

them. A trip across the Atlantic may add years to his life; at all events his friends may reasonably expect to see him upon his return, in the enjoyment of the same hale hearty health and strength, with which his Lordship has been continually blessed hitherto.

The "known principles" for which Dr. Beaven gives me credit, must lead me, in my proper place, to maintain "for the Church, her liberties, and her rights,"—as far as those of the Presbytery are concerned. And as I am satisfied that the Dr. will be able to explain the inconsistency (to all appearance) of his present position, more satisfactorily hereafter, than he did at the annual meeting of the Church Society, I hope he will rest satisfied that the humble individual whom he "had been in the habit of respecting," will be able, "when a proper time for explanation shall have arrived," to remove from his friend's mind, all seeming inconsistency with those known principles. And, as I shall furnish incontestable evidence in support and justification of my conduct as a Protestant Parish Priest, against a perfectly uncalculated innovation, (I mean uncalculated for by circumstances, not by individuals) I should hope that he will be ready to bring into court, some more reliable "accuser of the brethren" than that scandalous gossip, Mr. THOUGHT.

As to my asking an "apology" of Dr. Beaven for his "late" notice of me in the Church paper, it is far from my intention; although he may have every thing to gain by his position, and I may have every thing to lose by mine.

Whether his fellow admirers of the Deaneries may, or may not require an apology for the very indifferent grace with which he has covered their retreat, I cannot so readily tell; for, they may possibly be of opinion that a bad argument brings discredit to a question which nothing ostentatious can efface, and friends may be far more hurtful to it by their advocacy, than opponents could have been by their opposition; or, on the other hand, they may consider that he has succeeded in making a plausible a defence as the circumstances of the case would admit of.

Your obedient servant,  
F. DENROCHE,  
Missionary at Bruchoille.

To the Editor of the Church.

REV. SIR,—As you have allowed me to see the letter of the Rev. E. Denroche, previous to its going to press, I merely wish to correct an apparent misapprehension or two, into which he has fallen.

1. I have had no communication with England upon the subject.  
2. I have not sat in judgment upon any of the English Clergy, but merely stated facts within the range of my own knowledge, of which every one else was as much cognizant as myself. The number of English Clergymen who objected to the revival of Rural Deans was extremely small, and with scarcely an exception, did not belong to the respectable part of the Clergy.

The personal remarks and reflections I leave to the judgment of others, only remarking that they were read by me, as I am sure they will be by many others, with the most extreme surprise and regret.

I remain, Rev. and dear Sir,  
Yours faithfully,  
JAMES BEAVEN.

To the Editor of the Church.

SIR,—As Mr. Bettridge has condescended—to use his own expression—to answer my letter to you, I wish that what he has said were more satisfactory. He has not written one word to the purpose. He says that the meeting in 1836 was called to take the subject of a Convocation into consideration. Does Mr. Bettridge mean to say that this was the subject discussed. If not, then, it is not to the purpose to say anything about the notice. I assert that the subject debated was a Convocation, not a Convocation. And more than this, that the subject of a Convocation never has been treated of at any meeting of the Clergy since 1827.

There have been but two Meetings of the Clergy in which this subject has been considered. The first was called eighteen or twenty years ago, and the second, that in 1836. I was present at both. At the first Meeting, Dr. Strachan advocated the expediency of a Convocation, and introduced "a plan"—to quote the words of the Rev. Mr. Evans, in the Church of April 11th—"resembling, in many of its principal features, that which Mr. DeBlaquiere now proposes." The introduction of lay delegates into the Convocation was one of these resemblances. This will go far to shew what was the plan submitted to the Clergy in 1836.

The same plan was introduced for our consideration in 1836—and the observations, pro and con, made at the meeting will shew that I am correct. The late Rev. Mr. Cartwright commenced the discussion, by asserting that the Laity had always from the times of the Apostles been admitted to meetings of the Clergy; and the Rev. Gentleman read several quotations from Bingham's Antiquities, which, he thought, proved the correctness of his views on this subject. When he had finished, one of the Clergy answered that if, as he asserted, the admission of the Laity was of Apostolical appointment, we should find the plan as universally adopted as the Apostolical office of Bishops. That this had never been the case; and then he read some extracts from Bingham to shew that they had been admitted in comparatively few places,—that, therefore, their admission was a matter of mere expediency, where it had been permitted. Then followed some observations on the working of the system in the United States; and these were made by a Clergyman who had been there lately—travelling in that country. Such was the form the discussion took, and it shews that we had, under consideration, not a Convocation but a Convocation.

