

NOTICES TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We must beg our friends to write the names of persons and places as distinctly as possible. This will save much annoyance. Communications received later than Wednesday morning must stand over till our next issue. We cannot undertake to return rejected manuscripts. Back numbers will be sent only on application. \*Subscribers are especially requested to make complaint at once to the office of any irregularity in mailing or delivery of their papers.

PERSONAL.—Mr. J. Wright ceased editorial connection with this paper on the 20th ultimo.

VISIT A. J. PELL'S GALLERY OF ART, 345 NOTRE DAME STREET, In rear of Post Office, MONTREAL.

Church Observer.

—“THIS PROTESTANT KINGDOM.”—Bill of Rights, 1688.

MONTREAL, 8TH OCTOBER, 1868.

CLERICAL INTELLIGENCE.

On Sunday, the 4th inst., the Lord Bishop of Toronto held a general ordination in St. Mark's Church, Niagara, when the following gentlemen were ordained:—Priests: Jones, Rev. Charles Garret, Port Whitty; Trew, Rev. Archibald George Lister, B. A., Curate St. James', Toronto. Deacons: Carey, William Beaufield, B. A., Trinity College, Toronto; Hinde, Ralph William, B. A., Trinity College, Toronto; Mackenzie, William James; Taylor, George Irwin, B. A., Trinity College, Toronto.

SUBSCRIPTION FOR A MEMORIAL TO THE LATE BISHOP FULFORD.

A meeting was held yesterday, which was largely attended by gentlemen representing the various congregations of the Church of England in this city, at which it was unanimously resolved that steps be at once taken to erect a memorial to the late Bishop of Montreal and Metropolitan of Canada. The sum of \$1,050 was subscribed on the spot; and in a few days the several congregations will be waited upon for subscriptions. The least that should be raised is \$5,000, but there may be a greater amount from the whole diocese. The form of the memorial is to be determined by the majority of subscribers. We think there is great propriety as well as call for this subscription.

EARNESTNESS IN DEBATE.

Very between a seep and a Christian, that whatever the merits of the question, the sceptic had the advantage in point of temper. And the explanation is easy: the sceptic was cold and calm, because he had no feelings engaged in the discussion; while the Christian was warm and energetic, because he was in earnest and was battling for the truth; and even when carried away by his zeal beyond the bounds of rigid judgment, we give the friend of truth our cordial sympathy.

Men, some without thought, and some peradventure with little spiritual insight, have, like the spectator referred to, ventured to lecture the Provincial Synod for the earnestness and heat displayed in the debates, and the tenacity with which delegates contended for their views of truth. The censors, apparently, would have a man weigh his words and chasten his action, and insist that he should be careful that he does not transgress the rules of orderly dignity, even if he saw the flames threatening to consume his home and the unspeakable treasures it contains. The delegates composing the Provincial Synod were in earnest, the depths of their souls were stirred—not about the colour or form of a vestment, or the posture or direction of the body as some perversely say or insinuate—but about great truths involving eternal interests; and, therefore, they spoke and acted as men ought to speak and act, and ever will, especially if they are worthy to be leaders, in contending for the faith. They spoke and acted not with acrimony—not with invective, not with bitterness, but with fearlessness, earnestness—and notably in the case of Archdeacons Fuller and Hellmuth, and the Revs. S. Givins and H. Caulfield, and Professor Wilson, with eloquence inspired by the fulness of their hearts.

It was our lot to listen, we venture to say, to every speech made on the floor of the house; and, after careful reflection, we can only recall one or two serious departures from strict propriety during the many days of warm debate on a most exciting subject. No doubt, at times, the zeal and warmth of the delegates caused them to disregard the rules of order in the matter of two or three rising together, and in such like minor things; but in serious points, no—only once or twice. Once, the members of the house were very much pained by, we must say, a coarse and most uncalculated attack upon certain delegates, charging them with holding some outrageously described views, ascribed by the speaker to Calvin; and it was greatly to the credit of those delegates

that they refrained from retorting upon the speaker in that, as well as in one or two other most unworthy and incorrect statements put forth.

