

dispensations of Providence it is permitted to do its worst. The enemies of Laud cut off from him, at the utmost, a few short years of infamy and pain; and this was all they could do!

"ARRIVAL OF THE LOND BISHOP ALEXANDER AT JERUSALEM, Jan. 27.—The entry of the Bishop of Palestine into the city of David was marked by as favourable circumstances as could possibly have been anticipated by the most sanguine friends of Protestant Missions in the East.

"So long as perfect integrity and sanctity of purpose, with a heart devoted to the service of his God, his sovereign, and his country, can win, for any human being, the reverence of posterity, so long, must an illustrious place, among English prelates, be assigned to Laud."

"For my faith," said the holy Martyr, in his last Will and Testament, "I die as I have lived, in the true orthodox profession of the Catholic Faith of Christ, foretold by the Prophets, and preached to the world by Christ Himself, His blessed Apostles, and their successors; and a true member of His Catholic Church, within the Communion of a living Pope, thereof, the present Church of England, as it stands established by law."

"I leave my body to the earth, whence it was taken, in full assurance of the resurrection of it from the grave at the last day. This resurrection I constantly believe my dear Saviour Jesus Christ will make happy unto me His poor and weary servant. And for my burial, though I stand not much upon the place, yet if it conveniently may be, I desire to be buried in the Chapel of St. John Baptist's College in Oxford, underneath the Altar or Communion Table there."

So on the 24th of July, being St. James's Eve, 1663, the remains of the holy Martyr were translated to Oxford, and laid in one of the four brick vaults beneath the Altar of St. John's. And he has no monument, except his own city of Oxford, and the present English Church.

"So the dead which he slew at his death were more than they which he slew in his life."

"Society's Book of the Church, p. 500. A Life of Laud by the Rev. C. W. E. Las, p. 389.

THE CHURCH.

TORONTO, SATURDAY, APRIL 9, 1842.

It is with much gratification we stop the press to announce, that the Governor General leaves Kingston on the 20th, and will reach this city on the following day. On the 23d, being St. George's Day, His Excellency intends to lay the foundation-stone of the University of King's College.

His Excellency remains over Sunday, and returns on Monday the 25th to Kingston.

We are authorized to intimate to such of the Clergy as may intend to be present at the meeting of THE CHURCH SOCIETY on the 28th instant, that they are expected to appear in Canonicals. The wearing of clerical vestments will greatly add to the solemnity and interest of the important occasion.

We are requested to inform those Pew-holders in St. James's Cathedral, who are willing to offer occasional sittings to strangers, that it will be deemed a favour, if they will communicate upon the subject with the Assistant Minister or either of the Churchwardens.

The thrilling and solemn account of *The Martyrdom of Archbishop Laud*, contained in this number, will not be thought too long by any, but those who entertain the political and religious opinions of the venerable Primate's murderers. We do not envy the feelings of that person who can rise from the perusal of it, without a livelier faith in the strength that Christ can supply, and without an increased devotion to His Holy Church.

In rendering our humble aid to roll away the clouds, with which rebels and fanatics have vainly striven to obscure the Archbishop's Christian fame, we derive a satisfaction of no ordinary nature. To rescue a glorious work of art, a statue or a picture, from obscurity and decay, is an office grateful to every refined mind; but to aid, however humbly, in doing justice to the memory of one of "the noble Army of Martyrs," one who fell crushed betwixt the millstones of Popery and Dissent, is a task far more accessible and easy of accomplishment, and, as we believe, of far higher excellence and importance.

A wonderful reaction, with reference to the general estimation of Laud's character, has been going on of late years:—and many who have been in the habit of ensnaring him indiscriminately, have altered their tone into that of eulogy after studying his writings against Popery, and following him through his troubled career until his heroic death upon the scaffold. Of the testimonies lately borne to his good name, one is particularly gratifying, and worthy of mention. It proceeds from the Rev. THOMAS MORTIMER, B.D., (the brother of the zealous Rector of Thornhill in this District,) and formed part of a Sermon preached before the University of Cambridge. Mr. Mortimer is generally supposed to entertain very different Church opinions from those held by Archbishop Laud, and his tribute is therefore the more valuable and unexceptionable. He very properly calls him "that martyred and murdered bishop," and says,—"in answer to the charge made against him for want of piety, let the honest inquirer into the records of the case, only weigh with impartiality the exquisite sentences, which form the opening of the Archbishop's prayer on the day of his martyrdom,—martyrdom I call it, and martyrdom I must call it to my dying hour, when I consider that it was for his love to our holy Church, that he became a sacrifice to popular fury and ranting hypocrisy." This is a plain-spoken and hearty avowal, and it gladdens us exceedingly to record it.

We intend to print this account of *The Martyrdom* in the form of a Tract; and as it will be rather an expensive one, we solicit the contributions of those who concur with us in venerating the memory of Archbishop Laud, and in believing that to vindicate his character, is to render service to the Church of Christ.