Dr. Strachan put in my mind that nothing could be done without the sanction of the Archbishop of Canterbury. The documents it was promised, should be sent Home to him, and I suppose they were, we waited some time for an answer, at last it came, and trusting to my memory, I thought, from the Archbishop; but as Mr. Bettridge would have regarded it simply as the opinion of an individual, not the decision of a person having a right to decide. I am not sorry that I was mistaken, for the answer comes in the shape of an extract from a celebrated work and from some, that is I suppose several Clergymen of "high standing and learning." And as Mr. Bettridge never knew anything of this answer, although he was present when the charge containing it was read, I am glad that I have now before me a copy of it, a few extracts from which, will again shew that a Convocation and not a Convocation was the subject on which we had been long expecting the answer. The Bishop says Sect. 10, pp 32 and 33. The advantage of annual meetings of the Clergy of the Diocese has been frequently a subject of deliberation. Such periodical Conventions were naturally suggested by the example of our neighbours in the United States. It appears that

the introduction of lay members in any such assemblies of the Clergy for Ecclesiastical purposes is altogether without the sanction of Antiquity. In regard to matters of doctrine, it is generally allowed by most persons professing Church principles that the Laity ought to have no voice. On the other hand, whether Laymen should be allowed a voice in the management of the temporal concerns of the Church is not without difficulty. And so on throughout page 33; thus again shewing by the answer that the subject deliberated on, was a Convocation consisting of Lay delegates as well as of Clergy. These remarks in the Bishop's charge, it is to be observed, were taken from the work referred to by him—and what do the "several Clergymen of high standing and learning" say. They asked the Bishop, "what particular business can you have to transact, or on which to deliberate? You are a branch of the United Church of England and Ireland. The constitution of the Church has been long settled, and you CAN MAKE NO MOVEMENT but in accordance with her principles and practice AFTER SHE HAS Laid THE WAY." Had nothing been proposed for the consideration of these learned Clergymen, a Convocation for instance, opposed to her practice and principles, there would have been no occasion for the last quoted remark. They go on to say, "a Diocesan Synod can only take cognizance of such matters as are peculiar to the Diocese, and dispose of them in a way that is agreeable to the usages of the Church, of which you are an integral part." The unity of the Church must be preserved, and this can only be done by confining the power of Legislation to the head, and restraining the branches. With what was said at the Meeting, and these extracts from the answer, it is very clear that not a Convocation, but a Convocation, was the subject of deliberation.

And now with regard to the resolutions having passed unanimously—we can judge of the nature of the resolutions from the above extracts, whatever the words used may have been, it is quite clear they had respect to a convention, and I should as soon have thought of voting in favour of a resolution recommending the abolition of Bishops, as in favour of one recommending a Convocation, and several of the Clergy were of the same opinion as myself, and I therefore again assert, that the resolutions did not pass unanimously. That the opposition made to them by me might have been treated as of no consequence and therefore overlooked, very possible—yet still they did not pass unanimously, therefore Mr. Bettridge "has misstated one of his facts;" and although he was present at the reading of the answer to the resolutions "he has not thought it necessary to mention the other."

Mr. Bettridge says, "our position demands it"—that is self-government.—The ecclesiastical law of England does not extend to us," &c., &c., and thence inferring the necessity of a convocation, and this although he says he is a High Churchman. What I have hitherto seen in favour of this plan has been from persons in the ranks of the Low Church party, I think—I rejoice to be able to ask of a High Churchman, if Mr. Bettridge be indeed one, for from a Conversation I had with him at the Bishop's, then the Archdeacon's table, I had concluded otherwise, what is to be the use or benefit of the Convocation or Convention, if we obtain either, what portion of the Bishop's doings or sayings is to come under its jurisdiction? Is it his refusing to ordain one Candidate for Holy Orders, and ordaining another—for this I suppose is one of the chief grievances.—But who will undertake to advise such an interference as this.—The Bishop alone has the right to ordain, and the fitness or unfitness of the person seeking ordination, surely ought to be decided on by him too.

