

lously avoid invading, but be even ready to assist in protecting the just rights of others. All the proceedings of the Association will be conducted with the strictest regard to truth, charity, and justice."

Now the reader will recollect that the great boast of that Church, now said to be in such need of "defence," is its thoroughly unchangeable character. When, therefore, in being (Roman) Catholic we hear of "the love of true liberty" of the Association, we must bring the experience of the past history of that Church to our aid, which we may safely do from its not being given to change; and with such aid we shall find that in a religious sense the word liberty has no meaning in the estimation of the true (Roman) Catholic. The true liberty of that Church is to believe what it enjoins and nothing else. But the scribe of the Association states, and this second PAUL, if not a second DANIEL, endorses the statement, that the new body will most scrupulously avoid invading the just rights of others. What are those "rights?" Clearly not freedom of thought or action, for the Roman Catholic Church concedes no such right wherever it can be prevented. It is, therefore, apparent that the whole manifesto is a tissue of deception from beginning to end.

Where the Roman Catholic Hierarchy have an object to serve, and where the system cannot be carried out with a high hand, it is seldom that those out of its pale have an opportunity of becoming acquainted with its true character. Occasionally, however, Roman Catholic writers throw off their restraint, and heretics are admitted to a peep behind the scenes. Thus, while the promoters of the Defence Association are attempting to throw dust in the eyes of the public by their professions about civil and religious liberty, "the Rambler," a Romanist publication, of considerable ability, declares the whole of such professions to be the most arrant nonsense, the most outrageous hypocrisy. In the last number of that journal, we find the following Confession of Faith, which, as agreeing with all past experience, we are inclined to accept as genuine:—

"We are (says the writer of the Rambler) the children of a Church which has ever avowed the deepest hostility to a principle of religious liberty, and which has never given the shadow of a sanction to the theory that 'civil liberty,' as such, is necessarily a blessing at all. How intolerable is it to see this miserable device for deceiving the Protestant world still so widely popular among us! We say, for deceiving the Protestant world; though we are far enough from implying that there is not many a (Roman) Catholic who really imagines himself to be a votary of religious liberty; and is confident that, if the tables were turned, and the (Roman) Catholics were uppermost in the land, he would in all circumstances grant others the same unlimited toleration he now demands for himself. Still, let our (Roman) Catholic tolerationists be ever so sincere, he is only sincere because he does not take the trouble to look very closely into his own convictions. His great object is to silence Protestants, or to persuade them to let him alone; and as he certainly feels no personal malice against them, and laughs at their creed quite as cordially as he hates it, he persuades himself that he is telling the exact truth when he professes to be an advocate of religious liberty, and declares that no man ought to be corrected on account of his conscientious convictions. The practical result is, that now and then, but very seldom, Protestants are blinded, and are ready to clasp their unexpected ally in a fraternal embrace.

"They are deceived, we repeat, nevertheless. Be instant, when you hear us pouring forth our liberalisms. When you hear a (Roman) Catholic orator at some public assembly declaring solemnly that 'this is the most glorious day of his life, when he is called upon to do'—be not too simple in your credulity. These are brave words, but they mean nothing; no, nothing more than the promises of a Parliamentary candidate to his constituents on the hustings. He is not talking Catholicism, but Protestantism and nonsense; and he will no more act on these notions in different circumstances than you now act upon them yourselves in your treatment of him. You ask if he were Lord in the land, and what would he do to you? That, we say, would depend entirely upon circumstances. If it would benefit the cause of Catholicism, he would tolerate you; if expedient, he would imprison you, banish you, fine you; possibly, even, he might hang you. But be assured of one thing, he would never tolerate you for the sake of the glorious principles of civil and religious liberty."

Again, the same writer observes that— "Religious liberty, in the sense of a liberty possessed by every man to choose his own religion, is one of the most wicked delusions ever foisted upon this age by the father of all deceit. The very name of liberty—except in the sense of a permission to do certain definite acts—ought to be banished from the domain of religion."

It is neither more nor less than a falsehood. No man has a right to choose his religion. None but an Atheist can uphold the principles of religious liberty.

"Shall I, therefore, fall in with this abominable delusion? Shall I foster that damnable doctrine, that Socinianism, and Calvinism, and Anglicanism, Judaism, and every one of them morbid sins, like murder and adultery? Shall I hold out hopes to my erring Protestant brother, that I will not meddle with his creed, if he forget that he has no more right to his religious views than he has to my purse, or my house, or my life-creeds. No! Catholicism is the most intolerant of all religions. It is intolerance itself; for it is the truth itself. We might as rationally maintain that a sane man has a right to believe that two and two do not make four, as this theory of religious liberty. Its impiety is only equalled by its absurdity."

