

The Ontario Episcopal Gazette.

VOL. I.—No. 30—PRICE \$1.50 per ANNUM

OTTAWA CITY, THURSDAY MORNING, SEPTEMBER 4, 1862.

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY BY JOHN HOYLAND.

Canada.

ONTARIO DIOCESE

Table with 2 columns: Name of church and Amount. Includes entries like 'Huntly, Christ Church', 'Napance, St. Mary Magdalene Church', etc.

CORRESPONDENCE.

The Editor does not hold himself responsible for any peculiarity of opinion held by Correspondents.

ANALYSIS OF ARCHDEACON HELLMUTH'S CHARGES AGAINST THE CANADIAN CHURCH, AND OF THE LETTERS OF THE METROPOLITAN IN REPLY TO THEM, AND OF THE ARCHDEACON'S REPLY.

Error is in its nature a bad and unchristian thing. It is not only a fault of the intellect, but a fault of the heart.

(To the Editor of the O. E. G.)

Sir,—There can, or ought to be but one feeling—that of regret—in reference to the subject of the letters just published by the Metropolitan of Canada and Archdeacon Hellmuth.

There are, he says, "Some godly, good and hard-working men, but too few in number for the purposes of the Church."

Of course there are many Clergymen to whom this work more fitly belongs—whose position and ability point them out as the most capable of doing it justice.

If any should say, "I, that the Metropolitan is able to defend himself, and, therefore, 2nd., that the matter ought to be left in his own hands, I reply to the first proposition, at once, in the affirmative, but with this qualification, that, standing as he does on his vantage ground as Metropolitan, he is limited to a line of argument and proof, which necessarily excludes the minute and more detailed features of the case.

As to the second proposition, that the matter ought to be left in the hands altogether of the Metropolitan. I would concur in it, if the matter altogether concerned the Metropolitan, but it does not—of all the Clergy, he is the least, personally, although the most, officially interested.

I. CHARGES AGAINST ARCHDEACON HELLMUTH. That in a speech at Ilington, England, delivered to the "Evangelical" audience, with a view to procure subscriptions from them, for the erection of an "Evangelical" College at London, O. W., the See of the "Evangelical" Bishop of Huron. He averred that: 1st. There was a very great lack of evangelical men in those (British American) vast colonies.

The first charge, of a lack of evangelical men, he qualifies by adding "not that there are not really, good, and hard working men, but too few in number for those vast regions, &c. &c." These four charges, stated in his own acknowledged words, constituted the "head and front" of the Archdeacon's offending.

Because he does not contradict the "Record," which represents him as affirming that, "a residence of nearly 15 years on the other side of the Atlantic gave him ample opportunity of becoming practically and thoroughly acquainted with the state of things there."

2. THE ARCHDEACON'S CHARGE AGAINST THE CONSEQUENCES OF HIS CHURCH ON THE PART OF IGNORANCE.

There are, he says, "Some godly, good and hard-working men, but too few in number for the purposes of the Church."

The venerable Archdeacon says it is to be asserted to each and every clergyman whom he meets on the street or elsewhere, who does not consider himself evangelical in the Archdeacon's sense, and who therefore fancies that he has just cause for complaint that he by implication should be deemed neither "godly, good, nor hard working," that he (Dr. H.) did not mean him—that as he gave the Colonies generally credit for a few "godly, good and hard working men" no man ought to assume that he is not one of the number.

Now I do not mean to blame the Archdeacon for his valuation of the evangelical as compared with his brother of the other, or high school of theology—the same thing has a different price in the eyes of different persons.

to do violence to language by twisting it so as to favor a sense which the ordinary reader cannot detect in it—in respect to the passage under consideration, a sense which no person but the Archdeacon himself has attempted to eluce from it.

