

for him, feeling that the task would fill him with horror which he could not endure.

It has been beautifully said by Mr. D'Israeli that philosophy becomes poetry, and science imagination, in the enthusiasm of genius.

The scientific genius will give up everything to bring to light some principle which he believes established in nature, and to look into her hidden mysteries.

The most severe studies become delightful to those who possess the great faculty of forgetting themselves, who dwell only on the great truths they have traced, and the secrets yet to be disclosed in some loved science.

We know of men pursuing their literary and scientific labours in a manner that nothing but genius could dictate, and nothing but enthusiasm accomplish; giving up all the luxuries, enjoyments, and comforts of life, to devote every energy of the mind to some darling pursuit, nay, wearing out the very springs of life in watching, in labour, and thinking.

"We have need of it," says Mr. Abernethy, in speaking of enthusiasm as giving support in the labours incident to the medical profession, "we have need of it, to induce us to spend our nights in study, and our days in the disgusting health-destroying observation of human diseases, which alone can enable us to understand, alleviate, or remove them."

There are innumerable most affecting cases on record, which have been given to the world by those who have sacrificed their prospects, and expended their means, and their health, and some their life itself to produce them.

The statue of Charles II. placed in the centre of the Royal Exchange, cost the young artist his life. In vain did his friends and physicians implore that he would desist, but his feelings were too much engaged in the work: he declared that he would willingly give up his life to die at the foot of his statue.

He did live to see it raised, but his unwearied exertions had brought on consumption: he returned to his home to die.

Milton was told by his physician, that if he persevered in the work in which he was engaged, the loss of sight was inevitable. Milton declared that he preferred his duty to his eyes, and would not desist.

The remains of Henry Kirke White furnish a very touching example of the fatal enthusiasm of genius. Moret, though certain to have risen to the highest eminence in his profession, gave up all to devote himself exclusively to the completion of his historical dictionary, and retired from all the flattering popularity which, as a preacher, he enjoyed, to spend himself on his work.

So great was his exertion in preparing a second improved edition, that his health gave way; the work came from the printer's hands—but Moret was dead!

These remarks, of course, have no individual reference. We know not, even by name, any of the parties whose performances have lately been so liberally placed on the walls of our city, and earnestly do we trust that none of them have gone the ghastly length which we have delineated above.

Still the picture is far, very far from being an ideal one. In the mother country we have known many deplorable instances of young men, whose prospects were quite as fair as those of any of the amateurs of Toronto or Hamilton can possibly be—who, bewitched by the sorceries of the "sack and buckin," were precipitated to the lowest and most degraded step of the ladder of life.

Never can we forget the heart-sickening sensation which we once experienced at recognizing in a tattered, paint-bedizened mountebank, whose half-intoxicated contortions called forth the derisive mirth of the "rascal rabble" at a Fair—one, who had been our fellow-student in our Alma Mater, and whose abilities were far from being of a mean or common place order.

His ruin, poor wretch!—and he had a widowed and penny-stricken mother to lament his fall—was to be attributed solely to amateur theatricals!

THE FRUITS OF RADICAL MIS-REASON. A late number of the Globe affords us a most captivating picture of the political millennium which, in the sanguine expectations of its present Administration, to enjoy under the auspices of its present Administration, we presume, as to the obviousness of the fact—assures us, very distinctly and emphatically, that "Canada is now governed by men!" and then proceeds immediately, to tell us what happy consequences must ensue from the government of the Province by his superior race of beings.

"Every rivalry of race must soon cease, and all unite for the good of the Province."—"This is the fair vision of his bright day-dream, and no doubt he thinks it extremely fascinating, and has enjoyed it very much indeed. But the Globe withal is selfish, and builds his palaces of enchantment and parcels out his political Elysium for none but his friends."

"The Tories"—he mysteriously threatens—"will do well to resign themselves to their fate."—"They, it appears, are to be crushed, trampled, extinguished; and the process of pacification is to be carried on, blandly and smilingly no doubt, with merciless ejections from office, and abusive speeches in Parliament, and remunerating treason with the public money, and the thousand other expedients of the same kind which always lie at the command of a strong and violent faction."

The "Globe's" "peace-making" scheme reminds us of his Lilliputian Majesty's humane and generous plan of destroying "the Bigendian exiles," enslaving his neighbours, and then quietly reigning "sole monarch of the world."

The afflictions which this Province is now suffering from its present oppressive party-government, are truly great and severe.—But a party-government so arbitrary and vindictive must, in the end, work its own downfall. The indignation and disgust which their proceedings have inspired, are unquestionably on the increase; and power which has been exercised—as theirs has been—with an utter contempt of generosity or justice, when it has been once lost, is very hard to be regained.

