

THE MOCK PARLIAMENT IN ST. JOHN'S HALL.

The Church of Rome from the earliest days has been accommodating; she commenced by a slight exchange of divinities with heathendom; and now that men cherish the delusion that they have popular representation in Parliament, and elsewhere, she manipulates them as a skilful chess-player manipulates his "Bishops;" she is accustomed to flank movements, and manœuvres accordingly. It is therefore no matter of surprise that certain unsophisticated members of the Separate School-Board, who, because they hold their position as the result of a popular vote, maintain a parliamentary demeanour, as well as they know how, and appeal to parliamentary precedent, entirely overlooking the fact that a certain *Arch-chess-player* takes care to have a sufficient number of *pieces* on the *Board* to check-mate them at pleasure. Of such a mode of proceeding as that above-indicated, we have heard of certain characteristic illustrations. A subject is mooted in conversation, at the sittings of this Parliament, and the gentleman who represents the *Speaker* therein, manipulates his subordinates, in such a fashion that the *motion* which has never had an existence in such a form, is suddenly and by acc' mation declared to have been *carried*, in absolute disregard of the wish of the majority as expressed in an informal discussion.

After a similar fashion, if we are correctly informed, private and unsaleable property is *voted* over to the Board, which, unable and unwilling as it is to sustain the burden, is nevertheless cajoled into the acceptance of it.

We trust that the several members of the Board may at least be enriched with the Church's blessing, in recognition of their subserviency and devotion.

MORPHINE.

This pernicious preparation is perpetually administered by the doctors, in spite of the protest of the *London Lancet* against their so doing. There is however a *patient* who figures behind a counter hard by the Arcade, whose vivacity leads him to give the lie to his employer's customers with the utmost facility. In that young man's case, we think *morphine* might be administered with advantage.

Pulpit Criticism.

MR. WATTS' ATTACK ON THE DIVINE ORIGIN OF CHRISTIANITY, AND MR. BROOKMAN'S DEFENCE THEREOF.

The only city paper which has recorded the above-described contest, has treated it as a *debate*; we have reason to know that Mr. Brookman distinctly declined, from first to last, to enter into argument on the subject; on the contrary, it was agreed that each of the contendants should state his individual convictions thereon. It was moreover stipulated that no offensive, or (what would be deemed by Mr. B.) blasphemous language should be employed on the occasion. At this juncture, we must observe that in civilized communities, it is universally understood that whenever any subject is under discussion, offensive language on either side, is regarded as inadmissible; but such representatives of infidelity, or (if they prefer the term) agnosticism as have visited Toronto, have appeared to regard themselves as at liberty to set such a tacit maxim at defiance, and to express themselves in the most offensive language they could command, with regard to a person and a book they know to be dearer than life to a considerable section of the community. One effect of such a course on their part has been to prevent (probably) the most competent man on this continent

replying to them, and another effect has been to deeply pain that section of the community which (whatever be their errors of judgment) is most active in good works.

If Mr. Charles Watts, while styling himself a rationalist, were publicly to assure the Governor of the Bank of England, that what he is pleased to designate the bullion of the bank is nothing but colored nickel, the governor might of course reply, if he thought fit, or he might laugh, if he were so disposed; Mr. Watts, in such case, would manifest either wilful or culpable ignorance, Mr. W.'s opening sentence, as reported in *The World* of the 13th ult., appears to us to be about as weighty as that suggested above; he is related to have said that "Christianity, like all other systems was the outcome of the human mind at a time when knowledge was the exception and ignorance the rule." If Mr. Watts have made so great a discovery as that he intimates, it is obviously due to the civilized world that we should learn from what human mind (or minds) this complicated system emanated; how it came to pass that intelligent and cultivated persons were so satisfied of its veracity, at the time when the facts on which it is based were fresh in the memory of eye-witnesses, that they sold their possessions for the benefit of others, and braved every kind of hardship, terminating in death, rather than relinquish their testimony to its truth—Mr. Watts (we think) should inform us how it came to pass that the books which record its history were speedily translated into several languages—we think we ought to learn who concocted these "cunningly devised fables"—what were the authors' inducements—and what their rewards for so doing—the precise date and place of their origination would likewise be objects of interest to the antiquary. This mode of investigation, and any inquiry into the grounds of belief on the part of myriads of the excellent of the earth would not attract an audience, anxious rather for justification of unbelief, and willing to pay those who will help them thereto. We do not need to be told that "miraculous power, and the possibility (or rather the certainty) of supernatural aid to man are leading tenets of Christianity." With the words "logic and reason" on his lips, Mr. Watts is so illogical and unreasonable as to pretend that "nothing is known of the origin" of the Christian religion. One would hardly suppose the audience before whom he delivered such a statement, consisted (as the reporter votes it did) "of reading people;" the facts of Christian history have probably not been included within the scope of their studies.

As Mr. Watts has referred to "miraculous power" as that on which the claims of Christianity are based, it would have been pertinent to enquire of him, if he could indicate any spurious miracle of which it could be maintained that it was of such a nature that (1) the senses could take cognizance of it; (2) that it was wrought before many witnesses, (3) that institutions and memorials were established in commemoration of it, and (4) that these institutions etc., date from the time at which the alleged miracle is said to have taken place. We purpose enlarging on this subject in the next number.

The most formidable obstacles to the progress of Christianity are the men who occupy the pulpits; instead of dividing them into the conventional "orders" of bishops, priests, and deacons, they may, with more correctness, be classed as hirelings, mummers, and infidels; in the estimate of thinking men they are ranged under one or other of these "orders." The fact we take to be traceable to that corruption of the Church as a whole, which has extended from apostolical times,—and the profound ignorance and indifference of the masses appealed to, accounts in great measure, for their toleration of it. Of the hireling and mummer orders of pulpit occupants we have treated in some detail, in past "criticisms," of one of the infidel order we are about to treat in the present.