

of us had a knife to cut the cords. By main force we broke the lashings and got out two oars. I took one of them, and a man-of-war's boy named Kegg another, and we pulled the boat under the lighthouse, and landed fourteen people on the rocks. I and Kegg, and the boy still keeping his finger in the plug-hole, again pulled out towards the sinking ship, and in doing so we saw the Roscommon steamer, and rowed to her; we got a cork from the Roscommon with which we plugged the hole in the bottom of the boat, and we then proceeded to the wreck. We found that she had disappeared, and that nothing but her masts were to be seen above water."

—Freeman's Journal.

Canadian Churchman.

THURSDAY, MARCH 17, 1853.

CLERGY RESERVES.

We subjoin from the *English Churchman* of the 24th ult., an article on the Clergy Reserves question. It speaks the sentiments, we are convinced, of the sound thinking and justice loving portion of the British nation.

"Not long ago, the Rev. William Sewell, Fellow and Sub-Rector of Exeter College, published a volume of eloquent Sermons delivered by him in Lent, as Whitehall Preacher, entitled 'The Character of Pilate and the Spirit of the Age,' in which he traced certain resemblances between some public measures, and the acts recorded of that unhappy person who holds such a disastrous place in the records of Holy Writ.

The question has, perhaps, already occurred to our readers, to consider whether these points of similitude are now about to be increased by another item in the dark catalogue? The Canadian Church now stands before the people of England. Many voices of a very discordant kind have been raised in the two Canadian Provinces, and are clamorous for her spoliation. No crime is proved, no charge is urged against her. Her endowments, coeval with the existence of the Provinces themselves as British possessions, are her only sins. And these endowments were guaranteed to her in 1840, by an Act of the British Parliament, which was declared in its preamble to be 'a final settlement' of the question.

What, then, will the people of England do? Will they act the courageous part of an upright judge, and reject with indignation the proposal, so derogatory to the honour of England, that she should be an accomplice with the many in oppressing the loyal few, and should take part with the strong against the weak? Or, on the other hand, will they, as it were, ask for water, and wash their hands, and deliver the Canadian Church over to the will of those who would pillage and destroy her, and who will thereby deprive hundred and thousands of her children, especially in the poor and sequestered places of the country of the means of Grace, and the comforts and hopes of the Gospel; and will thus give a heavy blow and discouragement to the loyal, and supply new hopes and excitements to the factious and turbulent spirits in all the British Colonies, and so prepare the way for the disruption of the Empire?

A few weeks, as our readers are aware, will decide this great question.

We have heard no argument in favour of the measure just proposed, which would surrender the Canadian Church in the manner just described, except one—viz., that it is desirable and right to leave the question to be determined solely by the Canadian Legislature, as a matter of their own domestic policy, with which the Imperial Parliament has no concern.

Was, then (let us be permitted to ask), the Imperial Act of 1840, which declared in its preamble that it settled the question, an unconstitutional Act? Was it an act of impertinent and indiscreet interference in the domestic affairs of the Colonies? Is the Bill of 1853 intended for a censure on the Act of 1840? And, if the argument just recited be a reasonable and general one, then the Bill itself is inconsistent; for it stipulates for the saving of "the vested rights," as they are somewhat strangely called, of the present recipients of professional income from the Clergy Reserves in Canada, and thus it refutes the principle upon which it is made to rest.

In fact, the present measure appears to be an abdication of office and dereliction of duty on the part of those who propose and sanction it. It is nothing to say that they regret the demand of the Canadian agitators, and that they wish that the Church should not be robbed of her own. This was Pilate's case. But he feared the people, and we know the result. And now he is made responsible for the deed done, and his name is stigmatised in the creed of universal Christendom, which says of the Prince of Peace—that "He suffered under Pontius Pilate."

LITURGICAL REFORM, IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

ARTICLE III IN THE NORTH BRITISH REVIEW. AUGUST, 1852.

It has often annoyed us, that reasonable men could even for one moment suppose the decision in the Gorham case to be binding or releasing to the consciences of churchmen.

