

THE CHURCH.

TORONTO, FRIDAY, APRIL 7, 1843.

Although it must certainly and cheerfully be confessed that Churchmen begin to exhibit a clearer understanding of their duties as such, still it is lamentable to behold those, whose station and opportunities of reading warrant us in looking for better things at their hands, compromising the plainest principles of Christian unity, and consorting in religious fellowship, with men whom Scripture bids us mark and avoid, as causing divisions, and rending the seamless garment of the Redeemer.

Instances have, in which gentlemen who call themselves Churchmen, and who are supposed to pray every Sunday for deliverance "from all false doctrine, heresy and schism," have presided at the Anniversary Meetings of Schismatical bodies, or enacted the part of Master of the Revels at one of those absurd and childish serio-comic money-raising festivities, commonly known by such name as METHODIST MISSIONARY TEA-PARTIES.

It is just possible that these gentlemen may have suffered their good-nature to overcome their scruples, and that their disinclination to oblige a certain number of their fellow-citizens may have induced them to accede to requests which they wish had never been made, but which they want the resolution to refuse.

They may, moreover, endeavour to persuade themselves, that by presiding over a Dissenting meeting once a year they are by no means failing in that general homage which is due from them to the Church, but that, on the contrary, they exhibit a spirit of diffusive charity in union with her spirit and teaching.

Such amiable weaknesses as these may be palliatives in some cases for the lax and mischievous Churchmanship, or rather no Churchmanship at all, of which we complain. But at best they are but very flimsy excuses, unworthy of men of any principle or reflection; and therefore we feel it our duty again and again to enforce those arguments, which we think ought to weigh with every Churchman, in regulating his religious intercourse with his Christian brethren belonging to Dissenting denominations.

It is bad and inconsistent enough in a Churchman to attend Dissenting places of worship either for curiosity or devotion. The evils of this practice have been dwelt upon by our best and holiest divines, and by none more strongly than by Bishop Beveridge. But at present we do not mean to revert to this point. We just glance at it, in order to say, that if a casual attendance at a sectarian place of worship be a breach of duty, how much greater a transgression is committed when a Churchman, on the grand and solemn occasion of some Dissenting Anniversary, allows himself to be thrust into the temporary hierarchy of a sect, gives all the weight of his character, and some of the contents of his purse, to the objects of the meeting, and the principles of those most interested in it, although the very existence of the sect, over which he enacts the part of president for the evening, is most expressly condemned by that branch of Christ's Holy Catholic Church, of which he professes himself a member!

Can inconsistency be more glaring than this? Mr. Lukewarm goes to Church on Sunday, and on Monday evening presides at a Methodist Missionary Meeting, recognizing, co-operating, and interchanging compliments with, unauthorised ministers, whom the Church regards as less than laymen, being self-excluded from her pale. Has he done all that he could for the Church? Has she no wants to be supplied, no Clergy to be supported? And is he therefore at liberty, having a superabundance of means, and seeing no regular channel for their employment, to devote them to some purpose not altogether regular and unexceptionable, but still, as he thinks, calculated to extend the Gospel, and to promote the spiritual welfare of his brethren?

Alas what a mockery, what a vain pretence is this! When the Churchman in this Province gives his five pounds, or his five dollars, to Dissent, he knows, in almost every case, that his own lawful minister struggles on with a scanty income, with difficulty contriving to feed, clothe, and educate his family in the plainest manner. He knows that his brethren in the town and poor settlements cry out aloud for ministers, while they can give nothing or but little to their support. He knows that Churches are to be built in every direction, and that those already built want the decent ornaments necessary for the suitable performance of divine service. He knows that Sunday and daily schools are to be maintained, and furnished with books—and that parochial lending libraries would be benefited by his contribution. He knows that there is a Church Society, the whole Church in action, comprising Bishop, Clergy and Laity, ready to receive his aid, and to employ it in the most judicious manner. He knows all this, and he knows that year after year, and at this very moment, he and his fellow-colonists have enjoyed and do enjoy the unparalleled munificence of the two great English Societies, and are indebted to them for the erection of Churches, and the fixed maintenance of a great number of the Clergy. How, knowing this, he can reconcile it to his conscience to bestow any portion of his means upon Dissent, while he is under obligations, which he can never adequately discharge, to English charity, we are quite at a loss to discover. But he may not know, and it is time he should be told, that the Church in this Colony must soon be thrown upon her own resources,—that funds must be raised by ourselves, or there will be no more Clergy for the Bishop to ordain,—that the utmost which we can spare from our scanty means will be sadly insufficient to meet the growing demand for the ministrations of the Church. Only supposing then that the sums bestowed by the Churchmen of this Diocese upon Dissent alone, to 5000*l.* a-year,—is it not a reproach and an injustice that a sum, which would support four missionaries, should absolutely be given for purposes which have a tendency to estrange people from our communion, and to increase the difficulties of the Church in her future attempts to collect her scattered children?

