

Colonial.

SECRETARY'S OFFICE, Quebec, 5th February, 1853.

His Excellency the Governor General has been pleased to make the following appointments, viz:

The Reverend William Bleasdel, M. A., Sheldon Hawley, Stephen Young, and George E. Redmond, Esquires, to be Associate Members of the Board of Trustees for superintending the Grammar Schools in the County of Hastings.

Elias Burnham, of Peterborough, Esquire, Barrister at Law, to be a Notary Public in that part of the Province called Upper Canada.

Arthur Shaw, of Niagara, Gentleman, to be a Surveyor and Landing Waiter in Her Majesty's Customs.

James Kinnear, of Walpole, Esquire, to be a Revenue Inspector for the County of Haldimand.

John Fitzgerald, of Stratford, Esquire, to be a Revenue Inspector of the County of Brant.

SPRING ASSIZES.

Eastern—THE CHIEF JUSTICE.

Brockville..... Monday, 25th April. Cornwall..... Monday, 2nd May. L'Original..... Wednesday, 10th May. Bytown..... Tuesday, 17th May. Perth..... Wednesday, 25th May.

Midland—MR JUSTICE DRAPER.

Kingston..... Wednesday, 20th April. Belleville..... Monday, 6th May. Picton..... Wednesday, 9th May. Cobourg..... Wednesday, 18th May. Peterborough..... Monday, 30th May.

Home—MR JUSTICE McLEAN.

Niagara..... Monday, 28th March. Guelph..... Wednesday, 4th May. Berlin..... Monday, 9th May. Bartie..... Tuesday, 24th May.

Oxford—MR JUSTICE BURNS.

Brantford..... Tuesday, 5th April. Hamilton..... Monday, 11th April. Cayuga..... Tuesday, 10th May. Simcoe..... Monday, 16th May. Woodstock..... Monday, 23rd May.

Western—MR JUSTICE SULLIVAN.

Sandwich..... Tuesday, 5th April. Chatham..... Monday, 11th April. Goderich..... Monday, 2nd May. Stratford..... Friday, 6th May. London..... Monday, 18th April.

Toronto—CHIEF JUSTICE MACAULAY.

Toronto..... May 2nd.

ARRIVAL OF THE NIAGARA

The Niagara, from Liverpool, arrived at New York at seven o'clock yesterday, with 35 passengers, among whom were Chevalier Hulsemann.

Liverpool cotton continued steady during the week, and closed firmly with advance on quotations of last week; sales of the week, 55,650 bales.

Breadstuffs all down. Wheat 2d. and flour 1s lower. Canal flour 25s 9d to 26s 6d. Ohio 25s. White wheat 7s 3d to 7s 6d. Red mixed 6s 9d to 7d. Corn—yellow mixed 33s to 34s. White 36s. All closed—dull. Beef active. Prime Mess. 97s 6d to 100s 10d. Pork 1s to 2s advance, but little doing. Lard dull—65s. Ashes dull; Pots, 26s 6d; Pearls, 28s.

LONDON MARKETS.—Colonial and foreign produce—firmer feeling. Flour and Wheat rather lower. Money in demand, without change in rate of discount. Bullion decreased 617,000.

CONTINENTAL NEWS.—The arrangements for the marriage of Napoleon, were nearly completed. The Empress Eugenia, has very sensibly written to the Corporation of Paris, declining the acceptance of presents of Jewellery, suggesting that they had better lay out the money in works of charity. It is said that an amnesty on an extensive scale would be promulgated immediately after the marriage. The rumour is still current in Paris, that a modification of the Ministry was about to take place. M. de Morny, would succeed Drouin de L'Huys. N. Magne, was spoken of for the Finance department, and Gen. Randon, for the War-office. The health of the Countess Chambord is in an alarming state, and her physicians express faint hopes of her recovery.

The Commerce of Cadiz announces that the steamer Nevada and transport Navigande would shortly sail for Havana with re-inforcements for the army in Cuba.

The Rhine rose on the night of the 15 ult., seven feet. On the following day the stream continued to rise a foot and a half every hour.

ENGLAND.—The non-arrival of any large portion of vessels with gold, known to be on their way from Australia, caused disappointment in London. Nearly half a million sterling was at sea previous to last advices via Singapore, and it is probable the Great Britain and Sydney steamers are now within 4 or 5 weeks of their return with an equal amount. At the same time, the exportation of goods had been good to an unprecedented extent and is increasing, so that Australia is at present indebted to shipments from England some £3,000,000.

