

great many who sincerely wish for their secularization but inasmuch as the present incumbents are not to be disturbed during life, under any circumstance, we cannot see how this secularization a few years sooner or later can affect the country for the better. They constitute rather a question of principle and honour than of utility and profit. If the Rectories be legally established, nothing short of a revolution and confiscation can sweep them away. Does our contemporary regret that he has not these two items to add to his "Four years of a Reform Ministry." Should the Imperial Government refuse to hand over the Reserves to Colonial management, there is no other alternative but to take them—if we are able—or leave them as they are. Does the *Signal* doubt it? If so, we would like to see his plan on paper. The closing part of the *Signal's* article is a curiosity in its way. He says:—

"Mr. Price must have known that Mr. Baldwin was a believer in State Churches. Mr. Baldwin must have known that Mr. Lafontaine regarded Church property and Church perquisites as a divine institution, too sacred to be interfered with. In short every member of the Government must have felt the conviction that a settlement of the question by that Government was morally impossible. And, hence, we cannot rationally avoid the conclusion that the formation of such a cabinet, under such circumstances, was a dishonest act—was literally a hoax played upon the people, and could not fail to end in confusion and disappointment."

Granting, for argument's sake, that Mr. Price knew that Mr. Baldwin was a believer in State Churches, and that Mr. Baldwin knew that Mr. Lafontaine regarded church property as too sacred to be interfered with, is that any solid reason why the country should be left without a government? But our cotemporary may object, that men who perfectly agreed upon these subjects, could have been had at the time to form a Ministry. We deny it, in toto. Whatever men might have been available in Upper Canada, none so competent as Mr. LaFontaine could be had for the office of Attorney-General for Lower Canada at the time; and none could be had at all who did not coincide with Mr. LaFontaine in his views regarding Church property. So long as men continue to exercise their reasoning faculties, no ten of them can be found to agree exactly upon all subjects. It is only by mutual concessions on the part of one another, that society exists, and it is only through the operation of the same principle that governments can exist, either in Canada or elsewhere. Should the *Signal's* doctrine prevail, we may bid adieu to all government for ever, unless the government of one man. But the *Signal* has no right to suppose that the question of the Reserves and Rectories was at all taken into consideration at the formation of the Ministry in 1848. It has been conceded on all sides that Mr. Baldwin, in his "address" to the electors of the Fourth Riding, and in his speeches at the Hustings and elsewhere, never once alluded to this question; nor was it prominently referred to by any of the Reform candidates at the late general election, because it was then thought to be finally settled. And had it not been for some disappointed "brawlers," we do not believe we should since have heard of it. See how silent the *Globe* remained on the question until he "got the sack!" You'll see how silent the *Examiner* will become, on this and other questions of a like import, should he be definitely fixed upon as the *Organ*. This convinces us that had it not been for some real or imaginary slight offered the dignity of a portion of our Metropolitan press, in times gone by, we should never have heard a word about "Sectarianism," "Rectories," or any of the other politico-religious subjects that at present distract the country, and that are sure to ruin it, if persevered in.

THE RECTORIES.

"The public look upon the erection of these Rectories as a great fraud, a robbery perpetrated upon their common property."

Such is the barefaced assertion of our contemporary the *Free Press*. He confidently tells us that the "public" look upon the erection of these Rectories as a robbery. It is a wonder that there is not some degree of modesty about this journal in making use of the name of the public. Do the *Roman Catholics* (certainly a respectable portion of the public) look upon this affair as a robbery? Witness the speech of Mr. Tache and the action of the French members! Does the *Church of England* look upon the solemn setting apart of the British monarch (at a time when nearly the whole province was vested in the Crown) the portion of land she now claims as her own by patent for the support of religion, a robbery? Witness the action taken on the subject by her Clergy and Laity in a formal assembly at Toronto! and also witness the proposal of our semi-Radical member (one of the members of that Church) to place the presentation of those Rectories in the hands of the Church Society. Does the *Church of Scotland* consider this pious provision for the support of religion a robbery? Witness the action of that Church lately in Synod assembled, in which formal resolutions were adopted in favour of retaining for the Churches the lands set apart for religious purposes! Are the members of all other denominations united in their opinions that the Reserves and Rectories are a robbery? Under all these circumstances, however, the *Free Press* has the hardihood to tell us that the public look upon the establishment of these Rectories as a robbery? By furnishing another quotation, however, from our learned cotemporary in the same article, we shall find that he stultifies himself by his own assertions, and that his *ipse dixit* in reference to the Public is all bosh. He declares that "It is admitted on all hands that the Provincial Legislature have the power to 'vary or repeal' the provisions of the Act constituting the Rectories."

