

you in all your temporal interests, but especially in those which belong to your eternal well being.

Your sincere Friend & Servant, (Signed,) WILLIAM RITCHIE. To Col Prince, M.P.P., Chairman of Vestry, Sandwich, July 24th, 1852.

KING'S COLLEGE, WINDSOR.

July 1, 1852.

The Academical year has been concluded with the accustomed ceremonial.

At the B. A. examination certificates (satisfacti) were granted to Maurice Swabey, Sch. C. J., and William A. Pickman, Sch. S. P. G. At the convocation held on the 23rd June, Thomas Hantford, of the University, was admitted to the degree of B. A.

The Terminal examinations were satisfactory in the respective departments. The C. G. S. Scholarship was awarded by the examiners, Rev. Dr. Twining, Henry Pryor, Esq., M. A., and John Ritchie, Esq., to John Manuel Hensley, with gratifying expressions of commendation.

The Committee of Alumni also adjudged to Mr. Hensley, a prize of books, in value £5, for proficiency in German.

The Eucenia was celebrated on the 29th June, with the usual formalities. The Annual Meeting of Governors and Alumni took place. The commemoration of founders and benefactors was observed and a Degree exercise was read. The Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Nova Scotia was presented by Rev. Dr. Twining, in full convocation, and admitted by the Reverend the President, to an ad eundem degree.

A conditional grace preparatory to further degrees was allowed by the Governors, and passed the House of Convocation in favour of Rev. Thomas G. S. Suther, B. A. of this University, Incumbent of St. George's, and Military Chaplain in Edinburgh.

The following degrees were then conferred, the Candidates being presented by the Reverend the Vice President:—

Master of Arts.—Robert Grant Haliburton, B. A. Bachelor.—J. N. Fairbanks; William Hazen; Chas. B. Bowman; Rupert W. Cochran; Maurice Swabey, Sch.; John B. Butler; Frederick Allison, Sch.; Robie Sewall Sterns, Sch.; Rev. John Ambrose; Rev. Wm. Stuart.

The Right Reverend the Visitor, took occasion, before the close of the proceedings, to address the friends of the Institution, and in choice and glowing language to declare the deep interest which he had been early led to take in the concerns of the Church and College in this Province, and to express his earnest desire to promote the real welfare of both.

His Lordship has offered a prize of £5 in books for the best English Essay.

The Hon. Mr. Justice Bliss, M. A., has proposed a prize of £5 (also in books) for Latin verses.

The subjects for these prizes, with the conditions annexed to the exercises, will shortly be published.

The Incorporated Alumni have assigned the sum of £25 to be expended in prizes of books, for proficiency in Classics, Mathematics, and Modern Languages.

Four Matriculations have been registered, of which two are from the Collegiate School. The proper time for the next Matriculation will be the first week in September.

THE GREEK CHURCH AND ITS CEREMONIES

In imitation of Christ's Presentation in the Temple, and the blessing of old Simeon when he sang his Nunc dimittis, the Greek Church hath from long Antiquity practised on the eighth day to present their children at the Church porch to receive the blessing of the Priest, who signs them on the forehead, mouth, and breast, with the sign of the cross, as a seal of the divine grace, and a disposition to receive the Holy Baptism, which they call the healing of infants; and afterwards says this prayer:—

“O our God, we beseech thee to infuse the light of thy person on this thy servant, and seal the Cross of thy only begotten Son in his heart, and in his thoughts, that he may fly the vanities of this world, and the snares of the enemy, and follow thy commands: Confess him, O Lord, in thy name, in me him in thy good time to thy holy Church, and perfect him by the stupendous mysteries, that so, living according to thy commands, he may obtain the kingdom of beatitude with thine elect, through the grace and mercy of thine only Son, to whom, with the life-giving Spirit, be Glory now and for ever, Amen.”

Afterwards the Priest taking the child into his arms before the gate of the Church elevates it, and waves it in the form of a cross, and so ends this ceremony, which is the introduction and preparation to Baptism.