Some specimens of Canadian gold from the St. Joseph District, on the Chaudiere River, have been tested by Thomas A. Bell & Co., and are worth three quarter grains less than standard with 28 penny weights of silver per pound.

R. F. Pries, the forger, is fully committed for two charges of forgery.

A collision took place in the channel, between the ships Herald, of London, and the Joham Carl,

of Riga, by which the former was sunk, and some 20 persons drowned.

INDIA.—General Godwin, having imprudently stationed an advanced post of only 400 men at Pegu, 60 miles from Rangoon, and within a short distance of the main body of the Burmese army, the Burmese commander immediately attacked it, cut off its communication with Rangoon, and seized an ammunition convoy, harassing the little garrison day and night. A naval force with 150 marines, 300 European troops and a steamship attempted to force the passage and reach the place, but were driven back with loss. Two columns of 2,400 men then left Rangoon, and encountered the Burmese and defeated them with great loss, and succeeded in reaching Pegu.

Communication.

(To the Editor of the Canadian Churchman.)

Sir.—As my letter on Confession was the subject of your last editorial article, I hope you will allow me to make further remarks on the subject. First of all it was never my intention to advocate the revival of auricular Confession, I never wished to see young ladies and gentlemen walk up to their Parish Priest, to confess their venial sins which they may have committed during the week, but I merely endeavoured to show that according to the doctrine of the Church of England, Priests have power to absolve all true penitent sinners and in support of what I advanced I gave quotations from three different parts of the common Prayer Book. My object in writing the letter was to contradict the assertion of the evangelical party who totally deny the Power of granting absolution as vested in the Priest-hood, now it is a notorious fact that these meddling clergymen do not attend to their duties and will not allow those who are willing to discharge their mission faithfully. I cannot see why you should take me to task for my explanation of the difference between the Church of England and Rome, as regards the practice of confession. I stated that in the one it was optional and in the other it was obligatory. Surely if confession is allowed in the Church of England it must be the one or the other, as far as morality is concerned I do not think we, Protestants, have much to boast of. Secondly, do we take up an old country Newspaper but we see some horrible murder, seduction, and infanticide, this too coming from people who are so zealous in circulating indiscriminately the Bible. As I see that you are shortly to have an article on liturgical reform I shall refrain from making further remarks on the present subject until I have seen it. In conclusion I always have great pleasure in reading your paper as I am sure it is a true exponent of the Church doctrine. I wish I could pay the same compliment to all papers devoted to the interest of the Church, in Canada West.

I remain yours truly, English Churchman.

(To the Editor of the Canadian Churchman.)

TABLE OR ALTAR.

Sir.—Your correspondent, "Churchman," perceives advocates the use of the word "Altar" in preference to "Communion Table" &c.—giving an extract from Stanton's dictionary of the Church in favour of his view.

The said dictionary says "The terms Holy Table, Communion Table, and Lord's Table, are sometimes substituted by the Church for the word 'Altar.' Now whether or not the Church in the States makes the substitution only sometimes, and uses 'Altar' interchangeably with other terms, I am not prepared to say; but we all know that our Church throughout the whole Book of Common Prayer invariably uses the term 'Table.' And while half-christendom used the word Altar as the corollary of a false hypothesis, and as a necessary accompaniment of a grossly superstitious tenet, our reformed Church was perfectly justified in expunging the name, together with the doctrine and the thing; and in adopting instead the simple term Table, which is a standing denial of, and protest against, that particular error.

Seeing too that the term altar is so much insisted upon by a party whose notions of the Eucharist have a remarkable leaning to that mystification on which Transubstantiation is founded, the safest course is to adhere strictly to the language of our Church, which admits of no mistake.

Your correspondent, with Wheatley (whom he quotes approvingly)—though the Prayer Book is much better authority than Wheatley's comment upon it—says that "for the first three hundred years after Christ the term altar was invariably used by the Church, and it was not until the very same period from which we date the rise of corruption, that the appellations came into general use, to the prejudice of the original name."

That it was so universally used is very questionable, notwithstanding Wheatley, and the allusions instanced by your correspondent, in some ancient canons. But admit that it was, and that the word Table only came into use, at the period when corruptions began to appear, instead of its being one of those corruptions, as our friend quietly insinuates, is it not just as likely that it was adopted in contradiction of a rising error?

