NEW ADVERTISEMENTS.

Atkinson's Parisian Tooth Paste.
New Books.

LETTERS RECEIVED TO OCT. 11.

J. W. W., Oakville, rem.; Rev. W. F. S. H., Bath, the rem. was acknowledged in *The Church* of Sept. 21; Rev. W. G., Kingston, add. subs. and rem.; Rev. W. K., St. Sylvester, add. sub. and rem. for Mrs. P., St. Mary's and J. S. St. George; Rev. J. A. M., Pakenham, add. sub. and rem.; Rev. J. S., St. Margaret's Bay, N. S.; A. L. R., Shannonville; Rev. S. S. W., Three Rivers; G. S. McL., Brockville, rem. for A. S. & T. D. C., all right, (much obliged); J. B., Otterville, rem. for vol. 18; C. Young, Escott Mills, rem. for vol. 18.

The Church.

TORONTO, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 12, 1854.

We commend to the careful perusal of our readers the following article copied from the *Scottish Episcopal Journal.*—The subject is one which ought to be studied by all the members of our communion, particularly at this time, when there appears to be a prospect of the Church's being deprived of the means given to her wherewith to support her clergy:—

THE SEVERAL SYSTEMS, HUMAN AND DIVINE, FOR THE SUPPORT OF THE CLERGY.

We have not unfrequently found occasion to appeal to the experience of our brother churchmen in the United States of America, as affording a lesson to ourselves in circumstances of difficulty. The parallel between the two churches is so close, in their worldly estate and political relations, as well as in their respective missions in the country of each, that such an appeal naturally presents itself. Among other things, we have more than once pointed out the apparent results of the voluntary system for the support of the American clergy, and have endeavoured to extract instruction and wholesome warning for Scotchmen from the fruits which that system has borne in a transatlantic soil. It will not be amiss, therefore, if we now avail ourselves of an opportunity afforded us to allow an American churchman to speak for himself upon this most important subject, and to test by his statements and reasoning the accuracy of the conclusions at which many had previously arrived, both as to the soundness of the system itself, and as to its fitness for the times in which we live and the duties which the Church has to perform.

The Colonial Church Chronicle and Missionary Journal for the present month contains a letter from the editor of *The True Catholic,** upon the "maintenance of the Colonial Clergy," which is so ably and temperately written, as well as so much to the point as regards ourselves, that we feel great pleasure in transferring it to our columns, irrespective of the bearing which it has upon what we have formerly suggested. It is as follows:—

"College of St. James, Maryland,
June 8, 1854.

"Rev. Sir,—In your No. for May, you have done me the honour to transcribe part of an article of mine. In it I intimate that the condition of the American clergy can only be improved 'by an increase of Christian charity on the part of the laity.' Upon this you remark, that 'even in America the Voluntary principle has led good and able men to regard the maintenance of an efficient clergy, not as an absolute requirement of Christian duty, but as an act of charity.' While duly sensible of the personal kindness to myself implied in this observation, I venture to think that it is founded on a misconception of my meaning, and is not exactly consistent with the truth. I used the word 'charity,' not in the ordinary sense of almsgiving, but in the higher, broader, and deeper sense of St. Paul, for the love of God and of our neighbour for God's sake. The true evil of the modern Voluntary system is, in my judgment, that it has taught ordinary men, if not those who are good and able, to regard the support of the Ministry, not, as it is, as a work of Christian love, nor even as almsgiving, but as matter of bargain. The prevalent idea in this country is, that the support of the clergy rests on that species of contract which civilians call *do ut facias.*

"There have been three systems devised for the support of the Christian ministry. The primitive, which was founded on the principle of dedicating to the service of the Church a certain proportion of the gains of each individual Christian, to be appropriated to such uses as might be selected by the ecclesiastical authorities. This dedication was voluntary, as far as relates to human law, but was considered to be required by the divine law. The second system was that of endowment, which consists in the appropriation of certain property to the support of the persons who may fill certain ecclesiastical offices, thereby releasing posterity from the obligation of providing for their maintenance. The third is, the modern voluntary system. It is founded on the idea that every clergyman should be maintained by the person to whom he ministers. From this the convenient inference has been drawn, that no one is bound to contribute to the support of any clergyman but him who ministers directly to the contributor. The whole obligation rests on the contract, *do ut facias.*

"The general result has been, that the first of these three systems has succeeded, and both the others have failed. They have failed for the same reason, that they were not sufficiently elastic for the wants of the Church. The progress of population, and the fact that the Church has never yet occupied the whole earth, keep her always in a state in which she ought to be aggressive. The endowment system, and the modern voluntary system, are both rather designed to maintain her position on the ground once possessed, than to extend her dominion.

"The great progress of dissent in England, the destitute and godless condition of the poor in your large towns, and the want of sufficient support for your actual clergy, demonstrate that the endowment system has been unequal to its work. It is not elastic; it has no power of expansion, or of redistribution, to meet the frequent changes of circumstances. Your Parliament has attempted to do something in the way of redistribution, but vested rights are found to interfere with any effectual step. The attempt has, however, brought out the fact, that the whole fund is inadequate to the whole work. England has too few clergymen for her demands, and they are not sufficiently supported. The last mail from England brought me a paper, in which it is stated that, curates included, there are 9000 clergymen in England whose ecclesiastical incomes are under £150 per annum. This implies a large amount of clerical poverty, and I believe that it has been publicly stated that one-half of the expenditure of the clergy of your Church is defrayed from their private resources. I am therefore justified in saying that the endowment system has failed.