I intend to apply as much as I am able this charitable principle of interpretation to every future criticism on this controversy, my object is not to put the Archdeacon on the "green table" for the purpose of cross-examining him, as to his reasons for this very serious charge against the non-evangelical—as to what is good, and as to who, constituted him a "godly, good, and hard working" man, and from what over-acts he concludes that the non-evangelical is not also deserving of these honorable titles—whether there are not shades or degrees of Evangelical and therefore of "godliness, godliness," &c. and if so, why he has thought fit to draw so clearly defined a line of demarcation between the two bodies as entirely to separate them—to place Jordan between Israel and Moab—whether he could trace a charge of an equally sweeping nature to a non-evangelical clergyman against the Evangelical—the particular works of a g. fearlessness, and delicacy in three of plagues or pestilence—in which the Evangelical evince his excellence in comparison with the other, &c. &c.

2d Charge that Evangelical men are at a very great discount in those Colonies generally. The word "discount" here means of course, low estimation, or position or both.

The word "discount" here means of course, low estimation, or position or both. The Metropolitan disproves, it would seem to any ordinary man's satisfaction, the truth of this imputation by instancing the many high and responsible positions held by Evangelical men in the cities of Canada. In the country parts are likewise found many strictly Evangelical clergymen in the Archdeacon's sense eminent for their self-denying labors and untiring zeal, who stand high in the estimation of their Diocesan co-account of these invaluable qualities but the word "discount" did not invite allusion to the Metropolitan, who therefor only made passing mention of those holding city cures. One of the most responsible, and certainly the most influential, in Canada is the Rector of Toronto, the Incumbent, which the friend and examining Chaplain of the Bishop of that See, is an Evangelical. In receipt it is said of \$3000 a year. This gentleman is certainly not at a discount. The next best is the Rector of London, of which the Rev. Dr. Cronyn was a clergyman, and still is I believe, although Bishop of Huron, Incumbent, and so in the enjoyment of two sources of revenue—the Rectorial and Episcopal. He is, I may also modestly assume, not at a discount—then Montreal and Quebec are also noticed by his Lordship as the scenes of the labors of Evangelical clergymen, who have the confidence, I may add, and the respect of their Bishops, as well as of their flocks, and who, most assuredly are not thought to be either by themselves or anybody else at a discount. Yet to all this, the Archdeacon in his second letter, replies as follows: "My Lord, have you not said more as to the paucity of 'Evangelical men' in Canada than I have ever ventured to say," &c. &c. The charge is that these gentlemen are at a discount—that they are not at a discount, the Bishop proves by showing that a fair proportion occupies high, responsible and lucrative positions—then the Archdeacon shifts from the word discount to the word paucity, which we now bear of for the first time, and endeavors to make it appear that the Metropolitan's answer only proved his entire failure to correct him of error, and so he claims a victory! And this kind of literary Blindness—made of dealing with definite charges runs throughout the whole of his composition, from which he derives certainly a vast advantage over his superior, who could not have recourse to a corresponding agility to pursue the Archdeacon, through all the tortuous and narrow passages of his devious and dexterous sophistry. The Archdeacon deserves the greatest credit for his nimbleness in turning the corner of an argument, and all of a sudden appearing cool and collected on the opposite side, with a ready and affecting apostrophe to his injured feelings, with a most mild and Christian severity of censure, and an engaging submission under pressure of the "hierarchical structure."

But, granting for a moment, that Evangelical men are few, and so allowing the Archdeacon the benefit of his agility, the question arises whose fault is it? This the Archdeacon seems to take the utmost care, shall not suggest itself to the reader, but it here inconveniently obtrudes itself. Is it the fault of the Metropolitan or of the Bishops generally (the excellent Bishop of Huron, of course, always excepted), as would seem to be implied by the close contiguity in which he places this assumed fact with his charge to be subsequently considered that "an effort is being made to rear a hierarchical structure, which he feared would not tend as is supposed by some to strengthen the cause of pure Protestant and Evangelical truth."

anecdotes; that I deem it wholly unnecessary to do more than barely advert to it as an evidence of the temporary suspension of the Archdeacon's admitted caution and foresight. I suppose we must make such allowance for that excitement of feeling, so natural to a speaker addressing an audience of congenial friends and sympathies, who meet to be pleased, and who are to be tuned and toned to the key of living. Who would not as the accredited agent of a Bishop, whose eyes are anxiously and strangely turned towards him, endeavor to please all his good opinions; and, favorable to his cause, and to be able to justify now and then the flashes of his indignation, and occasionally to indulge in the luxury of in-roking his identity for the coloring of his pictures.

