

## British American Presbyterian.

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY AT  
TORONTO, CANADA.

TERMS: \$2 a year, in advance.  
 Payment by monthly instalments, payable at the  
 office of delivery.  
 Single Copies, and Post Office Orders should be drawn  
 in favor of the Publisher.  
 Club Rates and List of Premiums furnished on  
 application. All who are desirous of extending the  
 circulation of the PRESBYTERIAN should  
 send for the list of premiums at once, as now is  
 the time to secure new names.

C. BLACKETT ROBINSON,  
 P.O. Drawer 2184, Toronto, Ont. Publisher and Proprietor.

THE  
"Sabbath School Presbyterian,"PUBLISHED MONTHLY,  
AT 102 BAY STREET, TORONTO.

TERMS: 20 cents per annum, in quantities.

Subscribers may commence at any time,  
 and pay by instalments in advance.

The numbers for March and April are  
 now before us, and wear a most attractive ap-  
 pearance, especially the April issue. A comparison  
 of these two shows decided progress, the articles in  
 the latter being shorter, plainer, and more readable  
 for children than in the former. The paper is  
 and both printing and illustrations are well ex-  
 ecuted.—*The Liberal*, 4th April.

The paper is good, and supplies a great desider-  
 atum among the young. It should certainly meet  
 with a wide circulation.—*Rev. Wm. Ross, Kirkcaldy*.

Specimen copies will be sent to any address.

C. BLACKETT ROBINSON,  
 P.O. Drawer 2184, Toronto, Ont.

## British American Presbyterian.

FRIDAY, MAY 7, 1875.

## ANGLICANISM.

The Anglican Church in Ontario is adding a diocese, and great are the rejoicings of that communion at the auspicious event. We rejoice in the advancement of that Church, so far as it is doing along with us the Lord's work, although it does not follow with us. Among the eminent men who were present at the consecration of the Rev. Dr. Fuller as bishop of Niagara, were several from the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States. That church being untrammelled by state connection, has outrun its sister in England and in Canada, and has been forced by circumstances, the strength of which has produced the Reformed Episcopal Church, to look around for more sure footing than the Puritan party of England has found, on which to rest the claim to be the only true Church of Western Christendom. After what we have been hearing of late in our Dominion of the Romeward tendencies of Ritualism, and the very sisterly relations in which the Anglican Church is considered to stand towards the Church of Rome, we feel deeply interested in the American "via media." They have found a halting place between the Reformed Church and Popery. Rev. Dr. Coxo, bishop of West Virginia, gave utterance to that theory in a lecture delivered on Friday last in Hamilton. We shall not give all the lecture, but a few extracts may be of real service to the truth:

The rev. lecturer said "he had often felt that the Anglican Episcopate, as such, had not yet found a historian. The annals of the Mother Church of England had been bright notwithstanding her difficulties. During the last two centuries that Church had been graced by an Episcopate which had been true to its mission. There might be an Episcopate true historically, but devoid of truth because it had departed from our Lord's teaching."

We can agree in this statement, for we have often wondered how in the light of history, as we have it, the Anglican Church can put forth a claim separate from that of Rome. And unless Bishop Coxo can cook history, and make it tell a very different story from that which it has hitherto told, we shall remain unconvinced. But no attempt in our day is too daring if by it a pet theory can be bolstered up. Mr. Tyndall will change the received definitions of matters to uphold his atoms, and the Anglican as well as the Papist, can distort history to uphold his theory. We shall see when the needed historian comes forth, and shall diligently examine his version of the past. Meanwhile, it is worthy of note that the venerable American prelate does not base his argument for Episcopacy on Scripture but on history. So far as Scripture goes he has nothing new to assert in his favour. Hear him:

"He took it to be understood that our Lord had established an order of bishops as the only order which had his personal commission, and with which he had promised to remain to the end of the world. The Script clearly distinguished the three orders—Apostles, or Angels, elders, and deacons. The Apostles committed their power, except the power to ordain, to presbyters, and also established the ministering of deacons."

