instruction, and where the schoolmaster was not a churchman. He would not at present give any opinion as to the propriety of insisting on these conditions. The British and Foreign School Society on the contrary though they desired the Bible to be read in all their Schools, did not allow any Catechism to be taught, nor did they countenance the establishment of any restriction as to the particular denomination of Christians to which the schoolmasters should belong; and therefore the schoolmaster might be an Independent or a Baptist, provided he was duly qualified for the situation.”

The noble Lord in explaining the principle of the British and Foreign School Society, candidly sets it in express opposition to that of the Church. He says, it is true, *he* does not see the necessity for that difference; but he owns that it is so powerfully felt by the Church of England, not only by the ecclesiastical but by the lay Members, that he admitted all hope of combination to be at an end. Combination! merciful Heaven; what under the admission that the guide of the religious education of our children may be a person of such principles as are stated, and I must say of even much worse than are stated. And all this is to be smothered under an ambiguous profession of establishing Schools upon "essentially Protestant Principles." Am I wrong in saying that this system contains provisions at the very least as irreconcilable with the views of the Church of England and of all her conscientious Members, as it can be to a Roman Catholic to send his child to a School where it will have the Bible put into its hand? With us it is an established point, not of discipline only, but of the strictest religious obligation, that every child shall be taught the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments; and be further instructed in the Church Catechism set forth for that purpose. It was the complaint, as our Homilies state, that before the Reformation very few even of the simplest people were taught the Lord's Prayer, the Articles of Faith, or the Commandments; except in Latin, which they understood not: and accordingly it was one of the very first and earliest cares of our Reformers to draw up a Catechism containing those necessary elements of belief and practise with the explanation of them, and, afterwards, to add an account of the doctrine of the Sacraments. Why do I enter into these statements? Not assuredly to convince you of the utility of Catechisms, which it is possible Your Excellency may be fully prepared to admit; but to shew that the use of them and of the formularies which they contain is so positively enjoined by the Church of England, and forms so inseparable a portion of her system of education, that, if you desire to have Schools made comprehensive by prohibiting the use of them, the effect must be to exclude the Church of England; and therefore upon the

principle of perfect impartiality which these Resolutions profess we have an equal right with the Church of Rome to have our separate Schools.

My feelings would lead me to say much, perhaps with too much warmth, were I not restrained by respect for Your Excellency. But can it be with any justice or attention to consistency maintained, that the members of a Church which holds such opinions as the Church of England does, respecting the necessity and importance of Creed and Catechism, can be adequately taught in the new and comprehensive School: "the only condition and great leading principle of which," is stated by its Secretary before a Committee of the House of Commons to be, "that no Catechism or Creed shall be introduced; those are the only terms required." Indeed, Sir, all we ask is, to be allowed to send our children as heretofore to Schools in which they may be taught to believe as the Church has believed from the beginning. This is the sole object and the prayer of the thousands of petitioners who have addressed this Council through me. To suppose that teaching them nothing which is absolutely false, (even if that point could be insured) will compensate for omitting to teach them what is certainly true, can never be admitted by any one who understands the true foundation of the Christian Church.

Now that there is an omission to teach the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, in the Schools of the British and Foreign School Society, an omission not accidental, but systematic and intentional, I will prove by reading, if the Council will permit me, some Extracts from the Report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Education, in the year 1834.

"16th June. Right Hon. Lord John Russell in the chair. Mr. Henry Dunn, Secretary to the British and Foreign School Society, examined.

In what way is religious instruction communicated during their attendance at School?

By their reading the Scriptures, and being questioned upon them carefully and seriously, both by the monitors and teachers, or masters of the Schools."

Here would appear to be a good foundation laid. But let us examine upon what system and under what restrictions this careful and serious examination is to be carried on. The same individual is afterwards asked,

“ You do not inculcate any particular doctrine ?

No.

But you inculcate the vital doctrines of Christianity ?

Certainly : inasmuch as they are found in the Scriptures, we inculcate them. We teach the child to answer interrogatories on the Scriptures ; and we always prefer that the answer should be given, as much as possible, in the words of Scripture.”

