TO THE PUBLIC.

THE proprietors of *The Weekly Mail* beg to announce that on and after the first of January the annual subscription price will be dollar and a half.

When the publication of *The Weekly Mail* was commenced, the price was fixed at one dollar, with a view of introducing the paper to as wide a circle of readers, and in as brief a period of time, as possible. The objects sought were attained, for the incredible success of *The Weekly Mail*, followed with great rapidity, until now the number of its readers is counted at fifty thousand. At the same time the proprietors assumed the burden of gratuitously supplying the subscribers to the *Weekly Telegraph*, which was about ceasing to exist, with *The Mail* which should be at once a substitute for and an improvement upon the paper to which they had paid their subscription. The obligation thus assumed has been fully discharged, and every subscriber to the *Weekly Telegraph* has received *The Weekly Mail* up to the close of his subscription to the former.

A very large, handsome, and carefully prepared journal, such as *The Weekly Mail* is, could not be produced without incurring a heavy expenditure both in money and labour; in point of fact, the material has absorbed nearly the whole of the subscription price. The proprietors were prepared, however, to publish *The Weekly Mail* without pecuniary profit until their engagement with the subscribers to the *Telegraph* had been fully and faithfully performed. They feel that this has been done, and that the time has come when they should seek to place the paper upon a paying basis. The annual subscription will therefore be raised as above stated, one of the first consequences of which will be a marked improvement in the paper, which even at present rates has been proved to be the most popular weekly circulated in this country.

It is hoped and believed that the friends and patrons of the paper will recognize the propriety of our present course, and will redouble their exertions to extend the circulation and strengthen the influence of *The Weekly Mail*.

TO AGENTS.

The terms to Agents and Clubs will be raised *pro rata*, in conformity with the change in price as above announced.

The Weekly Mail.

TORONTO, FRIDAY, JUNE 12, 1874.

NOTICE.

Subscribers are reminded that the coloured address-label of each paper sent to them shows a figure which indicates that future number of the paper up to which their subscription has been paid, serving, in fact, as a date. The current weekly number can readily be ascertained by reference to the volume and number printed on the title page.

We are informed that a person representing himself as a travelling agent of this journal is soliciting subscriptions for *The Weekly Mail*, throughout the townships of West Gwillimbury and Tecumseth. We have no travelling agent. Numerous flagrant instances have occurred in organizing local clubs, and otherwise aiding in furthering the circulation of the *Weekly Mail*. Such acts, of course, either well-known in the locality where they are canvassing or accredited by this office.

LIBERAL-CONSERVATIVE ASSOCIATIONS.

We have received several letters from friends throughout the country who are office-bearers in newly formed Liberal-Conservative Associations, or are desirous of forming Associations, asking for information as to the way in which they should act, and for copies of the Constitution of the Toronto Association. We take this means of informing our friends who have written us, as well as others who may be in the same position, that they will best get the information they desire by addressing "The Secretary of the Liberal-Conservative Association, 85 York street, Toronto," who, we have no doubt, will be pleased to give them all the information they may require.

THE WEEKLY MAIL.

THE attention of our readers is directed to an advertisement on another page, from which will be seen the inducements held out to persons having time or inclination to form Clubs for the circulation of *The Weekly Mail*; a paper specially suited for readers at a distance from Toronto, whether residing in the country part of Canada, in Great Britain, the United States, or other foreign countries. For cheapness, in comparison with the wealth of information to be gleaned from it, *The Weekly Mail* is in advance of all competitors for popular favour, while the unparalleled success which has followed it since its first publication, is a gratifying evidence of the exhaustless tact displayed in the tastes of the reading public. No doubt, one cause of the extraordinary success which *The Weekly Mail* obtained its immense circulation was that members of the Great Liberal-Conservative Party, barrier as it was to the furtherance of the cause of Union and Progress, at once became it a favourable reception in the country constituencies of Members of Parliament, as well as intending candidates for Parliamentary honours, have not been slow to see that a sifting was best prepared for a canvass in the interest of their Party, by the circulation of *The Weekly Mail* among the intelligent electors. Consequently, as a cheap and effective co-operator in the political education of the masses, unmoved by efforts ever made by influential local residents to promote the circulation of the paper in the neighbourhood of their own homes. The present crisis in the political history of Canada would indicate the necessity for redoubled energy in the same direction.

THE RELIGIOUS ANNIVERSARIES.

In conformity with the wishes of the great majority of our readers, we devote a chief portion of this week's issue to reports of the meetings of the various Church organizations in Canada. They have been carefully prepared by special reporters and correspondents of the *Mail*, and will be found of unusual interest.

RESUMPTION.