And once again the house was rather amused as well as irritated by a delegate, (a lawyer we believe) in great warmth, assailing gentlemen on the anti-ritualist side of the question for having delayed the business of the house, when it was notorious and acknowledged that such were the tactics of his friends, and that he himself had been the most clever and successful as an obstructionist.

The delegates from the Diocese of Montreal took very little active part in the debate. They were depressed and saddened. There was a great weight resting upon their hearts. On one day, many of them were found in an upper room weeping over the cold form of their loved Bishop; and every day there was a consciousness of bereavement which sobbed and silenced them amidst the keenest contention. They did their duty in the various divisions, and when they spoke, their words were firm, chastened and earnest. They did their duty as became men who were compelled to act while overwhelmed with a sudden grief, and who were glad when the duty was performed.

On a calm review of this session of the Provincial Synod, we feel that, as a whole, it is creditable to the Church in this Province.

GOOD RESULTS.

Cherishing accounts of the good accomplished by the late action of the Provincial Synod have reached us from various quarters. A missionary residing in the west, said that he considered the effect of the decision on ritualism would be of more worth to the church than was the money lost by the alienation of the clergy reserves. Leading churchmen throughout the Province have hailed the result with devout thankfulness to God, and have felt that a new era of prosperity was about to dawn on the church of their affections. Prominent members of other communions have expressed their satisfaction and wished us God-speed. In short it is almost universally regarded as the most important meeting ever held by the Canadian branch of the United Church of England and Ireland. Confidence has been in a measure restored, and those who love the church will now give freely of their means for its extension. It is fearful to consider what would have been the result consequent on an adverse decision. Had ultra-ritualism been legalized and established, the affections of many would have been alienated, and the church would have been divided into other channels.

Thank God we have not been subjected to the trial. Certain practices are absolutely forbidden, and others the Bishops are pledged by every means in their power to prevent. We have great confidence that our right reverend fathers will be faithful in the discharge of their trust. They will thus earn for themselves the gratitude and respect of the great body of the church. The effect of the action of our late Synod is also felt abroad. The *Episcopalian*, a widely extended journal, published in New York and Philadelphia, thus writes:—“As it should be.—The action of the Canadian Episcopal Synod against the use of quasi Roman vestments, altar lights, wafer bread, the elevation of the elements, etc., is hailed by all Evangelical men here, as just the right thing in the right place. It will do good here as well as in Canada. It is a well-known fact that Ritualism on the St. Alban's plan, was beginning to crop out in several parishes in Montreal and other cities, so that the very decisive condemnation of it by the Synod, therefore, did not come a moment too soon. We have no idea that after this, we shall hear anything more of these Popish mimics in that quarter, and it is morally certain a like judgment on the part of our General Convention would put an end to them here.”

Our contemporary is in error in supposing that ritualism was beginning to crop out in several parishes in Montreal. We are glad to be able to say that the churches in this city are almost a unit in their determination to hold to the old paths. Nevertheless it is true as he says, that the condemnation of ultra-ritualistic practices did not come a moment too soon. We believe that the *Church Observer* exerted no small influence in producing the result to which we have alluded. It was scarcely possible in a time of such great excitement to avoid writing words of bitterness; but we are certain that this journal had the effect of drawing the attention to those innovations in doctrine and practice in the mother church which were slowly but steadily working their way into our Diocese, and which would, if unchecked, have led in many instances to an assimilation and final union with the church of Rome. We have already received the approval of many churchmen, and are having a more substantial proof of their good opinion in a rapid increase to our subscription list. A solemn trust is committed to us, and we mean, with the help of God, faithfully to execute it, avoiding, as far as possible, all bitterness and personality.

HER MAJESTY'S HEALTH.—The *British Medical Journal* intimates that though the Queen has received benefit from her foreign tour, and will continue to regulate public

business, she will not be able to bear the excitement of a lengthened residence in London, and the fatigue of continued receptions.

Correspondence.

