

with the privileges it declares, the duties it enjoins, and the hopes it reveals. Of course I am not supposing or wishing any course of polemical instruction to be given by our school masters, but it cannot be safe to our children's feelings of veneration, nor reverential to Almighty God, to permit His Word to be read by a pupil to his tutor, and that tutor to be either unable or unwilling to use it as opportunity served, for his pupils' religious benefit. So in all their reading aloud to their master, what innumerable opportunities of profitable remark, in elucidation of exclusively christian principles, must occur. Also the intercourse of the scholars one with another,—their courtesy, their evil tempers, their brotherly kindness, their integrity, &c., will all call, almost hourly, not only for moral, but christian instruction. For what is the only true foundation, for instance, of love either to God or man, but this, "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us, and sent His son to be the propitiation for our sins." What is to be the Christian's motive, whether young or old, to the love of his race, but this, "Beloved, if God so loved us, we ought also to love one another." Again, what is to be the great motive for the peculiar love of Christians one to another, but this, "For by one spirit we are all baptized into one body." But at and about school, perhaps more than any where else, the language of a child, its mode of speaking of God, its personal behaviour, all require to be watched over; and what are the highest motives which a christian child, when old enough to commit wilful transgression, should have placed before it? Are they not these, "Without holiness no man shall see the Lord;" and again, "What I know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own? For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body and in your spirit, which are God's." I might of course go on multiplying examples without end; for how few moral and religious positions, of which a child is susceptible, are there in which he may not be sometimes placed, even in a day-school; but let these suffice. Can then such exclusively Christian training as this be received under our present school-system? And yet it is nothing but bare Bible Christianity! Consequently no Christian can be guiltless who willingly places his child, for a large portion of his life where, when Christian instruction is thus immediately called for, it cannot be had.

Really to a sincere believer in Christianity the matter may be brought within a nut-shell. What is man sent here for? Is it not first to bring glory to God, and, secondly, to use this life so as to secure for himself an inheritance in a better? Is it reason then to lose sight for a moment of higher motives, to expect such a believer to be willing to place his child, during those years when it is most susceptible of impressions, for 7 or 8 hours daily where the glory of God and that eternity which gives its value to his own present life, are practically forgotten? But we take higher ground and ask, can a Christian do so and be guiltless? Would not such conduct be a flagrant violation of that positive command,—with which I have also honoured this letter by placing it at its head,—“Whether therefore ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God.” But, Mr. Editor, I appeal to those Christian parents, who earnestly believe that all life should be a Christian life; for that each hour of the member of Christ, from the weaning from the milk “to the moment when the silver cord is loosed,” is designed to increase the glory of their Master and of their own eternity. Can then, I ask, such a Christian parent consent to sever his child for so vitally important a portion of his life, from Christ and His influences. In sober truth, for God forbid that in so important a matter I should merely declaim, the very thought of such a separation is little short of impiety.

Nor let it be answered that I am extravagant in expecting such teaching from denominational school teachers. I do not expect, nor indeed desire, that in Church Common Schools, for instance, we should have teachers who would give theological treatises to the children upon the doctrine of the New Birth, Episcopacy, or the Resurrection; but I do expect and desire, that we should obtain teachers who, when a child had committed some flagrant fault, would endeavour to bring him to repentance by reminding him whose child he was; or, who when a confirmation was approaching, would speak to the children of the great privileges of such a rite, and who in hearing their catechism would impress upon them, if only by one word, the nature of the vows which they were about to take. In short, in Church schools, I should hope to see Christian teachers, who, like Christian parents, would seize every suitable opportunity of making Christian impressions upon the minds of the children entrusted to them. To such schools, from the parish to the university, England, under God, owes most of her greatness and of her reverence for Christianity. But, had religious schools been the failure which some falsely pretend, even that could form no defence of a legislature for enacting—much less a Christian minister for suggesting—a system of national education in open opposition to Christian accountability and in scornful neglect of the holiness of Christian training.

