

swells upon the ear of distant generations, the chorus will forever mark the names of those who, in the hour of gloom, and when brave hearts quailed, and good men even stood dismayed, raised a voice for God and for a people, and who never rested, under grace and grace, a strength imparted which at first they believed not till they tried its efficacy, and left established in the land the spirit in its stillness, the incumbent of the parish at his prayer, and congregation after congregation filling with hymns of sacred joy the resounding dome.

I am, as an aged person has a moral and spiritual right to do, the youth of the province to the rescue. The question is, the right of the Church to the donation of King George the Third, of blessed memory, to one-seventh of the conceded land of Canada, and also, *in default*, (in default of the Imperial Government maintaining good faith in the matter) to a compensation from Her Majesty's Government, *specially*, for the moral value of the same.

W. MACGILLIVRAY,
Rector of Victoria.

March 20, 1854.

To the Editor of the Church.

REV. AND DEAR SIR,—Will you allow me a corner in your paper for my convenience, for the purpose of making an effort to call attention to the great and important neglect in many of the churches in this diocese, in the want of any provision for due order in the worship by the congregation: I refer to the provision for kneeling. Every other necessary, in many quite cases, is duly provided for, in many quite cases, yet not the slightest attention is paid to the necessity for some convenience for kneeling, a position for a large portion of the service which no one will dispute. It happened only a couple of Sundays ago, I was at a morning service in a country church, I do not know of what denomination, where the clergyman, preaching strenuously urged the congregation to join in the beautiful services of the church, humbly kneeling where it is prescribed, and also at home in private, to supplicate their heavenly Father humbly on their knees, &c. I felt it my duty to make this humble effort to draw the thoughts of clergymen to an improvement, for on no occasion could such a charge, of the utmost importance in itself, sound more inconsistent. I was sitting in a pew, and all around me were the same, which is so constructed as to be most inconvenient, and the new was very narrow, too much so to allow of your kneeling forward with your face to the minister, and the back of each pew closed quite down to the floor, or so nearly as to prevent the possibility of kneeling square in the pew, even after the disgraceful necessity of turning round; this is the more singular looked in this instance, because, in the arrangement of the pews an evidently strict regard to the placing of them so that all the congregation shall face the organ, is observed, and another similar constructed church building exists in the city, in the province.

It is the want of a proper arrangement that gives occasion to the very invidious practices indulged in in many of our churches during prayers, where you will see some standing up with their backs to the organ, some kneeling, some sitting in easy positions; others, not willing to put themselves to the trouble of turning round and kneeling on, perhaps, a muddy or wet floor, sitting on their seats, perhaps leaning their heads on their hands, perhaps not; and those who feel that they cannot address the Almighty humbly in any position, but who are obliged to resort to the unpleasant alternative of turning completely round with their backs to the organ and kneeling on the floor, whether clean or dirty, and in the instance I have referred to even crossways.

This is an evil greatly to be deplored, and might be remedied by a very trifling expense, and if done so very materially aid in restoring a greater degree of order and uniformity in our worship. Hoping that shortly some more attention will be paid to this matter.

I am Rev. Sir,
Yours truly,
A MEMBER.

Dioecese of Toronto,
March 13th, 1854.

To the Editor of the Church.

REV. AND DEAR SIR,—In my last letter I promised that I would endeavour to set forth, in reply to your correspondent M., the real views of Becon upon the point of the baptism of infants. Let me then first briefly state what seem to me to be the real opinions of the Rev. Mr. Becon in connection with the subject; and secondly explain how, holding these views, he came to use the apparently doubtful language quoted by M.

1st. He holds respecting baptism itself, that in Scripture there are three orders, (1. St. John's baptism (of course adult) receive (p. 225); that of the Holy Spirit whose gifts are sealed to Christian infants in baptism; and that of blood, which martyrs dying without prior baptism receive (p. 225).

(a) True Christian baptism is but one (p. 225) in which the Holy Spirit accompanies the outward sign, and the word added makes the sacrament. (p. 202)

(b) This is "the fountain of the new birth, and renewing of the Holy Ghost." (p. 202)

(c) To be thus baptized is "to be regenerated," and, (p. 202) "to be received into the household of God, and from henceforth to be reckoned, ye and also to be from sin and heir of God," and, (p. 208) and "to receive with remission of our sins, and the Holy Ghost." (p. 204)

2nd. He holds that all children of Christian parents ought to be brought to this baptism, because,

(a) As children of Christians, they please God. (p. 212.)

(b) As pleasing God, they have faith as an extraordinary grace, which is to be God's ordinary way being in the case of adults that faith should follow on the hearing of the word. (p. 211-12.)