Since writing the above we have perused an article in the Globe of yesterday, entitled "Rebellion in Montreal." Having on Tuesday learned from our contemporary the Colonist, that Mr. W. L. McKenzie had arrived in that city, we, by an association of ideas not unnatural, connected that circumstance with the Globe's startling heading. Our apprehensions on this score, however, were speedily dispelled, no more serious outbreak having occurred in Montreal than the entertainment which was given to Mr. Vansittart!

We can assure our readers that we are speaking gravely and not in jest. A full column of the Toronto Ministerial organ, is occupied with a laboured attempt to demonstrate, that the expression of sympathy which Mr. Vansittart's shabby and most vindictive persecution has elicited, is "treason against the constitution."

Comment on such insane and tyrannical insolence (we can use no milder term) is altogether unnecessary. We may simply remark, that the most servile organ of the most despotic, and irresponsible Government which ever existed—Austria itself not excepted—would never have spoken, in a more arbitrary, or insulting tone, of parties, who dared to question the policy of the reigning Sattap.

Two Communications relative to this valuable Institution have been sent us for publication. The friendly spirit and manifest ability of Y. Z. have afforded us most satisfaction; but, as we are sure that his only motive is to consult the interests of our beloved Church, we have no doubt that he will cordially approve of our withholding his communication, when we tell him that, in our opinion, any discussion of the subject at the present time would be premature.

Pending the decision of the University question, we think that it would be inexpedient to say anything about the future movements of the Bishop's College at Cobourg. If the Church should be eventually thrust out of the University, the proper position of the Bishop's College would doubtless be in the Cathedral city, under the Bishop's immediate supervision.

In the general question of removal all the details of internal management are, of course, involved, and if it be not judicious, as we believe, to enter upon the one, it cannot be desirable to anticipate or propose anything, just now, in regard to the other. Meanwhile,—that is, until the destiny of King's College has been fully determined,—we need not assure our correspondents that the welfare of the Theological Institution rests in the very best hands, and that the Bishop of Toronto will watch over the concerns of his own College in a manner worthy of his long and deep experience, and in keeping with the affectionate care which he has evinced in his active and faithful guardianship of it from the beginning.

What is needful to be done, when the proper period for action has arrived, with every necessary degree of promptitude and vigour.

REBELLION IN LOWER CANADA. Under our Colonial head, our readers will find a brief report of the late Annual General Meeting of this Society. The Province is deeply interested in its success, and we hope that the amount of contributions necessary to place the Society in a vigorous and unembarrassed condition will speedily be raised. We look forward with much satisfaction to the receipt of reports, which the able Secretary has been authorized to draw up.

NEW VERSION OF ISAIAH. We have received the prospectus of a "literal translation, with a critical, philological, and historical commentary, on the book of Isaiah," by our fellow citizen Mr. Hirschfelder. The author, we understand, has for five years been occupied in preparing this work; and when we take into account the qualifications which the learned gentleman possesses for such an undertaking, we are warranted in anticipating, that the forthcoming volume will be of acceptable and important addition to the library of the clergyman, the theological student, and the man of letters. It is to be published under the auspices of Mr. Rowell, and will be comprised in twelve monthly numbers, and the subscription for the entire work is \$2. currency. Cordially do we wish Mr. Hirschfelder every success.

At a meeting on this subject held yesterday at St. Catharines, numbering 400 to 500, the supporters of the Ministry were defeated by an overwhelming majority.

REPORT OF THE EASTERN BRANCH OF THE CHURCH SOCIETY. The report (with Emendation) is in type;—but on second thoughts we have deemed it expedient to postpone its publication till our next.

RECEIVED FROM "SELDEN," £1 5s. for the distressed Medical Gentleman in Yorkville, also, 15s. Anonymous.

COMMUNICATIONS. [We deem it necessary to follow the example of the London Church Society, and to apprise our readers that we are not responsible for the opinions of our Correspondents.—Ed. CHURCH.] To the Editor of the Church. REV. AND DEAR SIR.—Some time since I noticed a short case appended to a communication from "A Catholic," viz: "That the people should support their Clergyman."

Numberless indeed, and the ingenuity of the nineteenth century, are the various methods suggested to attain so necessary an object, yet the support of our Clergy, and the increase of our numbers, is not such as it ought to be in this enlightened age. It is possible that like King David, when Uzza was slain, we are thoughtlessly imitating some of the prevalent customs of the age in which we live? (Chronicles xv 13 v.)

