

achievements unexampled as they have been, of our armies, or our navies." Their deeds have not been so brilliant, nor has fame emblazoned them so brightly as those of a Nelson or a Wellington; but their influence has purified the household character of England, and taught her gentry, that station, refinement, and wealth, gain additional and imperishable lustre from an open profession of Christianity. And, (thanks be to God!) their mantle has not fallen to the ground, uncaught. Though many of our most illustrious laymen have lately descended to the tomb in the ripeness of years,—though the father of Lord Glenelg, a principal instrument in evangelizing India, be gone to his reward,—though a Raikes, the originator of Sunday Schools, can no longer, in the body, feast on the sight of thousands of children reclaimed from vice and misery,—though a Wilberforce now looks down from the sky, and sees Slavery extinguished throughout the British Empire, chiefly through his own heaven-inspired, enthusiastic exertions,—yet have we still those living, and breathing, and active in England, who "teach the spire to rise,"—who feed the benighted heathen and the famishing colonies with the bread of life,—who devote themselves to their country, their church, and their Queen. Laymen of Upper Canada! emulate these guides and benefactors of mankind. Your labours may be silent and inglorious here,—but your reward and your glory will be hereafter!

ALAN FAIRFORD.

Cobourg, 1st September, 1838.

TESTIMONIES OF DISSENTERS & WESLEYANS
IN FAVOUR OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

By the Rev. R. Meek.

No. IV.

Dissenters represent it as an act of the greatest injustice, that they should be compelled, either directly or indirectly, to contribute to the support of the Established Church.—They who will decide aright on this point, will find it necessary to discriminate between church rates and tithes. The former, generally speaking, go to defray the incidental expenses connected with the repairs of the church edifice, burial yards, and for what is necessary for the decent performance of public worship; while the latter constitute the legal emoluments of the clergy. "The justice of exacting from all classes who are liable to such a tax, the payment of church-rates, rests upon the same principles as a Church Establishment. If the legislature deem a national religious establishment necessary and beneficial to the nation, then have they a clear right to exact from the community at large the means necessary for its support. The authority of laws, especially of laws enacted by a representative government like our own, cannot with safety be allowed to be nullified by the prejudice, the selfishness, or the real, or affected conscientiousness of individual objectors." "It may be said, without the fear of contradiction, that in far the greater number of instances, Dissenters do receive a full equivalent for the amount of church-rates contributed by them, not merely in the general good effected by the Established Church, but in the particular and local benefits which they receive from the clergy of the Establishment. In our rural districts, and numerous villages and hamlets, too poor and scattered to admit of resident dissenting ministers, how awful would be the disorganisation of society, and the corruption of morals, but for the influence of the resident clergy? The clergyman in very numerous instances is the only individual to render those pastoral and benevolent attentions to dissenters in our rural districts, which are so necessary and important in the season of affliction and want. Shall it be said, then, after this, by dissenters, that they receive no equivalent for the small contributions which the state enjoins them to make to the Established Church?" "As to tithes, which are the legal endowments of the Church, it might easily be shown that this payment is no burden upon the great body of the community: it is in fact a certain rent charge which falls upon the land owners, and not upon the people generally. If tithes, as now paid to the clergy, to whom they legally belong, were abolished, a natural consequence of it would be an increase in the rent now paid, equal to the value of the tithe now received by the clergy. It would be taking from the clergyman his right, and giving it to the landed proprietors, who have no right to it, either in law or equity. Lord Brougham, the late Lord Chancellor, though himself no Dissenter, yet friendly to Dissenters, said,—"*I think the right of the Church to the property it enjoys, as sacred as the rights of individuals to their estates or freeholds, and that the parson of the parish has as good a right to the tenth of the produce of the soil, as the body of the proprietors have to the other nine parts.*"

The following testimonies from Dissenters are important and valuable on these points:—

PHILIP DODDRIDGE, D.D., *Dissenting Minister*.—"If no coercive power were admitted, it is probable that covetousness would drive many into dissenting parties, in order to save their tithes or their possessions. So that none can reasonably blame a government for requiring such general contributions."[†]