(c) As children of Christian parents they have received, "before the foundation of the world," the gift of the Holy Spirit. (p. 225)

3rd. He holds that all children of Christians, though coming to baptism, thus already gifted in some measure with God's Holy Spirit, and possessing faith (not as an active principle, but as an incipient germ), are still, as children of Adam, sinners, and need a redemptive baptism.

(a) Remission of sins. (p. 204.)

(b) The gift of the Holy Spirit to make them to produce the fruits of a godly life. (p. 206.)

(c) And in addition, the sealing of God's eternal election of them to be His children and heirs of everlasting glory. (p. 226.)

4th. He holds, as regards the state of those who have been baptized in infancy, that,

(a) Though they have received remission of sins, conscience remains. (p. 204.)

(b) Yet this does not condemn those who strive against it through God's spirit. (p. 204.)

(c) Baptized children, therefore, are not regenerate. (p. 213.)

(d) Those who are leading very evil lives do plainly evidence that they are fallen from grace received in baptism. (p. 206.)

5th. He holds, with regard to the necessity of the outward rite, that all who neglect it when it can be received, or despise it, are left with the spirit of devils, and have no portion in the Kingdom of Heaven (p. 215 & 226.) But that where, through unavoidable circumstances, baptism has not been administered before death of infants, they are still saved in Christ, because they have, as children of Christian parents, already received the grace of election. (p. 226.)

6th. As now let us inquire respecting the sacraments giving grace to such as receive them. Becon very properly says, "This doctrine is contrary to the word of God, brought lately into the Church by the Papists, and is greatly injurious both to the grace of God and to the blood of Christ, and also to the dignity of faith." Now, had M. read on a little further, he would

have met with a key to this, if his previous reading of the works of the Reformers did not supply him with an immediate perception of the meaning. Becon continues: "The sacraments could give grace, that is, the favour of God, remission of sins, justification, &c. BY THE WORK WITHOUT, as they say, or, by any power that remaineth in the outward signs; so should it follow that our justification depends not only on the free grace of God, but of works, which is most false." &c. I think now any tyro in divinity might see at once what the passage means, and that Becon is arguing against the Popish doctrine of grace, "Ex opere operato," or that the mere administration of baptism ensures accompanying grace: this is the *novelty* which B. Ch. says has been lately brought into the world, and which he so justly denounces as "most false." M.'s second quotation I need hardly notice, because it is but a continuation of the same argument, and because we have referred already to the opinion expressed in it, that all infants of Christians receive grace even before baptism. But as Mr. M. must read very carefully when he could quote these closing words, (which I here repeat), and not see that the plain statement they contain is of itself quite subversive of his views on the matter. Becon says, "Who seeth not now that baptism itself (that is, the mere outward rite) brings no grace," while the Papists, he would say, falsely declare it does? But both testify unto the congregation that he which is baptized hath already received grace and the Spirit of God, and is accepted of God, for His merciful promise sake, a dear child and heir of everlasting glory." (p. 204.) My object is not to deny that the outward sign, that they all are accordingly accepted as God's children, and receive other benefits of Christ's passion; and that, as they did not inherit this from Adam, they are all for God's merciful promise sake regenerate, even though they should afterwards fall away from grace.

But the objection which I have already given will of course enable those possessing the work to see how far they are correct. But as some, who feel an interest in this matter, may not have the book, I subjoin a few quotations, feeling at the same time how much stronger my arguments would appear, could I venture to quote as fully as I might.

"How do children obtain faith?"
"By the Holy Ghost." p. 212.

"How provest thou that children have the Holy Ghost?"
"Paul saith, 'If any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of God's.' But children are God's, and dearly beloved of God, as we have before heard. Therefore children have the Spirit of Christ." p. 213.

"But the adversary object, we see no fruits of faith in the infants?"
"That the infants show no fruits of faith, and therefore they have no faith, is no good argument." p. 213.

"Thou holdest then that the infants of the Christians have both the Holy Ghost and faith; and that therefore they ought of right to be baptized?"
"Yes." p. 214.

"Comest thou a sinner unto baptism?"
"Yes, and the very child of wrath by nature." p. 204.

"And art thou delivered from the whole lump of ungodliness by this baptism?"
"Yes, verily." p. 204.

"In art thou committed and forgiven us, ye and put away in baptism, how cometh it then to pass, that we feel in ourselves such cruel and raging lusts?"
"That conscience is left unto us to be an exercise of our faith, that we should do labour to overcome the Spirit of God." p. 204.

"Doth not that conscience condemn us?"
"No, verily; except we willingly give over the Holy Spirit of God, and give place to those fleshly lusts, and so fall away from the grace that was given us in our baptism." p. 204.

"So men therefore are baptized, ought to address themselves unto a new life, and to walk worthy this kindness of God, which they have received in their baptism?"
"Yes, verily; for they that are baptized in Christ Jesus have not only remission of all their sins, but they receive also of the gift of the Holy Ghost, which worketh in them new effects, and new motions." p. 206.