Probably the following questions asked in a sincere desire to learn the truth, and to see God's Holy Church prosper in our land, may meet with your kind insertion, and I trust some of your Rev. brethren will favour us with their opinions on so vital a subject.

1st. Has, or has not, God made a direct demand of one-tenth of his flock, as Christ came to fulfill, not to destroy the law, but to fulfill it? 2nd. Why do people imagine that the produce of land alone comes under the command "to tithe of all that you possess?"

3rd. How, or when did it first happen that the Church consented to allow the state to make the payment of tithes compulsory? The doctrine of the New Testament appears to me, though perhaps I am wrong, to be a doctrine of kindness and persuasion; I do not therefore mention of compulsion. Though there is abundance that to the Church was committed the power of denying the privileges of her sacraments and teaching, and, unquestionably, we dare not hope that the name of one dying, so denoted or excommunicated, will be found in the Lamb's book of life.

4th. Might not the Jewish Church be highly instructive in this instance? How did the Priesthood receive tithes from the people? Not surely by the invidious method of exacting a carrying to his priest. What public acknowledgment did they give to the amounts received and paid? How were they again distributed? Did the tithes support more than the Priesthood? Does not the early Church afford us a worthy example for imitation in any way, I mean, of course, in the things which are more important, and not justly assign many of the failures of our beloved Church, and her slow increase, to the not adopting the means of support divinely appointed by her great head? Seeing that God does not require new inventions to perform the duty assigned to us, and unceasingly pray His blessing upon our imperfect efforts for Christ's sake.

Contemplate for a moment the old reiterated petition of the prayer given to us by our blessed Lord and Saviour in Heaven. "How is it done in Heaven? by the implicit and willing obedience of His Holy Angels, in a word, by obedience. Imagine a Holy Angel winging back his way to heaven, hasting to show our heavenly Father some new contrivance, or some new method for more improving the dominion of our Lord's Kingdom upon earth. Ah! our blessed Lord would veil his glorious face in sorrow, recollecting the blood stained garden of Gethsemane, and the memorable words, so little heeded in this age of expediency, 'not my will but Thine be done.'

Perhaps I am wrong, I trust to you dear Rev. friends, as many other laymen do also, to set us right; but I feel very strongly that the great God can never leave his body, the Church, without a divinely appointed means of support, and that the means which we have adopted, and are increasing until we heartily do it. Paul may plant, and Apollos may water, God alone can give the increase, this He has promised, and always has performed to those who walk in the way of his commands. We live by faith, not by the sight of things, but by the promises. The limits of the Israelitish Camp were most exactly marked, the faithful Israelite went not beyond that limit when he was in the neighbourhood of the fiery serpent, no; he would have been out of sight of the brazen serpent, and a miracle, not the fulfilment of a promise, would have saved him.

Without enumerating the many instances of success that have attended upon perseverance in the appointed way, I hope that some of those to whom God has entrusted the unfolding of His Holy truths, will be enabled so fully to possess our hearts, as to be left without the honest truth seeking mind, no doubt will be left.

I am, dear Sir, yours, A LAYMAN. Toronto, Feb. 19th, 1849.

For The Church. INSTANCES OF THE WRONG USE OF THE WORD CATHOLIC, WITH CORRECTIONS. INSTANCE XII. "An attempt has been made by the Church of Rome to realize the idea of Catholicism—at least in form—and with but a partial success; an attempt will now be made to restore the word Catholic to its primitive significance in its application to this Series, and to realize the idea of Catholicism in spirit."—Prospectus of a Series of Works to be called the "Catholic Series," now publishing by a London Bookseller.

[Here the word "Catholic" is wrenched away from its technical theological sense, and is made to mean a general term. The series of books put forth under this specious misnomer, are works of a bold Socinian and Pantheistic character, all distinctly anti-Church and anti-Catholic, by Channing, Emerson, Martineau, and several German writers. The following, we believe, better seen, if it ran thus:—] CORRECTION XII. "An attempt has been made by the Church of Rome, assisted by the Church of France, the Church of Spain, the Church of Austria, and other national Churches, also by the Romanist communities who have separated from the United States of America, to realize the idea of Catholicism—at least in form—and with but a partial success: an attempt will now be made to restore the word Catholic to its primitive significance, to give it a novel character; the word 'Catholic' as used in the forthcoming series will be diverted and turned aside altogether from its strict technical and theological sense, and applied in such a manner as to promote the establishment of a new religion, the broad of life, and spirit, unbounded at least to this extent,—that is, so long as the writers unite and are unanimous in resisting the doctrine, and discipline of the Church, unlimited latitude and variety will be permitted in speculation, and disposition of statement, on every other point."

