

self. But he never saw a stronger feeling or a more determined bias than was manifested by the Jury upon this trial. This passage was followed by a loud burst of applause from the strangers in the benches of the court.

Lord Campbell and the other Judges having conferred, a rule was granted, upon the ground that the verdict was against the weight of the evidence, and upon that ground only. [This announcement was followed by loud applause and stamping of the feet.]

Correspondence.

To the Editor of the Canadian Churchman:

REV. SIR,—

The following article so entirely coincides with my ideas, so far as it relates to the consistency of those Clergymen who fraternize with Dissenters on platforms that I cannot asking you to republish it, for the benefit of those whom it may more nearly concern.

Yours respectfully,
OMEGA.

(From the Banner of the Cross.)

WHAT THE "EVANGELICAL SECT" THINK OF BISHOPMEN WHO GO HAND AND GLOVE WITH THEM.

MR. EDITOR:—I have often wondered what grounds, some of our Church clergy are wont to act upon, when they attend the services of our various sects, or take part in their exercises. If it be, because they consider the sect quite on an equality with the ONE APOSTOLIC CHURCH, it may be asked, Why they do not join them, when their sympathies and taste can be so fully satisfied thereby? If it be because they think such a course conciliating, a stroke of policy, the following extract from a respectable Methodist paper. [Nouville and Lovisville Advocate, for Oct. 28th 1852.] will set them right. The remarks were called forth by the controversy between Bishop Whittingham and Rev. Dr. Johnson. Let the methodist speak for himself:—

CONSISTENCY.

"If Methodist ministers, and all others who have not been episcopally consecrated according to their understanding of what constitutes an episcopacy and episcopal authority, are ecclesiastically 'irregular,' and are wholly destitute of the proper Christian warrant and authority to preach the Gospel, administer the Christian sacraments, and perform other official acts pertaining to the ministerial functions, it must follow that they are false pretenders to a divine warrant which they have not—however honest and sincere they may be in their delusions. If they are so grossly deceived, whether from ignorance, prejudice, or other causes, as impudently to assume a sacred function for the exercise of which they have no scriptural warrant, or just and proper ecclesiastical authority, then, for ministerial functions of the 'true church,' to co-operate and participate with them in their 'irregular' and 'unauthorized' religious exercises, would be to encourage them in their fundamental ecclesiastical errors, strengthen them in their delusion, and would contribute also to the farther deceptions and delusions of their misguided adherents; causing them erroneously to suppose that they have a valid Christian ministry, and and have received valid Christian sacraments, when in truth and in fact—agreeably to Episcopalian principles—they have not the first or the last claim of God's covenant mercies, under the true and proper Christian economy, but like all other HEATHENS, have nothing to rest their hopes of pardon, salvation and Heaven upon, but 'the uncovenanted mercies of God.' As, therefore, it would be alike compromising the fundamental principles of 'the true church,' and jeopardizing the salvation of the deluded adherents of these pseudo-churches, to take part with them in their authorized religious exercises every one who holds the doctrine of the exclusive *ius Divinum* of such an episcopacy as that which Episcopelians profess to have, is bound by obligations the most sacred, and of paramount authority, to refrain from giving the least countenance and encouragement, by his presence, his ministrations, or otherwise to any system of religious worship and Christian teaching that does not recognize the foregoing (alleged) fundamental principles respecting the constitution of the ministry, and the validity and efficacy of the Christian sacraments.

From the principles so ecclesiastical exclusiveness, which we have seen to be characteristic of Protestant Episcopalianism, no well disciplined mind can resist this practical conclusion; and we maintain that no consistent Episcopalian clergyman could, or would, have acted as Dr. Johnson did, in co-operating with the Methodists in their religious exercises and teachings. True he read his prayers, before preaching out of 'the book of common prayer,' and thus saved himself a literal violation of the canons of his church; but nevertheless, we think it must be evident that his course was contrary to the avowed principles, the genius, and prevailing spirit of Protestant Episcopalianism. He may be a very good Christian minister, but he is both a refractory and inconsistent Episcopalian clergyman.

