

those, who in our days strive to get themselves a name, and to build up their reputation, by slighting, undervaluing, and by all uncharitable malicious ways, rendering odious those from whom they dissent, I should not much intercede for them; THESE ARE EVIL WORKS, FRUITS OF THE FLESH, EVIL TEND TO ALL."³

DR. DODDRIIDGE, Dissenting Minister.—“Of the Established Religion of his country, he (Dr. D.) always spoke with great respect; and he never made any petulant objections to its worship or discipline, or uttered against it any severe or unkind reflections.”⁴

ROBERT HALL, Dissenting Minister.—“The large portion of property it (the Church of England) holds gives it a great national weight and importance. The regular gradations of authority and rank cement its several parts closely together, and prepare it on all occasions to act with the utmost promptitude and unanimity. Its ministers, vested with legal authority and character, are the natural objects of a veneration, of which nothing but personal misbehaviour can deprive them.”⁵ “If we contemplate, in connexion with the subject we are upon, the manners and institutions of the British nation, we shall perceive that the Established Church in these kingdoms possesses such pledges of its safety, as are not to be found in any Protestant community besides. A finished English education is, in all its stages, clerical: the public seminaries of instruction, together with the two Universities, being almost entirely under the conduct of ecclesiastics; by which means a reverence for the Church is imbued with the first elements of knowledge. Its splendid literary establishments, its magnificent libraries, the accumulation of ages; and, above all, the great and illustrious names it has produced in every department of genius and learning, the glory of the world, who have conferred dignity not so much on their profession as on their species; gives it, in a literary view, a decided superiority, and in popular opinion an exclusive esteem.”⁶

A Wesleyan Minister (anonymous).—“I, for my part, am too well versed in days of yore, ever to expect a Church more tolerant than the Establishment: and, while I can worship God in my way, ‘under my own vine, and under my own fig-tree, none daring to make me afraid,’ I think it not too much in return to abide by the majority; particularly as I know, both in parliament and in the world, this is the only practicable way to secure peace. I could mention some denominations under whom I should be afraid to venture my protection, if they were the dominant party. A lion there must be; and I think that country happy where the lamb can lay beside him. It is absurd to suppose that there should not be a ruling power,—one which embraces the opinion of the majority, whatever those be. But I fear from the tone of some Dissenters, that they have left the old school of their forefathers, and have become too political. I fear, if some of them were to get on the top of the tree, many of us would have to repent of it. I know also many Baptists, who disclaim connexion with those who urge exorbitant demands: and I repeat, for the sake of my brethren, that we are decidedly averse to that attack which some of the Dissenters are meditating against the Establishment.”⁷

D. WARR, Dissenting Minister.—“With any thing less than her utter destruction, I am persuaded that neither popery nor infidelity will be satisfied.”—“The people of God have but one common interest: many a holy devoted minister in the Establishment is labouring to promote the glory of God and the good of souls; and it is but solemn mockery to bless God for their success, and to pray for its increase, while our hands are stretched out to unroof the building that covers them.”⁸

JOHN EAGLETON, Dissenting Minister.—“Whence but from the restless spirit of insubordination to the dominion of revealed truth, is the wide-spreading rage for the dissolution of the union which subsists between Church and State? Why contend so vehemently for the emancipation of British politics from the control of the principles of religion? Politics cannot be separated from religion without trampling under foot the oracles of God.”⁹

P. R. SMITH, D.D.—“I will only beseech you, my dear hearers, and especially the ministers of the Gospel of peace, to pray that ‘the Lord of peace may give us peace always, and by all means; and on no account to lose your interest in his gracious declaration, ‘Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God.’ We cannot help being involved in the agitations of our time,—a time probably big with events of solemn importance for all the interests of our country, and especially its religious interests. But, my honoured brethren, let us take heed to our own spirits, and strive, and pray,—that ‘we do no evil; that we discountenance to the utmost, hard speeches, rash assertions, exaggerated statements, sarcastic or in any way irritating expressions, and every thing, in word or deed, that is inconsistent with the meekness and gentleness of Christ.’”¹⁰

The same.—“We are not building a new edifice upon unoccupied ground. Admitting the abstract argument to be in our favour, its practical application would require the greatest caution, and holy wisdom such as I dare not look for in man. The religious Establishment of our country has been for ages wrought into the connexion and habits of the nation. To break its manifold connexions with our civil institutions, in any way than by the gentle operation of conviction in the minds of its own members, would be venturing upon a dark and perhaps perilous course. My ardent wish and prayer is, that the Establishment may be improved, delivered from evils and defects of every kind, and meliorated, honoured, and blessed, to the highest perfection of conformity to the requirements of the Holy Scriptures.”¹¹

