

WEEKLY CALENDAR.

Day	Date	1st Lesson	2d Lesson
C	Sept. 5.	13 S. APT. TRIN. { M. 2 Kin. 19.	Matt. 6. Rom. 6.
M	" 6.	{ M. Amos 7.	Matt. 7. Rom. 7.
T	" 7.	{ M. " 9.	Matt. 8. Rom. 8.
W	" 8.	{ M. Obadiah 1.	Matt. 9. Rom. 9.
T	" 9.	{ M. Jonah 1.	Matt. 10. Rom. 10.
F	" 10.	{ M. " 2.	Matt. 11. Rom. 11.
S	" 11.	{ M. " 3.	Matt. 12. Rom. 12.
C	" 12.	14 S. APT. TRIN. { M. Jer. 5.	Matt. 13. Rom. 13.

TORONTO VOCAL MUSIC SOCIETY.

Rooms—St. Lawrence BUILDINGS.

Regular practice every Wednesday, at Eight P.M.—
Terms of admission, Performing Members 25s. per annum;
Nonperforming 25s.

J. P. CLARKE, Mus. Rec. Conductor.
G. B. WYLLIE, Secretary & Treasurer.

REMITTANCES to September 1st 1852;—H. C. P. Woodstock, for R. A.; J. G. Port Colborne for F. C.; J. W., J. W. Jr., and self; E. R. M., St. George; Mr. McC., Kingston; G. D. R. L'Original; J. W. Williams Oakville; A. M., Adelaide for self and W. J. Medway Mills; C. L. L. Drummondville, for self, G. S., and Mrs. M.; A. A. Millbroke; W. K., St. Sylvester for Mrs. G. P., H. R., and W. P.; W. G., Woodstock; E. C. B. Sydenham Loughboro; J. B. W., Smith's Falls, for self, Mr. J., and Mr. S., Miss R., Seymour, west; J. B., Napanee for T. G. M., Kingston and Dr. C., Murray; Judge McC., Montreal; Rev. J. W., Grafton; W. H., North Augusta, for self L. O., and S. P.; J. H., Harrisburg; G. McC., Brockville, for eight old subscribers and seventeen new ditto; Dr. M., Stamford; Rev. Dr. J., Grimsby; E. M., Smith's Falls, J. J. senr., Hillier; T. B. F., Thorold for A. L., Woodstock, and self; M. J., Cobourg, for Mrs. D., Rev. W. B., G. W. S., H. R., and R. D. C.; E. S., Dundas; G. H., Thorold;
Mrs. R. D., Niagara; Capt. J. P. D., Picton, J. C., Napanee; F. W. S., Guelph; C. Brent, Kingston, for G. M., J. M., and Mrs. F.; L. G., Amherstburgh; S. G., Newmarket; J. T., Bloomfield, for Miss S. and Mrs. M.; T. W. A., Portsmouth, for J. D., D. E. G., C. McP., and self; S. J. H., Grand Falls, N. B.; H. C. B., Hamilton; J. McL., Beamsville; G. H., Medonte; D. E. G., Hamilton; W. B., Dundas; J. L. B., Stoney Creek; R. H., Hamilton; Hy. B., Kingston; C. and T. K., Dunnville; T. G., Wellington Square, for Mr. McC., W. S., and self; R. T., Esquimaux, for W. J.; W. H. W., Dawn Mills, pays for one year for each subscriber ending August 1st 1853; Rev. T. W. M., Norval for J. C.;
J. H., London, W. R., Elora, J. D. W., Walsingham, for T. D., F. W. S., Chatham, P. B. N., Grimsby, for Mrs. N., Miss N., and self.

Canadian Churchman.

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 2, 1852.

The Lord Bishop of Toronto will, with the Divine permission, hold his next GENERAL ORDINATION at Toronto, on Sunday the 10th October. Candidates for Holy Orders, whether of Deacon or Priest, are requested to communicate without delay to the Rev. H. J. Grasett, M.A., Examining Chaplain, their intention to offer themselves; and to be present on examination at the Rectory, Toronto, on the Wednesday previous to the day of Ordination, at Nine o'clock, A.M. They are required to be furnished with the usual testimonials and the *Si Quis* attested in the ordinary manner.

THE DIVISION OF THE DIOCESE.

As we have week after week read the list of arrangements entered on by our Venerable Bishop, we have wondered how a man of his years could possibly go through the mere bodily fatigue necessary for the performance of such extensive labour. And when is superadded to this the other numerous important engagements connected with the Episcopal office, our wonder is that so much good is accomplished and so comparatively little left undone. As years roll on the increasing demands of this fast increasing Province add new features to the Diocese and there is work to be done in places to day which a little while ago were hushed in the voiceless stillness of the forest. For some time both the Lord Bishop and his Clergy have seen the necessity for a division of the present diocese, and the former has more than once used his efforts to effect a division. What the peculiar difficulties in the way were, we are

not able to state,—but we infer from general observation that the principal obstacle was a supposed want of means. Taking this to be so, we lately borrowed from the *English Churchman* some very valuable remarks on the re-establishment of Suffragan Bishops, and it was there strongly asserted that such Sees could be supported by attaching to the office a Parochial cure.