As to Bishop Whittingham, however much we may condemn the uncharitable and unscriptural exclusiveness of Protestant Episcopalianism we admire and commend also consistency and a firmness as a bishop of that Church. He has the understanding to perceive that High Church principles are inwrought and are part and

parcel," with the entire organic structure of the Christian community to which he belongs; and that clerical prerogative and sacramental efficiency maintained by Dr. Pusey, must stand and triumph, or eventually fall, along with "the book of common prayer," the prescribed church services, and the ecclesiastical doctrine that the validity of an ordination depends solely upon the fact of an unbroken chain of "succession" from the apostles of Jesus Christ. Knowing these principles to be identified with the very being of his Church, dare mention them with a talent and dignified firmness, worthy of a better cause.

We trust we have just appreciation of the intelligence and piety to be met with in the Protestant Episcopal Church; nor have we any quarrel with their form of Church government and Church discipline, proper. We confess a strong predilection for episcopacy as a third and distinct order of ministerial functionaries in the Church of God; and we honestly believe Episcopalianism to be the only Protestant Christian community of which we have any knowledge that are consistent with themselves and with the Word of God, in the proper pastoral oversight of the children of the Church.

(To the Editor of the Canadian Churchman.)

DEAR SIR,—

In your paper of the 16th instant a letter, headed "The decent Tippet of black prescribed by the 58th canon," has just come under my notice, and has caused me no little astonishment. The writer, who styles himself Peter Brown, is evidently a non-graduate, and in order to gratify a feeling which cannot be far removed from vanity, is endeavouring to import an abuse into the diocese which happily does not exist here at present. He refers to a "practice which prevails," he states, "in England, where it is invariably the custom for men who are literates to wear a badge, resembling a hood in the main features, yet easily distinguishable from it."

Now in reply to this I beg to state, that I passed the greater portion of my life in a diocese (that of Chichester before its subdivision into two) which with the one of Carlisle, perhaps, for many years back contained more literates than any other part of England, and if we except Wales, than all the other dioceses put together. And I have had ample opportunity of observing their practice, and can safely assert that up to the years 1846 and 1847, it was in accordance with the present usage of the literates of this diocese.

Above thirty years since, a theological institution for literates was established at St. Bees, in Cumberland, by the late Bishop of Bath & Wells, (Law), who was then Bishop of Chester, and the supply for Chapels of Ease in country places in the two dioceses to which I have alluded, came almost wholly from it. This institution was for many years under the Principalship of the late Rev. Dr. Singer, and though I have seen and been acquainted with numbers of the alumni of this place, I never saw one of them who were prepared for orders under that gentleman, and his immediate successor the late Rev. R. P. Burkicom, who ever wore any kind of hood, or substitute for it.

However, soon after the appointment of the Rev. Canon Parkinson of Manchester, in the latter part of the year 1846, I observed some young men very recently ordained Deacons, who were from St. Bees, wearing something in the shape of a hood, which was entirely black, and of some kind of stuff. This excited the surprise of myself and others, as it certainly was not a tippet, but a hood in shape, and was so called by themselves. We felt somewhat astonished that the then Bishop of Chester did not in some way express his disapprobation of this innovation, for so it was, and forbid its use.

It would appear that some further approximation has been made to the hoods of Oxford and Cambridge since that time, as regards colour, &c., by combining the distinctive colour of the Masters' hood of each University. But be this as it may, it has called forth the express disapprobation of the Bishop of Manchester, who, at a recent ordination held at Bolton le Moors, called aside those who wore these spurious imitations of University hoods, and asked them what they were intended to represent. He further stated, that he should refuse ordination to those literates who persisted in wearing any of these imitations of University badges.

Now the great point at issue is, what is meant by the word "tippet." It is evident from the usage of literates in the Church at home, until very recently, that they did not understand it to mean a hood, or anything approaching to it. And the word in the original Latin of the 58th Canon is *lirippium*, whereas for hood it is *capulum*. Now without it can be shown that these words are synonymous, that they both mean what is conveyed by the word hood, the whole of Peter Brown's letter on this point will go for nothing. It is also evident, that if they had had the same meaning, we should have had no such language as your correspondent quotes from the latter part of the Canon, where it is expressly said *instead of hoods* non-graduates may wear "some decent tippet of black, so it be not silk."

If we enquire into the modern acceptance of these words, any lady will inform Peter Brown that a hood is not a tippet, nor a tippet a hood.

He further informs us, in a postscript, that Mr. Bilton, of King Street, Toronto, has a pattern of the most correct form of the "literates badge." Now I trust that this badge, which is thus advertised, is not a hood either as to shape or colour, or anything that can be mistaken for one; for if so, it is a decided innovation which no Churchman ought to countenance. And the plight of the aspiring candidates from St. Bees, at the ordination

to which I have referred, may be the one in which our non-graduate candidates for Orders may find themselves on some future occasion, and then their feelings will be akin in some measure to the foolish bird in the fable, who arrayed herself in peacock's plumes.

