

Spirit of the Press.

TRINITY COLLEGE, TORONTO.

Our columns to-day contain an appeal in behalf of Trinity College, Toronto; and the Address delivered by the Rev. McMurray, which will be found in another column, reveal facts which must awaken the interest, and kindle the indignation, not only of churchmen, but of every honest man.

Time was, when, to be a State Church, or connected therewith, was a claim to favour, protection, and fostering care. That time has passed away. And the change is easily accounted for. In olden days statesmen had some religion themselves, or at least thought it of the greatest importance to the welfare of the people that they should be under the influence of the right religion. Therefore, that Religion which was considered by those in power to be true was fostered and protected. Now, Religion, as such, is no longer to be found among the realities of statesmanship, except as a matter of business. Religious bodies are regarded only as so many pieces of various powers upon the chess-board of politics. Patronage and government favour are the capital of politicians, on which they trade. And they have long since discovered that patronage and favour are thrown away on those whose obedience and loyalty are already sure. In our day, therefore, claims to favour from "the Supreme Head of the Church in temporal," are valid only when coming from a professedly hostile quarter. Schism is munificently subsidized; heresy is ostentatiously honoured; and when rebellion has been added to this list of extraordinary qualifications, the gratitude of government is endless, the royal bounty knows no bounds.

But funds are not always at command for all desirable purposes. Taxes are already heavy, and the nation will not willingly bear more. It is easier and simpler to plunder those who will not rebel for the benefit of those who will. A State Church whose dignitaries are nominated absolutely by Government will not rebel. A State Church which has no voice finds it physically impossible to remonstrate or grumble. A State Church may therefore be defined, in our day, "A religious body that can be plundered with impunity, and is in duty bound to be thankful that it is not destroyed."

The facts revealed in the interesting Address of the Rev. Mr. McMurray explain to us the causes of the demand lately made by Mr. Gladstone on the floor of the House of Commons, in behalf of the Colonial Churches. They humbly petition to be raised up to the same level with the sects, in their political and economical position. They wish to be relieved from the oppressive protection of the Government. They would be happy to be as well off as it were Papists, Presbyterians, Wesleyans, or Mormons, instead of being in communion with "the Church as by law established."

They beg and beseech to be no longer petted—*to death*. It is strangely instructive to contrast this treacherous tenure of Church temporalities under the "supreme temporal Head of the Church," with that which is enjoyed in these United States of America—which our English brethren are fond of denouncing as an un-Christian or a "godless" country, because its Government does not recognize any definite form of religious belief. Here, all the royal charters given before our American Revolution are yet valid. Church property held under royal grant is inviolable, and has been so declared, time and again, by the highest courts of the land. Property of the Venerable Society, which had once been confiscated wholesale by State Legislatures, has been recovered by the authority of the Supreme Court of the United States, which has, in every case, reversed the decisions of the courts below. But while the royal grant is thus an inviolable protection for Church property in our "godless" Republic, we find that, under the "supreme temporal Head of the Church"—under special oaths to that Church—a royal grant is no protection, but offers rather a premium upon plunder. The sign manual of one king or one queen is sacred in our Republic; but, in "the glorious Empire on which the sun never sets," the signatures of three successive Sovereigns are no defence against a sacrilegious robbery perpetrated by an unscrupulous and hostile majority in a provincial legislature. Nor is it a simple confiscation merely, nor the simple sacrifice of alienating Church property to secular uses. It is a confiscation to endow a rival institution, from which all religion is to be excluded. The terms of this exclusion are as rigid as in the will of the noted Stephen Girard, of Philadelphia, for clergymen, or teachers of religion, "under any form or profession of religious faith or worship whatever," are disqualified from a seat in its Senate. We beg pardon of the memory of Mr. Girard, this enactment is worse. And yet the Girard will was, in this respect, an outrage upon the general feeling of the whole of this "godless country." Thus the oath to maintain the Church is kept, by abusing the legal power to plunder it. The obligation to promote religion is fulfilled by making it the only branch of learning which is expressly excluded from Government Institutions for ever.

It is a pleasing incident in the story of these enormous wrongs, that so gross, so bare-faced has been the injustice of the Legislature and the Crown, that even dissenters—the natural enemies of the Church everywhere—have sympathized with her sufferings in this instance, and given her, in some degree at least, the benefit of their voices and their votes. For this they deserve all honor. May the "powers that be" deal more justly with them!

