

council of Chalcedon held A.D. 451, it is written, "From St. Timothy until now 27 bishops have been ordained in Ephesus." (Act. ii. tom. 14.) Ignatius, according to Chrysostom, was ordained bishop of Antioch, being promoted to that dignity by the apostle Peter himself on the death of Evodius the first bishop. (Homil. in Ignat.) Irenæus a disciple of Polycarp, the contemporary of Ignatius, says, "Because it would be too long to enumerate the succession of all the churches, I will instance that of Rome." And again "We can enumerate those who were constituted Bishops by the apostles in their Churches, and their successors even unto us." And yet again, "The blessed apostles, founding and instituting the Church (in Rome) delivered to Linus the bishopric. To him succeeded Anacletus—after him Clement—to Clement succeeded Evaristus, and to Evaristus Alexander, and then Sixtus was appointed the sixth from the Apostles—after him Telesphorus, then Hyginus, then Pius, after whom Anicetus. And when Soter had succeeded Anicetus, now Eleutherus has the bishopric in the twelfth place from the apostles.—By this ordination and succession the doctrine of the truth hath come even unto us." Tertullian, Hegeppus, and Irenæus, all living within a hundred years of St. John, urge against heretics the argument of the universal consent of Bishops succeeding in a direct line from the Apostles. This is an undeniable proof that at the very period when the facts of the case were most likely to be well known, the lineal succession of Bishops from the Apostles was a thing undoubted.

It would be easy to continue this account of the government of the Church by bishops throughout the succeeding ages to the present time. As, however, it is confessed even by the enemies of Episcopacy that the Church was governed by bishops superior to deacons and presbyters after the time of Eusebius, it will be needless to carry the argument farther.

Let us then recapitulate what has been proved. It has been proved that the vital principles of Christianity preclude the idea of a ministry deriving its authority from man, while inspired history assures us that God has in fact commissioned a living ministry. It has been shown from Scripture that it was the design of God that this ministry should continue to the end of time, from which the inference is necessary that a divinely established ministry must exist somewhere at present. It has been shown also that scripture testifies to the continuance of the apostolic succession throughout the first century, and that subsequent credible history assures us that afterwards the apostolic powers were exercised by persons denominated bishops. It has been proved furthermore that bishops alone ordained bishops; that they alone ordained presbyters and deacons, that they alone ruled the entire body of the Church, and that the lineal succession of Bishops in several Churches was a matter of history soon after the era of Scripture. When, in addition to this, we recollect that three bishops at least have generally concurred in ordaining a successor to a deceased Bishop, we draw the inevitable conclusion that the apostolic succession has been never lost or broken.

Wherever, then, this succession has been retained, we may find those who in fact, though perhaps not in name, are Apostles of Jesus Christ. Such is the case throughout eleven-twelfths of the christian world—such is the case in the venerable Church of England. Let it then be remembered that whatever dignity our Bishops may derive from the State, far higher is the nobility, far holier are the prerogatives which they inherit as the successors of Paul and of Timothy, of Titus and of John. An earthly government may take from them what an earthly government has given: it may deprive them of their titles, strip them of their possessions, and interdict them from participating in the councils of their country. But it can never take from them what God has given; it can never dissolve them of the apostolic office; it can never hurl them from their high pre-eminence as rulers of the Church of God and judges of the spiritual Israel. Should persecution once more rage against them, as in the days of Peter and of Ignatius, of Ridley and of Cranmer, their real, religious dignity would shine the brighter in the hour of calamity. The apostolical succession would roll on like a mighty river, diffusing blessings to millions, unchecked by all the shallow artifices and puny force of rebellious man. And it must flow onwards, causing the desert to blossom and the wilderness to be glad, until the gracious work of redemption shall have been accomplished, and time itself shall be no more.

H. C.

Brockville, March 9.

THE FOUNDERS OF DISSENT.

From Dean Swift's Sermon on the Martyrdom of King Charles I.