Toronto, Feb. 1st, 1849. Ecclesiastical Intelligence. CANADA. DIOCESE OF TORONTO. The Rev. Dr. Lett, thankfully acknowledges to have received from Mr. E. B. Holt, of the Diocese of C. B., the subject of the PRIZE ESSAY for the year 1849 is fixed as follows:— "The Scriptural Authority, and practical benefits of Forms of Prayer." The NEW TESTAMENTAL PRIZE (value £10 10s. or as the annual Diocesan may furnish) will be awarded to the writer of the best Essay on this subject. The BISHOP'S PRIZE (value £5) will be given to the writer of the second best Essay on the subject. The PRIZE (value three Guineas) will be given to the writer of the third best Essay on the same subject. The Essays must not exceed in length forty pages of letter-paper, ordinary hand-writing, and will be required to be transmitted to the Hon. Secretary at Cobourg, on or before the 15th May, 1849.

The names of the writers (who must be resident members of the Diocesan Theological College) are to be sent in a sealed note accompanying the Essays, superscribed by a motto answering to the one affixed to the Essays, respectively. The prizes will be adjudged at the conclusion of the Annual Examination in August next. The following Scholarships will be open for competition, and awarded according to the results of a General Examination, to be held at Cobourg, on Wednesday and Thursday, the 15th and 16th August, 1849:— Two of £40 Sterling per annum, each, founded by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. Two of £40 Currency per annum, each, chargeable upon the Bishops Students' Fund in this Diocese. Two of £30 Currency per annum, each, chargeable upon the same fund. All of the above bear date to the successful Candidates from the 1st October following. The Scholarships will be tenable for not more than four years, and the age of Candidates must not be under 16. Candidates for the Scholarships above announced, will be required to communicate, at the time of offering their names, with your kind insertion, and I trust some of your Rev. brethren will favour us with their opinions on so vital a subject.

about grinding the poor, and at the same time to be adopting such measures as would for ever keep him poor.—

There is a long story in the last Examiner of the dreadful oppression caused to a worthy man named McKinnon, by the tyranny and rapacity of Episcopal Priests—all arising out of that "curse to the Province," the Rectory. The readers of the Examiner will not doubt be horrified, and join in its noble and just indignation. But there are two sides to every story—and as "anti altar partem" is one of our favourite maxims, we will give our readers to know by a faithful and true version of the facts, what we know to be a faithful and true version of the facts.

In the first place John Frank could not have had any lease of lot No. 19 in the 9th Concession in the Crown Land office as a Glebe and applicants for leases for lots so marked were always told that they could not be leased or sold.

In 1834, according to the Examiner, Frank sold his right of pre-emption (having no right whatever,) to Martin McKinnon. In 1835 the government completed the title, and the Glebe was marked in the Crown Land office as a Glebe and applicants for leases for lots so marked were always told that they could not be leased or sold.

McKinnon, however, having a lease of the lot, and being in possession, resisted the Clergyman's right to title, and petitioned the government to ratify his claim, title, and petitioners, however, found that he had no right or title to the land whatever—and decided accordingly. The Rev. V. P. Mayerhoffer, the Minister above spoken of, however, considering kindly and correctly the case of the lot, leased it to him for twenty years at a nominal rent. McKinnon proved however a most troublesome tenant, constantly resisting the payment of the rent, because of this same lot, then accepted except by a squatter, or on a squatter's right—as an endowment for the Minister of the United Church of England and Ireland doing duty in Markham—and be it remembered, that the same squatter knew that he was on a "lot" apart as a Glebe, which the Glebe said, to be a Glebe, and he remembered that the same clergyman also discharged the same duties in Vaughan. McKinnon some time after claimed as having some right in the lot, and being in possession, resisted the Clergyman's right to title, and petitioned the government to ratify his claim, title, and petitioners, however, found that he had no right or title to the land whatever—and decided accordingly.

The Rev. V. P. Mayerhoffer, the Minister above spoken of, however, considering kindly and correctly the case of the lot, leased it to him for twenty years at a nominal rent. McKinnon proved however a most troublesome tenant, constantly resisting the payment of the rent, because of this same lot, then accepted except by a squatter, or on a squatter's right—as an endowment for the Minister of the United Church of England and Ireland doing duty in Markham—and be it remembered, that the same squatter knew that he was on a "lot" apart as a Glebe, which the Glebe said, to be a Glebe, and he remembered that the same clergyman also discharged the same duties in Vaughan. McKinnon some time after claimed as having some right in the lot, and being in possession, resisted the Clergyman's right to title, and petitioners, however, found that he had no right or title to the land whatever—and decided accordingly.

