

guide for disburdening of the conscience, and as a help to repentance." "Confession made by a single person to a Priest—this itself is in nowise condemned by our Church; nay, she recommends it in some cases." Before, however, he begins to abuse us, let us say that these are John Wesley's own words. He further declares the authority of the priest in pronouncing Absolution to be "Ministerial, Declarative, and Conditional." How very *Sacerdotal!*

In some of the prayers put forth by Wesley for daily use amongst his followers, *seven times a week*, prayers for the dead. They were suppressed in Jackson's edition of his *Works* in 1829.

Time and space both fail us to give much further information from the sources to which we have been referred. We must, however, add just a few more. In the year 1787, John Wesley said: "When the Methodists leave the Church of England, God will leave them;" and fifteen months before his death he wrote: "I never had any design of separating from the Church; I have no such design now. I do not believe the Methodists in general design it when I am no more seen. I do, and will do, all that is my power to prevent such an event. Nevertheless, in spite of all I can do, many will separate from it, although I am apt to think not one half, perhaps not a third of them. These will be so bold and injudicious as to form a separate party. In flat opposition to these, I declare once more that I live and die a member of the Church of England, and that none who regard my judgment or advice will ever separate from it."

We have written but little comment of our own, and leave our contemporary and his friends to refute the founder of that society to which they profess to belong, but whose teachings they hold up to scorn and derision, both by their utterances and by their burlesques of the most solemn services of the Church which he loved. The doctrines, offices and rubrics of that Church are what they were when Wesley said; "As a minister, I teach her doctrines; I use her offices; I conform to her rubrics." At the close of a long life he said, "That in the course of fifty years he had neither premeditatedly, nor willingly, varied from it in *one* article either of doctrine or discipline;" and "that he was not yet conscious of varying from it in *any* point of doctrine." Our contemporary says that *expediency* ruled the Conference in its decisions. It is not expediency which rules the conduct of those whom our courts of law regard with somewhat marked disfavour? In abusing us for applying the teaching of Korah to themselves, the Methodists are abusing John Wesley most of all. Alexander Knox, his old friend, who with his old friend, who with regard to Coke, &c., pronounced him "the dupe of his own weakness and other men's arts," states in his *Remarks on the Life and Character of John Wesley*: "When, some years before his (Wesley's) death, I asked him in a private conversation how he would wish his friends to act in case of the Methodists withdrawing from the Church, his answer was 'I would have them adhere to the Church and leave the Methodists.'"

The statements made of the increase of Methodists, whatever their intention, certainly had the effect of misleading people as to their numbers in the colony until the last census showed the real proportion of the figures among Europeans. An ex-President of the English Conference says: "It is not an uncommon complaint of Methodists to-day that their children, when they grow up, migrate to the Church of England." That the better educated do so is notorious. It was stated twenty years ago that no less than eight hundred sons of Wesleyan preachers had received Holy Orders in the Church of England. But a few weeks ago the *London Times* stated that three Wesleyan preachers in succession in one town had left the Society for the Church. We have no recent

figures to go upon, but the last returns available to us show in England that members were leaving the connexion at the rate of 40,000 per annum. If Wesleyanism (we use the term although it is misleading) only held its own, the mere increasing population of the country would account for an increase of its members, but the returns show that the increase is 35 per cent. below the increase of population. The minutes of Conference for 1884, whilst stating a net increase of 3,281, confess to a leakage of 43,104. In 1885 the net increase was 2,797, with a leakage of 41,320; whilst in 1886, in spite of 45,230 new members, there is a net decrease of 779. The returns for 1887 shew a further decrease, as do also the returns of the Primitive Methodists—one of the numerous "splits" of the original Society. In 1787 John Wesley said: "When the Methodists leave the Church of England God will leave them." Again in 1790, "The Methodists are to spread life among all denominations, which they will do *till they form a separate sect.*" In 1796 he wrote of one of the societies: "I used to wonder that they did not *increase.* Now I should wonder if they *did*, so exquisitely bitter are the chief of them *against the Church.* I solemnly *warned* them against this evil, and some had ears to hear." Again, "If ever the Methodists in general were to leave the Church, I must leave them." "The term church," says Watson in his *Observations on Southey's Life of Wesley*, "Mr. Wesley never applied to his societies, but to the Church of England." Being charged with usurping the functions of the governors of the Church in excluding some of his members, Wesley replied, "No; not the power of excluding from a *private society.*" The Methodists in the time of their "venerated founder" were a "private society": they are now a number of private societies. 'The stream cannot rise above its source,' and if Wesley's judgment be of any value, they having separated from the Church are not a church or members of churches, but *sects.* In 1746 Wesley wrote, and reaffirmed in 1772: "If any more separate from the Church, he is no longer a member of *our society.*" And in 1778: "We inserted in the very first rules of *our society,* 'They that leave the Church, leave it.'" In 1793 conference *forbids* Wesleyan preachers to assume the title of *reverend.* In 1840 the term 'preacher' was dropped by conference, and 'minister' substituted—*both in defiance of John Wesley.* In 1858 Smith's History of Methodism says: "We insist on the strict propriety of calling the Methodist Connexion the Methodist Church." In 1872 placards were posted in London, The President of the Wesleyan Conference being there styled 'The Right Reverend.' In 1893 preachers are told, at an 'ordination' in Queenstown, that they are now "Ministers of the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church." We might in a similar way trace the evolution of preaching houses, ordered by Wesley to be "built plain and decent," from their original style to their present condition. In 1879 at the opening of a new preaching house (we use Wesley's term) at Manningham, Bradford, thirty-six boy choristers were described as "sitting in stalls attired in black surplices," A Wesleyan minister, in a book called *Temporal Prosperity and Spiritual Decline*, bewails the introduction into Methodist preaching-houses of fine toned organ "and "the skilful choir composed of gay young men and giggling girls."