We are not responsible for any opinions expressed by our correspondents.

MY BIBLE CLASS.

[To the Editor of the Church Observer.]

DEAR SIR,—I have just been turning over the leaves of a large photograph album, glancing at old familiar faces and recalling many pleasant associations. This album has a history for me. Its frontispiece tells what that is—“Presented to the Rev. \_\_\_\_\_, by the members of his Bible Class, St. \_\_\_\_\_, April 25th, 186—.” Its pages contain sun-pictures, much cherished of many of those members. The months in which I gathered and taught that class, are amongst the most pleasant of the past.

I had long felt the need of bringing together the members of the congregation in a more social way than they had been accustomed to be brought. I wished to get nearer them myself to get them nearer with each other, and with His blessing, to get them nearer to Himself. I am thankful to say that my desires were largely realized.

In the parochial school-room on a week-evening, the class was commenced; it grew in interest and in numbers, and became a power for God. It was composed of young men and staid matrons—grey-headed men and bright-eyed girls—from the professions, from the trades, from the mansion, from the cottage; all came and all were welcome. Oh! how pleasant the hours we spent there, following the early disciples in their journeyings with the Gospel message, and endeavouring to impress more deeply the truths of that Gospel upon our own minds and hearts. Oftentimes I have been ready to exclaim with the disciples on the mount, “Master it is good for us to be here.” I trust and believe that the good seed there sown is springing up, and will spring up and bear the fruit of everlasting life.

Alas! that the changeful circumstances of this changeful world should have scattered my dear old class. In looking over the still kept roll-call, I see that in a very brief period many changes have come over some of my old scholars. Some are married—several are removed to other parts of the country—one has crossed the ocean, and one is with the angels. Oh! that we may meet again, “meet ne'er to sever,” meet “to be for ever with the Lord.”

Diocese of Huron, 1868.

JESUITISM.

[To the Editor of the Church Observer.]

SIR,—Some one, not known to me, has posted to my address a copy of the *Montreal Gazette* of the 26th inst., containing a sermon preached in an Episcopal Church in your city on the preceding Sunday, and “published by request.” I take it for granted that the object in publishing it, is to vindicate the orthodoxy of the author; which it appears has lately been called in question, and to administer a rebuke to the opponents of excessive ritualism, whose conduct at the late Provincial Synod the preacher thinks it his duty to rebuke.

As a Jesuit, I am willing to admit it to be such that all should lay to heart, and I hope that every one that reads it will do so; but I would beg leave to remark, there is much also in it that is objectionable; and, as it appears to me, makes directly for those very things which were so strongly condemned by the resolution adopted at the late Provincial Synod. Nor is it surprising that this should be the case when the preacher delights to draw his Divinity and his illustrations from the source he has done.

In looking into Lempriere's Universal Biography, I find that Cornelius a LAPIDE, from whose works the preacher quotes—was a French Jesuit, the author of 10 vols. *Folio of explanations and commentaries on the Scriptures*. He died at Rome in 1637, aged 71. I will merely add that if clerical commentaries for food wherewith to feed their flocks, it is to be wondered at that they gradually, (though perhaps insensibly to themselves, not to others) assimilate themselves in doctrine, in sentiment, in looks and in dress to those they so much admire? or that their people love to have it so.

Ontario, Sept. 28th, 1868.

SCHOOL TAXES.

[To the Editors of the Church Observer.]

GENTLEMEN,—Will you kindly inform the public through the columns of your very popular journal, as to the *modus operandi* to be observed by parties paying the Educational or School Tax, levied for the first time this year in the city of Montreal.

It is the practice in some of the country places, to give the tax payers the option as to what school their respective taxes shall be applied; and the question now asked is—will the same privilege be maintained in this city or not; and shall it be necessary for the tax payer to give notice of his intention in that respect, and when and how it should be done?

Yours truly, PROTESTANT.

MONSIGNOR TALBOT AND RELIGION IN ROME.

[From the Morning Advertiser.]