That invaluable and most comprehensive Journal, the London Church Intelligencer of the 2nd March, furnishes us with the following pleasing account of Bishop Alexander's arrival at Jerusalem, which it has borrowed from the Times:

"ARRIVAL OF THE LOND BISHOP ALEXANDER AT JERUSALEM, Jan. 27.—The entry of the Bishop of Palestine into the city of David was marked by as favourable circumstances as could possibly have been anticipated by the most sanguine friends of Protestant Missions in the East. On the morning of the 20th instant our little community was much excited by the arrival of a messenger from Jaffa, with the intelligence that the British Consul General and Bishop Alexander had arrived off that port in a steam-frigate, and might be expected in Jerusalem on the following day. Mr. Nicolson, a highly respectable and talented Holstein Danish gentleman, who is now a clergyman of the Church of England, and the head of the mission for promoting Christianity among the Jews at Jerusalem, immediately started to meet them. The reconre took place at Ramech, the Ramah of Scripture (still a considerable town), where the Bishop, the Consul-General, and a numerous suite, halted to pass the night. The Bishop took up his quarters at the house of the American-Consul, the wealthiest Christian in the place, and the Consul-General, with several officers of the Devastation steam frigate, alighted at the Armenian Convent. On the following day they made their entry into our ancient capital in a procession which will be remembered by those who saw it to the latest day of their lives.

"When within five miles of the gates they were joined by the few British and American residents on horseback, headed by Mr. Proconsul Johns, who is architect of the intended church, as well as *locum tenens* of Mr. Young. On approaching the town the cavalcade, which already consisted of 50 or 60 persons, was swollen by the junction of the Bey, second in command of the troops, who accompanied by a guard of honour, and the Janissaries of the Pasha, had been sent to compliment Colonel Rose on his arrival, while all the loungers of Jerusalem turned out for the occasion. The throng passed on, and the scene which ensued at the Bethlehem-gate, by which it entered the town, affords a description of the one side were the gray massive battlements and picturesque towers of Jerusalem—no repetition of the solidity with which Sultan Suleyman fortified the conquests of his predecessor Selim; and on the other was the vale that leads to Bethlehem, now rugged and now undulating, with all its light and shade softened in the approaching twilight, while the dark and singularly even and unpeaked line of the mountains of Moab beyond the Dead Sea, loomed in the prospect. The wildly-scattered and unearthly-looking Bedouin irregulars, who had been playing the dervish, and gamboling round the procession at the full speed of their desert horses, contented themselves with firing off their muskets, being now hemmed in by the motley throng of citizens and fellahs,—Muslimans in their furled pelisses and well-fitted turbans, down to the filthy old Polish Jew in the last stage of willful hydrophobia. After acknowledging the presentation of arms at the Bethlehem-gate, the party moved on towards the house of Mr. Nicolson, and at the scene which comers turned their heads to admire the Titan-like majesty of the tower of Babel, which dates from the days of Herod the Tetrarch, the grand triumphal arch of the great Emperor Constantine, and a long and narrow street, the Protestant Bishop made his public entry into one of the four holy cities of Islam (the others are Mecca, Medina, and Damascus), on the occasion of one of the greatest festivals of the Mahomedan religion. Colonel Rose descended at the Spanish convent of Terra Santa. Dr. Alexander took up his quarters temporarily with Mr. Nicolson, his own residence, which is upon the Pool of Hезekiah, being as yet unfinished. On the 22d, Colonel Rose, Dr. Alexander, and a large party, inspected the intended site of the new church. It will be built upon the most elevated part of the city; the body of the church will be Gothic, and the towers in the style of Moslem minarets, which accords admirably both with the church itself and with the other public edifices of the city, for Gothic and Saracenic are the twin daughters of the Byzantine style. The Bishop's residence will be Elizabethan. The stone necessary for the edifices will be procured from the Mount of Olives. In the afternoon of the same day Colonel Rose presented Dr. Alexander to Tahir Pasha, who, as I have understood, received him with great politeness. Of course, it would be an impertinence to suppose that his reception proceeded from any sympathy with the objects of the mission on the part of the Turkish authorities. On the 23d the Bishop preached his introductory sermon, choosing for his text Isaiah, chapter 65, and verse 15:—"Whereas thou (alluding to Jerusalem and the Jews) hast been forsaken and hated, so that no man went through thee, I will make thee an eternal excellency, a joy of many generations." The tendency of the Right Rev. Prelate's discourse was to show that, although Jerusalem had endured, and might still endure, much suffering in the fulfilment of inspired prophecy, nevertheless his brighter days were at hand. In concluding we sincerely and heartily wish the fullest success to extend the worthy individuals who compose this mission, although we are quite unprepared to go the lengths of those who attempt to read all the signs of the times, and who think they foresee the proximate commencement of the millennium. It cannot be disguised that these individuals have a severe ordeal of groundless calumny, intrigue, jealousy, and opposition to go through. Even a few days before their arrival the Greeks and [R.] Catholics had been circulating cock and bull stories about the decline of English influence: they were, however, silenced on perceiving that when Colonel Rose paid his state visit to the Pasha on the 26th he was received with honours paid only to persons of the highest rank, a guard of 100 Grenadiers having presented arms when he left the palace. The mission is sure of the firm support of the British Government and the British Ambassador at the Porte. As regards Syria, the Consul-General has lent all the force of his official authority, personal influence, and popularity, to set the undertaking afloat, while the mild and benevolent character of the Bishop, and the sound practical sense and valuable local experience of his coadjutor, Mr. Nicolson, are some guarantees that caution, charity, and conciliation will preside at all their efforts.—Correspondent of the Times."