No one acquainted with the history of the Papacy can for a moment deny that this is a true exposition of it. This is the system as actually administered at Rome, and as it would be in the United Kingdom if it was a duty to put down heresy with a high hand wherever they can venture to do so. When, therefore, we hear of professions of civil and religious liberty and of charity coming from such a source, we shall do well to bear in mind what is really meant by these terms, and more especially as expounded by some of their own people.

QUEEN'S VISIT TO MANCHESTER. The true disciples of the Manchester school, all the world knows, will sell whatever will fetch money, even their own, and to their brother's soul, as well as their own. But we were not prepared, we confess, to hear that even the Manchester people would have the Queen. Such, however, it appears, is the course to be pursued on the occasion of the proposed Royal visit to the town of cotton and smoke, as appears from an advertisement in the Manchester papers, in which Mr.

John Potter, Mayor of Manchester, desires that "all persons who may be desirous of being present in the Exchange, on the occasion of Her Most Gracious Majesty's visit to Manchester, will forthwith make application to him for admission. Every application must be for two places, specifying the names and addresses of both parties, as no seats can otherwise be allotted.—Admission for each person one pound. Should the applications exceed the number that can be accommodated, a ballot for admission will take place." This is really too bad. Her Majesty's Ministers ought not to permit such an insult to be offered to their Royal Mistress. Though money may be the only criterion of social position among themselves, yet the Manchester Oligarchs should be taught that admission to the Royal presence is not a marketable commodity.

It is with profound regret that we announce the renewed indisposition of the Earl of Derby. His Lordship has been suffering from another attack of gout, which prevented the noble earl from taking the chair, as he had intended to have done, at the meeting of the Auxiliary Society for the Propagation of the Gospel at Liverpool, on Monday last. Fervently we hope and pray that a health so valuable to the whole empire as that of the Earl of Derby is at this juncture, may be speedily and effectually restored.

In another part of our columns will be found the scheme drawn up by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for the regulation of Episcopal incomes. It is more conspicuous for the business-like character of its tone than for the delicacy of its provisions, and affords melancholy proof of the difficulties by which a Church is encompassed, when she is not permitted to take order for her own welfare. However, if it shall put an end to such scandalous discussions as those originated last session by Mr. Horsman and Sir Benjamin Hall, much will have been gained, though at some expense, perhaps, to the feelings of some of the Right Rev. Prelates. The lesson, we trust, will not be thrown away. If Churchmen do not set their own house in order, it will be set in order for them by ruder hands.

Fresh proofs of the disloyalty of the Papists transpire every day. In Ireland, this week, opposite the hotel where the members for Tipperary were being entertained by their constituents with pleasant fare, and were, in return, entertaining them with their wild eloquence, a bonfire was made, and the Act of Parliament which prohibits the intrusion of the Pope's supremacy into the Queen's dominions, was committed to the flames amidst the shouts of the populace. In Canada, the flag of England was burned in the market place, on the arrival of the intelligence that the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill had become law. What demonstration are Her Majesty's Ministers waiting for, to convince them that Popery is a rebel creed, which requires to be curbed?

"The Constitution, the whole Constitution, and nothing but the Constitution," is the cuckoo cry raised by the Knight of Bolton. A new watchword this, truly, in such a mouth as his. In what sense are we to take it? Except it be this, that "the Constitution the whole Constitution," is that which he and his followers are bent upon destroying; that "nothing but the Constitution," the utter demolition of it. root and branch, will satisfy the evil wishes of the Manchester demagogues. Their hopes, it seems, are high enough just now, to warrant their most extravagant expectations. It is upon the necessities of the Prime Minister upon the utter prostration of the Whig party, that the sanguine calculations of the "National Association" are founded. "The First Minister of the Crown," quoth their Joshua, "has himself declared his intention to introduce a new measure of Reform, and we know he cannot afford a little war. He has left us to infer that his measure will be based more upon the demands and support of the people, than upon any preconceived plan of his own." Now, then,—Sir Joshua Walsley would say to the misguided disciples of the Manchester Reform School—now is your time for asking; whatever you may ask, you are sure to get it, for Lord John is not in a position to stand upon trifles. We think it extremely likely that this is a correct estimate of the squeakableness to which the noble Premier is reduced; but what we take leave to doubt, is, that the support of the National Association will be considered by the noble Lord a sufficient compensation for the utter loss of character and position which compliance with its demands is sure to entail.

