

Communications.

[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.

Toronto, July 15, 1851.

SIR.—In the Patriot of yesterday I observe an article headed "Twelfth of July," and purporting to give an account of the celebration of that anniversary in Toronto, in which the following passage occurs:—"We had understood that there was to be no procession, and we believe that the authorities of the Order had so decided, but, as we anticipated, the zeal of the loyal brethren was not to be restrained by cold-blooded resolutions, and walk they would, and walk they did."

Now, it is true that a superior local tribunal of the Order, at a meeting at which most of the Grand Officers of the Institution were present, decided, by a very large majority, for the reasons then urged, that it was most desirable that a public procession should not take place in this City, this year, but that the Glorious Anniversary should be celebrated by the Brethren attending Divine Service in the Church. Such, Sir, was the resolution which was adopted by a superior tribunal, and which the Patriot styles cold-blooded.

It will be seen that it was the desire of all that there should be a public celebration on the 12th of July, though a difference existed as to the manner of carrying out such celebration.

However, it was finally resolved, as before stated, and such resolution was passed for the good of all, not for the gratification of a few,—and I feel convinced that more good would ensue from an adherence to a resolution deliberately carried, than from that spirit of democracy which would set all authority at defiance.

I am, &c. AN ORANGEMAN.

To the Editor of The Church.

TO THE HONOURABLE P. B. DE BLAQUIERE.

HONOURABLE SIR,—I informed you in my last letter that one of the reasons which, in my judgment, renders it impossible for the Church of England to connect herself by an affiliated College with the University of Toronto, is the essentially irreligious character of that Institution. And in order to demonstrate that such is the character which justly belongs to your University, I proved by the Act of the Provincial Parliament, by which it has been established, the following facts:— 1st.—That no religious qualification is to be required of, or appointed for any individual in the University, and hence that Infidels or Atheists are just as eligible for Professorships in the same as men of the soundest religious views, and most orthodox faith. 2.—That all public worship of Almighty God is prohibited in the University according to any form whatever. 3rd.—That the teaching of Theology is excluded. And 4th.—That the ministers of religion are declared ineligible to some of the chief places of authority therein.

Having thus pointed out the manner in which the Constitution of your University labours to exclude from its system all trace of religion, I showed that there is no satisfactory recognition of the principle that religion is the basis of all sound education, either in the scheme by which it is proposed to affiliate with the University of Toronto a number of independent Colleges, to the authorities of which is to be committed the business of providing, in any manner they please, for the religious instruction of their respective adherents, or in the exercise of the powers declared to be vested in the visitors or Senate of the University to make regulations in regard to the attendance of its Students upon public worship in their respective churches; because there is no essential or necessary connection between either of these sources of religious instruction and your University—no student being required to be a member of any affiliated College, or to have any religious qualification, or in other words any religious belief—and consequently none being obliged to acknowledge any minister on whose religious teaching or public ministrations he can be required by any regulations to attend.

To all this it has been replied that inasmuch as under the system lately in operation in King's College, any student who professed to feel a conscientious objection to the worship maintained therein, was given a dispensation excusing his attendance; and inasmuch as there was no authority for enforcing the attendance upon that worship even of the Church of England, it was just as possible for a young man to be trained up in infidelity under that system, as it is under the present Constitution of the University of Toronto; and hence that those persons are inconsistent with themselves who object to the University of Toronto on the score of irreligious character after having supported King's College, although open to the same objection.

Sir, I am no eulogist of the system which lately obtained under the amended Charter of King's College. I believe it to have been lamentably deficient in several important respects; nevertheless that it was open to the charge of irreligion may safely be denied, for it did not repudiate a christian qualification in its Professors—it did not interdict the teaching of religion—it did not prohibit the worship of Almighty God, nor proscribe his Ministers in regard to any of its offices; and if any of its students chose to absent themselves from the worship of God which it maintained, the fault was their own, not that of King's College. It is very different when, as in the University of Toronto, the worship of God is prohibited altogether under any form whatever; there the guilt of irreligion—or of infidelity, should such unhappily prevail, is chargeable upon the very Constitution of the University itself, inasmuch as neither within nor without its walls does it make any provision of its own for religious instruction, or adopt as its own any kind of divine worship whatsoever.