Christ committed the keeping of his truth not to the world but to his Church; nor had the Church herself any authority to appoint a portion only of her members or officers to be the keepers, or final interpreters, of that truth. What then could the decisions of a committee, appointed by a worldly and Secularian Parliament, without the Church being so much as consulted, either as to the principle upon which it was based, or the men who composed it, what, we repeat, could the decisions of such a Committee have to do with binding or loosing the consciences of Christ's members, and much more of his ministers? If the British government were to say that a denial of the doctrine of the atonement should be no bar to Church preferment, and, consequently, some miserably fallen clergyman who was content to sign the articles and to use the formularies of the Church, at the altar, at the font, and in the desk, while he openly blasphemed her head in the pulpit, was promoted to the richest living in the Church, would this affect either the consciences of the Clergy or the purity of the Church? We trow not. The sin would rest betwixt the Church's oppressors and her lying minister!

But this Reviewer, in common with many other persons, pleads that the Royal supremacy gave authority, by its sanction, to the Judicial Committee. Upon this we have to remark—

1. That if the Church, either in the reign of Henry the eighth, or at any other period, gave or rather professed to give, an unchristian power to the Crown, it would have no force because the Church could have no authority to give that which was contrary to the will, or lessening to the dignity of the Divine head. But yet, even by such an act the Anglican Church would not be rendered unorthodox, since it would not be the denial of any catholic truth, but be caused by the overstraining of a proper regal supremacy, either through ignorance or fear. Such an act would therefore call for deep repentance and humiliation, but would not be apostasy.

2. That, by the gracious care of Almighty God, the Anglican Church has however been altogether saved from this sin. The Catholic Church has ever believed royalty to be of God and to derive its authority from him, and hence, has always conceded to the Crown important functions connected with her government. Still in doing so the Church of England has been especially cautious. Thus, to quote Palmer, "the Clergy of England, in 1531, did so, as Burnet proves, with the important proviso, 'quantum per Christi legem licet,' which original condition is ever to be supposed in our acknowledgement of the royal supremacy." The very words of the oath of regal supremacy, seem to us equally happily guarded, and have no reference whatever to doctrine, but only to "spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes," a phraseology carefully excluding doctrine. Hence it necessarily follows, that as the Crown had not, nor would have any power of doctrinal decision itself, it could give none to the Judicial Committee, consequently the judgement in the Gorham case is utterly devoid of all real pretension to spiritual authority.

3. That as no power in heaven will, so no power on earth can, give the right to deal deceptively. All English Clergymen are positively required to give an *ex animo* assent and consent to all that the Prayer Book contains and obviously teaches; and until this is repealed, not even the license of Convocation itself could, as we conceive, justify any man in saying with his lips that he gave such *ex animo* consent, when in his heart he did not do so. Much less can any human authority excuse him in leading the devotions of the people, in their worship of Almighty God, in formularies, the plain meaning of which he believes to be untrue! Again, therefore, the decision in the Gorham case is found to be worse than valueless, since it sanctions the immorality of deception, and that before the immediate presence of God.

5. That finally, the Judicial Committee was without any lawful authority whatever as a tribunal of the Church; because, whatever supremacy was given to the Crown, was, as we before stated, given to it as "the anointed of the Lord," and therefore can no more be delegated to another, than can the authority of the Episcopate. Hence on this ground also, the doings of this Committee are utterly powerless, as regards the consciences even of the Clergy, who, though they have taken the oath of supremacy, did so to the Queen as the vicergerent of the Incarnate King of kings, and not to any mere humanly appointed, irresponsible Committee. We wish our readers to bear in mind that we here give no opinion upon the question of the "Divine right of kings," but only state as a fact, that the royal supremacy of the British Crown in the matters of the Church, was built upon that belief, and in all honesty ought to stand or fall with it.

CATHEDRAL REFORM.