How, then, can the use of that article be a robbery which the Public themselves allow to and have the power "to vary or repeal?" And why is not that alteration made, unless it be for the fact that a larger portion of the "public" are in favour of our supporting religion as a nation, than are to be found in favour of general infidelity by secularizing property solemnly set apart for religious uses—*London (C. W.) Times*.

RECIPROCITY EXPOSED. — We understand that a quantity of Ohio wheat, 19,000 bushels, has been imported into Canada, during the present month, by one of our extensive milling establishments on the Welland Canal. Perhaps the agricultural community of this country are not aware that this is a favourite scheme with many of our millers and wheat speculators, and one which the present one-sided free trade system greatly accelerates. It is done with a view of controlling the market, and keeping the price of wheat considerably lower than it would otherwise be, and the fact of our present tariff being such as to allow the importation of American Wheat into Canada, free of duty, while Canadian wheat is charged 20 per cent. in the United States, considerably facilitates the carrying out of such gambling speculations. We

have not been informed at what price the wheat above alluded to was purchased, but there can be but little doubt that it was much under the average price paid in Canada. In the face of this statement, therefore, what becomes of the great reciprocity theories, that were to enhance the price of this staple commodity twenty per cent? The fact of the matter is, that the whole affair has been nothing more or less than a mere subterfuge, got up by a few interested parties and annexationists, at a time when the crops in the United States proved a partial failure. We trust that a few such examples as the one given above will be sufficient to satisfy the agriculturists of Canada, that the present system of allowing American wheat to come into this country, *duty free*, is ruinous to their interests; and that it is one which loudly calls for a speedy alteration. The elections are fast drawing nigh, and it is at the polls, the great battle of free trade and protection must be fought. We say to the country—be ready, for in your hands lies your own destiny.

One thousand Pounds have been granted to the Free Church College in Toronto. Of all the "voluntaries," the Free Kirk men are amongst the most determined. Consistency, thou art a jewel!—*St. Catharines Constitutional*.

We regret to learn from various parts of these Counties, as well as from the more distant portions of the Province, that the potato rot is prevailing extensively, and is likely to be destructive.—*Niagara Chronicle*.

NOTICE TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS.

As the first month of the present volume of the *Church* paper has nearly expired, we would again call the attention of our Subscribers to the terms of the *Church*, as below; hoping that all those who wish to avail themselves of the reduction for advance payment, will send in their subscriptions, *post-paid*, before the 7th of September, after which date no abatement from the original price will be made.

TERMS:

Fifteen shillings per annum, payable at the expiration of the first six months;
Ten shillings per annum, if paid within the first month of the volume;
To our city list, 1s. 3d. extra will be charged for delivery.

Our Subscribers in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and the adjoining Provinces, will please to take notice, that owing to new arrangements in the Post Office Department, we are compelled to pre-pay their postage, (amounting to 2s. 2d. per annum,) which amount we must charge in addition to the subscription. Those Subscribers who have paid us in advance for the present volume will be furnished with an account of the amount, which may be remitted with the subscription to the subsequent volume, or sooner, as occasion may offer.

TO CORRESPONDENTS

The account of the Meeting of St. Haycinthe in our next.

We have reserved the notice of the *Sunday School Fete* at Goderich, for the *Young Churchman*.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

LETTERS received to Wednesday, Aug. 27 1851.—
Rev. T. Machin; Rev. W. Logan, with 15 new subscribers; J. Benson, Esq., Napanee; Mr. R., has paid up. Mr. Griffin, Montreal, rem. for self and Mrs. Porteous, vol. 15; the Indices of vols. 12 & 13 have not yet been printed, but they will be ready in a few weeks when they will be forwarded. A. O. Gen. Trew, Niagara, rem. vol. 15; P. Durnford, Esq., Montreal, rem. vol. 15; Mr. P. Sinclair, Quebec, 18th and 21st, rem. Mr. C. Hamilton, vol. 15; Rev. W. B. Lauder, with two new subscribers; Capt. Wardell, vol. 15; Rev. G. Milne, New Carlisle, rem. for vol. 15, *Young Churchman*, and books; Rev. H. B. Osler, rem. vol. 15; A. Milne, Esq., Ancaster, rem. vol. 15; David Canfield, Esq., rem. vol. 14 & 15; Rev. J. Padfield, rem. vol. 15; C. Brent, Esq., for Mrs. Ferns, Kingston, rem. for vol. 15; John Ballenger, Streetsville, rem. vol. 15; George McClean, Esq., rem. for Mr. Weatherhead and Mr. Robt. Stewart vol. 15.

THE CHURCH.

TORONTO, THURSDAY AUGUST 28, 1851.

APPOINTMENTS FOR CONFIRMATION.

