

deadness around, from which it is difficult to escape: we lose the benefit of united service. But, on the other hand, when we hear, close to us, the earnest, pious, and audible response of one who, "with a pure heart and humble voice," offers up his petitions to the throne of grace, the earnestness of his devotion gives a stimulus to those who are near him, and the pious feeling is caught, and reciprocated, and conveyed onward, kindling new fires of devotion in the hearts of all around.

And so it is, or even more so, with singing. In this important department of common worship we are, I fear, sadly behind the Dissenters. This may arise in some degree from the fact, that singing is the only part of the dissenting worship in which the congregation joins; whereas almost the whole of our liturgy is adapted to united service. But I fear it must be attributed principally to the false delicacy, (to give it no harsher name,) of the upper classes. There is in this nation, owing to the closeness with which the different classes touch upon each other, a constant tendency in each class to imitate the manners of those immediately above them. Hence it happens that the silence of the principal person in the Church is sure to throw a damp on those below them; and so the sacred psalmody falls to a few hired singers; and the voices of the congregation, which used, in ancient times, to swell in solemn grandeur, so that the roofs of the sacred building and the very shore of the sea re-echoed with the sound, is now replaced by the sonorous organ—poor substitute for the outpouring of a thousand souls!

Will not the fair daughters of the Church, if any such should read these pages, strive to take away from us this reproach. Whence arises this ill-timed reserve? "Beautiful as the polished corners of the temple," why should your hearts also be as cold? Can it be right to confine to the social and domestic circle that delightful power which has often been acquired with so much assiduity? Shall those lips which are cheerfully opened in song to obtain the thanks, and win the approval of human society, be closed when the praises of God are to be sung? shall the voice be mute only in the temple of Him who gave it its power to please?—Rev. W. Grestley's Portrait of an English Churchman.

THE REFORMATION NOT SCHISMATICAL.

We did not separate from Rome, but Rome separated from us. They denied us Church communion. We never denied it to them. On the contrary, they communicated with us for several years in Queen Elizabeth's reign, till the Pope by a bull ordered them to separate from us, and at the same passed a sentence of excommunication against us, which he had no authority from the universal Church to do, and of course we paid no attention to it. All this is very simple, and it is pure matter of history. But persons will say that this is not the whole account of the matter. We had a connection with Rome before the Reformation, which we had not afterwards. By what right did we put an end to it, and how did we escape the grievous guilt of schism? The answer is very plain.—We do not believe that our Lord gave St. Peter any power or jurisdiction, which He did not give equally to all the other Apostles when He repeated the same words to them afterwards. The primitive Church did not believe it. It was a novelty of later times, an opinion which grew up out of the circumstances in which the Roman Church was placed. We say therefore that, although we doubtless owe a great debt of gratitude to Rome for what she did for us in barbarous times, she had no right to bring us under her power, seeing we had been, as we had been, a free British Church for a long while before. This however she did very cruelly, just as a strong man may tyrannize over a weak one. No length of time or custom can make that right which is in itself wrong. But we were very feeble, and could not help ourselves; so were content to groan under her oppression, till the days came when we were strong enough to throw her off and make ourselves free, as free as God intended all particular Churches to be. This was the main thing done at the Reformation—throwing off the Papal dominion.

But, whilst we were under her power, and could make no resistance, Rome had forced upon us many rites and ceremonies which were highly superstitious, and some doctrines for which there was no warrant in Holy Scripture or the early Church. These likewise were novelties—traditions of men, not commandments of God. These also we rejected, as soon as we were our own masters. We did nothing more than settle our faith, and order our own ceremonies; and this we had a perfect right to do. Moreover, in doing it, we never departed from the Canonical Scriptures, or interpreted those Scriptures otherwise than as they were interpreted in the first pure ages of the Catholic and Apostolic Church. This was our Rule of Faith. Thus we read in the 20th Article, that "the Church hath power to decree Rites or Ceremonies, and authority in controversies of Faith;" and again, one of the Canons of 1571 bids preachers "be careful to teach nothing in a sermon, except that which is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old and New Testament; and which the Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops have collected from the same doctrine." Thus, in opposition to Roman Dissenters, we say that we never did separate from the universal Church; neither did we reject and despise, but did most highly venerate, her teaching and her judgment, which they do not do. Neither can Protestant Dissenters find any thing in the principles of the Reformation to justify their separation from us. All changes were made by rightful ecclesiastical authority—by the Bishops and Convocation of the whole British Church lawfully summoned by the King. The words of the 34th Article are plain: "Whosoever, through his private judgment, willingly and purposely, doth openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the Church, which be not repugnant to the Word of God, and be ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly (that others may fear to do the like), as he that offendeth against the common order of the Church, and hurteth the authority of the magistrates, and woundeth the consciences of the weak brethren." Thus clearly does the Reformation look upon all dissent as direct schism, as the parent of political discontent and sedition, and as utterly destitute of the very chief of the Christian graces. Nor is it too much to say that English History since that period has been little more than a witness to the truth of that judgment.—Rev. F. W. Faber.