The short-comings of the government have been in strong contrast with the steady support rendered by the Venerable Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and by other friends in England, who were rallied to the work by the indefatigable Bishop of the Diocese. It will be remembered that, when that Society called upon the Church of America to unite in celebrating its Jubilee, they expressly said that they "desired no gift from us." Yet the debt we owe them is great. When the English Government were wholly and wilfully blind to their duty, that noble Society, to the best of its ability, was spreading "the Gospel in the Church" through the length and breadth of our land. Our mission of Bishops to England will show them our gratitude in one way. But this appeal from Toronto opens to us another, which, we are sure, will commend itself highly to the minds and feelings of all churchmen, who realize the blessings they enjoy—another mode, more substantial and more direct than Episcopal representatives and neatly-written resolutions, to show the Mother Church in England that we are both one; both labouring in one cause, for one common object, in the unity of the Faith and the bond of peace; and that, of the bounty she formerly entrusted to us, we are now ready to return a substantial acknowledgement, in aiding those of her fold who are now what we were then.

Another consideration which may have weight with some minds, is, that Toronto is not a foreign country. It is part of our own continent, and in progress of time, in all human probability, we shall hereafter find that, in strengthening the hands of this noble institution in

Toronto, we have only been building up an integral portion of the Church of America.

We have seen a wood-cut of the College Buildings. They are in good collegiate style, and will form a noble Quadrangle, which would do honor to any country. Those who contribute to its erection will have the comfort of knowing that their money will not be squandered on temporary edifices which perish in the using; but judiciously invested, in substantial buildings, which will furnish not only shelter, but also crowds of rich and beautiful and endearing associations for generations to come.—*New York Churchman.*

MAYNOOTH AND ITS FRUITS.

The grounds on which Mr. Spooner on Tuesday last rested his motion for an inquiry into the system of education pursued at Maynooth College, had in them more of force than of novelty. This, however, so far from being an argument against the proposed inquiry, is, on the contrary, the strongest possible argument for it. No doubt those who have taken the trouble of ascertaining the facts of the case, have long been aware that principles of disloyalty and a system of ethics subversive of all truth and all morality, are inculcated in that institution. The doctrine that to a "heretical Sovereign no allegiance is due from a Papist, and especially from a Popish priest, who is the Pope's serf doubly bound," the doctrine that oaths are binding only so far as they consist with the interests of the Romish Church,—are dogmas which have been taught, and not only taught but practised, for ages by the Church of Rome; and the code of morality inculcated in the confessional has long been more infamous for the sins which it suggests than famous for those which it prevents. But although these things have been known, though they have been published on the housetops, it so happens that Parliament has never admitted a knowledge of them into its official consciousness. On the contrary, the legislation of the last quarter of a century has proceeded on the assumption that all these abominations, whatever might have been the case in former and darker ages, had long ceased to exist in the Romish Communion. Hence the necessity of an inquiry, a necessity forced upon the House of Commons not so much through the impetuosity of the hon. member for North Warwickshire, and other Protestant members who have from time to time called attention to the subject, as through the evidences which the fruits of the system inculcated at Maynooth furnished of its real character.

This view of the question was ably enforced by Mr. Walpole. On the part of the Government he assented to the necessity of enquiry on the express ground that the results of the support given to the Jesuit-training institution at Maynooth had disappointed the expectations of those who, not without misgivings of conscience, voted for the successive grants, and especially for the last munificent endowment. These expectations, we confess, we never shared; we never imagined that a corrupt tree would bring forth good fruit, if it was only well dunged and watered. Others, we know, thought differently; and those who took our view of the subject had for a time to submit to the reproach of narrowness of mind and bigotry of spirit. Well the experiment has been tried, and the event has more than justified our anticipations and predictions. No one will contend that the generous confidence and liberality of the British Government and Legislature has had the effect of rendering the Papists of the United Kingdom more loyal to the Crown or more disposed to live in peace with their fellow-citizens. The very reverse has been the case. Every concession has been followed by fresh demands and further encroachments; every act of friendliness and goodwill towards them has been responded to by increased insolence and hostility on their part. That which we were told would be accepted as a boon, is no sooner yielded than it is spoken of with contempt as the first instalment of a debt, to be followed by further instalments for which the pretended creditor is clamorous. That which we were cozened into believing would be a final settlement, proves but a starting point for a renewed conflict.