"The failure of the modern Voluntary system with us has been yet more signal; and it was to point out that fact that I wrote the article which you have done me the honour to copy. The causes of the failure are the same—want of elasticity both as to the amount contributed and as to its application. Our failure has been greater than that of the endowment system, because the causes have existed among us in aggravated forms. Men have come to believe that a clergyman is a person who is hired to perform a particular amount of work for a particular reward, not a messenger of God, entitled as such to a maintenance, and executing his office for the love of his masters and of souls. They prefer, too often, that he should live in part by other means than his *salary*, which they purpose to make the smallest which they can induce any one to accept. They are willing to dispense with a part of his services, that he may be able to earn a part of his subsistence in some other way. They pay him what they think an equivalent for his services to them; if it is not sufficient for his need, he must supply them by such labour as he can perform in his unoccupied time. There is thus no provision for the poor. The consequence is, that the Church is the religion of the rich and the comfortable, and is unpopular among the masses.

"The recent diocesan conventions of Pennsylvania and Maryland have turned their attention to these evils. It was suggested in both that the minimum *salary* of a married clergyman should be fixed at seven hundred dollars, less than £150; and that of a single man $400, rather more than £80, but no mode has been suggested for enforcing the rule. The real difficulties are, that clergymen are not sent but *called;* that those who call them pay them what they please and regard them as their chaplains, expecting and deriving nothing for their money but ecclesiastical offices, including preaching and public prayer, on Sunday, for themselves and their families. The true remedy is, as I suppose, to be found in that kind of charity which consists in loving one's neighbor as one's self, which I regard as an absolute requirement of the Christian religion. Men must be taught, that they are bound to provide for the religious wants of others besides themselves and their families. Both the modern systems have neglected to teach this lesson. The endowment system has not even called on people to provide their own wants. This has given rise to the notion, *that the* provision for public worship and religious instruction is the business of the public, and not of the individuals who compose the public. The modern voluntary system leaps to the conclusion, that no man is to provide for any religious wants but his own, as a logical inference from its first principle, that every man ought to maintain his own minister. This principle makes every minister the chaplain of those who pay him.

"The remedy is the same in both cases, Christians must be taught, that charity which will lead them to have a care of the souls of others. They must be made not only to know, but to feel, that they are under a responsibility for the souls of others; first, for those of their own households, then of their neighbors, then of their countrymen, then of the whole world. The primitive system succeeded, because it taught these lessons. Both the modern systems have failed, because they do not teach them. They both leave the support of the church in destitute places, on the footing of alms-giving. Alms-giving in one sense it is, but not in the common degraded meaning of the word.

"In those parts of the country with which I am personally acquainted, Methodism is the religion of the masses. It is so, because the wisdom of Wesley imitated, in this particular, the primitive church. Their ministers are supported by a common fund. It is to this idea that I wish to call the attention of those who administer the affairs of the Colonial Church. Do not make your endowments parochial. Let both the funds contributed in England and those raised from the people of the Colonies go into a common fund in each diocese; let the Colonial clergy derive their support from a common fund, whether that fund be fed by an endowment or by voluntary contributions. So they will not be in danger of becoming, as with us, the chaplains of those to whom they look for support. The whole money raised will be applied to the dispensation of the Word and Sacraments to those who need them, not to those who can pay for them. Nor will the endowments be for ever chained to one spot, to the neglect of others where they may be more really needed.

I am, sir,
"The Editor of the True Catholic."

We entirely agree with this writer* in his opinion as to the scriptural duty and primitive rule for the support of a christian ministry; nor do we imagine that any one will dispute either the subsistence of that duty at the present day, or the desirableness of seeing that rule restored in practice. But men generally argue and act upon the assumption, that the revival of the ancient rule is impracticable in the existing state of society. Good men, alas! come to this conclusion in despair; others who might not deserve that title are well satisfied that it should be so. We shall presently inquire how far such a conclusion is, even now, reasonable or justifiable.

Let us turn in the meantime to the substitutes for the original plan which the editor of *The True Catholic* enumerates. One of these is "Endowment"—endowment strictly tied up to special purposes and pastorates. Now, while we do not mean to dissent from this writer's estimate of the evils consequent upon an entire reliance on such endowments as the sole source of ecclesiastical revenue in a church, and while we in a great measure also agree with him as to the endowment system in the Church of England being deficient in elasticity, we yet think one or two observations are requisite to do justice to this system, and to prevent misunderstanding as to the extent of its actual operation in the English church.

In the first place, while it certainly does not stand in precisely the same position in point of authority as the system which was divinely enjoined for the support of those holding the ministerial office, it unquestionably stands on ground totally different from, and far higher than, the modern Voluntary system. We cannot doubt that the dedication of a man's whole means (meaning thereby his *capital*), or of a portion of it over and above that part of his fruits or *income* which, by the Divine law, he is bound to contribute to pious purposes, will, if made in a proper spirit, be graciously regarded as acceptable service by Him for whose sake it is rendered. It cannot be displeasing to the Head of the church that His children should restore not only what he strictly requires, but all that they derive from Him. Nor does there appear to be any reason to suppose that when, in primitive times, any of the faithful so acted, and "having land, sold it, and brought the money, and laid it at the apostles' feet," or those of their successors, the whole was devoted to present purposes or immediate consumption. There is nothing, at least, to indicate that the retention of capital, in order that its fruits should be insured for some particular ecclesiastical service, is inconsistent with the Divine will. A certain portion of the fruits of every man's industry and estate is required annually (or *weekly**) at his hands; with regard to the remainder we are in somewise left at liberty to choose our own mode of disposal. We apprehend, therefore, that the system of endowment is not in itself opposed to the principle of the primitive system, but rather, if it be not made to supersede that system, in harmony with its spirit, and not unlikely to carry a blessing along with it.