The testimonies produced in the preceding pages, from Dissenting writers, supply answers to the more popular objections, which it is now so common for Dissenters to advance against the Church. It might have been hoped, that our non-conforming brethren, in their professed zeal for the glory of God, and the wider spread of real religion, would have rejoiced in the good which God is doing in and by the Church of England: and that, in a day when popery and infidelity are making such vigorous and united efforts against the truth, they would have united their efforts with those of the Church to defend and extend that truth for which our martyrs bled, and in the maintenance of which is involved all that is dear to us as Christians and as Britons. It may be demanded, in order to account for their hostility

against her, does the Church of England proscribe and persecute Dissenters? Nothing like this can in truth be alleged. Dissenters enjoy a full toleration: the mode of worship which they prefer has the fullest protection of the laws of the land: dissent does not exclude them from a single civil privilege. Why, then, should they misrepresent and oppose the Established Church, from which they profess to have conscientiously seceded? What have they as Dissenters to do with the Church? To such we say, in the spirit of Christian love,—refrain: if this Church be the mere device of man it will come to nought; but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it: refrain, lest haply ye be found to be fighting against God.” Far be from the members of our venerable Church, that spirit which would have called down fire from heaven to consume their adversaries: rather let them cherish and manifest towards their opponents the spirit of Christ,—“Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do!”

The evidences adduced in these pages in favour of the Church of England, supplies to the members of that Church additional reasons for steadfastness of attachment to her communion. Shall they forsake the Church of their pious forefathers, which has proved for so many ages the faithful depository and dispenser of the truth of God, to which so many martyrs sealed their attachment with their blood, and which God is so eminently blessing, and making most extensively a blessing at this time, not only to this nation, but to distant nations, which she is rescuing from pagan darkness? This would be, indeed, to forsake their own mercies, and to forsake a Church upon which the glory of the Lord hath arisen. It is not enough, however, to prove us good members of the Church of England, that we merely continue to worship in her assemblies; it behoves us to recommend her to others, by an exhibition in our tempers and conduct, of the holy effects of those life-giving doctrines which she so largely and frequently inculcates. To the holiness and consistency of our lives must be joined our fervent prayers. Let us beseech Almighty God to “send down upon our bishops and curates, and all congregations committed to their charge, the healthful Spirit of his grace,” and “the continual dew of his blessing.” Then may we hope to see better days for the Church of God among us, and that all counsels and projects devised against her, will be brought to nought; that many now separate from her will say, “we will go with you, for we see that God is with you.”

THE LENGTH OF THE CHURCH SERVICE.

(From the Rev. I. J. Blunt's 'Sketch of the Reformation in England.')

The length of our church service, of which we now hear so much, and the repetitions it contains, are evils, if evils they be, which have been practically existing almost from its first formation; which a Hammond, a Sanderson, and a Taylor could tolerate without a complaint, but too happy, (as were then their congregations also, for those were not fastidious days,) if they were permitted in their secret assemblies to give utterance to these burning words with which the great Reformers had furnished them; nor scrupulously counting how often they were taught to pour forth the Lord's Prayer; as they counted not how often they were taught to cry out in the selfsame phrase for the Lord to have mercy upon them; as David counted not how often he exclaimed “My son, my son?” or as these critics themselves it is presumed, would not count their own iterations when they were suing earnestly for their lives. Such are not vain repetitions; and it is to be hoped, that an age so little fitted for the task as this by any theological attainments, will pause before it attempts to improve upon the labours of a Cranmer, who, according to the testimony of one of the ripest scholars of his time, Peter Martyr, nor he by any means a creature of the archbishop, “had diligently noted with his own hand every one of the fathers: had digested into particular chapters, with a view to the controversies of his day, councils, canons, and popes' decrees pertaining thereto, with a toil, and diligence, and exactness, which would seem incredible to any but an eye-witness; who both publicly and privately, and by a marvellous strength of learning, quickness of wit, and dexterity of management, had asserted what he held to be true from the thorny and intricate cavils of sophisters;” and who pronounced concerning this very Book of Common Prayer, “that no man could dislike that godly book that had any godliness in him joined with knowledge.” Moreover it is to be hoped that an age, which for a time, unchastened by any national calamity, has suffered much of that spirit of devotion to escape which animated the holy men of old, who were ever compelled to walk with their lives in their hand, and who were, in fact, called upon at length to lay them down, will not be allowed to communicate its narcotic influence to our Liturgy, and quench in any degree the ashes of the martyrs. In truth, it is impossible to contemplate the projects of our Liturgical Reformers without something of alarm, lest, whilst, with the best intentions in the world they “dandle the Rid,” they should clumsily kill him nevertheless.