The Archdeacon would never have reason to complain of a scanty measure of forgiveness by the Canadian Church, had he only pleaded the circumstances of his position when in explanation of his unfortunate remarks. My own opinion is, that could he have foreseen the results to which they have led—the alienation of the great body of his ecclesial brethren in Canada—the course of his Metropolitan and the general disturbance of the existing unity and harmony, he would have been more careful to plumb his imagination and to have looked clear where for ideas to fill up the much decided hiatus in an extemporaneous speech. His audience might not have been, it is true excited to the same degree, but the pecuniary result would not have been very unfavorably affected. But this opinion of mine is not shared by others—the general sentiment will not admit the possibility of the Archdeacon ever for an instant permitting either his feelings, his imagination or his enthusiasm to agitate or divert his reason from the object of his pursuit. It cannot be persuaded but that what we, in our blindness designate as an error of judgment in him to his most sagacious eye, is a stroke of forecast policy—that what are called by the world reverses which would drown any ordinary audience are premeditated conjurings of his wizard spirit, designed as the media by which he may put himself into the rich port for which he originally embarked.

Surely the Archdeacon must have forgotten that the Metropolitan is the patron of, and co-worker with, the Colonial Church and School Society, of which he himself was the Agent and General Superintendent, and which exactly suits his theological views. Did the Metropolitan ever evince the slightest evidence of disfavor? Who faults it, I again ask, that evangelical men are not more numerous? If this be a fault in our Bishops, is it not also in the home Bishops? Does the Archdeacon require that 1st. they must all assume his theological complexion, and then daily, set to work and impart a uniform tinge to the theology of the age? This would indeed, be a proof, strong and tangible, did they so attempt, against them of tyranny, and an effort to erect that "hierarchical structure" which the Archdeacon so much dreads. Surely our Bishops cannot be justly accused of condemning, either by act or word, the doctrinal views of any Clergyman, however low, who labours within the Church, and conforms to her discipline and rules of order. The Archdeacon, as the Agent and General Superintendent of the above named zealous Society, had great power reposed in his hands, of leaving the several Dioceses of Canada with Clergymen of his own taste. Did he ever receive opposition from our Bishops? Was any obstacle ever thrown in the path of his work? No! Why then can he not point to the fruits of his labours for the truth? How many men has he introduced "faithful, good, hard working, godly men" into this Macedonia of ours? Who are they? What have they done? Is he then the fittest person to throw the first stone? There is nothing easier than to talk, to fame, and to fret over the things which they place before us and have not done. It is only a restoration of an old patent for the speedy manufacture at the smallest cost of worldly reputation for piety and zeal, to compass the whole world to make one proselyte. The world ever favors its own inventions and devices, and applauds the clever engineer who masters and directs its machinery.

The reader is then himself the judge as to the measure of the Archdeacon's success in proving the truth of his 2nd charge against our Bishops (with the single exception above made and all ways implied whenever they are here spoken of) that "Evangelical men are at a very great discount in those colonies generally," as well as of his first that of "a very great lack of Evangelical men in the British North American Colonies."

ments lie, he can make his words express any meaning he pleases, but until they incommode him, he refrains from giving them any definite signification, any inconvenience arising out of their obvious sense is instantly averted by another, which accepts all objections, as to the application of his remark in the Ilington speech, as to the hardness of evangelical, or "godly, good, and hard-working men" in those colonies to every Clergyman he incidentally meets, who conceives himself as a Churchman to be excepted.