Baptism (as the Greek Church defines it) is a cleansing or taking away of original sin, by three dipping or plunging into the water, the Priest saying at every dipping, In the name of the Father, Amen; and of the Son, Amen; and of the Holy Ghost, Amen.

This three dipping or plunging into the water this Church holds to be necessary to the form of baptism, as water to the matter; for proof whereof is brought the 50th Canon called Apostolical; which says, Si quis Episcopum aut Presbyterum remanuerit, non est in unum mysterium celebrat, sed tenet in unum in Baptismo quod dicitur in nomine domini, dicitur, Non enim dixit vobis Dominus, in nomine baptizate, sed Euntes docete omnes gentes, in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus sancti. In the manner they produce the 42nd chapter of the Apostolic Constitutions, wherein they have these words: For immerge vos Episcopi in unum Patrem, et Filium, et Spiritum sanctum. If any Bishop or Presbyter shall not use a three-fold dipping in this one mystery, but only dips once in Baptism, let him be condemned, &c. In farther favour thereof are quoted the Homilies of St. Chrysostom, who rhetorically discoursing of the Virtues and Efficacy of Baptism, he symbolizeth it with the life, death, and resurrection of a Christian; for the first plunging into water, as he saith, buries the old man of sin; the second regenerates and revives him to a new creature; and the third raises him to the perfection of life Eternal; according to that of St. Paul, we are buried with

Christ through Baptism that we might rise with him: so that the Greek Church, which receives the whole number of 85 Canons (which for their Antiquity are called Apostolical) as made by the Apostles themselves, or the next succeeding Apostolical men, doth believe them to carry very great force with them, and therefore the Tertium is as constantly practised as if it had been the interpretation of the Baptizate. The which Canon, being very ancient, was first ordained against certain Hereticks who denied the Holy Trinity, Baptizing only in the name of Jesus, on those words of the Apostle before quoted, we are buried with Christ by Baptism, &c. in opposition to whom these three immersions were used; for they cannot deny the Trinity, who in Baptism distinguish three persons in the Divine Nature; wherefore, though nothing is essential to Baptism, nor other precept than to be dipped or sprinkled in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; yet to make a more exact Test, to say who were Hereticks, and who were not, it was judged necessary in those days to super-add this ceremony to the more internal parts of Baptism.

Before Baptism the Priest blows three times upon the child to dispossess the devil of his seat; then he pours oil on the water in form of a cross, as a token of peace and reconciliation between God and man, and of regeneration by the Spirit, as appears by this prayer immediately following that ceremony.

O Lord the God of our Fathers, who sentest to thee in Noah's ark a dove bearing in her mouth an olive-leaf, the token of reconciliation, denoting the mystery of salvation, in thy grace by the flood, and bestowing the fruit of the olive for perfecting the mysteries of thy Saints, by which thou satisfiest those who are in the Law of the Holy Spirit, and in the Grace of perfection, do thou bless this oil with power, energy and illumination of the Holy Spirit, that it may be the chrism against all Evilness, the armour of righteousness, and the renewing of the spirit, and conversion of the body from all diabolical works.

Immediately before the Act of Baptism, the Priest takes the child from the arms of the god-father, or surety (of which the Greek Church requires but one) and making the sign of the Cross with oil on the forehead, breast and reins of the back, saith,—the servant of the Lord is anointed; when he seals the Breast, (as they call it) he saith,—for cure of soul and body; then he anoints the ears, that by hearing Faith may be received, the feet that they may walk in the ways of God, the hands that they may perform good actions; and thus the child being anointed, the Priest dippeth it three times into the water, and looking towards the East, saith,—the servant of the Lord is baptizate. And these are the principal ceremonies observed in Baptism by the Greek Church.

