

pal Church in America, which prayer-book is all but a reprint of our own inimitable compilation. So that there are at present in the East three separate Churches, which, were overtures to be made, might, no doubt, be welded into one, and put an end to the scandal of having in the same town the "followers of Paul, Apollos, and Cephas."—*Corresp. London Guardian.*

Correspondence.

The Editors of the Church Times do not hold themselves responsible for the opinions of their correspondents.

FOR THE CHURCH TIMES.

KING'S COLLEGE, WINDSOR.

Sir—The city having been rife for some time past with rumors of a Row in the above institution, it may not be uninteresting to those of your readers who have not the means of knowing all that is passing, to learn some of the particulars of the affair referred to.

I think it also due to the College, in the absence of authoritative information,—of which, by the way, we have so little upon any subject, that I, and I doubt not many others, would feel deeply grateful to any of your readers who would enlighten us from time to time as to the disposal of our funds, the state of the Balance-sheet, &c., &c. These the people, who are now the patrons and paymasters of this popularised institution have a natural curiosity, if not the right, to inspect. It is due, I say, to the College, to remove the impression which is already widely spread, that so severe an act of discipline could only be called forth by the recurrence of such scenes of dissipation and disorder as happily for some years have been entirely unknown. It is due also to the young men on whom this disgrace has fallen, to make it widely known that it is for no act of immorality nor for any crime. It appears from what we can learn, that for some short time previous to the grand *dénouement* the smaller boys had been undergoing the usual process of domestication—the first lessons in the battle of life—the most serious of these was the smutty joke of stuffing their flues. To effect this it was necessary to remove the lock which secured the hatch leading to the roof, and this having been repeated in the face of the functionary whose duty it is to look after the young men's manners, a fine of £4 5s. was imposed, and a day of payment named. A hope was also expressed that the guilty parties would come forward like gentlemen, which they should have done, and save their fellows from expense. The day came and passed unheeded—a second day was named, and all were to be kept in bounds until payment should be made. Before that day expired, three fourths of the number made payment under protest, and had their fines remitted,—the others, having been prevented by various causes from doing the same, were mulcted in the whole amount, and subsequently sent about their business for the remainder of the term.—These are the leading facts as nearly as we have been able to ascertain.

Now, as regards the whole affair, it seems to us that there can be but one opinion. That there were acts of disobedience is undoubtedly true, and that punishment should have been inflicted is equally clear.—Discipline must be maintained at any cost, but it must be conceded, that in the present case the original offence was contemptible, and that the punishment throughout, (the fine in the first instance, and the subsequent rustication,) was unwise, unreasonable, and unjust. It does seem as if our poor old college was doomed, in spite of every effort, to be perpetually disgraced before the public. Here are the labors of years wiped out in a day, and the world, not knowing and not caring to know the merits of the case, has forced upon its notice the naked fact, that an institution of 5 full-grown professors are confessedly incompetent to the government of 1/2 each—that they have been obliged to return one-fourth of them to their anxious mamma! Pity, pity that the punishment, if punishment were necessary, had not been kept within the college walls, and not have scandalized the Institution in the eyes of its foes.

Nor can we for the life of us see that the occasion called for such severity, or even that the offence in the first instance required to be noticed at all:

"All's not offence that indiscretion finds,
And dotage terms so."

It has of late been repeatedly affirmed by very grave, if not by very high authority, to-wit, the Rector of the north end, that "the College" was going to the dogs,—that there was such a tame, spiritless set of fellows there, so different from his day and times,—

what could you expect from it? The farmer's wife now a days never thought of putting extra eggs under her sitting-hens to furnish poultry for the college gentlemen, nor the farmer leave a tree or two of unplucked fruit to garnish their deserts. Professors too could lie at ease upon their beds, and turn their black-mares into pasture over night without fear of their becoming white by morning—they were all going to the bad together."

Now we are heretical enough to hold very much the same opinions as the authority referred to. We do not object to a little mischief in the character, may we rather like it so long as it does not exhibit a vicious tendency. It is an old Italian saying, that, in the formation of a perfect character there must be "poco di matto"; nor do we believe any more than they, in those animated jelly-bags,—mere conglomerates of amiability, iniquity and dalsness. We could therefore hazard a guess that the perpetrators of these practical jokes are sharp-witted, ready and intelligent lads, and if this were their sole offence, cannot help thinking that it was by no means commensurate with the penalty imposed.

"Qui fortiter emungit, elicit sanguinem," and one can perfectly understand how boys of spirit and independence would resent excessive punishment, and be incited to rather than be deterred thereby from further acts of disobedience. It is not to be expected that they should possess

"that godlike magnanimity to keep
"When most provoked, our reason calm and clear."
But admitting that there was no such provocation, that there was not even ground for jealousies—that there are no pets, no pimps, within the College walls, but that equal justice is meted out to all, and that favours are at all times impartially bestowed;—still we cannot be rid of the impression that the punishment was unreasonably severe. There is but one other that can exceed it. Next to expulsion it is the most serious, the most disgraceful it is possible to inflict—and never before in the whole history of the University, has it been imposed for so trivial an action." In former times,—as in cases of transportation at the present day,—a culprit required no little interest to insure his rustication. It was held in reserve for grave ecclesiastical offences, such as shaving the tails of a Bishop's horses, or for attempting to make "Guys" of Reverend Professors, through a too familiar acquaintance with torpedos and maroons. But to have attained to that distinction through the smoke of a chimney flue, would in those days have been as hopeless on the one side as the act itself would have been beneath the notice of the other.