I am anxious to avoid the use of any harsh terms ; but really, having compared the above answers with others which occur in the course of the same body of evidence, I must say, that this individual was either not aware of the practical working of his own system, or that he was desirous of misleading the Committee upon that point. Here are some extracts from the evidence of his colleague, Mr. William Allen, the Treasurer of the same Society.

“ You said that you confine your instruction to the Holy Scriptures ; do you mean to say, that the Holy Scriptures are read without any explanation, and that every child is allowed to draw its own inferences ?

The Scriptures are read as reading-lessons in the School ; there is no attempt made to enforce any particular view of them, farther than just to know that the child understands what is read. There is no attempt made to impress his mind with any particular view of the subject, farther than the Scriptures themselves give.

In short, no explanation is given, but the child is left to draw its own inferences ?

I should suppose so.

Your intention is to enable the child to understand and explain the texts of Scripture upon which the doctrines are founded, but you do not teach them to prefer one doctrine to another ?

Certainly not.

With reference to the doctrine of the Atonement, do you

suppose that any child leaves your School without having that inculcated upon him?

He has what the Scriptures say of it, and that is abundantly sufficient.

Has he no explanation of it?

It is understood, that these are not Schools of theology; they are Schools for teaching the elements and the means of acquiring knowledge, and we take advantage of that opportunity to imbue the mind with the great truths of Christianity and morality, as contained in the Scriptures; but we do not enter into nice points."

This, then, is the way in which the vital doctrines of Christianity are inculcated, under this comprehensive system! The doctrine of the Atonement is not among the great Truths, but among "nice points," not to be entered upon. Yet these are the Schools, conducted upon "essentially Protestant principles," recommended to be introduced into this Colony at the public expense; and in which the children of the Church of England may receive that assistance to which, in point of education, the Resolutions say, they are equally entitled with all other classes of the community. Here are other examples to shew the exact value of this impartial mode of teaching, for which the Church Catechism is to be surrendered.

Mr. J. T. Crossley, master of the British and Foreign Schools, during fourteen years and upwards, is asked:—

"Do you mean, that you would ask for an explanation of a word that referred to a doctrine?"

In every case we require the meaning of words.

Might not a great deal depend upon the meaning of the words?

Yes: the word baptize, for instance.

Take the word *justify*, for instance.

Then we take the literal meaning of the word: "fy," from facio, I make; and "justus," just: meaning, "I make just." But the word to be explained, always occurs in a sentence, and generally, in several sentences, and thus its various shades and meaning are ascertained."

Now, under all this plausible profession of arriving at the true

sense of one word, or one portion of Scripture, by means of comparison with corresponding passages, is contained the very principle which we desire to see established; and if it were allowed to be fairly carried out, we should have nothing to complain of. But, in reality, the course is arrested the moment it approaches the point of shewing the true sense of words or passages: that is, the doctrine contained in them. In truth, therefore, boys may acquire a kind of fluency in the use of Scriptural terms, without the remotest conception of what the sense is. This is as apparent as possible, from the very next questions and replies.

"Should you be satisfied with the explanation that *to justify* means *to make just*?"

I stated, before, that the word would be in every case connected with a sentence.

Suppose, for instance, you were reading the text, *This is my beloved Son*, you would probably ask the child *What God called the Saviour?* and expect the child to say, *His Son?* but you would not ask in what sense he is called his Son?

We should ask, Who is called the Son? and By whom he is called the Son? and then it requires no further question."

And this is to be deemed a religious education for the Members of a Church which acknowledges the Nicene Creed!

Hear again Mr. J. T. Crossley.

"Supposing you were teaching children, and you saw one or two who entertained notions that you thought theologically wrong upon important points, according to your belief and conscience, should you consider it your duty as a teacher to set them right?"

I will take an instance. A Jewish child has objected to reading the word Christ: in such case we have allowed him to pass it."

If you will put the New Testament without discrimination even into the hands of those who profess to despise and abhor the Christian faith, as if your liberality knew no bounds, but you must suffer even the name of your adorable Redeemer to be treated with this contempt, you may have no resource but to endure the affront. But what a system of comprehensiveness is

this; to put the children of Christian parents under the necessity of standing by to be witnesses of this profanation; and to be edified by the spectacle of a Jew thus casting contempt upon the Son of God, and permitted to carry his point, because to contradict him would be opposed to the fundamental principle of the School: that of admitting no Creed or Catechism.

