

a lengthy reference to former School bills—and after declaring that all former School bills were repealed by the new act; and also after reading and expounding several sections of the New School Act the Court gave its judgment, supporting the decision arrived at by the Trustees. The concluding part of the judgment will be sufficient for us to copy. It is as follows:—"The present application being restricted to School Sec. No. 9. in St. James' Ward, raises the question whether the applicants are entitled as of right to have such a school established within the limits of that section, and involves the more general question whether the Board of Trustees can, on separate applications by twelve or more heads of families,—(whether Roman Catholic, Protestant or Coloured people)—be compelled to authorize the establishment of separate schools in such common school sections or divisions into which the City may be divided—in which event three schools might be required in each of such sections or divisions. We are disposed to think the limits of separate schools are in the discretion of the Board of Trustees, and that they are not restricted by this request of the applicants to a particular section or sections assigned as limits for common schools generally, which last mentioned limits the Board is also empowered to alter *ad libitum*;—in short, that the Board, and not the applicants, is to prescribe the limits of separate schools;—and that applications should therefore be for the establishment of one or more such schools in general terms, leaving it to the Board of Trustees to define the limits, a duty which no doubt ought to be performed with a due regard to the number of children for whom such schools are required and are to be provided, and the residence of the families to which they belong.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

LETTERS received to Wednesday Feb. 19th, 1851:—Rev. J. Rothwell, rem.; W. J. Imlach, Esq.; Rev. C. L. Ingles, rem.; Rev. H. Patton, rem. (the communications, &c., will be printed in pamphlet form—5s. appropriated for that purpose—Rev. F. Mack; Rev. C. L. Ingles.

THE CHURCH.

TORONTO, THURSDAY, FEB. 20, 1851.

THE BALL ROOM.

In tracing the progress of a young fresh community, such as our Colony presents, the patriot and the philanthropist will find much to gladden their hearts. To such it must be cheering to behold the trackless forest gradually giving way to the bustling village, and the well-cultivated farm. And to the refined mind it cannot fail to be gratifying to note evidences of a growth of intellectual refinement in our Cities, in the superior style of their architectural adornments, and the increasing attention which is paid to the claims of science, art, and the *belles lettres*. So far as Toronto, and her sisters, the leading cities of Canada are concerned, there are to be found in their borders, even now, at this early period of our colonial history, all the comforts, and to a great extent, the luxuries, held forth by a majority of the county towns of the mother country. Exceptions of course there are, but exceptions only go to prove the rule.

In all this, we repeat, there is much cause for gratification and legitimate pride. Cold-hearted and sordid must be the Canadian, whose pulse does not throb quicker when he contemplates the advancement of his chosen quarter of the British Empire, which is destined to be the natal soil of his children, and children's children. It is undeniable, however, on the other hand, that the picture presents a gloomy as well as a bright aspect—evil, unhappily, keeps a disastrous pace with good. What we gain in refinement is, too often, counterbalanced and neutralized by moral degeneracy. All this is sad, but it is not uncommon. Perfection cannot be looked for, on this sin-blinded earth. With much knowledge there is much sorrow—and the fine linen of Dives too often induces that course of living the end of which is destruction, and misery eternal!

But it is time for us to inform our readers of the texts which have given occasion to these remarks. They are various,—but we can only take up one of them on the present occasion.

During the elapsed portion of the present winter our newspapers have recorded the giving of many Balls, both in town and in country. These conventions, have been more numerous attended, and of more frequent occurrence, than has been the case in any preceding year;—and our contemporaries have been lavish of their commendations of the style in which they have been got up—and of the manner in which they have been conducted.—The question comes to be, have our contemporaries been justified in assuming this laudatory tone? Mighty is the power of the press either for weal or for woe,—has the bane or the blessing predominated on the present occasion?

Into the abstract question, as to how far a consistent Churchman, who is living in a daily state of preparation for death and judgment, can indulge in dancing, as an occasional, and well-regulated relaxation, it is not our intention, at present, to enter. Whilst we freely concede that the Puritan party, carried their opposition to the practice to an extent verging upon caricature:—an extent which was equally repugnant to the dictates of Revelation and of common sense,—we equally hold that dancing is the meanest, and most contemptible source of recreation, which a cultivated or a vigorous mind would apply to as a relief from graver pursuits. In the case of children, or very young people, it may, under proper restrictions and regulations, be made, not only a harmless, but a

healthful exercise. Deeply, however, do we pity the adult, (for whom the plea of mental imbecility cannot be urged,) whose frivolous and emasculated taste would lead him to prefer the ball-room to the library,—or abandon the music of Mozart Handel, or Bishop for the insipid stupidities of the quadrille, or the more than questionable freedoms of the Polka!