AMONG the most important announcements of the mail day or two ago is that which gives the world to understand that President GRANT has declared for the speedy resumption of specie payments by the Government of the United States. The fact itself is beyond question. The text of a memorandum from the President, which is just published, shows that he has, beyond possibility of recall, committed himself to a policy of resumption within two years from the first of July. In his memorandum on desirable financial legislation, he says that he states merely the general features of a plan for resumption; but this professedly general sketch is in fact sufficiently definite to insure that resumption of specie payments must promptly follow its adoption by Congress as a basis of legislation. There is every reason to believe that the new Secretary of the Treasury, General BRISTOW, has been selected specially with a view to the carrying out of the policy indicated in the President's memorandum. He is not spoken of as a man of financial reputation, but he is spoken of as a man who has in him enough both of honesty and determination to make sure that while he remains in office neither BUTLER nor any other representative of what has been called "Butlerism" in politics will be able to appoint "special agents" of the Treasury, sitting power to put public money into private pockets. He is not expected to originate a financial policy for the United States, but merely to "execute the laws" and to enforce common honesty in Treasury management. It is not too much to say that even in this apparently limited role he has abundant opportunity of making himself one of the most distinguished financiers of the day in the United States. If we may be allowed to hazard a guess we should say that probably the real adviser of the President, and the potential Secretary of the Treasury of the United States to-day, is Hon. Horace MACCULLOCH, a former official compatriot of the position, now in London in the business of a banker. When "Cooke's crash" came last September, he was involved to some limited extent as a London partner in the house of Jay Cooke, but with admirable promptitude he hastened over to this side of the water, and at whatever sacrifice, more or less as it may have been, cut himself clear of entangling alliances. We take it that President GRANT's determination to the currency question is not only backed by the money power of New York, but that London also is at his back to give effect to the policy which he has announced. Without taking time at present to criticize this policy, or to say what its results are likely to be, we venture to advise all concerned to bear it as the policy that will certainly be carried out, and to govern themselves accordingly.

ABOLITION OF CHURCH PATRONAGE IN SCOTLAND.

In the House of Lords a bill has been brought in providing for the total abolition of patronage in the Church of Scotland. An attempt was made to deal with the subject last year; it was brought forward in both Houses by private members, and was evidently favoured by high quarters, but was both ill-timed, but Mr. GLADSTONE pleaded for a brief delay, and nothing was done. This year the men now in power bring in a bill dealing with it as a Government measure. The measure was introduced by the Duke of RICHMOND in the House of Lords. The bill provides that the presentation by private patrons to benefices in the Church of Scotland shall cease, that patronage rights shall be compensated for out of the exchequer, and that henceforward ministers shall be elected by the male communicants in each congregation, subject to such rules as the General Assembly may lay down. The London *Times* (May 19) other remarking that the General Assembly was then about to meet in a day or two at Edinburgh, on which occasion some important criticism of the scheme might be expected, adds that "at present it seems simple and straightforward enough to evade all "attacks that are not studiously "malignant." The hint which the leading journal gives of the existence of a "studiously malignant" opposition at home appears to have its application here also, as something closely resembling to the description is conspicuously visible in the columns of a city contemporary. At a time when the two Presbyterian bodies in Canada are discussing the question of Union it shows anything but good feeling or good taste when a political journal which tactfully claims to speak for one of them, indulges in ungratuitous abuse of the parent church with which the other is connected. We do not suppose the existence of some such feeling as that hinted at both in the House of Lords and in the British press—that of fear least the measure now before the Imperial Parliament might have the effect of strengthening the Kirk, an institution which Scotchmen, as all events, should rather venerate and honour. But, to return to what has been done and said in Britain with regard to the matter in hand, we find a very general approval of the Duke of RICHMOND's new proposes to do. Details of the measure are not yet given, only its general lines are known. Sensitiveness is already it appears certain that it will shortly become law, and that what has been done at home and intention in Scotland will be finally done away with. The attitude of the Free Church body towards the bill is scarcely fail to be altogether changed; and, it is possible that, as the Liverpool *Post* remarks, the fear of losing, precisely this, that the new measure may are long cause the return of that body into the old connection. On the different positions occupied by the Free Church and United Presbyterians, respectively, in Scotland, the *Times* thus remarks:

"The United Presbyterians, however, may be said to be now separated from the Establishment by a dividing question which is almost as vital and which ranks with Patronage, for they are almost to a man Voluntaryists, and no change in the law of the Kirk relating to patronage can reconcile them to the Union between Church and State. The position of the Free Church is altogether different. The men who protested and seceded in 1843 believed most firmly that there shall be no interference of religious sentiment; and, though, they believed that the interference of the law with the Church was a sacrilegious act, to be resented even at the cost of quitting a spiritual home and sacrificing worldly professional status and worldly prospects, they were in some sense committed to Voluntaryism. In fact, their distinctions by stand committed even indirectly to the voluntary principle is one of the things that have prevented the long mediated amalgamation of the Free Church with the United Presbyterians. But if the Duke of Richmond's proposal should become law, there will be nothing, except a spirit of rivalry, that could prevent the Free Church accepting the Establishment. If personal jealousies and animosities were laid aside, the Assembly should be able soon to present to the world as imposing a front as it showed before the Disruption. It is a fine field, one, for it would not be ruined by any of those "Disruptions" which make the Church seem so violent and painful. Of course for this very reason the Anti-State Church party do from the first seem to have taken a position which might result in giving the Establishment a new lease of existence; but that party is not powerful at present in Parliament, and if the provisions for granting compensation for the abolition of patronage be skilfully guided through both Houses of Parliament, and the Assembly's proposal meet in its hands,—a victory it has been striving for, when during several successive years large majorities in the Assembly have spoken in favour of abolishing those rights of patronage which have led to so much bitterness and in the ecclesiastical politics of Scotland."