If then the above words mean anything, that is rational, it must be the sense here applied to the Bishops, it is plain that if the Metropolitan had been placed in the position of one whom the Archdeacon would be much likely to select from the Episcopal bench, his expression would never have been uttered by him—then the "hierarchical structure" instead as now, he says, "weakening the cause of pure Protestant Evangelical truth," would have been pronounced to be a solid wall of defence against doctrinal error. However, as this is but one opinion, the reader need not accept it if he pleases; however numerous or powerful its advocates. This supposed "hierarchical structure" probably has an existence in his mind, but he will not, I hope, impute public incredulity as to its reality to want of respect for his opinion, if it be not received until supported by some proof however insignificant. A Canadian reader is a thinking man, who takes with him, to all his judgment in all public questions and disputations, a cool and calculating mind, strengthened by business habits, and well stored with a knowledge of the outlaws which sway human action. His quick perceptions are not likely to be warped by insinuating appeals to cherished prejudice, or his interest to be enlisted on the side of error by imaginary terrors conjured up to frighten him into acquiescence. This "hierarchical structure" idea may be a very bright thought—an ingenious device of a very subtle controversialist, but in this land of hard, dry fact, we cannot admit it into the category of recommended by some proof, however insignificant. The best of us may be deceived. The Archdeacon's excessive zeal, in the cause of "pure Evangelical truth," may possibly credit visions which a cooler and less imaginative advocate would be utterly unable to perceive. Of this I am sure, that he cannot find a more faithful ally than I will prove to him in his laudable efforts to crush down this dangerous "hierarchical structure," if he will only persevere.

Yet I do not deny that we have a "hierarchical structure," but this is only one-third of the truth—why not be candid, and inform his falling friends that we also have a clerical structure, in which he himself is a stone of no mean moral magnitude, one object of which structure is to counteract any dangerous inclination, or "bent sinister" in the hierarchical—and moreover, in addition to the clerical, a lay "structure," also which is well able to take care of itself, and needs no sound of alarm from any Archdeacon to quicken its watchfulness, neither any intellectual aid to assert and to maintain its rights and privileges. Our latter are, in fact, now too enlightened to listen with patience, or calmly to bear, the excited pleadings in their behalf of an over zealous friendship. Such an affected interest in their welfare may impose on the credulity of ignorance, but can never enlist the sympathy of the learned. This popular avenue to an ephemeral fame, is now being rapidly closed up, because in proportion as new ground in intellectual vigor, in the same proportion do they become the guides of their own conduct—the masters of themselves—when in a state of ignorance and blindness they were obliged to look to others for direction—they were then weak, and had to lean on others for support. This was the age of the damage—the popular flatterer, whose stock in trade was his superior enlightenment, and the mastery which it gave him over the wills and affections of men—a mastery which was but too seldom controlled by the law of philanthropy, or softened by the emotions of human sympathy.

The laity of the Church now know well enough that they have a co-ordinate power in Diocesan and Provincial Synods with the Clerical and Episcopal bodies—who shall say that they do not know, and are not as jealous of their rights, privileges, and immunities as the other two bodies? If they are, what need have they of the warnings, the cautions, or the alarms of any man, to make them see or understand that, which they are already conversant with. I maintain that any such conduct is an insult to their intelligence. Why does not some uneasy agitator sound the note of alarm in the ears of the Clergy or of the Bishops? Simply because he knows that his only reward would be laughter or contempt. But, in fact, the present is the most inopportune period for raising the cry of "hierarchical" domination or "structure"—for never in the whole history of the Church, from Apostolic days down, has there been an age of such entire freedom and equality among the three orders of Bishops, Priests, and Laity, as the present; and in no Christian denomination does there exist an organization in which the laws and principles of co-ordination are more intelligently appreciated, recognized, and acted upon, than in the Canadian Church. For all these reasons, I conclude that, the Archdeacon's harangue at Ilington, is innocuous as to its effects, although determined in its spirit, and for the same reasons, every attempt of his to raise money, by playing upon the weaknesses, the ignorance, or the religious prejudices of people at home, will not be accorded the approbation of the people of this country. Every Christian must will judge for itself, as to

the value or probable prosperity of a religious institution for the education of men for the gospel of peace and truth, which may be reared by means of funds so obtained.