If, however, changes there must be after all,—if old things must here, too, pass away, and all things become new,—be the conditions those proposed by the sagacious South, and all apprehensions will be hushed. “Let us but have our Liturgy continued to us, as it is, till the persons are born who shall be able to mend it, or make a better; and we desire no greater security against either the altering this, or introducing another.”

ENGLAND'S PRIVILEGES.

By the Rev. H. Melvill.

God hath done marvellously for England: in planting the standard of his truth among us, and in not removing our candlestick out of its place. He hath not allowed Christianity to become disguised and deformed, by the accused heresies and inventions of designing men; for now, in the very evening of time, he seems to multiply the number of zealous pastors, and to rear up in every part of the land fresh and bold advocates of the truth, as it is in Jesus. But if much has been done for England, much shall be required of England. It is idle to say that, as a nation, we act up to our privileges. Woe unto thee, England! woe unto thee, Scotland! for if the mighty works which have been done in thee, had been done in Asia or Africa, they would have repented speedily in sackcloth and ashes. O! I do fear, that, crowded as the land is with the despisers of the Gospel, with the disciples of an ensnaring and destructive liberalism, the Almighty may be provoked to withdraw from us our advantages, and leave us as a state, to the havoc of revolution, and, as a church, to the ravages of impiety. We are not, and we would not

be blind to the fact, that thousands are thirsting for the overthrow of our Church establishment; and that parties, however separated in other things, bind themselves together for the object of hunting down its venerable institutions. Be it so. We are not bigoted enough to argue, that the Church of England is too pure and perfect to need any reform; but we are bigoted enough to believe, that the Church of England is the great bulwark and pillar of national religion; yea, that her existence is identified with the State: that when England shall cease to have an Established Church, she will cease to have an established kingdom. The State, wearied and lacerated by the importunities of designing men, may, if she please, throw the Church overboard; but the Church will not sink, she has too much of the cross of Christ in her; and that never goes down in the most troublous ocean. But the State having rid herself of what thousands call an incubus, will be no gainer by the separation; she will have lost, if I dare use the expression, her ballast; and rolling backwards, will at last sink beneath the mighty whirlpool of evil. We stand not here as prophets of evil; but we do stand here as preachers of truth. As a nation, and as individuals, we have been made partakers of privileges, which, if they issue not in our salvation, must awfully swell our condemnation.

THE CHURCH.

COBourg, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1838.

The subjects which we have lately been compelled to discuss in our editorial columns, have partaken of the character of passing events. It has not been permitted us to follow the native bent of our inclinations, and to devote ourselves exclusively to the pleasant and peaceful pursuits of religious literature, or even to know no other strife than that of polemical disputation. Identified with the common cause of our country, and sharing alike in her prosperous and adverse fortune, we could not remain unconcerned spectators of the recent American invasions. Bound by obligations the most sacred to strive to the utmost for the maintenance of national peace, we have, as the most direct means of ensuring that peace, lifted up our voice against those godless foreigners who, if much longer unchecked by their own government, will plunge this continent, and perhaps the whole world into a war. We have felt ourselves stirred by a patriotic indignation; we have, as we trust, been angry and sinned not; and so long as our right hand is not forgetful of its cunning, so long will its energies, and those of the mind that directs it, be exerted in defence of our Jerusalem,—our native country.

Having thus premised, we offer no apology for inditing a few remarks on the gallant defenders of Upper Canada.

A long peace has happily afforded to the British Army but few opportunities for showing, by practical manifestation, that the national courage retains the moral vigour and the physical irresistibility, which triumphed so gloriously at Waterloo. There can, however, be no reason for apprehending any decline or degeneracy in the warlike spirit of the Empire, because it has slumbered in almost uninterrupted repose for a quarter of a century. If, in that long interval of inaction, our troops have not been injured to the conflicts, the stratagems, and the hardships, of war, they have not degenerated in discipline,—they have become elevated in moral character,—they have partaken of much of the benefit, with but little of the evil, which the increased diffusion of education has produced,—and, at this present moment, they constitute a force which, if wielded by the hand of a monarch minded statesman, would restore the tarnished honour of England to its pristine brightness, and establish, on an honourable and permanent foundation, the peace of the world, now jeopardized by the imbecility of a Palmerston, and his truckling co-adjutors in an office of which millions of high-born and free-born Britons pronounce them to be unworthy.