THE CHURCH.

COBOURG, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 7, 1839.

We have been much encouraged in the prosecution of our labours since the commencement of the present volume, by the kind commendations which our Episcopal contemporaries in the United States have been pleased to bestow upon us. Those who have been so fortunate as to become acquainted with the columns of the Churchman of New York, the Gospel Messenger of Utica, the Chronicle of the Church of New Haven, and the Banner of the Cross of Philadelphia, must have been delighted to witness the learning and zeal so profusely exhibited in these most orthodox journals, and their happy combination of practical divinity with valuable ecclesiastical information. Whenever we open one of the papers which we have just mentioned, we are sure to meet with something to instruct and gratify,—with some noble extract from the treasures of our common ancient English Theology, or some original argument in defence of pure doctrine, or the Episcopal form of Church Government.—Add to which, our esteemed fellow-labourers seem to breathe the most fraternal and sincere affection towards the Church and religious institutions of old England, and to rejoice in recording every instance of their growing influence. Would that the same tranquil and Christian spirit which actuates the Episcopalians of the United States were common to the members of other denominations! we should not then be compelled to regard an American as an enemy, and, in a time of international peace, to see our frontiers guarded against the incursions of a nominally friendly neighbour by some of the choicest troops of the British army! But Sectarianism in the adjoining Republic has been the active and fanatical ally of Sympathy, and religion, which ought to have proved a

check to gross breaches of faith and violations of every principle of humanity, has, in too many instances, prostituted itself, by invoking the favour of the Almighty on projects of massacre and rapine. The extended influence of our sister communion would, we are convinced, do much towards bringing back the American people to a sense of justice; and, even as it is, we cannot imagine any American Episcopalian, who is thoroughly imbued with "the quiet spirit" of his own Apostolic Church, looking with aught but condemnation upon the crimes committed by his countrymen against our peace, under the specious names of Liberty and Patriotism.

Having thus wandered a little from the object with which we commenced, we proceed to avail ourselves of the encomiums with which we have been greeted by a portion of the American Episcopal press; and, in laying them before our readers, we are not moved by any impulse of vain ostentation; but we do so to show that the doctrines which we have advocated in this Province with so much of substantial encouragement and approval from Churchmen, are cordially responded to by our fellow Episcopals in the United States; and we moreover adduce these testimonials in our favour, as confirmatory of the judgment of those who have so far supported us, and as likely to lead to a still greater diffusion of sound principles in Church and State.

We will now detain our readers no longer from the flattering notices which have given rise to these remarks:— From the Churchman, 29th June, 1839.

"The following extract will find favour with our readers. It is from the editorial columns of the Church, the ablest of our exchange papers, and that to which, in furnishing selected matter for our paper, we have been under greater obligation than to any other. The Plague of Eyam and most of the short extracts from our standard divines which have so often appeared in our last page have been borrowed from this valuable repository of good reading."

From the Gospel Messenger, 13th July, 1839.

"The Church.—This estimable paper, edited by our valued friend, the Rev. A. N. Bethune of Cobourg, U. C., has commenced its third volume on an enlarged sheet, and in its accustomed neat style of mechanical attention. This paper has, from the first, been a great favorite with us, and we can readily adopt the language of our brother of the Churchman and say that it is "the ablest of our exchange papers." We open no one with more confidence than in it we shall find something either original, or selected, which we can transfer to our columns, with profit to our readers, and we regret often that we cannot take all we should readily adopt. The article found in our present sheet, in relation to the early history of the Church and the Reformation, is from this paper, and which we hope to continue."

