in landed estates took place, producing an ample supply of healthy industry, and occupation for the rich and poor. Their possessor being no longer the long-absented father of his family, rural blessings smiled on the land; "the rich and poor met together;" and the wife, aided by her household, held a useful and dignified sway amidst the innumerable employments which then fell to the charge of women of all ranks.

It has been the fashion to smile at, and to turn into ridicule, the domestic lobours and avocations of these practically wise and virtuous women of former days, who, in the events of war, and in the absence of a better guardian, could, in the strength of their concentrated duty and affection, secure their dependants from destruction and their home from pillage. Can we venture to cast reproach on her who, in perplexity, "did all that she could," —who was the mother of her family,—whose fortitude was so disinterested, that she forgot herself to save those whom Providence had committed to her care? Did she love the less deeply because she could bind up the wound, or close the eyes of the dying, for whose well-being she had lived? Had she first to learn to perform these tender cares at the awful moment when they pressed upon her as duties? No. The useful training of her education had envigorated her bodily powers, and her heart was supported by religion. Beneath the eye of her father and her brothers, she had from infancy the example of courage and exertion. Her family-duties were not, like ours, refined down to giving mere directions that one set of servants should direct another at a distance; on the contrary, her mind was strengthened by her actual acquaintance with the toils of the household, and its sources of support. The rental was augmented by her "liberal economy;" her household, while it consumed, also procured by its own labour the means, abundant or frugal, of its own subsistance. The corn, perhaps, which made their bread was grown on their own acres, and ground in the mill on their own stream; the malt and beer were theirs; the herds and sheep, perhaps, were subservient to their clothing; the spoils of the farm-yard and the groves filled the downy beds of those who did not court repose in vain. The valuable dairy, the provision of fuel, the lights of the short evenings of a busy household—all filled their place in the list of an English lady's ménage. Hospitality, with the care of the sick, the preparation of simples, and the storing of fruits and vegetables, produced no scanty work of head and hand for one who was at once a wife, a mother, a mistress, a guardian, and a friend.—"*Home Discipline.*"

THE CHURCH.

COBOURG, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 1843.

CONTENTS OF THE OUTSIDE.

First Page.	*Fourth Page.*
Poetry.—Confirmation.	St. Augustine of Canterbury.
Rubrical Conformity.	Venerable Bede.
Condition of Ireland.	Garner—Dr. Isaac Barrow; Rev. G. C. Croly; Bishop Sanderson; Bishop Ridley.
Wives and Mothers of Former Days.	

NOTICE.

A general meeting of the Church Society of the Diocese of Toronto, is requested to be held at Toronto, on Thursday, the 21st day of September, instant, at 2 o'clock P. M., at the Rooms of the Book Depository, for the purpose of taking into consideration the state of the Reserved Lands which have been set apart in Upper Canada for the support of Religion, and the necessity of making an immediate application to the Government, in respect to that portion of the said property which is assigned by law for the support of the United Church of England and Ireland,—as well as some other matters connected with the general objects of the Society.

JOHN TORONTO.

We promised to advert again to the important subject of the above Notice. By the Act which was passed about three years ago, and which finally regulated the question of the Clergy Reserves, it was provided that one-half of the Reserves unsold should be divided between the Churches of England and Scotland, in the proportion of two-thirds to the former, and one-third to the latter. Now it is important to the communion of the Church of England,—and, no doubt, to that of the Church of Scotland also,—that in regard to this allotment, arrangements should be adopted which would turn it to the best and most profitable account. They are concerned to look to this, because from the system pursued, or that appears likely to be pursued, the whole revenue therefrom is likely to be well nigh eaten up by the expenses of inspection and sale. This system, in short, seems to have been rendered as cumbrous and expensive as possible; for what object, it is easier to understand, than to approve. But if the local Government expect to augment their patronage, and advance their own interests by a system of inspection and sale which must result in the almost total sacrifice of the property of the Church, it is no reason that the friends of the Church should look tamely on, and contemplate the certain sacrifice, without a protesting voice.

The cant of the times has been to regard the existence of the Clergy Reserves as a great grievance; and since amongst the constituted inspectors of the Reserves there are not a few who were loudest in the condemnation of this alleged grievance, it is not too much to fear that their voice will be given now for its removal and obliteration upon any terms! They are thought, in some quarters, to hinder the improvement of the surrounding lands; and since a considerable number of the inspectors have a direct and personal interest in adopting that view of that question, we can hardly fail to anticipate from them a recommendation by which the public property should, as rapidly as possible, be transferred to private hands. Not but that, in many cases, the most scrupulous and conscientious fulfilment of their duty, is to be looked for on the part of the Inspectors; but the temptation is great to discharge it otherwise, and, in many instances, we fear that this temptation will not be successfully withstood.

The same feeling, combined with other motives no less probable and no less exceptionable, must be expected to operate against the interests of the Church, on the part of those who are to direct and manage the sale. The leading motive will be to dispose of a given quantity in a given time; and with this as the rule of action in the case, we cannot expect that the question of possible or needless sacrifice of the interests of the Church, will be taken very seriously into the account.

At all events, conceding to all the parties concerned the utmost good-will and conscientiousness, we are not to anticipate from them the same desire to subserve and protect the interests of the Church, which would be felt by a body directly concerned to promote her cause. On this ground, it is manifestly advisable to procure, if possible, the management of these lands into the hands of the parties most interested to turn them to an advantageous account. Let, for instance, the Church of England be permitted to manage for herself the remnant that is left to her; and let such management be guarded by all the provisions and restrictions which the Government may think necessary for ensuring a conscientious discharge of the trust. While, by this means, no room would be left, on the one hand, for unfaithfulness in the fulfilment of a public duty, we may, on the other hand, reasonably anticipate that the object of the reservation of this property would be more directly and beneficially promoted.