In our humble opinion, there cannot be the shadow of a doubt, that dancing parties, as now generally conducted among us, are utterly devoid of sound, or sober defence. They involve a waste of time, and an expenditure of physical strength and mental vigour, inimical alike to body and soul. It is no uncommon thing for these parties to be protracted, even in winter, to sun-dawn. And frequently does the mechanic proceeding to his honest, daily toil, meet with the bleared, worn-out revellers returning to seek unnatural and unrefreshing repose!

Surely no argument is necessary to convince a reflecting mind, that such a state of things is morally pestilential in the highest degree. The *pleasure* (so called) becomes an *occupation*—a feverish, exhausting, laborious occupation. To use the words of our excellent contemporary the "True Catholic,"—"the evidence of this may be found in the appearance of many a young lady at the close of a *gay season*, and may be strengthened by following her to the sick-room and the grave!"

There is something in all this which we cannot characterize in milder terms than as being positively idiotical! Admitting for the sake of argument, that it were lawful to fritter away eight consecutive hours, amidst the silly commonplaces, and the unwholesome atmosphere of the ball-room, why not commence the pastime at an earlier period of the evening? If Mammon be so exacting as to require from his hard-tasked devotees a given amount of worship, wherefore not darken the windows of the Demon's Temple, and beginning at three o'clock close the orgies at eleven? In such an event, though the mind would still be dissipated as greatly as it is at present, the poor body would be more mercifully dealt with—and our bills of health, and tables of mortality be less burdened with records of constitutions prematurely debilitated, and the triumphs of pale-visaged consumption!

We shall resume consideration of this subject in our next.

TORONTO DISPENSARY AND LYING-IN-HOSPITAL.

"A public charity, designated as above, has been, for some short time, in existence in this City. It was sustained by the public generally—and not by any individual denomination. It had assumed an important character; and, in the present state of the new University projected by Bishop Strachan, its transfer from the public to the Episcopalians, became an object of some moment. Accordingly, arrangements were made to effect this object, and it was done in a most scandalous and nefarious manner.

"In the first place, the medical students not connected with the new medical school under the Episcopal Bishop's patronage—were so treated, that self-respect required their withdrawal from the hospital. In the next place, an annual meeting was held, when the attendance of a large majority of Episcopalians was secured, when seeing their strength, the following astounding resolution was presented and adopted: Moved by the Rev. J. H. Grasset and seconded by Dr. Beaven,

"That in consequence of its having been found impracticable to conduct the business of this institution while members of different denominations are associated on the Committee of Management, the Directors of the charity shall in future be selected from the members of the Church of England."

"Thus, for the present, a public institution is coolly transferred from the public to the Episcopal body, without as much as, "by your leave!" This is of a piece with the rectories, University, and clergy reserves spoils. But the end is not yet. As the plotters have been made to disgorge in other instances; so will they in this, or we are mistaken. If no other plan is adopted to set the matter right, a public meeting should be called by the Mayor, and an opportunity offered to the public to ease Bishop Strachan of this additional piece of public property."

We copy the foregoing paragraphs from the *Christian Guardian*, and we observe that the *Globe* of last week has taken the cue from this notable *Christian!* echoing its sentiments with the usual impudence and disregard of fact, which now so eminently characterize the *Organ*.

The venom which both papers so liberally expend upon the Church, and our venerable Diocesan, is so impotent in effect, that we can afford to pass it over without the aid of our *Esculapian* friends. But in charity to the public, we shall point out the misstatements contained in both publications, which are so discreditable to their authors.

The truth is this, that the TORONTO GENERAL DISPENSARY and LYING-IN-HOSPITAL is not, and never was, a Public Institution. It was commenced, not a "short time" since,—but nearly seven years ago, by one gentleman, through whose energy and charitable exertions, aided by the christian benevolence of *private individuals*, it has steadily progressed to its present importance.—Among its supporters have been members of several denominations, from the general body of whom there was annually chosen a board of direction, and all things went on smoothly and well, until the recent meeting of subscribers, when the torch of discord was lighted by two persons, whose exertions in the cause of discontent have latterly proved so successful in another field.