From the Chronicle of the Church, 19th July, 1839.

"The Church.—This valuable paper comes to us much enlarged. We congratulate the conductors of it upon that state of prosperity which enables them to add thus materially to its size. We have always regarded this paper as a very valuable one, not only for its sound principles, and the ability with which they are maintained, but also for the amount and variety of its gleanings from the choicest stores of Old English Theology; and we take pleasure in acknowledging our indebtedness to it, for matter of that kind."

From the Banner of the Cross, 13th July, 1839.

"The Church, published at Cobourg, U. C., has recently been issued in a large, handsome, and, as usual, well-filled sheet. It is an excellent paper, able beyond most others, and the estimation in which we hold it may be inferred from the frequency of our quotations. We cordially wish it the success which it deserves."

Such praise, and from such quarters, is extremely gratifying; it renders every toil pleasant; and spurs us on to sustain the character which it has been our good fortune to acquire.

Since the publication of our last paper, we have seen the Statesman, in which is contained an elaborate argument on the question of RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT, bearing the signature of O. R. Gowan Esq., M. P. P.

We feel rejoiced that our cotemporary has chosen to come to definitions and arguments,—that he has left his vantage-ground of popular by-words and empty declamation, and descended to the common field of argument, in full array for a pitched battle.

We confidently look to the friends of Responsible Government for a corroborative assent, when we assert that we have defined what it really is, much more favourably to their side of the question than their own advocate, Mr. Gowan, and we do not fear but that those who will take the trouble to read our last number, will find it so.

But we have, at present, to do with Mr. Gowan's definition, which we give verbatim, as follows:— "By Responsible Government then I mean that the Lieutenant Governor should form his Executive Council, or Colonial Cabinet of gentlemen, having seats in the Colonial Legislature, and in whose judgment, ability, and discretion, the representatives of the people could rely, so as to ensure to the Executive, in all the important questions of domestic government, the concurrence and support of the Legislature.—The Governor not to be bound to take any particular set of men, but to be allowed a free choice not only in the selection, but in the dismissal, of his advisers, also."

We do not know by what means Mr. Gowan proposes to preserve to the Governor the free choice of the men, or set of men, who are to form the Colonial Executive. But we do know well that such free choice is not practically open to the Sovereign in England, and that this is not the British Constitution as administered in England.

Does not Mr. Gowan know that when the Sovereign in England finds it necessary to change the Administration, the leader of the party, which possesses the majority in Parliament,—a person as well known in general, as if he was appointed under the great seal,—is invariably sent for, and to him the choice of colleagues is always given, and, not only this, but that the whole patronage of the Government is at once placed in the hands of the cabinet so chosen by him?—There is no unlimited discretion, then, exercised by the Crown in the choice or dismissal of ministers, or even of subordinate functionaries; and it is difficult to conceive how it could be so; for when once the responsibility for the management of public affairs falls upon any man, or set of men,—it would be an act of insanity in him, or them, to leave the patronage in other hands, or to become accountable for the conduct of men, in whose appointment they had no share, and over whom they could exercise no power of dismissal.

We need not go back into history to look for precedent or information on this head. The debates in the Imperial Parliament on the late resignation of the Ministers, are before the public, and we have only to detail the course of proceeding on that occasion.

When the present Prime Minister of England, Lord Melbourne, tendered his resignation,—by his advice the Duke of Wellington was consulted by the Sovereign, and from her received an offer of the station of Prime Minister of England.

The Queen on this occasion did not name the colleagues of the Duke.

The Duke of Wellington advised the Queen to appoint Sir Robert Peel in preference to himself.—The Duke did not recommend Sir Robert Peel's colleagues, nor did the Queen name them. On the contrary, Sir Robert Peel, on accepting the appointment, sent in a list of the Ministers with whom he would act, and it was of course accepted. Now we should like to ask could Her Majesty have formed a Conservative Cabinet, excluding Sir Robert Peel? Who then had the choice of Ministers? The Queen, or Sir Robert Peel? If the latter, where was the Queen's free choice? Or, if the system of Responsible Government were adopted in Upper Canada, where would be the free choice of the Lieutenant Governor?