If any attempt is made to assume the hood in any shape, I do trust that all the graduates of Oxford, Cambridge, and Dublin, with those of Kings College, Toronto, that are in the diocese, will unitedly protest against it.

Faithfully yours,
A GRADUATE.

Diocese of Toronto,
Dec. 18th, 1852.

(For the Canadian Churchman.)

THE CHIEF SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, AND HIS REPORT FOR 1851.

LETTER V.

DEAR SIR,—I proceed to notice the fourth section of the extract, which appeared in your paper of the 4th Nov., from the Chief Superintendent's forth-coming Report;—he says,—“But, it may be asked, ought not religious instruction to be given in the day schools, and ought not Government to require this in every school? I answer,” he proceeds, “what may or ought to be done in regard to religious instruction, and what the government ought to require, are two different things.” After declaiming upon the difference in the powers of despotic, and free governments, in a manner the point of which, as respects the moral obligation to give religious instruction in day schools, I confess myself unable to discover, he concludes, “who then are to be the judges of the nature and extent of the religious instruction to be given in schools; their parents and pastors, or the Executive Government, &c., &c.” Oh Dr. Ryerson! Dr. Ryerson! when will you argue with Christian simplicity and manly openness? Right well do you know that it is this very privilege of parents and pastors to educate their children as they choose, for which we, who advocate Denominational Schools, are contending; and, with equal clearness do you know that by denying us such schools, you are, in the present divided state of the religious world, forbidding us to exercise this most common and yet dearest right of Christian freemen: The power of educating our own children in that way and manner that we ourselves their parents and pastors, consider most conducive to their present and eternal well-being! O most execrable oppression! Other despots may occasionally require an oppressive degree of state service from the sons of their subjects, but your despots seek to compel us, if possible, either to leave our sons and daughters uneducated, or to yield them to be taught under a system which we believe to be most injurious to the noblest faculties of their souls in this life, and awfully perilous,—if there be truth in nature's aphorism, that “as the twig is bent, the tree inclines,”—to our hopes of rejoicing over them in the “life to come.” And this bitter religious tyranny is the boasted freedom of democratic Canada in the nineteenth century!

4. But I proceed to notice the mistake in principle, with respect to Government interference in education, into which the Chief Superintendent falls, in this section of his remarks. Because the Executive, from its own non-religious character, and the multitudinous sectarian divisions so unscripturally existing amongst us, is unhappily prevented from adopting any uniform system of Christian training in our common schools, he seems to regard it as a necessary consequence that therefore they can in no way be subjected to distinctive religious teaching. The fallacy of this supposed consequence, I have however, I trust, successfully proved in my third letter, wherein I laid down a scheme of Denominational Schools which, notwithstanding the sore evils above alluded to, while it aids the government in securing the best secular education of the people, secures, at the same time, distinctive Christian training.

(1.) But the Chief Superintendent's error lies deeper. He does not seem to know that the education of the human mind is in every department and at each progressive step a distinctively religious work, as is most clearly proved by the express teaching of Holy Scripture, and by the, all but common consent of mankind, whether Jewish, Christian, Mahomedan, or Pagan, in every age of the world. And that such universal position is in strict accordance with every reasonable and honest understanding of true Christian obligation, I have previously shown in these letters. Consequently where a government comes to be distinctively religious, it loses every right—save that of the oppressor—to interfere with the details of the people's education; henceforth that must, in common consistency, be left to those to whom such government has abandoned the moral and religious care of the people. It follows then, that in such a case, and it is that of this Province, the only office of the rulers in the matter of education, is to assist the various religious denominations from public funds, in establishing schools, and to see that the aid so granted is honestly and efficiently used, so far as the secular instruction given in such schools is concerned. The only exception to this principle would be where the Clergy and their people so neglected their duty as not to establish schools where they had the ability to do so; then, perhaps, it might be permissible for a government, through its own officials, to establish a more secular school; if indeed, even then such a non-religious school would not be more of a curse than of a blessing; for “knowledge is power” for evil, as well as for good; and we know that naturally “the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth.” It may, however, be objected that if a government is not to direct the education of its youth, it ought not to be expected to assist such