McKinnon, however, having a lease of the lot, and being in possession, resisted the Clergyman's right to title, and petitioners, however, found that he had no right or title to the land whatever—and decided accordingly. The Rev. V. P. Mayerhoffer, the Minister above spoken of, however, considering kindly and correctly the case of the lot, leased it to him for twenty years at a nominal rent. McKinnon proved however a most troublesome tenant, constantly resisting the payment of the rent, because of this same lot, then accepted except by a squatter, or on a squatter's right—as an endowment for the Minister of the United Church of England and Ireland doing duty in Markham—and be it remembered, that the same squatter knew that he was on a "lot" apart as a Glebe, which the Glebe said, to be a Glebe, and he remembered that the same clergyman also discharged the same duties in Vaughan. McKinnon some time after claimed as having some right in the lot, and being in possession, resisted the Clergyman's right to title, and petitioners, however, found that he had no right or title to the land whatever—and decided accordingly.

McKinnon, however, having a lease of the lot, and being in possession, resisted the Clergyman's right to title, and petitioners, however, found that he had no right or title to the land whatever—and decided accordingly. The Rev. V. P. Mayerhoffer, the Minister above spoken of, however, considering kindly and correctly the case of the lot, leased it to him for twenty years at a nominal rent. McKinnon proved however a most troublesome tenant, constantly resisting the payment of the rent, because of this same lot, then accepted except by a squatter, or on a squatter's right—as an endowment for the Minister of the United Church of England and Ireland doing duty in Markham—and be it remembered, that the same squatter knew that he was on a "lot" apart as a Glebe, which the Glebe said, to be a Glebe, and he remembered that the same clergyman also discharged the same duties in Vaughan. McKinnon some time after claimed as having some right in the lot, and being in possession, resisted the Clergyman's right to title, and petitioners, however, found that he had no right or title to the land whatever—and decided accordingly.

McKinnon, however, having a lease of the lot, and being in possession, resisted the Clergyman's right to title, and petitioners, however, found that he had no right or title to the land whatever—and decided accordingly. The Rev. V. P. Mayerhoffer, the Minister above spoken of, however, considering kindly and correctly the case of the lot, leased it to him for twenty years at a nominal rent. McKinnon proved however a most troublesome tenant, constantly resisting the payment of the rent, because of this same lot, then accepted except by a squatter, or on a squatter's right—as an endowment for the Minister of the United Church of England and Ireland doing duty in Markham—and be it remembered, that the same squatter knew that he was on a "lot" apart as a Glebe, which the Glebe said, to be a Glebe, and he remembered that the same clergyman also discharged the same duties in Vaughan. McKinnon some time after claimed as having some right in the lot, and being in possession, resisted the Clergyman's right to title, and petitioners, however, found that he had no right or title to the land whatever—and decided accordingly.

McKinnon, however, having a lease of the lot, and being in possession, resisted the Clergyman's right to title, and petitioners, however, found that he had no right or title to the land whatever—and decided accordingly. The Rev. V. P. Mayerhoffer, the Minister above spoken of, however, considering kindly and correctly the case of the lot, leased it to him for twenty years at a nominal rent. McKinnon proved however a most troublesome tenant, constantly resisting the payment of the rent, because of this same lot, then accepted except by a squatter, or on a squatter's right—as an endowment for the Minister of the United Church of England and Ireland doing duty in Markham—and be it remembered, that the same squatter knew that he was on a "lot" apart as a Glebe, which the Glebe said, to be a Glebe, and he remembered that the same clergyman also discharged the same duties in Vaughan. McKinnon some time after claimed as having some right in the lot, and being in possession, resisted the Clergyman's right to title, and petitioners, however, found that he had no right or title to the land whatever—and decided accordingly.

McKinnon, however, having a lease of the lot, and being in possession, resisted the Clergyman's right to title, and petitioners, however, found that he had no right or title to the land whatever—and decided accordingly. The Rev. V. P. Mayerhoffer, the Minister above spoken of, however, considering kindly and correctly the case of the lot, leased it to him for twenty years at a nominal rent. McKinnon proved however a most troublesome tenant, constantly resisting the payment of the rent, because of this same lot, then accepted except by a squatter, or on a squatter's right—as an endowment for the Minister of the United Church of England and Ireland doing duty in Markham—and be it remembered, that the same squatter knew that he was on a "lot" apart as a Glebe, which the Glebe said, to be a Glebe, and he remembered that the same clergyman also discharged the same duties in Vaughan. McKinnon some time after claimed as having some right in the lot, and being in possession, resisted the Clergyman's right to title, and petitioners, however, found that he had no right or title to the land whatever—and decided accordingly.