And, in the next place, one must not forget that the system of the Church of England is not a pure endowment system, but a mixed system of endowment and of the primitive rule by which "a certain proportion of the gains of each individual Christian is appropriated" to the service of the Church. This appropriation, to be sure, is no longer "voluntary, as far as relates to human law," for the State has stepped in to enforce, with the magistrate's sword, the requirement of the Divine law. And who will say that she does wrong in this, any more than in enforcing obedience to the Divine command, "Thou shalt not steal," and "Thou shalt do no murder"? The original appropriation has indeed been in many cases invaded with the sanction of the State herself, and it may also be that in other cases the practice is too unbending as to even the ecclesiastical uses to which the fruits of this appropriation are put. But still it appears to us clear, that the English system is neither without scriptural and primitive authority, nor truly defective in principle. In practice we willingly admit it is chargeable with want of elasticity; but that is a fault which can be remedied without demolition of the system itself.

* *The True Catholic, edited by a Layman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, with the approbation of the Bishop of Maryland.* (Baltimore: Joseph Robinson.) A monthly publication, which we can heartily recommend as a sound and able exponent of Church principles. The price is 2½ dollars per annum.

* It is plainly by a mere slip of the pen that the correspondent of the *Colonial Church Chronicle* speaks of the primitive system as being "*devised.*" Other systems have been, in whole or in part, *devised,*—the primitive system (he will agree with us) was *ordained by God Himself,* and cannot be said to have been *devised* in the same sense as others.

If, then, it be conceded that endowments for ecclesiastical purposes are not forbidden by the spirit of the Christian rule, the only question that remains is, whether their existence in a Church is expedient and beneficial? To us, we confess, the answer to this question appears easy. We are not affected by the fact that in some ecclesiastics they may have tended to foster individual indolence and luxury—that in some periods of the Church's history they may have been accompanied by general deadness and even vice—that at all times they may be accused (without proof) of checking the charitable impulses of men, and evincing a lack of faith. Things lawful are notoriously good or bad to us according to the use we make of them, and instances of abuse form no argument against their legitimate use. Now, who can deny that ecclesiastical endowments have been productive of most beneficial effects when these have not been frustrated through the sinfulness of men? There must, probably, be in all Churches occasional periods during which a secure provision becomes of the highest importance. Who can say what might have been the fate of the Church of England, if the pious foresight of former ages had not provided for her Ministry during the coldness of such an age as that of the last century? Can it be doubted that our own Church, after the confiscation of her revenues, suffered grievously (and suffers still) from the precariousness and scantiness of clerical incomes? Who does not see, in the case of Trinity Church, New York, itself, a signal instance of the blessings which flow from a richly-endowed ecclesiastical corporation? We do not speak, be it observed, of an endowment system which excludes all other effort, but of one which goes hand in hand with the periodical offerings of the people. The tendency of some very good and earnest men of the present day is to look upon the one as opposed to the other, and to lean exclusively on God's power to put it into the hearts of Christian men to provide from day to day for the necessities of His service. We think it right to protest against this tendency as pernicious and false. Such a doctrine, if sound, must hold good in regard to men's ordinary affairs as well as in matters ecclesiastical; but the knowledge of God's infinite goodness and power does not warrant personal imprudence. There is no proper reason why ecclesiastical endowments should not coëxist with a current of Christian liberality; nor is it in accordance with God's Word to expect that wastefulness of present means will be rewarded by a more abundant supply.

With regard to the most dangerous substitute for the primitive method—the modern Voluntary system—the letter of our American fellow-labourer is in particular full of valuable instruction. That system is clearly contrary to scriptural rule. It is thoroughly selfish. Its failure to do *the work of the Church* is therefore inevitable. Nevertheless, it is so common to find it popularly spoken of as in accordance with primitive practice, it in reality prevails so largely among ourselves—disguise the fact as we may—that this testimony to its "signal failure," and to the causes of failure in America, deserves to be attentively considered by Scottish Churchmen.

It adds not a little to the value of the lessons which this letter teaches, that they were written neither for us nor to us, but with a view to the circumstances of the English and Colonial Churches, and that yet the writer's words so precisely meet our own condition, as to describe our peculiar wants and defects with the most minute accuracy. Surely this is an undesigned admonition which is not to be disregarded:—

"Men have come to believe that a Clergyman is a person who is hired to perform a particular amount of work for a particular reward, not a messenger of God, entitled as such to a maintenance, and executing his office for the love of his Master and of souls."

Is not this belief deplorably common among the members of our ancient Church, as well as among those of her younger sister in the West?

"They prefer, too often, that he should live in part by other means than his *salary,* which they purpose to make the smallest which they can induce any one to accept. They are willing to dispense with a part of his services, that he may be able to earn a part of his subsistence in some other way. They pay him what they think an equivalent for his services to them; if it is not sufficient for his need, he must supply them by such labour as he can perform in his unoccupied time."