A letter from one of the Bishops of the Sister Church in America, came timely to warn us against assigning to a Bishop too large a Parish; practical experiences teaching our brethren in the States, the injustice of imposing too heavy parochial work on one who is burthened with the additional and paramount care of many churches.

There can no longer be any doubt that the interests of the Church prepotently demand an increased Episcopal supervision, and that the old ideas respecting the large endowment of Sees must give way to more rational and temperate views. The time has, thank God, arrived in which neither the apathy of individuals or of the State can avail to keep back the Spiritual Life which has been infused into the Church. "The zeal of the Lord of hosts" is abroad in the hearts of His people. Bishops and Clergy, Princes and People find that the death like torpor that hung over them is passing away, and that their destiny is not to enjoy an inglorious ease, but it may be to suffer a season of persecution and trouble for the shortcomings of the past.

The enactment of Penal Statutes against those whose liberty had been granted at the sacrifice of our own, may for a time serve to amuse the short-sighted politician; but to those who know anything of the history of the Church, they feel that the only secure and certain safeguard against aggression is the manifest and active life of the Church. If while the Roman Catholic schism is allured to propagate itself without let or hindrance, the Church of England is trammelled with oppressive hindrances to her extension, all the penal laws in the world cannot curb the rebellious spirit of heresy and schism. Let the Anglican Church meet her old enemy fairly, give her the power to send her Bishops into the Lord's heritage, and permit the assembling of her people together for counsel and action, and then indeed will aggression be the enemies of the Church dread the restoration of her Synodal powers and will employ all means to baffle and frustrate her endeavours to obtain it. They dread the influence which she will exercise, and feel that her emancipation must re-act injuriously on themselves.

It must be admitted that the Anglican Church has suffered a greater amount of bitter hostility and persecution from Protestant Dissenters in Canada, than from the Roman Catholic body, from whom bitterness and hostility would have proceeded naturally. And the same spirit which induced the soldiers of Cromwell to break in pieces Altars and Fonts is now burning to impoverish and bear down all that we hold dear to us.

Every where our enemies are actively engaged in concerting our ruin, and rather than fail or balk in their purpose they will dismember the Colony from the Empire. If Canada is to be saved to Britain it can only be through the golden link of England's Church; it can only be by the spread and propagation of those doctrines which teach the people "to fear God and honor the Queen." To enable her to exert so precious an influence her machinery must be concentrated and perfect. The circles in which she is to move must be more circumscribed, and her Bishops Priests and People must see and know more of each other.

To effect so desirable ends we must be more earnest in our demands and open in the expression of our opinions. Instead of whispering misfortunes in secret, let us set about to remedy them by candid and open honesty of purpose. Let but sincerity guide our actions and an ardent single-minded love for the Church direct us and who can doubt but that blessings will descend upon our Zion.

PROVINCIAL PARLIAMENT.

Nothing has occurred in the Provincial Parliament during the last few days, beyond the debate on the Address, which has been carried. In the course of that debate, the question of the Clergy Reserves was alluded to, and on this subject the determination of the Ministry to secularize them if they had the power was avowed.

It is not often that we take up our pen to comment upon subjects purely of a political nature; but times will come and circumstances will happen to compel a deviation from our usual course. Such has been the case in the progress of this debate.

On Wednesday the 25th, the Hon. Francis Hincks, goaded by the challenge of Sir A. MacNab, attempted to give to the House an explanation of the circumstances under which the present Cabinet was formed at the close of the last year. But as the truth of the statements given and the principles of the Ministry are pretty much on a par, we need not dwell on them, but proceed at once to discuss a new principle of "Responsible Government" laid down by the Hon. member—first giving him credit for one admission in his speech, namely, that "as to the principles of the new Ministry, he could say nothing in particular" about them.

Upon the "responsible" principle, he proceeded to lay down a vast distinction between a member of the Imperial Ministry and a member of the Canadian. Speaking of the clause in the answer of the House to the Speech from the Throne, he said "he admitted that the Ministry did not think it improper to express regret at the course of the Imperial Government (on the Clergy Reserves,) while they did not think it advisable to put that expression into the mouth of His Excellency. This arose from a difference in the position of the Colony and of Great Britain, which must always prevent the exact following of British practice. The Governor General was the servant of the Crown, bound to obey the injunctions of the Imperial Ministry, and he did not therefore think it proper to put into the mouth of the Governor General expressions of regret at the conduct of that Ministry. But the case was different with the Canadian Ministry, who were not responsible to the British Ministry, and might, therefore, properly express their views. At any rate, while he held his place as a Canadian Minister, being as much a Minister of the Crown as Lord Derby was, he would never consider for one moment what might be the opinion of any British Minister."