But the Reverend Superintendent dwells much upon the importance and sufficiency of Parental and Pastoral instruction. It is well; most important are they, and it is precisely for interfering with these, that we denounce our present Common School system. Our Chief Superintendent, in effect says to the parent,—you may train your child in religion as you like on the Sabbath and during mornings and evenings of other days; but on the chief part of each week day I will take your child and have him taught as I see fit! So

to the Clergyman, he says,—It is your duty to teach this child religion, but I will only allow you to do so as best you may, on the Sabbath, all the rest of the week I will appoint such teachers for him as I choose! If this be not the bitterness of tyranny, a tyranny most recklessly interfering with the closest relations of life, I know not what is! I am quite aware that our Educational despot may answer: It is not I, but the trustees, who appoint the teachers. I acknowledge the fact, but he is the author, and the hand that guides the helm of the whole system, and therefore he is personally responsible for its whole effects. But, especially are his remarks with respect to the Pastoral instruction of our youth a mockery. This will appear by considering,—

(1.) That his own Common School system is greatly subversive of Sunday-School influence. In England Sunday-Schools have been so popular and useful because they are the only means offered to a large body of the people, of attaining any education at all; hence it is natural that they should be numerously attended, and although a very considerable proportion of the parents are actuated by secular and not religious motives, happily this does not prevent their children from receiving the benefits of the religious instruction there given. But in this Province the case with which secular instruction is obtained in our Common Schools does away with this motive for parents sending their children to Sunday-Schools, consequently, as most parents are not religious, (I suppose Dr. Ryerson will admit this!) and do not therefore care for their children being religiously taught, it is but a small proportion of those unhappy little ones who need such teaching most, that can, reasonably be expected to attend them. I indignantly complain, therefore, of the disingenuousness which proposes to rely so much on Sunday religious teaching, when the very circumstances to which it mainly owes its success and usefulness at home, do not exist here.

(2.) That by preventing the connection of ministers with Common Schools, the law takes out of their hands one very chief means of causing the children to attend their Sunday religious instruction. In the Canon which the Chief Superintendent so unfairly quotes, setting forth the duty of the Clergy to catechise, it is also declared to be the law, that parents and masters and mistresses shall cause their children and servants to attend. Upon this part of the law he wisely says nothing. But in England, since law has ceased to enforce these things, the relation of the Clergy to the parochial schools has been a great means of enabling them to secure attendance on their Sunday teaching. Now all such influence is, by our iniquitous school system, denied to the ministers of this Province. The Reverend Egerton Ryerson, D. D., will surely admit the truth of the scriptural declaration, that “men love darkness rather than light;” what then, when all secular instruction is withdrawn, is to induce irreligious parents to send their children to receive “the light?”

(3.) That the Clergy are so few, and so over-worked, that—even if the attendance of the children could be secured—they have seldom the time or the strength, on a Sunday, to comply with the most desirable requirements of the Canon, at least in any satisfactory manner. The Reverend Superintendent himself belongs to a large and respectable body of Christians; I would respectfully ask him, how many hours, in a week, month, or even hour, the ministers of his own denomination devote to the exclusive religious teaching of the youth of their flock? If then, as I venture to believe, his own brethren find little or no time, and least of all on Sunday, for this duty, is it christiably honest, does it manifest that godly jealousy for the glory of God and the salvation of his fellow men, he coming a professed minister of Christ, to offer such Sunday teaching as a substitute for religious or denominational schools?

Once more I must quote the Chief Superintendent, and then I have done trespassing on your patience for this week. He says, “The demand to make the teacher do the canonical work of the Clergyman is as impolitic as it is selfish.” This is simply an unworthy slander; and such I fear Dr. Ryerson knew it to be when he penned it. In truth, the ministers of any denomination, in contending for distinctive schools, are thereby seeking to increase their own labours, since they will then be greatly responsible for the conduct of both master and children; having the oversight of both the secular and religious training of the latter; attending certain days of the week to give special religious instruction, and other days for general examination, &c., besides the public catechising on Sundays, which then there might be some hopes of accomplishing with profit, both to the children and to the congregation.

Hoping that one more letter on this subject will be all that it will be necessary to tax you with, at least at present,

I am, yours truly,

A. T.

Diocese of Toronto, December, 18'2.

N. B. In answer to Dr. Ryerson's note of the 3rd instant, I have simply to re-assert that he has expended public money and abused his office in lecturing the Ministers of this Province for opposing his “sectarian” liberalism,—and that he has taught, through the same medium, “sectarian” Socialistic principles on the School question, which the Church, at least, esteems to be a vitally “religious” one.