McKinnon, however, having a lease of the lot, and being in possession, resisted the Clergyman's right to title, and petitioners, however, found that he had no right or title to the land whatever—and decided accordingly. The Rev. V. P. Mayerhoffer, the Minister above spoken of, however, considering kindly and correctly the case of the lot, leased it to him for twenty years at a nominal rent. McKinnon proved however a most troublesome tenant, constantly resisting the payment of the rent, because of this same lot, then accepted except by a squatter, or on a squatter's right—as an endowment for the Minister of the United Church of England and Ireland doing duty in Markham—and be it remembered, that the same squatter knew that he was on a "lot" apart as a Glebe, which the Glebe said, to be a Glebe, and he remembered that the same clergyman also discharged the same duties in Vaughan. McKinnon some time after claimed as having some right in the lot, and being in possession, resisted the Clergyman's right to title, and petitioners, however, found that he had no right or title to the land whatever—and decided accordingly.

McKinnon, however, having a lease of the lot, and being in possession, resisted the Clergyman's right to title, and petitioners, however, found that he had no right or title to the land whatever—and decided accordingly. The Rev. V. P. Mayerhoffer, the Minister above spoken of, however, considering kindly and correctly the case of the lot, leased it to him for twenty years at a nominal rent. McKinnon proved however a most troublesome tenant, constantly resisting the payment of the rent, because of this same lot, then accepted except by a squatter, or on a squatter's right—as an endowment for the Minister of the United Church of England and Ireland doing duty in Markham—and be it remembered, that the same squatter knew that he was on a "lot" apart as a Glebe, which the Glebe said, to be a Glebe, and he remembered that the same clergyman also discharged the same duties in Vaughan. McKinnon some time after claimed as having some right in the lot, and being in possession, resisted the Clergyman's right to title, and petitioners, however, found that he had no right or title to the land whatever—and decided accordingly.

McKinnon, however, having a lease of the lot, and being in possession, resisted the Clergyman's right to title, and petitioners, however, found that he had no right or title to the land whatever—and decided accordingly. The Rev. V. P. Mayerhoffer, the Minister above spoken of, however, considering kindly and correctly the case of the lot, leased it to him for twenty years at a nominal rent. McKinnon proved however a most troublesome tenant, constantly resisting the payment of the rent, because of this same lot, then accepted except by a squatter, or on a squatter's right—as an endowment for the Minister of the United Church of England and Ireland doing duty in Markham—and be it remembered, that the same squatter knew that he was on a "lot" apart as a Glebe, which the Glebe said, to be a Glebe, and he remembered that the same clergyman also discharged the same duties in Vaughan. McKinnon some time after claimed as having some right in the lot, and being in possession, resisted the Clergyman's right to title, and petitioners, however, found that he had no right or title to the land whatever—and decided accordingly.

McKinnon, however, having a lease of the lot, and being in possession, resisted the Clergyman's right to title, and petitioners, however, found that he had no right or title to the land whatever—and decided accordingly. The Rev. V. P. Mayerhoffer, the Minister above spoken of, however, considering kindly and correctly the case of the lot, leased it to him for twenty years at a nominal rent. McKinnon proved however a most troublesome tenant, constantly resisting the payment of the rent, because of this same lot, then accepted except by a squatter, or on a squatter's right—as an endowment for the Minister of the United Church of England and Ireland doing duty in Markham—and be it remembered, that the same squatter knew that he was on a "lot" apart as a Glebe, which the Glebe said, to be a Glebe, and he remembered that the same clergyman also discharged the same duties in Vaughan. McKinnon some time after claimed as having some right in the lot, and being in possession, resisted the Clergyman's right to title, and petitioners, however, found that he had no right or title to the land whatever—and decided accordingly.