All this has been answered a hundred times from holy writ. He does, however, give us something new, he blames the Pope of Rome for arrogating to himself the Episcopate, and says the bishops of that church "were mere shadows of the Pope," although the form of consecration was sufficient to convey the Episcopal order:

"The Episcopate of a Roman bishop was deficient, because it was not the intention to raise him to the order of a bishop, but only to consecrate him to the office, as bells, candlesticks, miss, altars, were consecrated; and further, because the Roman Church had in many cases departed

from the canonical rule of the Council of Nice, by which three bishops were required to consecrate. It had never been denied that one bishop could make a valid consecration, but it was uncanonical for one alone to consecrate, and in the Church of England no instance could be found in which less than the canonical number of three had taken part in the consecration."

The grand defect in Popery then, is not that its bishops are unscriptural, but that they are uncanonical according to the rule of the Council of Nice. Then John Calvin, that terrible fellow, when he threw off Popery, threw off also the Popish bishop as he ought to have done, and led all the Reformed Churches into the same error, not knowing that there was a true bishop in England who had been ordained in regular apostolic succession by three bishops according to the Nicene canon. He introduced Presbyterianism, and it was a re-action from Popery. Now, that is news for us. Only we don't believe it. Gregory was not a Pope, and abhorred Popery. He sent Augustine to England by his patriarchal and not pontifical authority. The Popery did not exist at that time, and down to the time of William the Norman there was no Papal rule in England.

This, we suppose is a sentence from the forthcoming history, and certainly it is a new reading of received history.

"He complained of the erroneous manner in which English literary men wrote of this question, and especially criticised and condemned Mr. Froude's remarks upon it."

No wonder; but query, who is right—Mr. Froude and others, or the American bishop? We hope to see all this cleared up with as copious authorities as Mr. Froude has given us. Also let us have the "clear and historical succession" of the Anglican bishops, from, we presume, the Apostle Paul to our own day, with the names of the three bishops ordaining in each case. Then we can judge if Bishop Fuller is really in the true canonical apostolic succession. Perhaps some would then receive him as a bishop. We would not deny his right to the office, because he was in that line, but it does seem solemn trifling to rest the claim to be an ambassador for Christ, on such silly twaddle, or on anything but the written Word of God.

## PRESBYTERIAN CONFEDERATION.

In another column will be found the Interim Draft of a constitution for the proposed Confederation of the Presbyterian Churches. A preliminary meeting will be held in London on the 21st of July next, to arrange for a conference of all the Reformed Churches of the world. Such a meeting will do much to give visibility to the unity of doctrine, sentiment and spirit that is found among Reformed Churches, which nevertheless differ much from each other in their usages of worship, and other non-essentials. The fact that Reformed Churches have not hitherto aimed at visible unity, but have been satisfied in endeavoring to follow the teachings of Scripture separately in the several countries where they exist, has left superficial observers unaware of the extent and spiritual power of the Reformed Churches. They are not sects, but have always endeavored to gather into one fold all Christians holding the faith as it is in Jesus, and holding no other authority for their constitution, doctrine, and government than the Word of God. As distinguished from Prelatic Churches, they are Presbyterian, that is, their government is by presbyters or elders, not by a hierarchy. They have no peculiar tenet as Baptists, or discipline as Methodists, holding them separate from the rest of God's people, and they hold to the unity of the visible Church in contrast with Congregationalists. Thirty out of thirty-eight of these Churches have already intimated their intention to take part in the conference. These represent over eight millions of communicants, and a population of more than thirty millions, scattered over the four quarters of the globe, and speaking almost every language. No one can foresee what may be the blessed results of a conference such as is proposed. United action may be possible only on a very limited scale, but hearty co-operation, mutual sympathy, and Christian confidence will be mightily increased, and the way may be prepared for the presenting of a united front, guided by intelligence, and bearing with Christian love and ardour, against the attacks of unbelief which rejects or covertly undermines revealed truth on the one hand, and of abject superstition which prostrates conscience and intellect before the authority of man, on the other hand. It will be a great privilege to be present at such a meeting, and ever to read of their deliberations will be fraught with blessing.

The Presbyterian Church in Listowel is undergoing repairs.

Rev. J. C. Baxter from Dundee, minister elect of Stanley Street Church, Montreal, arrived in that city on Monday morning from New York, and was met at the depot by a delegation from the Stanley Street congregation. His induction to the pastoral office of that congregation takes place this evening.