In Baptism one god-father stands at the font, if it be a male-child, and one god-mother if it be a female, which gossips or sponsors, and as they call them in Greek comparisons, esteem themselves to have the same duty incumbent on them in the care and education of the child, as both the natural father; and hereby so great a friendship is contracted between the two gossips, that ever after they are concerned for each other's interest; and they fancy that imaginary relation of a sacred consanguinity arising hence, that the god-father cannot marry the wife of his disensed compare, nor his son the daughter of him, nor can they mix blood for several descents after, but under the censure of incest and condemnation of the Church; all which did arise at first from the indecency of the god-father marrying the child to which he was a father in Baptism.

The Georgians, which in some manner depend on the Greek Church, baptize not their children until they be eight years of age; they formerly did not admit them to Baptism until fourteen; but by means of such preachers as the Patriarch of Antioch sends amongst them yearly, they were taught how necessary it was to baptize infants, and how agreeable it was to the practice of the ancient Church; but those being a people very tenacious of the doctrines they once received, could hardly be persuaded out of this error, till at length, being wearied with the importunate arguments of the Greeks, they consented as it were to a middle way, and so came down from 14 to 8 years of age, and cannot as yet be persuaded to a nearer compliance.

UNITED STATES.

CONVERSIONS FROM DISSENT IN THE UNITED STATES.

The Bishop of Western New York stated, at the meeting of P. G. Society, that—At the present time he had nearly fifty missionaries under him, who were diligently, and in a self-sacrificing spirit, labouring for the glory of God and the salvation of man. The whole number employed by the diocesan societies alone he set down at two hundred. In order that they may perceive from what materials the increase of their numbers was to be derived, he begged leave to state that he had kept a correct account of all the persons he had confirmed, and fully one half were converts from the errors of Rome, and from various denominations of Protestants; they had learnt that, in the apostolic days, Paul rebuked Peter, and that the latter did not preside in the apostolic council at Jerusalem—they had learnt that the Pope was not then in existence, and did not preside at the Council of Nice. From those undeniable facts they considered that the Papacy was not known until after the year 325. Hence they were Protestants by name. The increase of the Church in the country was to be calculated from the character of the floating population as it was called. It was a sad thing to have to speak of a floating population. In some of the parishes there were as many as twelve different denominations. If they took the instance of a place with a population for which two churches, or four clergymen, to say the least, were amply sufficient to supply all the necessities of the people in communicating the knowledge of religion and the

character of its principles, they must have ten clergymen, according to the prevailing system; and he looked upon it as an invasion of the rights of the laity, who had to provide for the increase. They were met in their country with the assertion that this was a happy state of things, where each man could please himself. It was hard to say where this was to terminate. They regard their Church as a beacon-light, to which this discordant body of men might look.

IRISH ROMAN CATHOLICS AND THE ROYAL PROCLAMATION.

There is something extremely melancholy in the state and prospects of Ireland—something that seems to give warning that the country must go back to deeper poverty and degradation than she has yet suffered, until Popery shall be either utterly extinguished or bound down and fettered by laws such as those which were found necessary at the beginning of the last century.

It is within the experience of even young men of this generation, that every indulgence made to Romanism has been almost instantly followed by some violent aggression; and resistance to such aggression again clamoured against as an insupportable grievance. The harassing statutes of the act of 1829 were manifold. Among them were the establishment of religious orders, and the assumption of territorial titles, never before attempted, and expressly forbidden by that Act; and to what extent even the feeble attempts to vindicate the authority of the law raised a clamour, is known to all. Processions, never before heard of for two centuries, were also forbidden by the Emancipation Act as the equivalent of the vast benefits conferred by that Act upon Romanists. And now these processions are resuscitated in the most offensive form, with the usual effect of exciting a furious clamour at any attempt to resist them. The Priests of Dr. Derry's Diocese have even gone the length of publishing the not less than reasonable Resolutions that follow:—

“I. Resolved,—That we have seen with indignant surprise, a proclamation issued by the present Government, in the name of our Most Gracious Queen, warning the Catholics of Great Britain and Ireland that their religious processions will be henceforward punished as criminal infractions of the law, and that their Bishops and Priests, as well as the members of the religious orders, will be prosecuted if they presume to appear in public in their distinctive dress; that, while we bear to Her Majesty all the allegiance which, in temporal matters, is rightly due to the Sovereign by the subject, we recognize in the Government no right to forbid to the Catholics of this empire the peaceful observance of the usages of their Church or the use in public as well as in private of their distinctive robes by its Bishops, Priests, and religious.”