To destroy then, this much dreaded "hierarchical structure," would be to reduce the Church to the Presbyterian form of government. Does the Archdeacon draw his inspiration from Calvin, or his logic from Loyola? He contemns the Metropolitan for his statement of the Gen. Evans' affair, because unsupported by proof, and yet here as well as elsewhere, as above shown, is a serious charge made against the Episcopate of Canada, not only without a shadow of proof, but also without a shadow of truth. The whole tenor of the Archdeacon's charges is this: "Three hundred years ago this Episcopobia could be made to serve a very hieraral purpose, the usually is now too old to alarm the present Moderator of the Presbyterian Church in Scotland, who lately recommended its union with that of the pure Episcopal branch in his country, would probably moderate, if he could not cure, the Archdeacon's disease, or if we may judge by his speech as to his wants, he will find relief in Presbyterianism—the retreat of Father Chisholm, his protege. It provides him with a Church unsupported or uncountenanced by any "hierarchical structure," and it possesses Colleges which send forth men which ours," according to the Archdeacon, do not "With the Apostolic determination," the words are his own, "not to know anything among men save Jesus Christ and Him crucified." Indeed, as a professed admirer of the broad School of German theology; the Presbyterian System as well as doctrine must be, and I am persuaded is, notwithstanding much sullen twaddle about "our beloved Church," more in harmony with his views than anything except a part in the "hierarchical structure," a Bishopric or an Archdeaconry, that he can find in the Church of England.

4th Charge, "that as this is the very first effort of the kind, to establish a thoroughly Protestant Theological College in the Colony, he trusted evangelical men will effectually help this good cause."

Granting the truth of this charge, what then is the proposed remedy? It is to erect this "thoroughly Protestant Theological College" of his. But grant that this is the remedy, and the only one, what assurance have we, beyond his own word, that it will be "thoroughly Protestant Theological College" as he says, "and do not doubt Dr. Hellmuth as its head—the most important ingredient in the whole panacea. It is all this sufficiently satisfactory to me who recognize in the Archdeacon a quarantary Professor of Hebrew, and you tem of Divinity also in, and zealous collector of funds for, Bishop's College, Lennoxville—a College which, it is true, the Archdeacon to this day scornets. If we are to believe himself for its soundness,—and because he does so venerate it, it is a prompt standing contradiction of another statement of his in England that his is "the very first effort of the kind to establish a thoroughly Protestant Theological College in the Colony." I maintain, therefore, that the guarantee offered that the funds sought for will be productive of the expected results, cannot be satisfactory to any business mind, which considers this slyly jumble of contradictory of which the person offering the guarantee of his word, is guilty. I do not conclude that these funds will not be collected, for my opinion is, that they will; but the secret of their collection will be the ignorance of the giver, and not the merits of the case.

If Lennoxville College be all that he wants, why not strengthen her rather than build another. This multiplication of Colleges is a positive evil, unless they would be strong, and could do something; scattered over the country they must be feeble, sickly, dying things—objects of contempt, devourers of money, yielding nothing in return. The College of which I speak will gladly unite, for it enjoys the confidence of the Church, as it always has done, in promoting the cause of sound Protestant evangelical truth. If this be the Archdeacon's sole object, he will more effectually accomplish it by honest, faithful exertion, than by expensiveness on the part of the giver.

excite people to the pitch of giving. An honest zealous servant in this exalted cause will readily forego, provided it prosper, any personal advantage. What is a Principality or Professorship in comparison with such an ambition?

But if Lennoxville College be not that of which he can approve, then he must have changed his slow contemporaneous with his appointment as Archdeacon of Huron, and Agent of the projected College; and if so, what guarantee can anyone have that he will not change again? The union of our interests and principles, however happy, is suspicious at the least. In this connection may be fitly introduced a correlative branch of the subject under illustration, although it is susceptible of separate comment, as a fifth charge against the Canadian Church, the "hierarchical structure, clergy, and laity." This is, that, with the exception of the few Evangelical, or which, with him, is the same "godly, good, and hard-working men"—"the Gospel of Christ is not proclaimed in all simplicity and fulness." A pretty sweeping charge certainly, to be made by any man against a whole church—and especially by a man without authority, power, commission, or superior qualifications, such as Apostle's intuition of the truth, &c. &c. But I have already learned from the Archdeacon's two letters how great is

(Continued on Fourth Page.)