And what shall we say of the inconsistency of the Dissenters, in always endeavouring to procure a Churchman to preside over their Anniversary Meetings? Their pertinacity and perseverance under rebuffs and refusals, is, in this respect, astonishing. They first try at the highest game, and if they cannot get a Judge, a Legislative Councillor, or some eloquent public speaker, they do the best they can, and, after a few failures, generally succeed in getting some respectable Churchman to take the chair for them. But why should they ask a Churchman? They are Dissenters, we presume, because the Church is not sufficiently spiritual for them,—does not sufficiently train up her members in the commandments of God. Yet, on the most public occasion of the year, when the treasury is to be replenished,—when the fairest exterior, and the most attractive names are to be presented to the public, they do not choose one of their own sect to preside, but enlist the services of some Churchman, whose religion makes him good enough to be their temporary president, but is not good enough for them to live by. And here,—without a particular individual in our eye, and expressly excluding those gentlemen, whose conduct of late has forced us into these remarks,—we must take occasion to observe, that the Churchmen selected to preside at Dissenting Anniversaries are by no means chosen with a reference to their moral or religious character, but merely in consi-

deration of their supposed popularity and influence, or their ability to make a speech. A zealous would it be, if, at the next general meeting of the Church Society, in June, we were to get a Presbyterian or Methodist layman to take the chair, instead of the Bishop! And equally ridiculous is the Dissenters to place a Churchman in the President's seat at their Anniversary meetings,—stationing him there as a decoy-duck, to entrap his brother Churchmen. Really Dissenters, in procuring the presidency of a Churchman at their Anniversary Meetings, must be considered as making either the one or the other of these admissions,—that they have not a member of their own fit to take the chair, or that Churchmen, on the score of character and influence, are far more desirable.

We write frequently, and as strenuously as we can, upon this subject, because we deem it one of great practical importance, and involving essential principles. We have not advanced one-half of the arguments which suggest themselves to us, and shall probably be called upon to adduce those that remain to be urged, upon some future occasion. One additional observation, however, we must make before we close.

A Methodist Anniversary Meeting is held in a Parish, and the most influential and respectable Churchman presides over it. The clergyman, if he has done his duty, has associated units and undivided fidelity to the Church, and warned his flock against the sin of attending dissenting places of worship. How discouraging then to him, to perceive that his principal parishioner, the man who ought to help and cheer him, and set an example to the rest, has refused obedience to his teachings, and united, albeit for a few hours, with the enemies of the Church. Few circumstances can send a sharper pang into the faithful clergyman's heart, than to see his Parishioners thus neglecting his solemn warnings, and bestowing their countenance and substance upon men who revile him and his principles openly, or who stealthily seek to withdraw the sheep from his fold.

Dr. Matthew Parker, the first Archbishop of Canterbury in Queen Elizabeth's reign, was consecrated to his high office, at the chapel of Lambeth Palace, on the 17th December, 1559. He was a man of grave, unambitious and retiring manners, and for a long time shrank with unfeigned reluctance, from the arduous dignity which was thrust upon him.

About the year 1600, the Roman Catholics invented a monstrous and incredible falsehood, to the effect that Archbishop Parker and the rest of the Protestant Bishops in the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign, or, at the least, sundry of them were consecrated at the Nag's Head Tavern in Cheapside together, by Bishop Story alone, or by him and Bishop Barlow jointly, without sermon, without sacrament, without any solemnity, in the year 1559, (but they know not what day, nor before what public notaries), by a new fantastic form. And all this they say, upon the supposed voluntary report of Mr. Neale, a single malicious spy, in private to his own party, long after the business pretended to be done. (Archbishop Bramhall's Works, p. 455, ed. 1876.) Father, writing nearly one hundred years after the consecration, informs us concerning this Tavern, that the Papias "show a place therein, just against the bar, so anciently arched, that an active fable, which can make anything of anything, may create to itself a top or tester of a pulpit there, though the like thereto may be seen elsewhere in the city." (Church History, Book 9.) In this pulpit Story is said to have officiated.