Upon the cruel persecution raised against the Protestants, under Queen Mary, among great numbers who fled the kingdom to seek for shelter, several went and resided at Geneva, which is a commonwealth governed without a king, and where the religion, contrived by Calvin, is without the order of Bishops. When the Protestant faith was restored by Queen Elizabeth, those who fled to Geneva returned among the rest home to England, and were grown so fond of the government and religion of the place they had left, that they used all possible endeavours to introduce both into their own country; at the same time continually preaching and railing against ceremonies and distinct habits of the clergy, taxing whatever they disliked as a remnant of popery, and continued extremely troublesome to the Church and State, under that great queen, as well as her successor King James I. These people called themselves Puritans, as pretending to a purer faith than those of the Church established. And these were the founders of our dissenters. They did not think it sufficient to leave all the errors of Popery, but threw off many laudable and edifying institutions of the Primitive Church, and, at last, even the government of Bishops; which, having been ordained by the Apostles themselves, had continued without interruption, in all Christian Churches, for above 1500 years. And all this they did, not because those things were evil, but because they were kept by the Papists. From thence they proceeded, by degrees, to quarrel with the kingly government; because, as I have already said, the city of Geneva, to which their fathers had flown for refuge, was a commonwealth, or government of the people.

Those wicked Puritans began, in Queen Elizabeth's time, to quarrel only with surplices and other habits, with the ring in matrimony, the cross in baptism, and the like; thence they went on to further matters of higher importance; and, at last, they must needs have the whole government of the Church dissolved. This great work they compassed, first by depriving the bishops of their seats in parliament; then they abolished the whole order; and, at last, which was their original design, they seized on all the church lands,

and divided the spoil among themselves; and, like Jerobam, made priests of the very dregs of the people. This was their way of reforming the Church. As to the civil government, you have already heard how they modelled it upon the murder of their King, and discarding the nobility. Yet, clearly to show what a Babel they had built, after twelve years trial and twenty several sorts of government, the nation, grown weary of their tyranny, was forced to call in the son of him whose life those reformers had sacrificed.—And thus were Simeon and Levi divided in Jacob, and scattered in Israel.

THE CHURCH.

COBOURG, SATURDAY, APRIL 6, 1839.

As a good deal of misconception appears to have prevailed in regard to the sentiments alleged to have been uttered by Mr. Gamble, one of the members for the County of York, on the question of the Union of the Provinces, we have been requested to furnish to the readers of the Church the following statement of what was really expressed by Mr. G. on that occasion. We have the more satisfaction in doing so, as Mr. Gamble is one of those—we regret to say few—members of the House of Assembly who entertain upon the question of the Clergy Reserves those sentiments of which we can ourselves cordially approve. For any plan that involves the principle of spoliation—that seeks to subvert what we have been taught to regard as the sacredness of right—that would humble religion to a state of mendacity—or that would destroy what constitutes the leading feature of the British Constitution, and the surest bond of British supremacy in every colony, we must in conscience oppose and with all our ability protest against.

Although it requires no extraordinary knowledge of human nature nor any very minute acquaintance with passing events, to detect the springs of conduct and trace up actions to their motives, we are not going to draw aside the curtain which conceals the apparatus of that political juggling by which lookers on may be pained or amused, nor shall we enter upon the invidious task of animadverting upon the secret views which may influence honourable members upon this question. That many of them,—individuals whose estimable qualities in private life have long won our humble esteem and confidence,—are sincere and honest in the opinions upon this subject, however erroneous, which they promulgate, we frankly admit; but we must entreat of this and of every class of our legislators not to measure the rule of public duty by the standard which the demagogue, the agitator, and the revolutionist may propose, nor to fancy that the good of the country consists precisely in what the most clamorous of its population may happen to dictate.—We would also, with submission, suggest to our more prominent and rising legislators, the advantage of adopting as models of political integrity and respectability, not a Palmerston, a Spring Rice, or a Glenelg, who can shift their views into a convenient accommodation to those of every party, when place and its attendant influence is concerned, but to the fixed and imperturbable honesty of a Stanley, a Graham, and a Pakington.