Is not this *literally* true of ourselves? Can we not all recall instances within our own knowledge perfectly in point?—*e.g.,* a pastoral charge becomes vacant, or it is proposed to erect a new one; the first consideration too often is to procure a Clergyman who has some private fortune of his own, or who can eke out a subsistence as a private tutor.

And what are the consequences of such a state of things? Let us again listen to the voice that has reached us from the New World:—

"There is thus no *provision for the poor.* The consequence is, that *the Church is the religion of the rich and the comfortable, and is unpopular among the masses.*"

Does not the language of our unconscious mentor depict our general condition, even with photographic truth? Some may question, perhaps, whether as regards Scotland his premises and his conclusions stand altogether in the relation to each other of cause and effect; but none can deny the truth of either separately. And such being the case, it will be wiser to endeavour to find and apply a remedy, than to argue as to their connexion. Let us remove the supposed cause; that will be in itself a great gain; possibly we may find to our joy that we have done more than we aimed at.

The letter before us is not without some hints upon this matter which are worthy of notice. It has been suggested, it appears, in two of the American dioceses, that a minimum salary for the clergy should be fixed; but no mode has been suggested for enforcing the rule. This certainly appears to be a most desirable regulation; and that there is nothing impracticable in it, other religious bodies in Scotland have shewn. It seems but right that some fixed minimum should be agreed upon, for which the bishop should be entitled to require a guarantee from the persons who present a clergyman to him for institution. And although such a regulation could not be imposed arbitrarily, nor for a while, probably, enforced peremptorily in all cases, yet we do not despair of seeing such a regulation in general operation. But perhaps this is one of those things which can scarcely be fully accomplished without the co-operation of laymen in the assemblies of the church.

Our American contemporary, however, proceeds; and here, undoubtedly, he lays his finger upon the real restorative:

"The true remedy is, as I suppose, to be found in that kind of charity which consists in loving one's neighbour as one's self, which I regard as an absolute requirement of the christian religion. Men must be taught that they are bound to provide for the religious wants of others besides themselves and their families. . . Christians must be taught that charity which will lead them to have a care of the souls of others. They must be made not only to know, but to feel, that they are under a responsibility of the souls of others—first, for those of their own households, then of their neighbours, then of their countrymen, then of the whole world."

How is this to be effected? Now, we have no hesitation in asserting that one great agency (humanly speaking) towards this end has never been properly tried in this country; and we feel satisfied that until it is in full operation no important amendment can be expected. We allude to the use of *the weekly offertory* in our churches, accompanied by *urgent and plain-spoken exhortations from the clergy.* Let the people be boldly taught the extent of their duty, and let them have continual opportunities as well as invitations to practice it, and we have no fear of the result. At present, whenever any little ecclesiastical work is proposed, the agencies invariably resorted to are a special subscription and a special collection. These only include the rich man's conventional tribute and the poor man's mite—once asked, and once given—in most cases asked with faltering lips, and given by hands unaccustomed to the act. The consequence is, that such appeals, almost always undertaken with hesitation, are too frequently unsuccessful. But if the weekly offertory were in general an intelligent operation, we feel more certain that the necessity of special appeals would become much less rare, and when resorted to would be far more successful than they now are. The Free Kirk have been fully alive to the truth of the principle of a frequent offertory, and the vastness of their funds is attributable to their having given full scope to its exercise more than to anything else. We may also refer our readers to the recently published experience of an English clergyman, the Rev. Richard Seymour,—stated in the preface to a sermon noticed elsewhere in our present number,—as to the results of a frequent offertory in a small and poor rural parish. As to the duty of the clergy in this matter, rather than speak of it ourselves, we shall here adopt Mr. Seymour's words at the conclusion of his preface:

"Alms-giving is too often popularly treated as a burthen, instead of a blessing, to those who exercise it. The correction of this error rests, of course, principally with the clergy. That *they* are behind others in the practice of this duty is plain from our subscription lists. I believe it to be no less plain in the sight of God from their secret acts. But I would venture to ask, whether it is equally plain from the frequency with which they invite their flocks to practice of the same duty? If we would make our flocks *devout,* we teach them that they must be *frequent in prayer;* and, as far as we can we give them *opportunities* of being so. Can we hope to make them *charitable* 'every one according to his ability,' 'rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate,' unless we put before them *frequent opportunities of giving?* And while I would hinder no one from the use of other modes of doing works of piety and of charity, I would earnestly ask, what mode can be so suitable to all, whether rich or poor, *as the one great channel of* [illegible] *works*—what so simple and easy, so religious, so likely to obtain the blessing of God upon both the giver and the receiver as that of Offertory, made according to God's Word, and in the manner for which provision is made in our Book of Common Prayer?"

One other paragraph in the letter of the Editor of *The True Catholic* is so suggestive, that we cannot forbear briefly alluding to it ere we conclude. He tells us that Methodism is the religion of the masses in those parts of the United States with which he is acquainted, because (as he believes) their ministers are supported by a common fund. "Do not," he then adds,

"Do not make your endowments parochial. . . . Let the clergy derive their support from a common fund, whether that fund be fed by an endowment or by voluntary contributions. So they will not be in danger of becoming, as with us, the chaplains of those to whom they look for support. The whole money raised will be applied to the dispensation of the Word and Sacraments to those who need them, not to those who can pay for them. Nor will the endowments be for ever chained to one spot, to the neglect of others where they may be more really needed."