With all my hereditary veneration for England's aristocracy, I find that, even in this sentiment, I must give place to the Canadian Chief Superintendent; since with me sound argument, by whomsoever propounded, would have far more authority than the mere opinion of even “a thousand” “such noblemen” as the

“venerable Marquis of Lansdowne.” But in deference to the Reverend Doctor's well known penchant for great names, I beg to refer him again to the opinion of “England's Duke,” quoted in my first; and perhaps even Dr. Ryerson may admit that His Grace's rank renders his opinion worthy of being placed in opposition to that of the noble Marquis!

Ecclesiastical Intelligence.

ENGLAND.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY AND PUBLIC OPINION.—The South Church Union has adopted the following resolution of censure upon the Archbishop of Canterbury:—

That the Archbishop of Canterbury, in appealing to “public opinion,” as the strongest ground on which to rest the opposition to those Clergymen who endeavour to act consistently with their duty to the Church, and in obedience to her written laws, not only has acted most unadvisedly, in reference to his own position as chief Pastor of the Church in these realms, but especially to that of the Clergy whom he represents; inasmuch as “public opinion” must be regarded, not as the expression of the mind of Christian men united in matters of faith and discipline, but rather of persons, many of whom are entirely opposed to the Church, and to each other in matters of faith; and that such appeal is in fact, nothing more or less than an appeal to the world against the Gospel.

PEWS IN PARISH CHURCHES.—The Bishop of Chichester has addressed the following sensible and excellent monition to the parishioners of Horsham, on the right to pews in parish Churches:—

“To the Vicar, Churchwardens, and Inhabitants of Horsham, greeting.

“Dear Brethren,—The extracts given below confirm by unquestionable authority the statement I made in my charge of 1850, of the law on the subject of Pews and Sittings in Parish Churches. My object in circulating them among you is to follow up the blow which has been given to the illegal and unjust practice which has too long prevailed in your parish church; to prevent, for the future, all sale and renting of pews and sittings, and to restore practically, as well as by the theory of the decision which has been had, their rights to the parishioners at large.

“I call upon those who suppose they have acquired a right in pews or seats obediently and loyally to submit to what is declared to be the law. I do not, however, see that it is necessary for me to require the churchwardens at once to remove from their pews or seats individuals who have hitherto occupied, or claim them in virtue of any supposed purchase or rent paid. On such ground they have no right or claim in them whatever. And should it be made known to me that any one henceforward presumes to take money for the purchase or rent of any pew or seat in Horsham church, I shall deem it my duty to institute proceedings against such person or persons; and let me tell them they will in truth receive money for that which is not theirs to sell or let. It belongs to the parishioners, and all must be content to occupy their seats as the law directs, viz, by the appointment from time to time of the churchwardens. And to these officers I say—the law is, that you seat the congregation, having regard to the station and position of different persons in the parish, and taking good care of the poor.

“If you find any improperly placed in virtue of any of these supposed purchases, it will be your duty to correct the anomaly. At the same time considerable allowance may be made, and no one be disturbed, or made to change, simply for the sake of change. There should be a reason, such as would weigh with you if the church were a new structure, and you seating the congregation therein for the first time. Nor should any pew or seat remain unassigned so long as there are families or individuals to provide for. Neither can you permit a lock upon a door. This were to surrender to the individual who should wish to hold the key that which is not his own, but the property of the parishioners for their use at the time of Divine service.

“Another important point. When you have assigned a pew or seat, it may not be kept unoccupied to a late period in the service: but if the parties entitled do not come, you should put into it proper persons with reference to the other occupants, who are waiting and standing without seats.

“If you ask me at what part of the service you may act. I would refer you in some degree to your own discretion. Distance, or nearness of abode, may make a difference or call for some allowance. But all should remember that that worshipper denies his Maker the most acceptable foundation of any service he can render who does not begin with the humble confession of his sins, and the imploring of pardon through our ever blessed Redeemer. It is, therefore, with most extreme reluctance that I can allude to any indulgence beyond the close of the exhortation. I cannot think it can be necessary; and in truth we know that it is just as easy to be punctual to the right time as to another time ten minutes later.

“I remain, dear brethren, your faithful pastor and servant,

“A. T. CHICHESTER.”