We rejoice that Mr. Gamble has ranged himself amongst the number of those who are unwilling to barter the best interests of present and future generations for a hollow and capricious popularity; and we recommend the remarks which follow, as proving that christian principle is brought to bear upon the mere views of the legislator. Amidst the calculations of earthly gain, none more than the guardians of our public interests are concerned to see that "the kingdom of God" and the "righteousness which exalteth a nation," receive their proper and paramount attention.

After shewing how problematical it was that the advantages anticipated from the control of the revenue of Lower Canada would be realized by an union of the Provinces, Mr. GAMBLE alluded to the ground on which the union was advocated by the learned Solicitor General,—viz. an improved condition in the political state of Lower Canada resulting from the British population being brought into more immediate contact with that of French origin, which he, the Solicitor, proposed to effect by abrogating the feudal tenures, the French laws, and use of the French language in the courts of judicature. Mr. G. contended that such a procedure would not ensure the desired end, and that peace was not to be obtained by goading to the quick the already exasperated feelings of the French Canadians. The learned Solicitor's argument reminded him of one used by a celebrated divine of the present day when advocating catholic emancipation, "give them, he said, a voice in the councils of their country, place them at the right of Majesty, give them the ear of the Sovereign, and the patronage of the Crown, and give me the circulation of the bible, and with this one engine I will dispel the dark mists that envelop Ireland and raise the fair temple of truth in their stead." The learned Solicitor said he admitted the inveterate habits of the French Canadians, their gross ignorance, their all but unconquerable prejudices to every thing British, but give him but the union with British ascendancy, and with that one engine, he would overturn their habits, he would enlighten their ignorance, he would eradicate their prejudices, truth must prevail!—the result of the former was known; the result of the latter he, Mr. G. dreaded.

Subsequently Mr. G. alluded to what had fallen from his honourable colleague, Mr. Thomson, "that if the seat of government was fixed at Toronto, he believed there would not be a dissenting voice to the union;" this taken in conjunction with the ground on which Mr. G. had considered it his duty to defend the interests of his constituents when the subject was under discussion the previous day had induced some hon. members to suppose that his opposition to the union arose from interested motives; but he now declared that if the seat of government were established in Toronto, he could never vote for that measure. He was not sure that he would have assigned the reason, had he not felt himself called upon to do so, by the assertion alluded to; and the reason was one that had not been broached by any hon. member: it was religion; nor did it surprise him that that reason had not been even alluded to before, for this Assembly had the unenviable distinction of being, he believed, the only Legislative body in Christendom that commenced their proceedings without supplicating direction from the Almighty. This he considered as tacitly admitting the principle of modern liberalism, that no religious opinions entertained or expressed, should be a barrier to any office either legislative or executive provided the person was otherwise qualified for discharging its duties—thus virtually excluding the ruler of the universe from the government of that world his almighty power had called into existence. From this principle he declared his most decided dissent; he did not intend to enter farther into the discussion of this subject, but merely threw it out for the consideration of the House, whether there was any danger to be apprehended to the Protestant religion from an Union of the Provinces when five-sixths of the members of the Legislature from Lower Canada would be adherents of the Roman Catholic faith. He asked what had been the case in Ireland? Were the pledges, nay the oaths of the members of the House of Commons of that Church not to interfere in ecclesiastical matters wherein the national Church was concerned, respected? Was it not a fact that the Church in that country had been dismembered? Was not Ireland virtually a papal kingdom? And here he would remark that he meant no disrespect to any honourable member of this House belonging to that communion. Heaven forbid that he should entertain one unkind thought, one uncharitable wish towards any honourable member of that Church; but he had

a conscientious duty to perform,—a duty for which he must give an account at the bar of Almighty God; and he again put the question to that House, that Protestant House, were they prepared to adopt a measure that might eventually affect the very existence of the Protestant faith in these Colonies?