education from the public revenue. But this objection is based on an entire misconception. It is not that the education of the people can be a matter of indifference to any rational government, but, that when a government is itself grounded on no positive distinct Christian principle, and presides over a religiously divided people, it is, both in its own nature and circumstantially, unable to conduct such education. And it is so from this fact, that vitally important as is a right religious and intellectual education of the people to the well-being of a nation, yet there are so indissolubly connected with it, interests of so infinitely more important and holier a nature, that mere secular politicians may not dare to guide it, nor may a spurious liberalism presume to drop various portions of revealed truth in order to vaunt a system of barely nominal Christian education, in the hopes of securing the support of discordant sects. Still, though from these causes governments, such as that of this Province, are unable themselves to direct the education of the people, they must have their people educated, and rightly educated, or the nation is ruined; consequently their only alternative, is to help the different religious bodies to educate their people, since, by training them as Christians they are taking the surest method of making them good citizens. Hence, the wisdom and political honesty, as well as the moral obligation, of even non-religious governments to assist Denominational Schools out of the public revenue.

(2.) Again, it is the grossest folly in any government to make public works of those matters which would be more efficiently accomplished, and at less eventual cost, by private energy and skill. Now this is precisely what the government of this Province has done in regard to Common Schools. It has sanctioned a very expensive central establishment, it pays local School Superintendents all over the country; it puts power to expend the public money, into the hands of illiterate men as school trustees. The consequence is, that school-houses are built in unsuitable situations and at unnecessary cost, and other useless expenses incurred from want of due knowledge; by the patronage also which Government has given to Free-Schools, a premium is offered to drunken villans, at the expense of the hard working man, especially the farmer. No wonder therefore that the people are miserably dissatisfied, and more especially as the *real* average attendance is after all most unsatisfactory. All this extravagance is the result of having the schools in the hands of those who have no high principled interests in their welfare. Did the government really understand the true educational interests of the country, and care to save the Provincial revenues rather than to increase its own patronage by the multiplication of unnecessary offices, a very large proportion of this official educational expenditure might be saved by having the Common Schools as far as possible, in the hands of the different religious denominations; at the same time the interests of the schools would be a vast deal better attended to, than at present. Thank God, with all our evils we are not yet a sceptical people; whatever may be the amount of the genuine piety of the land, certain it is, that the religious prejudices of our people are the strongest which they possess; hence when our Common Schools shall be connected with those prejudices, or may we not say principles, they will take an incomparably deeper interest in them than at present. But especially will the ministers and official members of the different sects feel both their religious affections and their personal honor concerned in the success of their various schools. Thus by establishing denominational schools, instead of our present inefficient and most expensive system, the Government would secure a numerous body of the most respectable and earnest-minded men of the province as the unpaid officials and guardians of the common schools, with the certainty of their expending upon them an amount of earnest zeal and personal care which no mere money could ensure. If, therefore, our Government longer refuse the demand for denominational schools, will they not prove themselves as selfishly reckless in their political economy, and as regardless of the real educational interests of the people, as they will be scornfully tyrannical in their religious oppression.

With two or three general remarks, I will close for the present this perhaps too long series of letters.

(3.) In his letter to you introducing the extract from his Report, upon which I have been commenting, the Chief Superintendent says, “I do not believe that even a considerable party can be fomented in the Church of England itself, much less in the country at large, against our system of Public Schools.” This assertion very forcibly reminds me of the days when the same reverend gentleman used so recklessly to speak of the Church in this Province as “a miserable faction, not a tithe of the people, &c., &c.” He is still remarkable, I see, for the cautious accuracy of his assertions! Did the Synodical Assembly of the Clergy and Laity in May last represent as you state no “considerable party”? But, Clergymen act as school superintendents, trustees, &c. Dr. R. will say. True, I have done so myself; but let not the Chief Superintendent suppose that they therefore approve of the system. Far, very far from it; but we sought to stem, as far as in us lay, the torrent of evil. I, for one, however, have long ceased to be connected with a system, that I have been compelled conscientiously to believe is hopelessly, irremediably bad; nor did I ever meet with one Clergyman, or one earnest-minded Church layman amongst the numbers I have known, connected with the Common Schools, who, so far as my memory serves me, did not think the system radically defective; a sentiment which,—Dr. Ryerson to the contrary notwithstanding,—is I think, largely shared by the well-informed and earnest-minded men of