But besides all this, we consider the present act unjust. The system of fines is objectionable in itself. In some of the Parent Universities they are not suffered to reach a pound. In the U. S. they are not tolerated. If actual damage were committed, it should of course have been charged with other expenses and settled with the Bursar in the usual way—and if punishment were needed, surely some mode might be devised by which it should fall on the offenders, instead of their unfortunate friends. Who pays these fines? Who suffers by these rustications? Is it dealing fairly by the poor man, who with many self-denials, ekes out enough for fees and commons, to make him pay a certain further sum in the shape of fines, or be subjected to the charge of extra travelling expenses, inconveniences, and loss of time.—We feel bound to assume that, in the case before us, the parents, though they might not have acquiesced in the justice of the sentence, were fully informed of its nature, and of the ultimate consequences of their refusal to pay. For amongst the much vaunted advantages of the newly created "chair of unintelligible duties," that of "pater familias" stands prominently forward. As such, he would calmly reason with the lads themselves, and affectionately point out the consequences of their persistence. Christian charity would in the next place lead to communication with the friends of the offenders, that they might, if so disposed, by a timely payment of the fine, save themselves from farther expense, and their children from disgrace. We should indeed be loth to think that it were otherwise—that any one of those departing youth, should have it in his power to retort with Romeo:—

"O Friar—how hast thou the heart,
Being a divine, a ghostly confessor,
Or sin abettor and my friend profest,
To mangle me with that word—banishment?"

Or that their parents should be compelled to hesitate whether they should send them back to an institution from whence, at any moment, they may be retorted unexpectedly upon their heads.

May, we would rather adopt the suggestion which the professional vote at the late Eacania would convey, that they were over-burdened with numbers, and were glad of an opportunity for reducing them from 1/2 to 1/4 each.

But more anon,

ALUMNUS.

News Department.

Extracts from Papers by Steamer Niagara.

ENGLAND.

The following petition respecting the operation of the Divorce Act is being very extensively circulated throughout the country. We content ourselves with directing attention to it:—

To the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty,
The humble and dutiful address of your Majesty's faithful and loyal subjects, the undersigned clergy and laity of the United Church of England and Ireland,

Humbly sheweth—That an Act was passed in the present Session of Parliament, called the "Divorce and Matrimonial Causes" Act, for the purpose, among other things, of enabling persons lawfully married to obtain, in certain cases, sentences of divorce, with liberty to contract marriages with other parties, during the lifetime of those to whom they had been so lawfully married, and making provision for the solemnisation of such marriages by clergy of the Church of England, according to the ritual of the United Church of England and Ireland.

The undersigned would humbly represent to your Majesty that there is great reason to conclude that the provisions of the Act 13 and 14 Car. II, c. 4, commonly called the Act of Uniformity, could not have been present to the mind of the Legislature at the time of passing the said Divorce and Matrimonial Causes Act, which, without referring to the said Act of Uniformity, does, nevertheless, contain provisions at variance, and in conflict, with the said Act:

For that the Book of Common Prayer, and therein the Form of Solemnisation of Matrimony, as settled at the last Revision, A.D. 1661, unanimously subscribed by both Houses of Convocation of both provinces, December 20, 1661, and made to be the law of the land in and by the said Act of Uniformity, contains a prayer in which are found the words following: "O God, who by Thy mighty power hast made all things of nothing; Who also (after other things set in order) didst appoint that out of man (created after Thine own image and similitude) woman should take her beginning; and knitting them together, didst teach that it should never be lawful to put asunder those whom Thou by matrimony hadst made one:" with divers other declarations and expressions to the same effect: more especially, the prohibitory words, "Those whom God hath joined together let no man put asunder:"

That there is no word, either in the said form, or in any other of the formularies of the United Church of England and Ireland, to show, or to suggest, that it hath been at any time the judgment of the said Church that marriage, once lawfully contracted, is dissolved except by death.

That the said Act of Uniformity binds every beneficed minister of the Church of England to "declare, openly and publicly before the congregation, his unfeigned assent and consent to the use of all things contained and prescribed in the said Book of Common Prayer; and to use the Morning Prayer, Evening Prayer, celebration and administration of both the Sacraments, and all other the public and common prayer, in such order and form as is mentioned in the said Book."

That moreover the said Act of Uniformity answers to, and is in exact accordance with, the conditions of the obligation taken upon himself by every priest of the said United Church of England and Ireland at his ordination—that is to say, that he "give his faithful diligence always so to minister the doctrine and sacraments, and the discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded, and as this Church and realm hath received the same"—but that the aforesaid Divorce and Matrimonial Causes Act contravenes those conditions.

That it appears therefore that the aforesaid Act of the Legislature—viz., the said Divorce and Matrimonial Causes Act—has indirectly repealed a material portion of another Act of the Legislature—viz., the said Act of Uniformity—such act not being the legal and constitutional basis of the public ministrations of the Church of England.

The undersigned would humbly represent to your Majesty that the principle of this precedent is most alarming.