With such claimants there can be, in the nature of things, no conciliate nor covenant of peace. Every effort to conciliate and to satisfy them only adds to their power to carry on the strife, which they are determined shall be ceaseless, until they can trample upon all who are not willing to bend the neck under their foot. As the debate has been adjourned to Tuesday next, we desire to call the attention of the Members of Parliament who may have a doubt remaining on their minds, to the tone taken by the organs of the Papal hierarchy on this very question. We have lying before us the last manifesto of the "Parliamentary Committee of the 'Catholic' Defence Association." How does that document speak of the Maynooth grant? "The Parliament which made this gift," says Mr. H. Wilberforce, the amanuensis of Dr. Cullen, well knew that their predecessors had robbed the Church of the Irish nation of its whole property—a property given to it by the piety of its own members—and had given that property, which is little less than six hundred thousand pounds a year, to maintain the foreign garrison which calls itself the Established Church of Ireland." And in reply to the observation of the Earl of Derby, when he expressed his disappointment at the result of the generosity of the British Parliament the same document says:—"Let him know that the Church of Ireland was no party to such a bargain. In accepting the endowment of Maynooth she never for a moment contemplated the abandonment of her religion and its duties. She accepted it as a small instalment of justice from a Legislature which had robbed her of millions. She was ready, and is now ready, as before the endowment—and even when she was persecuted by the State—to teach and practice peace and obedience to human laws, so long as they are not inconsistent with the laws of God and of His Holy Church; when they are, she has ever disobeyed, and will ever disobey them, even if she were bribed by all the wealth of which she robbed. She would gladly see the Protestant State leave religion in this country to itself, withdrawing from the Protestant Clergy the whole of the endowments which the State has given and still gives orders to them (endowments wrested from the Catholic Church) and in this case she neither require or desire any State grant either to Maynooth or any other object."

There is no mistaking the meaning of such language as this. Nothing short of the ruin of the true Church of Ireland, of that Church whose maintenance in the integrity of her position and of her property was one of the most express conditions attached to the Emancipation Act, will satisfy the rancour and the rapacity of the Popish Priesthood. As for their obedience to the law, the document is no less explicit. "He (the Earl of Derby) complains that the Irish Clergy have not obeyed the law, and taught loyalty. What law have they disobeyed? The Ecclesiastical Titles Act, which they could not have obeyed without abandoning

their religion altogether, and without becoming Protestants, or worse. These, then, are our crimes. The Pope has taken the steps which he thought necessary for the spiritual benefit of the Catholics in England, and we and our Clergy have disobeyed a law which we could not have obeyed without denying our God and our faith." And further on:—"He expected the Catholic Clergy of Ireland would have obeyed the law, and they have openly refused obedience to the Ecclesiastical Titles Act. Who are they that have disobeyed the law? The Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland. They have treated it, as they were in duty bound, simply as if it did not exist."

Let us not be misunderstood. We fully recognize the principle of liberty of conscience. If the Papists are really convinced that to assume this attitude towards the Crown and the Legislature of England is a sacred duty to which they are bound in the sight of God, let them assume it, by all means. But do not let them combine with this high-handed defiance, the excessive meanness of asking us to support a costly institution for the express purpose of training up men in the very spirit in which these lines are penned. Let them at least recognize this common-place propriety of life, that those who hold such language are not entitled to ask favours, nor can they accept them without the deepest self-degradation. We strongly commend, for the admiration of Papists, and for their imitation on all such occasions, the tone of menacing frankness adopted by the accredited organ of the Papal hierarchy in Ireland, which, in one of its recent articles, admits that the Government has no alternative between absolute surrender to the claims of the pope and open rebellion. "The bigots of Exeter Hall and Downing-street," says Dr. Cullen's demi-official scribe, "must either be destroyed and trampled under foot; everything that stands in the way of perfect equality of all classes and creeds of citizens must be rooted out; the very notion of insulting Catholics, Dissenters, or Jews with toleration, or with the exercise of a legislative or administrative control over them—these things must either be utterly destroyed, or the empire will be convulsed and shaken to its base." If this be really the only alternative left us, either the Papist must have all he wants, or the empire must be convulsed, it seems to us that the choice cannot be difficult. Let, we say, "the empire be convulsed" at once; let us take the initiative in the fight, if fighting cannot be avoided; and let Popish perfidy and treason be put down once more and for ever, as it was three hundred years ago. We may possibly have a dearer price to pay for the maintenance of our liberty than we bargained for when we called in the Papist to share its blessings; but still we shall, at whatever cost, maintain our national dignity and independence; we shall escape the ignominious fate of being trodden down under the hoof of the basest as well as the most arrogant tyranny on the face of the whole earth.—*John Bull.*

LORD BLANDFORD'S CHURCH REFORM.