There can be no question of the real, substantial truth of the distinction drawn by the *Times*, as between the United Presbyterians and the Free Church bodies in Scotland. Had the Free Churchmen who left the Establishment in 1843 been Voluntaryists, there would be no proper place should have been found at once with the Secession body, dating back to 1732, which has ever been consistent in opposition to everything savouring of Union between Church and State. The United Presbyterians, if, were not Voluntaries—or Voluntaryists, as the *Times* now frames the designation—and they were believers in the principle of Church and State, for which reason it was that, when leaving the Establishment, they felt that they could not consort under with those who repudiated such union altogether, and that they must take up a middle ground between the two. Their position was not a very logical one, strictly speaking, but whatever defect there may have been in this way was lost out of sight by an outburst of energy and action springing from deep conviction and earnest longing for the spiritual and the expansion and prosperity of the Free Church. It was the outburst of the zeal of the marvels of the age. When patronage is finally abolished, as it will now certainly be, it will be difficult to tell what defensible barrier remains that should continue to separate the Free Church from the parent Church in Scotland. Here the conditions are altogether different, and it seems just as difficult to realize what need there was or could be for a division in the church, where, if anything, which caused the disruption in Scotland, is unknown. Here, surely, the differences which have prevailed in part are those of form merely, and not of substance. In one direction only do we see any danger of a division arising, and of such danger a warning appears in the case of Mr. SCOTT in Chicago, threatening a disruption of the old and new schools of Presbyterianism, only recently united. If there were ground for believing that, either in Scotland or Canada, such divisions as to doctrine as those between the old and new schools in the United States were coincident, or nearly so, with political dividing lines between the Free Church on one hand and the Kirk on the other, then, we should say, Union might be a hazardous experiment. In Scotland there does appear to be some danger of this sort, and one by no means altogether imaginary, either. A majority of Free Church ministers in Scotland holds the most extreme "Old School" doctrine; they are thoroughly stamped and committed in their belief; and would speedily excommunicate by "bell, book and candle," not only such men as HENRY WARD BEECHER, THEODORE CUYLER, and DAVID SWING, but also all such men as Dr. WALLACE and the late Dr. NORMAN MACLEOD; while even the venerated CHALMERS, were he to appear again and delivered his "Astronomical Discourses," might be in danger at their hands—or from their votes. It is extremely doubtful whether the Reverend Robert Moffat, certainly one of the fathers of the Free Church, though a layman, would now be tolerated in some quarters, as one of early contemporary before alluded to mentions, the Establishment has the land and the people. It is just possible that apparent strength of numbers may mislead, and that the Free Church Christian truth requires for its defence men of really superior intelligence and culture than are to be found, or, at all events, in either School or General Assembly, by a majority of the former. It is disappointing, and to be noted in that congregations having first-class men for their pastors will certainly not be so much of a desirable barrier remains that should continue to separate the Free Church from the parent Church in Scotland. Here the conditions are altogether different, and it seems just as difficult to realize what need there was or could be for a division in the church, where, if anything, which caused the disruption in Scotland, is unknown. Here, surely, the differences which have prevailed in part are those of form merely, and not of substance. In one direction only do we see any danger of such a division arising, and of such danger a warning appears in the case of Mr. SCOTT in Chicago, threatening a disruption of the old and new schools of Presbyterianism, only recently united. If there were ground for believing that, either in Scotland or Canada, such divisions as to doctrine as those between the old and new schools in the United States were coincident, or nearly so, with political dividing lines between the Free Church on one hand and the Kirk on the other, then, we should say, Union might be a hazardous experiment. In Scotland there does appear to be some danger of this sort, and one by no means altogether imaginary, either. A majority of Free Church ministers in Scotland holds the most extreme "Old School" doctrine; they are thoroughly stamped and committed in their belief; and would speedily excommunicate by "bell, book and candle," not only such men as HENRY WARD BEECHER, THEODORE CUYLER, and DAVID SWING, but also all such men as Dr. WALLACE and the late Dr. NORMAN MACLEOD; while even the venerated CHALMERS, were he to appear again and delivered his "Astronomical Discourses," might be in danger at their hands—or from their votes. It is extremely doubtful whether the Reverend Robert Moffat, certainly one of the fathers of the Free Church, though a layman, would now be tolerated in some quarters, as one