

helpless child to the mother's apron. They must now act with her—for her—for themselves. Never had the Church in Canada a stronger evidence of devotion to its cause and desire for its welfare in any man than has been displayed by Lord Elgin in the Despatch to which we allude. Situated as he was and bound as he was, and is in common with ourselves by the fetters of French Canadian influence, he could not tell the ministers at home that they should not accede to this demand, but he told them why they ought not, and through the very channel that conveys the intelligence of our Church's contemplated ruin we are pointed out the instant means of security.

"It is an evil," says Lord Elgin, "of no small magnitude on a subject of this nature that, while the more violent and unscrupulous of the opponents of the existing settlement are enabled to create a prejudice against it by representing it to be the result of Imperial interference in a matter of Provincial concern, its friends are tempted to endeavor to influence opinion in England rather than resort to measures which may strengthen their position in the Colony."

This must not longer be—we must now act so as to strengthen that position, to maintain it against all assaults from whatever quarter they may come, and if needs be, even to carry the war into the very camp of our enemies. We have the numerical strength—the integrity—the industry—the intelligence of the country on our side—but hitherto we have not had organization sufficient even to control the votes of our own representatives or punish a defection or desertion from their post. Now, however, we believe, the laity have taken the matter into their own hands. It is determined that organization we shall have, and that of such a nature as will be not only ample to repel all assaults of our enemies, but to ensure to our children and children's children all the blessing flowing from religious instruction and the diffusion of Christian knowledge. We trust in our next publication to be able to lay the whole particulars before the public.

CHURCH UNIVERSITY TENDERS.

The tenders from contractors for the erection of the buildings, according to the drawings and specifications of Mr. Kivas Tully, Architect, were as follows:—

John Worthington, £8375; Richard Bell, £8635; John Ritchey, £8800; Metcalfe, Wilson, and Forbes, £7845; John Browne, £9328; John Harper, 8980.

The following estimates for painting and glazing only, were also opened:

John Craig, £384; John Carr, £292 10s; Chas. March, £207; Maitland O'Connor, £230. The tender of Messrs. Metcalfe, Wilson, and Forbes, was accepted for the whole building, at the above sum of £7845.

THE SEAT OF GOVERNMENT.

Our contemporary the Colonist calls on us to correct an alleged error in our brief statement of the proceedings of the meeting of Wednesday last on this subject, inasmuch as after giving the terms of Mr. Robinson's amendment we said:—"Further amendments were proposed by others; but it ended in the Address to His Excellency being abandoned, and Addresses being adopted to the Governor General, and both Houses of Parliament, in their collective capacity, thus passing by the Executive altogether."

The Colonist observes thus:

"Mr. Sherwood's address was not abandoned—but the slightest alteration whatever—Mr. Robinson having previously obtained leave to withdraw his amendment, which, it is evident, if persisted in, would have received little or no support. No addresses were adopted to the Governor General and both Houses of Parliament, in their collective capacity—but at the suggestion of Mr. Sherwood, both in his speech and afterwards, a resolution was adopted, naming a Committee to Council, and one to the House of Assembly, containing the substance of the Address to His Excellency, and to obtain signatures thereto.

"The Church will, no doubt, correct the error into which he has fallen, in the next number."

"The Church" has no error to correct. Our resolution was—"That the address to His Excellency the Governor General, upon the threatened removal of the Seat of Government to Quebec, during the present year be adopted." On this Mr. Robinson moved, "That it is the opinion of this meeting, that the contemplated removal of Government for four years, and its remaining in Quebec the Government, proclaimed two years ago, and will, if persisted in, lead to a dissolution of the Union."

After some discussion, says the report in the Colonist:—

"Mr. John Nasmith, after a few remarks, in which he showed some strength of lungs, and great physical energy, moved as an amendment to the amendment—that although the citizens of Toronto would like the Seat of Government to remain here, they are satisfied that, according to the agreement made before leaving Montreal, it is imperative upon the Government to remove to Quebec at the close of the ensuing session." This was received amidst the loudest groans and hisses, and for want of a seconder, died a natural death. It was then suggested to address his Excellency

and both Houses of the Legislature. This was well received by the meeting, and thereupon, says the Colonist—

"Alderman Robinson begged to add to his amendment the following, in order that His Excellency might learn the particulars of this meeting—

"That a statement of the proceedings of this meeting, with a copy of the resolutions, be forwarded to His Excellency the Governor General, not [Ald. R. added] in the shape of an address, but as one citizen would communicate his opinion to another.

"Mr. Sherwood.—In the event of the address being passed he would move that petitions, founded on the address, be presented to both branches of the Legislature, and that a committee be appointed to obtain signatures.

"Alderman Robinson.—If the passage of the address were to be followed up with petitions to the Legislature he would no longer oppose its passage, and would withdraw his amendment.