A few timorous persons, who fear to look danger in the face and to prepare for its coming, have thought that upon some occasions we have spoken too harshly of Dissent, and have gone beyond the mark of justice, in attributing to it a settled and malignant hatred to the Church of England. It will be borne in mind however, that we made no statements but what we supported by strong Dissenting testimony; and it will now be seen, by the subjoined extracts from the Nonconformist, a London journal devoted to the interests of Dissent, that the English language can scarcely supply terms sufficiently acrimonious and envenomed to express the detestation which the great body of the Separatists nourish against the Church. If sentiments such as we proceed to transcribe do not proclaim "war to the knife,"—do not cry out, "Down with her, down with her to the ground,"—do not warn Churchmen to assume the defensive, to break off a hollow and destructive truce, and to uphold the Church, the whole Church, and NOTHING BUT THE CHURCH,—we know of no alarm-bell, sufficiently powerful to dispel the slumbers of security, or to dissipate the dreams of a blind and suicidal confidence in the tender mercies of Dissent.

The union of Church and State is thus denounced in the Nonconformist of the 19th January:—"The whole scheme is redolent of human avarice, craft, and hypocrisy—scriptures distinctly repudiate it—the genius of religion abhors it—common reason even, and natural sense of justice, reject it with scorn. Nothing but the profoundest and most Stygian ignorance of what religion is can extenuate the crime and guilt of those who abet it. Why, even political ends now-a-days are pursued by moral means only, and all classes unite in disclaiming the instrumentality of physical force. And is Christ's Church to be supported by means which would be held to contaminate a movement for civil reform? Let the sanctioners of babbler, who gravely tell us this, have done with their trumpety! The Christianity they profess rebukes them to their faces, and points out upon their foreheads the marks of Anti-Christ."

Out of this reckless tirade it is difficult to select any part peculiarly offensive, but it may not be amiss to mark for an instant that the whole English Clergy are pointed at as "sanctioning babbler," dealers in "trumpety," and bearing "upon their foreheads the marks of Anti-Christ."

The same paper, of the same date, thus continues a strain which would have well befitted the Cromwellian age. The Christianity denounced is the Christianity of the Church of England:—"And this gentle, confiding, lovely, peace-inspiring truth [Christianity], the wisdom, or rather the craft of priestism, has allied with physical force—smeard her beauty with gunpowder and blood—sent her forth into the land accompanied by troops of policemen and bands of military—put into her hand a license to plunder—armed her with power to enter the dwellings of the reluctant—to seize booty and distribute it

among her followers—to imprison gainsayers, and endorse the warrants of their apprehension with 'take no bail'—to shoot widows' sons and cleave the skulls of poor fatherless children—and all this that she may have gold to give to her clergy. Ay! here is the naked truth. Men in these realms and in this enlightened century are to be worried, hunted, fleeced, incarcerated, shot, that the clergy may have gold. They proclaim war to the knife, in order that they may have the wherewithal to preach peace, and crush out of man's necessities the food which is to strengthen them to minister to man's wants—Amiable priests! how like thou art to Christianity!"

But what we have already quoted is Christian meekness itself when compared with these fierce and Moloch-like invectives which appear in the same journal of the 9th February:—"Newgate is full of its [the Church's] members—so is the House of Lords. It receives the refuse of all other sects. All is fish that comes to its net. A wretched infidel has committed what. Gamesters, duellers, adulterers, scoffers, the foes of God and the pests of man, all fraternize in this wonderfully comprehensive ecclesiastical society. And there they are, mingled together pell-mell, for what conceivable purpose it would puzzle the most sagacious to divine. The charm-song of the establishment is full of charity—"