personal lady-attendants. Now even this choice was considered by the Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel, as interfering with, and derogating from, the authority and functions of a British minister. It is no answer to the argument plainly deducible from these facts, to say that this claim of Sir Robert Peel was disallowed, for the question ultimately turned upon a misunderstanding. It was admitted, upon all hands, that the Minister had the right of control in the appointments for the Royal Household. The Queen understood Sir Robert Peel to ask for the dismissal of all the Ladies; Sir Robert Peel, on the contrary, understood Her Majesty to insist upon retaining all of them,—and so they separated, leaving the principle of the control of the Royal household resting in the Ministers of the Crown, still untouched and undisputed.

Even those who contended most strongly for the exercise of the royal will, never, in the whole course of the debates, asserted that it should extend further than the Queen's household; and, in truth, it would be strange, if they had; for no man in his senses would be found hardy enough to attempt the management of national affairs, if it were known that he could not use his own discretion in the appointment of those by whom they were to be conducted.

Let us, for instance, by a slight change of names, accommodate the late events in England to this colony, and suppose a circumstance, by no means improbable, if the Imperial system of Government be introduced into this Province. Let us suppose Mr. Gowan sent for as a talented, leading member of the Assembly, and requested to become an Executive Councillor. Would he permit the nomination of his colleagues, without his previous consent? Would he become answerable for retaining a majority of the Assembly, if he had no share in the choice made? Would he become accountable for the acts of officers selected by the free choice of the Governor? Would he permit the dismissal of his colleagues, without his approval? Would he undertake to preserve friends and popularity, without the patronage of the Government?

So much for Mr. Gowan's definition of Responsible Government! He wishes for a particular system, but he denies one of its natural and inevitable consequences,—namely, the establishment of the power of an Executive Council uncontrolled by the will of the Governor, or the Imperial Government. We say distinctly, that such a Council would be responsible to the Assembly for all appointments to office. But how can they be responsible, unless they have the choice? And then how can they and the Governor have the choice at the same time?

Let no man misunderstand us, and think we are wishing for any modification of the system of Responsible Government which would accommodate it to Mr. Gowan's notions of what would be safe and reasonable in a colony; or suppose us to be attempting to fix Mr. Gowan's inconsistencies upon his party. That party know well that the establishment of their system would virtually abolish the authority of the Imperial Government, and of its officer, the Governor. They know it would, as we said in our last number, make him "an ambassador in a foreign court, and the only officer of the Government bound, by official duty, to consider the interests of the Empire." The consistent advocates of Responsible Government desire this; and this, we assert, with the other consequences, amounts to a virtual separation of this Colony from the Empire.

Those who waver between two opinions, must therefore ask themselves this preliminary question,—Are we willing to consider the Governor of the Colony, as a person of no real authority? Are we desirous of submitting altogether to the majority in Parliament, and the officers possessing, by means of that majority, supreme Executive power? Are we willing to have that power unquestioned, or to have any of our objections to it answered, or any opposition we may offer to it silenced, by being told,—that such is the will of the majority?

Did we conceive the system proposed to be compatible with the connexion between this country and England, we might well inquire into the effects which uncontrolled party spirit dominant and supreme, would produce in all the ramifications of society in a small community. We might show that justice may be demanded, with effect, by an injured person, forming one of the minority, from an officer rally accountable to the Imperial Parliament; and how ain such a claim for redress must be when made upon a Government of party in a nation containing but 400,000 souls! But we forbear, and return to our allegation that Local Responsible Government is inconsistent with Colonial Relations.

Not to make this article longer than we can help, we shall confine ourselves for the present to Mr. Gowan's first question,—"Does the present irresponsible system work well for England?"

Mr. Gowan in very flattering language styles this loyal Province, "a sort of unfathomable whirlpool, into which millions of British gold continually enter, and from which nothing but discordant and fresh demands, are emitted."

Such is Canada, and such are the Canadian subjects of the Crown according to the account of a member of their own Parliament,—the editor of a loyal newspaper,—and a man who assumes to guide and express the opinions of 20,000 men, gallant and faithful subjects of the British Crown.