A writer in the *Dissenting Eclectic Review*.—"So long as the support of the Establishment by legal provisions shall be deemed necessary or proper by the constitutional authorities, they have an undoubted right to tax the community of every description for that object; and a difference of opinion entertained by individuals, as to the fitness of the object, is no more a ground for exemption from contribution, than a difference of opinion on any other question of political economy, is a ground of exemption from payment of the taxes applicable to the measure disapproved. The state enjoins me to pay—by force of the social compact the state has a right to my obedience; and my paying is the evidence not of my submission of opinion, but of my civil obedience to the state. Under every possible form of government, individual will must, for all practicable purposes, be sacrificed to the public will, as proclaimed by the constituted organs. If the state applies, or orders me to apply, the money paid to an object which I do not apprehend to be aid-worthy, that is no ground for my refusal to obey, or there is an end of civil obedience at once, and the private opinion of every individual becomes the measure of his civil submission. All this has nothing to do with the question of the right of the state to dictate in matters of religion, (which the writer is the last person in the world who would attempt to advocate,) because the payment of tithe is not required by the

state, as evidence of my assent to the doctrines or discipline of the Church, nor is any such meaning attached to it. I am in no other dilemma with regard to tithe (and the writer might have added church-rates) than I am with regard to levies of any other description, the purposes of which I may think morally or politically unjustifiable. The state, provided I pay my taxes, leaves me in the undoubted possession of any private opinion I might think fit to entertain. It never attempts to tell me that I have pledged my individual assent to the cause, by contributing my quota towards its requisitions."[‡]

JOHN FELL, *Dissenting Minister*.—"They (tithes) cannot well be looked on now as an oppression; length of time has taken away the causes of reasonable complaint, some circumstances excepted, which affect the landholders only, and which are not at all of a religious nature. There is not a family in the kingdom which has any legal and just right to more than nine parts of those estates which pay tithes. No more than nine parts are ever purchased; and no Dissenter, I suppose, will attempt to prove that the lands which he now possesses have been in his family ever since the days of Alfred, or his son Edward. TO REFUSE TITHES WOULD BE TO USURP A PROPERTY WHICH IS NOT OUR OWN, AND TO WHICH WE CAN HAVE NO JUST CLAIM, AND WOULD BE EQUALLY INCONSISTENT WITH OUR COMMON NOTIONS OF RIGHT AND WRONG, AND WITH THE ACKNOWLEDGED PRINCIPLES OF EVERY CIVIL GOVERNMENT."[§]

T. DWIGHT, an American Presbyterian Minister.—"I am well aware that there are men who, in spite of any reasoning—in spite of demonstration itself—may, and in all probability will say, that however good and useful the public worship of God may be, they do not wish to avail themselves of its benefits, and owe, therefore, no contributions to its support. To these men I reply, that he who has no children, or who does not wish to send his children to school, and he who does not use the roads and bridges of his country, because he is either necessitated or inclined to stay at home, may, on exactly the same grounds, claim an exemption from supporting schools, roads and bridges."[¶]

PRE SATTU, D.D., *Dissenting Minister*.—"I trust that no spoliation will ever be suffered."^{||}

* Eclectic Rev. Sept. 1817.

† Fourth Letter on Genuine Protestantism.

‡ Travels in New England and New York.

§ Sermon on Necessity of Religion, p. 29.

WHY DON'T YOU GO TO CHURCH.