Late events in the two Canadas confirm the justice of these observations. The British soldier has signalized himself by his courage, his humanity, and his civil virtues: in the field, he has been intrepid; in the camp, submissive to discipline; in his intercourse with civilians, peaceful, unoffending, and obliging. Nor have we colonists, on our parts, failed to testify our gratitude to those who watched while we slumbered, and fell covered with wounds, while we sat in security round our fire-sides. When the brave men, who were sufferers in the sanguinary contest at Point au Pelee, exhibited their scarred and lacerated forms, the generous inhabitants of Toronto administered to their necessities with a liberal hand,—and that honourable beneficence was imitated in other quarters. When the mangled body of the butchered Weir was consigned to the tomb, the Britons of Montreal were congregated in thousands to pay their tribute to departed valour. And when, very recently, Lieutenant Johnson and Private Downes, sharers alike in one common death and burial, were carried to the soldier's long last resting place, the loyal town of Kingston was overclouded with an undimmed sorrow. Honour and peace to the lamented slain! May they have exchanged their earthly armour for the wedding-garment of eternal bliss,—their shattered sword for a branch of palm—their low laid helmet for a crown of glory! Our gifted and patriotic ZADOC has sung their requiem in a Christian strain; and our liberties will be dearer to us for having been watered by their blood—

“In glory will they sleep, and endless sanctify.”

Proud as we are of the gallant troops despatched to our succour from the parent isles, we are not less proud of the noble militia of the Canadas. Our farmers love their peaceful firesides, and cherish the blessings of their free, fair homes with a zest and affection that none but a Briton can feel; and they would much rather handle the plough than their bayonet, and mow down the yellow wheat-fields with their sickle, than “like reapers descend to the harvest of death.” Yet when their country calls for their aid, they are not tardy in obeying the summons. They—yes, and every other class and condition of society—sacrifice interest, comfort and affection to their sense of duty, and regardless of danger, are foremost, and even rashly daring, in repelling the violators of their soil. Ample and practical proof do they afford that they live under a beneficent and paternal Government; for who would bare his breast to the bowie-knife, or incur the risk of having his remains dishonoured with a fenshish indecency, or mangled, like a log of wood, with the axe, unless for the preservation of that freedom which a Monarchy only can secure? Their manly bearing has provoked the admiration of their better disciplined companions in arms; and strangers to every ancient jealousy, the militia-men and the soldiers of the line form “a band of brothers,—a phalanx in which we may glory and rely.

Our infant Navy,—if we may venture so to designate our

force upon the Lakes,—must not be forgotten, or repaid with silence for the services it has already rendered. Lieutenant FOWELL and his resolute crew, were the first to encounter the invading brigands: the success with which they opposed themselves to overwhelming numbers, and to a vessel of a bulk that might easily have overpowered them, inspires that confidence which is ever derived from an auspicious commencement of hostilities.

In the present atrocious and extraordinary contest in which we are engaged, and which, we fear, has not yet reached its worst, our main dependence is on the outstretched arm of the King of kings; and we do not think that we lay ourselves open to the charge of extravagance, when we express our belief that some signal vengeance will alight upon the nation that acts as if there were no God nor a hereafter,—and that some special blessing will be vouchsafed to a people who, however much they may have provoked the Almighty by their murmurings and discontent, have so long borne accumulated wrongs with a magnanimous and unprecedented forbearance.

We may not ourselves shoulder the musket, unless in the hour of pressing need, or exchange the sacerdotal garb for military attire, but we may bring all our influence, humble though it be, to the animating and sustaining of the public spirit. May, did we say? It is not only permitted to us, but it is required of us. The clergy of our loved and loyal church have never been slack to blow the trumpet in Zion when its battlements have been beleaguered; and we, in this Colony, should be unworthy of our connexion with the Establishment of England, if we did not feel our responsibilities as subjects immeasurably increased by the influence with which our calling invests us. We should deem ourselves unfit to minister at our country's altars, if we shrunk from exhorting the people to go forth to the defensive battle in the name of the Lord,—if we refused our humble mood of honour to those who “jeopardized their lives unto the death in the high places of the field.”