"Of all the slanderous aspersions" (writes Bramhall) "cast upon our Church, that lying fable of the Nag's Head Ordination,—that 'tale of a tub,' as he elsewhere calls it, 'doth bear the bell away.' It was a fiction, bid from the light and noticed by no Roman Catholic writer, until the year 1600. The Papias Controversialists up to that time, do not avail themselves of it, and that quick-witted and unscrupulous Jesuit, Harding, in his conflicts with Bishop Jewel, does not press it into his service. The validity of English ordinations has been admitted by many learned Papias, by Cusenius, Valerius, Armand, Snellart, the great Bossuet, and Le Courayer. Of the Protestant writers, who are no great partisans of the Church of England, Hallam consigs the Nag's Head fable to contempt, and Sir James Mackintosh says, 'It is needless to discuss the ridiculous story of a consecration of the new prelates at the Nag's head Tavern; which has been judiciously abandoned by Dr. Lingard, the most eminent of our Roman Catholic historians.' Indeed with Fuller and Bramhall we may well declare, that 'this lie of the Nag's Head was bred in a knave's brains,' and that 'the first deviser of it doth justly deserve the character of a man of a brazen forehead, and leaden heart.'

From time to time, however, this preposterous fabrication has been revived by some unscrupulous Romanist, and in the Hamilton Catholic, of the 29th March last, a long letter, purporting to be written from Kingston by a layman, takes up the oft-explored absurdity, and dresses it out again in its old and tattered rags. It would be tedious, and useless were we to follow the layman step by step, and to transfer to our columns the masterly refutations of Bramhall and Le Courayer. We deem it sufficient to state a few points, which we think bear most clearly and conclusively upon the subject.

Every Bishop in the English Church, though virtually appointed by the King, is nominally elected by the Dean and Chapter. Upon a certificate of this election being returned, the King grants a commission to examine the election. "Upon the receipt of this mandate [or commission], the Bishops who are authorised by the King, do meet first at Bow Church in London, where, with the assistance of the Chief Ecclesiastical Judges of the Realm, the Dean of Arches, the Judges of the Prerogative and audience, with the registers to actuate what is done, they do solemnly, in form of law, confirm the election. Which being done and it being late before it be done, the Commissioners and Judges were, and are sometimes, invited to the Nag's Head to a dinner, as being very near Bow Church, and in those days the only place of note. This meeting led Mr. Neale (a man altogether unacquainted with such forms) into this Fool's Paradise; First, to suspect, and, upon suspicion, to conclude, that they were about an ordination there; and lastly to try to be greedily swallowed by such as wished them true, to assert his own drowsy suspicion for a real truth. But the mischief is that Dr. Parker who was to be consecrated, was not present in person, but by his proxy."—(Bramhall, 466.) "Bishops are ordinarily confirmed by proxy, but no man was ever consecrated, no man was ever attempted to be consecrated by proxy."—(ib. 461.)

In 1613 the Register of the Consecration was shown to some Romish Priests, who, after close examination, admitted that "the book was beyond exception" (ib. 461). This testimony has been impugned, because when the Priests wished to peruse the records in prison, their request, with a proper regard to the safe-keeping and integrity of valuable documents, was not complied with.

Charles Howard, Earl of Nottingham, Lord High Admiral of England, "not more famous for the coronet of a Count, than the crown of old age,"—being in the latter end of the reign of King James [I.],—was requested of a friend whether he could remember Matthew Parker's consecration, gave an exact account

of the same solemnly performed in Lambeth Chapel, being himself an eye-witness thereof, and an invited guest to the great feast kept there that day, therefore the more observant of all particular passages thereat, because the said Archbishop was related to him as a kinsman." (Fuller's Church History, Book ix.) If our impression, that Lord Nottingham was a Roman Catholic, be correct, his testimony is, therefore, the more valuable.

The four public notaries who witnessed Parker's consecration, "were the same who did draw Cardinal Pole's consecration into acts, and attest them. Either let the Papias deny that Cardinal Pole was consecrated, or let them grant that Archbishop Parker was consecrated. There are the same proofs for the one and for the other. There needeth no more to be done to satisfy any man that hath eyes in his head, but to compare the one Register with the other."—(Bramhall, p. 455.)

One objection against the consecration, apparently of some weight, is thus set forth by the writer in the Hamilton Catholic:

"Parker is called 'Archbishop Elect of Canterbury' in a royal commission of 9th September, but in another common act of 20th October, before mentioned, he is addressed absolutely 'the most Reverend Father in Christ, Matthew, Archbishop of Canterbury.' Now as this commission of 20th October was issued, to empower the persons therein named to present the oath of supremacy to the Archbishop of Canterbury, Bishops of London and of Ely. And they acted that none but a consecrated Bishop can administer such oath. Therefore, they argued that the Nag's head ordination in September did take place. But this is pure fancy. The statute of 1st Elizabeth allows every person appointed by the Pope to administer the oath, and there were two commissions that very year where laymen are empowered to administer the oath even to bishops.