But, lest all this weight of authority should be insufficient, Mr. Gowan quotes the words of British Statesmen, and pledges himself that they are "conclusive." The following are the authorities, advanced in his own language:—

"ADMIRAL COFFIN, upwards of 15 years ago, declared in his place [in the House of Commons], that so great and extravagant were our demands upon England, that it would be much better for the nation, that the rope was cut and the colonies were sent adrift."

"MR. WARBURTON, in the course of a lengthy speech delivered in the British House of Commons in August 1838, stated that the Canada cost the English nation upwards of two millions annually,—including Canals, Ecclesiastical establishments, the Army, Navy, and Indian establishments,—the Ordnance and Engineer Departments, and public works, exclusive of the Timber Monopoly, wheat, corn, and other monopolies,—and argued, at much length, that it would be to the advantage of Great Britain, to negotiate a peaceable separation."

"Upwards of two years ago, similar opinions were entertained by Sir HENRY PARNELL, Bart., M. P. for Dundee, and Secretary at War."

The enormous sums then swallowed up by extraordinary expenses, including the Rideau Canal, are all arising out of the military and naval establishments for the defence of the Canadas.

Mr. Gowan must, therefore, be understood either to argue, That, with Responsible Government, the Province would have expended from her own resources upwards of nine millions of pounds sterling in three years,—or— That, with Responsible Government, the expenditure would have been wholly unnecessary.

Let us therefore enquire which, if either, of the propositions is tenable, and, for this purpose, ascertain what positions the expenses complained of.

First, we find the American Republic treacherously taking advantage of the arduous struggle in which England was engaged for the maintenance of the liberties of Europe against the military despotism of Bonaparte,—joining with the despot himself in his unholy warfare,—and exerting its utmost strength and resources for the conquest of these Provinces; which attempt, however, was ignominiously foiled by British and Canadian arms, at the expense of England.

We then find a small regular military establishment maintained in the succeeding peaceable times. Quebec is garrisoned; its fortifications are kept in repair; ordnance is sent from England for its walls; and it still stands, at the expense of England, with the flag waving over it which Wolfe first planted on the heights of Abraham, the finest fortress in America,—the impregnable strong-hold of British Transatlantic power.

We find, on the peace establishment, a very few regiments quartered at a few stations in the Provinces.—But the fortifications and barracks, by degrees, are permitted to go to decay; the cannon are dismounted; and the whole country, with scarcely the exception of Quebec itself, is left in as helpless and defenceless a position as the most responsible government upon earth could possibly desire.

All this was in the neighbourhood of a nation, which had recently shown itself inimical and treacherous,—whose every village has its brigade of militia artillery,—and whose whole population, inveterately hostile to Monarchy, openly express impatience at the existence of Royal authority in America.

All this neglect of military defence was moreover, in the neighbourhood of a nation, which permitted and encouraged its citizens to enter piratically the territory of Texas belonging to a friendly republican power, and to establish themselves therein by right of conquest.

Now, having thus premised, let us again propose our alternative. Under a Responsible Government, would these Provinces have been desirous, or would they have been able, to sustain the expense of war, or even of the small peace establishment that was kept up? We do not fear Mr. Gowan's answer. He knows well these Provinces could not have borne the expense.

Then, would it have been prudent, when peace was proclaimed, to open the gates of Quebec, to tumble its walls into the fosse, to withdraw every British soldier from the Canadas, and to leave the country to the tender mercies of American citizens?

Nay, setting American citizens out of the question, would it have been just or prudent to leave the British inhabitants of Lower Canada exposed to the national antipathies of their French fellow-subjects?

What is the answer to these questions? It is this,—To have spared the expense complained of by Mr. Gowan, would have been to forfeit the Colony—this would have been Separation, not Responsible Government.

But let us go, step by step, through Mr. Gowan's demonstrations.

The great expenses of the last three years have been occasioned by

- 1. The Rebellion in Lower Canada; 2. The Rebellion in Upper Canada; 3. The driving out American Sympathy by the employment of military force, and by arming our gallant Militia, at the cost, however, of the British Nation.

Now let us enquire whether Responsible Government would have prevented Rebellion in Lower Canada.

Some will answer, Yes; and Mr. Gowan cannot sustain his argument without proclaiming himself of the number.