“That a law, in terms directed against the free exercise of the Catholic religion, has no binding force, and, like all other penal enactments against the Church, must be disregarded.”

“That the law which would prohibit to Catholics the free exercise of their religious ceremonies has been felt to be so unjust that no administration before the present has outraged public opinion and sound policy by attempting to enforce it.”

In other words, the Pope's law must be paramount to the law of the land—a doctrine which would be held to be treasonable in every civilized country on the face of the earth. The Priests, however, will not venture upon a second 1798, and now their hostility takes the shade of an electioneering contest, every Protestant opposed to a Papist, no matter his claims, is to be opposed on the hustings. This is a very sad indication as respects the prospects of Ireland, for it is plain acknowledgment that they who make the threat care nothing for the interests of the country, and those people submitted too much to their control. Is there a Protestant gentleman in Ireland who does not and must not desire the prosperity of his country and countrymen? It may be that there are many, may a majority who are not favourable to Romanist aggression; but let even these be once persuaded that such aggression would not render less safe their lives, their property, and the Church which they belong, and it cannot be doubted that they would look with complacency upon the general welfare, Protestantism, or, as it has been called, Orangeism in Ireland, is purely defensive. It has resisted the advances of Popery much more upon prudential than controversial grounds. It has resisted them, because they render life, property, and their Church, less safe than before, and that their resistance is not unreasonably proved by the fact that the Irish Priests generally, like Dr. Derry's Priests, renounce the temporal allegiance as often as they choose to bring it into collision with the allegiance which they suppose to be due to the Pope. For remark in the case before us. It is not the interruption of an old usage that provokes their disloyalty, but the inhibition of a new practice. This is made the pretext for a war against the Irish gentry, who naturally are, and since 1782 have proved themselves, the anxious if not always the judicious friends of all classes of their countrymen. This is a sufficient reason for alliance with the Manchester men, who for 80 years have been the increasing and insupportable enemies of every Irish interest, and with the Political Economists, who have avowed officially their purpose of extirpating the Celtic Roman Catholic race, and have been too successful in the execution of their purpose. Is there any hope for a country where the counsels of such advisers as the Priests prevail?—Standard.

Imperial Parliament.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Mr. GLADSTONE—I complain very much of that statement. The right hon. baronet knows that the moment he told me it was his wish to enter upon the debate, as far as he was concerned, I made not the slightest objection.

Sir J. PAKINGTON—The right hon. gentleman had not the power to object. What he said was, that as I was going to object to the bill, he should postpone the debate till another fortnight. The result of this would