The late lamented HUGH JAMES ROSE has disposed of this specious but flimsy argument, in his able analysis of Le Courayer's Defence of the Validity of the English Ordinations. The passage we are about to quote is to be found at pp. 242-3 of Rose on the Commission and consequent Duties of the Clergy, 2nd ed.:

Then the Roman Catholics allege a commission issued on the 20th, to certain persons to administer the oath of supremacy to others, and in this Parker, Grindal, and Cox, are called Archbishop of Canterbury, Bishops of London and of Ely. And they acted that none but a consecrated Bishop can administer such oath. Therefore, they argued that the Nag's head ordination in September did take place. But this is pure fancy. The statute of 1st Elizabeth allows every person appointed by the Pope to administer the oath, and there were two commissions that very year where laymen are empowered to administer the oath even to bishops.

The only argument then, that Parker is not called Archbishop Elect, and so of the others. But though it is more usual to insert this word, it was often omitted. This Roser was translated from Hereford to London, (before his consecration) and though elected Oct. 20, 1539, he was not consecrated till April 4, 1540. But in the patent enabling him to exercise jurisdiction, the word elect is omitted. (Barnet, Vol. i, App. p. 184.) and in several other records about Henry, Nay, he omits the word in describing himself. (See his Register.) Besides this, in a letter of Jewel to P. Martyr, on Nov. 1559, he tells him that the new bishops were not then consecrated.

We deem this notice quite sufficient to satisfy every Churchman, and every enlightened and truth-loving Roman Catholic, that the Record of Archbishop Parker's Consecration, preserved at Lambeth, "agrees" (to quote from Dr. Lingard), "in every particular with what we know of the history of the times; and that there exists not the semblance of a reason for pronouncing it a forgery." "To prove the truth of our relation, and falsehood of theirs, we produce the Register of the see of Canterbury, as authentic as the world hath any, the Registers of the other fourteen sees then vacant, all as carefully kept by sworn officers, as the records of the Vatican itself. We produce all the commissions under the Privy Seal and Great Seal of England. We produce the rolls and records of the Chancery, and, if the records of the signet-office had not been unfortunately burned in King James's time, it might have been verified by those also. We produce an Act of Parliament express in the point, within seven years after the consecration; we produce all the controverted consecrations published to the world in print, anno 1572, three years before Archbishop Parker's death, whilst all things were fresh in men's memories." (Bramhall, 436.)

Popery, of a truth, has lost none of her spots. She still fabricates "lying wonders," still points her heraldic votaries to modern miracles, still performs her liquefaction of the blood of St. Januarius, still bids her unhappy children crawl, upon bleeding knees, over jagged stones, as an expiation for sin, and a service acceptable to God. Can we then wonder that she should revive a fable which would strike at the very root of the succession of the English Church—a fable, which the most enlightened Roman Catholics have rejected, but which may still serve to seduce some weak-headed Churchmen, and to confirm mistaking Papias in the exclusive validity of Romish ordinations? We trust that this Canadian attack upon our English Orders will convince Canadian Churchmen that the veil of liberalism, assumed by Popery, hides an old, and not a new, face,—that she still regards them as heretics and schismatics,—still entertains the hope of bowing their free-born necks beneath the hateful and unscriptural yoke of that daring priest, the Pope, who arrogates to himself the titles and the functions of the Godhead.

We are glad, however, that the Hamilton Catholic has spoken out so plainly. It will put Churchmen upon their guard. It will check them in the insinuated practice of contributing towards the maintenance of a Church, which denies a valid Priesthood to their own. It will bring home to them a conviction of the sin and impolicy of tampering with so subtle and unmitigated an enemy as Popery. It will induce them to abstain from all such compromises of faith, as attending at the worship of the Mass, on festival anniversaries; and will lead them to regard Popery as an enemy never to be parleyed with, never to be trusted, never to be withstood but by an unshaken and inflexible opposition. We may, (as who does not?) love the persons of many Papias, and respect them for their virtues and sincerity; but against their principles we must protest, to the latest moment of our existence.

In our last number, the subject of Temperance Societies was discussed,—the principles on which such associations are grounded being defended by a Correspondent of this paper, and impugned by a writer in the Irish Ecclesiastical Journal. In addition to what was advanced on that occasion, we have now to introduce a few remarks and paragraphs, from various quarters, bearing on the question.

In the first place, we will submit to the reader an extract from a letter addressed to us by a country clergyman in this diocese:—

"One of my congregation came to me this evening to ask my advice about signing the Temperance pledge to which he was urged by a neighbour, a Dissenter. After some conversation with him, in supporting the only argument which I think can validly be brought against Temperance Societies, a simple struck me which I immediately used and it had the happy effect of settling the mind of my friend, and he went away determined not sign any pledge of the sort. As I have not seen the simile elsewhere, that I am aware of, and as some ideas strike some men in a different way to what they do others, I have sent you the following so that when you next write against these Societies, which I hope you will still occasionally do, if you think proper you may make use of it, by no means however trying yourself to the words but just shaping the comparison in what way you think best.