There is much of truth and wisdom in these remarks; but it is well that they should be kept in view when the permanent disposal of funds or property gifted to the Church is to be fixed by legal deed. The amount of local endowment is not in any place in Scotland so great as to cause apprehension that inconvenience or loss is ever likely to arise from its being "chained to the spot." But it is well to be warned in time; and we see no harm that could ensue from inserting in the legal conveyances of Church property power to some proper body, say the Diocesan Synod, of altering, under certain contingencies, the original destination. In the meantime, it is satisfactory to know that the system of the Scottish Episcopal Church Society, so far as it goes, is founded upon principles very analogous to those which are here recommended to us. The annual contributions of the whole Church, for instance, go into a common fund, and this fund is distributed (or should be) to those who most need them. The accumulated capital of the Society too, fully carries out the idea of an endowment in which there is ample power for adapting the distribution to varying circumstances. If some elasticity of endowment be deemed desirable, the further extension of the principle may be easily effected by means of the Church Society.

In another respect also, we believe that we are already in the right path. We conceive that the fittest and most correct mode, not only for our times, but for all times, of providing the needful funds for the work of the Church is a *system of moderate endowment combined with periodical contributions from the people.* And to a certain extent we may say that we have, as a Church, adopted this mixed system,—though it is neither in sufficiently extensive operation, nor has it yet displaced that spurious substitute for Christian duty, the modern Voluntary system. These, then, are the things which most immediately press upon us—the sweeping away of every vestige of selfish Voluntaryism, the increase of the congregational alms-giving, and the extension of the Church Society's mixed system of ministerial support. Towards a speedy amendment in these important particulars, let our best energies be applied.

* "*The Divine* [illegible] *and Measure of Good Works,*" a Sermon, &c., by the Rev. R. Seymour, M.A., &c. London: Rivingtons, 1854.

THE PHILHARMONIC SOCIETY.

We are glad to learn that the members of this Society have again resumed their regular practisings. We are informed that this is the commencement of the half year, and that two more open concerts will be given. Tickets to be had at the Treasurer, Mr. Wyllie's. Those who have not hitherto subscribed, have an opportunity now of doing so for the half year, for the small sum of 12s. 6d., in return for which they will receive tickets which will admit six persons to the two remaining concerts.

TRINITY COLLEGE.

The following gentlemen have been elected to Scholarships in Trinity College.

DIVINITY SCHOLARSHIP.

1st. *Class Scholarship*—John Ardagh.
2nd. *Class Scholarships*—Wm. P. Atkinson. Stewart Houston.
3rd. *Class Scholarships*—J. G. Bourinot. Wm. B. Evans.

[illegible] SCHOLARSHIP.

Hora[illegible] Phillipps.

We received an announcement of a marriage which took place, according to our informant, at Chippawa. The party who forwarded the notice did not sign his name; we must therefore, decline inserting it for the present.

We give the following intelligence extracted from a private letter. We trust the writer will excuse us for publishing it.

"The sermon in aid of the Widow's and Orphans' Fund of our Church Society, which was to have been preached by the late lamented Bishop Wainwright of New York, was preached on Sunday by our own venerated Diocesan, and a beautiful and pathetic sermon it was. His lordship's subject was, the Widow's Son, of Naine.—As he came to the gates of the city a man is carried out, the only son of his mother, and she was a widow." He spoke of the gates of our own city, and the frequency with which during the late visitation of cholera, the processions of the dead were to be met there. He beautifully alluded to Bishop Wainwright, who was to have stood in the pulpit he then occupied, but was alas "a dead man," and concluded with some forcible practical reflections.

The collection was £48 17s. 6d.. but will make £50.

We are sure that every well-informed Churchman of the Diocese, no matter what his peculiar views on certain questions may be, will read with disgust the following letter, addressed to the Editor of the *Christian Examiner*, and headed

SOCIETY FOR THE PROPAGATION OF THE GOSPEL.

(*To the Editor of the Christian Examiner.*)

Dear Sir,—Having lately met a clergyman, just returned from Canada, where he has been actively employed as minister of the Established Church more than twenty years, and being anxious to learn from one so well qualified to give an opinion on the subject, what is the state of religion in the diocese of Toronto, I ascertained from him the fact that three candidates for ordination were refused, by the Archdeacon of York, presentation for orders to the Bishop of Toronto, because they would not hold the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. How many others may have been similarly treated, I did not learn. The clergyman to whom I allude is one as capable as any man in Canada of judging of the present state of the question, as it affects the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. He told me that he believed that the majority of the clergy of the Established Church were imbued with Tractarian principles; and that the strong feeling against these principles held and expressed by the laity, alone prevents a still more decided demonstration of them. I consider this of importance for you to know, as you have so faithfully protested against the Tractarianism of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel,—but which has been denied by those who are advocates for the working of that Society at present. I enclose my name and address.

Your obedient servant,
A Friend to Truth.

—Many will ask, who is this slanderer of his brethren? For our own part, we do not believe that "A Friend to Truth" received any such information from a clergyman who has resided long in Canada; for the letter contains not one single sentence of truth, and is evidently published in the hope of injuring the noble Society to which our colonies owe so vast a debt of gratitude. We defy this anonymous slanderer to prove his assertions. The Archdeacon of York never refused to present a single candidate for orders to the Bishop, upon any ground! Now, "A Friend to Truth" says *that he refused to present three.* His clerical friend of twenty years' standing should enable him to prove that we are in the wrong. If he fails to do so, the *Examiner* will know how to estimate the depth of his friendship for truth; and believe us, that the charges against the clergy and the Society P.G.F.P., contain about as much truth as the one we have defied him to prove.