We do not enter into any calculation of what, with judicious management, the share of the Church of England in the Clergy Reserves might be made to yield; but we believe that if not hurried into sale, or needlessly sacrificed,—if attention should be paid to the permanent reservation of lots particularly valuable, and if the expenses attending their disposal and management should be restricted to the narrowest possible limits,—a decent, if not by any means an adequate, provision might be secured for the ministrations of the Church of England in this Colony; while, upon the present system, her extension from that source strikes us as all but hopeless.

We conceive, therefore, that no time should be lost by the members of the Church of England in endeavouring to procure, by some corporate power lodged within themselves, the management of their share of the Clergy Reserves; and if such an arrangement is absolutely all-important to the interests of our own Church, it must be equally so to the Kirk of Scotland, or to any other parties who have been led to expect benefit from the Reserves. The object of the proposed meeting of the "Church Society," on the 21st instant, is, we understand, to take this important point into consideration, and to adopt such means for its advancement as the peculiarities of the case may appear to demand.

A subscriber to our paper, who communicates with us through a mutual friend, appears to have made a strange mistake in his conception of certain of our remarks upon a recent article on "Mesmerism;"—as fancying that the expressions employed by us, in reference to that new device,—namely, that "if we should admit a direct supernatural agency for evil, we should have to acknowledge, at the same time, a direct supernatural agency for good,"—go to overturn the belief in the unseen, and always supernatural, operations of Almighty God in providence and grace! We might very naturally feel ourselves relieved from the necessity of any explanation upon this point, from a conviction that a re-consideration of our remarks must beget of itself the correct impression which they were intended to convey. The word "*direct*," applied to "supernatural agency," would, we should suppose,—in conjunction with the whole context,—settle the point at once. A direct supernatural agency, of course means one which is palpably and visibly different from one in correspondence with ordinary and known laws of nature,—one, in short, which is positively and visibly miraculous,—such as were the miracles and signs which our Lord performed; which he empowered his Apostles and his first ministers to perform; but which, if the power of working them, as is in some quarters contended, be still lodged in the Church, we have not had, as we believe, any satisfactory or undoubted evidence for fifteen centuries that it has been plainly and undeniably exercised. We beg to call the attention of that respected correspondent to the argument of Paley in the sixth chapter of the third part of his admirable work upon the evidences of Christianity, in support of the position which we think it reasonable and judicious to maintain upon this question. Suffice it then to say, that our meaning was this,—that if an agency for evil, directly supernatural, or, in other words, positively miraculous, were allowed, we must expect to see corresponding *miracles* performed of an opposite and counteracting character; miracles, properly so called, palpable, visible, undeniable. Though it is true that the whole direction and operation of God's Providence is to us a miracle,—much more his incomprehensible dealings of love in the salvation of the world; still, that is a very different thing from a miracle properly so termed and understood by us,—from such miracles as are recorded in the Old Testament, in the Four Evangelists, and in the Acts of the Apostles.

The respected writer of that communication would, doubtless, excuse us, if we made no observations whatever upon the further remarks he offered, and the suggestions he threw out. It would be enough for us to say, that if we adopted a half, or even a tithe, of the plans which are, from time to time, proposed for the management of our journal,—as to the topics that should be introduced and those that should be abstained from, the mode of treating this question or of discussing that one,—it would be found to present rather an unseemly medley, and a startling exhibition of contradictions! With all its imperfections, therefore, it would be better, we apprehend, to adhere to the plan which has been pursued so long, and with a measure of success for which every true Churchman has great cause to be thankful.

It is with mingled emotions that we advert to our remarks last week upon what we deemed a desecration of the Lord's Day by a portion of the Cricket Club of this town;—of regret, that those remarks should have given needless pain to any, and of satisfaction at discovering that there is a very general admission of the reality of the offence, and a very general acknowledgment that it merited pastoral rebuke.

We need not enter into any detail of our reasons for adopting that manner of conveying reproof for what we deemed a fault,—not wantonly or recklessly, but as we believe thoughtlessly,—committed, in a public way: our reasons must speak for themselves, and present themselves in the full force of their justice to every thoughtful mind which looks to cause and consequence beyond the restricted sphere of a mere parochial circle; and from our conviction of the absolute propriety of this manner of dealing with the subject, we have heard nothing that can by possibility induce us to say that we recede.

We are grieved, as we have said, unwittingly or unintentionally to have given pain in any quarter: it is foreign to our nature to do so; but we are often compelled, in the discharge of a public duty, to do violence to our own private feelings. All are liable to transgression; and the transgression we felt called upon, from the peculiar circumstances in which it was committed, to rebuke in so public a way, is not worse than a thousand others for which, under different circumstances, we should have considered a private reproof,—quite as gentle as was our public one,—to be sufficient. Where error, too, is acknowledged, the offending party,—from proving that they are swayed by correct Christian principle, any dereliction of which is a source of regret and contrition,—must always stand higher than ever in the estimation and interest of those to whom is committed the painful office of reproof, as well as of the Christian public at large.

We rejoice to feel that many of the highly respectable juvenile party, who thus,—thoughtlessly, and without due reflection, as we believe,—were chargeable with a public transgression of a Divine law, have entitled themselves to our heightened regard, by a frank acknowledgment of their error; and we cannot but hope that all,—if they are not already animated by the same truly honourable and Christian feelings, —will soon arrive at the persuasion that the surest way to maintain the public confidence and the public esteem, is manfully to confess the full propriety of a reproof which was meant, in any and in every quarter, to check offences of a similar character, but often far more aggravated; and that the pastor of a Christian flock, or the Editor of a Christian journal, is entitled to the thanks and the support of every Christian community, for doing what he can to arrest the career of thoughtless transgression, not less than the boldness of unblushing sin.