"Black spirits and white, red spirits and gray, Mingle, mingle, mingle, you that mingle may." The point blank unscriptural or rather anti-scriptural character of this national Church, is no less marked a characteristic of it, than its pitiful vacuity of all significance. As nothing more stupidly unmeaning can be conceived, so nothing more flatly contradictory to Christianity can be devised. After having looked into this ecclesiastical cauldron, into which are thrown indiscriminately—"Eye of newt, and toe of frog, Wool of bat, and tongue of dog, Adder's fork, and blind-worm's sting, Lizard's leg, and owlet's wing," one is amazed at the blindness of men, who could ever have mistaken this thing for a Christian Church. One is not so surprised at the prevalence of the mistake amongst those who never had a Bible in their hands; but for those who have, the delusion is unpardonable. What is this mere aggregation of men, without assumption—the fraternization of all man's kind, good, bad, and indifferent—this blending into one mass, without assimilation, of every variety of moral material—is this what was meant by the apostle, when he said, "Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people,"—this, that Church of which Paul said that it was "the pillar and ground of the truth?" We will not go further into the subject. We feel reprobated and understanding insulted by the prepositional pretence. Satanic craft could not invent a fouler or more malignant libel on Christianity. Why, the very world has had virtuous enough to spit upon it with bathing; and to give inequivalent intimations to the priesthood of this lie in the name of truth, that if there be indeed what it purports to be, then revelation is but a fable,—the clumsy figure of monks and priests. One word more and we have done. So long as those who know better, in assumed or mistaken charity, choose to recognise this mere worldly association as a Church, and more fearful of being thought violent than of actually convicting at a pestilential falsehood, refrain from denouncing it as an anti-Christian imposture, so long must they expect its continuance and even its growth. From all ranks, Dissenters are hurrying to join this body, under the persuasion that it is one branch of Christ's Church; and that if there be some things in it capable of improvement, it only resembles in this respect the Churches with which they have been more familiar. When will our youth be taught, and our congregations told, that a national Church is so Church at all—that it has none of the characteristics of a Church—none of the powers of a Church—none of the ends for which a Church is constituted? It distinguishes not between the disciples and the opponents of Christianity. It is the "pillar and ground" of nothing but a vast hierarchical edifice. It is not associated goodness, nor meekness, knowledge, faith, nor love. It is a compulsory association of men in one company, with a view to their being taxed by one order of clergy—and the sooner its real character is made known, the better."

We have italicised some of the more striking expressions in the preceding extract, but the whole of it is so downright and explicit a character as to leave little need for elucidation. It is curious, by the way, to notice the gratifying admission that "from all ranks, Dissenters are hurrying to join this body [the Church], under the persuasion that it is one branch of Christ's Church,"—and to observe that the writer, in the blindness of his fury, overlooks the truth, that the wheat and the tares must grow together in Christ's Church, and are not to be separated until the gathering in of the harvest. A thousand facts in favour of the Church, would not be equal to this proof of its wonderful growth and influence. The Nonconformist is as a man who, seeing the battle lost, rushes headlong upon the swords of his victorious foe, and dies breathing vengeance rather than survive defeat.

We have just read what the English Nonconformist writes concerning the Church,—let us now inquire how his Canadian brother expresses himself upon the same subject. Our readers have already been apprized that Mr. Garrett, lately a Methodist preacher in connexion with the Conference in this Province, has returned into the bosom of the Church, and expressed regret for his temporary alienation from it. Circumstances compelled him to make public the letter in which he announced his reasons for taking this step. Upon this, Mr. L. Houghton assails Mr. Garrett in the Brockville Recorder, and Mr. Garrett, in the same journal, replies to the attack. The controversy will be found in another column, under the head of *Canadian Ecclesiastical Intelligence*.

It is not for the purpose of vindicating Mr. Garrett from the semblance of blame,—for anything like a specific charge Mr. Houghton does not pretend to advance,—that we notice this correspondence: but it is with the object of following Mr. Garrett in his calm and clear exposure of the engrained and deep-seated hostility which Dissent, when off its guard and having no present purpose to gain, will ever be found exhibiting towards the Church in Canada. Mr. Houghton defies the Church to produce "one soul," in "the length and breadth of the United Provinces of Canada" that has "been brought 'from darkness to light,'" "has 'been born again,'" "has been justified," "has been sanctified through her instrumentality,"—and he calls Methodism "a living branch," and the Church "a dead body." If we cannot thank him for his charity, we can at least feel grateful for his plain-speaking; and we count it honest in him, to let Churchmen know that, in the estimation of Methodists, the Church is a dead body, and cannot produce a single soul in all Canada which, through her instrumentality, has been brought into a state of grace. An open enemy is better than a false friend, and we thank Mr. Houghton again for his straightforward Methodist avowal.

Mr. Garrett has so temperately and completely exposed the weakness of Mr. Houghton's observations, that we are spared the necessity of any laboured or lengthened refutation. We cannot, however, dismiss the matter without showing the folly of Mr. Houghton's remark, that had "that holy man [John Wesley] lived to the present day, he would have left a Church so unworthy [as the Church of England] of being sustained." "When we forsake the Church, God will forsake us," was one of his innumerable declarations on this subject. Not long before his death, he declared "I LIVE AND DIE A MEMBER OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, AND NONE WHO REGARD MY JUDGMENT OR ADVICE WILL EVER SEPARATE FROM IT." He died in this conviction, and no one who does not belong to the Church, can be fairly called a follower of John Wesley. The Church is infinitely more spiritual and efficient than it was at Mr. Wesley's death, and to say that, were he now living, he would separate from it, is to contradict every evidence furnished by his writings, and to fly in the face of common sense.