We copy the following from the *Banner of the Cross:*—

"How rapid are the changes of this mortal life! Such is the first thought which possesses our minds, as we recur to the proceedings of the New York Convention. Within a week, an honored and beloved Bishop is laid in the grave, and another is chosen to fill his vacant place. Rapid as this change may appear, we must think it was wisely ordered that the funeral of the lamented Bishop was so soon followed by the election of his successor. The need of the active services of a Bishop in that diocese is ever urgent; and we cannot doubt that the solemn impressions produced by their sudden affliction must have affected every heart, and brought about more united and harmonious action.

"The election of Dr. Potter, at last by a unanimous vote, is also an event upon which the diocese of New York may well be congratulated. One of her oldest Presbyters, distinguished not only as a learned divine, but for singular constancy as a parochial clergyman, loved and honored by the people with whom he has sojourned so long, as a faithful and devoted parish minister—none can doubt his qualifications for the high office to which he has been called in the Providence of God. Resembling the departed Bishop in his conciliatory temper and prudence, and, like him, a true-hearted and decided Churchman, we feel sure that he will, with God's blessing upon his efforts, carry on the good work of peace and reconciliation which had been so well begun. That he may be made an instrument in furthering this great issue, will be the desire and prayer of every faithful member of the Church. And if the efforts of each only second such prayers, then will that which has been so well begun, be continued and ended, by God's most gracious favor, and His continued help, to the increase of His glory, and the welfare of his people on earth. Such are our hopes—such our prayers."

THE TEN THOUSAND JOB.

JUDGMENT RENDERED.

Judgment was given on Monday in the Court of Chancery, on the case of Paterson et al. vs. Bowes. Mr. Chancellor Blake and Vice chancellors Esten and Spragge delivered their opinions at length; with perfect unanimity agreeing in finding for the plaintiffs, and ordering the defendant to refund to the City Treasury his profits on the job with interest, and to pay the costs of the suit.

The Rev. Mr. Mitchele, M.A., Rector of St. John's Church, York Mills, requests us to inform his brethren in the city and adjacent parishes that his church is (D.V.) to be consecrated on Wednesday, the 18th instant, at 11 A.M., and that their presence will be most welcome, and to request that as many as can attend will carry their surplices.

We are sorry to say that the statement received by telegraph, that "the Czar had sued for peace," is not confirmed. The *Times* holds a similar report, which was current at Constantinople, as a foolish fable.

Edward T. Dartnell, Esq., of the *British Canadian*, has been induced to stand for South Oxford. We wish him every success. He is opposed by a Dr. Cook.

The Lord Bishop held an Ordination in the Cathedral Church of St. James, last Monday.

The following four Deacons were ordained Priests:

Rev. Joseph Chambers Gibson, Curate at Woodstock.

Rev. J. Strutt, London, late Curate at St. Catharines, Travelling Missionary in the county of Bruce.

Rev. John Hilton, Missionary at Norwood, Asphodel.

Rev. Colin Campbell Johnson, late Missionary at Sydenham, destination not known.

The following gentlemen were ordained Deacons:—

Thomas Tempest Robarts, B.A., Curate of St. Catharines.

John Carroll, Travelling Missionary in the county of Leeds.

Thomas Leech, Curate of Prescott.

James Smyth, Missionary Warwick.

We commend the letter of the correspondent of the *Colonist*, which we have transferred entire to our columns to our readers. There is little doubt that his views are identical with those of a large portion of our Protestant fellow-subjects.

(For the Church.)

The Rev. Geo. A. Bull begs to acknowledge an offering of £1 5s. by an unknown friend, at the Offertory of Sunday the 8th inst., in St. Peter's Church, Barton. The sum will be applied to Missionary purposes in this diocese, as specified.

DIOCESE OF TORONTO.

THE CHURCH SOCIETY OF THE DIOCESE OF TORONTO.

Collections made in the several Churches, Chapels and Missionary Stations on behalf of the Mission Fund appointed to be taken up on the 9th of July, 1854.

MISSION FUND.

Previously announced		£280 6 10
St. Phillip's Church, Markham	0 9 0	
Grace Church, do.	0 6 3	
Per Rev. G. Hill		0 15 3
St. John's Church, Mono.	0 14 3	
St. Mark's do do.	0 6 6	
St Luke's, Mulmer	0 4 5	
Trinity Church, Adjala	0 1 1	
Per Rev. J. Fletcher		1 6 3
St. John's Church, Portsmouth, per Churchwarden		2 10 0
St. Peter's, Osnabruck, Rev. M. Ker.		0 15 0
Anonymous, per Rev G. A. Bull		1 5 0
St. George's Church, Etobicoke, per Churchwarden		0 14 0
South Cayuga, per Churchwarden		2 10 0
St. George's Church, Toronto, per Churchwarden		30 0 0
208 collections, amounting to		£320 2 4

PAROCHIAL BRANCH.

Markham, per Rev. G. Hill	1 8 9

Reviews, Books and Publications.

We have received *The Church Review;* it contains its usual number of excellent articles:—"A Heedless Truth and a faithless Creed—Gibbon Confronted—The Revival System, its Good and its Evil—The Question of the Papacy—The West and its Wants—The Adaptness of the Church to the Genius of the American people, &c., &c.