We have to acknowledge the receipt of an excellent Sermon, entitled, "The Doctrine of Infant Baptism, as taught in the Scriptures and practised in the Church,—By the Rev. Wm. Bullock, Rector of Digby, Nova Scotia."—We shall be glad to make extracts, on a future occasion, from this valuable discourse: at present we have only room for the following passage from its introduction:—

"I have strictly confined myself to the one great doctrine of Infant Baptism, and have purposely avoided the dispute upon Immersion, the Shibboleth of the Baptists; and upon the necessary qualification of the baptizer. But, I will here state that I am fully persuaded that the spirit of the commandment is fulfilled either by affusion or sprinkling,—each and all being practised in the Church; nor can I shrink from the avowal of my belief, that they, who so scrupulously adhere to the one mode of administering the sacrament, have no authority to administer it at all; and that having no scriptural ordination to the ministry, their baptisms must be irregular, if not altogether invalid."

We very sincerely thank this reverend brother for the kind interest he is pleased to express in the prosperity of this Journal, and for the efforts which he individually is making for its circulation. Our subscription-list in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick is a large and increasing one; and we shall always be most happy to render our paper the medium of ecclesiastical intelligence appertaining to those valuable Provinces.—We are permitted to say that Henry Stewart Esq., Postmaster in Digby, will act as Agent for *The Church* in that neighbourhood.

The Lord Bishop of Toronto,—we beg to remind our readers in this neighbourhood,—will preach in behalf of "The Church Society," in the Churches of Cobourg and Port Hope, on Sunday next;—in the former at Morning Service; in the latter at afternoon Service, which will commence at 3½ P. M. His Lordship will hold Confirmations at both those places, at the Services above mentioned. We publish again the list of his Lordship's further appointments for Confirmation:—

Tuesday, " 12,—Carrying Place, 11 A. M., and afterwards proceed to Belleville.
Wednesday " 13,—Belleville, 11 A. M.
Thursday, " 14,—Mohawk Church, 10 A. M. Napanee, 3 P. M.
Friday, " 15,—Bath, 10 A. M. Amherst Island, 3 P. M.
Saturday, " 16,—Fredericksburgh, 11 A.M., and Adolphustown, 3 P. M.
Sunday, " 17,—Picton, 11 A. M. Marysburgh, 3 P. M.
Monday, " 18,—Proceed to Kingston.
Tuesday, " 19,—Kingston, 11 A. M.

CHURCH SOCIETY OF THE DIOCESE OF TORONTO.

Collections made in the several Churches and Missions of the Diocese, in compliance with the Circular of the Lord Bishop of 10th July, 1843, to be appropriated to the formation of a permanent fund for the support of Missionaries, under a resolution of the Society passed at the Annual General Meeting of 7th June last:

St. George's, St. Catharines,—through the Rev. A. F. Atkinson,				£15	0	0
St. Peter's, Thorold,—through the Rev. T. B. Fuller,				4	10	0
St. James's, Louth,	£1	12	1½			
St. John's, do. through the Rev. G. M. Armstrong,	1	12	10½	3	5	0
St. Mark's, Niagara,—through the Rev. Thomas Creen,				10	10	0
Five Collections, amounting to...				£33	5	0

The Treasurer has also received for the general objects of the Society, an anonymous donation of £ 7 0 0

T. W. BIRCHALL, Treasurer.

30th August, 1843.

Communication.

KING'S COLLEGE UNIVERSITY.

To the Editor of The Church.

Sir,—The Synod of the Presbyterian Kirk in Canada has, I perceive, put forth what it calls "a summary of statements and arguments" on the subject of King's College University. This document, strange to say, first caught my eye in the *Baptist Register*, published in Montreal. As it is satisfactory to meet with any thing bearing even the name of argument, advanced against King's College, I take the liberty, from the interest which I feel in the advancement of Education throughout the Province, to request the favour of your inserting the following running commentary, in reply to the various assertions bearing the name of arguments, contained in this Presbyterian production:—

SUMMARY OF STATEMENTS AND ARGUMENTS

On the subject of King's College, as proposed to be made an Institution not only fit for the Instruction of all, but to be under Management by representatives from all classes in the Colony.

1. King's College has been endowed with public property, to a very large amount. There are 250,000 acres of land, which with good management might be expected, at no distant period, to yield a revenue of £12,000 or £15,000 a year. It is thus the most wealthy Educational Institution in British North America.

2. It is just and reasonable that all the great sections of the community should have the benefit of this endowment, not only as to admission to instruction and degrees, but admission to its management upon some defined and specific plan of representation in the council of the University.

Answer.—It is not "*just and reasonable*" that the Government of the University should be "*under management by representatives from all classes in the Colony.*" The University of King's College was founded and endowed by the Crown, and not by a tax upon any individual of any religious denomination in the Colony. As the free gift, therefore, of the Crown, a gift, I will add, the most munificent ever conferred upon any Colony by the benevolence of a gracious Sovereign, the Crown has an undoubted and *inherent* right to retain in its own hands the government of the University, to appoint its Principal and Professors, and to regulate its discipline, exactly in the same manner as the Methodists, the Roman Catholics, the Presbyterians, and the Baptists, have to regulate their own Colleges at Cobourg, Kingston, and Montreal.