The complexion which the Colonist would give to the proceedings is not borne out, and he has been well taken to task by the Patriot, from which we make the following extract:—

"We beg leave to tell the Colonist, that he misrepresents and perverts the facts entirely, when he says that 'the Mayor and all others who proposed a different course from that laid down by Mr. Sherwood in his admirable speech, * * * were condemned by the meeting.' The plain truth is—and we had abundant opportunities of ascertaining it, both from our own observation and the testimony of others—that Mr. Sherwood, who had refused previously to the meeting to make the address a joint petition to the three branches of the Legislature—was compelled at last to adopt the very advice he had positively rejected. Had Mr. Robinson persisted in his motion that there should be no address, we believe it would have been carried; and he only withdrew it on condition that the 'address to His Excellency' should be altered as we have described. Then what becomes of all the Colonist's nonsense about the Mayor's conduct being 'condemned by the meeting?' and all his worse than nonsense about his 'lauding' Lafontaine, &c., which is as arrant tom-foolery as we ever read, and quite unsubstantiated by anything that fell from Mr. Bowes.

"In another place the Colonist takes The Church to task for having said truly, that—

"It ended in the Address to His Excellency being abandoned, and addresses being adopted to the Governor General, and both Houses of Parliament, in their collective capacity, thus passing by the Executive altogether."

"It is true, that the wording of Mr. Sherwood's motion was unaltered, but there is all the difference in the world between an address to His Excellency alone, and addresses to His Excellency and the other two branches of the Legislature in their legislative capacity. An address to the Governor General requires an answer; petitions to the three branches of the Legislature require none."

HERR SCHALLEHN'S CONCERT.

We had the gratification of being present on Thursday evening last at the concert given by this talented musician, assisted by gentlemen amateurs and several efficient performers, vocal and instrumental, including Messrs. Humphrey's, Strathy, Ambrose, Maul, Searle, &c. The whole performance went off with great éclat; each performer in his respective sphere doing his best to excel. We were particularly pleased with the tasteful and pleasing manner with which Mr. Humphrey delivered the well-known song "When childhood's gay dreams," which drew down a rapturous and unanimous encore. We have to remark, however, that we considered the concert of too mixed a character to be, as the programme set forth, a Sacred concert.

NOTICE.

Arrangements having now been made to open "Trinity College—Church University"—for the business of instruction, on the first of October next; information is hereby given, to all whom it may concern, that Grammar Schools in any part of Upper Canada, will be received into union with the College upon application to the Council.

Testimonials will be required to afford evidence that provision is made in the regulation of such schools for the systematic instruction of the scholars in the doctrines and duties of Christianity, as taught by the United Church of England and Ireland, and also that the Head Master and regular Assistants be members of that Church.

Pupils educated in the schools "in union" will become entitled to certain privileges, not conferred upon those from other schools, such as becoming Associates of the College in shorter time, &c., &c.

An annual prize will also be given by the Council of Trinity College to the best pupil from each school.

By order of the Board,
THOS. CHAMPION,
Secretary.

Trinity Col. C. Chamber,
20th February, 1851.

Communications.

To the Editor of the Church.

SIR,—I take the liberty of sending you the following notice, extracted from the English Ecclesiologist—a standard authority—of a Wooden Church, about to be erected at St. Francis's Harbour, Labrador.

"It is with much pleasure that we have seen a rough lithographic view of this proposed wooden Church, which will be the first Church of our communion on

the Labrador coast. Our readers will remember the Bishop of Newfoundland's account of his journey to that part of his Diocese, and the spiritual destitution of the whole region. The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel has already sent a missionary, and this is the Church intended to be built. It is designed by the skilful and intelligent clerk of the works in the new Cathedral, (Mr. Hay), and he has got hold of the right idea of a wooden fabric, not disregarding, as we have learned, a paper of our own on the subject, which was put into his hands. It appears to embrace—under one broadly-pointed roof—chancel, nave, and aisles. The chancel is marked by a small rude bell-cote; a sacristy is formed on the south side of the chancel, the roof being extended over it in a lean-to. There is a south-western porch. The boarding is vertical, and is not improved (perhaps) by horizontal tables. The windows are rightly formed: adjacent plain lights, grouped in twos and threes, in the aisles, and trefoil-headed lights in the chancel. The east window is a triplet, and there is a small circular window above it."

The subject of wooden Churches is one, Mr. Editor, of much interest and importance to Churchmen in Canada; and as I believe Mr. Hay, the architect alluded to in the above letter, has relations in Toronto, well known to yourself, may I suggest that it would be very desirable, if, through them, a copy of the drawings for this Church could be procured, for the use of the Church in the Province?

Your obedient Servant,
A CHURCHMAN.