McKinnon, however, having a lease of the lot, and being in possession, resisted the Clergyman's right to title, and petitioners, however, found that he had no right or title to the land whatever—and decided accordingly. The Rev. V. P. Mayerhoffer, the Minister above spoken of, however, considering kindly and correctly the case of the lot, leased it to him for twenty years at a nominal rent. McKinnon proved however a most troublesome tenant, constantly resisting the payment of the rent, because of this same lot, then accepted except by a squatter, or on a squatter's right—as an endowment for the Minister of the United Church of England and Ireland doing duty in Markham—and be it remembered, that the same squatter knew that he was on a "lot" apart as a Glebe, which the Glebe said, to be a Glebe, and he remembered that the same clergyman also discharged the same duties in Vaughan. McKinnon some time after claimed as having some right in the lot, and being in possession, resisted the Clergyman's right to title, and petitioners, however, found that he had no right or title to the land whatever—and decided accordingly.

McKinnon, however, having a lease of the lot, and being in possession, resisted the Clergyman's right to title, and petitioners, however, found that he had no right or title to the land whatever—and decided accordingly. The Rev. V. P. Mayerhoffer, the Minister above spoken of, however, considering kindly and correctly the case of the lot, leased it to him for twenty years at a nominal rent. McKinnon proved however a most troublesome tenant, constantly resisting the payment of the rent, because of this same lot, then accepted except by a squatter, or on a squatter's right—as an endowment for the Minister of the United Church of England and Ireland doing duty in Markham—and be it remembered, that the same squatter knew that he was on a "lot" apart as a Glebe, which the Glebe said, to be a Glebe, and he remembered that the same clergyman also discharged the same duties in Vaughan. McKinnon some time after claimed as having some right in the lot, and being in possession, resisted the Clergyman's right to title, and petitioners, however, found that he had no right or title to the land whatever—and decided accordingly.

McKinnon, however, having a lease of the lot, and being in possession, resisted the Clergyman's right to title, and petitioners, however, found that he had no right or title to the land whatever—and decided accordingly. The Rev. V. P. Mayerhoffer, the Minister above spoken of, however, considering kindly and correctly the case of the lot, leased it to him for twenty years at a nominal rent. McKinnon proved however a most troublesome tenant, constantly resisting the payment of the rent, because of this same lot, then accepted except by a squatter, or on a squatter's right—as an endowment for the Minister of the United Church of England and Ireland doing duty in Markham—and be it remembered, that the same squatter knew that he was on a "lot" apart as a Glebe, which the Glebe said, to be a Glebe, and he remembered that the same clergyman also discharged the same duties in Vaughan. McKinnon some time after claimed as having some right in the lot, and being in possession, resisted the Clergyman's right to title, and petitioners, however, found that he had no right or title to the land whatever—and decided accordingly.

McKinnon, however, having a lease of the lot, and being in possession, resisted the Clergyman's right to title, and petitioners, however, found that he had no right or title to the land whatever—and decided accordingly. The Rev. V. P. Mayerhoffer, the Minister above spoken of, however, considering kindly and correctly the case of the lot, leased it to him for twenty years at a nominal rent. McKinnon proved however a most troublesome tenant, constantly resisting the payment of the rent, because of this same lot, then accepted except by a squatter, or on a squatter's right—as an endowment for the Minister of the United Church of England and Ireland doing duty in Markham—and be it remembered, that the same squatter knew that he was on a "lot" apart as a Glebe, which the Glebe said, to be a Glebe, and he remembered that the same clergyman also discharged the same duties in Vaughan. McKinnon some time after claimed as having some right in the lot, and being in possession, resisted the Clergyman's right to title, and petitioners, however, found that he had no right or title to the land whatever—and decided accordingly.

McKinnon, however, having a lease of the lot, and being in possession, resisted the Clergyman's right to title, and petitioners, however, found that he had no right or title to the land whatever—and decided accordingly. The Rev. V. P. Mayerhoffer, the Minister above spoken of, however, considering kindly and correctly the case of the lot, leased it to him for twenty years at a nominal rent. McKinnon proved however a most troublesome tenant, constantly resisting the payment of the rent, because of this same lot, then accepted except by a squatter, or on a squatter's right—as an endowment for the Minister of the United Church of England and Ireland doing duty in Markham—and be it remembered, that the same squatter knew that he was on a "lot" apart as a Glebe, which the Glebe said, to be a Glebe, and he remembered that the same clergyman also discharged the same duties in Vaughan. McKinnon some time after claimed as having some right in the lot, and being in possession, resisted the Clergyman's right to title, and petitioners, however, found that he had no right or title to the land whatever—and decided accordingly.

