

W. W. Reynolds

THE ORANGE LILY.

VOL. VI.

BYTOWN, JUNE 10, 1854.

NO. 22.

Poetry.

(FOR THE "ORANGE LILY.")

THE RED MAN'S WRONGS.

The Pale face in our evil hour,
Crossed o'er the great and mighty stream,
Light was his hand—as weak his power,
And mild his voice as noonday's dream,
We could have crushed him then to earth,
And hurled him back on ocean's breast;
But not we led him to our hearth,
And till his faltering frame could rest,
We gave a home and found him food,
He paid us with—ingratitude!

No country now nor earthly home,
Have we, congenial to our taste,
No wood so wild o'er which we roam,
But there the Pale faced hand has placed,
His home, his landmarks, or his blaze,
And we who own these forests grand,
Which fade before his greedy gaze,
Must meekly move at his command,
Must back retreat, and further fly
Before his jealous, un-aided eye!

The forests that our fathers trod,
Are fading like a dream away,
O'er Father's graves—the Prairie sod
Are desecrating day, by day,
The lordly lakes and streams that sweep,
Their crested waves towards the sea,
Will leave them soon, nor need we weep,
We could not happy by them be,
While every day—aye, every hour,
The works of art deride our power!

The Pale face claims them, "might is right,"
If patient, soon he'll have them all,
Ope short, and starless summer night,
And we will fly the white man's trail,
The broad, the blue, and boundless deep,
Yavos yonder neath our very feet,
Palse pale face, tempt us not to leap,
Into its last and cold retreat;
Be patient, urge us not to bound,
Unbidden to the Spirit ground!

Once in that hunting ground, we'll rove
Through fragrant forests, great and good,
And lave our feaves in golden foam,
Poured forth from our great Spirit's hand,
There rove our tribes:—their voices call
In echoes, soft as yonder rill;
They whisper this, the best of all,
No pale face over did or will,
Spoil with monopolizing power,
The Red man's spirit bounded bowler.

HENRY KEMPTVILLE.

Bytown, June 1854.

[From the Edinburgh Review.]

Ast. I.—1. *The Divine Rule of Faith and Practice.* By W. Good, M.A. 2nd edition. London: 1853.

2. *Discourses on the Controversies of the Day.* By W. F. Hook, D.D. London: 1853.

3. *Means of Utility.* A Charge by Archdeacon Hunt. London: 1847.

(Continued from our last)

The position we have described cannot exist without involving much insubordination. Accordingly the party which began with watchwords of order and obedience, is now the most disorderly and disobedient in the Church. Every clergyman is pledged, not merely by acts of Parliament, but by

Articles, by Canons, and by repeated Oaths, to acknowledge the Royal Supremacy in Ecclesiastical Causes. Yet we have lately seen the decision of the Queen in Council openly repudiated, with a formal publicity which exposed the guilty parties to the penalties of a *præmunire*. But it may be said that the Supremacy, though an Anglican, is not a catholic doctrine; and that a 'catholic mind' acknowledges subordination to the divinely appointed governors of the Church, not to the earthly rulers of the State. Such is, indeed, the profession of the Tractarian party. 'The Bishops,' they tell us, 'are the living representatives of Christ;' and again, 'Whatever we ought to do, had we lived when the Apostles were alive, the same ought we to do for the Bishops. He that despiseth them despiseth the Apostles.' But alas, these guides are only divine and apostolic so long as they side with their professed worshippers. If they venture to decide against them, they instantly become not merely fallible but heretical. Out of the whole body of English bishops, two only are now considered sound in Tractarian faith. And the scorn expressed even for their collective decisions, may be seen in the contemptuous denunciations hurled by these champions of Ecclesiastical Order against the Episcopal Monition to the Clergy, which was signed in 1851 by twenty-four out of the twenty-eight bishops on the bench. The party seems, in fact, to take a school-boyish pleasure in showing the annihilation of Episcopal power, and the unlimited license of disobedience practically possessed by the clergy. Greenwood and Penry were hanged by Whitgift, Leighton was whipped and mutilated by Laud, for the use of language against bishops mild in comparison with that which every pamphleteering curate now uses with impunity. We were especially edified by one pamphlet which was published by a rustic pastor soon after the Gorham Judgment. The worthy man (who was Vicar of Puddleton Parva in the county of Wilts) informed the Archbishop in all sober earnest, that whenever he, the said Archbishop, should present himself as a communicant at the altar of Puddleton, he should be repelled therefrom. Imagine the vindictive satisfaction with which Archbishop Laud would have received such a document! and how pleasant he would have noted in his diary, a few weeks afterwards, the results of its publication upon the ears, noses, back, and cheeks of the author!