Here is another extract, and this shall be the last. It is from the evidence of the Rev. Samuel Wood, so he is called—a self-proclaimed Unitarian; “Secretary to the School on the British system in Harp-Alley*.”

In the last printed Report of the Society (a Copy of which was delivered in by the witness) occur these words “*without bringing into view those doctrines which have occasioned so much controversy between different sects.*” What is the meaning of those words? What are those doctrines?

It means the doctrines of any particular sects: those of Calvinism, or Arminianism, or any others.

Do you include among those, the Trinity and Atonement?

Yes: I am happy to have an opportunity of explaining that passage in the Report. I am myself a Unitarian Minister. I consider that the principle, upon which the British and Foreign School system is established, is that of perfect impartiality between different sects. I am always on my guard to see that neither the Master nor any of the older boys introduce any Trinitarianism or Calvinism into the School; and I am equally cautious, on my part, never to introduce any thing that can be considered as peculiar to Unitarians.”

So then the British and Foreign School system is admitted to be established upon a principle of absolute neutrality as to that doctrine which, the Church of England teaches, we chiefly learn from the Articles of our Belief. The sequel of the examination of this witness shews how possible it is, under the mask of that impartiality to introduce any thing, that the conductor pleases, peculiar to the Unitarians; and in fact proves that it depends wholly upon the teacher, what bias in sentiment shall

* Evidence before Select Committee, p. 133.

be given to the children. And this he says is a system, which exemplifies the possibility of different sects uniting, and taking the Bible as the basis of instruction, without bringing forward their own peculiar sentiments*. Different sects uniting, of course, without any sacrifice of principle, and taking the Bible—yes, indeed, the Bible—as the basis of instruction! And yet the doctrines of the Trinity and the Atonement are to be thrust out of sight; hid under a bushel, as peculiar sentiments; the adoption or rejection of which, was equally indifferent to the purity of the faith. Really, these admissions make one's heart to bleed; and I am ready to sink with shame, when I call to mind, as stated by Your Excellency, the other day, that I am in an assembly of which the greater number of Members belong to the Church of England; and yet we are debating whether we will reduce the poorer members of our body to the alternative, of either abandoning that assistance towards the support of Schools, to which the Resolutions say they are equally entitled with all the other classes of the community, or else of sending them to be instructed and brought up in Schools, where such a latitudinarianism as this is tolerated; nay, forms an integral part of the system.

I shall content myself with offering to the Council a very few remarks upon the practical difficulties and insecurities of the system. First, I would ask them to consider what check they propose to establish, or in fact can have, upon the appointment of schoolmasters, and the interference of conductors of the Schools whose religious views and sentiments may be of the most dangerous and objectionable character? It is admitted, we see, that they may be Dissenters of any class or sect, and it is upon record, there are examples to shew, that Unitarians may creep in. How do you propose, or do you at all propose, or consistently with the principles of the system can you so much as attempt, to prevent or remedy this? You may say there will be a Board. A Board there may be. But who will answer even for the Board itself; what security can we have as to the religious principles of the Members, and therefore as to the general bias of such a

* Evidence, No. 2091, p. 159.

Board? And were the Board ever so satisfactory and safe in that respect, what possible inspection or control can a Board, confined to one spot and its Members occupied by their private or official duties, exercise over teachers in Schools at Port Macquarie, at Melbourne, or beyond the mountains? The thing is hopeless and impossible. You will remember that upon principle you exclude the clergy, all except those of one Creed, from interference with the education carried on in Schools, the masters of which shall be wholly supported by the public. And, to what a condition do you propose to reduce the clergy of the Church of England in particular; what a humiliating spectacle will you make of them both actually and in comparison with others? His Excellency the Governor tells us in his Minute, that there shall be no two Schools of one denomination within five miles from each other. But there is nothing whatever to prevent the establishment of a Roman Catholic School and a Comprehensive School next door to one another. What an opportunity would this afford for displaying, in the most becoming light, the perfect equality that is to subsist between the Roman Catholic clergy and ours! Your Excellency did observe, it is true, in your opening address upon the Resolutions, that some special advantages were to accrue to the Church of England from this new system, in consideration of which some corresponding benefits must in equity be given to others. But Your Excellency did not proceed to particularize what those advantages were, and I am altogether at a loss to conceive the nature of them. At any rate I cannot think it to their advantage or credit either, that while a Roman Catholic priest may go into his own School at pleasure, has it and all that is in it under his absolute control, may teach and indoctrinate the scholars according to his own views (nor, indeed, in accordance with those views do I blame him for so doing), while the clergyman of the Church of England, if he should by chance venture to put his foot over the threshold of the School, "upon essentially Protestant principles," which may be established next door, dares not so much as ask a single question upon points of belief, which, according to his persuasion, are of eternal importance to be taught the young. He is regarded as an intruder; he