The truth is, that the writings of John Wesley condemn separation from the Church, in terms too plain and decisive to be misunderstood; and the greater number of the Canadian Methodists having departed so widely from his rules and teaching, had better, in common honesty, cease calling themselves after his name. We cordially concur in these observations of the Patriot:—"WANT OF CHURCH ACCOMMODATION IN TORONTO.—We have more than once alluded to this subject, and willingly seize this opportunity of re-asserting our conviction of the pre-emptory necessity that exists of something being done, and that immediately. "With a population so rapidly increasing as ours, and now numbering nearly Seven thousand professed members of the Church of England, it is a fact equally startling and lamentable that only one place of worship [belonging to that communion] is to be found within our extensive limits. The consequences of such spiritual destitution are of the most vital importance to the temporal as well as the eternal interests of numbers of accountable beings, and must excite the sympathies of the most sympathetic. "Look at the rapidly mounting census of the last six years—see the numberless buildings every day springing up in every direction—go out into our suburban roads and see the population there becoming more dense every half year—behold man every day erecting fresh houses to meet his earthly wants, and then learn the humiliating fact that so few are to be found even to lift up their voices to advocate the rearing up of a House of Prayer to that God, to whom our earthly prosperity is so directly to be attributed. "We want a large number of free sittings for the use of the poorer classes, and also pews devoted to the accommodation of strangers and occasional visitors—at present should an Emigrant family of respectability arrive in Toronto and remain over a Sabbath day, they would be utterly unable to procure seats in the Cathedral, unless happening to know some of the fortunate pew-holders. "The effect of free sittings would soon be apparent in the regular attendance at Divine Worship of numbers of new faces, who though old inhabitants of Toronto, are rarely able to attend the services of religion according to the rites of their own Church. When St. James's Cathedral was being rebuilt, service was performed both in the City Hall and the College, and all seats being free, numbers were seen to avail themselves of the unusual privilege, and to be regular attendants. Where are they now? Ay, well may the question be asked—But the answer is too humiliating to commit to paper. "We are sure that the zealous Lord Bishop of the Diocese deplores equally with ourselves this spiritual destitution, and his good example we will confidently look for an immediate step toward remedying an evil of universally acknowledged magnitude."

We deeply regret to find the following paragraph in the *Christian Guardian*, of the 6th instant:—"The Hon. J. B. Robinson, Chief Justice, a distinguished member of the Church of England, has just given a very eligible and valuable site at Holland Landing to the Canada Conference for a [Methodist] Church, which is to be immediately erected. It is with much gratification and gratitude we announce this act of Christian generosity."

The affection of the Chief Justice to the Church has been evinced by too many generous acts to be called in question; but, with all due respect, we must say that it is contrary to the teaching of the Bible and the Prayer Book to support Dissent in any shape whatever. It also strikes us as unaccountable how any consistent Churchman can divert one farthing of money, or one rood of land, from the purposes of the Church, when his wants are so painful, so numerous, and so great a burthen upon English charity. Did not the Chief Justice stand so high in official station, and even still higher in the esteem of the Canadian community, we should not venture upon these remarks. But when we see the first layman in Upper Canada setting what we conceive to be an erroneous and most pernicious example in Church matters, and practically teaching the people that there is no material difference between the Church and Dissent, we feel bound, however reluctantly, to protest against a precedent which militates against sound Church principles, and clashes with the prayer, contained in the Liturgy, "from all ungodly, heresy, and schism, good Lord deliver us."

It is very painful for us to make these remarks upon the Chief Justice, whom we so much respect for his private virtues, and admire for his abilities and public services. But our duty binds us to maintain the cause of the Church, and, in the discharge of that duty, we neither fear the face of man, nor "have respect to persons."

Some of our English papers have come to hand, and supplied us with a mass of most interesting matter, from which we can, in this impression, only find room for the following:—"BISHOP OF SALISBURY AND THE BIBLE SOCIETY.—The Dorset Chronicle says, that the cause of the Bishop of Salisbury's secession from the British and Foreign Bible Society was, the refusal of that Society to put itself under the sanction of the Archbishop of Canterbury."

This is an inspiring indication of the growing prevalence of Unity and true Catholic principles.—Many of the most evangelical among the Clergy have followed the Bishop of Salisbury's excellent example, and have withdrawn from the British and Foreign Bible Society, and the Religious Tract Society, because they are not exclusively placed under the control of the Church. Emboldened by these occurrences, we again call upon Canadian Churchmen to support the *Toronto Church of England Tract Society*, and to withhold their aid from the Canadian branch of the *Religious Tract Society*, an Association which is partly sustained and managed by Dissenters. While a few weak-minded, but conscientious men, have embraced the novelties and anti-scriptural dogmas of Popery, it is some consolation to learn, both from the confession of foes and from repeated instances, that many exemplary men among the Dissenters have sought admission into the fold of the Church.—Another occurrence of this description has just come under our observation:—"CONVERSION TO THE CHURCH.—Mr. David Davies, a student at Cowbridge, who has been for more than 14 years a preacher in the Welsh Methodist connexion, has seceded from that body, and is now in regular communion with the Church of England. He is a man of considerable talent, and universally esteemed for his mild demeanour and pious and moral character.—Correspondent of the Cardiff Advertiser."