[Mr. Hay, alluded to in the above notice, is brother-in-law to Mr. G. B. Wylie, of this city.—Ed. CH.]

To the Editor of The Church.

DEAR SIR.—Several gentlemen having kindly made known to your readers various modes of manifesting kindness to their clergymen, I am happy to have it in my power to name a very good plan, different from any as yet suggested. In mentioning it, however, I would wish not to be understood as discountenancing the methods already detailed, but as pointing out one, which to some may be more acceptable, especially to those clergymen who have much travelling duty.—The people to whom I have the happiness of ministering, have generously presented me with a noble horse, for which they paid a few days since £27 10s; I believe the sum was raised by a general subscription. Now, there cannot be a doubt, of there being many clergymen in the diocese who, like myself, would find it next to impossible to appropriate so large a sum out of our scanty incomes, but who, nevertheless, need as good a horse as can be obtained for the efficient performance of their duty, and I feel very sure that there is many a locality in which a substantial kindness might be shown in this manner to the pastor without distressing a single person. To the good people who have shown their good-will to me in this way, I feel grateful indeed, and hope that the example they have set may be followed elsewhere.

Yours truly,
ROBERT G. COX.

Wellington, March 10, 1851.

Further Extracts from our English Files.

Imperial Parliament.

Friday Evening, 28th February.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

The Marquis of LANSDOWNE said, he had to state that the attempt in which Lord J. Russell was engaged on Monday last, had failed before that night had passed. In consequence of that failure, a negotiation had been entered into with Sir J. Graham, for the purpose of ascertaining if he was prepared to undertake the formation of a Cabinet. Under those circumstances, he had undertaken it, but had communicated to her Majesty his inability to succeed in his attempt. In this important and critical state of affairs her Majesty was desirous of pausing, and informing herself of the opinion of others, before taking other steps, especially of an illustrious Duke—the Duke of Wellington—to whom she had had on another occasion to refer in moments of difficulty.

Lord STANLEY then made his statement, and said that at his first interview with her Majesty he had advised that an attempt be made to form a Ministry by a coalition between the supporters of the late Ministry and the followers of Sir Robert Peel. He believed that the cause of the abrupt resignation was not the division on the motions of Mr. D'Israeli and Mr. Locke King, but by their difficulties with respect to the question of Papal Aggression and the Budget, and the failure of Lord John Russell to reconstruct the Ministry. He had earnestly made an attempt, but having failed to obtain the co-operation of the leaders of the Peelite party, he was convinced that the opposition in the House of Commons would be too great to enable his Ministry to bear up against, and he had accordingly made a communication to her Majesty to that effect. If he had succeeded in the attempt he should have considered it his duty to repeal the income tax, and bring in measures for the relief of the agricultural districts, but would not have pursued so rash and hasty a step with reference to the Papal aggression as had been taken by the late ministry. The noble Lord sat down amidst loud cheering.

The Earl of ABERDEEN said, he had been unable to unite with Lord John Russell for the purpose of forming a Government.

After a few words from Lord Stanley their lordships adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Lord JOHN RUSSELL, at a few minutes after five, rose to make his explanations. He referred to the circumstances of his interviews with the Queen, and stated his inability to agree on certain questions, among which was the Papal aggression; Sir James Graham and the Earl of Aberdeen thought any legislation upon the subject was unnecessary. Under these circumstances no administration had been formed, and in this difficulty the Queen had this morning sent for the Duke of Wellington to take his advice as to the course to be pursued. This being the case, he should move that the House be further adjourned. He then reviewed his career upon the Papal assumption bill, the subject of free trade, the extension of the suffrage, and concluded by announcing his determined adherence to those principles.

Sir J. GRAHAM gave an account of his several interviews with the Queen, in company with Lord Aberdeen, with the view of forming a Ministry in conjunction with Lord J. Russell. He had long been in office with Lord J. Russell, and he trusted he might now be allowed once more to call him his noble friend, especially as with regard to several main questions of public policy on which they were of the same opinion. At the same time he could consent to no extension of the franchise, which, in his candid judgment, he deemed it not likely to preserve the Government and constitution of the country, nor could he be an assenting party to the ecclesiastical

titles assumption bill, even with the modifications that his noble friend had indicated.

In this opinion the Earl of ABERDEEN entirely coincided. This circumstance was therefore an insuperable objection to his junction with the noble lord, though agreement on other points was perfectly possible. (Loud laughter.) The steps taken by the Pope and Cardinal Wiseman were extremely offensive, though he did not think actual legislation necessary.

After some desultory conversation the House adjourned.

Extract from the London Correspondent of the Patriot.

London, February 28, 1851.