may in fact be excluded altogether by a master who understands a little management ; and covertly the same master may be engaged in instilling into the minds of the children the most objectionable principles. We all know how easily the mind of a child is poisoned. I do not say that objectionable tenets can be professedly taught. The system does not tolerate that. But covertly, and by a crafty man, I say they may, and in such a way as shall evade detection and secure impunity. Nay, I do not see what is to prevent a schoolmaster, if he use a little prudence, from gathering round him a congregation of riper years to whom he may address his doctrines, and so not only shut the clergyman out of the School, but actually set himself up as a rival to him in his own parish. And so the equality between the Roman Catholic clergy and ourselves is proposed to be secured ! It may be said that in the Sunday School the clergyman may remedy all this. But in the first place I will say, that where a child during five or six days in the week is inured to a system which precludes his knowing anything, as he ought to know it, on the subject of religion, it will not be very easy, perhaps I may say it will be altogether impossible, to apply the corrective effectually by a few hours' attention on only one day, even if the children would attend. But they who have practical acquaintance with the difficulty of bringing children regularly to Sunday Schools, even when the impressions received from their teachers during the week are all encouraging to their attendance, will immediately perceive that the attempt to bring them together will be altogether hopeless, if, as I believe to be possible and very likely, the school-teacher should be a man who by insinuations duly applied should be constantly, though covertly, putting it into their minds to despise the Church, and the clergyman, and the Sunday School and everything connected with them.

There is one other subject which I would touch upon ; that is the number of Petitions which I have presented and the number of signatures to them. It has not been possible to have the printing of these completed in time to have them even yet in the hands of Members ; and this is so far to the disadvantage of our cause. I trust, however, Honorable Members will not forget the

fact of which I now remind them, that the signatures to Petitions actually laid on this Table amount to very nearly 3000 ; and there are others of which I have information, but which have not arrived in time, which would have carried the total number above 3000. This exceeds by far the numbers to the Petitions in 1836 against the Irish System, when the whole body of Protestant Dissenters united with the Church. Now we stand alone, and no particular exertion or interference has taken place, as it did then, to obtain signatures. Yet, look at their number: greater I really believe than ever were affixed to Petitions upon any subject which ever came under deliberation in this Council. This shews convincingly, what my own observation has long taught me : that is, the attachment of the people in this Colony, I say *the people* in the strict and proper sense, to the Church of England. His Excellency felt it necessary more than once to remind us that we, the Members of this Council, are by a great majority members also of that Church : and this was done, lest in our zeal for our own profession we should do too much for it. On the other hand, I must express my hope that this will not induce us to do less than is just ; that we shall not desert our own cause through fear of being thought illiberal if we uphold it. God help the poor Church of England, I must say, if her own children should desert her through such a fear as this ; if on this ground she should be given up to be betrayed by her kinsfolk and friends, and her foes should be those of her own household. I will say a word or two upon the tendency, I think experience justifies me in calling it the necessary tendency, of this liberality of sentiment in religion, the praise of which is so much coveted. In the matter of education, I have no doubt it leads to results such as are described in a letter which was read by Mr. Monsell at an Education Meeting at Limerick, on the 12th of January in the present year. Mr. Monsell first spoke in these terms : " It has always been found that Colleges founded on no religious principles become institutions hostile to religion ;" a remarkable confirmation of these words of truth " He that is not with us is against us." The Belfast Institution, founded on these principles has been alluded to, and therefore I will read to you a letter I have received

from a gentleman in that neighbourhood with regard to its working." Mr. Monsell then read the Letter as follows:

" *Balymena, 1st January, 1839.*

" Dear Sir,

" The Belfast Institution is based upon the broad principle of making no provision for the religious instruction of students. The several Presbyterian bodies are permitted to appoint professors of Theology for the young men designed for the ministry, among those who attend the other classes of the Institution. The whole concern has been for some time in a very tottering state, owing to the management being kept in the hands of Arians. The professor of moral philosophy, as appointed by them, having been suspected of entertaining heterodox religious opinions, has been for several years warmly and faithfully opposed by the Presbyterian synods. They have in vain sought for his dismissal. Another ingredient was at the last meeting of the managers thrown into the already overflowing cauldron of distrust and discussion; one of the Arian ministers announced that two persons had been appointed by his body to become instructors of youth in some religious department; and as at the meetings of the faculty he found there would be objections among the other theological professors to join in Divine worship with them, and as they would not by any means relinquish the right which the others possessed of usually opening their meetings with prayer, he proposed that the Theological should form a separate faculty by themselves. I believe the fate which awaits that Institution is that of every thing which is not based on religion and the revealed will of God."

Concurring entirely in this latter opinion, I will but request the Council to remark how invariably every system of education founded on the comprehensive principle of discarding Creeds and Catechisms terminates in the same result—the admission of Arianism and the interruption of united prayers. To this there is not an exception. Indeed it is necessary to add that neither is this the worst. There is but one step from the persuasion that all forms of religion are unimportant, to the still more fatal per-

suasion that all religions are alike. I will shew this by reference to the example of that country in which these comprehensive schemes of perfect liberty and equality first exhibited themselves:—France, from which they have been since propagated to every quarter of the globe. His Excellency was pleased to state his opinion just now, that of all the evils the world had ever witnessed, the most dire and disastrous are those which now afflict England, in consequence of the maintenance of the Church of England in its exclusive privileges. But, if I have any just recollection of the history of the times in which we have lived, I must retain the persuasion that the course of those commended principles of liberty and equality has been traced in characters of bloodshed and rapine, through almost every country; from which, by the blessing of Providence upon her constitution, England has been and is still preserved. I will shew however the appalling extent to which among the French nation religious liberality is carried, by an instance which occurred in a country lately subdued by its arms—in Algiers. A few years after that conquest it was considered proper that Christian worship should be introduced, and as the Royal Family of France are of the Roman Catholic persuasion, which is also nominally that of the nation, it was chosen as the religion of the African Colony. Application was made accordingly to the heads of the Mahometan persuasion to surrender a Mosque to be converted into a Church, which request, having necessarily the force of a command, was quickly complied with. The account of this transaction is to be met with, not in any obscure or despicable authority, but in a publication scientific in character; esteemed, conducted, and written by men of high rank in science. Its title is “*Annales Maritimes et Coloniales*,” and the extract of which I will venture to read a translation, occurs at p. 185, of the 1st vol., of Series 2.—“We will not lose this opportunity,” the Editors observe, “of laying before our readers the reply of the Mufti and of the *Alémes* to the General commanding; when, before deciding this important question, he deemed it proper to ask their assent. This reply partakes of the toleration which marks our own principles, and no person can read it without a

lively interest:—‘ Our Mosque will change its form of worship without any change of master; for the God of the Christians is also ours; and we differ only in the mode of worshipping him.’ ”

It may be useful to add that when the Roman Catholic worship was thus established in the Mosque, the sentences from the Coran which were inscribed upon the walls, were carefully preserved; as if it would have been too deep a violation of the principle of religious equality to erase these, and replace them by sentences from the Gospel. I feel that it would be impossible to shew more forcibly than by this example of impiety and profaneness, what a dreadful extremity the principles of liberality can carry men to, when they reach what we must consider as their final result, and their natural proportions. The Editor’s observations upon the above reply from the Mufti, are as follow: “ The interval remaining to be passed, in order to complete the perfect association of the two nations, cannot be great, when the most enlightened men belonging to the one, do not hesitate to express themselves in such terms. The religion of the Coran, heretofore so jealous, so exclusive, living now in peace by the side of a religion more gentle, more in advance, furnishes an example which may be cited for the imitation of the French and of the Moors, of the followers of Jesus Christ, and of those of Mahomet.”* It is indeed my earnest hope that this Council will pause at the commencement of this system of resigning all regard for peculiar tenets, and all regard for Creeds, when they see the frightful depths of infidelity into which that principle may lead them.