We are happy to find it stated that Dr. Gilbert, the new Bishop of Chichester, voted against Sir Robert Peel in 1829, when he determined to carry through the Roman Catholic Relief Bill. The new Bishop has also given assurance, in the appointment of the Rev. H. B. W. Churton as his Chaplain, that he is as far removed from approving the latitudinarianism of Dissent as the errors of Romanism.

Dr. O'Brien has succeeded the munificently charitable Bishop Fowler in the see of Ossory. An Irish Collegiate School, in which a number of young men will be instructed in the Irish language, preparatory to their entering at the University, is about being established on a large and noble scale. The Wesleyan of the 6th instant has copied the substance of a paragraph which appeared in the Presbyterian Dundee Warder, (a journal bitterly opposed to the Church of England,) to the effect that THE REV. SANDBERSON ROBINS, an eminent Clergyman, had apostatized to Popery. The whole statement is utterly untrue. We shall return to this matter next week.

We must again caution the members of the Church of England not to give credit to the idle reports that a portion of the press, hostile to the Church, so industriously disseminates. Popery has perverted a few members of the Church, but while this has been going

on, pure Christianity has gained ground notwithstanding—; for in Ireland the circulation of the Scriptures has opened the eyes of hundreds of Roman Catholics to the danger of their creed, and in England Dissenters have joined the Church, convinced that she is the ground and pillar of the truth, and the divinely constituted "witness and keeper of Holy Writ."

Among our Canadian items will be found the Presentation of the Grand Jury, relative to the Lunatic Asylum. We call upon the Government, in the sacred name of humanity, to pay immediate and effectual attention to this shamefully neglected institution. Dr. Ross, the humane and successful Physician who superintended it, has been exposed to severe privation and personal annoyance; and we understand that nearly 2,000 are due to the various tradesmen who have supplied provisions, &c.

We have the pleasure to acknowledge from "A Friend at Cobourg," the receipt of 10s. for Tracts, and of 1l 5s. for Chippawa Church. The latter sum has been forwarded to the Rev. W. Leeming.

Canadian Ecclesiastical Intelligence. MR. GARRETT AND THE METHODISTS. (From the Brockville Recorder of the 24th March.) To the Editor of the Brockville Recorder. Sir,—In your last Recorder I saw a letter from Mr. R. Garrett, a seceding Minister from our Church, directed "to the official and private Members of the Wesleyan Church," [?] at the Brockville Station, "in which were expressions very exceptional in themselves, and highly derogatory to my character; you will of course allow me to reply to such statements through your medium. By giving the following an insertion you will much oblige Your most obedient and humble servant, L. HOUGHTON.