MONSIGNOR TALBOT, who holds, we believe, some office in the Papal Court, lately appeared at a public meeting in London, in company with Dr. Manning, and made use of the following language:—“He had come from Rome, the only city in the world in which religion was predominant. And he had been travelling through the cities and villages of England, and he was grieved to behold the spiritual desert which existed in this beautiful island. The higher classes pursued their pleasures, and the poor, abandoned to their own vices, were in some places in a state of brutality.”

The audacity of this sort of contrast almost takes one's breath away. Rome is “the only city in the world in which religion is predominant.” Why did not Monsignor Talbot add, that it is also the only city in the world in which the ruler is obliged to be protected by foreign bayonets. Rome is guarded at this moment, by a motley horde of Dutchmen, Belgians, Frenchmen, and Irishmen. Could these be withdrawn to-morrow—could the Pope be left in the care of the people of Rome, he would fly, as he did once before, in a lacquey's jacket, before the week was over. Will Monsignor Talbot have the goodness to explain how the “predominance of religion” and the pre-

dominance of discontent among the people, come to be found together?

But again,—“The predominance of religion,” if the religion were worth anything, should imply and insure the predominance of morals and purity and a holy living. Will Monsignor Talbot tell us that such is really the state of things in Rome?

The census in 1852 gave a return of the number of persons in Rome who were devoted to a religious life. These were, 29 Bishops, 1,280 priests, 2,092 monks, and 1,698 nuns; in all, 5,099 persons, for the religious culture of about 160,000 or 180,000 people; in other words, about one religious teacher for every 35 persons. Certainly, there never was a city in the world better supplied with religious teaching. The quantity is abundant; but what can be said about the quality?

The Papal advocates boast of their noble institutions for the reception of foundlings. The founding hospitals of Rome, according to Mittermaier, received in ten years no fewer than 31,589 children. This would give an average of 3,159 every year.

How many children were annually born in Rome? Sir John Bowring's Report, laid before the House of Commons, gave, in the year of his inquiry, 4,373 births; so that, in a city in which “religion was predominant,” out of 4,373 children born, 3,159 were sent to the founding hospitals! Again we ask, what is to be said of the quality of this religion?

Try it by another test—the worst sort of crime. In the year when Sir John Bowring, sent by Lord Palmerston, made his inquiry, the number of persons imprisoned for murder in the Papal States, lying in prison at one time, out of a population of three millions! The population of England is more than six times three millions; yet when have we so many as fifty murderers in our prisons at the same time? Mr. Hobart Seymour went minutely into the calculation, and showed that while in England we had, on an average, no more than four murders per annum, out of each million of the population, in the Roman States, the average was one hundred and thirteen to each million. Again, we ask, if religion is predominant in Rome, what sort of a religion is it that so predominates?

More recently, the present Dean of Canterbury, Dr. Alford, a man of most catholic and liberal spirit, has visited Rome, and has described what he saw. We can only give two or three items out of his full and instructive description.

On Saturday, Feb. 20, 1864, two young men, clerks of Signor Baldini, were conveying home, from the office, to their master's bank, the money remaining after the day's transactions. They conveyed it in a hired carriage. At half-seven o'clock, in the Via Lucina, within seventy paces of the crowded Corso, the carriage was stopped by six armed men, who dragged the clerks out, killed them, and took away the money, £1,700. The murderers escaped and never were taken. The universal conviction was that the police were privy to the whole transaction. And this in the middle of a city where, says Monsignor Talbot, “religion is predominant.”