"Suppose a subject had taken the oath of allegiance to his Sovereign and had bound himself by the most solemn obligations to fight against all the enemies of his King;—suppose also in the same country were living persons who either were not true subjects, or were rebels to his King;

and that these persons were much troubled by the assaults of a grievous enemy to their peace, and who was also the known enemy of the King, and that these men were to enter into a combination to fight, tooth and nail, against this enemy, not because he was the King's enemy, but on account of the injury he did to themselves and their families,—would it be a question with the true subject whether he should, in view of the King's safety, to enter into such a combination, he himself may be counted amongst the enemies of his Sovereign and he will find that he has not only neglected this but every other enemy and therefore would do well to report an return to his allegiance, and would seem also to me to be a good opportunity for a combination of that sort to get up among true subjects: their King holds all his enemies in the same light, they hold one enemy to be more injurious than another, and because he is destructive to others who are opposed to his King, therefore they make a vow with themselves, to forget him, and to fight his own safety, upon them, to unite in his destruction. In all these combinations self-preponderates. It is not how grievous is this enemy to the King, but how painful to ourselves. There are many worse enemies to us than this,—and for this plain reason that this is an open enemy and can be seen and brings his own punishment, whereas others which are quiet and odious and in the end quite as destructive (to throw off the simile) to the soul are not so visible, and their punishment does not so plainly follow. When will Christians learn to do all things unto the glory of God,—then will they be true subjects, and will be true to their King, the grand enemy of the human race, knows well our weakest points, he knows how to take advantage, and I hesitate not to say, that he has taken an advantage in insinuating these Temperance Societies, which are a great evil, as well as an angel's voice.

"The above suggestions about Temperance Societies may not present anything new to your mind on the subject; but I have sent them at a venture. I am aware there are many excellent persons who approve of these Societies, and who will not be brought into a quarrel with me, but I do so, as I cannot help thinking, that however pure the motives may be of those who do sanction them, that they are guided by wrong principles: To say that to no individual present good has been done by these Societies, would be absurd; but that they do not do good, as they are in the evil that will follow, I think is not to be doubted. If the same good were brought about by other legitimate means, and I see no reason why it should not, it would then be lasting and followed by no evil consequences, which must be the case with all good actions, and right principles. I do not know whether I make my meaning plain,—but for one evil, I know no better nursery for hypocrisy than such Societies. I do not mean in the individual sin of intemperance, but in all other sins. The reformed drunkard, when he has not become so from the fear of God, is very apt to be good only in the eyes of his fellow-men, and that good which he may lead him to pay a formal attention to the duties of his religion; he knows what a state he has been in, and that others know it too; and as he is pleased to be thought better of, he strives to do something else to increase that good opinion, and to be thought so throughout, and there are some who know any thing of the human heart, but also know that self-esteem is the deadliest foe a man can have."

It is but justice to our Correspondent to state, that his letter was never intended for publication; but as it sets forth an argument, the force of which has been tested by experience, and as it places the whole question upon the only proper ground, we are sure that he will excuse the liberty which we have taken in pressing his private remarks into the public service.

The fullest and most conclusive argument, in a brief space, against Temperance Societies, with which we have ever met, is contained in the sixth lecture of a very popular and comprehensive work, entitled, The Primitive Church compared with the Protestant Episcopal Church of the present day, by the learned and vigorous-minded Dr. Hopkins, the present Bishop of Vermont. That acute Prelate furnishes a simile somewhat like that with which our Correspondent has just presented us. "A plain illustration" (writes the Bishop) "of this principle,—viz, that the doing even of that which is good in itself, without reference to God's will, is not acceptable in his sight, but the contrary,—may be found in the relation of parent and child. Suppose, for example, that I commanded my son to perform any particular act, and he refuses to obey me, openly despising my authority, and repaying my affection with ingratitude and scorn; but as soon as he finds that the very act which I commanded will be gratifying to his companions, and will serve his interest, he forthwith accomplishes it, for this reason only; while he continues as hardened towards me, his father, as before. Is it not manifest that I should regard such conduct as an insult to my parental rights? Instead of gratifying me, would it not wound me to the heart, to see that the very thing which my child had so readily done to please himself or his associates, was the same which I had entreated and commanded in vain?"