To Mr. RICHARD GARRETT. Dear Sir,—It is a source of affliction to me that anything should have happened to disturb the harmony of feeling and apparent affection, that has existed between us during the short period of our acquaintance and intercourse together; an affection that had, on my part, become matured into settled confidence, and I supposed duly reciprocated on your part; and though you have seen fit to withdraw from the Wesleyan Methodist Church, [?] (or more properly leave your charge in Brockville) [?] on your own volition, and not a member of the Canada Conference, you had an undoubted right to leave when you pleased—or the Conference had an equal right to drop you should they please, according to our discipline, which provides that, "taking on trial is essentially different from admitting a Preacher into full communion—one on trial may be either admitted or rejected without doing him any wrong"—therefore it was not the subject of leaving, but with the manner that we mutually plain)—I feel it might not have interrupted our mutual confidence and respect for each other, if I say it might not, for it was in your power to have introduced the matter at issue between us, so as to prevent any diminution either of confidence or affection, and that might possibly have prevented even your secession from a body of Christians to whom you are so deeply indebted. I conceive that to say the least, you ought, on a subject of such importance, to have opened your mind to some one of our Ministers if not to me, especially as you consider us as *Schismatics*; and you say "in your letter you call it 'an awful sin' to you and me, was to say the least of it, not dealing generously or faithfully with me; in short, the profound secrecy in which the whole matter has been involved and carried on shows, that your subject was either too delicate and painful to suffer you to broach it, or you were afraid of the light, and therefore preferred concealment and an under current than an open avowal of the whole matter. Which of the two predominated I leave you and the public to determine. Your first paragraph informs us that you are "thoroughly convinced that no scriptural reasons can be assigned for continuing a separation from the branch of the Church of God, which is usually termed the 'United Church of England and Ireland.'" What you may require for a reason why you should remain with, or secede from, our Church, I am ignorant of; but what should be a governing reason is not hard to determine, especially as you appeal to the scriptures as a directory. I would ask, what are the proofs required to demonstrate that the Church is "an awful sin" to you and me, or that creed, constitution and liturgy? However scriptural these may be in themselves, yet, unless we exhibit the most important evidences, such as holiness of heart and life,—fruits, both in the ministry, and laity, of a scriptural conversion to God, as also demonstrations of a direct call to the ministry, which to the Apostles, was the instrument of conversion of souls by their labor, as well as the introduction of those means that are calculated to cheer and perpetuate the work of Grace in the Church, it matters but little whose hands are put upon our heads, whether those of a bishop, or a presbyter, or whether the Church is "an awful sin" to you and me, or that you think a Church a "secession" from a body of Christians, much less the *Apostolic Church*; and to say it is "schism to continue a separation" from such a Church, is more than a scripturally sane man can say. The next point that calls for our remarks is the course pursued by the venerable J. Wesley, than whom there has been few, if any, since the Apostolic days. "Whose praise is so universally in all the Churches of the world." It is true he loved the Church of England, because of the sublimity of her liturgy and the orthodoxy of her creed, together with his early attachment to her ministers and members; he remained in her communion, and no doubt hoped, that through the great revivals he had been instrumental in introducing into England, to purify her so that she might be, as she ought to be, not only a praise in all the earth, but a retreat and a home, "a refuge from all storms and a covert from the wind," as well as a means of salvation and holiness to all who might wish to be sheltered under her branches; and much indeed, as has been said in this respect towards saving her from destruction and annihilation.—But what was the treatment she received from both her ministers and laity? I need not recapitulate the many instances of brutal force as well as shameful calumny, that were heaped upon him and his coadjutors, by that very Apostolic Church to which he belonged; so that he was literally obliged, in order to save himself and the people he had been the instrument of converting, to form them into a separate body, as an independent Church; [?] and indeed that which between the anticipated, is evident from a conversation with two of his brothers, or at least the remarks of C. Wesley, who said, "J. Wesley, just before he died,—'Why do you not set the Methodists off, as you know they will do in after your decease'; and the very fact that J. Wesley's enroling the 100 in chancery, called the Conference, was a virtual withdrawal from, [We suppose the words "the Church of England" are here inadvertently omitted, and an independent recognition of the Methodist Church?]. And notwithstanding all that has been done for the Church of England by the Methodists, and the various other helps she has received from other denominations, yet, what is she at the present day? Where are those marks of Apostolicity, "the seals of her Ministry known and read of all men"—where the Apostolic seal for souls—how many have been brought "from darkness to light"—have "been born again"—have been justified—I have been sanctified through her instrumentality? I give you the length and breadth of the United Provinces of Canada to produce me one such soul, not to say the many that are necessary in order to establish her claim to be a branch, much less the Church of God; and had that holy man lived to the present day, we hesitate not to predict that he would have left a Church so unworthy of being sustained; and we envy not the man the applause he receives for leaving a living branch, and uniting with a dead body. I hasten to the examination of another paragraph in your letter, in which you say, "I was unable to find any argument from the 'Word of God,' or from reason, to justify my remaining self-separated and cut off from the Church, to which, under God, I owe my Christianity." It will be recollected by you, as well as by many of us, to whom you have repeatedly stated, that you were converted under Methodist influence—[at a Methodist Prayer meeting, and at a Methodist altar, you received your conviction of sin—was brought to her Altar a penitent]

Your most obedient and humble servant, L. HOUGHTON.