Suppose that in the early ages the primitive names were more generally used, it is probable enough that the prevalence of an idea that an "altar" was a necessary part of Christian worship prepared the way for the payment of transubstantiation. The deceit itself required an altar, and found one ready for it.

It does not however seem to me to be of very great moment whether it was so used or not. It

might have been continued to be used with perfect harmlessness, had not a particular heresy grown up in which an altar became a thing of necessity, as part of the false doctrine involved in that heresy.

If we could metamorphose ourselves into the Primitive Church, or sponge out Romanism from the tablets of the past and the present, "Altar" or "Table" might be irrelevant. But this cannot be; and in our estimate of the right or wrong of any question—not being a Scripture doctrine or an Apostolic ordinance—we must be guided by the requirements and aspect of our own times and the voice of our own Church.

Your correspondent after stating the difference between the Romish doctrine of the Eucharist and that of our Church, observes, that "if this distinction had always been kept in view, the clamour about converting altars into tables would have sunk to rest, entombed in its own folly."

I may be permitted to suggest as not at all improbable that the fathers of our reformation were quite as well aware of all the great distinctive features of Romanism as we are,—that through the whole of the arduous task which they so nobly performed, they never lost sight of those distinctions—and that it was to maintain still more decidedly the distinctions between the Romish and English Church on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, that the substitution of table for altar was made. And it does seem to me very unaccountable that persons specially designating themselves Churchmen, should be so ready to set themselves against the language of the Church, and to speak of one of its deliberate and well weighed acts as a mere concession to a clamour which deserved to be entombed in its own folly.

However those who maintain the use of the word table in preference to altar have the Canons on their side, which the others have not.

A table is what it really is—a table is what the Church has ordered to be used, and a table is what the Church calls it.

H. C. C.

(To the Editor of the Canadian Churchman.)

Dear Sir,—If your correspondent Peter Brown, had adhered to his intention expressed in his letter of the 3rd inst., he would have been wise. But instead of that, fearing lest he should appear to be "writing down" his opponent, he has again appeared in your paper of the 27th instant, and there disingenuously avoids the point at issue, and concludes by asking a question.

Now, I appeal to any unprejudiced person, whether he has answered, or even really touched upon, what I advanced in the 5th and 6th paragraphs of my letter as printed in your paper. Whether it would be correct to ascribe this to what he designates "obtuseness" or design, I leave the public to judge, after stating that my own opinion is that he has acted disingenuously.

He alleges that I "avoid anything like a rigid analysis of the words of the Canon," and evidently assumes that he is the correct expositor of its sense. Surely the language of the indignant Cicero would not be inappropriate in reference to this assumption of Peter Brown. "Quosque tandem abutere, Catilina, patientia nostra? Quamdiu istius ferre iustis non eridetur?" Here in this matter he shows himself ready to go with the innovating spirit of the age and country, that would destroy or make void all our ancient institutions by thus invading the privileges of our ancient Church Universities, and travestying the badges of their honours.

Again I call his attention to the words of the Canon, "which (hood) no Minister shall wear (being no Graduate) under pain of suspension. Notwithstanding, it shall be lawful for such Ministers as are no Graduates to wear upon their Surplices, instead of Hoods, some decent Tippet of black, so it be not of silk."

Here the language is express, the hood (capitulum) is forbidden altogether, and the tippet (liripium) prescribed. Your correspondent indeed, in his second letter admits that the liripipe, or liripoop, is not a hood, but only part of it, in the following words, "The liripipe is that part of the hood which hangs down, often to a great length from the part which more immediately covered the head;" and he further refers us to Strutt's English dresses.

Now, I have a work which contains engravings from Strutt, and from M.S.S., in the Royal collection, which illustrates this point, viz. "Old England," published in two folio vols., by Knight, of London. And I am willing to believe that the word was applied, but not altogether to what might be designated the top-tail or the end of the hood. If Esqr. Brown is content with this interpretation, and will act upon it, I am sure that I am.

But in the name of justice and common honesty, I do trust that the hood itself, whether it be imitative of some university or not, will not be assumed by any one who has no such university status as a degree conferred by an university that prescribes the use of the hood.

In the 1st vol. of the work, which I have referred, at page 381, the author designates certain pendants worn or attached to the shoulders and hanging as low as the knee, in the male and female costume of the reign of Edward I., and figured in the engravings numbered 1129 and 1138 as "long streamers of tippets." And this I apprehend, is the original meaning of the word tippet, which might be applied to these pendants, or to the part of the hood to which I have referred. These streamers appear to have been fastened to the part of the dress covering the shoulders; but notwithstanding this, it may have

given rise to the idea that the stole or modern scarf was the ancient tippet.