At the present moment when so many minds are turned to the contested question of the Clergy Reserves, we readily avail ourselves of the suggestion of a friend to publish two documents which bear with an important interest upon this subject. The first is the opinion of Judge Patteson, delivered in 1824, before he was raised to the dignified station which he still so worthily fills;—the other document refers to the main argument advanced by the claimants of the Church of Scotland.—

"I am of opinion that the provisions of 31 Geo. 111. are applicable only to the Clergy of the Church of England.—Whatever might have been the original meaning of the expression, 'a Protestant Clergy' in the 14 Geo. 111., it appears to me that the subsequent instructions and message of His Majesty, recited in the 31 Geo. 111., together with the provisions of that Act, (and especially that which speaks of institution, and of the spiritual jurisdiction of the Bishop,) plainly point out that the expression is to be understood as referring to the Clergy of the Church of England only. 'A Protestant Clergy' evidently means one single and entire body of persons; now the Clergy of the Church of England and those of the Kirk of Scotland, can never form one body. If, therefore, the Clergy of the Church of Scotland be let in, there is no reason why any other denomination of Dissenters should not be admitted, and the word 'a protestant Clergy' must then be taken to mean Protestant Ministers, or Teachers, which appears to me to be absurd. The expression was used in contradistinction to the Romish Clergy, and although I am not prepared to say that an establishment, similar to the Kirk of Scotland, might not have satisfied the words of 14 Geo. 111., yet I am quite convinced, that it would not have satisfied those of the 31 Geo. 111. Being of opinion therefore, that the Acts contemplate one single body of Protestant Clergy, I have no doubt that the Clergy of the Church of England are that body; and the erecting the Provinces into a Bishopric; and every thing done since plainly shows that such is the right interpretation. I am also of opinion, that the governors of the Provinces acting under His Majesty's directions, cannot legally make any appropriation to the Ministers of other Churches. I think that nothing short of an Act of the Legislature confirmed in England, can authorise them to do so. The charter* of April 1819, would create a difficulty in the passing of any such Act, and without a new Act, that charter alone would almost decide the question.

(Signed) JOHN PATTESON.
Temple, May 20th, 1824.

* Mr. Patteson here alludes to the Charter instituting the Corporation for the management of the Clergy Reserves.

To the Editor of the Hamilton Gazette.

SIR,—Having recently arrived from Scotland, my attention has naturally been drawn to the question of "the Rectories," which at present is so unprofitably agitating the Colony, and I must confess that the construction which I find attempted to be put upon the Articles of the Union by the Ministers of the Kirk in this Province, as favouring their claim to what they are pleased to term "a co-ordinate establishment with the Church of England," has not a little astonished me. I had thought that every person at all acquainted with Scottish history, or who had even read the Articles of the Union, must have been aware, that the subject of Religion was expressly prohibited by an Act of Parliament, from being taken into consideration by the Commissioners nominated by Queen Anne, to carry through that important treaty. That this is no mere assertion of my own, I take the liberty of quoting the statement of the celebrated contemporary historian Burnet, on the subject. In his "History of his own Times," page 459, he says, "there was no provision made in this treaty with relation to Religion. For in the Act of Parliament in 1707 kingdoms, that empowered the Queen to name Commissioners, there was an express limitation that they should not treat of those matters." This statement of Burnet is not only historically correct, but is completely borne out by the articles themselves, in which there is not the slightest allusion throughout to the subject of Religion; and it is upon the very ground of this omission that the Act for securing in Scotland the doctrines and government of the Kirk is founded. The preamble of that Act is as follows.