A strong argument against these Societies, which ought to be conclusive with every true Churchman, is the circumstance, that in very many instances, at Temperance meetings, the grossest abuse is poured upon their Clergy, and their brethren of the laity, who refuse to bow down before this idol of resuscitated error, and who think that the Church is the Temperance Society appointed by God himself, and founded upon Jesus Christ and his Apostles. Yes, we know that these Temperance meetings are frequently exhibitions of the most intemperate passions, and occasions of dealing anathemas against all who think it no sin to make a moderate use of the blessings which God has bestowed upon man, for promoting his health and cheerfulness.

As a specimen of the manner in which the advocates of Total Abstinence enforce their opinions, we subjoin some extracts from a communication which appeared in a late number of the Victoria Chronicle, published at Belleville:—

"Taking it for granted that the principle of Total Abstinence, from alcoholic drinks, has been sustained, as being scriptural, I shall now proceed to apply that principle to the different grades of society, as they are now found; observing, that it is not a thing which can substitute itself in the place of any other, or of any compromise at all; it is inflexible and unyielding in its claims to the attention and obedience of all for whose guidance and benefit it has been registered in the Sacred Record. It is, as every clause of the Divine Law, admirably adapted to promote the present and future well-being of the human race, and, in its own nature, nothing can be better adapted to the mental and moral improvement of intelligent beings than the strict observance of this principle in all its bearings."

"It is truly lamentable that the accusers of such as are labouring assiduously for the amelioration of the wretched condition of a large proportion of their unhappy fellow-men, are not merely those whose 'craft' of making a vendible is 'in danger,' and who have received 'great gain' in the unhalloved traffic of the poisonous fluid, 'many professing to be the 'Ambassadors of Christ,' have engaged in a demoralizing crusade against that institution which has for its object the saving from the drunkard's grave, and a drunkard's hell, many thousands of undying spirits; and to save from the drunkard's infamy, in time, tens of thousands of youth of blooming promise, annually."

"I can regard an opposition to the efforts of temperance reformers, whether given in form or effect, as perfectly innoxious, in no other light than as an opposition to the Divine Law,—as subjecting those who offer it, to the fearful charge of fighting against God: 'as I confidently assert it, no usage of the Jewish or Christian Church, formerly [?] or precept of inspiration, gives the least countenance to the practice regulated by temperance men, but the reverse. Every clergyman, therefore, belongs to whatever ecclesiastical body he may, [of course, our application of the word 'clergyman' is much more restricted than this. En. C.] if he uses, or countenances the use of strong drink, he not only does without authority, but contrary to the highest authority. The same remark will apply to the laity. That the civil authorities allow the manufacture and use of intoxicating liquors is not a plea that can set aside the imperative claim of the 'holy commandment once delivered.'—Nor can want of information now be pleaded as a just-

fying circumstance in behalf of any who have the Scriptures to consult.—Upon what ground, then, can any person claiming an honourable rank in the world, rise up and repudiate the pretensions and efforts of temperance men?"

"The answer to the above question is, that the love of appetite, and the love of gain are motives of higher account than are the claims of the Divine Law. And, though thousands of lives—widowed hearts—and orphan's tears be the consequence, appetite and gain, misanthropic in nature, will add of no sacrifice for another's good, nor heed the claims of justice, be they urged never so eloquently. Fearful indeed must be the responsibility of, and tremendous the account that must be given by those claiming to be spiritual teachers in the land. If God once complained that 'the priest and the prophet have erred through strong drink, they are swallowed up of wine, they are out of the way through strong drink, they err in judgment, they stumble in judgment,' will he be led to justify similar practices in the priests and prophets of the nineteenth century? And that such practices do exist is matter of no secrecy, though concealment sometimes be sought."

"I am not a Tea-Totaller yet," said a young clergyman at the Establishment on board of a religious steamer, plying on Lake Ontario, as he drained his glass at dinner. "I am not a Tea-Totaller yet," is not the boast of one among many from whom the world has a right to expect better things, but the unanimous response of hundreds of like or similar standing is "nor are we," and like Peter, who confirmed his denial of Christ with carings, they evidence the truth of their boast, by their hearty and repeated libations to Bacchus."