"What sayest thou then to those Christians which brag much of Christ, and of Christ's gospel, and yet lead a life spotted and defiled with all kind of sin?"
"These are fallen from the grace which they received in their baptism, and have lost the Holy Ghost, whereby they were renewed in the fountain of regeneration." p. 206.

My object, I trust, is now attained; and, without pledging myself to any particular one, cannot but feel thankful, that in a time of such disruption of long-settled false opinions as this Reformation was, there was preserved to the Church so much of Catholic truth. It was perfectly natural for minds that had just burst the shackles which Rome had long imposed upon the intelligence of man, to run occasionally into language very susceptible of misrepresentation, if not really unsound in doctrine. This has been the case at times with most of the Reformers; but still, from the acquaintance which I have had with their writings, limited it is true, yet I (I trust) neither very narrow nor superficial. I feel assured that if a general consciousness of the controversies and exciting circumstances of the times, together with a candid and unprejudiced mind, accompany the reader, there are very few expressions in all their writings which cannot be satisfactorily explained in accordance with the present teaching of the Church. It is the more to be wondered at that their doctrine concerning baptism should have so generally been misapprehended, when the evidence is so plain there was the disturbing cause of foreign Calvinistic influence.

I must apologize to M. for any severity in my former letter, and assure him that I am sorry that I allowed a feeling somewhat akin to indignation to show itself at times; but I wrote under the sense that one who undertakes the correction of another publicly, offends wilfully if he has not previously made himself acquainted with his subject.

If these letters may have any tendency to induce a more general reading of the Reformers, and the answers to the queries through the publications of the Parker Society, and in any way lead to the exacter ascertaining of what their real views were, the space occupied by them in your valuable paper will not have been filled in vain.

Yours very truly,
W. S.

To the Editor of the Church.

REV. AND DEAR SIR,—The Rev. Mr. Stinson, in his communication of the 20th inst., appears evidently under misapprehension on one or two important points, and, lest your readers might fall into similar mistakes, I beg leave to offer a few words by way of correction.

Among the resolutions read at the meetings held at London and Simcoe, by the rural dean, was the following:

"That all donations to the Diocesan Endowment Fund shall be given on the express condition, when the sum required shall be provided, the incumbent of the new western diocese shall be elected by the clergy and the lay delegates within its limits."

Now, Sir, I was present when that resolution was prepared, and it was worded in studied conformity with the language of our Bishop himself, contained in a most important letter to His Lordship to the Rev. Mr. Cozart, which was read by the latter gentleman on several public occasions, and is published in the report of the proceedings at Hamilton, published in the first page of the Church of the 23d inst.

Your readers will observe that whatever may be the advantage or disadvantage attendant on an election of bishops, by the clergy and the representatives of the laity, the plan is

conferred in by the Bishop, and the proceedings endorsed by Mr. Stinson are suggested by His Lordship's letter, and not by the resolution.

I am quite aware that there are respectable and very intelligent men among the clergy and laity who would prefer the old system of having the colonial bishops nominated, as was done in England, by the minister of the Crown for the time being; but I can assure you, Sir, that many of the clergy, and an immense majority of the laity, desire the privilege of electing their bishops.

It will be remembered by those who were present at the late Diocesan Synod, that the desirableness of our being permitted to elect our bishops was generally advocated. If I remember right, also, a former minister for the Colonies did formally admit the reasonableness of conceding that privilege to those colonies which should provide an endowment.

As the law now stands, we cannot do more than elect, and submit the name of the individual chosen to the Queen for her approval and appointment; but we have every reason to believe that such a recommendation will be favorably received. Allow me to add, while on this subject, that the bill now before the Imperial Parliament makes no change whatever in this particular, but leaves matters just where it finds them.

I was present at the meetings of the rural deaneries at London and Simcoe, and at seven or eight meetings of the Church Society, at all of which the subject of the subdivision of the diocese, as recommended by His Lordship, that the idea of the election being confined to the clergy in any particular portion of the United Church of England and Ireland, was not only not advocated by any, but was emphatically repudiated by all. I rejoice much, as Mr. Stinson seems to think that faithful clergy, true to the principles of the Church, are to be found in abundance, whether we seek to supply our wants from Home, or from the Eastern, Western, or Central Diocese; and he and I may safely congratulate ourselves, and one another, when we think that the clergy and laity of the Western Diocese will choose no other.

As to the significant words which my revered brother refers, I can only say that they escaped my notice, and I am not sure that it is very much the practice of the clergy and laity of the West to openly and freely express their sentiments, without any affectation of mystery.

I remain, Rev. and dear Sir,
Very truly yours,
FRANCIS EVANS.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

"A Country Rector" in our next.

The Church.