"Measures, not men," would perhaps be the reply to any strictures we might feel disposed to make on the personal fitness of Lord Blandford for the work which he has undertaken. But it is sometimes forgotten by the admirers of that venerable saying, that measures generally owe their peculiar complexion to the character of the men by whom they are framed, or whose support they are designed to obtain. Personal deficiencies do not indeed disqualify a public man from advocating great measures; but they too often impair the quality of the measures, which are dwarfed or distorted in consequence of their parentage. This will be found, we think, to hold good in the case of the important measure of Church Reform, which on Thursday last Lord Blandford introduced. It was not to be expected that a young nobleman, whose attention has been but recently directed to religious matters, should thoroughly understand so vast a subject as the constitution of the Church of England, or that he should sympathise with her element, except in so far as public opinion has already recognized and approved it. Some plain scandals he has accordingly marked; for the adoption of certain popular remedies he has made provision in his bill; but where the organs of public discussion had failed to enlighten him, he has made fundamental mistakes. We fully accord to him the merit of industry and research, for which he received the tribute of so many speakers in the House of Commons; we only regret that his work had not rather fallen into the hands of some grave and experienced legislator, whose ecclesiastical knowledge and religious sympathies would have afforded a better guarantee for an adequate fulfilment of the task. His best vindication is that men of this character have failed to attempt the work; the reforms which we have long expected from learned and dignified Churchmen, are indefinitely delayed; it may seem hard, therefore, to blame the volunteer who has somewhat rashly occupied their place. It was not difficult to hit the blots in our present Church Establishment, for which some remedy was required. The Horsmans and Halls, whose whole political capital has been derived from the existence of these blemishes, have made them sufficiently known. The inadequate performance of episcopal duties, the misappropriation of ecclesiastical revenues to the enrichment of private families, the residence of Bishops in luxurious country-houses, the apparently sinecure position of Deans and Canons, all co-existing with an absolute want of pastoral superintendence in populous districts, were familiar to every Englishman who perused the fresh recital of these evils contained in Lord Blandford's speech. It would be worse than useless to deny their existence; our readers know how steadily we have endeavoured to promote their removal.

But it is important to observe, what Lord Blandford seems to have overlooked—that these scandals are in the main due, not to a defective state of the law, but to the unworthiness or incompetency of the persons by whom ecclesiastical offices have formerly been held. The Bishops, who have given fraudulent leases of their estates, and made their descendants nobles or millionaires; the Deans, whose neglect of duty has caused their offices to be regarded as sinecures; and the Chapters, whose disregard of the obligations belonging to their estates has become so painfully notorious, owed their appointments to influences alien alike to true religion and sound policy. To gratify personal predilections, to secure political support, sometimes even for the very purpose of paralyzing ecclesiastical energy, Ministers have filled the high places of the Church with the perpetrators of these scandals. The political class—the class to which Lord Blandford himself belongs—must share with these predators and sinecurists the blame of having been instrumental to the Church's wrong. We have been speaking indeed of a past generation; we wish that it were less easy to apply our remarks to the circumstances of the age in which we live. Members of Parliament may rest assured that no measure of Church Reform will do lasting good which is to have for its administrators the same de-

scription of ecclesiastics whose histories now serve to point the moral of the Reformer. If pious, learned, and zealous Churchmen had filled the great offices of the Church, palaces and cathedrals would not offer so fair a mark to the censor of her abuses. The mode of distributing patronage—not the amount of endowment—is the real cause of the scandals which we are now unable to conceal or to defend.

In legislating for the capitular bodies, Lord Blandford has betrayed a natural, but palpable, ignorance of their origin and their use. He has picked up the statement that Chapters formed the Bishop's Courts, and he has also learned from Mr. Whiston's case that their statutes in some instances enjoined educational duties, which they have notoriously neglected. But he seems to have been quite ignorant of the fact that they were for the most part designed—we speak of the Chapters of the old foundation—to be communities of religious men, living under a stricter rule than could otherwise be observed, attending mainly to the services of the Church, exercising indeed hospitality and charity, and maintaining schools of theology, but above all engaged in setting forth the praises of Almighty God in solemn services, whose beauty and devotion should be patterns to the churches of the diocese, and by whose prayers the whole community should be helped. Of all this there is not a word in Lord Blandford's statement; he finds canopies spoken of as sinecures, that is, without cure of souls, and he therefore concludes them to be sinecures in the modern sense, that is, places of emolument without duty. We can quite understand that men of the world should think lightly of the value of prayer, and overlook the advantages to be gained from the existence of religious communities; but it is for this very reason that we doubt the competency of men of the world to reorganise the Church.