The Bishop of Toronto in announcing the following appointments for Confirmation, requests that it may be understood, that candidates are not admissible to that holy rite, till they shall have attained the full age of fifteen years.

Thursday	4	Burford	3 P.M.
Friday	5	Norwichville	10 A.M.
	5	Otterville	2 P.M.
Saturday	6	Ingersoll	3 P.M.
Sunday	7	Woodstock	11 A.M.
	7	Zorra	3 P.M.
Monday	8	Princeton	10 A.M.
	8	Paris	2 P.M.
Tuesday	9	Galt	10 A.M.
	9	Guelph	4 A.M.
Wednesday	10	Paslinch	10 A.M.
	10	Eramosa	3 P.M.
Thursday	11	Elora	10 A.M.
	11	Peel	2 P.M.
Friday	12	Eramosa	12 Noon
	12	Balnafad	4 P.M.
Saturday	13	Georgetown	10 A.M.

Toronto, August 13, 1851.

THE NEXT PARLIAMENT.

The policy of the Imperial Government, the implied reproach of the Queen's representative, the action of the Local Parliament, and the clamour of the sectarian press have all conspired to make the Church and her temporalities the leading subject of political controversy, the great test question of the forthcoming election. "Down with the Church" is the war-cry of the bold and uncompromising among the ranks of her infidel enemies. "Secularize the Reserves"—"abolish the Rectories"—"no State Endowment" are the echoed

watchwords of the popularity-hunters, those weak-pated seekers after place, who build their hope of success upon every bubble which floats on the current tide of popular opinion. The combined influence of the several forces thus arrayed against her, cannot fail to arouse the energies of her true and faithful children, and to awaken the sympathies of every generous heart. At such a crisis it behoves every churchman—for all are directly and personally interested in the issue of this predatory onset, earnestly to consider the value of that right which he possesses in common with our foes—we speak of the elective franchise—and to exercise it with prudence and determination. In order to give our aid as efficiently as we can to the good work of securing for the interests of the Church, the most effective representation in the next Parliament, we propose to review succinctly the present position of those vital questions which have, by common consent among our opponents, and from necessity among ourselves, been made the touchstones of representative qualification.

In carrying out this intention, we shall not be deterred from expressing our sentiments as freely and as fully as we can by the fear of compromising our character as a religious publication; as long as those sentiments are in accordance with the true christian principles which have characterized the controversial struggles of the Apostles and Divines in all ages of the Church, and as long as we offend not by harshness of language, we consider ourselves justified in maintaining steadfastly to the extent of our ability, the integrity of the temporal rights and welfare of what we by confession believe and declare to be, a pure Apostolic branch of Christ's Holy Catholic Church. We esteem it a high privilege to be permitted to fight in such a cause, nor shall we shrink from our duty.

It will be unnecessary to enter into any detail of the history or circumstances attending the present endowment of the United Church of England and Ireland in this Colony. It is a subject which has been recently so frequently discussed, that we may fairly presume our readers to be familiar with the merits of the whole question. Still it appears expedient that we should briefly review these, and at the same time premise the general principles by which we conceive every Christian Government ought to be influenced in making provision for the religious instruction and moral well-being of the people over which it is placed—principles which have plainly guided Great Britain in the case of this Colony and her other numerous dependencies. And, indeed, we may clearly trace the operation of these principles in almost every instance of territorial acquisition whether by conquest or settlement, where any system of colonization has been attempted, in ancient as well as in modern times; the most recent being the most glaring exceptions to the contrary, the evil results of which demonstrate the fallacy of departing from this fundamental obligation of sound constitutional government.

"The happiness of man is the end of civil government." This political axiom guides us to the consideration of the surest means by which that happiness is to be secured, and, consequently, we are led to investigate the relative duties of a government in accomplishing this end. It will not, we presume, be denied that true human happiness springs from "a heart tempered by religion and virtue for the enjoyment of that which God has bestowed upon us." With such premises we may fairly reason thus: If the great end of a government is to secure the happiness of its people, and if that happiness depends principally upon the religious condition of the people, it clearly becomes the duty of every government to provide those means which will tend to promote such a condition. As a corollary to this syllogism, we infer the following maxim to be correct: namely—that "religion depends upon the encouragement of those that are to dispense and assert it."

Here then we take our stand with reference to our endowment. It was a righteous and indispensable duty in Great Britain—one which she justly appreciated and faithfully accomplished—when founding this Colony, to plant within it her Established Church, through whose ministry and offices her migrating people and their successive generations might be preserved and nurtured in the true fold. For the maintenance of this Church it was necessary to make ample provision. From what source could she so completely and legitimately draw the means required for such sustenance, as from the country she had rightfully acquired, and for the future prosperity and greatness of whose inhabitants she was then wisely legislating.