3. The Legislature have recognised this principle, in the amended charter.

Answer.—The amended charter was passed by the Legislature, not because it had *any power* to do so, but because it was permitted by the Crown, very unconstitutionally, in my opinion. That this was also the opinion of the late Lord Sydenham, is obvious from the fact, that when the Provincial Legislature took it upon itself to incorporate Queen's College at Kingston, the Act, on being pointed out to the Law Officers of the Crown in England, was pronounced illegal, and the sound and constitutional doctrine maintained that to the Crown alone belonged the power of granting a Charter of Incorporation to any University in a British Colony.

The reasons of this judgment on the part of the Crown will be obvious to every one—Christianity being part and parcel of the British Constitution, it is the DUTY of the Crown to take care that in no portion of its dominions shall there be established, by Royal Charter, any University or Seminary of Education, in which Christianity and the teaching of Christianity, does not form the fundamental principle of its constitution and discipline.

4. The amended charter, however, does not provide for the permanent and equally proportioned influence of the various classes of the community: the government of the University being *de facto* in the hands of the Episcopalian body, whose influence is also increased by the appointment of Professors exclusively Episcopalian.

Answer.—If Episcopalians can produce higher testimonials of their abilities and acquirements than either Presbyterian or Baptist preachers, there is nothing in the amended charter, nor any reason in common sense, why members of the Church of England should not fill all the chairs in the University of King's College.

In the University of Edinburgh, since the barrier of subscription to the Westminster Confession of Faith has been broken down, every Chair of Literature or Science that, during the last fifteen years, has become vacant has been filled by a Scottish Episcopalian, and, in one instance, by a Clergyman of the Church of England,—the Kirk candidates having been beat *hollow* in every contest.

5. From the circumstance of the Episcopalians having this preponderance at starting, the apprehension is naturally entertained, that the University will be moulded into a pre-eminent Episcopalian form.

6. This last circumstance is so much felt by the public, who desire and have a right to expect that all Ecclesiastical bodies should enjoy a due share in the management, that the Institution cannot be expected to go into operation with that measure of cordial support and co-operation on the part of the public generally, which in the case of an Institution so liberally endowed with public funds, is so highly necessary and desirable.

Answer.—The government of the University has, upon the fairest principles of justice and expediency, been vested by the Crown in the hands, *ex officio*, of the chief functionaries of the Colonial Government,—individuals whose official *status* affords the best guarantee which the Colony could obtain, that the management of its University will not fall into incompetent hands; but on the contrary will be directed by men of talent and education, responsible to the Crown and in the eye of the Colony for the high trust committed to their care. But it is said that a body of irresponsible preachers, of all sects and descriptions, "*have a* RIGHT *to expect*" to be set in authority over the University, not, be it remarked, by any election on the part of the Colony, as expressed by its intelligence or education, but, *ex officio*, as the representatives of their own little sectarian seminaries of education, over which neither the Crown nor even the Provincial Legislature have the shadow of a control. Any proposition more monstrously absurd, more subversive of the rights and prerogatives of the Crown, or more destructive of the best interests of literature and of the University, could not have been advanced.

7. The feelings of distrust generally experienced, are greatly strengthened by the appointment of a Professor of Divinity of the Church of England alone.

Answer.—The prelections of the Professor of Divinity will, of course, be confined to those students of the Church of England who may wish to attend them. How this can create feelings of distrust, is beyond my comprehension. Do members of the Church of England feel any distrust at Dr. Liddell's lecturing on Theology in Queen's College in Kingston? I will add, that it is grossly insulting to our gracious Sovereign to affirm, that she has not the right to endow a Professorship to teach the doctrines of the religion which she herself professes, and the religion of the vast majority of her subjects, in a University which, as the Crown never dies, may be said, with perfect propriety, to be her own free gift.

8. Though King's College should proceed under these circumstances, it may be argued that under the amended charter, other bodies as well as Episcopalians may have a chance of acquiring influence in the Council; but it is obvious that this (which is not likely, as the business is to begin under Episcopalian influence) would be affected by perpetual contentions for influence in the University; which would make the University a scene of political animosity—whereas, as a seat of learning, it ought to be so constituted in its Council of management, as to make it the place above all others destructive of feelings of animosity.

9. This then is an excellent, perhaps the only opportunity of making the University the means of allaying all those feelings, and blending all great interests.

Answer.—There is nothing to prevent Presbyterians, or any other class of religionists, obtaining influence in the Council of King's College. The offices of Chief Justice, of Attorney and Solicitor General, &c., are just as open to them as to the members of the Church of England. As to preventing "perpetual contentions," the wit of man could not have hit upon a better plan for producing "perpetual contentions," than that proposed, viz., of wresting out of the hands of the Crown the government of its own University, and placing it under the control of a body elected by the various and contending sects throughout the Province.

10. This object might be gained by securing to all the leading interests of the country, a fixed and definite proportion of influence in the governing Council of the University. Each College, for instance, admitted upon certain conditions to form an integral part of the University, and possessing a certain number of Professors as its representatives in the Council.—Thus there would be secured in the Council a representation of the various interests of the country, and also of the various Ecclesiastical bodies.

Answer.—I have already sufficiently exposed the absurdity and the unconstitutional nature of the project of governing the University by an elective body, representing the heterogeneous religious sects of the Province.

11. If this opportunity be not embraced, and if King's College is to go into operation under exclusive Episcopalian influence; and if the Episcopalian church is to be the only one which is to have a Divinity course in the University, other Ecclesiastical bodies will feel that they have a right to demand endowments in the same proportion, for similar Institutions, as much under their control as King's College is under that of Episcopalians; which would be an intolerable, wasteful, and unnecessary drain on the public exchequer. The Legislature would thus be at a greater expense in perpetuating dissention, than in satisfying the just claims of parties, while they would lose the opportunity of producing harmony among the people.