It will perhaps be said that the religious teaching in the affiliated colleges, and the religious worship in the respective Churches which such of the students as please may attend, is to be regarded as the teaching imparted and the worship offered up by the University itself. Sir, the Act 13 and 14 vic. cap 49 for removing all doubts "as to the Christian character of the said Institution," goes out of its way to assert the contrary; providing expressly "that no part of the funds of the said University shall be expended for any such purpose; but that it be left to the authorities of each denomination of Christians to provide for the religious instruction of its own adherents attending the said University." But be it so; let it be admitted that the University of Toronto does teach religion and does worship God, (although the University itself tells you it does not,—that there is nothing with which it is more particular that it shall never be charged,—that it prohibits them within, and refuses to pay for them

without.) the question next occurs, what is the nature of this teaching and worship? Is it such as tends to confusion in religion,—to break down the great principles of religious truth,—to tell the people of this province it is immaterial what they believe, and so to foster religious indifference until it grows into a widespread religious infidelity? and if it be, is the system which for the purpose of conciliating public favour and support, patronizes alike truth and error, regarding with equal favour tenets the most contradictory and doctrines the most conflicting, (and that, as it is explained in the Act for removing all doubts "as to the christian character of the said Institution," from "a tender regard for the conscientious scruples of all classes of professing christians") one to which the Church of England can become a party, either with honor to herself or with advantage to the spiritual welfare of this Province? In my judgment it is not. And it is this tendency of the affiliation scheme to confound truth and falsehood that I allege as my second reason why the Church of England should not connect herself by an affiliated College with the University of Toronto.

Sir, if there be one thing more than another, which we are bound to guard with watchful care and sacred jealousy, it is religious principle. We are bound in the first instance to see that we ourselves hold the truth, and then to abstain from every act which might produce confusion or perplexity in regard to it, or might minister in any way to the demon of Infidelity. Now if a premium were to be offered for the plan best calculated to produce these mischievous effects,—I do not think it possible that any could be presented which would be more effectual than that of establishing a great seminary of learning which shall formally recognise all systems of religion,—no matter how opposed or contradictory to each other—as equally true and worthy of its sanction—which shall receive into connexion with itself by affiliation, Colleges for the special purpose of teaching Romanism and Protestantism, Unitarianism, and Trinitarianism, which shall have its College for the Socinian who denies the divinity and atonement of the Redeemer, for the Quaker who denies His Sacraments and Ministry, for the Universalist who denies a future state of retribution, for the Swedenborgian, the Shaker, the Mormon and every sect however fanatical if it be only of sufficient numbers and ability to establish a College respectable enough for affiliation; and of course we must not leave out the Jew, whom the Prime Minister is now endeavouring to introduce into the Imperial Legislature—the Jew who proclaims Jesus of Nazareth to be an impostor—and then I think we shall have effectually removed all doubts as to "the christian character of the said Institution."

But the affiliation scheme which you support is not satisfied with thus inculcating contradictory religious teaching in the University of Toronto, but it proposes to send forth throughout the Province the ministers of these various systems of religion invested with degrees as Doctors of Divinity—all stamped with the sanction and imprimatur of the University of Toronto as equally worthy of the confidence of the people—although that which one declares to be true, another pronounces to be false. Alas Sir, what a melancholy contrast does this present to the teaching of that word which is truth itself. "If the trumpet give an uncertain sound who shall prepare himself to the battle," "God is not the author of confusion but of peace," "I beseech you brethren that ye all speak the same thing, that there be no divisions among you"—"One Lord, one faith, one baptism." Lamentable indeed is it to find your rich University throwing its weight into the scale of religious confusion and infidelity, and doing all in its power to confound truth and falsehood. Far better would it be to have no affiliated Colleges than thus practically to insinuate into the public mind the pernicious notion that the most contradictory systems of religion are all equally true, for what is this but declaring in effect that they are all equally false. I can only say may God avert the evil which such a system tends to inflict upon this country.

That the Church of England can be a party to such an unhappy system is, in my judgment, impossible; nor can she degrade herself by the acceptance of degrees in divinity which would place her on a level with every fanatical or heretical sect that may spring up—and which would give her ministers no better claim to the respect of the country than that which it proposes to establish equally in favour of the Socinian, the Unitarian, the Universalist, the Swedenborgian and the Jew.