TORONTO, THURSDAY, APRIL 6, 1854.

ORDER OF SERVICES

IN THE CHURCHES OF TORONTO DURING Lent.

St. James's—Ash Wednesday, at 11 A.M.
Every following Wednesday and Friday, at 11 P.M., with a sermon.

Du'ng Passion Week, Prayers every morning at 11.
Good Friday, at 11 A.M. and 8 1/2 P.M.
St. Paul's—Ash Wednesday, at 11 A.M.
Every following Wednesday, at 7 P.M., with a sermon.

Trinity (King Street East) Ash Wednesday, at 11 A.M.
Every following Wednesday, at 7 P.M., with a sermon.

St. George's—Ash Wednesday, at 11 A.M., and 7 P.M.
Every following Wednesday, at 7 P.M., with a sermon.

Every other day in the week, Prayers at 3 P.M.

Passion Week, Prayers at 9 A.M. and 7 P.M.
Good Friday, at 11 A.M. and 7 P.M.

Holy Trinity (Yonge Street), at 11 A.M. and 7 P.M.
Every following Wednesday and Friday, at 7 P.M., with a sermon.

The services every day during Passion Week, will be as follows:—
Morning Prayer at 9 A.M.
A Communion service 12 noon.
Evening Prayer (with lecture) 7 P.M.
Good Friday, morning service at 11 A.M.—evening service at 7 P.M.

THE ANTI-RESERVE MANIFESTO.

One thing is certain in regard to this "Manifesto"—that it will neither do much towards shaping public feeling, nor acquire an immortality of fame.

We are willing to make charitable allowance for the heavy disadvantage under which its authors laboured in the absence of all help or sympathy from the Churches of England and Rome, the Scottish Establishment, and the Wesleyan Methodist Society; still, even deprived of the countenance of so large and influential a part of the community, the framers of this document, we think, might have made a more respectable appearance than they now present to the world. It is possible to conceive that, even under their obviously discouraging circumstances, they might have stood better on their guard against the strong excitement which seems to have betrayed them into some of the more infelicitous passages of their celebrated composition.

Take, for example, the following paragraph:—

"In violation of professions of duty, and of honor; instead of giving immediate effect to the popular will, and the recent legislative sanction, a dissolution of Parliament is proposed, and the struggle which all classes hoped had at length come to an amicable termination, is again to be revived, not only under a most fallacious constitutional pretext, but under circumstances alike unfavourable to the interests of religion and the peace of the province."

After the fashion of a certain school of painters more remarkable for eccentric dashes of genius than for accurate copies of nature, it may be necessary to state that, in point of fact, the authors of the "Manifesto" intend this as a hit at their opponents. Who would have thought it? The whole is a most beautifully truthful sketch of themselves and their own doings.—

"Violated pledges?" "the popular will," thwarted in the most insulting contempt for a popular legislative enactment; "Imperial sanction" despised and contravened; "a struggle" which had actually "come to an amicable termination," "revived,"—nothing could be more complete! These gentlemen have executed their own likenesses true to every line. The egotism with which the whole document is so offensively inflated, became so irrepressible, we must suppose, at this particular point, that it was simply impossible for them to abstain from exhibiting themselves even whilst dealing out their anathemas on others. Their great council-chamber (and what an Areopagus it must have been!) was hung, no doubt, on every side with mirrors, in which the grave senate of the "Manifesto" were under a fatal necessity of viewing themselves at every turn.

It is really a very poor specimen of that coherence which ought to subsist between the words and the deeds of professedly honest men, to hear people talk with apparent indignation of "Imperial sanction" disregarded, and those places who gladly pay into the treasury of the Church in order that the Gospel, in all its fullness, may be sent to their distant brethren in back townships, would not be content in giving their own words. Your managing editor, moreover, believe that the vast majority of the people of this country do not understand the question, because, of late years especially, he has heard only one side of the argumentalist who attempts have been made to bring forth side before them, and that is, the one that they act more from knowledge than from perversity of mind in urging upon the Legislature the secularization of these lands.

In 1791, when antislavery was given to Upper Canada on separation from Lower Canada, the same of the Imperial Parliament which made the Imperial Government, a Legislative Council and House of Assembly, provided for a "Pendant Clergy," by setting apart for their maintenance one-seventh of the unceded lands within the Province. These lands were unquestionably bequeathed to the Crown by the original grant, and were to be held in trust for the benefit of the children of the King and Parliament to this reservation in favour of the clergy, the clergy were to be granted lands to the U. Y. loyalists and their children may be justly said to be "found one."

The argument of the people of this country

seconded the suggestion; and the Government, under the pretence of obtaining a more thorough expression of public opinion, are apparently attempting to give effect to this most treacherous, unjust and ruinous policy."

