

These consequences, however absurd, must follow, if the principles expressed in the above very objectionable paragraph be insisted on and carried out. If, therefore, they cannot be vindicated, I hope to see them either retracted or explained.

Yours truly,
CAMPBELL.

Hants, May 23, 1839.

Review.

A Short Catechism on the Duty of Conforming to the Established Church, as good Subjects and good Christians: being an abstract of a larger Catechism, on the same subject. By the Right Rev. THOMAS BURGESS, D. D., Bishop of St. David's. Ninth edition: London. Re-printed at St. John, N. B., by Lewis M. Durant & Co. 1837: *With an Addition to the Re-print.* 12 pp.

"Q. From what authority is derived the civil right of publicly exercising the Christian Ministry?"

"A. From the laws of the land in which it is professed."

But is this "civil right" essential to the Christian Ministry? It is not very "civil" to say it is. The Apostles of our Lord had not this "civil right," as it is notorious they preached *without authority* from "the laws of the land." Yet their ministry was not thereby invalidated.

"Q. What is a legal Church?"

"A. That is a legal church which is established by law."

The first Christian churches were not "legal" churches, as they were not established by law; and yet they were no worse on this account.

"Q. Is every true church a legal church?"

"A. No. A church may be a true church, and yet it is not a legal church, if it be not established by law."

Then other churches may be true churches, though not established by law. If the mere fact of a church being "established by law," add nothing to its true and spiritual character, why is the argument from *legal establishment* adduced? If we belong to a true church, not established, why should we leave it for one that is?

"Q. Is every legal church a true church?"

"A. No. A church may be established by law, and so be a legal church; but if the *word of God* is not preached in it, and the Sacraments are not *duly* administered by persons *rightly* ordained, it is no true church."

What a deadly thrust at the heart of the Church of Scotland! It is established by law, and therefore a *legal* church; but the Sacraments are not administered by persons "rightly ordained," that is by persons *ordained by bishops*, and therefore it is not a *true* church! The Church of England can neither bear an equal nor a rival! In *Scotland* persons ought not to unite with the Church of Scotland, though *established by law*: In *England* persons should unite with the Church of England, because *it is* established by law,—as it is their "*duty*" to conform to the laws of the land, for

* Continued from page 109.

the "powers that be" are "ordained of God." Really this argument from legal establishment is truly *pro-tem*: it can assume any form the Compiler thinks proper to give it! Can the approvers of this Catechism inform us, how the "powers that be" over the British Realm, "ordained" as they are "of God," can establish by laws both a true and a false church? The Presbyterians, however, as much I think their Church a true Church as the Episcopalians think theirs to be such. But if the Scottish Church be a false church, merely because its ministers are ordained by *presbytery* and not by *episcopacy*, the Compiler of the Catechism pays no very great compliment to the Sovereign, (the Temporal Head of the Church,) Lords temporal and *spiritual*, and Commons, by whom it was established by law! If then as the Compiler asserts, a *true* church may not be a *legal* church, and a *legal* church, not a *true* church, what supreme folly does it cringe on the part of those who strive to *establish* the imperious necessity of all British subjects, at home and abroad, conforming to that part of the Christian Church called the Church of England, on the ground of its establishment by law! If the admissions and assertions of the Compiler negative the argument from legal establishment, the question then before us is simply this,—Is ordination by *episcopacy* necessary to the validity of the Christian ministry? To this question the New Testament, the greater number of the Protestant Churches in the world, with their Ministers, men of piety, learning and usefulness, not at all inferior to their opponents, and some eminent Divines of the Church of England itself, answer No. As to just claims to conformity, the Church of England has none superior to other true, efficient Protestant Churches. Wherever there are the most enlightened and spiritual ministry, the most scriptural and effective discipline and the most numerous and efficient means of salvation, whether *in or out of* the Establishment, *there* may persons lawfully and conscientiously repair. With those who prefer the English Church we have no dispute: but we certainly do strongly object to the conduct of those who *would*, if they *could*, force their fellow-subjects, protected equally with themselves by "the laws of the land" in their religious worship, and privileges, into the Establishment, and who deal out anathemas against those who, on the subject of church polity, cannot with them, "see eye to eye." We would not, however, object to the friends of *episcopacy* employing all proper, just, and honorable means to uphold and extend the interests and influence of the Established Church. In this career they have our free and hearty assent to run as far and as well as possibly they can. For this purpose they may, if they think proper, exhibit the scriptural character of its doctrines, the piety, devotedness, self-denial and usefulness of its ministers, and what they conceive to be the peculiar and especial means it professes to consolidate the interests of piety, awaken and convert sinners and build up the truly pious on their most holy faith. Here is a sphere spacious enough to afford ample play for the energies of all its sons, without their entering the contracted but defenceless citadel.