To Mr. RICHARD GARRETT. Dear Sir,—It is a source of affliction to me that anything should have happened to disturb the harmony of feeling and apparent affection, that has existed between us during the short period of our acquaintance and intercourse together; an affection that had, on my part, become matured into settled confidence, and I supposed duly reciprocated on your part; and though you have seen fit to withdraw from the Wesleyan Methodist Church, [?] (or more properly leave your charge in Brockville) [?] on your own volition, and not a member of the Canada Conference, you had an undoubted right to leave when you pleased—or the Conference had an equal right to drop you should they please, according to our discipline, which provides that, "taking on trial is essentially different from admitting a Preacher into full communion—one on trial may be either admitted or rejected without doing him any wrong"—therefore it was not the subject of leaving, but with the manner that we mutually plain)—I feel it might not have interrupted our mutual confidence and respect for each other, if I say it might not, for it was in your power to have introduced the matter at issue between us, so as to prevent any diminution either of confidence or affection, and that might possibly have prevented even your secession from a body of Christians to whom you are so deeply indebted. I conceive that to say the least, you ought, on a subject of such importance, to have opened your mind to some one of our Ministers if not to me, especially as you consider us as *Schismatics*; and you say "in your letter you call it 'an awful sin' to you and me, was to say the least of it, not dealing generously or faithfully with me; in short, the profound secrecy in which the whole matter has been involved and carried on shows, that your subject was either too delicate and painful to suffer you to broach it, or you were afraid of the light, and therefore preferred concealment and an under current than an open avowal of the whole matter. Which of the two predominated I leave you and the public to determine. Your first paragraph informs us that you are "thoroughly convinced that no scriptural reasons can be assigned for continuing a separation from the branch of the Church of God, which is usually termed the 'United Church of England and Ireland.'" What you may require for a reason why you should remain with, or secede from, our Church, I am ignorant of; but what should be a governing reason is not hard to determine, especially as you appeal to the scriptures as a directory. I would ask, what are the proofs required to demonstrate that the Church is "an awful sin" to you and me, or that creed, constitution and liturgy? However scriptural these may be in themselves, yet, unless we exhibit the most important evidences, such as holiness of heart and life,—fruits, both in the ministry, and laity, of a scriptural conversion to God, as also demonstrations of a direct call to the ministry, which to the Apostles, was the instrument of conversion of souls by their labor, as well as the introduction of those means that are calculated to cheer and perpetuate the work of Grace in the Church, it matters but little whose hands are put upon our heads, whether those of a bishop, or a presbyter, or whether the Church is "an awful sin" to you and me, or that you think a Church a "secession" from a body of Christians, much less the *Apostolic Church*; and to say it is "schism to continue a separation" from such a Church, is more than a scripturally sane man can say. The next point that calls for our remarks is the course pursued by the venerable J. Wesley, than whom there has been few, if any, since the Apostolic days. "Whose praise is so universally in all the Churches of the world." It is true he loved the Church of England, because of the sublimity of her liturgy and the orthodoxy of her creed, together with his early attachment to her ministers and members; he remained in her communion, and no doubt hoped, that through the great revivals he had been instrumental in introducing into England, to purify her so that she might be, as she ought to be, not only a praise in all the earth, but a retreat and a home, "a refuge from all storms and a covert from the wind," as well as a means of salvation and holiness to all who might wish to be sheltered under her branches; and much indeed, as has been said in this respect towards saving her from destruction and annihilation.—But what was the treatment she received from both her ministers and laity? I need not recapitulate the many instances of brutal force as well as shameful calumny, that were heaped upon him and his coadjutors, by that very Apostolic Church to which he belonged; so that he was literally obliged, in order to save himself and the people he had been the instrument of converting, to form them into a separate body, as an independent Church; [?] and indeed that which between the anticipated, is evident from a conversation with two of his brothers, or at least the remarks of C. Wesley, who said, "J. Wesley, just before he died.—'Why do you not set the Methodists off, as you know they will do in after your decease'; and the very fact that J. Wesley's enroling the 100 in chancery, called the Conference, was a virtual withdrawal from, [We suppose the words "the Church of England" are here inadvertently omitted, and an independent recognition of the Methodist Church?]. And notwithstanding all that has been done for the Church of England by the Methodists, and the various other helps she has received from other denominations, yet, what is she at the present day? Where are those marks of Apostolicity, "the seals of her Ministry known and read of all men"—where the Apostolic seal for souls—how many have been brought "from darkness to light"—have "been born again"—have been justified—I have been sanctified through her instrumentality? I give you the length and breadth of the United Provinces of Canada to produce me one such soul, not to say the many that are necessary in order to establish her claim to be a branch, much less the Church of God; and had that holy man lived to the present day, we hesitate not to predict that he would have left a Church so unworthy of being sustained; and we envy not the man the applause he receives for leaving a living branch, and uniting with a dead body. I hasten to the examination of another paragraph in your letter, in which you say, "I was unable to find any argument from the 'Word of God,' or from reason, to justify my remaining self-separated and cut off from the Church, to which, under God, I owe my Christianity." It will be recollected by you, as well as by many of us, to whom you have repeatedly stated, that you were converted under Methodist influence—[at a Methodist Prayer meeting, and at a Methodist altar, you received your conviction of sin—was brought to her Altar a penitent]

The Wesleyan of the 6th instant has copied the substance of a paragraph which appeared in the Presbyterian Dundee Warder, (a journal bitterly opposed to the Church of England,) to the effect that THE REV. SANDBERSON ROBINS, an eminent Clergyman, had apostatized to Popery. The whole statement is utterly untrue. We shall return to this matter next week. We must again caution the members of the Church of England not to give credit to the idle reports that a portion of the press, hostile to the Church, so industriously disseminates. Popery has perverted a few members of the Church, but while this has been going

on, pure Christianity has gained ground notwithstanding—; for in Ireland the circulation of the Scriptures has opened the eyes of hundreds of Roman Catholics to the danger of their creed, and in England Dissenters have joined the Church, convinced that she is the ground and pillar of the truth, and the divinely constituted "witness and keeper of Holy Writ."

Among our Canadian items will be found the Presentation of the Grand Jury, relative to the Lunatic Asylum. We call upon the Government, in the sacred name of humanity, to