Answer.—In this argument, No. 11, the Kirk knocks on the head the whole of its previous arguments, 1, 2, 3, &c. It has all along been arguing for the admission of a representation from the various religious bodies in the province into the Council of King's College, upon the ground of the Church of England being represented in the University by the appointment of a Professor of Divinity; but to what purpose, I would ask, if religion, as connected with any Church, is to be banished from the teaching of the University? Argument No. 11 affirms, that it would be "*an intolerable, wasteful, and unnecessary drain on the public exchequer*"! hear this, ye Baptists, Methodists and Independents, who are now backing the Kirk to endow Professorships of Divinity for each of the different sects. What then is the avowed meaning and intention of all this present sectarian agitation against King's College, but as follows:—

1st. To drive from the University the present eminent Professor of Divinity, and with him, the science of Theology, the noblest of all the sciences.

2nd. As it would be "*an intolerable, wasteful, and unnecessary drain on the public exchequer*" to found Professorships for each of the various sects, that every thing in the shape of religion, in a definite form, should be banished from the University, or, in other words, that King's College, founded and endowed by a Christian King, should be transformed into an Infidel College, denying in its corporate character the God who created and the Saviour who redeemed the world, and who has instituted his Church for conveying the benefits of redemption to a guilty world.

3rd. That in order to carry into effect this project,—a project as blasphemous against God as it would in the end be destructive of the supremacy of the British Crown in this British Colony, it is necessary that the Council of King's Council should be made—what! the representative of the Infidels of the Colony, if there unhappily be such persons? No; but of *its various ecclesiastical bodies!!!*—Well may men of plain understanding ask the question, if religion, in every definite form, is to be banished from the University, for what purpose should its government be vested in the hands of religious bodies at all?

12. The funds of King's College are amply sufficient for affording a University education for all.

Answer.—Undoubtedly they are; and all classes and denominations may avail themselves of the noble system of education now offered to them by the University of King's College. No religious test is required from any student, none from any professor, but that of merit, and a profession of his belief in the Divinity of our Saviour, and to any student who may happen to be a Presbyterian or a Roman Catholic, a dispensation from attendance on the religious services of the College is readily granted. Is it possible for the wit of man to frame the discipline of a Christian University upon a system more Catholic, or better calculated to diffuse amongst all classes the inestimable blessings of refined and intellectual education?

13. The argument may be advanced by the Episcopalians, that the charter of King's College is liberal enough; but other parties will view this as a mere evasion, in as much as having now the exclusive management, it is most natural that that party will make every effort not only to retain their influence, but to increase and strengthen their interests, by means of the University; and it is hoped that other Ecclesiastical bodies have no wish to be in perpetual conflict with Episcopalians for influence in the management of that Institution. It is a notorious fact, that at the present King's College is viewed with distrust by the whole community, except Episcopalians; and even among them it is well known that there is a very considerable proportion who would rejoice to see a system in reference to the management of the affairs of the University, very different from that which has hitherto been pursued.

Answer.—All the influence which the members of the Church of England possess in the Council of the University, has been obtained in the most constitutional manner, from their official situations, which they hold and have obtained from the Crown. It is the height of absurdity to attack any institution on the ground of its being governed as it is alleged by such and such persons, if the complainants cannot point out the *particulars* in which the government complained of is erroneous or corrupt. Not a jot or tittle of argument is advanced to shew either that the Professors of King's College are incompetent, or that its course of study is defective, or unfitted for the great ends of its foundation.

The assertion that King's College is viewed with distrust by the whole community, is altogether untrue. So far from it, that whilst the Kirk College at Kingston has turned out a complete failure, the University of King's College has started with a degree of popularity, and with prospects of success beyond what its most sanguine friends could have anticipated. Indeed, the prophetic hopes of the enlightened Governor Simcoe seem about to be fulfilled, viz. that King's College "*will in due progress acquire such a character, as to become the place of education to many persons beyond the extent of the King's* [now Her Majesty's] *dominions.*"

14. With regard to Queen's College being exclusive, an argument which may be employed against Presbyterians, it is manifest that Queen's College could have been nothing else than it really is, in as much as it was established by funds raised by Presbyterians; and all merely Theological Institutions must be in a certain sense exclusive. And Queen's College was originally intended to be merely a Theological Institution, and it is still the anxious desire of Presbyterians to make it so.

Answer.—Queen's College was not erected by funds raised exclusively by Presbyterians. Many Churchmen, very foolishly, were amongst its most generous supporters. The assertion that Queen's College was originally intended to be merely a Theological institution is grossly untrue. The support and benefactions of Churchmen were assiduously asked for in its behalf, on the ground of the perfect adaptation of its constitution to impart a liberal education to all classes and denominations of the community. That this was the burden of the various addresses delivered by Mr. Morris, Dr. Liddell, and even by Mr. Esson himself, will be in the distinct recollection of every one.

Here, Mr. Editor, closes my commentary on this "summary" of statements and arguments, as it is called, against King's College. I shall only add the expression of my confident hope that the loyalty and intelligence of the Colony will put down the agitation which has given it birth, and support the Crown in maintaining the monarchical constitution of King's College University against the assaults of its sectarian and, *in the end, Infidel* enemies.

I am, Sir,
Your's respectfully,
AULD REEKIE.

NOTE.—There is an old proverb in Scotland, that "Every herring should hang by its own head." I would recommend my Kirk friends to try and get their College in Kingston to stand upon its own legs. Why should they not endow Queen's College with a portion of the Clergy Reserve lands allotted to them? By and bye there will be room enough in Canada for two Universities. By taking this advice, they may rely upon it, they would make themselves much more respected in the eyes of all good men, than by leaguing themselves, as they are now doing, with Baptists and Independents, and a host of non-descript sectaries, in one common and impotent onslaught on King's College University.