Here we have Total Abstinence set forth as a "scriptural" principle,—in the very teeth of innumerable passages of Scripture, and several actions of our blessed Lord, explained away by an "alcoholic" process,—and all opponents of Total Abstinence denounced as "fighting against God." One would hardly suppose, from such logic as this, that Total Abstinence was the saviour of the world, and the restorer of man to a hope of salvation. Indeed the purport, unintentionally we grant, of many of these Temperance agitators is to subvert the Christian religion and to erect a human system in its stead.—Hear, on this point, what Bishop Hopkins most incontrovertibly affirms:

"Faith must be the foundation of all virtue, in the eyes of the Christian. 'Without faith,' saith the Apostle St. Paul, 'it is impossible to please God,' because the controlling maxim of his government must be submission to his will, and without that submission, we cannot hope for his approbation. Now the Temperance Society, as such, adopts nothing of all this; but simply demands a written pledge of abstinence from ardent spirits, as the single condition of membership; from which it results, undeniably, that, in this society, the unbeliever is on an equal footing with the believer,—the infidel, with the Christian. How then can it be called a religious society, when it asks no religion in its members? How can it be called a Christian society, when an avowed atheist might be its president? How can it be said that the constitution of this society rests on any other than worldly principles, when its officers are as much thrown open to such men as Thomas Paine or Robert Owen, as to the most zealous Christian upon earth? This far, then, the argument resolves itself into a very simple syllogism. There can be no Christian society which does not acknowledge Christ. But the Temperance Society does not acknowledge Christ in its conditions of membership, and is made to suit the unbeliever; and, therefore, it is not a Christian society."

Another thing which ought to deter Churchmen from uniting themselves to Temperance Societies, is the striking fact that they are made up of, both by Protestant and Popish Dissenters, as instruments to promote their religious ends. This is no unusual coincidence; for the page of ecclesiastical history proves that these two apparently antagonistic principles proceed from the same root, the superseding of Scripture by man's inventions,—and produce the same fruits, "false doctrine, heresy, and schism." Many of our readers may not be aware that Father Mathew, the Roman Catholic propagator of Teetotalism, is regarded in Ireland with a superstitious reverence, and supposed to be invested with miraculous powers. The Irish papers teem with accounts of the pretended wonders that he has wrought. On his administration of the pledge, the paralysed and helpless walk; the dumb speak "in a low key," thousands being witnesses; and disease of every kind disappears at his healing presence. Father Mathew himself, we are told, attributes to himself no miraculous power of curing diseases, but attributes that great prerogative to the Supreme Being. Be it so; but the mass of the people believe that he has the power to work miracles, and the language of the Catholic Directory for 1841 (we now quote from the Irish Ecclesiastical Journal), "clearly proves that the question of connivance is gravely entertained by the Romish priests, and that the delusion, where it is admitted to be delusion, is looked on with anything but severity."

Mr. Mathew is not severe or repulsive in his manners. It would not suit the purposes of his extraordinary mission that he should be such,—he believes it wisest, and he knows it to be more charitable, to have regard to the humility of the humble, and to abstain from ridiculing the weakness or simplicity of the illiterate. He encourages not their misconceptions; he wishes to dispel them, but in combating a deeply rooted national evil, he cannot see immediately the mischief will follow, if the people will arm against those prejudices which arise from credulity rather than malice. Allowing all this, it will not be contended that miracles may not be wrought, and that some men may not be favoured with the power of performing them. It may only, after all, be believing too much, that any one man does, on ordinary occasions, perform miracles, and that there is in this that Mr. Mathew is bound directly to denounce, especially where the superabundance of the people's faith may tend, and does tend, to the destruction of a soul and abandoned vice? We regard the reports of the power of Mr. Mathew as not believing that he possesses this virtue; but he is persuaded that the Almighty, in regard to the extraordinary faith of some, and in order to their entire conversion, may suspend in their favour the ordinary laws of nature. This is the ground which Father Mathew may take, and on this ground, he can scarcely be assailed." Cath. Direct, p. 249; Dublin.

Such a very equivocal disclaimer as this,—such a no meaning yes,—such an indirect justification of doing evil that good may come, is well worthy of a Jesuit, and cannot escape the notice of an attentive observer.

It has been well remarked by a learned divine of this day, that almost every modern error has its prototype in the earlier ages of the Church, and is nothing but the revival, under a new name, of an exploded heresy. Thus, with regard to Temperance Societies, we find the Encratites, the Teetotalists of the second century, condemning marriage, wine, and animal food, and "becoming," says Dr. Burton, "so decidedly heretical as to reject the Acts of the Apostles, and the Epistles of Paul." Such, we believe, is, and will be, the downward course of the modern Teetotalists; they have already dared to tamper with Christ's institution—the Lord's Supper, and substitute water for wine; and we know that the far greater number of them are either "decidedly heretical," or decidedly schismatical.

Let the Churchman, then; when solicited to join this human sect, established in derogation of Christ's Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, reject the invitation with unalterable firmness, and if called upon to assign his reasons, let him, in the words of Bishop Hopkins, say that he cannot join the Temperance Society,—

Because it is not based on religion, but worldly principles. Because it opposes vice, and attempts to establish virtue, in a manner which is not in accordance with the word of God. Because, if it could succeed, it would be a triumph of infidelity. Because it gives a false prominence to one particular vice, contrary to the doctrines of the Bible.