That the sweeping and "root and branch" reforms (falsely so called) which such clamorous demagogues as Sir Benjamin Hall and Mr. Horsman would make in the Anglican Church, do not meet with the concurrence of intelligent liberalism, the following extract from the last number of the *Edinburgh Review* will demonstrate.—

"That cathedrals ought to be places for learned men will not, we trust, be forgotten in any reform which is attempted. There is a great rage among persons zealous in religion to multiply a hard worked Parochial Clergy. This is all well. But we must urge once more, in conclusion, that a parochial Clergy without learning will not reform the age.

"We must renew our protest;—certainly this age wants quiet places for learned men. It certainly wants in every district what the Cathedrals may supply—something to counteract its absorbing, money making, bustling interests. The quiet cultivation of sacred learning may do much to regenerate the age. If it be true that infidelity stalks abroad throughout the land, this evil we repeat, can never be met, either among rich or poor, by an overworked Parochial Clergy. No dislike of sinecures must lead us to forget this."

It is pleasing to meet with such sentiments in a journal which is an exponent of the doctrines of Whiggism. When the *Edinburgh Review* enunciates these views, can we question the truth of the assertion recently made by a distinguished layman that "at no former period of her history did the Church of England possess a deeper hold upon the affections of her people of all shades of political opinion than she does at the present day."

THE REFORMATION IN IRELAND.

We have received a communication signed *Englishman* upon the subject of the conversions from Romanism at present taking place in the south of Ireland. Our correspondent animadverts in no measured terms upon the defective Churchism of many of the parties engaged in this work—and deplores that the children who are snatched from Romanism should be consigned to the infidel charge of the "National School Society."

Alluding to this Society *Englishman* says, "I visited the National Schools in Dublin and here is his opinion of them. 'I could not help repeating to myself how lamentable is the reflection that while an annual expenditure of £164,577 is granted by Parliament to assist the great work, the Commissioners although they have spared no pains in giving to the children they have undertaken to educate, every temporal assistance that ingenuity could possibly desire, cannot to this day agree amongst themselves as to the admission of the Bible or even in the construction of any simple christian prayer in which the rising generation of Irish Catholics and Protestants might be taught to unite. In short to the discredit of both religions, these children who are taught so innocently to join together with heart and voice in a harmonious sound of national homage to their sovereign, are literally by the dark rules of the institution which excludes from the Schools all catechisms and books inculcating peculiar religious opinions, strictly forbidden from exclaiming together with similar unanimity—'Glory be to God in the highest and in earth peace and good will towards men.'

We will now follow Sir H. B. Head to Maynooth, after he had sauntered through the college and the grounds round about it, he goes to the library and on looking at class A he finds the shelf filled with Bibles written in the following languages, English, French, Latin, Greek, Syrian, Arabic, Spanish. Then one huge polyglot divided into three compartments in which was the Bible of almost all the civilized languages in the world. Sir Francis then observed to the Vice-president, that he was glad that he had visited the compartment A of the library. The president answered him in the following words, which Sir Francis read to him telling him that he had exactly copied them from his mouth. "It is a rule said he, of every establishment that every young man at entrance should be provided with a copy of the Bible for his own individual use; and so solicitous are we for the observance of this rule, that our procurator purchases a number of Bibles, one of which is handed by him to each student immediately after his accession, if he has not already a bible in his possession."

"And" said Sir Francis, himself "if the procurator of the college of Maynooth actually purchases a Bible and hands, to every candidate for the Roman Catholic priesthood, what possible excuse can the commissioner of public instruction in Dublin, offer to God or man for virtually excluding the same Bible throughout Christian Ireland, from the education of Catholic and Protestant youth of both sexes?"

These extracts are certainly very striking, and should be seriously pondered by the advocates and upholders of a creedless system of education? To Dr. Ryerson, especially, would we commend the reflection which so powerfully forced itself upon the mind of Sir H. B. Head. Even Maynooth

furnishes a rebuke to their God-ignoring, Bible-repudiating Commons Schools of Canada West.