But what sort of religion? Here is one specimen, as Dean Alford describes it:—“We enter the church of S. Maria sopra Minerva. After perhaps an hour of service of different kinds, in which the people take no part whatever, we see, by the side which is going on, and the passing out and in, between the interior

to be done. At last a silver canopy appears, borne on four poles at the corners. A priest goes up to the altar and puts a white cloth, which had previously during the service been concealing something beneath, as is the case on the Communion Table of our English churches, when the elements about to be consecrated are placed there before morning prayer. And now, if my English reader had been present, I believe he would have felt as I felt,—a glow of shame heating his cheek,—shame for our disgraced Christianity, shame for our very nature itself,—when the object thus reverently concealed proved to be a wax doll about eighteen inches in length. This the priest took in his arms with gestures of reverence; and it was borne round the church, under the canopy, in solemn procession, with candles held by each Dominican. When the end of the procession reached the end of what we in England should call the scuth aisle (churches in Rome are built without regard to east and west), he stood still, and faced down the aisle. Each member of the body, as he came up, having given his candle into the hands of an attendant, who extinguished it, reverently approached the doll, kissed its toes, and, bowing, touched them with his forehead. Nor was this all. When every one in the procession had done this, the priest delivered the doll to another, apparently inferior in rank, who took it to a side altar, over which was a *presepe*, a representation of the manger, with St. Joseph and St. Mary. In this manger the doll was eventually deposited; but first, a rail was run out into the church, like the rail at which our communicants kneel, and at that rail the people flocking knelt by relays, while the doll was carried round again and again, each person, as the Dominicans had done, kissing its toes, and touching them reverently with the forehead.”

What sort of a religion? we ask again. Here is a second specimen:—“A friend of mine, shocked at his profanity, asked him, ‘Do you forget who Christ is, that you thus blaspheme Him?’ ‘Bah,’ answered the man, ‘I'm not afraid of Him (non ho paura di lui!)’ ‘Whom, then, do you fear?’ pursued my friend. ‘Vi diro I will tell you,’ was the answer of the man, as he approached the questioner, and whispered in his ear, ‘Ho paura della Madonna, ma non di lui.’—I'm afraid of the Madonna, but not of Him.”

If this is to be called a religion at all, it is a false religion, a religion scarcely any better than that of Mahomet or Buddha. And hence we feel no surprise that, under such a system, the morals of Rome are no better than those of Persia or of Burmah.

But what of the “spiritual desert” which grieves poor Monsignor Talbot, when he looks around on the cities and villages of England, where the “higher classes pursue their pleasures, and the poor are sunk in brutality?”

We question not, for one moment, that thousands of our higher classes have no religion beyond the name, or that millions of the poorer sort are similarly heathenish. All this we sadly but unhesitatingly admit. But Monsignor Talbot presses a comparison. England is so much worse than Rome. This statement is so audacious and so profligate, that we feel astonished that any man should have the face to make it. How? the city in which “religion is predominant,” would throw the Pope and all his cardinals into the Tiber, if a hired mob of “Papal Zouaves,” consisting of Dutchmen, Germans, and Irishmen, did not crush down and keep down every movement of public feeling. We have Fenianism and rabid Radicalism in London, but who ever dreams of the

slightest peril to Queen Victoria, or to any of the Royal family? We have vice in London, and illegitimate births; but who can conceive such a state of things as that three-fourths of our infants born should be sent to founding hospitals or asylums? We have murders every now and then, in this vast accumulation of people of all kinds; but if our murders bore any resemblance to those in Rome, we should have in London three or four hundred murders in every year, or some six or eight in every week. No, the idea of a comparison is preposterous; and the supposition that such a comparison would be unfavourable to England is so outrageously absurd, that it needs a man of Papal training to be equal to such a monstrosity.

THE LATE BISHOP OF PETERBOROUGH.

(From the Morning Post.)