Let us analyze this political "data" of a Canadian "Minister of the Crown." According to the principles of the British Constitution, there must be a harmony of interests and feeling between the governing and the governed. The preponderating wish of the population, expressed through both houses of the legislature it is the duty of the Sovereign to carry out, and her Ministry are in doing so the agents not so much of her, as of the popular will. If the Sovereign should seek to carry out by her Ministers measures adverse to that popular will, an honest Minister would remonstrate, and if unsuccessfully, resign. On the other hand, if a Minister would force upon a Sovereign measures which the people would not sustain, or if he refuse to carry out what they through the Sovereign may desire, the dismissal of that Minister must in either case follow, according to the Imperial practice. Ministerial responsibility is in both cases essential.

Again, Mr. Hincks tells us "the Governor General is the servant of the Crown, bound to obey the injunctions of the Imperial Ministry." The Governor General, we say, is more than that. He is not only the servant of the Crown, but he is also the personification of the Sovereign in Canada, and as such invested with all the Sovereign's attributes and entitled to all the Sovereign's rights. If harmony between the Sovereign and her Ministry at home be essential to good government there, surely there must be, not only harmony between her Representative and her Ministry in Canada, but also between the Royal person and the Royal representative, however personally imbecile or contemptible he may be, as well as between the Canadian and Imperial Ministries on local matters; and no Governor General who had the slightest respect for his Royal mistress, could for one moment tolerate the promulgation of anything by a Minister adverse to these principles. Mr. Hincks, however, contends that in Canada the Minister may fly in the face of the Sovereign and her Imperial servants, and not only insult her by a rebuke through her local Representative, but defy her by denying his own responsibility to his Imperial mistress and her servants. He cared not a fig what she or they might think or instruct, nor would he "so long as he held his place as a Canadian Minister."

Language such as this has been held before, and may be held again by traitors to their Sovereign, by men who would sever the connexion of these Provinces with the mother country. That there are such men in the Canadian Ministry cannot be denied. That the tendency of their legislation is to that end is too evident,—and can it be that the popular struggle for Responsible Government has now come to this, that a Canadian Minister should be henceforth irresponsible alike to the Sovereign, her ministers, her representative, or her subjects? Are the so-called Reformers of Canada prepared to endorse this doctrine, and live under a Hincks-dictator—an "irresponsible" ruler?

But should the so-called reformers of Canada be willing to sacrifice their liberty thus, there are others who will not. The loyal population of both French and British Canadian race (and we are proud to say both combine a vast majority of the population of the Province), are devotedly attached to British connexion, and will maintain it if necessary with their lives. In 1837, when such men as now in part fill the Canadian Cabinet, attempted to sever it, British hearts alone defeated the treason. Not only are their numbers four-fold greater now, and over sixty thousand of them members of the Orange Association, sworn to maintain that connexion with their lives, but among the French Canadian population we believe a large majority are now devotedly attached to British interests, and thoroughly imbued with British feelings. In fact, never was "annexation" in more disrepute than at the present day.

But language such as this man has uttered on this and other occasions is inconsistent with his position as "a minister of the Crown," and this he is, as he says, "just as much as Lord Derby." We trust the day is not far distant when he will be made to feel so; and that if the local Representative of the Sovereign fail in so outrageous a case to vindicate the honor and dignity of his Royal Mistress, and preserve that harmony which should exist between her, her Ministers and her people, that Her Majesty may soon find a worthier and fitter representative to maintain the dignity of her Royal person and throne in Canada.

THE RECTORIES.

It is to the sagacity and foresight of the Hon. J. H. Cameron that the Diocese of Toronto owes the preservation of the Rectories. But for his watchfulness last Session the Bill introduced by Mr. Morrison would have had the effect of preventing the filling up of present, or the creation of Rectories even by future private munificence. Mr. Cameron extracted the poison from the sting, and rendered harmless a wound which might have been deadly.

The Government consented to place the patronage exercised by themselves in the hands of the Church Society—the only body at this time representing the complete Church in this Diocese. This Society consists of the Lord Bishop of Toronto for the time being, who has the power of veto over its proceedings, and of the Clergy, freely elected, and of a large portion of the Laity, also elected by vote.

As, therefore, the Church Society was entrusted by the Government with the custody of such important patronage, it certainly becomes the duty of that body to take care that the trust be properly fulfilled. We, accordingly, on mature reflection, believed that the best and wisest course was that which we ventured to suggest.

If the Church Society acted independently of its President; or, if the Lord Bishop was, by virtue of his sacred office, antagonistic to the Church Society, we could easily imagine strong objections to the Society exercising a voice in the filling up of vacancies. But, since by the very constitution of the Society and of the Church, the Bishop has a veto power, the Clergy need not fear any undue or improper influence being brought against them; nor need we fear that the just and legitimate prerogatives of the Bishop would be interfered with.

A second reason influenced our opinion, viz., the unmistakable and settled determination of the Church to exercise her legitimate Synodal powers; and as she is in this Province in a similar position with that which she holds in Australia, and as it is more than probable that a similar Constitution will be enacted for ourselves, we deemed it the better course to shape all our plans towards one point—unity of action and practice. Indeed we may go further, and assure ourselves that the Lay element will even in the Mother Church be removed from the civil Legislature, and be seated on the benches in Convocation.

We do not profess to believe the plan hinted at by us to be the very best, nor do we desire to see the number of names sent up to the Bishop limited to three. Make the