Because, calling it an introduction or preparation for religion, is at war with the principles of the Gospel.

Because it cannot be relied on as a remedy against vice, for which the religion of Christ is the only cure, and because the good effected by it, whatever it may be, cannot justify the Christian in trying experiments to reform mankind on any other principles than those which are set forth in the Scriptures.

The Churchman may be told (see Finny's Revival Lectures, p. 265, 2nd ed.) that "the man's hands are red with blood who stands aloof from the Temperance cause"; but, finding no such anathema in Scripture, he will regard it as the idle wind. To him, if conscious of his right privileges, "the Church is the true school of virtue, the true Temperance Society, the true preservative from all the vices which infect our miserable world; because the Almighty Saviour is his guide, its pledges are blest by the power of God, its rewards are pre-eminent in temporal comfort and eternal joy. Away from Christ you can have no safety. Out of his Church you can have no peace." (Bishop Hopkins.) While he will dread to commit excess, not because it is injurious to his health, but because it is a violation of his Redeemer's commands, he will not shrink from the temperate and virtuous use of God's gifts, provided he finds that he can enjoy them in moderation; and if he finds that he cannot, he will abstain altogether, without the assumption of fresh vows; that are of human obligation, and do dishonour to his solemn baptismal engagement. The first miracle, and almost the last act of our Saviour's life, sanctions the use of wine; and shall we dare to condemn what He, in his infinite wisdom, was pleased to permit? Are we to be denounced as "fighting against God," because we will not join with the Puritan and Papist in a scheme unauthorised by Scripture, and fraught with the evils of heresy, schism, fanaticism, and superstition?

The following paragraph,—taken from the London Tablet, a Papist journal,—was transferred to the Hamilton Catholic of the 22nd March:

"Church of England" Idiotry. In the parish church of Dorney, near Eton, reports a correspondent of the Times, the Lord's Prayer has been removed from one side of the altar and a statue of Bacchus has been substituted in its place. A similar statue of Ceres (both from Italy) has been erected in the place of the Cross, and the altar is profaned or profanation the deponent sayeth not.—Tablet.

An impression is left upon the mind, after reading the preceding paragraph, that there is a tendency in the Church of England towards the idolatrous practices of heathenism. How far this is justified by facts will be more easily gathered from the subjoined condensed statement (which we borrow from our long-eyed and indefatigable English contemporary, The Church Intelligencer), than from a garbled and imperfect representation:

PROFANATION OF DORNEY CHURCH. A correspondence, extending over a whole week, has been going on in The Times, respecting the village church of Dorney, in Buckinghamshire, the patron of which is John Palmer Esq., high-sheriff of the county, who resides at that property. The first correspondent, "Iconoclast," made this strange assertion, calling for inquiry, and offering evidence:—"I have been credibly informed that the parish church of Dorney, near Eton, has been profaned in a manner perhaps almost unequalled: It has been changed to the Lord's Prayer, and the Cross has been removed from either side of the Altar; and that, in their places, have been erected marble statues of Bacchus and Ceres, brought from Italy." Another correspondent of The Times, "A Pheasant," cites another report affecting Dorney church,—"I have heard, and believe it to be true, that some person, not long since deceased, in a church of a few of most unusual construction, resembling nothing so much as a conservatory; not only placed on the side, but with a glass roof, and fitted up with a stove! The humble minded man who, if the report be true, thus separated the church from the church, and substituted in its place a temple of the heathen, and an unusually accommodating monument, may probably be easily discovered by the Archdeacon whose duty it is to take care of the sacred building." A third, who signs himself "A Protestant," hints further charges—"I beg to trouble the Archdeacon to extend his enquiries beyond Bacchus and Ceres, and to ascertain the metal of which the vessels used in the administration of the eucharist are composed. If I am not misinformed, they are of pewter, or some such metal, and have been substituted for others of silver. What became of the silver vessels? Were they sold, if so, why, and what was done with the money? Is the parish too, in this affair, silver?" In Thursday's Times appears a letter from Mr. Palmer, who says, "Of the statues, they are not marble divinities brought from Italy, but female figures, clothed in flowing drapery, executed in composition by an Italian artist in London, and holding in their hands a cup and ears of corn; emblematic of the bread and wine used in one of the holiest mysteries of our faith." Mr. Palmer adds however, that, "from interested misrepresentations made to our Rural Dean, and from the fact that the Cross is not on the altar, I have been induced to express a doubt whether the gentleman who has written the simplicity of a village church; believing, therefore, that all disputes are detrimental to the religious well-being of the community, the figures were immediately removed."

As to the pew of the church, "my family pew, like that of many other country churches, has