The Right Rev. Francis Jeune was the son of Mr. Francis Jeune, of Jersey, the representative of a Huguenot family, who had taken refuge in that island at the time of the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. The late Bishop was born in 1806, and was at first educated at a French college. In 1823 he obtained a scholarship in Pembroke College, Oxford; and in 1827 took his degree of B.A., with the rank of a first in classics. Lord Seaton, going out to Canada as Governor-General in 1829, secured his services as tutor to his sons, and on his return in 1830 he obtained a fellowship and tutorship in his own college. He became public examiner in 1834, and in the same year head master of Birmingham School, where he introduced excellent reforms in the curriculum, completely remodelled the system of education in addition to the classical foundation. In 1838 Lord John Russell appointed him Dean of Jersey and Rector of St. Helier, and while in the island he evinced a warm interest in its welfare. He was one of the most active promoters of the foundation of Victoria College, and was followed by the regrets of the whole island when his own college of Pembroke invited him to become master in 1843. As head of Pembroke College he also became Vicar of Taynton, in Gloucestershire, and was appointed to a stall in Gloucester Cathedral. As canon and treasurer to the chapter he displayed no small amount of administrative skill, and so managed the cathedral property as to obtain sufficient funds to enable him to restore the cathedral as well as to increase the value of the property materially. In the year 1858 he became Vice-Chancellor of the University of Oxford, and his tenure of that office was marked by some important events in the history of that ancient abode of learning. The heir apparent to the throne took up his residence and his studies at Christ Church, and he came, accompanied by his lovely bride, to receive the honorary degree of D.C.L. from the hands of the Chancellor, the Earl of Derby. During this period, and on that occasion, the Master of Pembroke was not behindhand in his hospitalities in honour of the illustrious guests of the University. It was also the duty of Jeune as Vice-Chancellor, in the year 1860, to confer honorary degrees on Adam Sedgwick, and other distinguished visitors, at the meeting of the British Association—the meeting at which the Prince Consort resigned the presidential chair to Lord Wrottesley. At this meeting, also the Vice-Chancellor's hospitalities were completely exhausted.

Dr. Jeune was a member of the French, in Westminster Abbey, on the subject of the International Exhibition, to a large and distinguished gathering. In December, 1863, he was appointed Dean of Lincoln, and early in 1864 he left Oxford to undertake the duties of the Bishopric of Peterborough. Since that time perhaps it may be considered no small praise to say that he has been but little before the public.

Dr. Jeune has published a few sermons, the first of which was preached in 1846 before the University. It is entitled “The Throne of Grace, not the Confessional,” and is directed against Dr. Pusey and his followers, of whom he was one of the earliest and most uncompromising opponents. He took an active part in defending Dr. Hampden against this party, both in the University and on the occasion of his appointment to the see of Hereford. He was one of the earliest supporters of university reform, and strongly recommended the commission of inquiry, of which he became one of the leading members. He was the author of the greater part of the Report, and afterwards ably assisted in carrying out most of the reforms which have been introduced into the University. He was instrumental in establishing schools for natural science, for law, and for history, and in procuring such changes in the course as provided that greater attention than in former times should be paid to the study of the pure sciences.

NEARING HOME.

Be not dismayed at the prospect of getting home. Where is the man that would be sorry to be ejected from a cottage, in order to his living in a palace? and yet death to a child of God is but a writ of ejectment, and turns him out of a prison, and transmits him to his apartments at court. Dread not the interjacent valley; it is but the shadow of death; and what is there in a shadow to be afraid of? Dark as it may seem, it will brighten as you enter; and the farther you go, the brighter will it prove. I have known many a believer go weeping to the river of death; but I never knew a believer go weeping all the way through it. Even an earthly parent is particularly tender and careful of a dying child. Much more will the great and gracious Father of the elect, support, cherish, and defend his own children in the hour of death. Believers should not have a slavish dread of death; for where is the infant that is afraid to go to sleep in its nurse's arms? Dost thou ask, O converted reader, which is best—to be taken to heaven by sudden death in a moment or two, or to be thrown on a lingering bed, and so, if the Lord please, be able to bear some testimony to his love, power and faithfulness? I answer, leave the whole matter to him. If possible, do not entertain a wish, either one way or the other. Be this your petition:—

“Only receive my soul to thee; The manner and the time be thine.” Or, are you afraid of what you may suffer in your last conflict? turn again to your rest; for the Lord will deal bountifully with you, and be better to you than your fears.

A. T.

JUSTIFICATION.

The doctrine of the Scripture is, that justification itself consists in God's esteeming and counting us righteous; that he thus esteems and counts us righteous, neither for our faith, nor for our works, nor for both of them together, but solely and entirely on account of Christ's sacrifice and obedience, as the alone matter of