Have the Bishops at Home any power able to control them similar to that now asked for here. It appears to me that what we want, is just what they have, not a Convocation nor Convention, for we have nothing for these to do, but the Ecclesiastical Courts for the trial of offenders. Here indeed the Bishops power needs to be circumscribed or enlarged, just as any one may think, he has all or no power over an offending Clergyman. A convocation or convention can be of no use to us for we can make no new laws for our own government.—But the Ecclesiastical Courts might be of great service and I think that all the Clergy in the Province would be glad to see them established.

With regard to the time at which the meeting in 1836 took place, the Reverend Mr. Bettridge observes, that it was during the absence of the Bishop. None of his remarks on this point apply to me, for were the Archdeacons now to call a meeting in the absence of the Bishop, I should as readily attend as I did then. Yet it is strange that even here Mr. Bettridge has been guilty of an omission of a very important fact—viz: that the absence of the good old man Dr. Stewart, was occasioned by his having gone home to die, and that we were without a Bishop till the consecration of Dr. Strachan, and further, one of the subjects debated on, at the same meeting I think, was the means of providing for the succession of the Episcopate in this Province.

"Mr. Boswell's E. kindly lectures me and others on our filial obedience towards our Diocesan." Mr. Boswell does no such thing. He lectures Mr. Bettridge and others on their wish for "self government" which supposes a separation between this Province and the Mother Country, for until this has taken place, the words of the Reverend and learned gentleman consulted by the Bishop are still true. "You can make no movement but in accordance with the principle and practice of the Church at home."—and a convention is in accordance with neither one nor the other. I remain, your obedient servant,

EDWARD J. BOSWELL.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

LETTERS received to Wednesday, August 7th, 1850: Rev. J. R. Tooke, ad. sub. and rem.; Rev. H. Patton, ad. sub. and rem. for Rev. J. Mountain, Mrs. Lindsay, R. G. French, Esq., P. G. Mulhern, Esq., P. E. Adams, Esq., Miss Purcell, J. Edgar, Esq., G. S. Jarvis, Esq., and self, all vol. 14; Fras. Taylor, Esq., rem. vol. 13; Mr. J. M. Crawford, rem. vols. 12 & 13; Rev. C. Dade, rem.; Rev. H. E. Piers, rem. for J. S. Merwin, Esq.; vol. 14; Rev. T. W. Allan, ad. sub. and rem. for Mr. Merton and self, vol. 14; Rev. A. H. B. rem. for Mr. J. Ginty, vols. 12 & 13, and self, vol. 14; Rev. T. A. Young, rem. vol. 13; Rev. W. B. King, rem., on referring to the late manager's books another volume appears still due; W. P. Vidal, Esq., rem.; J. Kerby, Esq., rem. for Rev. A. Elliott, vols. 12 & 13; Rev. Mr. Kennedy, vol. 13; W. Florence, Esq., vol. 13; Rev. J. C. Usher, vol. 13, and Jno. Kirby, Esq., vol. 13; J. D. Cameron, Esq., rem. vol. 14; Rev. R. Garrett, ad. sub. and rem. for Mr. J. Watta, and self, both vol. 14; Rev. F. S. Harper, rem.

Letters received by Mr. Champion, from 1st July to 7th August, containing remittances on account of The Church newspaper:—Rev. P. Shirley, for vol. 14; Mrs. Anderson, vol. 13; Rev. J. A. Mulock, vol. 14; James Emnis, vol. 14; Rev. M. Harris, vol. 13; Mr. G. Patterson, vol. 13; Mrs. Evans, vol. 13; Benj. Babbitts, vol. 14; Lawrence Dale, vol. 14.

