

capture the British entrenchments in front of it, but he was repulsed with a loss of 600 men.

Sept. 21st, Drummond raised the siege and retired into winter quarters, and a little later Brown evacuated Fort Erie and continued his retreat across the border.

This was the last battle on the Canadian border.

The Americans during all this peril were compelled to keep troops along the Canadian frontier, and to make armed demonstration, so that the British, who were about to send troops to the United States, would be obliged to divert them to Canada.

But a new danger threatened. The ships of England took on board the army of Gen. Ross, now commanded by Gen. Packenham—the former officer having been killed in a skirmish before Baltimore—and sailed away down the coast.

In the meantime Gen. Andrew Jackson held command in the Southern States. He drove the Spanish out of Pensacola, because they harboured some English, and when he knew of the presence of the British fleet in the vicinity he believed its objective point to be New Orleans.

This place he fortified with mud walls and cotton bales, behind which were posted his Tennessee and Kentucky riflemen.

Gen. Packenham landed his troops, among whom were some of the most celebrated of Wellington's veterans. But they were fighting, this time, against an impregnable position. Their assault was repulsed, their commander slain. This battle took place Jan. 8, 1815. Before this, on the 24th Dec. 1814, the Commissioners Plenipotentiary of Great Britain and the United States had signed a treaty of peace at Ghent, in Belgium, which had it been known by the belligerents in America, would have saved both parties the shedding of blood after that date.

By this treaty the posts occupied by each party which belonged to the other were to be given up. The frontier disputes, between Canada and New Brunswick on the one side and the United States on the other, were to be settled by a Commission to be appointed by both Governments some time in the future. The United States Government was humiliated by the terms of this treaty, which omitted everything relating to the rights of search by England.

England also obtained the signature of the United States to the fact that slavery was inhumane, and ought to be stopped on the high seas by both nations. The United States by this treaty failed to obtain the recognition of the right of neutral states to trade with belligerents.

It has been stated by some historians that the cause of the war was the desire of the Americans to conquer Canada, and this was the reason why the Government of the United States did not insist in the treaty on the recognition of the rights of neutrals and a denial of the right of search. But such is not the case. The struggle was fierce and vindictive for what the causes of the war were said to be, namely, the rights of commerce; because, before the war, the ocean trade of the republic was enormous. The exports, that were more than £22,000,000, and the imports £28,000,000 in 1812, had fallen in 1814 by the war to less than £1,800,000 for the exports, and less than £3,000,000 for the imports. The Government of the United States, deprived of the revenue resulting from this trade was obliged to revert to imposts and loans, which in 1814 exceeded \$20,500,000.

Two-thirds of the merchants of the North were ruined. This class of sea-merchants formed one of the most cultivated societies of the land, and furnished the captains of the sea in the American navy. They were liberal and generous in idea from intercourse with foreign states. They were intelligent and travelled, many of them having made voyages of pleasure in their own ships, and had collected for the ornamentation of their homes curios found in foreign lands. On the walls of their drawing-rooms were sometimes seen the family coat-of-arms—for as a class they were derived from the best stock of the North—from generations who before, in the colonial period, had some excellence to boast of.

Now the war of 1812-15 ruined this class entirely. Consequent on this the political, industrial and social arrangements of New England were altered. These fell out of sight by the ruination of these families, those links formed in the chain of revolutionary and colonial history, which held the colonies of the North in friendship with the colonies of the South. The spirit and hardihood of command which be-

longed to the old sea-rulers were thrown down then. There arose after from the ranks of the meaner, more bigoted and dishonest classes of New England, at first a set of makers of small wares, who, as their gains increased, developed into important manufacturers. Now, there should be no mistake in understanding how wide apart were the origins of these two classes. In the first were reckoned the gentry and the professions, who had followed the same lines in generations back to England with the persistence known only in the castes of ancient days. In the second were servants and menials who had a prejudice and hatred for those above them. The first class were not unfriendly to the English, and were on terms of sociability with the Southern colonists. The second class hated England and the Southern aristocracy with the same narrow and intense hatred that characterized the butchers of the French Revolution, and the meaner of the roundhead carles who rioted in the shadow of Barebone's Parliament. From this time there arose in the United States those elements that were destined to come into conflict in North and South, because the systems, industrial, social and political now coming into power in the North, were those diametrically opposed to what had been before.

VISCOUNT DE FRONSAC.

* * *

The Lambeth Articles.

IN reviewing some lectures on Church Unity, given before the students of Union Seminary, New York, during the session of last winter, the "Lambeth Articles" were mentioned. Coming as they do from the authoritative representatives of the historic Episcopal churches of the Anglo-Saxon peoples, they carry an influence, and afford a definite ground for conference on the subject of Church Unity, possessed by no other statements thus far presented to the churches of the Reformation. No apology is offered, therefore, for an examination of them.

The genesis of these articles was seen at Chicago in 1886, when the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States considered an overture on the subject of the reunion of Christendom. The articles then drawn up were considered anew at a more general gathering held in Lambeth Palace, London, in 1888. This convention consisted of one hundred and forty-five bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Churches of Great Britain, the Colonies and the United States. The articles were somewhat amended, and stand as follows: facetiously called after the four fortresses of Lombardy, "The Anglican Quadrilateral."

I. The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as "containing all things necessary to salvation," and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith.

II. The Apostles' Creed, as the Baptismal Symbol; and the Nicene Creed, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith.

III. The two Sacraments ordained by Christ himself—Baptism and the Supper of the Lord—ministered with the unfailing use of Christ's words of institution, and of the elements ordained by Him.

IV. The Historic Episcopate, locally adopted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of His Church.

It is not our purpose to criticise these articles; but, viewing them as an honest and devout endeavour to promote unity and discourage schism, to enquire how far they may be taken as representing our common Christianity; in no other way can they be viewed as an irenicon, for no "The temple of the Lord are these" on the part of any sect will in these days of free enquiry stand: even Rome is most egregiously failing in her *Sic volo, sic jubeo*.

With regard to the first article there can be no real difficulty. As the symbol of all distinctive Christian teaching the Scriptures are acknowledged; nor can the difference in the modes of interpretation or in exegesis be greater than in the general Christian world than they are already in the individual churches; nor more to be feared is their influence upon Christian unity. Confessedly all we can know or hope to know of our common faith is to be found within the compass of the Old and New Testaments. Even Catholic tradi-