But if the Primate, by voluntary betrayal of his most sacred trust, has deserved such treatment from the laity, at least the Bishop of London, we might hope, must command their grateful deference. He favoured not the heterodoxy of Godham; he stood alone among his brethren of the Privy Council in resisting the institution of that obstinate heretic. And at the same

* Tract No. 10.
† From a desire not to expose a country clergyman to unnecessary ridicule, we suppress the name of this Wiltshire Vicar, and alter that of his parish.
‡ See Laud's detailed account (in his diary) of the execution of Leighton's sentence (Rushworth's Collections, vol. ii. p. 57).
§ Part of the Bishop of Exeter, 1549.

time, he was glorified by the members of the Sect as the pillar of orthodoxy. But this was when he gave a judgement in their favour; since then he has ventured to decide against them; and now he too is a mark for the scoffs of the 'Chronicle,' and the more polished sarcasms of the 'Guardian.' His fall is connected with a controversy which was brought before Parliament three years ago. It will perhaps be remembered that Lord Palmerston, when Foreign Secretary, displaced the Chaplain at Madeira. The Bishop of London, however, did not think the faults committed deserved so severe a punishment, and refused to withdraw the Chaplain's Episcopal license. The ejected clergyman continued to minister to a section of the British residents, and the new chaplain was denounced by the seceding party as the worst of heretics. No sooner was he landed than his predecessor put into his hands a solemn protest. In this document (which with its Appendix, fills up thirty pages of the Parliamentary Blue Book* containing an account of these transactions) the chaplain is informed that his 'assumption of the office without license from the Bishop is a schismatical and unlawful act.' His congregation are warned that if they attend his ministrations they will become partakers in the sin of disobedience and schism; and innumerable quotations are gathered from old fathers and modern divines, to enforce the Ignatian maxim that 'the obeying of the Bishop is the necessary condition of Christian communion, and he that does not obey the Bishop is worse than an infidel.'† Who would have supposed that the very man who wrote this protest, and his followers who applauded it, would within three years be themselves denying the authority of the self-same Bishop? Yet so it was. The extravagance of their conduct induced the Bishop to withdraw his countenance. At once obedience was changed into rebellion. The Priest who had just signified unlicensed ministrations as worse than infidelity, himself continued to officiate for many months after his license was cancelled. When he left the island, the extreme sections of his partisans went yet farther. For the Bishop having, in the meanwhile, given a license to the Government Chaplain, they refused to acknowledge its validity, on the ground that it was granted to a notorious schismatic. And when the Bishop desired them to recognise his nominee, as the only clergyman acting there under Episcopal authority, they replied by now citations from the Fathers, directing the faithful to resist heretical bishops, and opened a church on independent principles.‡

All this insubordination is defended by the Tractarian party on the ground of a

* Correspondence respecting the British Chaplain at Madeira, printed by order of the House of Lords, 1842.
† Above mentioned. *Hisso Book*, p. 146.
‡ *Ibid.* p. 185.
§ Letter of the Bishop of London, September 1, 1852 (quoted from the 'Guardian').
¶ 'I have re-opened our church,' says the minister, 'falling back upon the general principle expressed by every priest for acting in emergency.' (Guardian, Dec. 29, 1852.)