In the performance of this great and sacred office she cautiously and generously respected the existing religious position and privileges of the nation which had preceded her in the enterprise of colonizing this country, thus recognising and acknowledging in another the great principle which was actuating her.

It is certainly to be regretted that the tenure of the endowment at that time provided for the Church should have rested upon so uncertain a foundation as the construction, perhaps we should more correctly term it the interpretation of the language by which the right of possession was conveyed to her. We maintain and we believe—few persons really think otherwise—that it was the

intention of the good King to vest the property then appropriated to her use absolutely in the Established Church of England and Ireland.

In the course of time, with the tide of population, the elements of discord and schism so rife in the Parent State were gradually introduced to our community; and viewing with envious eye the strength of the growing olive tree, efforts were successfully made to divide her portion. After deliberate investigation by the legislative and judicial authorities of both countries, and some mutual concessions on the part of conflicting interests; the question of right and manner of appropriation were determined on and settled, to the manifest satisfaction of the people, in 1840. Nor are we disposed now to cavil at that settlement; we accepted it in good faith—we have always considered it to be, and still regard it as, final and irrevocable.

Since that period, however, there has sprung up among us a hydra of infidelity, scepticism, and sectarian avarice, which seeks not alone to renew the question of right, but to rob and despoil us of the pittance reserved for, and secured to us, by the justice and wisdom of no very remote age. To oppose the tortuous movements of this monster, whose captious spirit is to be overcome only by a bold front and resolute measures, is the imperative duty of every conscientious churchman. The manner of opposition has been tauntingly pointed out to us; it is left for us only to consider the means and proper instruments for carrying on the work, which we propose to do in our next issue.

CLERICAL COMBINATION.

The topic so ably brought before the notice of the Canadian Church by our esteemed correspondent W. S. D., merits grave consideration. Fondly do we hope that it will be discussed calmly yet with earnestness, and in a prayerful spirit, devoid at once of party bias, and controversial acrimony.

To us, and as we have reason to believe, to many of our readers, the idea of clerical families, so to speak, is by no means unfamiliar. It has frequently occurred to those who have made the exigencies of our beloved communion the subject of their devout and anxious deliberation, from the rapid increase of the population of Canada West, these exigencies have now attained a point which renders it a matter of absolute necessity that they should be grappled with promptly and vigorously. Our towers must be strengthened, and our lanes and outworks extended, if we would hope to bring the vast plains of this magnificent continent under the healing shadow of the Cross.

The harvest truly is plentiful, but the labourers are few. This is a fact plainly self evident to every Canadian Churchman, and the question forcibly occurs—how are the labours of the handful to be so regulated, that they may be most conducive to the cultivation of the fair vineyard?

No one who has experienced its spirit-crushing evils will be disposed to question the fidelity of W. S. D.'s estimate of *solitary labour*. We fully admit that the loyal official soldier of Christ should make up his mind to submit to every privation, and endure all hardships in the cause of his Divine Master. His baptismal, as well as his clerical vows render this imperative. Still it should never be forgotten, that at the best, he is but a frail earthen vessel. Ordination does not emancipate him from the common longings and aspirations of humanity, nor is it desirable that such should be the case. The Saviour gracefully participated in the relaxations and amenities of life, and it is a leading objection to the stern Jesuitism of schismatic Rome, that by rendering its votaries mere passive instruments—moral *cadavers*—"missionary machines," as Coleridge says—it makes them so far, unlike the kind-hearted Godman, who rejoiced with the marriage guests of Cana, and refused not to banquet with "one of the chief of the Pharisees!"

If this be admitted, the conclusion is unavoidable, that the usefulness of a clergyman would be materially influenced by the social circumstances in which he might chance to be placed. If outlawed from the intercourse of his intellectual peers—if condemned to *drece the weird* of moral solitude, can we question that his energies would suffer a corresponding deterioration and abatement? The strong, earnest heart may wrestle successfully with poverty, and mere physical inconvenience, but will pine and languish when deprived of kindred sympathy. It cannot be otherwise, and for a very valid and sufficient reason Jehovah, in the morning of our world said: *It is not good for man to be alone; I will make a helpmeet for him.* This divine dictum had reference not merely to the matrimonial association, but to all the various relations and positions of Adam's great family. It embraced the spiritual ambassador as well as the husband, because the same great laws were applicable to both. "Solitary labour"—as our correspondent well observes, "has comparatively little warrant or encouragement from Holy Scripture, or the history of the Church. For since the day when our Blessed Lord sent forth His disciples *two and two*, upon their holy mission, it seems ever to have been found that in the great work of spreading the knowledge of God on earth, as in every other undertaking, *union is strength.*"

To this vitally interesting question we shall re-