But I have no doubt you will feel disposed to say to me, in all this declamation you are beating the air, for these degrees in divinity are the degrees merely of the affiliated Colleges, not of the University itself which has nothing whatever to do with religion—and which therefore pronounces no judgment whatever as to the truth or falsehood of the religious opinions of the various bodies by whom Colleges Degrees in Divinity are to be conferred.

My answer to this is short and simple; either the religious instruction, worship, and degrees in Divinity of the affiliated Colleges are to be regarded as those of the University of Toronto, or they are not. If they are not, then most plainly that University has no religion at all, and is as godless as any one can well imagine; and if they are, then the religious teaching of the University is as plainly one which, being contradictory and at variance with itself, tends to bring all religion into contempt—and which, admitting of the denial, one by one of the most vital doctrines of christianity, may even of christianity itself, reduce the University which adopts such a system, to a condition justly meriting the name of "Anti-Christian"—a designation which, as I learn from a published despatch of His Excellency the Governor General, has been applied to it "by English noblemen and gentlemen of high character and station."

I now come to the third reason why the Church of England should not connect herself by an affiliated College, with the University of Toronto; which is, that this affiliation scheme degrades and insults the highest of all sciences, namely Theology, by banishing it from the University of Toronto and sending it to seek for a degree in some petty affiliated College.—The 28th Sec. of 12 Vic. Cap. 82 enacts that "the said University shall have no power to confer any degree in Divinity, but shall have full power to confer all other degrees in all other Arts and Faculties whatsoever." And 17th Sec. speaks of affiliated Colleges as such as "are now or shall hereafter become incorporated, with the power of conferring degrees in Divinity." And it is obviously intended that every Sect with any considerable number of followers, shall, upon application, have its college thus incorporated with a view to its affiliation.

Now, what is the reason alleged for the adoption of this course? I learn from Earl Grey's Despatch to the Governor-General dated the 11th of March, 1851,

that it is because he understands from Lord Elgin, "that it is considered advisable to raise the value of degrees in Arts by confining the power of granting such degrees as nearly as possible to the University of Toronto." So then Sir, degrees in Arts are to be "raised in value" at the expense of those in Divinity. Religion is to be degraded and insulted in order that secular learning may be exalted by means of her dishonour. The goddess of Reason is to have a colossal statue erected to her worship in the "National" University, as you are pleased to call it, and Religion is to be banished to a niche in some miserable affiliated College there to be dignified with a degree of D. D., mayhap in the person of some Mormon Professor, or other fanatical enthusiast. Secular learning is to be everything, religion nothing. Masters of Arts are all to be Brobdignagians, and Doctors of Divinity Lilliputians. We read Sir in mythological story, of a nation of dwarfs called Pygmaei (Anglice Pygmies) who dwelt near the source of the Nile, and who having found Hercules asleep after his victory over Antæus, gallantly resolved to make war upon the great "mountain." The vigour of their onset having awakened the hero, he was so much pleased with the courage of the little gentlemen that he quietly gathered them all into the skin of the Nemean lion, and carried them off as a present to Eurystheus. Now Sir how admirably would it illustrate the relative value of the different degrees to which I have referred, could we but see some strapping Master of Arts, marching down King-street, Toronto, and carrying on his shoulder a black bag full of your Doctors of Divinity, as a present to the Governor-General, in token of gratitude to his Excellency, for his endeavours "to raise the value of degrees in Arts" at their expense.

Sir, the reductio ad absurdum but poorly expresses the feeling of general contempt with which your proposed degrees of "affiliated" Divinity will, I am persuaded, be received, as well in this Province as in the Mother Country. And equally feeble is it to convey a sense of that just reprobation, with which every one who values religious truth, be his communion what it may, should regard this attempt to degrade religion at the feet of secular learning. And with all my heart I pray that no consideration may ever induce our Church to follow your unfortunate example by giving it the sanction of her support and countenance.

Not having yet exhausted my reasons against your affiliation scheme, I shall be obliged to trespass on your patience with another letter, when my avocations permit.

I have the honor to be, Hon. Sir, Your obedient humble servant,

ARTHUR PALMER.

CLERICAL AGITATORS.

To the Editor of the Church.