"Our Sovereign Lady, and the Estates of Parliament, considering that by the late Act of Parliament for a treaty with England, for an union of both Kingdoms, it is provided that the Commissioners for that treaty should not treat of, or concerning any alteration of the worship, discipline, and government of the Church of this kingdom, as now by law established. Therefore, &c." The Act then goes on strictly to confine the establishment of the Presbyterian Church to the limits of the kingdom of Scotland. Unless, therefore, the Presbyterian Ministers can, by a peculiar species of logic, prove that Canada is a part of the kingdom of Scotland, their legal claim to a co-ordinate establishment with the Church of England must fall to the ground. The truth is, that the words of the Articles of the Union to which they refer, have a reference, and a reference only, to commercial privileges, or to privileges arising out of mercantile transactions. If any other proof were wanting that the Church of Scotland has neither legal right nor title, by the Articles of the Union to any Establishment in her Majesty's dominions, beyond the limits of the said kingdom of Scotland, I will mention a circumstance not generally known, and carefully concealed by the Preachers of the Kirk, in their discussions on the subject, and which is decisive against their claims. After the Articles of the Union had been agreed upon by the English and Scotch Commissioners, the General Assembly, not content that their rights should be secured within the bounds of the kingdom of Scotland, drew up a Memorial to the Scottish Parliament, complaining, amongst other matters, "that the Sacramental Test being the condition of access to places of trust, and to benefits from the Crown, all of our communion must be debarred from the same, if not in Scotland, yet through the rest of the dominion of Britain, which may prove of the most dangerous consequence to this Church." Well, what was the reception which the Scottish parliament gave to this memorial? They enacted, I quote the words of Marshall, a Presbyterian Minister, and the author of a History of the Union,—they enacted,—"that no test inconsistent with the principles of their ecclesiastical establishment should be imposed upon Scotchmen, within the bounds of the Scottish kingdom; but a motion for rendering them capable of any office, civil or military, and of holding any command or place of trust under the Sovereign, within any part of Great Britain, was rejected!"

After this rejection of the claims of the Kirk by the Scottish parliament then sitting in Edinburgh, and keenly alive to all matters affecting the honour and independence of their country, I will simply ask, with what face can the Presbyterian ministers come forward and tell their flocks that, by the Articles of the Union they have a right to an Establishment in any part of her Majesty's dominions beyond the

limits of the Kingdom of Scotland? In conclusion, I have only to express a hope, that my respectable countrymen will not permit themselves to be led away by agitation, or deluded into an idea that they possess rights which were forever renounced by the Scottish nation at the time of the Union, through their legitimate organ, the ancient Parliament of Scotland.

I have the honour to be, Sir, &c.

SCOTUS.

Note.—I observe in the Montreal Herald, that a writer who subscribes himself "A Follower of John Knox," founds an argument in favor of the claims of the Church of Scotland, from the circumstance of Scotland possessing at the time of the Union, the Darien Colony. This, however, is not the fact. The Darien Colony was annihilated in the previous reign of King William, and was not in existence at the time of the Union.

We are gratified to perceive that some of our contemporaries have taken the position on the debateable ground alluded to in our previous remarks, which we ourselves feel it a scriptural duty to assume; and as in any contest, the presence of able allies is inspiring, we are thankful for the co-operation which is now so seasonably afforded. A calm discussion of this question,—not upon republican theories, but upon those principles which, in the mother country, are set down as fundamental, established, and immutable,—would soon elicit a sound and healthful expression of public opinion; something very different from those ebullitions of party spirit which, instead of rational argument, we are so much in the habit of hearing. We give the following in general corroboration of the sentiments we entertain, from the Brockville Statesman:—

"If Religion is to be upheld as being of paramount importance to the well being of Society, let us have an Established Church, and but one. For the benefit of the people we would be tyrants enough, had we the power, to impose one Church on them. That it would be for their benefit, we will shortly make manifest.

"But what church ought to be established? This is a question, which we fear will not be so easily agreed upon. But if it could be agreed that it should be the one, which first gave light to a world of darkness, that one would be the Church of England. If it could be agreed now that we are tired and sick of the excess of religious novelty, that it would be more desirable to retrace our steps where more repose would be found in the pure and steady faith of our ancestors, we would fly into the bosom of the Church of England. It is the Church of the nation to which we are all proud to have the honor to belong, and there are a thousand endearing associations connected with it, which every member of the reformed faith, who has the least spark of patriotic or religious feeling glowing in his soul, must venerate.