Now, reader, we must have a word with you personally on this subject. You know very well that Christ, and his Apostles, and his Holy Church, in all ages, have taught you by precept and example, to assemble yourselves together.—You will not deny, or pretend to doubt, the usefulness, or the necessity, of public worship. Do you—you who are reading this paper—attend it constantly? Do you attend it generally? If not—why don't you go to Church? Answer this faithfully. Remember, you will have to answer, when it may be too late to remedy what is wrong. You will have to answer before the judgment seat of God, and you know not how soon. Remember, too, that we who even now put this question, speak in Christ's name, and deliver God's message. With that high and awful authority we ask—why don't you go to Church? Alas, we have often been compelled to ask this question! Do you deny that you ought to worship God in his temple? No. Why, then, do you not? I must attend to my family, says one—I have no shoes, says another—my gown is so shabby, says a third—I have not been able to get ready, says a fourth—it is cold, it is wet—I have an engagement—I have letters to write—I always sleep late on Sunday—I have not got a good pew. In short, there are hundreds of excuses of the same sort made, and, we lament to say, by hundreds who have the means and opportunities to go to Church, but do not go. But, we have another question to ask you, if you, Reader, are in the habit of making some such excuse to your conscience; and we pray you, deal with yourself faithfully—put it home to your heart. Suppose that the minister, instead of leading you to join in praise to your heavenly Father, or in prayer to your offended God—instead of teaching you what to do to be saved, and warning you to flee from the wrath to come—were, after detaining you the usual time in Church doing nothing, to stand every Sunday at the door, and present to each poor member of the congregation HALF-A-CROWN—and each member in moderate circumstances TWO GUINEAS, and to each rich one FIVE? How many Sundays do you honestly think you should miss church? Most probably, not one in the whole year. Instead of having to ask, why do you not go to church? he would not have room for his congregation.—We should hear nothing about your dress—nothing about cooking for your family—nothing about the cold or the wet—nothing about your getting up late—nothing about your engagements—nothing about your pew. You would be thinking only how to be in time, and would gladly take your post in the aisle, or anywhere that you could get a place. Every corner would be crammed—old and young, rich and poor, healthy and sick, would be there. Brother, is not this the truth? Can you deny it? You may, perhaps, smile at it. But, beware—it is no subject for mirth. For what is the true inference from this? That you would find no difficulty at all to go to Church for a MISERABLE PIECE OF MONEY,—when you will not go for the LOVE OF CHRIST, for the HONOUR OF GOD, or for the SALVATION OF YOUR OWN SOUL! Half-a-crown, a guinea, or five guineas, as the case may be, is more precious in your sight than God's blessing and your soul's eternal safety. Do not imagine that we speak this to the poor only—we speak to the rich, as well as to the poor. Here we have no respect of persons. The rich and leisured man is even more to be condemned in this, than the poor. We address you all, brethren; read and reflect—let not the Christian freedom of our reproof offend you, and raise your pride. We speak as ambassadors of Christ, we beseech you to consider what we say—go to Church yourselves—make your children and your dependents go; for, on the day of judgment, before the searcher of all hearts, our question—why don't you go to Church? will again be present to your trembling souls. All the trumpery excuses usually made would not weigh against a piece of silver or gold; yet they are allowed to overbalance the salvation of your soul—duty to God—and love of the Lord Jesus. O, remember, that "ye cannot serve God and mammon." What will ye do in that day, when the self-deceiver and worldly "shall cast his idols of silver and his idols of gold, which they made each one for himself to worship to the moles and to the bats; to go into the clefts of the rocks, and into the tops of the ragged rocks, for fear of the Lord, and for the glory of his majesty, when he ariseth to shake terribly the earth." (Isaiah ii. 20, 21.) What will ye do

when to your horror and eternal remorse you shall hear that "your riches are corrupted, and your garments are moth-eaten? Your gold and silver is cankered; and the rust of them shall be a witness against you, and shall eat your flesh as it were fire? Ye have heaped treasure together for the last day" (James v. 2, 3.)

Be wise in time, lest ye be miserable in eternity.—*The Penny Sunday Reader*.

THE CHURCH.

COBOURG, SATURDAY, SEPT. 8, 1838.

Some of our cotemporaries have worked themselves into a frenzy of excitement in consequence of the official announcement of the intelligence, long ago made public, that the establishment of the Fifty Seven Rectories by Sir John Colborne is a legal and valid act. To those in the country who had given any particular attention to the question, this was no unexpected intelligence; while to thousands in the community, of nearly every sect and party—to all, in short, who respect the claims of justice and the sacredness of vested rights—the confirmation of the Rectories was a fact as gratifying as it was certain.

We shall not pause to show—what there are evidences enough to establish—that the present are strange times, and that this is a degenerate age; because this strangeness of humour and this degeneracy of principle has, in a more or less degree, developed itself in every age, amongst every people, and throughout every condition of society since the Fall. To the native depravity of the human heart—the perpetual theme of the theologian's rebuke and the pastor's warning,—to this depravity, uncorrected by the sanctifying temper of christianity, is to be referred the dislike of personal restraint and of legal subordination, the evidences of which have so lately been written in characters of blood amongst us; and to this inborn depravity, unchastened by the purifying spirit of the Gospel, is also to be referred that envy and jealousy of the advantages of others and that uncharitableness towards their possessors, which, in the controversy under review, has latterly been so apparent.

THE RECTORIES!—and to what amounts the long catalogue of grievances associated with that dreaded name? What is the vast extent of injustice which their establishment inflicts? What are the disastrous results that are to follow from their endowment?—Simply that in Fifty Seven towns or townships of the Province, a few hundred acres of land have been assigned to the support of a clergyman of the Church of England,—an appropriation which, in no instance, will be adequate to his respectable maintenance for years to come; and which, in a majority of instances, will never yield him even the tithe of a sufficient support! But supposing that it should,—supposing that, in every instance, the means were thus secured of providing religious instruction for generations to come in at least Fifty Seven scattered spots of this extensive and fast-peopling Province, is this a circumstance—is this a prospect at which the professing Christian, anxious for the spread of the Redeemer's kingdom, should rejoice? Or should it not rather awaken in every breast that is actuated by the genuine principles of our holy faith, a regret that, in the wide waste of our spiritual desolation, the boon has not been extended to fifty times fifty-seven?