SIR,—Will you allow me through your columns to address a few words to the Globe. Perhaps he can inform me and the country wherein consists the Christian spirit of these worthy reverends who attended the Anti-Clergy Reserve Meeting the other evening? One thing is certain—it is not in the heart, neither is it in the soul. If it were in the former, they would not be present at, nor join in the proceedings of political agitators, especially where no spiritual advantages can be derived either to themselves, their churches, or the members thereof, and more especially where the interests of another church are concerned, and likely to be damaged. If it were in the latter, they would soar to higher things; they would not let their carnal, covetous, selfish and jealous propensities predominate, or induce them to fill the minds of their flocks with dissension.—If the learned agitators will bear with me, I may, perhaps, put ideas into their heads, and stings in their souls, which they never dreamt of.

If the cause for which they profess so much concern, and in which they take so great interest, were any good, charitable, or beneficial object, in which religion would be advanced, or infidelity put down, successful and worthy would be their object and exertions; but when their assembling together was for no other visible earthly object than that of satisfying their envious and malicious dispositions, and their actions are highly censurable. Men who thus act under the name and garb of religion, deserve to be branded with infamy, and hooted from society. If they, as clergymen, stand up and tell me the amount of religious good that would or could ensue from robbing the Church of England of the Reserves, or that would compensate for the loss of the benefit at present derived from those reserves, then, and only then shall I and those who think with me be satisfied to remain in communion with them. If they can come forward, and with a clear conscience declare that their actions in thus joining in the robbery of the Church of England spring from pure motives, and that they wash their hands of all envy, covetousness, jealousy and dissention, then, and not till then will I admit their freedom from the guilt in the sight of God and man. I am doubtful, alas! too doubtful of the sincerity of the Presbyterian Clergymen of this city.—I fear they are not Christ's disciples. I go to hear them worship on Sunday; they then please me well enough, but somehow or other—perhaps they themselves can account for it—their actions and transactions out of doors do not in my sight correspond with their preaching on Sunday. Another thing strikes me, which I think no harm in mentioning here. There is one little doctor, I believe Scotch, who worships at the shrine of the memorable and worthy John Knox, but who leads a different life from that of his worthy patron. His preaching is good, pure, and unimpeachable; but lamentable to say, there is not a day that I do not hear complaints from his hearers, and other would be hearers, of his unsoundness and inconsistency. I need not go on with the list here; but if I am challenged, I will fully and satisfactorily do so. The Presbyterian Church, as conducted in Ireland, I loved; yes, I delighted in her; my affections were riveted towards her; I thought nothing on earth could ever shake me from my adherence to her and her principles—but sorry am I now to say the word, that the outrageous conduct of her ministers in this Province has actually compelled me to worship with another denomination of Christians. I know hundreds more of my Irish brethren who have come to the same conclusion. I told them I would put our opinions in the paper, by way of warning to such clergymen, and thus prevent them from further progressing in this—fifty times worse than Popish spirit; and they willingly consented that I should do so, and use their names if required. If the renowned Dr. Cook of Belfast was here, in him would some of our crooked, stiff-necked clergymen find an opponent—yes, an able and successful opponent too. It is well known that this worthy man never would be present and allow one word of disrespect to be expressed towards the Church of England. But here it is not mere disrespect; our worshipful clergymen seek to join in the robbery of that Church! Shame, Ministers of the Gospel! go

board 26 chief cabin, 19 intermediate, 280 steerage passengers: the Randolph had 217 passengers; the Sir George Seymour, 213; the Cressy, 214. A complete list of the colony would be an interesting record for the future. Some hundred years hence it would be curious to inquire what proportion of the then population of the colony consisted of the descendants of these first occupants of its territory; and to trace their varied fortunes—how some have gone back in the world, while others have risen from poverty to prominent stations.

There are only thirty Jewish families resident in Dublin. The Jews' Conversion Society estimate that within the last twenty years 16,000 Israelites have embraced the Christian faith.

The Sunday Times says that Father Ignatius has discarded shoes and stockings.

There is a cab driver in London who once held a commission in the army, and had property to the extent of £1,500,000.

Queen Victoria is just thirty-three, and has reigned fifteen years.

The third vacancy in the Scottish Bench within the last eighteen months is now made by the death of Lord Dundrennan, formerly Mr. Thomas Maitland and the successor to the robe which fell from the shoulders of the late Lord Jeffrey. Mr. Maitland was several years Solicitor-General under the Whigs, and sat in Parliament for Kircubright.