Mr. Thomas Champion acknowledges receipt of Clergy Reserve Petitions from the following:—

Revs. R. J. C. Taylor, S. S. Strong, J. A. Mulock, E. Morris, E. R. Stinson, T. W. Alle, J. McIntyre, J. Pentland, J. A. Mulock, R. V. Rogers, J. B. Worrell, R. Harding, F. W. Sandys, J. Rothwell, T. W. Marsh, R. G. Cox, R. Garrett, G. Graham, V. H. Gunning, G. Hallen, T. B. Read, P. Keefer, Esq., Revs. J. Gibson, W. C. Clarke, S. F. Ramsey, C. Brown, F. G. Elliott, F. Mack, E. L. Elwood, H. Paton, C. L. Ingles, E. Grasset, F. Tremayne, R. Rolph, J. Padfield, W. Bleasdel, A. H. R. Mulholland, W. Ritchie, R. C. Boyer, D. Fraser, J. R. Tooke, J. Mockridge, J. Magrath, P. Shirley, W. McMurray, A. Pyne, H. L. Ouler, A. F. Atkinson, W. F. Harper, J. Fletcher, V. Bettridge, G. Bourn, J. McLean, Esq., Rev. D. E. Bake, P. Shepard, Esq., Rev. D. E. Blake.

THE CHURCH.

TORONTO, THURSDAY, AUG. 8, 1850.

THE ARCHDEACON OF YORK will (D. V.) visit the following parishes and stations in the Gore District, at the times undermentioned. The same course is recommended as at former visitations,—that the business of the meeting should be preceded by Morning or Evening Prayer:—

Stony Creek	Tuesday,	August 20,	3 P. M.
Binbrook	Wednesday,	" 21,	10 A. M.
York (Grand River)	"	" 21,	4 P. M.
Caledonia	Thursday,	" 22,	10 A. M.
Tuscarora	"	" 22,	3 P. M.
Mohawk	Friday,	" 23,	10 A. M.
Brantford	"	" 23,	3 P. M.
Paris	"	" 23,	6 P. M.
St. George	Saturday,	" 24,	11 A. M.
Galt	"	" 24,	6 P. M.
Beverley	Monday,	" 26,	10 A. M.
Dundas	"	" 26,	6 P. M.
Ancaster	Tuesday,	" 27,	10 A. M.
Hamilton	"	" 27,	7 P. M.
Wellington Square	Wednesday,	" 28,	10 A. M.
Nelson	"	" 28,	3 P. M.
Palermo	Wednesday	" 28,	6 P. M.
Hornby	Thursday,	" 29,	11 A. M.
Norval	"	" 29,	3 P. M.
Milton	Friday,	" 30,	11 A. M.
Oakville	"	" 30,	6 P. M.

THE CHURCH UNIVERSITY.

The following Circular has been addressed by the Lord Bishop of Toronto, to every Clergyman in England whose name appears on the Clergy list. The "printed document" alluded to by His Lordship, was published in our last:—

LONDON, 19 Bury-street,  
St. James, 12th June, 1850.

REVEREND BROTHER IN CHRIST.—I venture respectfully to invite your attention to the accompanying printed document, from which it will appear, that the means of providing a University education in the principles of the Church of England, for the Members and Ministry of that Church have been violently destroyed in my Diocese, by the withdrawal of the Charter of King's College and the seizure of its endowment.

In this great emergency my only resource is in the aims of God's faithful people. My own Diocese has contributed almost beyond its power, and I have now come to England at an advanced age to begin anew a work which has occupied fifty years of my life, and to throw myself on the Christian liberality of the Mother Country.

Reference has been made, in this case of unprecedented hardship and oppression, to the two Archbishops and all the other Bishops of the Church, who not only sanction any application I may make in their respective Dioceses, but accord me their kind sympathies and best wishes, and bid me God speed.

Under these circumstances I feel no shame in soliciting such aid from your Sunday offerings, Congregational collections, or Friendly donations, and subscriptions, as may be in your power to grant.

Perhaps as the case is urgent and I am anxious to return to my Diocese, you will do me the farther kindness of remitting your gift at your early convenience, either to the office of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, 79 Pall Mall, or to one of the other places pointed out at the foot of the printed document.

I am, Reverend Sir,  
Your Faithful Brother,  
JOHN.

By Divine Permission, Bishop of Toronto.

"THE GODLESS UNIVERSITY."

A letter has been pointed out to us in the British Whig, bearing the above title, and purporting to be written by "a Clergyman of the Church of England," advocating the cause of the Government in passing the late University Act.

We have strong reason to believe that this correspondent of our Kingston contemporary is sailing under false colours, and that he is not a Clergyman of the Church of England at all; and that he employs that respectable name only for the purpose of gaining greater attention to his opinions.