To Your Excellency then I venture to address myself, in hope that the freedom with which I have spoken my sentiments has not betrayed me into any breach of moderation, or of that respect which I entertain for Your Excellency’s high station, the rights of which I would not invade for any earthly consideration. I appeal to your Excellency for that protection, which you alone

* It should be stated that in return for this great act of liberality on the part of the Mufti, the Duc de Nemours, son of the most Christian King, manifested towards Mahomet a corresponding sentiment of toleration, by laying the foundation stone of a new mosque; with a view, as was expressly stated, of narrowing the interval which separated the two religions.

perhaps of all men have power to afford us, against the calamity which threatens us. It is the Church of England rather which in her extremity appeals to you, as a mother to her offspring, beseeching you, that no supposed political necessity, no yielding or concession to those who seek her hurt, should cause Your Excellency to withdraw from her the support of your powerful arm, at the very moment when she most requires it should be raised in her defence. Can Your Excellency be insensible to the dangers which are rising around us on every side? Your Excellency will perhaps impute to me that in painting those dangers, I have argued upon extreme cases—it may be so; but my reasoning, as to the future prospects of the Church, if the proposed plan be carried into effect, is not on that account to be slighted. In all religious declinations from that which is good there is that tendency to advance, by necessary though perhaps by slow degrees, to the extreme of evil, which renders it highly important to resist the beginnings of it. Therefore I have argued most justly in endeavouring to dissuade this Council from once admitting a false principle, by shewing them what it is in its consequences, when these shall have reached their natural and full proportions. I can imagine nothing more evident than that this System of Education which is now proposed, will have the effect of totally changing the religious aspect of this community. We shall not have, as Your Excellency describes our present condition, here a Churchman there a Dissenter, here a Presbyterian there a Roman Catholic; but we shall have first an increased diversity, and finally, growing out of this, we shall have the Unitarian and Romanist persuasions almost equally dividing the land. Your Excellency I am aware may regard the views which I have taken as the mere prejudices of education and habit, by which I am still trammelled, though your more vigorous mind may have broken through and cast them off. I beseech you, Sir, do not yield to that way of thinking, if you desire your own happiness or the happiness of us all. Sir, I will venture my own soul upon the assertion, that these are *not* prejudices; but truths as divine and eternal as God who is the Father of them; and who has set up the Church of England, I

confidently feel, to be a faithful witness to them throughout the world. The Schools which, if Your Excellency's plan be carried, must be abolished, are to her as her right hand, by means of which she is to execute the work which is given her to do; or rather they are the artery through which the life-blood is conveyed from the heart to the extremities of the body. Sever this, and she dies! It is the heaviest and severest stroke which in this Colony has ever been aimed at the welfare of the Church: and if it must fall, I wish that some other hand at least than Your Excellency's should inflict the blow. Does your Excellency desire support in the position which I urge you to take? You have it then in the Petitions which I and other Members have brought to this Table, bearing no fewer than 3000 signatures. Can Your Excellency then doubt what the real feelings of the people are? The people, properly so called, are, I hesitate not to say, in favour of the Church of England; and there cannot be a measure which shall in the just sense be so popular, as that which shall ensure to them and to their children the continuance of her edifying services. I have now concluded. Whatever the result of this debate may be, I have acquitted my own conscience. Yet I do not affect to deny that I await the determination of the Council with intense anxiety; knowing that if it be in favour of these Resolutions, my responsibilities must be increased in a fearful proportion, and, what weighs with me still more, the Church of England in this Colony must be placed in a condition of difficulty and peril, such as she has not for some centuries been called to encounter.

RESOLUTIONS WITHDRAWN WITHOUT A DIVISION.

*continued after Res. P. W. Williams
sermon later in this vol.*