Canadian Ecclesiastical Intelligence.

CEREMONY OF LAYING THE CORNER STONE OF A CHURCH AT THE CONSECON.

On Tuesday, the 29th August, the interesting ceremony of laying the Corner Stone of a new Church at the village of Consecon, in the Prince Edward District, was performed by the Hon. R. C. Wilkins, assisted by the Rev. Job Deacon of Adolphustown, and the Rev. P. G. Bartlett, of the Carrying Place.

The service was commenced by offering up some appropriate prayers from the beautiful Liturgy of the Church. After which was read the thanksgiving and prayer of David, when "with a perfect heart the people offered willingly to the Lord," taken from the 29th chapter of 1st Chronicles.

The Stone was then laid by the Hon. R. C. Wilkins, and the prayer—"This Corner Stone of the foundation we lay in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, &c. &c." was read by the Rev. Job Deacon. The beautiful and appropriate hymn beginning—"This Stone to Thee in faith we lay," was then sung by the assembly, after which the Rev. P. G. Bartlett delivered an address; and the ceremony was concluded by singing the also appropriate and beautiful hymn, "And wilt thou, O Eternal God, On earth establish thine abode, &c. &c." and the Benediction. A bottle, containing the last number of *The Church*, some silver and copper coins of the present reign, and the following inscription on parchment, was inserted in the stone:

In the name of the Father, and the Son,
and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.
This Corner Stone
of Trinity Church, in the village of Consecon,
was laid on Tuesday, the 29th August, 1843,
(and in the 7th year of Her Majesty
VICTORIA,
Queen of Great Britain and Ireland,
Sir Charles T. Metcalfe,
Governor General,
The Hon. and Right Reverend John Strachan, D.D. LL.D.
Lord Bishop of the Diocese),
By the Hon. Robert Charles Wilkins.
The Hon. R. C. Wilkins, the Rev. P. G. Bartlett, Major John Young, E. D. S. Wilkins Esq., and Joshua M. Cadman,
The Committee for the erection of the Church.
George Hayes, Contractor.
William Andrews, Builder.
This Church was erected by voluntary contributions.
"Except the Lord build the house, their labour is but lost that build it."

Before the meeting dispersed, a vote of thanks was passed to the Hon. R. C. Wilkins, for his indefatigable exertions to obtain subscriptions for the erection of the building. It is only due to the Hon. R. C. Wilkins to state here, that it is entirely through his means that this Church has been commenced, and that at a great sacrifice of time and trouble he has collected nearly sufficient subscriptions to complete the edifice, with the exception of the interior finishing.

This little sanctuary is to be built of beautiful lime-stone, evenly and regularly coursed, and smooth faced. It will have a tower 65 feet high, and the "acutely pointed" windows; and will altogether have a very neat and appropriate appearance.

To the Editor of The Church.

Dear Sir,—Will you kindly give a place in your journal to the pleasing instance of generosity noticed in the accompanying letter to Capt. George Ives, of the steamer *Frontenac*, from the Committee of the Consecon Church:

Carrying Place, August 25, 1843.

Sir,—The undersigned,—The Committee superintending the erection of a Protestant Episcopal Church in the village of Consecon, in the District of Prince Edward,—beg leave to offer you their sincere thanks for the very handsome manner in which you handed over to the Hon. Robert Charles Wilkins the sum of £5 5s., being the proceeds of your first trip up the Bay of Quinte, on Thursday last, in the Steamer *Frontenac*, in aid of the funds for building the said Church. Impressed with a strong sense of your kindness and liberality on this occasion, the Committee feel it but due to you and to themselves thus publicly to record this acknowledgment of their gratitude.

(Signed) P. G. BARTLETT,
R. C. WILKINS,
JOHN YOUNG,
E. D. S. WILKINS,
JOSHUA M. CADMAN.

To Capt. George Ives,
Steamer *Frontenac*.

English Ecclesiastical Intelligence.

SOCIETY FOR THE PROPAGATION OF THE GOSPEL IN FOREIGN PARTS.

July, 7, 1843.

The Society invites the attention of its friends to the following extracts from the recently published charge of the BISHOP OF MADRAS.

"So much misrepresentation has been circulated lately against the Reverend Missionaries of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, located in the different Colonial dioceses, of which those resident in my own have not, I fear, been without their portion, that I feel it my duty to this vast Missionary diocese, over which it has pleased Providence to call me to preside, and which I fully believe to be the richest, and, perhaps, the whitest field of missionary labour to be found in the whole world, to endeavour to repel it. We read from time to time, as the monthly mails arrive from England, dark hints of strange doings in the East, of a lingering after customs, if not of their open assumption, which savour of the worst follies of Romanism, and of a leaning towards some of its most pernicious doctrines; in a word, of a taint of semi-popery plainly to be detected here, as elsewhere, among the missionaries of the venerable Society. It is due, then, from me to my brethren who are labouring for Christ in my diocese, publicly to declare my firm persuasion, that not one missionary supported here, either by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, or by the Church Missionary Society, is not simply and soberly a faithful uncompromising clergyman of the Church of England, and that I could not wish for better men. The Missionary Church of this diocese is equally pure from extravagance and latitudinarianism; and I know not a single missionary in the employ of either Society who would shrink from the avowal, and who does not act upon the principle, that as it is his duty, so it is also his determination 'always so to minister the doctrine and sacraments and discipline of Chaist as the Lord hath commanded, and as this Church and realm hath received the same, according to the commandment of God.' The harmony that prevails among the clergy of the two Societies is indeed a cheering sight 'in a strange land;' God has joined them here together, in one heart and one mind for our work, and let not man strive to put them asunder. Solemnly, then, do I protest against such insinuations as those to which I refer, as most injurious to the cause of evangelical truth, and to the winning of countless souls to Christ. Weaken materially the resources of either of our Church Societies, and you stop the growth of the Gospel in every quarter of the Globe."