When we are unable to say any good of a contemporary, or when, in replying to his animadversions, we should be obliged to use the language of severity, we feel it to be most consistent with christian duty to say nothing at all. This feeling, conjoined with an unwillingness to disturb by controversial disputations what we believe to be the peace-loving disposition of our readers in general,—more especially as we rarely discern in the articles designed for our special rebuke or edification, much that we have patience to read, far less to reply to,—has induced us to observe a good-natured silence in answer to the columns of argumentation and vituperation, directed specially at ourselves, with which the *Christian Guardian* abounds. When, however, we find any allusion to facts or circumstances which are unfairly stated, or from which improper inferences are drawn, we feel constrained to break the rigidity of our silence, and to represent things as they really are. In the *Guardian* of the 5th inst. is the following passage, purporting to be an extract from a letter from Peterboro' to the Editor, and giving an account of the progress of a certain petition, emanating from the Editor of the *Guardian* and a few of his friends, and circulated, we suppose, for the very meritorious purpose of keeping up the excitement of the public mind, fostering and maintaining a spirit of discontent, disturbing the concord of the people, and calling off their attention from the paramount duty, at the present moment, of defending the country from brigands and assassins:—

“But it is said, in speaking in reply to the impropriety of giving certain powers to Rectors, they will never use those powers to injure any person.” Now I do not believe this doctrine, for I once knew a Wesleyan Minister residing in the town of Cobourg, (where the Methodists have no separate burying place,) one of whose family it pleased the Lord to take to himself. The intention of the father of the deceased was to inter him in the burial ground of the English Church, and for this purpose a friend went to request the Sexton to dig a grave; he also called at the residence of Mr Bethune to request him to perform the burial service. He knocked at the door, and the lady said the parson was from home. The messenger told his errand, and then remarked, ‘I suppose there will be no objection, as it is a minister's child, if one of the Wesleyan Ministers, three of whom will be at the funeral, will officiate?’ The reply was, ‘I do not know; you must ask the Church-warden, Mr. C.—’ Mr. C. said the thing could not be allowed; the Clerk, in the absence of the Clergyman, was the only person who would be allowed to officiate within the enclosure. When this was conveyed to the father, he sent the messenger immediately back to the Sexton to tell him to fill up the grave again. The Wesleyan Minister then applied to the Trustees of the Presbyterian burying place, and had his son interred there. The Rev. Mr. H.—officiated on the occasion. This, Sir, leads me to believe that the Episcopal Clergy will use all their power, and more than belongs to them, or than becomes any one branch of the Church to use, to the injury of another.”

In the above, as far as our recollection serves, there is no very material deviation from the facts of the case, when we separate them from the accompanying comments and inferences. It is true that such an application had been made—that the clergyman alluded to was in Toronto at the time—that the reverend friend who acted as his substitute was at a distance on a missionary excursion—and that the fact was courteously communicated that no interment was usually permitted in a Church of England Burial-ground, unless the service of that Church was read at the grave, and that, in the necessary absence of a clergyman, any respectable layman was competent to perform that duty. We may add, in order that there may be no misapprehension upon this subject, that no church or chapel belonging to the same Establishment can be used by any other than a lawfully ordained clergyman of the Church of England. Now, we need not enter into any formal defence of the obvious propriety of this regulation: suffice it to say that it is a regulation, and that it is not in the power of any individual clergyman of the Church of England, consistently with his duty to his Ordinary, to depart from it. And we must add, that this is a regulation perfectly irrespective of any peculiar privileges which it may possess, or may claim as an Establishment. It is simply a rule of discipline, which has been uniformly exercised by the church, and which, if we mistake not, is just as strictly adhered to in the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States. And that such is a disciplinary regulation not unknown to other denominations, is manifest from the fact that the very clergyman of the Church of England, alluded to in the above paragraph, after having been invited some years ago to make use of a Methodist chapel in a neighbouring village for the occasional performance of the services of the Church, was shortly afterwards informed that it was a resolution of the Quarterly Conference that he should do so no more! We do not adduce this circumstance in any spirit of complaint, but merely to show that the charge of exclusiveness—if such can be fairly made at all—is not applicable solely to the disciplinary arrangements of the Church of England. But the grand secret of the above little narrative, is

³ Owen's Works, vol. xv. pp. 75, 76.
⁴ Life prefixed to the Expositor, p. 107.
⁵ Works, vol. iii. pp. 349—351.
⁶ Letter in the Times, Dec. 20, 1833.
⁷ Letter in Record newspaper, last year.
⁸ Sermon published at Huddersfield, 1829.
⁹ Sermon on Necessity of Religion, &c. p. 21.
¹⁰ Ibid. p. 22.