Whilst agreeing in many points with our correspondent, we think that he has exaggerated some of the evils which he enumerates. The following article from a recent issue of the *English Churchman*, meets, to a great extent, the objections which he urges:

Our question here is, we apprehend, a very important one. It is not—Is the Irish "Church Mission Society" free from blemishes?—is it exempt from serious faults?—are its Missionaries Hookers, Lands, Taylors, or Bramhalls? No—this is not the question. But the question is—Is the present religious movement in Ireland sanctioned by the successors of St. Patrick? Has it the sanction, and guidance, and encouragement of the Irish Episcopate? We are grateful to know that it has. Does it content itself with detaching Romanists from Rome, or does it also bring them into the pale of the ancient Apostolic Church of Ireland? Does it, therefore, circulate the Book of Common Prayer as well as the Holy Scriptures?—Does it disseminate the former as a practical comment on the latter? We rejoice to know that it does. We are grateful to hear that at this present time the Venerable Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge is preparing to supply, in a most effective manner, the demand for Irish Prayer Books in the vernacular tongue, to aid the efforts of the Irish Episcopate to bring back, as they are bringing back in thousands, the erring sheep of Christ to their true fold—the Irish Church.

We indeed are very thankful for these things, and we accept them as pledges of the future. We regret, deeply regret, any excesses or extravagances of individuals in Ireland—especially in a Puritan direction. We wish that the principles of the Irish Missionary and Education Societies were wholly unexceptionable. But we cannot but remember that wherever Popery is dominant, as in Ireland, the remedy is driven almost in spite of themselves, by a process of reaction into Puritanism. We feel it a duty, therefore, to make charitable allowances for Irish Churchmen. We endeavour to realize their position, and to take into account the natural working of human infirmities; and we feel satisfied that if the present movement is guided and regulated, as well as promoted and encouraged, as we trust will be the case—and if Papacy abates, and at length disappears from Ireland, then, with the fear of Popery, Puritanism will disappear also.

DEATH OF THE BISHOPS OF LINCOLN AND SYDNEY.

It is our mournful duty this week to record the deaths of two members of the Anglican Church, Dr. Kaye, Bishop of Lincoln, and Dr. Grant Broughton, the excellent Bishop of Sydney.

Dr. Kaye, who expired on Saturday the 19th ult., was born in 1783, and was for some time Master of Christ's College Cambridge. He was consecrated Bishop of Bristol in 1820, and was translated to the see of Lincoln in 1827.

The death of the Bishop of Sydney took place on Sunday morning the 20th ult., at the residence of Lady Gipps, Belgrave Square. A severe attack of bronchitis, and the subsequent exhaustion, proved too much for the strength of the Bishop, already weakened by a long sea-voyage, and by the inclemency of an English winter. His Lordship was in his sixty-fifth year, and was born at Canterbury. In 1816 he became B. A., of Pembroke College, Cambridge; and in 1820 he was selected by the Duke of Wellington, to fill the office of Archdeacon of Australia. His consecration as Bishop of Australia took place at Lambeth, on Feb. 14th 1836, on the same day with that of the Bishop of Quebec; and in 1847 his episcopal jurisdiction was limited to the present Diocese of Sydney, while authority was given to him as Metropolitan over the whole of Australia.

MOST DISTRESSING OCCURRENCE.

We subjoin from the *British Canadian*, the particulars of an event which has created a deep and most painful sensation in Toronto.

A melancholy accident occurred in this city on Saturday evening last. A fine young lad about 13 years of age, Dorset, son of T. W. Birchall, Esq., was engaged about six o'clock on that evening in company with another young lad, a son of T. D. Harris, Esq., firing with a pistol at a mark in a yard attached to the residence of the latter gentleman; young Harris was seated loading the pistol when it unfortunately went off, the ball entering the body of young Birchall below the heart, and passing completely through him lodged in the waistband of his trousers behind. On being struck he spun round but did not fall. He then walked into the house and calmly lay down on the sofa; medical aid was immediately sent for, and Dr. King shortly arrived, and at once pronounced the wound mortal. The bleeding was chiefly internal; he was soon after removed to his father's residence and lingered until one o'clock in the morning when he breathed his last in full consciousness of his approaching end. He never alluded to the accident,