PROGRESS OF RELIGION IN SOUTHERN INDIA.

"* * * From its Diocesan I pass to a far more important and interesting subject, the state of our diocese; and on this subject, thanks be to the Giver of all good, I can, on the whole, speak cheeringly and full of hope. A marked improvement has taken place; we have more clergy, more churches, more schools, more communicants, infinitely more baptized natives and catechumens, though by no means enough of any."

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF SERVICES RENDERED BY THE SOCIETY FOR THE PROPAGATION OF THE GOSPEL IN FOREIGN PARTS.

"* * * And here I gladly avail myself of this more public opportunity of expressing my gratitude to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, without whose aid a Bishop of Madras could do but little for the advancement of Christianity on the sound principles of the Church of England among the natives. I have drawn largely on the Society's funds, and more largely still on its confidence. The funds intrusted to the management of our diocesan committee, to whose secretary (*) I here tender my warmest thanks for his equally valuable and disinterested labours at the cost of time and health, both so precious in India, as well as the very liberal grant placed at my sole disposal, have greatly assisted me; but the Society's confidence has been still more acceptable and cheering; and has bound me to it by a tie of love stronger even than that of duty. The Lord do so to me, and more also, if aught but death part me and it. To our other Missionary Society I am also deeply indebted for the many faithful men whom it maintains in my diocese."

"* Since the delivery of this charge at Madras, that faithful servant of Christ and zealous friend of the Society in this diocese, the Rev. F. Spring, has been most unexpectedly taken from us. His loss, heavy to all his friends, and they were all who new him, is to me unspeakable. Mr. Spring was a most unwearied friend to the propagation of the Gospel, in which cause no toil seemed too great for him. He worked, literally, from morning to night. The night is come upon him, in which no man can work; may his soul have found rest for His sake whom he served."

THE CHURCH IN AUSTRALIA.

(*From the Sydney Morning Herald, March* 27, 1843.)

In the *Sydney Morning Herald* of the 16th instant we alluded to an assumption by the Most Rev. Dr. Polding of the title of "Archbishop of Sydney." We then viewed the question simply in a secular light, the attempt on the part of a foreign prince to confer a title and territorial jurisdiction within the realm of England; the religious question involved in the attempt we left for those to deal with who are the appointed guardians of our religious interests.

The Bishop of Australia, as the head of the Reformed Church in this colony, conceived, and we think justly, that it became his duty formally to notice the assumption of Dr. Polding, and on Saturday last, in the face of the congregation in St. James's Church, his lordship read the protest contained in the following notarial declaration:—

"In the name of God. Amen. By this public instrument be it declared and made known to all, that in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and forty-three, according to the course and reckoning of the Church of England, on Saturday, the 25th of March, being the Festival of the Annunciation of the blessed Virgin Mary, at or near the hour of eleven in the forenoon, before the commencement of the morning service for the day, in the vestry adjoining and pertaining to the Church of St. James the Apostle, in the city of Sydney, and colony of New South Wales, in the presence of me, James Norton, notary public and registrar of the diocese of Australia, lawfully constituted according to letters patent of his late Majesty King William the Fourth, and in presence also of the witnesses whose names are hereinafter recited, the Right Reverend Father in God, William Grant, by divine permission Bishop of Australia, did personally put in and exhibit a certain written protest, and did then and there openly and publicly protest, and otherwise also did profess and do in such manner and according as was more fully contained in a certain parchment schedule which he held in his hands, and publicly read: of which schedule the purport is here inserted, and is as follows, without any addition or omission whatever:—

"In the name of God. Amen. We, William Grant, by Divine permission bishop and ordinary pastor of Australia, do protest publicly and explicitly, on behalf of ourselves and our successors, bishops of Australia, and on behalf of the clergy and all the faithful of the same church and diocese, and also on behalf of William, by Divine Providence, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England and Metropolitan, and his successors, that the Bishop of Rome has not any right or authority, according to the laws of God, and the canonical order of the Church, to institute any episcopal or archiepiscopal see or sees within the limits of the diocese of Australia and province of Canterbury aforesaid. And we do hereby publicly, explicitly, and deliberately protest against, dissent from, and contradict, any and every act of episcopal or metropolitan authority done or to be done, at any time, or by any person whatever, by virtue of any right or title derived from any assumed jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence, or authority of the said Bishop of Rome enabling him to institute any episcopal see or sees within the diocese and province hereinbefore named."

All and singular the foregoing acts and declarations were had and done as they are above written and recited in the year, month, day, hour, and place aforesaid; there being then and there present, (having been specially invited and summoned as witnesses in the premises,) the Rev. Robert Allwood, the Rev. Henry Hodgkinson Bobart, the Rev. William Branwhite Clarke, the Rev. Thomas Steele, the Rev. Henry Tarlton Styles, and the Rev. William Horatio Walsh.

(L. S.) (Signed) JAMES NORTON,
Registrar and Notary Public.

We, the undersigned Presbyters, duly licensed within the diocese and jurisdiction of Australia, being present in the church of St. James the Apostle, at Sydney, in the diocese of Australia and colony of New South Wales, on the festival of the Annunciation of the blessed Virgin Mary, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and forty-three, do hereby testify, that the Right Reverend Father in God, William Grant, Bishop of Australia, personally attending and assisting at the celebration of Divine service on the festival aforesaid, at the conclusion of the Nicene Creed, standing at the north side of the altar or communion table of the said church, holding in his hands a certain parchment schedule, did read therefrom, in our presence, and in the sight and hearing of the congregation, all that Protest hereinbefore set forth, without any addition or diminution whatsoever.