Douglas E. Jerrold's *News Bag*, illustrated by Bryce Smith, Toronto, published by Thompson & Co. The wrapper is very amusingly and cleverly illustrated, and there are three well executed vignettes, emblematical of Births, Marriages, and Deaths.

The *Canadian Journal* for October, published by T. McClear & Co., for the Canadian Institute, contains No. 14 Geology of Western Canada—New Zealand Flag—Modern Discoveries by the Microscope—Ascent of Monte Blanc by a Lady—Submarine Telegraph without Wires, and other interesting articles.

From H. Rowsell we have *Dicken's Household Words*, published by McElrath & Co., 17 Spruce street, New York, for October—just received.

The *Children's Magazine* for October.

Colonial.

WHAT WILL BE THE EFFECT OF SECULARIZING THE RESERVES.

(From the Daily Colonist.)

We give below a letter of our Quebec Correspondent on this subject. Our correspondent writes strongly; but the spirit of his remarks will be responded to by the majority of the Conservatives of Upper Canada; and the French Canadians may rely upon it, that his predictions will be verified, and perhaps much sooner than our correspondent has foreshadowed.

Quebec, 28th Sept., 1854.

The Lower Canadian Church Property, and the Upper Canadian Clergy Reserves. What will be their fate? Messrs. Morin and Drummond's position considered; and what will be the inevitable result of giving up truth and right to an aggressive majority.

The telegraph at present would hardly make a paragraph of readable news out of the House's proceedings; and a correspondent, who is always expected to make a spicy hash out of a sad specimen of trebly-cooked ideas—and these of the very leanest at best—may well be excused for not attempting it at present. I shall therefore proceed to discuss the position of the Lower Canadian Conservatives on the Clergy Reserve question.

In the first place, there is no class or people on this great continent, who have more to fear from those who hold all church endowments in abhorrence, than those very same French Canadian Conservatives. They hold large ecclesiastical properties, which, if they cannot be absolutely alienated by a tyrannical and aggressive majority, may at any time be encumbered with a thousand disabilities. Their management of these properties, too, is peculiarly repugnant to the men whose voluntary principles and whose hatred of church endowments is the sole cause of the contemplated alienation of the Reserves. For the genius of the Roman Catholic Church is clearly to centralize all property, and the power which it gives, in the Hierarchy. The genius of voluntaryism is to invest everything in the hands of the people. The Roman Catholic Church, in all that relates to religion, seeks positively and immeasurably to control its votaries. Voluntaries seek in every way and in every respect to control the priesthood; and if there is any one thing they fear as well as hate, more than another, it is the existence of a church, which exacts tithes for its support on the one hand, or accumulates large properties in the hands of its clergy, on the other.

Now what have ever been the peculiar, if not indeed the only arguments for the secularization of the Reserves? Have they not been, that the people of Upper Canada wanted no church in their midst which owned and controlled large properties? Have they not been, that the people's debasement and the Clergy's corruption would be the inevitable consequence of different churches being enriched by the Reserve lands? Have they not been, that all such endowments were alike contrary to the genius and to the liberties of America, and must not be tolerated by those who would be free, and who would have a pure and zealous priesthood? I can fearlessly appeal to any honest man in Upper Canada, I care not what church he belongs to, if these have not been the staple interrogatories, from the first, of those who have agitated for the alienation of the Reserve lands; and if the majority, or apparent majority they have got in parliament, has not been attributable to the ceaseless, energetic and zealous propagation of these doctrines? The question of the rights of property was seldom or never mooted. The voluntaries who had votes, and the agitators who wanted them, seldom troubled themselves with the consideration of unattractive constitutional law, or dry details of royal charters. They dealt in the far more melo-dramatic commodities, of "no state-paid churches;" "no corrupted priesthood at the expense of the public's domain;" "no tithes, and no priests, who could set the people at defiance, whilst they taxed them." These were the staples of the thirty years' agitation in favor of secularization; and I fearlessly and emphatically assert, that they were the *principles*—if such they can be called—which elected nine-tenths of the secularizers now in parliament, or who ever were there.

Now I would ask Mr. Morin, and those who side with him in Lower Canada, if they unchain such a tiger as this, will his appetite be appeased by simply devouring the Clergy Reserves? Have they not themselves far more attractive bait for him in a field just beyond the church property, in the shape of rich endowments, tithes, and an ecclesiastical polity, which is the very antipathy of all voluntaryism? But they say—"oh we have a title to *our* property which cannot be disturbed without a revolution, and an utter disregard of the first principles of civil society." But they will find that the argument which has no better foundation than a majority, and which seeks to sacrifice the Reserves, as a fit offering to the aggressive spirit of religious agrarianism, *will deem civil society amazingly unsafe with large Roman Catholic endowments, and civil liberty wholly inconsistent with extensive properties in the hands of a Roman Catholic priesthood.* They farther say, too, "have we not the pledges of the entire reform party, a part under Mr. Hincks, Dr. Rolph and Malcolm Cameron, and a part under Sir Allan McNab, that our religious rights shall be respected, and our ecclesiastical property be held sacred?" But they will find, that men who purchase peace and security to themselves, by sacrificing their neighbors' rights, will, in the end, not only have the hostility of their common enemies to contend against, but will have the scorn, the reproach, and the indifference of those they selfishly sacrificed, to accelerate and embitter their fall. They will say, too, "is there not a majority in Upper Canada ready to alienate the Reserves, and why should we not rather purchase immunity from the spoliator than make common cause with the bespoiled; Why should we risk a contest for a right, when we can purchase security against a wrong?" Upon this part of the question I now purpose making a few remarks.