If your correspondent would prefer such tippets as I have here adverted to should be worn, I have no doubt but that every Graduate would say that he and his sympathisers were welcome to their use, but not to the hood.

I would, Mr. Editor, as much as possible, abstain from sarcasm, but I am sorely tempted to it in dealing with the position assumed by your correspondent, and I should be sorry that any literate should do anything at which "the hand of scorn might point his slow, unmoving finger at," which would certainly be the case as soon as the university hood was speedily imitated. It is in accordance with the spirit and teaching of our Church that men should appear what they really are, and not what they are not. A non-graduate has no academic standing, no university status, consequently he has no pretence for wearing a hood. Let the literate in orders wear all that belongs to his office as Deacon or Priest, but not that which is the layman's right as well as the clergyman's; provided that they are graduates of an University where the use of the hood is enjoined.

With respect to Peter Brown's remark that there "will not be many of my way of thinking," referring to the mode of attack &c. I can only say that my two nearest clerical neighbors, speaking of the point at issue only two days since, said that your correspondent's position was such that they entirely approved of the course adopted toward him. Furthermore, one of them, a Rector and Rural Dean, said that he would not allow a literate with a spurious imitation of a hood to officiate in his Church.

Whatever may be the ecclesiastical faults imputed to the Bishop of Manchester, by your correspondent, he is not destitute of that spirit to which I have already referred as imputed by our Church, of men appearing what they really are, and consequently determining that those over whom he exercises authority should canonically appear as too.

In conclusion, I would remark, that if in any thing I have said in this letter, I may have appeared too severe, I can only say that an inveterate disease requires strong remedies, and in his last letter Peter invited it by accusing me of refusing "to follow the Canon to its legitimate results," and language of a similar character.

Yours, faithfully, A. GRADUATE.

Diocese of Toronto, } Jan. 31st, 1852. }

(To the Editor of the Canadian Churchman.)

MONO FEB. 7th 1853.

Rev. Sir.—I sent a letter to the Editor of the Christian Guardian on the 12th ult. in reply to some remarks which he had made in the previous number of that paper, on myself and the treatment that he pretends Wesley received from the Church; but he refused to insert it. Will you do me the favour to give it an insertion in your next issue.

I am Rev. Sir, yours sincerely, John Fletcher.

(To the Editor of the Christian Guardian.)

MONO, JAN. 12, 1852.

Sir.—A friend has favoured me, with a copy of your paper of the 5th inst., in which I observe a critique upon a letter that I considered it necessary to address to the members of your Society in my opinion. I request that you will give me the opportunity of setting your readers right with regard to the misstatements you have made in it, as they are calculated to mislead those who have not had the opportunity of seeing the subject of your animadversions.

May I not properly ask you, if you had intended to discharge the duty of an impartial critic would you not have had the honest manliness to take extracts from the work upon which you were commenting, in order that your readers might have had the opportunity of hearing both sides of the question. But this course, Sir, would not answer your purpose. My plain straightforward warfare would ill comport with your gross perversion of truth, and your own readers being the judges, you will appear weighed in the balance and found wanting.

Might I not also properly ask, is your editorial a general sample of the "Christian" spirit of what you profess to be the "Guardian," as if so it is diametrically at variance with the Christianity of the Bible. There we are taught that humility is characteristic of the followers of the lowly Jesus, but in your observations I see too clearly displayed that spirit for which your Society has been and is still noted—spiritual pride. I shall now proceed to notice your misstatements and deviations.

1st.—That the pamphlet in question had been written for the purpose of grossly abusing. If you Sir had read the pamphlet you pretend to criticize, you would have seen that this was not its object. Had this been my design I would have adopted a far different style and shown not only the beauty of that Church of which I have the honour of being a minister but also the deformity of the system which I would have been opposing. But instead of doing so I merely acted on the defensive, answering from Wesley's works objections made in this neighborhood against the Church, of which Wesley lived and died a minister. If you had had a desire to see what was the intention of my letter, you would have found that it was "to support the following assertion, that the objections to the Church which are commonly held by you, were not held by our founder, and that consequently methodism in Mono and I suppose in the whole of Canada is not the methodism of John Wesley." This Sir is the petition I