But Responsible Government would have peacefully insured to the French in Lower Canada, the supremacy they have sought for by taking up arms. They were, it is true, a community of conquered foreigners, but they would thus have virtually been the conquerors, the supreme rulers of the British population. All their demands must have been acceded to; all their wishes must have prevailed; the British subjects of the Crown in that Province must have held life, liberty, and property at their will. They sought to accomplish this, but could not,—because they had not "Responsible Government."

They rebelled,—they were put down at the expense of England. Mr. Gowan, to be consistent, must maintain that the expense ought not to have been incurred; but if it had not been incurred, the rebellion must have proved successful. Therefore, as one who disapproves of the expenditure, he must maintain the righteousness of the Rebel Cause, and wish it had met with the success which, as a righteous cause, it would have merited.

Then as to the Rebellion in Upper Canada. It was caused, 1. By the Rebellion in Lower Canada. 2. By the election of a loyal Assembly here, in which Mr. Gowan's friends materially assisted. 3. By the bitter disappointment of Mackenzie and his partisans, who thus saw the sceptre of Responsible Government snatched from their hands at the very moment when they hoped to grasp it.

The question then arises, Would the Rebellion have been prevented by Responsible Government?

There can be no doubt that,—if the whole of the demands of the Mackenzie Parliament had been conceded, and its leaders placed in power,—these leaders and a portion of the party which sustained them, would have been for a short time satisfied. But, in preference to yielding to their demands,—that which they themselves challenged as a right, and that which the advocates of Responsible Government allege to be the constitutional mode of deciding a question, was actually adopted by Sir Francis Head. They were sent back to their constituents. Finding, upon this, that they could not obtain their ends at the hustings, a portion of the inhabitants of the Province rose in rebellion. Were they right or wrong in doing so? If Mr. Gowan says they were right, then they ought not to have been resisted,—on the contrary, they ought to have been aided, and the expense of suppressing the rebellion would have been avoided. But if they were wrong in appealing from the hustings to the pike and to sympathy, the rebellion ought to have been suppressed, and the expense of suppressing it was properly incurred. Had the result of the elections been different,—had the majority shown themselves in favour of the Mackenzie Assembly, there would have been some show of argument remaining to Mr. Gowan, and perhaps we should have been forced to answer, as in the case of Lower Canada, that the measures of the majority were unjustifiable and tyrannical. But we have in this case a triumphant argument. The people were appealed to, and upon their decision being pronounced, the enemies of British rule rose in rebel-

lion. The rebellion was crushed by the loyalty of the Upper Canadian Yeomanry,—but alas! though they formed the majority of the Upper Canadians, the expense was borne by England!

Next let us examine the case of American Sympathy, in the discomfiture and expulsion of which Mr. Gowan bore a part that does him more honour than his present course, and that imprinted on his person the marks of the friendship of the United States. Does Mr. Gowan seriously mean to assert that Responsible Government would, without expense, have driven the marauders from Prescott, or Sandwich? Would it have armed our Militia? Would it have garrisoned our frontier? Would it have frightened the Buccaneer Johnson, McLeod, Sutherland, Theller, and their outlaw myrmidons?—Would it have defended the Disputed Territory below, and expelled the lumber pirates from the Aroostook? Would it have saved Ussher from the murderer's rifle, or kept Assassins out of Cobourg? The public may be persuaded to believe strange things, but it requires too great a stretch of credulity to believe that the American Culture, which casts his greedy eyes upon what he views as the dying struggles of Canada, would be scared from his prey by the terror of Lord Durham's Report, or the threat of a Responsible Government.

But after all, let us recapitulate Mr. Gowan's quotations and authorities, which he pronounces "conclusive," and "not to be doubted!" We find Admiral Coffin cutting the tow rope, and setting the Colonies adrift. Does this mean Responsible Government or Separation? We find Mr. Warburton and Sir Henry Parnell recommending the negotiation of a peaceable SEPARATION. Is this Responsible Government? In truth it is. And there is not a single word said in all this branch of Mr. Gowan's argument, that does not make a cut at the tow rope as conclusively as the gallant Admiral did in his place in the British House of Commons.