Unhappily, the ideal which we have sketched has now no illustration in practice. Canons are unable even to take their part in the services of their own cathedrals, which they delegate to the subordinate members of their body; they have no opportunity of living as a community, for they are compelled to hasten away, after their statutory residence, to the benefices which they hold, perhaps, in distant parts of the country. Lord Blandford's measure, so far as we understand it, would aggravate this evil, by making the Canons of necessity responsible for the cure of benefices, on which they ought to be continually resident. The duties of the Decanal office, nominally devolving on the Bishops, would really be left undone amidst the pressure of his episcopal business. In short, the Chapters—an essential part of our Diocesan system—would practically become defunct; our noble cathedrals would remain as monuments of an obsolete devotion.

Capitular legislation may proceed on many different principles. The Chapters may be treated on the theory we have suggested, that they are religious bodies founded for the highest religious purposes; or they may be viewed as educational institutions; or they may be regarded in the light of Diocesan councils and courts; or these purposes may be combined with more or less prominence given to any of them; or they may be dealt with, as by the English Parliament in 1840, on no principle at all. Against the *status quo* we, too, would earnestly protest. We are desirous to return to the ancient uses and practices of our cathedrals. We should gladly see communities of clergy, learned, pious, and influential men, without parochial benefices, assembled round each Bishop in the mother church of his diocese. How the virtual abolition of the Chapters, which Lord Blandford proposes, should conduce to this end, we are unable to conceive. Let him abridge their revenues if he will; but let him leave the frame work of these ancient institutions in their integrity; we should even welcome the confiscation of the property, if the receivers of the diminished incomes should be taken from a class among whom a juster appreciation of the duties and privileges of their holy office might be found to exist.

Into another important branch of the new Church Reform—the transfer of the management of ecclesiastical property into the hands of a commission—we cannot now enter at length. The advantages pointed out by its supporter do not seem to us to outweigh its manifest dangers. The attitude already assumed by the lessors of Church property renders it highly improbable that the Ecclesiastical commissioners would be allowed to manage the estates in a way that would be really beneficial to the Church. Nor can we see that the Commissioners are at all likely to be good administrators of property; hitherto their performances have rather corroborated than lessened the ill name which boards of management have usually gained.—The Marlborough estates are public property in a stricter sense than any Church endowment can be; yet we doubt whether Lord Blandford would concur in a request to the Commissioners of Woods and Forests, or to the Court of Chancery, to relieve him from the future burthen of their management on the condition of paying him a fixed stipend equivalent to the rental they may have yielded. The plan is open to a further objection when we take into account the great change to be looked for in the value of money, and consider that our future ecclesiastical stipendiaries may bear a very different relation to the owners of land from that which their present property enables them to hold.—We might cite the case of two neighbouring schools on King Edward IV's foundation, of which the one received its endowment in land, the other in a fixed payment; the unchanged income of the latter is now less than that of a national school, the other has ten thousand a year. Lord Blandford's system will place (as it appears to us) the future dignitaries of the Church at large in the position of the impoverished grammar school to which we refer. In truth the obvious tendency of the change is to bring on the adoption of the French system, whereby all ecclesiastics are stipendiaries of the State. Abuses would soon be found in the bureau of the Commissioners; Parliament would dispose of their estates; and from that moment the whole security of Church property would depend on the fluctuations of national prosperity or the favour of Parliamentary leaders.—*Christian Guardian.*

ONE OF THE GREAT COMMERCIAL MOVEMENTS OF THE AGE.

(Translated from the Paris Journal des Debates, May 3.)

In our days, even the children have already been witnesses of many revolutions. They will yet see several others, for humanity never stops; and just as nature has a horror of the vacuum, so has the mind a horror of immobility. While old Europa folds again her tired wings, and appears to accomplish upon herself a concentric work, the immortal law of progress opens other ways in its favour, and the spirit of Him who walked upon the waters, pursues through the sea the work of expansion and propagation, which cannot be finished but at the end of time. "You go on the right, I go on the left," says a proverb; "as the earth is turning round, we will come to meet each other one day!" Well, these words will be accomplished; and