We have been betrayed into a very long article in response to the call of our contemporary, but we have had to omit matter enough from Wesleyan *Works* to fill a whole number. We must now leave the matter to the judgment of our readers, who will no doubt be able to gauge for themselves the absurdity of the contentions of our contemporary, and how far they represent the mind of the "patron and friend of lay preachers." To our mind the "ambition and pride" of the preachers have led them into an utterly false and dishonest position.

The Church is not anybody's "ism." We are not bound by anybody's notes on the New Testament or by volumes of sermons selected to suit our own views, from anybody's works. A Wesleyan Methodist is bound to bring a world-wide religion within the boundaries which encompassed, not even one man's whole mind a hundred or so years ago, but within the limits of some selected portions of the expression of his mind. From time to time some member of the Society carries out the principle by eliminating some further portion of the writer's mind, and splits off into a sect of his own. There are now, apart from the Irish and the many American sects of Methodists, some thirty "splits" from the original Society. "It is only the first step that costs." The lesson of insubordination is rapidly learned. All this controversy and loss of energy are the unhappy results of that separation against which John Wesley, in spite of occasional inconsistencies, strove to the end of his life. How well did he judge when he said, "To lose a thousand, yea, ten thousand of our people would be a less evil than a separation from the Church."

CATHOLICISM AND COLUMBUS— BISHOP PERRY'S POSITION.

(The Iowa State Register, June 18th.)

BISHOP'S HOUSE, }
DAVENPORT, IOWA, June 10, 1893. }

[Continued.]

Father Nugent, in combating my statement that, at the time of the Cabots, "Rome had not then, as was subsequently the case, destroyed the independence of the national Churches of Europe," makes this bold assertion: "Rome never recognized such a thing as a national Church." I refer the father to the "Catechism, by Decree of the Holy Council of Trent, published by command of Pope Pius V., translated into English and published with the original Latin text by J. Donovan, D.D., Rome: printed at the Propaganda Press, superiorum permissu, 1839." (2 vols., 8vo.) On pages 104-105 of this authoritative document of "the Holy Roman Church," in Latin and English, occur these words, as rendered by Dr. Donovan: "But portions of the universal Church are commonly called a Church, as when the apostle mentions the Churches at Corinth, at Galatia, of the Laodiceans, of the Thessalonians." But besides the evidence thus afforded by the Catechism of Trent that my reference to national Churches has the warrant of "Rome," I call the attention of Father Nugent, who cautiously avoids noticing my assertions of the frequent "protests" of the ante-reformation Church of England against the usurpations of Rome, to historic evidence that the same line of conduct obtained in the case of the national Church of France. I cite as follows from "A Catholic Dictionary," (p. 367, second edition, London, 1884), bearing the *imprimatur* of "Henry Edward" (Manning), Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster: "By the Pragmatic Sanction of 1438, passed at Bourges, the Gallican Church, in union with the King, adopted the decrees of the Council of Basle abolishing papal reservations and expectatives, and restricting appeals to Rome to the *causas majores.* Many popes protested against the Pragmatic Sanction; but it was maintained till the date of the Concordat (1516) between Leo X. and Francis I., and, although it was then abolished, several of its provisions continued to be in force. On the whole, there was in the sixteenth century a large body of customs and privileges, more or less ancient, which the courtly portion of the clergy delighted to speak of as the 'Gallican liberties,' etc. Certainly my statement is con-