If the aid of the Church of Rome rendered to us on this question from motives of self-preservation, and by us not rejected, be rightly designated by so strong a term as "alliance," it is, at all events, as any man of common sense may see, an alliance involving no concession or compromise of one iota of religious principle. It is simply a case of mutual assistance against the confiscating appetite of democracy; and when the interchange of such assistance on the well-defined ground of common opposition to public injustice and bad faith, shall justify apprehensions of our Church being Romanized in the smallest particular, then we shall confidently expect to hear of excited Londoners gathering in a vast crowd at the foot of Ludgate Hill to see the novel and amazing spectacle of St. Paul's Cathedral surmounted by the Crescent in consequence of the "unholy alliance" of Christian Britain with the Turk against the covetous plunderers of the North.

The "Manifesto" hazards some statements touching the revenue of the Reserves which drag the precious document deeper and deeper into the mire. Its mode of dealing with general principles is wild and rash enough; but when it comes to figures,—that satisfactory, but to the ignorant and the precipitate, most perilous test of accuracy—the "Manifesto" seems to be perfectly beside itself,—literally intoxicated with the effluence of its statistical information.

We suppose that, having issued to the world their fiery homily, its authors consider that the throes of their intellectual partition are over, and that their duty has been nobly done. This high sense of magnanimous effort valourously exerted raises them probably above all paltry vexation as mortified feeling. Were it not so, they would surely feel the huffling which the Leader gives them,—the Leader opposed to "all religious endowments as equally bad," yet altogether nauseating a production so weak vainglorious, factious, and blundering as this "Manifesto" is.

The innocent signers of the manifesto, says the Leader, will learn with shame and indignation what a string of falsehoods they have been seduced into endorsing. The public is gravely informed that the annual income now derived from interest and rents is estimated at from £100,000 to only about £27,000; that the present income is little over one-half of £50,000 per annum. In 1852 the amount distributed among the churches was £26,032 3s. 2d.; instead of £50,000. All the revenue but a mere fraction is distributed every year; so that the total amount actually received on account of the Churches of England and Scotland, by the Imperial Act of 1840, is £179,115 11s. 8d.; but of this the greater part was capital revenue, £5,551 10s. 19d. on account of old sales, and £25,002 19s. 10d. on account of new sales, leaving but a fraction over £14,000 of revenue, and against this there was a Crown land charge of £2,890 19s. 3d. for management. Of the point of revenue, then, the manifesto is grossly inaccurate. What it states as the revenue one year being nearly equal to that of two years."

The representations as to aggregate amount are equally incorrect. That aggregate amount is far short of a "million of dollars." He again we will avail ourselves of the *recherché* collection of statistical facts.

The Church of England has received from the Reserves for the following amounts in the years stated: 21 £150; 1822 £200; 1823 £275; 1824 £31; 1825 £1072 4s. 6d.; 1826 £2097 1s.; 1827 £2898 9s. 11d.; 1828 £2500; 1829 £261 2s. 2d.; 1830 £1200; 1832 £244 8s. 10d.; 1833 £675 10s. 11d.; 1834 £4,708 13s. 2d.; 1835 £110 9s. 7d.; 1836 £6,456 5s. 11d.; 1837 £132 11s. 8d.; 1838 £5,988 6s. 0d.; 1839 £132 17s. 2d.; 1840 £5,020 11s.; 1841 £1,941 11s.; 1842 £5,150 5s. 11d.; 1843 £1,313 11s.; 1844 £7,725 14s. 3d.; 1845 £5,728 8s. 2d. These sums comprise every shilling received by the Church of England out of the Reserves Fund up to the year 1846. Since that period, the amount has been shorter; but aggregate amount will be found far short of a million of dollars; showing the manifest to be a main false information on this point also."

4th. That a breach of faith in the public had as a breach of faith in an individual, productive of more extensive injuries to the public morals.

5th. That when once the principle is adopted that any bodies can be deprived of their property, because a majority (which in this case is the question point) cover it for the public, an agitation may as justly be raised to deprive the Canada Company of the remainder of the lands, because the people of the country never consented to their sale, and the company has already realized enough from the lands which they have sold to pay them the purchase money, and a fair profit on their investment, and then the step will easily be taken which will deprive the large landholders, or any every man in the community who, by industry and frugality, has accumulated more than his neighbours, who view it with an envious eye.

6th. That at the time of the revolution in neighbouring Republics lands granted by the Crown, religious bodies were held sacred and inviolable whereas one of the first acts of the French Republic, at the close of the last century, was to secularize all the property of the Church.

7th. That the robbery of the Church of England three centuries ago has, in a remarkable manner, been visited upon those noblemen and their descendants who have become possessed of the spoil thereof.