The true use of the Great Exhibition and the real gain of the *Annus Mirabilis* have been discovered at last. Our excellent and ingenious contemporary the *Morning Chronicle*, after applying for a length of time the whole machinery of his mind—with the exception recently of a Detector-lock at Lambeth—to the great mystery with no less assiduity than Hobbs bestowed upon Bramah, has at last unlocked the great wonder of 1851. It is—guess, gentle reader, what it is—once, twice, three times, no! guess again,—do you give it up?—well then, it is that the "willow-pattern" is for ever abolished. *Io Pean!* "It is now impossible to go back to the manufactured abominations which, while they encompassed, debased our early associations. And for this we have to thank the exhibition." As our contemporary sagely observes, "It is no paradox after all to say, that even a dinner plate may have its social value." That, Sir Peter Laurie would say, depends very much on what is put on it. Of course we do not contend that there may not be prettier plates than the "willow-pattern," still we are staggered, we confess, to see all the short-comings of Old England set down to that primitive essay in the art of landscape painting. "When the whole English nation, below the upper circles—in all its families of the vast middle classes, one and all, day after day, and year after year, morning, noon, and night, only ate off the blue 'willow-pattern,' the sense of the beautiful as an element of the popular mind, must have been incredibly low." We really wonder, now that the idea has been suggested, how we ever got beyond a simple tattooed existence, with that horrid pattern always before our eyes. We trust our morning contemporary will not content himself with a mere column and a quarter on the extinction of the "willow-pattern."

The theme in his hands is a fruitful one, and quite out of the common. For our parts, with a smaller spice of the philosophy of fancy in our nature—it may be owing to this very "willow-pattern" who knows?—we cannot strain our imagination beyond the vision of some old man, twenty or thirty years hence, spying a cracked "willow-pattern" plate in an old curiosity shop, and gazing upon it with tearful eye, and thoughts of England in "the good old time." Very low, we are aware of it, very low indeed!

The Neapolitan Government is at great pains to clear itself of the charge brought against it by Mr. Gladstone. We are afraid this is but another attempt to wash the blackamoor. The Right Hon. Gentleman may have been mistaken in regard to some of the information which he felt it due to humanity to publish

to the world. He did not himself place implicit reliance on his facts, being aware of the difficulty of getting at the truth in a country governed as Naples is. But assuredly, if there were but the one uncontradicted fact of the prisoners being chained together two and two, never and for no purpose whatever, to be separated, that alone speaks volumes. A state of the law which permits such refined cruelty, is but indifferent proof of the humanity of the Government which allows it to exist. Of such a Government almost anything is credible, though little may admit of proof. Mr. Gladstone has however, the satisfaction of having made the Government of Naples feel that it is accountable for its deeds at the bar of civilized Europe.

The buccaneer expedition against Cuba has been brought to a tragical termination. A horrible death has put an end to the career of its desperate leader.—The American journals though more rational in their tone, yet continue to vapour about the loss which Cuba has sustained by not having embraced her liberators. But are our brethren on the other side of the Atlantic quite sure that their republican institutions answer the ends of human government to so superlative a degree as to entitle them to force upon their neighbours their political condition. While there are in their streets negro riots, in which citizens shoot each other down like wild beasts, while in their own province of California vigilance committees armed with revolvers undertake the protection of life and property by the execution of secret and arbitrary law, there seems hardly ground sufficient for the Americans to imagine that to resemble them is the perfection of all social and political existence.