There was no desire either expressed or implied to connect this institution with the Church University, although such a proceeding *might have been* reasonably anticipated, from the fact of the largest number of subscribers being members of the Church. Nor does it follow, that because the medical staff of the institution are nearly all members of the Church University, any connexion existed between them. It would be quite as absurd to suppose that because the medical staff of the Toronto General Hospital is almost entirely composed of members of the University of Toronto, therefore these institutions are necessarily connected.—Dr. Burns knew well at the time that he fulminated his groundless charges against the medical men, who so generously give their valuable time to the care of the sick relieved at this institution, that his Lordship the Bishop of Toronto had no more influence over the affairs of the institution than any other subscriber—nay, not so much even as Dr. Burns himself, he being on the Board of Directors. We certainly wonder that the learned and Reverend Doctor, who is the avowed patron of another similar private institution in the city, should have the indelicacy to venture upon such a course with respect to this one, unless his conduct arose from the desire to bring it also within the meshes of his individual power, actuated by a spirit of exaction as complete, though more limited in its sphere, as that now evinced by his prototype of Rome.

The result with which the public are now familiar was brought about by the factious proceedings instituted by Dr. Burns, which the report of the meeting in question so clearly demonstrates. If premeditation existed in the mind of any one, with regard to the meeting, it was in his own, as to the course he adopted, for we are assured by parties in whom we place the utmost reliance, that every subscriber of one pound was served with a notice of the meeting, that being the amount on which they are entitled to vote under the by-laws of the institution—and it was as competent for that meeting to have constructed a Free Kirk as an Episcopalian Board of Directors, and then we probably should have heard nothing but praise from Roberto Primo.

As to the charge of discourtesy towards the pupils attending the Dispensary, who were not Students of the Church University, we speak advisedly when we say that it is a groundless fabrication.

THE HOSPITAL TRUST.

The *Daily Patriot* of yesterday contains a communication by Dr. O'Brien, to the Mayor and Council of our City, in reference to the removal of that gentleman from the Trusteeship of the Toronto Hospital. Without entering into details, we have to express our conviction that Dr. O'Brien's statement, confirmed as it is by the appended testimonials from the Rev. H. J. Grasset, Dr. Widmer, and Clarke Gamble, Esq., furnishes a complete refutation of the charge of dereliction of duty so wantonly made by Mr. Alderman Beard.

Dr. O'Brien has good reason to complain of the treatment which he has received on this occasion, and if the Council reconsidered their resolution, and reversed the objectionable decision, they would perform but an act of common justice.

MISDIRECTED ZEAL.

We have before expressed our belief, that one leading object of Lord John Russell in his contemptible letter upon the Wiseman affair, was to stir up a feeling against the Anglican Church. In this, to a certain extent, that exquisitely small-minded statesman has proved successful. There were not wanting hosts of Jesuitical dissenters, and some nominal churchmen, ready and willing to echo the Premier's crafty cry, that the Church was untrue to herself, and was radically tainted with the insidious plague-spot of Romanism.

It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that many of our Clergymen who honestly endeavour to discharge their ordination vows by conforming as strictly as possible to the rubrics and requirements of the Book of Common Prayer, should have exposed themselves to the obloquy of the excitable and unreasoning mass. For several weeks bygone, our British exchanges have teemed with reports of demonstrations of this nature, several of them far from creditable to the leading actors, and clearly evincing that canonical conformity on the part of an ecclesiastic, is regarded by the latitudinarians as a conclusive evidence of a bias to Popery.

In reference to this matter, we subjoin extracts from two letters which have recently appeared, one in the *Brighton Gazette*, and the other in the *Nottingham Journal*, which we deem worthy of a calm perusal.

The first is written by the Rev. William Gresley, who remarks:—

"Being a visitor at Brighton, I have for several weeks past assisted in the administration of the Holy Communion at St. Paul's, and beg, from my personal knowledge, to be allowed through the medium of your paper to correct several misstatements made by Mr. Bevan, the chairman of the meeting held at the Town Hall on the 9th of this month.

"It is altogether untrue, that one of Mr. A. Wagner's colleagues "goes with head touching the ground," as Mr. Bevan has stated. If any thing of the sort

were done I could not have failed to observe it. There are, indeed, two or three of the congregation who are accustomed to bow rather lower than usual when they receive the Sacrament; but I confess I have noticed their devotion with respect rather than contempt.—For a stranger to the church like Mr. Bevan to take upon himself to hold up any persons to public ridicule because they bow their head somewhat lower than he thinks they should is certainly a most unwarrantable act of interference.

"It is also perfectly untrue to say that the incumbent of St. Paul's is ten minutes, or even five, in administering the Sacrament to himself, or that he raises the cup or holds up his hands in any improper manner. He simply takes the cup from the table, and having partaken of it, puts it on again. The whole administration is reverent and proper, and strictly according to the usages allowed in the Prayer Book, which in some places have been, I believe, designedly left open by the Reformers to the discretion of the minister.