But is it an arbitrary, an unconstitutional enactment?—Not while there stands recorded and unrepealed upon our Statute Book a provision, "that it shall and may be lawful for his Majesty, his heirs and successors, to authorize the Governor, or Lieutenant Governor, of each of the said provinces (Upper and Lower Canada) respectively, or the person administering the government therein, from time to time, with the advice of such Executive Council as shall have been appointed by his Majesty, his heirs or successors, within such province, for administering the affairs thereof, to constitute and erect, within every township or parish which now is, or hereafter may be formed, constituted, or erected, within such province, one or more PARSONAGE or RECTORY, or parsonages or rectories, according to the ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, and from time to time, by an instrument under the great seal of such Province to endow every such Parsonage or Rectory with so much or such part of the lands so allotted and appropriated as aforesaid, as such Governor, Lieutenant Governor, or person administering the government, shall, with the advice of the said Executive Council, judge to be expedient under the then existing circumstances of such township or parish." [Act 31. Geo. III. chap. 31. Sect. 38.]

But will the impression,—honest, we are aware, in the minds of many,—that the Church of Scotland has a co-ordinate right with the Church of England to the Clergy Reserves, justify an opposition, on the part of that Church, to the creation and endowment of the Rectories thus legally and specifically provided for? We are not aware that the maintenance of such an opinion ever implied the necessity of the repeal of the Act which appropriates the Reserves: if it does, their claim, in common with any preferred by others, must go for nothing: if not, the separate and distinct provisions of the Statute just quoted must stand untouched, and there the authority for the establishment of the Rectories is too clear to be denied—too decided to be overturned. But if the claim to the Reserves preferred by the Church of Scotland be asserted to rest on the opinion of the Crown Officers given to Earl Bathurst in 1819, we can deduce even from that opinion the fullest justification for the establishment of the Rectories. In this it is asserted, that by the 37th section of 31 Geo. III. the Governor would, in their judgment, be "justified in applying such rents and profits (of the Clergy Reserves) to the maintenance of the Clergy of the Church of Scotland, as well as those of the Church of England, but not to the support or maintenance of ministers of Dissenting Protestant congregations;" and the same law officers proceed to state, that by the 38th section the authorities specified in the Act may "endow any particular Parsonage or Rectory with the WHOLE lands allotted or appropriated in that township or parish." Now, we by no means admit the soundness, the legality, or the consistency of this opinion; we by no means allow that it constitutes a decision of the question at issue, because for its final adjudication it must receive the sanction either of an Act of Parliament, the decision of the Judges, a decree of the Privy Council, or the award of the Court of Chancery. But supposing that the opinion were sound and final—the latter portion of it, above quoted, not only leaves untouched the authority to create and endow parsonages or rectories, but it admits the existence of a power so to endow them that no rents or profits would be left at all for appropriation to the sister Church! However,—and it is one amongst many signs of the strange times in which we live,

—that opinion, inconsistent and incomplete as it is, has actually been so far adopted as to induce the Colonial Secretary to appropriate five or six hundred pounds out of the rents and profits of the Clergy Reserves in Lower Canada to the support of the Ministers of the Church of Scotland. Now, if they have actually received the benefit of one portion of this opinion, why are we to be excluded from the benefit of the other portion of it? If they—the justice or right of the case out of the question—have obtained a share of the rents and profits, why are we to be excluded from the benefit of the land for the endowment of Parsonages or Rectories?

And what are the powers, the alleged magnitude of which has provoked so many dolorous whines on the one hand, and so much ferocious defiance on the other?—With a wickedness and falsehood, the full extent of which nobody knows better than its propagators, the public are told—yes, through the medium of public papers, never very sparing in the dissemination of slander and untruth, they are told—that TITHES may now be established through the powers conferred upon the lately appointed Rectors! This is reiterating a cry which the enemies of the Constitution did not fail to excite at the last General Election, and which the very persons who, from the worst of motives, choose now to repeat it, were at that time amongst the foremost in silencing by a manly appeal to facts. Need we then for the hundredth time answer, as they so promptly answered to the foes of the country, that an Act stands recorded and unrepealed upon our Provincial Statute Book, expressly providing that TITHES SHALL NOT BE COLLECTED IN THIS PROVINCE?