McKinnon, however, having a lease of the lot, and being in possession, resisted the Clergyman's right to title, and petitioners, however, found that he had no right or title to the land whatever—and decided accordingly. The Rev. V. P. Mayerhoffer, the Minister above spoken of, however, considering kindly and correctly the case of the lot, leased it to him for twenty years at a nominal rent. McKinnon proved however a most troublesome tenant, constantly resisting the payment of the rent, because of this same lot, then accepted except by a squatter, or on a squatter's right—as an endowment for the Minister of the United Church of England and Ireland doing duty in Markham—and be it remembered, that the same squatter knew that he was on a "lot" apart as a Glebe, which the Glebe said, to be a Glebe, and he remembered that the same clergyman also discharged the same duties in Vaughan. McKinnon some time after claimed as having some right in the lot, and being in possession, resisted the Clergyman's right to title, and petitioners, however, found that he had no right or title to the land whatever—and decided accordingly.

McKinnon, however, having a lease of the lot, and being in possession, resisted the Clergyman's right to title, and petitioners, however, found that he had no right or title to the land whatever—and decided accordingly. The Rev. V. P. Mayerhoffer, the Minister above spoken of, however, considering kindly and correctly the case of the lot, leased it to him for twenty years at a nominal rent. McKinnon proved however a most troublesome tenant, constantly resisting the payment of the rent, because of this same lot, then accepted except by a squatter, or on a squatter's right—as an endowment for the Minister of the United Church of England and Ireland doing duty in Markham—and be it remembered, that the same squatter knew that he was on a "lot" apart as a Glebe, which the Glebe said, to be a Glebe, and he remembered that the same clergyman also discharged the same duties in Vaughan. McKinnon some time after claimed as having some right in the lot, and being in possession, resisted the Clergyman's right to title, and petitioners, however, found that he had no right or title to the land whatever—and decided accordingly.

McKinnon, however, having a lease of the lot, and being in possession, resisted the Clergyman's right to title, and petitioners, however, found that he had no right or title to the land whatever—and decided accordingly. The Rev. V. P. Mayerhoffer, the Minister above spoken of, however, considering kindly and correctly the case of the lot, leased it to him for twenty years at a nominal rent. McKinnon proved however a most troublesome tenant, constantly resisting the payment of the rent, because of this same lot, then accepted except by a squatter, or on a squatter's right—as an endowment for the Minister of the United Church of England and Ireland doing duty in Markham—and be it remembered, that the same squatter knew that he was on a "lot" apart as a Glebe, which the Glebe said, to be a Glebe, and he remembered that the same clergyman also discharged the same duties in Vaughan. McKinnon some time after claimed as having some right in the lot, and being in possession, resisted the Clergyman's right to title, and petitioners, however, found that he had no right or title to the land whatever—and decided accordingly.

McKinnon, however, having a lease of the lot, and being in possession, resisted the Clergyman's right to title, and petitioners, however, found that he had no right or title to the land whatever—and decided accordingly. The Rev. V. P. Mayerhoffer, the Minister above spoken of, however, considering kindly and correctly the case of the lot, leased it to him for twenty years at a nominal rent. McKinnon proved however a most troublesome tenant, constantly resisting the payment of the rent, because of this same lot, then accepted except by a squatter, or on a squatter's right—as an endowment for the Minister of the United Church of England and Ireland doing duty in Markham—and be it remembered, that the same squatter knew that he was on a "lot" apart as a Glebe, which the Glebe said, to be a Glebe, and he remembered that the same clergyman also discharged the same duties in Vaughan. McKinnon some time after claimed as having some right in the lot, and being in possession, resisted the Clergyman's right to title, and petitioners, however, found that he had no right or title to the land whatever—and decided accordingly.

Scripture knowledge, Latin, and arithmetic; the progress made having been quite satisfactory.

The Bishop stated that he had held his first Ordination in Trinity Church, on Thursday, June 29th, the anniversary of his consecration. There were two candidates for deacon's orders. The Ordination service took place in the presence of an attentive congregation and the Clergy, the Archdeacon, the Colonial Chaplain, &c.

The Lord Bishop of Capetown, in a letter dated Utenga, Sept. 15, 1848, wrote as follows:—"You will not, I feel assured, be sorry to receive a few lines from me during my visitation, even though my letter should bring with it additional applications for assistance from the venerable Society, which has already contributed so liberally to the cases which I have brought under its notice."

"I have now passed through about a third part of my extensive diocese, and have travelled, either in a wagon or on horseback, near 900 miles. Should I be spared to complete the visitation of this part of the diocese, I shall in the course of four months have accomplished about 3000 miles. There will then remain Port Natal and St. Lucia to be visited (N. V.) in the course of next year. I feel, perhaps, surprised to hear that, since I left Capetown, I have not met with a single English church, or more than two English Clergymen, although there is a considerable but scattered English population. During my progress