A CURIOUS DISCOVERY.—It will be recollected says a correspondent of the *Daily News*, that in the accounts given of the means of livelihood of the notorious Cauty, who a few weeks ago was so cleverly captured while robbing the Westminster Bank, and who was transported afterwards for the robbery, it was stated that for a great number of years he had lived in the most luxurious style, and must have had a splendid income, and that he had obtained this income by being concerned in some way or other with all the great robberies in the kingdom. This appears to have been to some degree an error, and the police were evidently at fault as to one source of Cauty's revenue. This man used to travel often in the West India Company's steamers to the Gulf of Mexico and the Spanish main, and gamble, and fleece the rich Mexican and Spanish American passengers on board the West India packets, who are always found to be passionately fond of gambling, and who are eager to indulge in it to relieve the monotony and tedium of long voyages. Cauty's apprehension was heard on board with some surprise, as although he was considered a sharper and a scamp, it was hardly expected that he would be caught in barefaced downright robbery. Cauty belonged to a gang of four, who used to travel in the mail packets on a fleecing expedition. Of course they travelled as first class passengers, and some idea may be formed of their gains, when it is considered that the passage money of each out and home must have cost oftentimes £100. These worthies did not limit their operations to the West India packets. The pigeons, however, that they used to delight in plucking best are to be found between Southampton and the Spanish main, the West India Islands, and the Gulf of Mexico.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION.—The Congregational Board of Education has taken the field against the secular education schemes started at Manchester, and has held a meeting in the same town, at which a resolution was passed, setting forth:—"That in the judgment of this meeting it is of the highest importance that the education of the young people of this country should include instruction in the truths of the Christian religion; as pre-eminently calculated, under the Divine blessing, to render them valuable members of society, and to lay the foundation of their temporal and eternal well-being. That this meeting, therefore, solemnly protests against the exclusion of religion from the day schools of this country; and at the same time, on the ground of well known non-conformist principles, it equally protests against provision being made for religious teaching by legislative authority and compulsory taxation."

INDIA.—THE OVERLAND MAIL.—News have been received by electric telegraph, from Trieste, of the 27th of September, of the arrival of the *Adria* from Alexandria with thirteen passengers. The dates from Bombay are to the 1st of September. Gholah Singh had suppressed the outbreak in Cashmere. The Khan Heerat was dead, and Dost Mohammed had succeeded him. A great quantity of rain had fallen in Scinde, which had caused inundations and much loss of life and property. General Battine, Commodore Hawkins, and M. de Bethune had died. The last would probably be succeeded by Sir E. Perry. Frauds to the extent of £70,000 had been discovered in the opium department at Bombay. An expedition had been fitted out there against the Arabs round about Aden. Gold was abundant, and the import trade brisk. Exchange, 1st September, 1s. Exchange at Calcutta, August 21, 2s. 0^d. to 2s. 1d. Freight from Calcutta to London, £3 10s. to £3 12s. 6d.

Communication.

[We deem it necessary to follow the example of the London Church periodicals, and to apprise our readers that we are not responsible for the opinions of our Correspondents.—ED. CH.]

To the Editor of the Church.

DEAR SIR,—I intimated in my last that I would trouble you again, if I saw any thing in your columns respecting the Toronto University and Trinity College to call for further observation. A correspondent who signs himself "T. C." has flourished a sharp sword, as he supposes, in your defence, but his letter unfortunately only puts one in mind of the belligerent boy who, in an unhappy moment of anger, being fully determined to flesh his maiden weapon in his adversary, drew forth from his scabbard—a turkey's feather!!

"T. C." has occupied some time in finding fault with me; but, Sir, I do not find that he has offered even the ghost of an argument or proof against any one of the facts I have advanced—and I wish to deal only with FACTS—I am perfectly willing to meet him on any fact (real or supposed) bearing fairly on the point at issue.

1st.—As to *British usage!* "T. C." is evidently ignorant that the Senate of the Toronto University is differently constructed from the governing bodies of the English Universities—I do not say whether this be right or wrong. "T. C." seems to forget that the Chancellor is merely the chairman or presiding officer—and does not meet the fact that any act of his, not authorized by the Senate or Convocation, is but his own act, and not that of the University. What the case may be in the British Universities, does not affect the question; and "T. C." evidently knows as little about it as I do, or, perhaps, less.

"T. C." says: "It was believed * * * that the Government and the authorities honoured and regarded him (Mr. de B.) highly as an efficient officer!"—A accuracy is all-important in these matters, will "T. C." tell us who "believed," and who "the authorities" are that he refers to?—as to the "Government" their conduct is not the question here.

I am accused of "plucking the crown from my master's head," which is mere silly trash—and, what is worse, advocating rank, rank republicanism." I fancy "T. C." means that as a member of the Senate I am bound to uphold every thing that the Chancellor says or does, and therefore if I freely express, or record my sentiments against them, I advocate rank, rank republicanism!—I ask him whether as a member of any Corporation he would consider himself so bound?—more particularly if such sayings or doings were not only opposed to his own conscientious opinions, but also opposed and refused by that Corporation or Body—would he do so as a member of the City Corporation? or as a Grand Juror—or a member of the Church Society, or of Trinity College? "T. C." must surely see the difference between prompt obedience to authority, and the claim to liberty of speech and thought, where no obedience was due. If he cannot, he is incapable of understanding what he has made such a flourish about, and had better pull off his lion's skin and confess himself an ass!