We doubt its being the production of a Clergyman, because there is a general flippancy of manner, and a misrepresentation of facts which we certainly should not expect from any of the Kingston Clergy. But there is one sentence in it which we think stamps it as the production of some person who has only assumed the name. In describing, or rather misrepresenting, the effect of the University Act, he says, "There is to be henceforth no chartered monopoly of religious teaching there, no one sect is to be allowed by Act of Parliament to institute a peculiar worship, to propound peculiar dogmas, to impose a peculiar

creed." We do not press the point, that the Church of England was the only body which ever had any thing like a chartered monopoly of religious teaching in King's College; we simply advert to the fact that this "Clergyman" in alluding to the circumstance that his own Church (together with the other religious bodies) is not henceforth to be allowed by Act of Parliament to institute peculiar worship in the University:—classes the Church of England with all the other religious bodies as a "sect."

This is quite enough to satisfy us that the writer cannot be one of the Kingston Clergy; and that he is either a Dissenter, or one of those low-principled laymen, who would be much more suitably placed out of the Church of England than in it.

But though this is the decisive mark of the latitudinarian, there are other indications of the cloven foot. For instance we do not believe that any of the Kingston Clergy would have selected a sentence from his Bishop's Pastoral Letter to hold up before the public as a misrepresentation. And we think that the Dissenter rather than the Churchman appears in the sentence in which he speaks of "one portion of the public enjoying privileges from which others are precluded," and "one party in the commonwealth monopolizing benefits, being patronized, favoured, enriched, and all others left to struggle for themselves." At all events we have mixed pretty largely with the Clergy, and know something of the Kingston Clergy, and we cannot imagine any one of them fancying himself to belong to a body that is "patronized, favoured, enriched." The joke is really too good. If there is any class of people in the community, who in proportion to their education, acquirements and labour, are trampled on, discouraged and poverty ridden, it is the Clergy of the Church of England. No, no! One of the Clergy themselves could never have written that sentence.

Our friend of course wishes us, having been expelled from the University, to give up the Rectories; for, "Can any one assert that it is fair that one portion of the public should enjoy privileges from which others are precluded?" He will next advise us, on the same principle, to give up the Clergy Reserves: next he will recommend that the whole Church of England should resign her tithe-rent-charge, and go upon the voluntary principle; for what is unfair in Canada is unfair in England, we presume.

—And yet this gentleman wishes us to believe that he is a Clergyman of the Church of England! The joke is too good.

With regard to the arguments contained in this letter, they are really of no importance, except as being supposed to come from a clergyman. It is simply the opinion which a correspondent and ourselves have so recently combated, that "general education, without religious preference or religious exclusion," is "calculated to benefit all parties without injuriously affecting any." This is assuming the whole question in dispute; and we deny most emphatically that such "general education" is calculated to promote "the well being of society in reference to its present happiness and most distant hopes."

But we will for the present re-inforce our opinion by an extract from the London Quarterly Review, which we have taken from an Article on the scheme of the London University, kindly borrowed for us by a friend.

"A weightier objection still remains against the assumed title of Education, in the omission of that large and diversified and all important province of it, religion. It is not enough to say that in this respect the students will be as well off as they were before; that all the churches and conventicles of London are open to them; that this is an affair between each individual and his own conscience; and that the times are gone by, when, unless men agree in certain articles of faith, they ought to be debarred from the benefits of intellectual improvement.

"Religious knowledge is not merely a code of precepts and articles of faith. It is intimately connected with the whole course of ancient history, with philology and criticism, with the study of the learned languages, with moral and metaphysical philosophy. [This is precisely what we have illustrated and proved in a recent number.—ED. CH.] It runs parallel with the progress of the human mind in every liberal pursuit. The peasant may be as wise as his condition requires him to be, without the light of learning or philosophy; but the information which is sufficient for the peasant is beneath the claims which such a subject has upon the scholar and the gentleman. If, indeed, the mind be carefully instructed in every other branch of liberal knowledge, without a corresponding acquaintance with that which is the most momentous of all, an undue bias must be given to the judgment.—The topic which is not expanded in proportion to the rest will virtually shrink into insignificance and be despised. Its track will be forsaken; its treasures undiscovered, its domain uncultivated.

"We cannot therefore too earnestly insist upon the incompleteness of any system of education in which this main ingredient is wanting; and we are disposed to attribute much of that enlightened religious principle, which, with all our faults, certainly