Are Mr. Morin and his adherents quite sure then that they can spoliate the Protestant Churches, who feel they have a constitutional right to their proportion of the Reserves, and yet continue safe themselves? Let us clearly understand how this matter stands. There are just seventeen members of the *parti Rouge* in Lower Canada, who, as the history of France but too clearly indicates, have neither sympathy for the peculiar pretentions of the Roman Catholic clergy, nor respect for the property which they acquire, either by purchase or through the gifts of enthusiasts, or devotees. As a proof of the antagonism which subsists between this party and the priesthood, there is not a single instance of a *Rouge* having been elected in Lower Canada, without the most strenuous opposition of the Hierarchy. I am aware of numerous instances, where the people were cautioned against them by priests from the pulpit, and by addresses and recommendations from the higher order of ecclesiastics. Yet, in defiance of all these appeals to the strongest feelings by which men can be actuated, they succeeded in gaining seventeen elections; and in placing in parliament unquestionably the cleverest men, as a body, who have been elected in Lower Canada since the union. Now it is alike absurd and unnatural, for Mr. Morin and his adherents ever to look for either countenance or support from this powerful party. Their hopes, their principles, their entire aspirations, lie in opposite directions to his. He would conserve the Roman Catholic Church and all its powers. They would restrict the priesthood, and limit their control of property. He would bow to religious dictation in matters of education and of state. They would repudiate all priestly interference in secular matters, whether as regards schools, material interests, or government. He, and his adherents, look upon their church and its interests as the chief end and aim of their existence. They look upon it, some with the indifference of deists, others with the suspicion of democrats, who abhor all priestly influences; and a few with an honest regard for its religious uses, and a pious horror of its political interference. Such are the distinctions between the *parti Rouge* and Mr. Morin and his adherents. And the *Rouge* party number, as I have said, seventeen in the present house; and I believe they have every prospect of numbering more in any future one; certainly no one expects they will ever count less.

On the other hand, there is the conservative party—at least that part of it who will feel, when the Reserves shall have been secularized, that they will have been selfishly and cold-heartedly sacrificed by Mr. Morin and his adherents—what will they think, or do? Will they not—can they avoid, indeed, bringing to their recollections, that Mr. Morin and Mr. Drummond went upon a converting expedition to Upper Canada in the summer of 1853, to nerve the arms of the secularizationists, and to increase the general cant against the very endowments they themselves hold sacred, *but only sacred as far as Lower Canada was concerned!* Can they avoid the recollection that a combination was entered into by Messrs. Morin and Drummond with Messrs. Rolph and Cameron, upon the basis of a spoliation of Church property in Upper Canada, which Mr. Lafontaine shrunk from with dread, and all that was honorable and truthful in Lower Canada responded to his manly and consistent decision? Can they help recurring to the fact with indignation and resentment, that an election was forced upon the people of Canada by an act of unparalled usurpation and audacity, and that Messrs. Drummond and Morin participated in it; that one-half or upwards of the Upper Canadian people were disfranchised by the circumstance; and that the remainder were actually hurried into a decision, at a time when asserting their franchise was a ruin to them; and proclaiming their principles was a destruction to their crops? —can, I say, the conservatives of Upper Canada forget this; nay, more, *that this was the manner in which Messrs. Morin and Drummond sought a verdict upon the Reserves question?* I ask honorable and truthful men, if this is the way to conciliate conservative feeling for Roman Catholic church property? If this is the way to rally honest men to the support of principles, institutions and endowments, which the democracy of all America hates, and which the hundred and one schisms of Upper Canada have sworn to destroy, Mr. Morin may rely upon it, that the submission of Sir Allan McNab to the recent fraudulent verdict against the Reserves will never reconcile men to spoliation under circumstances of gross and violent abuse of power. Least of all, will it make men love those who sowed in the first place to the hurricane of agrarian injustice.

I have, for my own part, little desire to bring up these harrowing and bitter reflections. Perhaps I might better consult my own interests, were I to allow Mr. Morin and Mr. Drummond to sail on under the favorable gales of party security, whilst the hidden rocks of outraged honesty and truth are being passed unseen and unthought of. But the time will come when the pelting storm will lay bare these very rocks, and when the miserable ship of political expediency will be shattered to atoms upon a coast that their selfishness, or their time-serving has, hitherto, obscured.

However, what I have more immediately to do with now, is this. Will the conservatives of Upper Canada, who will feel that they have been sacrificed by the French Canadians, not from principle, not from truth, nor from a sense of justice, but from an unworthy desire on the part of Messrs. Morin and Drummond to retain power —support and uphold those hereafter, who have thus handed them over to a vindictive, aggressive and ungenerous majority? Nay, more, can they ever look with respect upon men, who allowed themselves to be converted into mere dinner-eating mountebanks, to produce and fructify feelings of agrarianism in Upper Canada, which, as men of truth and of honor they should have repudiated and spurned? For it is not alone that Messrs. Morin and Drummond now demand of Sir Allan McNab, that the Reserves shall be alienated, it is that they allowed themselves to be hawked through Upper Canada, to crush, by mountebank and vulgar exhibitions, all who clung to truth as a principle, and all who had the manliness to stand out for the right, against the united influences of fanaticism, folly, and political jugglery. Can the conservatives, I say, who must, and who do feel thus, come forward to protect men, their interests, and their institutions, who are associ-