For these and other reasons, which might be given did you permit, your managing committee call upon all Churches to unite to the Church in this day of her trial, and neither through lukewarmness, timidity, nor hope of obtaining a fleeting popularity, which is gained without sin and lost without crime," shrivel up from opposing to the utmost of their power, every honest and constitutional measure, a measure which is unjust to themselves, subversive of the public morality, and calculated to bring down the wrath of God upon the country for this act of sacrilege; and, at the same time, to give every legitimate opportunity of the satisfaction of 1840, but also a measure transferring the proportion of lands belonging to each body of Christians to its own care, and requiring them to dispose of them within a limited period, that removing for ever from the area of political agitation the vexed question of the Clergy Reserves.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES AND TOPICS.

We feel much pleasure in recording the fact, that our worthy fellow-townsmen, Dr. Burnside, whose munificence to Trinity College will not soon be forgotten, has informed the Board of the House of Industry that he has placed in the hands of his executors the sum of £1,000, as a bequest to that Institution—signifying at the same time his wish that the money should be invested in real estate, so as to afford a regular annuity to the charity.

The English papers record the obituary of a man whose death will be felt to be a heavy loss—the Bishop of Salisbury; Dr. Jenkins, of Balliol College, Oxford; and Mr. Justice Talfourd. In Bishop Denison the Church has lost one of the chief ornaments of the episcopal bench. He administered the affairs of his diocese with strict integrity, through devotion to the Church, and a munificent hospitality to the poor as well as to the rich. His Lordship was likewise distinguished by his able and active exertions in favor of the Church's restoration to her right of synodical action. Dr. Jenkins rendered to his college services the value of which it would be hard to estimate. He prosecuted his designs for its advancement under difficulties, but with enthusiasm and high success. It was through his exertions that it was made an "open" college, and raised to its brilliant position in the University. He was universally beloved, and, although opposed in church principles to Mr. Gladstone, whose overwhelming influence at Oxford is well known, he always demeaned himself so amiably and so temperately, that there is probably not a single individual who entertains an unfriendly thought, or would breathe a harsh word of him. The death of that eminent lawyer, Mr. Justice Talfourd, was awfully sudden. In the very act of addressing the jury his voice suddenly ceased, and the spirit went back to God who gave it. His last words were about sympathy in the higher classes, and sobriety in the lower.

Information has reached us that the Lord Bishop of Quebec has received an official letter from the Hon. Col. Bruce, Governor's Secretary, announcing the arrival of a despatch from the Secretary of State for the Colonies, addressed to the Administrator of the Government, which signifies the very gracious reception by Her Majesty of the petition of the Bishop, Clergy, and Laity of the Diocese of Quebec, upon the subject of their synodical action, and mentions (a circumstance already recorded by us) the introduction into the Imperial Parliament of the Bill for relieving the Colonial Churches from their disabilities in this behalf. The Chancellor of the Exchequer has also been pleased, we understand, to signify to the Bishop of Quebec his willingness to advocate the interests of the Church in this matter. It was to him that the petition to the Commons was confided.

The keen observation of our adversaries, who deem it matter of conscience to say the worst they can of the Church, is pretty sure to bring to light all the real, and no small number of unreal, cases of Romanward tendencies amongst us. Italian affinity, however, springs from other soils besides an English one: witness the views recently propounded on certain doctrinal points, by a Dr. Nevin, president of a college under the care of the German reformed church. He repudiates most explicitly the notion that "the New Testament is a sufficient warrant for the modern system."

The Echo, in a correspondent's communication, reports the case of a young Protestant's perversion at the nuns' school in this city. We have always felt the strongest possible objection against the inconsistent and perilous step of sending Protestant children to Roman Catholic schools of that description, and we trust that the case now reported, if the facts be correct, will be improved as a warning.

The Patriot (London) gives a very dismal picture indeed of the present state of the Wesleyan Methodist Conference in England. Internal convulsions, it should seem, and rude assaults from without, are shaking the ruling body of Wesleyan Methodism to pieces.

These indicate the early stages of a complete disruption of the connexion, which, beginning in the very bosom of the conference, in the very heart, as it were of the body, will ere long reach its remotest members; and, shivering the great faith which has been the glory of the denomination, will leave it a miserable wreck, and an impressive warning to all other churches to beware of the first stealthy approaches of spiritual despotism."

did not consent to this reservation, when there was but a handful of them settled in the country, is about as sound a one as would be the argument adduced by children against a disposition made by their father of his estate, of which he was the absolute master, before they were born, because they had not consented to it. From the warm attachment of the U. E. Loyalists to Great Britain and all her institutions, and from their hatred of everything republican and leveling, as shown in the heavy sacrifices they have made on account of these feelings, we may fairly conclude that had they been appealed to in regard to this act of the parent state, they would have heartily sanctioned it. At any rate, this reservation was considered no "grievance" for thirty years after it was made.