On Saturday, Lord John Russell, stung by the desertion of his own friends on a question of parliamentary reform, and fearing to be in a minority upon the income tax, which the opposition, led by Mr. Herries, had sentenced to condemnation, placed his resignation in her Majesty's hands. Lord Stanley was commissioned to form an administration, but upon conditions which appear to have been unacceptable to the Protectionist leader, for his lordship intimated to her Majesty his inability to form a cabinet. On Monday, Lord John Russell explained the position of affairs to the House of Commons. His lordship informed the house, that on Saturday evening, he had again been sent for by the Queen, who informed him that Lord Stanley was not then prepared to form a government. Mr. D'Israeli gave the flattest contradiction which words could convey to this statement. Lord John Russell persists in his version of the story, and there the matter rests at present, it being clear that up to Monday evening, the charge of reconstructing the Cabinet, devolved upon Lord John Russell. The ex-Premier appears to have made overtures to Sir James Graham, Lord Aberdeen, Mr. Cardwell, the Duke of Newcastle, and Mr. Sidney Herbert, and others of the Peel party—but the scheme of a coalition failed at the outset. From the first no one expected that Lord John and the Cumberland baronet would row in the same boat, and, moreover, apart from free trade, the Peelites have no feelings in common with the Whig party. Had success crowned Lord John Russell's efforts, I do not see how an union with the Peelites would have strengthened his position; the sacrifice of a section of his cabinet in order to unite with a more Conservative division would have lost him many supporters amongst the liberal party, whilst it would not have gained him a single vote from the opposition. On Tuesday morning it was known that all Lord John's attempts to form a ministry had signally failed, and that Lord Stanley had been once more summoned to the palace, and charged with this onerous, perplexing and difficult task. It would seem that the difficulties which on Saturday stood in the way of a Conservative ministry, are now removed. Lord Stanley applied in the first instance to two of the most moderate of Sir Robert Peel's followers—Mr. Gladstone and Viscount Canning—men of brilliant abilities both in a parliamentary and administrative sense,—to the former I have reason to believe, Lord Stanley offered the Colonial, and to the latter the Foreign Department.—But these statesmen, it is said, declined to take office in the new government, and as far as the determination of the right hon. gentleman, the member for Oxford University, is concerned, there is little matter for regret. In religious views, Mr. Gladstone notoriously favours the Puseyite party, and with such a colleague Lord Stanley would never have been able to deal in a vigorous manner with the Papal Aggression. The accession of Lord Canning to the new cabinet would have been satisfactory, his lordship, besides being a good speaker, is possessed of considerable official experience, having been under Foreign Secretary from 1841 to 1846. The Times pretends that Lord Stanley will fail in his mission, and that Lord Clarendon, the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, will be commissioned by her Majesty to try his hand as a cabinet-maker.

I think that in both cases the Times is in error. At all events a Clarendon ministry would be very short lived. The ex-Lord Lieutenant of Ireland has given too much encouragement to Popery to be an acceptable minister to the people of England. In anti-Papal measures it is quite certain that Lord Clarendon would not go nearly as far as Lord John Russell, and we all know what a little way in that direction the ex-Premier went. For my part, I believe that Lord Stanley will be successful in forming an administration, a list of which I shall probably be able to give you at the end of this letter.—There are plenty of capable men in the ranks of the country party, and I need only cite the names of Lords De Grey, Glengall, Ellenborough, Hardwicke, Lonsdale, and Malmesbury, the Duke of Richmond, the Marquis of Exeter, Mr. Herries, Mr. D'Israeli, Mr. Stafford, Mr. Henley, Mr. Seymour, Mr. Walpole, Mr. Stuart, and Sir Edward Sguden—I say, I need only cite these names to show that more than one good cabinet can be constructed from the ranks of the country party. The Queen is said to desire that a dissolution should be avoided if possible. For my part, I do not see how Lord Stanley, if he should succeed in forming a cabinet, can go on with an adverse majority in the House of Commons. Indeed there appears lately to be an increased feeling that a dissolution must take place at no distant period. The fall of the Russell Cabinet, threatens to occasion a mighty change, if not a political and commercial revolution, in the country. Questions of immense importance are involved in the present crisis, and it is earnestly to be hoped that a ministry may be formed which will uphold the Protestantism of the nation, and deal justly with all classes of the community.

TORONTO MARKETS.

Table with columns for market items (Fall Wheat, Spring do., Oats, Barley, Peas, Flour, etc.) and prices. Includes sub-headers for TORONTO, MARCH 19, 1851, and sub-columns for s. d. and a. q. d.

To the Members of the Western District Branch of the D. C. S. T.

DEAR BRETHREN.—I beg to notify you, that the Annual Meeting of the Western District Branch of the Diocesan Church Society, will be held (D. V.) at Sandwich, on Tuesday and Wednesday, the 8th and 9th days of April next. Wm. Ritchie, Secretary.