## OBITUARY.

Mr. Alexander Munro of Lobo, died after a short, but severe illness, on the 21st ult., at the advanced age of about eighty years. He was born in the parish of Ardrier, in Invernesshire, Scotland, and was by trade a mason. He came to Canada about forty-five years ago, when the greater part of Upper Canada, as it was then called, was almost an unbroken wilderness. His first home in Canada was in the Township of Dumfries, where he remained about fifteen years. During the most of that time he enjoyed the privilege of being a regular hearer of the late Dr. Bain, towards whom he continued to the last to cherish sentiments of profound respect. About thirty years ago he moved with his family westward to Lobo, where he remained during the rest of his days. The deceased belonged to a class of men who, though not deficient in public spirit are yet, owing to their extreme modesty and retiring habits, but little known to the outside world. "His voice was not heard in the street," but such as had the opportunity of observing his daily walk and conversation, could scarcely fail to regard him as a man who laboured to "keep a conscience void of offence towards God and man." He was scrupulously just and honest, even in matters that to many would appear so trivial as not to require any attention, because he was governed by principles that knew of no distinction between the little and the great within the sphere of their operation. By his inoffensive and obliging manner he secured the esteem and confidence of all that knew him. And as he never unnecessarily spoke evil of others, it was a rare thing for any one to speak disparagingly of him. But it was in reference to the cause of Christ that his character as a sincere Christian appeared to the best advantage. That cause demands from all its professed adherents sacrifices which are distasteful to corrupt nature and therefore well fitted, as no doubt they were intended to be, tests of Christian character; and perhaps few things of this kind supply a truer index to the state of the heart than the measure of liberality with which the cause of Christ is supported, and if this is so, is it any wonder that the spiritual life of many professing Christians should "hang in doubt before them," for it cannot be denied that there is a great lack of self-denying zeal manifest in this direction, and not only so, but often persons occupying the influential position of acknowledged leaders in congregations by the grudging spirit which they manifest in this respect, check rather than draw out the liberality of their brethren for the support of divine ordinances. But not so the subject of this notice. Though his cast of mind inclined him in general to follow rather than to lead, yet in the matter of liberality for the support of the Gospel, both at home and abroad, he was always far ahead of many others who were much richer than he. And if Christ saw fit to put on record instances of this species of self-denial, whether it was the box of ointment or the no less liberal contribution of the poor widow, it cannot be wrong to make honourable mention of it in other cases that come under our notice. But it is not referred to here for the purpose of making invidious distinctions, but rather in accordance with our general aim in this notice to provoke others to seek to abound in this grace also. We might refer to other traits of Christian character that were exemplified in him, but I forbear, as they may be easily inferred from what has already been said of him as an example, so far, of consistent piety.

He had in common, with all other Christians, his faults and imperfections, and that he felt and deplored these I have no doubt. But there is good reason to believe that he knew where the effectual remedy for them was to be found, and that faith in Christ's atoning blood was the sustaining principle of his life, and his comfort and support in death.

The death of such men, though a great gain to themselves, is in many respects a serious loss to the congregations to which they belonged. The congregation of Lobo has been sorely tried in this way, as within a few years past, several of its most exemplary and useful members have been removed by death, and some others from their age and infirmities may be expected soon to follow. May the great Head of the Church raise up others among them to fill their places so, that His work may be carried on there with increased vigor and success.

He has left a wife who, to him, was a true yokefellow, ever sympathizing with him in all his joys and sorrows, and two daughters to mourn his loss, and also two sons by a former marriage, viz., William of Parkhill, and John of Williams. May the Lord in their case, and in all like cases, be a father to the fatherless and a husband to the widow, and thus fill the empty places with His own gracious presence. And "be ye also ready, for in such an hour as ye know not the son of man cometh," and be followers of those who through faith and patience are now inheriting the promises."—*Com.*

LORD BOLINGBROKE said:—"Had Christ's gospel been propagated with the same simplicity with which it was originally taught by Christ, it would have been to the unspeakable benefit of mankind."

## The School Question.

EDITOR BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN.