Some have argued that because deeds for the lands thus reserved for a "Protestant Clergy" were not executed, as the lands were surveyed, the claim to them might be disputed. But this would be proving too much, for it would destroy the claim of the younger children of the U. E. Loyalists to their U. E. rights, for which deeds were not executed till many years had elapsed, in a great majority of cases, after the Government had been authorized to grant them their 200 acres apiece.

The case of the Canada Company may aid us in obtaining a correct view of this question.—About the year 1827 the Crown,—that is, the Imperial Government in England,—for reasons which need not be stated, appeared to the public, that company "The Crown Reserves" and the Huron Tract. The right of the Crown to do this, and the title of the Company to these reserves and this rich and valuable tract has never, as yet, been called in question.

For these and other reasons, which might be given did you permit, your managing committee call upon all Churches to unite to the Church in this day of her trial, and neither through lukewarmness, timidity, nor hope of obtaining a fleeting popularity, which is gained without sin and lost without crime," shrivel up from opposing to the utmost of their power, every honest and constitutional measure, a measure which is unjust to themselves, subversive of the public morality, and calculated to bring down the wrath of God upon the country for this act of sacrilege; and, at the same time, to give every legitimate opportunity of the satisfaction of 1840, but also a measure transferring the proportion of lands belonging to each body of Christians to its own care, and requiring them to dispose of them within a limited period, that removing for ever from the area of political agitation the vexed question of the Clergy Reserves.