Plus IX., has named an extraordinary congregation, composed of six cardinals, for the purpose of enquiring into the moral state of convents and proposing remedies for the abuses that have crept into those establishments.

A QUAKERESS AT SCHOOL.—There were two of the girls giving to preaching; these two—both prime pairs of sister Betsy—plugged me sadly. My hair was long. Oh! what concern Eliza Morland had that I should not only have it cropped off like her own, but that influenced by her persuasion, I should ask permission to have it done. She said "it would be an acceptable sacrifice." Then my boots; there was a tassel on my boots, which caused great mental concern to both Eliza and Anne. They entreated me to cut the Babylonish ornament, and told me "I would have peace in so doing." Another thing disturbed these righteous girls, as sister Betsy once called them to repeat the Lord's prayer, as my mother had ever taught me to do. There was not one of all the forty girls, but myself, had been so habituated. Eliza and Anne remonstrated with me on this which they called a Popish practice; and because I paid no regard to their preachings, then they went and told Sister Betsy, and she forbade me to kneel. She said "it was too solemn an act for any one but an appointed minister of our society, and wholly unbecoming in one so far from righteous as I was." One of our girls used to make for herself, and wear, most enormous pockets. "Jane," said I, "is it to be thought pious, than hast such big pockets?" She laughed. "Yes," said she, "sister Betsy does think them more friendly than thy little scraps of things; but they are very convenient. Look! what I have in them now." I looked, and saw a good-sized book; it was Ivanhoe. "I can always borrow a book when I go to dine with my cousin on first day," said Jane; "and if thou wilt write out my French exercises for me, I will let thee read it." I gladly agreed; and whether it was because stolen waters are sweet, or because of the exceeding fascination of the book itself, certainly no one enjoyed a book more than I did that, and some more of the same delightful author's works, which I obtained in the same manner.

When reading it in the arbour; or in the study, I always took care to supply myself with either an Atlas or Sarah Grubb's Journal; and then if either one of the mistresses or one of the spy girls came in sight, the novel was popped under, and the Atlas or the Journal looked innocent or editing.—Quakerism, by a Member of the Society for forty years.

EARL GREY AND FREE TRADE.—It is stated that the noble Lord-Lieutenant of this country, yielding at length to the pressure and necessities of the times, has sold most of his estates re-valued, and a reduction of about 25 per cent. made upon the rental of his farms.

It is little more than twelve months ago that Earl Grey told his suffering tenants their face that he would not reduce their rents—that the depression prevailing in the agricultural interest was merely a passing cloud—that higher prices would rule again ere long—and that he could and would abide the time. The simple truth of the matter is, that the noble Free-trader could no longer let his lands upon the old or protection terms. One farm after another, which he was either unable or unwilling to work himself, were being thrown upon his tenants; and hence the salutary change which has at last taken place.—Newcastle Journal.

FRENCH NEWS FROM ENGLAND.—One of the "correspondents" of a Paris daily paper sent to London, to describe the Exhibition, gravely relates as a specimen of English manners that a great sporting nobleman recently gave a magnificent banquet to his friends, and when it was over told them that they had eaten the winner of the Derby, which he had specially killed as a mark of respect both to the horse and them.—Globe.

INDUSTRY OF LORD CAMPBELL.—Lord Campbell's industry is amazing. He manifestly loves work for its own sake. He is thoroughly a man of business; painstaking, never weary; bending all his powers to the task, and when a thing is to be done, doing it. As it is always, the spirit of the Chief Justice has inspired those about him, unconsciously perhaps to themselves, but obvious in the results. A greatly increased activity is perceptible at Westminster. Lord Campbell will not permit of postponement in deference to the convenience of two or three leaders. If counsel are not ready when good reasons for delay are shown. Then he will not reserve a judgement for consideration unless there is judgement some doubtful point to consider; but immediate judgement is pronounced more frequently than it used to be. Lastly, when the Court has taken time to consult upon the subject to which they relate, as the reader of the reports here will doubtless have noticed, which Lord Campbell must expend in the performance of his office, and of the industrious nights which must succeed his laborious days. And the results are visible in the greater activity of all the Courts, which have during the last term, the crown paper was cleared off for the first time within legal memory; and all the other papers were reduced to the smallest dimensions ever known.—Law Times.