We shall conclude this article by assuming one of Mr. Gowan's statements, (which, by the way, is utterly without foundation,) namely, that the boon of Responsible Government has been granted to New Brunswick, and by asking the question, Has this prevented the extraordinary expenses which, according to Mr. Gowan's argument, are an intolerable burden to England? Did this Responsible Government keep the American marauders out of a British Province? Is not the maintenance of British power there, one of the subjects which give rise to the most substantial apprehension of war in the only shape in which it can be really formidable? Can we charm the Republicans of Maine, charm we never so wisely, with our Responsible Government? Are there any means of avoiding the expense of maintaining British authority in that Province, but abandonment and separation?

So much for Mr. Gowan's first question. The rest are fully as capable of a solution as the one we have now noticed; and, in a short time, we may think it right to meet them with a summary answer.

In the last and present numbers we have occupied a very large portion of our columns with discussing the question of Responsible Government. Our more serious friends may perhaps consider that, by taking such a course, we are becoming too secular in our editorial character; but to meet the contingency of such a remark, we must be permitted to observe that, though our best efforts are due to the Church, we are also bound to take sling and pebble in hand, and do battle for the State, when menaced by any political Goliath.

Impressed with this conviction, we have assailed the project of Responsible Government, because we consider it as just the same in effect as separation from the Mother Country; and, in doing so, we have acted in concert with our cotemporaries of the Conservative Press, whose ill-requited labours we are happy to perceive are beginning to disabuse the public mind of the fallacies with which it has been so actively plied. Having now contributed our humble assistance towards the producing this salutary change of opinion,—yet at the same time having endeavoured to provide a select variety of religious and miscellaneous Ecclesiastical matter,—we shall return to our custom of devoting a larger editorial space to matters more immediately and apparently connected with our venerable Church.

Our agents and friends will greatly oblige us by making remittances as soon as possible.

ECCLESIASTICAL INTELLIGENCE.

The shareholders of the Brighton railway, following the excellent example afforded by several other railway companies, have voted £100 per annum towards the support of three clergymen, who are to go among the labourers employed on their line, and impart to them religious instruction. This is in itself a very pleasing circumstance; but another very gratifying circumstance remains to be stated—the vote, which was passed in consequence of an application from the Church Pastoral Aid Society, was moved by a member of the Society of Friends, Mr. Cash, who expressed himself warmly in its favour.

FULHAM.—A meeting was lately held of the inhabitants of the district of All Saints in this parish, in order to consider of the expediency of enlarging the church, an object which for some time has been greatly wanted. The Bishop of London was in the chair. It appeared, however, that the estimates prepared for the work were so expensive in proportion to the increased accommodation that would be gained, and that the difficulty was so great of removing many of the inconveniences of the present building, that the general opinion of the meeting was adverse to the measure; and it was agreed, on the proposal of the bishop (who headed the subscription with a liberal offer of £500), to attempt to raise a fund adequate to the erection on the same site of a new, larger, and more commodious church. The old and unjustly admired tower will remain. Before the meeting was adjourned, £1650 had been subscribed, and there is good reason to hope that within a short time the whole sum required will be obtained without having recourse to any rate.

Her Majesty the Queen Dowager has presented to the parish of Teddington, which abuts on Bushy Park, £100 towards the erection of a parsonage house.

HARROW SCHOOL.—Joseph Neeld, Esq. M. P., one of the Governors of Harrow School, has presented a very handsome altar-piece, by West, to the new chapel for the use of the school. The first examination of the scholars just finished by Mr. Neeld at Harrow will take place at Christmas next.

The Hon. Mr. Justice Ball attended Divine Service in the Roman Catholic chapel of this town on Sunday. This is the first time since the Reformation that such a circumstance has occurred in this part of the country.—Rosemon Journal.

A Roman Catholic church was opened at Everingham in a style of splendour unequalled in England. The building cost £30,000, and the procession of bishops and clergy, with the Pope's banners and the host elevated, was more splendid than ever witnessed before in modern days in this country.—Sheffield Iris.

THE VICAR OF BRADFORD.—The Liverpool Courier has the following reference to Dr. Scrooby:—"The reverend gentleman was, it will be recollected, once commander of a Greenland-man. After quitting the deck, he entered the pulpit; and, for several years, was minister of the Mariners' Floating Church, in George's Dock, Liverpool."

The inhabitants of Oldswinford and the gentry of the neighbourhood have subscribed upwards of £4000 towards building a new church in that parish.—Hereford Journal.