SIR,—This question has again been forced into public notice, and discussions, which in this Province may be called old, are being revived through the agitation upon this subject in New Brunswick, and the action of the Dominion Parliament. Usually you are pronounced enough in your opinions, and it is not difficult to know what side of a question you take; but in this case I confess I am a little at a loss to know just exactly what you mean upon some points, and what side you are on, and should therefore like to ask you a few questions. I am aware that others beside myself are in the same predicament, and therefore I hope you will take no offence, Mr. Editor, where none is intended, when I especially ask for some explanation. Your discussion of this question at all, shows your appreciation of the importance of the subject. Assuredly both the questions of national education, and of our own system of education as established by law, are of so great importance that they can hardly be overestimated. On this account it is the more desirable that so widely read and influential a paper should speak with decision and transparent clearness so as to be understood by all.

Well then, to proceed with my questions, will you kindly explain

I. What you mean by "Protestant Schools?" See your editorial quoted in the New Brunswick letter of March 23rd. So far as our own system of public schools is concerned, I was not aware that it is, or was ever intended to be either Protestant or Roman Catholic.

II. What do you mean by the religious instruction which you seem to think should be imparted in our common schools? At one time I inferred from what you say that you meant simply the reading of the Bible in our schools without note or comment. If that is all, I fear the religious instruction would be not much more than a name. But this is not all, for you say "The permission to read a portion of Scripture in the school, without note or comment, may serve to mislead unthinking men, but it will not satisfy the religious need, or make Rome cease the cry of godless." "Confessedly, even where the Bible is thus read, it has no influence as religious or moral teaching, but is simply a recognition of God and revelation." So I conclude that you mean the Bible should not only be read in school, but also explained. Here then, we have denominational schools at once, and of course a cry for separate denominational schools from every separate sect. The results of such a system as seen in England, for example, are certainly not so grand or beneficial as to make us wish very strongly to import them into Canada. And besides, with all respect to the great body of our common school teachers, it might well be questioned how far they are qualified for this task of not only hearing the Bible read, but also of explaining and enforcing its truths. Conceive, for instance, of a teacher of Sangsterian proclivities expounding the seventh commandment, what it requires and what it forbids. But I have the question, and shall be glad to have your answer.

III. You say in your editorial of April 2nd, "We assume that it is the duty of the State to see that the youth of the country are educated." Very well. I should like to ask if you also assume that it is the duty of the State to provide the religious instruction you speak of, whatever that may be, for the youth attending our schools. If it is the duty of the State to provide this for the youth, then why not for adults? Would not this land us at once in church establishments, a thing which we hardly suppose you intend to advocate at this time of day. But letting this pass, will you indicate how the State can furnish for the youth in our common schools, during school hours, and as a part of school work, religious instruction to suit all the diversities of religious views found amongst us, as well as to suit those who have no views at all upon the subject that are worth the name."

IV. In your editorials are found not a few statements, which, though it is not said they are aimed against our system of education, we can yet hardly help believing, are intended to be so. To give only a specimen or two; in your edition of April 2nd, you say, "It is folly to attempt the establishment of a system where Protestant and Roman Catholic are both included." "Perhaps it is well that pure secular education is found to be impracticable." So you mean to intimate that these two statements have been demonstrated to be true by the result of our experience in Ontario. I humbly think that the history of our public school system, and the facts will not bear you out.

Again you say, "It is a great price to pay for securing the adherence of Roman Catholics to our system, when we set aside revealed religion, and ignore the lessons of history, and constitutional struggles in the education of our children." If you intend this to apply to our schools, and I suppose you must, it is altogether too sweeping to say that, because the Bible is not read, or taught in them, revealed religion is thereby set aside, and if the lessons of history and of our constitutional struggles are set aside in our text books on these subjects, is certainly a piece of information quite new to the people of Canada, and must have been persistently done by English historians themselves, for it is their works which are used in our schools. I have been a teacher for many years, and never made the discovery which you announce, and cannot, without more evidence than mere assertion, believe it to be true. It is a serious thing, without "be most abundant and undoubted evidence," make statements which, if they are accepted, will weaken confidence in our system of education, and in that aspect of it which is most important of all—its moral influence. In the same editorial you say—"Our nation is a Christian nation; its laws rest on God's revealed law." But of our system of education, which is regulated by these very laws, you say that in it "we set revealed religion aside in order to

secure the adherence of Roman Catholics." I shall be thankful if you will condescend to give some proof of this statement. It is a fearful charge, and casts a reflection of the most serious kind, not only upon those who have taken an important part, many of them D.D.'s, in laying the foundation and rearing the structure of our public school system, but upon all the people of Canada who support and uphold such a system.