If an appeal be made to the Bishop, I think it should be of a very different sort from that intended by the persons who attended the meeting. It might run something in this way:

"Whereas in many churches gross acts of irreverence are continually performed, many persons on entering the church looking for a moment carelessly into their hats instead of kneeling to pray, many never kneeling at all through the whole service, but sitting bolt upright, others taking no part in the responses or the singing, but staring about them to the great annoyance of devout worshippers, many persons seldom, if ever, attending at the Holy Communion, all which irreverent acts have a manifest tendency to infidelity, the young and the humbler classes being naturally led to think that their elders and superiors cannot really believe in the sacredness of a service which they treat with so much indifference,—we therefore request your lordship's prompt interference to correct these improprieties, and hope that your Lordship will require all your clergy to conform strictly to the orders of the church, and to set an example of becoming reverence."

"Something of this sort would, I am sure, be more suitable than to get together a meeting of noisy people and rail against those clergymen who are most earnest in the performance of their duty. I am no advocate for any usage or ceremony which is opposed to the order of our church; but to interfere with those ministers who honestly endeavour to conform to their instructions appears to me, the most unjust and unreasonable act that can well be imagined.

The correspondent of our Nottingham contemporary, after animadverting with becoming indignation upon the callous apathy displayed by the Imperial Government in reference to the claims of the Church in India and the American Colonies, proceeds to observe:—

"But while the British Government has grievously neglected to spread the Protestant faith at home and in the colonies, it has not been slow recently to remove every restriction and impediment to the free spread of the Romish faith, even to the full recognition of the Archbishops and Bishops appointed by the Pope, allowing them in one or two instances to take precedence of those appointed by the Crown. It may be that a desire to extend the principles of free trade to foreign states caused Government to propitiate the Romanists by an affected sympathy for their religious views.—How could they better induce France, Austria, Spain, Portugal, part of Germany, and Switzerland, with the Brazils, &c., to reciprocate their commercial policy? But this is a suggestion for the consideration of politicians.

Perhaps State missions were not attempted from the impossibility of defining the "Protestant faith," amid the multitude of creeds that existed in the Legislature. "The Catholic faith," which was re-established in its purity when the Reformers rejected the Papal supremacy and expunged the Romish errors and corruptions from the Liturgy, seems more odious to Government as it becomes better understood; for it had been gradually lost sight of by the Protestant church from the time of Charles the First,—though I admit it was preserved on paper and in the minds of a few Divines and Lay Churchmen.

There is now, however, a mysterious heresy afloat, called Puseyism or Tractarianism, against which a strong popular demonstration has been made at all the anti-Papal meetings. At Mansfield it was as strong as anywhere, though I believe the demonstrators were as much in the dark as myself as to what it signified.

If it means Romanism, the sooner the propagators of such heresy are pointed out to the notice of their Bishops, and expelled the Church, the better both for Church and people. "But I suspect, may I know, the term is often used because it is a popular stigma, and slanderously applied against many a Clergyman, who, adhering to his ordination vows, endeavours to carry out the principles of the Reformation, and regulations of the Reformers, as embodied in our Book of Common Prayer."

Should a clergyman, for instance, urge his congregation to say their prayers themselves instead of leaving them to be said by a clerk, and sing praises instead of listening to an interlude from a gallery; should he endeavour to revive the offertory and use the prayer for the Church militant, in which God is besought to accept the prayers and praises, the alms and oblations, that have been offered up, he is a "Puseyite." Should he wish to see the Church equal, or superior to, a private residence, and self-idolatry diminish in favour of greater regard for the state of the temple of worship; should he desire the seats to be open and uniform, and the poor to be treated with greater consideration in the house of God than they are in the world, he is a "Tractarian." To restore daily prayers and services appointed by the Church in commemoration of the Apostles, or to enjoin fasting (which our Saviour sanctioned), would be downright Popery. Why are such mistakes made? and why is the "Catholic faith" odious to a popular Government in proportion to its revival and reception in the Church?

The sectarian cry of Romanism is no new thing. Selden, alluding to the state of matters in his day remarks:—"We charge the prelatial clergy with Popery to make them odious, though we know they are guilty of no such thing; just as heretofore they called images Memmets, and the adoration of images Memmetry; that is, Mahomet and Mahometry—odious names—when all the world knows the Turks are forbidden images by their religion."

We have much pleasure in inserting the proceedings of a meeting of the Students of the Diocesan College, Cobourg, which will be found in another