have been that on the part of the Government I should have objected to the bill without having an opportunity to have stated what those objections were. Of course I could not consent to that arrangement. I therefore did not at once enter into my objections to the bill, but I told the right hon. gentleman that I would conclude with a motion in order to set him free to reply to anything which I might say, and which would thus enable him to speak again upon the question. Now I think that in taking this course I took the most courteous course which could be adopted under the circumstances. Although three weeks had elapsed from the time when the right hon. gentleman had first brought on his motion, he could not, according to the forms of the house, have spoken again upon the subject, and therefore, in order to afford him an opportunity of doing so, I concluded with a motion that the house should pass to the other orders of the day. The right hon. gentleman, however, did not avail himself of the opportunity to reply to the speech which I then made, but said a few sentences showing the existence of a feeling that I did not at all intend to excite. Five weeks have elapsed since then, and now comes the third speech of the right hon. gentleman, who has today delivered an elaborate reply to the speech which I made five weeks ago. The course which would properly meet that taken by the right hon. gentleman would be for me to reply to the speech of to-day at the meeting of the next Parliament, supposing that both of us have the honour of being members of it—(a laugh)—but I shall not take that course; I shall reply at once, and I think I shall be enabled to do so in a very few sentences. The right hon. gentleman has first of all stated his reasons for not proceeding with the second reading of the bill, and one of them was an extreme desire on his part that her Majesty's Government should not stultify themselves by opposing this bill. To which member of the Ministry that remark applied I know not; but I do not think the right hon. gentleman need feel very sensitive on the subject, because, if formerly certain members of the Ministry gave their support to certain clauses of the Australian Government Bill, I cannot hold that those members of the Government are thereby precluded from exercising a sound discretion in regard to a bill which I conceive to be open to those grave and serious objections which, upon a former day, it was my duty to point out. The right hon. gentleman then proceeded to refer to the interest felt in the colonies upon the subject of the bill; and here there is no difference between us, for I fully admit the great interest which prevails on the point, and have, in fact, received further proofs of it since the right hon. gentleman brought it under the notice of the house. Then the right hon. gentleman commented, in a manner upon which I must make some remark, upon the position I held, namely, that we should postpone legislation pending the references between the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishops of Australia. Now I am not going to recede from anything I then said upon that subject. I said then, that to proceed in this house upon such a subject pending the references between such parties, would have been neither more nor less than indecorous and improper. It would have been most hasty and precipitate. On that ground alone I could never have been a party to offering a mark of such great disrespect to the Archbishop of Canterbury and to the Bishop of Sydney; and, when the right hon. gentleman tells me, upon the strength of this correspondence, that there is a marked discrepancy between the first part of the Bishop of Sydney's letter and the part which I cited, I deny the discrepancy and repudiate his charge of disingenuousness. It is perfectly true that in the earlier part of that letter the Bishop expressed a hope that the minutes of the conference of the Bishops sent back to this country would have been held as a sufficient indication of their wishes on the subject of legislation. Those minutes certainly did show the wish of those bishops for a certain mode of action in the colonies, but there was not the groundwork for legislation in this country; besides which, I pointed out when I last addressed the house on the subject, that the proceedings of that very assembly of the Bishops had excited great alarm and uneasiness both among clergy and laity in the colonies. It would have been, therefore, a great mistake to take that expression of opinion on the part of the Bishops alone as a sufficient basis for legislation. I think, on the contrary, we were bound, from the Bishop of Sydney's letter, and from what is now taking place in Tasmania, not to legislate, and I believe we shall reap the full benefit of the delay. But then, again, the right hon. gentleman tells me that from private sources—[Mr. Gladstone—And from public sources too]—he knew what the Bishops wished. I should like to know whether I could have ventured—recollecting that it was a matter of such importance and interest, and one in which the Archbishop of Canterbury was himself seeking an opinion from the Australian Bishops—whether I could have ventured to act upon the private sources of information possessed by the right hon. gentleman. The house will see that this was clearly out of the question. The right honourable gentleman proceeded to notice the three objections which he said I made to his bill, and he said that they were very exaggerated objections. He stated that the bill was not open to objection on account of what he called the preposterous tendencies and the monstrous enactments which he declared I had in view. I am sorry to say that after listening to the speech of the right honourable gentleman, and after the intervening time I have had for reflection, I cannot recede from anything which I said with regard to the grave objections I first entertained to this bill, and I have altered no opinion as to the three objections I then stated. One of those objections was the tendency of the bill to break up the Church of England in the colonies into what I called separate fragments, and he complained that I had proved that objection by quoting certain letters and addresses of the Bishop and other parties in Australia. Now, the right honourable gentleman is quite mistaken in that statement, and must have quite forgotten the mode in which I argued. I did, it is true, advert to those addresses, but for this reason—I wished to show that the right honourable gentleman, in breaking the Church of England up into fragments, in omitting the oath of supremacy, and, as I think, impugning the authority of the Crown, was not consulting the wishes and views of those parties in Australia; and when the right