"The Senate of Toronto have obeyed their Government Masters"—This a clap-trap assertion without a tittle of evidence—I call on "T. C." to point out the when and the how—if he can, which I doubt most exceedingly;—and with their Chancellor have opposed Trinity College, and with many overt acts." Now, Sir, what am I to think of a man who persists in such assertions, notwithstanding the unqualified contradiction they have received, and yet does not dare to support his assertion by a particle of evidence? To assert that "the Senate with" or without "their Chancellor, have opposed Trinity College with many overt acts" is grossly untrue. Disposed as you are yourself to out-herd Herod in your injustice to the Toronto University, you could find but "one overt act" as you were pleased to style it, which I trust I have shown in my last letter to you, not yet published to be an unjustifiable term—because the act there referred to, the reduction of the fees, could at the worst be looked on only as following an example set by Trinity College. Your turkey-feathered champion is not satisfied with your last "overt act," but reiterates "many overt acts." I dare him to the proof—except indeed he shelters himself under your authority and throws upon me the onus probandi of the negative!

The next assertion is most serious, but it would require strong proof before it become credible. I quote "T. C.'s" own words:

"Will the Senator inform us why these members and professors, being sons of the Church of England, and who profess 'as they may say,' sincere attachment to that Church, were not permitted to attend the ceremony of laying the corner stone of Trinity College?"

Here is a distinct allegation that the members and professors of Toronto University, who belong to the Church of England were not permitted to attend that ceremony. This prohibition should have been made only by the President (the Rev. Dr. M'Cauley)—the Vice-Chancellor—(Dr. Croft) the Caput, including Dr. M'Cauley, Dr. Beaven, Dr. Nicol, Dr. Connor, and Mr. Crookshank, all belonging to the Church of England;—or the Senate. Now positive sure am I that from none of these did such a prohibition issue, and the assertion is a pure fiction; the green innocence of "T. C." having been shamefully imposed upon. It is true that a meeting of the Senate was held that same day which may have prevented the attendance of some; but will "T. C." dare to assert that none of the members were present at the ceremony he speaks of?—Again—the words "who profess as they may say" &c., convey an insolent imputation fit only to be flung back with undisguised contempt. If I have misapprehended "T. C." I am ready to make the most humble amende.

I had not the least intention of replying to "T. C." at this length—I regret that I have been compelled to do so. As I said before, I wish only to deal with facts and legitimate inferences; every thing else, whether vituperation or empty declamation is foreign to the subject. Let "T. C." take either of my letters and analyse them as he pleases, he will find that whether I admit or not "the opposition given to Trinity College by the Government creators of Toronto University, and the official and legally constituted head of that Institution," which I freely admit and protest against, it does not weaken or modify one iota of the facts or arguments I have brought forward in rebuttal of the unfounded charges made in the Editorial article in the *Church* of the 23d inst. My tilting has been with you, "T. C." has volunteered to support you, but I think you might pray him to let you alone. Do pray to be protected against such injudicious friends.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your very obedient Servant,
ONE OF THE SENATE,
OF THE TORONTO UNIVERSITY.

Toronto, Oct. 16, 1851.

Colonial.

THE STEAMER "ADMIRAL."—We are happy to be able to state, that this fine steamer, about the fate of which much anxiety has existed for the last two days, has not been ashore, as had been reported.—After leaving Coloubr on Thursday night, for Rochester she broke her crank-pin, and had then to depend upon her sails. It blew a perfect gale during the night from the South-west, and she sailed slowly before it; and when about half way between Long Point and the Ducks Island, yesterday morning at half past 7, and about five miles from land, the mate was sent ashore to make the best of his way to Kingston for assistance—the wind being off the land, which prevented her from keeping her course to Kingston. The 'Passport' wet in search of her yesterday morning, but was unable to find her. As the *America* was despatched from Toronto on Sunday to look for her about the Ducks Island and the south shore, it is to be hoped that she will pick her up. The mate reports that the vessel was perfectly tight and in good order when he left, with the exception of the broken crank-pin which can be easily replaced. Since writing the above we have seen a telegraphic communication from Capt. Kerr, announcing the safe arrival of the *Admiral* at Oswego.—*Patriot*.

VIEW OF TORONTO.—At the meeting of Council on Monday night, Mr. Alderman Wakefield brought up the Report of the select Committee appointed as judges to award the premium of £25 offered by the Council for the best view of the City of Toronto, at the Mechanics' Institute Exhibition. The Report briefly stated that in the opinion of the Com-