MISSIONARY MEETING AT GRANTHAM.—A public missionary meeting was held at the Guildhall on Thursday evening, the 25th of November; John L. Ostler, Esq., in the chair. He

was supported by the Revs. Charles Hodgson, (rector of Barton-le-street) and John M. Ward (curate of Claypole), who attended as a deputation, and the Rev. George Welby, of Barrowby, and the Rev. Alfred Allen, of Barton Coggles. About a hundred persons occupied the room, nearly the whole of whom were ladies. The Rev. George Welby addressed the meeting, and was followed by the Rev. Mr. Ward. He directed the attention of the meeting to a part of the world where missionary operations have been rather discouraging—the island of Ceylon. The Portuguese had introduced Christianity there by force, which had created a feeling of disgust in the minds of the people. Such a course was always pursued by the Jesuits and other Popish emissaries. But we have some interesting results even in Ceylon. A man cast in prison there had come into contact with a missionary, and become a good Christian; his conduct won the respect and regard of all his friends and relatives; and he had brought some of his family and many others to Christianity. The Rev. speaker next turned to India. There was a shaking of dry bones there which promised glorious results. The superstitious of the country were beginning to totter; and a change was going on in the minds of the Hindus. The new mission to the Punjab, consisting of Mr. Clark (a clergyman from Lincolnshire) and his coadjutor, had been received with open arms. The foundation stone of a new church had been laid; one Sikh had been converted, and there was a school where fifty or sixty children were being taught the truths of the Gospel. To show what great things might be expected in India, he read extracts from a work written by a leading Brahmid, a teacher in one of the Government institutions bore testimony to the conversion of the natives who had been taught in the missionary schools in India, and expressed fear for the venerable structure of Hindooism attacked by a hostile faith.

“Hindooism,” said the writer, “is sick unto death, and he feared it must fall.” Mr. Ward then alluded to China. The Church Missionary Society had ten converts there. The excessive politeness of the Chinese was a great obstacle to the spread of the Gospel in that country; as a matter of courtesy they agree with everything told them. The Rev. Alfred Allen afterwards moved a resolution, and urged upon the meeting the importance of promoting missionary enterprise. He was succeeded by the Rev. Charles Hodgson, at whose suggestion the company stood up and sang a missionary hymn. He stated that the society has 180 teachers and preachers of the Holy Gospel, making known the Gospel of Christ in twenty different languages. There are 40,000 children in its school, and it has many churches and congregations.

THE FRIENDS OF THE CLERGY.—On Tuesday afternoon a general meeting of the subscribers to this charity, the objects of which are allowing permanent pensions to the widows and orphan unmarried daughters of clergymen of the Established Church and affording temporary assistance to necessitous clergymen and their families, was held at the Loudon Tavern, Bishopsgate Street, for the purpose of electing ten pensioners on the funds from the long list of candidates. The Rev. J. Brown, M.A., having taken the chair at one o'clock, most ably but forth the claims of the society, and then declared the poll to be open. Mr. Stephen J. Aldrich, the secretary informed the meeting that there was at present 20 persons on the funds, receiving from £40 to £40 per annum. During the past years grants and loans has been made to 75 necessitous clergymen, to the amount of £660; to wives of ditto, £10; to 25 widows of ditto, £145; to 34 daughters of ditto, £181—making a total of £996. The funds were stated to be in a very flourishing condition. At three o'clock the poll was closed, and the names of the ten successful candidates having been announced, a vote of thanks was passed to the chairman, and the proceedings terminated.

THE CONVOCATION.

FOURTH DAY—WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 17.

The Upper House re-assembled on Wednesday, at two o'clock in the Board Room of the Bounty Office, Dean's Yard.

It was resolved that the Committee of Prelates previously nominated be instructed to consider the heads of a petition to Her Majesty on the subject of the correction of clerks in holy orders, to prepare a draft of such petition, and report to Convocation thereon.

The Prolocutor of the Lower House attended with a resolution, and presented amendments introduced into the address by the Lower House; the most important were additional clauses relating to the death of the Duke of Wellington, and the necessity of an increase in the episcopacy.—The amendments were considered and agreed to with some verbal alterations.

The address as amended was adopted.—The following important matter concludes the amended address:—“And in thus referring to the subjects which appear to us especially to concern the well-being of the Church, we cannot omit to speak of these deliberative functions of this Convocation which many members of our Church desire to see again called into active exercise.—We do indeed deem it advisable, at the present moment, to petition your Majesty for your royal license to transact such business as we may not enter upon without it; but we think it our duty respectfully to express our conviction, both that its legislative assemblies are an essential and most important part of the constitution of our Church, and that the circumstances of the present day make it the more imperative to preserve and as far as possible to improve them, and also the more probable that the resumption of their