In witness whereof, in the year and on the day aforesaid, in presence of each other, and before the said Right Reverend Bishop of Australia, we have hereunto set our hands and seals.

ROBERT ALLWOOD, B.A., Minister of St. James's, Sydney, Commissary. H. H. BOBART, M.A., Minister of St. John's, Parramatta. W. B. CLARKE, M.A., Minister of St. Simon's, Castle Hill. THOMAS STEELE, LL.D., Minister of St. Peter's, Cook's River. HENRY T. STILES, Minister of St. Matthew's, Windsor. WILLIAM H. WALSH, Minister of St. Lawrence's, Sydney.

The reasons which induced his Lordship to take this step, may be gathered from the following Circular, addressed to the Clergy of the diocese:—

THE FESTIVAL OF THE ANNUNCIATION.

Sydney, 25th March, 1843.

REVEREND BRETHREN,—An occasion of no ordinary importance, and of no less difficulty, constrains me to summon you to the support of the Church entrusted to our keeping; and to claim your assistance, unitedly with that of the whole body of the clergy, to guard it from harm and loss.

Subjoined to this communication, you will find a Declaratory Protest, which, in fulfilment of my part of the common obligation, I have promulgated in resistance to recent acts of the see of Rome: such acts being in breach and contravention of the canonical laws, usages, and common order of the household of faith.

In calling your attention to this defensive measure, I am not studious of your instruction only; but it is my desire, that in communicating to the flock under your charge the decision which I have formed in this matter, you will explain at the same time the necessity to which I have been reduced. You will therefore take care to read in the hearing of your congregation, during the celebration of Divine service, and at the close of the Nicene Creed, on some Sunday or other festival which may be most convenient after the receipt hereof, all that protestation which is hereunto subjoined. I recommend also that you take occasion to notify to your parishioners the just grounds upon which that instrument has been drawn up; and after full deliberation, executed, published, and placed upon record in the Registry of this Diocese, as a perpetual testimony against the attempted invasion of the See of Rome.

To aid you in the execution of this necessary duty, I proceed to point out to you in what respect, and to what extent, the act against which I have thus solemnly protested does, by immediate and necessary consequence, infringe on our undoubted ecclesiastical rights and independence, according to the principles of that Catholic Church, to which we have never ceased to belong.

The inference from the establishment of an archbishopric with metropolitan privileges within the limits of the province of Canterbury must unavoidably be, that it is intended thereby to deny to the Primate of all England any rightful possession of metropolitan jurisdiction within the limits of the new or assumed archbishopric. Moreover, the erection of the City of Sydney, within this already existing diocese, into an episcopal see, amounts to a denial that there is a lawful Bishop of Australia according to the canons and usages of the Church. These are consequences which I could not witness in silence. They may not be universally perceived, or at once admitted; but there will be no dispute concerning them among such as are conversant with the system of the Church. According to its general rule, there can neither be two metropolitans of one province, nor two bishops in the same diocese. The one of these proceedings would involve a reversal of the canons of the Church, the other a contradiction of the ordinance of the Lord. The heads of the Roman Catholic Church are perfectly aware of the truth of these assertions. Their present proceeding is therefore an act of direct and purposed hostility towards us; since it could not have been adventured upon by them, except they had held, and had meant thereby to proclaim their persuasion, that we have no canonical bishop, no Catholic Church, no such administration of the Holy Sacraments among us, as shall be effectual to everlasting salvation.

The favourite and governing impression with the many you will find to be, that the matters in controversy might be adjusted by a tacit compact, or mutual connivance, according to which each should pursue its own measures without interference on the other part. It will therefore be proper for me to explain to you that we, at least, could neither propose nor accept such a compromise; which would make us parties in fact to the establishment of a permanent schism in the body of Christ's Church.

It is not necessary that I should enter very deeply into a statement of the grounds upon which we constantly protest against the right of the Bishop of Rome to exercise jurisdiction within or over any portion of the Church, beyond his own proper, actual, and immediate diocese and province; the range of which was determined by usage and canonical authority many centuries ago. But although such our denial of his supremacy be sufficiently known, yet in order that advantage may not be hereafter taken of our silence, under pretext that the present unfounded pretension to establish a metropolitan jurisdiction here by the sole authority of the Bishop of Rome was suffered to pass without contradiction or remonstrance, I have held it my duty thus publicly to declare, in express terms, in the face of the Church, that, beyond its own limits, the see of Rome possesses no right to establish bishoprics, or other offices of ecclesiastical order, in provinces of the Church where they already subsist. No such prerogative or privilege can be proved to belong to the Bishop of Rome, or to his see, either by virtue of any supposed succession or derivation from St. Peter, the first of the apostles; or of the authority direct or indirect of Holy Scripture; or of the testimony of the early Fathers; or by the decree of any General Council lawfully assembled; or through the mission of Augustine into Britain; or by the laws and statutes of this realm; or in any other manner, or by any plea of what nature soever.

Whatever widening of the unhappy separation which prevails, may be apprehended from the act to which, after full and mature deliberation, I have subscribed, such a consequence, however deplorable in itself, is not to be weighed in the balance against an apprehension of God's anger, which must fall upon us if we should, through fear of man, engage in a weak and ineffectual attempt to maintain outward peace by surrendering the fundamental principle of christian unity.

In my own name, therefore, as bishop and ordinary pastor of the diocese of Australia, and for my successors canonically entering, and in behalf of the clergy and all the faithful within the same Church and diocese of Australia, and also in the name and on behalf of my proper lawful superior, William, by Divine Providence Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England and Metropolitan, and on behalf of his successors, I have