In regard to the rights and privileges, real or supposed, of a Rector, we stated in the first number of this journal, nearly eighteen months ago, that the very warrant of Institution by which he is placed in possession of his Rectory, limits his powers and privileges to the congregation amongst whom he is appointed to minister. And who does not know, in regard to Church Rates or any other pecuniary impost for religious purposes, that even in England a Rector has no power of himself to levy a Church Rate, but that this is always established by a vote of the parishioners? We are quite confident that the law authorizing Church Rates in England does not apply to this country,—it is not even applicable, to the latter, in Ireland, where a different species of provision for the same object exists; but should there, upon reference to legal authority, be any ground of fear discovered of its applicability here, it is quite as practicable to fence the Provincial Constitution against this dreaded impost, as it was to do so from the possible imposition of tithes. But to shew how far the Church of England are disposed to grasp at shadowy powers; how far, for example they are disposed to try the legality of a Church Rate in this Province, they suggested in a late scheme for the employment of the Reserves that, in each township or parish, one or more Clergy Lots should be appropriated exclusively to the repair of Churches and Parsonages within its bounds.

We shall not, at present, prosecute this subject; it has been twisted and tortured enough, but we can wind our way through all the perplexities with which the foes of peace and the enemies of true religion would involve the question. We pretend not to divine the secret workings of the mysterious heart, nor profess ability to detect all the schemes of selfishness on the one hand, and of malicious hate on the other, which lie hidden beneath these attempts at the spoliation of the rightful proprietors of the Clergy Reserves. This much we can predict,—because we have full confidence in the good sense and good feeling of the mass of the community,—that the efforts now in unhalloved progress to shake the public mind from its quinquinity, will experience a miserable failure. We venture to predict further,—because we have equal confidence in the faith of Acts of Parliament and the decrees of law,—that the present attempt to subvert the rights of the Church of England in this Province will fail as miserably too. Rival and hostile sects may, for a moment, lay aside their jealousy and appear to smother their antipathy—they may unite in unnatural and unholy combination to rob us of our patrimony—they may, for this iniquitous purpose, join hand in hand while the spirit breathes hatred and the heart feels loathing—they may reciprocate embraces as fervent, were all their ardour to be put forth, as the eastern serpent's deadly clasp,—all this they may do in the belief that we shall take alarm at their menaces, and be terrified into a surrender of what neither conscience nor duty will suffer us willingly to yield. But we tell them—we tell the world, that we despise their threats, and that, by every constitutional means, we shall resist their aggressions. We place our feet upon the rock of PRINCIPLE, and from this position—come weal, come woe—we shall never recede.

In our paper of the 25th ult. we said, "we are confident that no well informed man in England or Ireland ever heard of any other 'Protestant Clergy,' save that of the United Church of England and Ireland;" in other words that every well informed person in those countries must know that the term 'Clergy' is one which is there legally applied only to those of the Established Church of England and Ireland.—This declaration has awakened the amazement of some, and excited the wrath of others; and to make out a case against us, every possible species of misconstruction of our actual meaning is resorted to.

One, with extraordinary vehemence, proclaims his wonder that neither here nor in foreign lands had we ever heard of any 'Protestant Churches' besides those of England and Ireland, as if an opinion had been expressed upon the meaning of the word Church at all; and upon this assumption of our ignorance or arrogance, as the case may be, a column or two of language neither very courteous nor very Christian-like is expended.

Another favours us with a special communication on the subject, and asks whether we hold to the astounding doctrine that there are no other 'Protestants' in the world besides the clergy of England and Ireland, and consumes a goodly amount of paper and of time in combating a position which he has himself been the only one to raise!

The placing of the term 'Clergy,' as we did, in italics, should have conveyed to every fair-judging person a sufficient indication of our meaning, viz. that the term 'Clergy' was, in legal phraseology, never applied to other in the United Kingdom than those of the Church of England. And, whether the amazement wilder than ever may follow, or wrath more fierce than before may ensue, we resolutely yet calmly reiterate our declaration, and we do so upon the grounds which are furnished by English law itself. In Tomline's Law Dictionary, we find the following definition of the term: "The word Clergy comprehends all persons in holy orders, and in ecclesiastical offices, viz. Archbishops, Bishops, Deans and

* See these points more fully treated in "Reasons for Attachment and Conformity to the Church of England, by the Rev. R. Meek," 2d edit., published by Hatchards, London, pp. 280—299.

† Doddridge's Lectures.