There is another important point which should not be overlooked, and that is, the adherents of the Church of England are more numerous (though less noisy,) than any other church in the Colony. This we entertain no doubt, the census taken this year, when made up, will sufficiently prove."

We have alluded before to the temperate and useful letters of "Anglo-Canadian" in the Commercial Herald, in opposition to the fallacies which have been so sedulously advanced by the opponents of an Established Church. How the prejudices which are alleged to exist against this principle, have been begotten, the able writer in question very briefly and clearly explains:—

"It is further intimated that opposition to its principle will either endanger the stability of the Government, or render it tyrannical. Now, Sir, there would be no danger of the former evil were there no "stirrers up of strife;" for it may be taken as an universal axiom, that the people will never be dissatisfied, if left to themselves, so long as their persons and families are unmolested, their houses are their castles, their consciences are unshackled, and their property not immoderately taxed; your correspondent, ready as he is to hazard bold assertions, will I think hardly venture to say that even the hated principle of an Established Church will interfere with any of these rights. I again therefore repeat what I have before stated, that if free from unrighteous agitation, the community at large would ere long feel the utility and bless the defenders of a "qualified" and pious Ecclesiastical Establishment; and if so, all the reported threats of tyrannical government" vanishes into thin air!"

It is frequently asserted, though with an extreme ignorance of Ecclesiastical History, that the corruptions of the christian church are ascribable, primarily, to the imperial patronage of Constantine, and to the connexion of religion with the State. The writer above alluded to, in his fifth letter, very satisfactorily refutes that assertion, and proceeds to point out the advantages which have flowed from the alliance that some, either from ignorance or a less excusable prejudice, choose to reprobate. We regret that we have only room for the following remarks:—

"It is a fact worthy of especial consideration in a discussion of this nature, that it is to the fostering care or arbitrary enactments of sovereign princes that we owe the happy maturing of the blessed reformation itself. The celebrated Wicliff of England in the fourteenth century, and the Bohemian Reformers, John Huss and Jerome of Prague in the fifteenth, endeavored in vain to purify the Church, though the former succeeded in obtaining numerous followers, and the latter sealed their testimony with their blood. How shall we account for the entire failure of these good men, no wise inferior probably to those more successful reformers who succeeded them? In candour is it not to be attributed to the fact that they were unsanctioned by the civil power? How is it that the comparatively pure and simple Vaudois, who arose in the twelfth century, and for a time spread so rapidly over many parts of Europe, should in the nineteenth be reduced to a small number not exceeding 20,000, who are under the spiritual direction of thirteen pastors? Because instead of being nurtured, they have been frowned upon and discouraged by a bigoted court. Few nations gave fairer promise at the time of the reformation, of a religious regeneration than did France; some of its royal princes and many of the very flower of its nobility, with vast multitudes of the people, cordially embraced protestantism, and yet few countries, with the exception perhaps of Spain and Portugal, were eventually brought more completely again under papal influence; I think your well-informed correspondent must, *maugre* his prejudices, be convinced that this at least was owing to the want of regal support and continuance; especially as with the apostacy of Henry IV. the hopes of protestantism in France were sunk for ages. How different was the success of protestantism in Saxony, Switzerland, Geneva, Sweden, Denmark, England, &c. in all of which it was aided supported and advanced by the public authorities? Indeed, had it been otherwise, there is little rational ground for supposing that the Reformation would at that time have been brought to so glorious an issue. I appeal to Mr. Ryerson himself, whether, excellent, venerable and mighty as were the reformers, he does not believe that the violence of Luther, the severity of Calvin, the timidity of Melancthon, the simple purity of Zuinglius, and the courtier-like pliancy of Cranmer, presented far too discordant materials ever to have expected extensive lasting benefit to the church, had they not been variously controlled, checked or sustained, as occasion required, by the regal power. In concluding this letter, allow me to direct your attention to the singular and most important fact, that wherever you find the reformation permanently successful, you invariably find it maintained by the princely and righteous agency of an Established Church!"

"If these things are so I would solemnly warn the opposers of such establishments to take heed, lest haply they be found fighting against God."