I should be glad also to understand more definitely the position you really mean to take, or that you wish people to understand you take, upon the New Brunswick school difficulty. Your correspondent from that Province knows what he means, and you cannot misunderstand him. But it is not so with you. If I were an anti-Separate School New Brunswicker, I should be at a loss to know whether you were a friend, or whether you were in favour of capitulation with Rome. I should suspect the latter, simply because you do not give a certain sound. But it is not very clear. In one editorial you say, "We agree with Mr. Mackenzie, that the establishment of Separate Schools is a necessity." In another, you represent Separate Schools in Ontario as a concession wrung from the Government from considerations of political expediency; and give it as your opinion that, had Presbyterianism been as strong there, relatively, in this Province as it is now in New Brunswick, the concession would not have been granted, and lead us to infer that with this you would have agreed. With the one breath you tell us Separate Schools are a necessity, and with the next you represent them as a concession which, if Protestants are strong enough, should not be granted. What are the people of New Brunswick to do in such a case? Fight against what you represent as a necessity, or make a concession, which had we been as strong in Ontario at the time it was made, as they are now, would not likely have been made?

Again. At one time you say that, "Neither the constitution of the Dominion, the peace of the country, nor the safety of the British Empire would be considered if they stood in the way of the Popish claim and alleged grievance." This is a fearful result which you hold up before the New Brunswickers as likely to come to pass through their continued opposition to Separate Schools; and yet in another place you say in effect that you rejoice with the Protestants of that Province that, so far, they have been successful in their opposition. I should say that this is rather a grim prospect to rejoice at.

To encourage our co-religionists in the sister Province, you say, "Glad should we be to know that the Maritime Provinces can maintain a system of education without Separate Schools; but experience leads us to believe that it is only a question of time and opportunity." A few sentences further on, in the same article you tell them, "It is folly to attempt the establishment of a system where Protestant and Roman Catholic are both included." The meaning of which two sentences appears to me to be that you regard the attempt now being made to oppose the establishment of Separate Schools as folly; but that, though it is, you would be glad to know that they can succeed in their folly, namely, the establishing and maintaining a truly national and non-sectarian system of schools, which I would hold to be a truly grand and noble thing. But it is strange encouragement to tell them that you regard the very attempt to establish such a system as folly. I am afraid the Protestants of New Brunswick will find it difficult to be very grateful for your aid—if it can be called aid at all. I humbly venture to suggest that it would be better either to warn them in clear and unambiguous language against persisting in a contest in which defeat is certain (as I suspect you imagine), or to throw your whole support, without a shadow of doubt, upon the side of those who, I think rightly, are contending against yielding to the Roman Catholics in their character of a religious denomination, privileges which no other religious body asks, but which they are equally entitled to, and which, if all were to ask and obtain as Roman Catholics have done through political subservience only, would end in making any national system of education impossible, and consequently would lead to the prevalence of ignorance and crime; or where education was given, to instilling and perpetrating sectarian bitterness and jealousy, which it should be the object of all good citizens, and still more of professing Christians, to eradicate as far as possible.

I quite agree with you, sir, that in our Government, in both political parties, and in the political press, there is a pandering to Rome, which is fraught with danger to our institutions; that the times in which we live require decision; but I humbly submit that the decision of the editorials referred to upon this most important question is not of that bold and uncompromising kind that will ever carry the day. It is, I fear of that kind which will lead Romanists very clearly to see that they have but to be bold enough and persistent enough in their demands to get all they wish.

Apologizing for the length of this communication, as well as for daring to take an editor to task, I am, sir, yours truly,  
 W. D. BALLANTYNE.

## A Suggestion.

EDITOR BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN.

SIR,—Is there no scheme on foot to commemorate the approaching Union by a worthy thanksgiving, like that of the American Presbyterian Church a few years ago? Why should we not raise a memorial fund of, say \$100,000, to be invested in buildings, and other ways, which would suitably commemorate an occasion of so great thankfulness for our church? I would venture to ask the attention of our Union committee and others to this matter. Yours, etc.,  
 GRATITUDE.

In consideration of valued services as leader of psalmody in the Presbyterian Church, Walton, Mr. James Fulton, was presented with an address and a handsome watch and chain. He replied in appropriate terms.