But, about thirty years ago, a small but restless and unprincipled faction, anxious to raise themselves at the expense of others, imagined that the "Clergy Reserves" would afford them a good subject on which to agitate the country. They accordingly raised a hue and cry against them, because all did not share in the proceeds of them; defamed the clergy of the church in the most unscrupulous manner; and, finding many jealous of the standing of the clergy, succeeded in exciting a feeling against the Reserves, and the Church of England, in the year 1839, anxious to satisfy these agitators, or, at least, hoping to divide their forces, proposed to the twelve judges of England the question, whether the term "Protestant Clergy" might not be so construed as to include the Church of Scotland? which at that time took a prominent part in the agitation. The judges, who were judges of England was in the affirmative. Having gained this point, by which the exclusive claim of the Church of England and Ireland to these Reserves was set aside, the Government deemed it a matter of duty to go a step farther, and to divide the Reserves into two distinct denominations of Christians. By the Imperial Act of 1840, the proceeds of the Reserves were divided into two distinct but equal parts. The first was to be given to the Churches of England and Scotland, as those entitled to the whole of the Act of 1791; while the second was to be divided among the Churches of the United States, and other denominations of Christians. By the Imperial Act of 1840, the proceeds of the Reserves were divided into two distinct but equal parts. The first was to be given to the Churches of England and Scotland, as those entitled to the whole of the Act of 1791; while the second was to be divided among the Churches of the United States, and other denominations of Christians. By the Imperial Act of 1840, the proceeds of the Reserves were divided into two distinct but equal parts. The first was to be given to the Churches of England and Scotland, as those entitled to the whole of the Act of 1791; while the second was to be divided among the Churches of the United States, and other denominations of Christians. By the Imperial Act of 1840, the proceeds of the Reserves were divided into two distinct but equal parts. The first was to be given to the Churches of England and Scotland, as those entitled to the whole of the Act of 1791; while the second was to be divided among the Churches of the United States, and other denominations of Christians. By the Imperial Act of 1840, the proceeds of the Reserves were divided into two distinct but equal parts. The first was to be given to the Churches of England and Scotland, as those entitled to the whole of the Act of 1791; while the second was to be divided among the Churches of the United States, and other denominations of Christians. By the Imperial Act of 1840, the proceeds of the Reserves were divided into two distinct but equal parts. The first was to be given to the Churches of England and Scotland, as those entitled to the whole of the Act of 1791; while the second was to be divided among the Churches of the United States, and other denominations of Christians. By the Imperial Act of 1840, the proceeds of the Reserves were divided into two distinct but equal parts. The first was to be given to the Churches of England and Scotland, as those entitled to the whole of the Act of 1791; while the second was to be divided among the Churches of the United States, and other denominations of Christians. By the Imperial Act of 1840, the proceeds of the Reserves were divided into two distinct but equal parts. The first was to be given to the Churches of England and Scotland, as those entitled to the whole of the Act of 1791; while the second was to be divided among the Churches of the United States, and other denominations of Christians. By the Imperial Act of 1840, the proceeds of the Reserves were divided into two distinct but equal parts. The first was to be given to the Churches of England and Scotland, as those entitled to the whole of the Act of 1791; while the second was to be divided among the Churches of the United States, and other denominations of Christians. By the Imperial Act of 1840, the proceeds of the Reserves were divided into two distinct but equal parts. The first was to be given to the Churches of England and Scotland, as those entitled to the whole of the Act of 1791; while the second was to be divided among the Churches of the United States, and other denominations of Christians. By the Imperial Act of 1840, the proceeds of the Reserves were divided into two distinct but equal parts. The first was to be given to the Churches of England and Scotland, as those entitled to the whole of the Act of 1791; while the second was to be divided among the Churches of the United States, and other denominations of Christians. By the Imperial Act of 1840, the proceeds of the Reserves were divided into two distinct but equal parts. The first was to be given to the Churches of England and Scotland, as those entitled to the whole of the Act of 1791; while the second was to be divided among the Churches of the United States, and other denominations of Christians. By the Imperial Act of 1840, the proceeds of the Reserves were divided into two distinct but equal parts. The first was to be given to the Churches of England and Scotland, as those entitled to the whole of the Act of 1791; while the second was to be divided among the Churches of the United States, and other denominations of Christians. By the Imperial Act of 1840, the proceeds of the Reserves were divided into two distinct but equal parts. The first was to be given to the Churches of England and Scotland, as those entitled to the whole of the Act of 1791; while the second was to be divided among the Churches of the United States, and other denominations of Christians. By the Imperial Act of 1840, the proceeds of the Reserves were divided into two distinct but equal parts. The first was to be given to the Churches of England and Scotland, as those entitled to the whole of the Act of 1791; while the second was to be divided among the Churches of the United States, and other denominations of Christians. By the Imperial Act of 1840, the proceeds of the Reserves were divided into two distinct but equal parts. The first was to be given to the Churches of England and Scotland, as those entitled to the whole of the Act of 1791; while the second was to be divided among the Churches of the United States, and other denominations of Christians. By the Imperial Act of 1840, the proceeds of the Reserves were divided into two distinct but equal parts. The first was to be given to the Churches of England and Scotland, as those entitled to the whole of the Act of 1791; while the second was to be divided among the Churches of the United States, and other denominations of Christians. By the Imperial Act of 1840, the proceeds of the Reserves were divided into two distinct but equal parts. The first was to be given to the Churches of England and Scotland, as those entitled to the whole of the Act of 1791; while the second was to be divided among the Churches of the United States, and other denominations of Christians. By the Imperial Act of 1840, the proceeds of the Reserves were divided into two distinct but equal parts. The first was to be given to the Churches of England and Scotland, as those entitled to the whole of the Act of 1791; while the second was to be divided among the Churches of the United States, and other denominations of Christians. By the Imperial Act of 1840, the proceeds of the Reserves were divided into two distinct but equal parts. The first was to be given to the Churches of England and Scotland, as those entitled to the whole of the Act of 1791; while the second was to be divided among the Churches of the United States, and other denominations of Christians. By the Imperial Act of 1840, the proceeds of the Reserves were divided into two distinct but equal parts. The first was to be given to the Churches of England and Scotland, as those entitled to the whole of the Act of 1791; while the second was to be divided among the Churches of the United States, and other denominations of Christians. By the Imperial Act of 1840, the proceeds of the Reserves were divided into two distinct but equal parts. The first was to be given to the Churches of England and Scotland, as those entitled to the whole of the Act of 1791; while the second was to be divided among the Churches of the United States, and other denominations of Christians. By the Imperial Act of 1840, the proceeds of the Reserves were divided into two distinct but equal parts. The first was to be given to the Churches of England and Scotland, as those entitled to the whole of the Act of 1791; while the second was to be divided among the Churches of the United States, and other denominations of Christians. By the Imperial Act of 1840, the proceeds of the Reserves were divided into two distinct but equal parts. The first was to be given to the Churches of England and Scotland, as those entitled to the whole of the Act of 1791; while the second was to be divided among the Churches of the United States, and other denominations of Christians. By the Imperial Act of 1840, the proceeds of the Reserves were divided into two distinct but equal parts. The first was to be given to the Churches of England and Scotland, as those entitled to the whole of the Act of 1791; while the second was to be divided among the Churches of the United States, and other denominations of Christians. By the Imperial Act of 1840, the proceeds of the Reserves were divided into two distinct but equal parts. The first was to be given to the Churches of England and Scotland, as those entitled to the whole of the Act of 1791; while the second was to be divided among the Churches of the United States, and other denominations of Christians. By the Imperial Act of 1840, the proceeds of the Reserves were divided into two distinct but equal parts. The first was to be given to the Churches of England and Scotland, as those entitled to the whole of the Act of 1791; while the second was to be divided among the Churches of the United States, and other denominations of Christians. By the Imperial Act of 1840, the proceeds of the Reserves were divided into two distinct but equal parts. The first was to be given to the Churches of England and Scotland, as those entitled to the whole of the Act of 1791; while the second was to be divided