

## Canadian Churchman.

THURSDAY, MAY 26, 1853.

## NOTICE.

As it is our desire to give a detailed report of the various important proceedings of the ensuing week, the next number of our sheet will not appear till the week following. This arrangement is adopted to enable us to present our readers not only with a continuous, but with a more accurate report than in other circumstances could be produced. The Church Society, and Trinity College number, of the *Canadian Churchman*, will contain an additional quantity of matter, and persons desiring extra copies are requested to transmit their orders to the publisher on or before Thursday next.

## DIOCESAN CHURCH SOCIETY.

The annual meeting of our Diocesan Church Society, takes place, it will be remembered, on Wednesday first. There will be prayers in the Church of the Holy Trinity at 1 o'clock p. m. and the meeting will be constituted immediately thereafter in St. James' parochial school house.

On Thursday, the Hon. the Chief Justice Robinson will be installed Chancellor of the University of Trinity College. The proceedings will commence at 10 o'clock a. m.,—and at 3 o'clock p. m. the same day, an adjourned meeting of the Church Society will be held.

It is unnecessary, we are persuaded, for us to urge a large attendance of the Clergy and Laity of the Diocese of Toronto, on the above interesting and most important occasions. The iniquitous Bill which has just passed the Imperial Parliament, renders it imperative upon every true hearted Canadian Churchman, to devote a fourfold share of his attention to the interests of our beloved communion.

We may add, that much interesting information may be looked for from the Venerable the Archdeacon of York, and Dr. McMurray, regarding their recent missions to Great Britain, and the United States, in behalf of Trinity College.

Tickets of admission to witness the ceremony of the installation may be obtained by the Clergy from the Secretary of the Church Society.

## THE CLERGY RESERVES.

We copy from the *English Churchman* the following able, and convincing letter addressed by the Venerable the Archdeacon of York to the Lord Bishop of Oxford, in reference to the part which the latter took in the House of Peers, in the discussion of the Clergy Reserves Bill. Whatever may be the ultimate fate of the endowments whose confiscation is clamoured for by creed-scourning demagogues, it is satisfactory to reflect, that the interests of the Church have been zealously and effectively attended to.

April 20, 1853.

TO THE LORD BISHOP OF OXFORD.

My Lord,—Your Lordship's skill in debate, and great eloquence must seriously damage any cause against which they are unhappily exerted. Both, to the great surprise and grief of thousands, were employed in a late discussion in the House of Lords on the Canada Clergy Reserves Bill, against the view which, on that momentous question, is entertained by the Bishops and Clergy—I venture to say without an exception—in Canada, and, with the abatement of a very inconsiderable fraction, by all the Lay members of the Church in that colony.

Your Lordship's sentiments on the religious bearing of this question cannot possibly differ from our own: as a Christian Bishop, you would better describe than I can the duty of upholding religion by a stated endowment, and the peril to that truth which our Church inculcates in leaving its support and propagation to the spontaneous good-will and natural partiality which men may feel for it. Your Lordship has often shown that the first is lawful, right and dutiful; and proved too, on many occasions, that the voluntary system in religion is neither Scriptural nor practicable.

With these convictions we could not for a moment doubt that the maintenance of the Clergy Reserves in Canada as a religious endowment, has your conscientious and genuine support. But

another question arises—whether, in consequence of the concession to Canada of the privilege of self-government in all matters of local interest and concern, the demand of its Parliament for unrestricted legislation upon the property of the Reserves is one which in justice can be resisted. In the belief that such a demand is equitable and reasonable, your Lordship in Parliament gives your support to the bill which Her Majesty's Government have introduced for placing the Clergy Reserves, without control, in the hands of the Legislature of that colony; with the almost certainty, on all hands acknowledged, that the effect of this concession will be the entire alienation of this property from the sacred purpose for which it was originally set apart.

Your Lordship's course as an independent Peer of Parliament must always command respect; but an honest surprise and natural grief will be felt and expressed by us who are to be the sufferers by this measure, that a Christian Bishop should be found to give priority to the political over the religious aspect and bearing of this question, so essentially connected with the welfare of an important branch of the Church of God. We deeply feel this regret, and we venture to give it utterance, because we have been accustomed, in our distant land, to regard the Prelates of our Mother Church as the natural guardians of our rights, and to consider that they would always be amongst the foremost to interpose the shield of defence when unrighteous efforts are made to despoil us of the means by which the faith and ministrations of our beloved Church may there be permanently secured. And we should be bold enough to express our hope that, where a Prelate of the Church discerns an antagonism between the religious and political bearing of a question affecting the welfare of the Church, he would at least abstain from supporting the political view to the destruction of the religious. That would be the universal expectation amongst a quarter of a million of Churchmen in Canada; and they will be mortified and grieved indeed to discover that, instead of this reasonable silence, the eloquent voice of the Bishop of Oxford has been raised in support of that political view of expediency, which, if carried out, must give a fatal blow to the extension and permanence of the faith which they so affectionately cherish.

In upholding what I shall not refrain from calling a bad cause, arguments will generally be resorted to which will not bear a very critical examination. Your Lordship said in that debate that "You should be one of the most inconsistent of men, if, having condemned altogether the opposition which was made in the last session of Parliament by the then Secretary of State for the Colonies to any attempt practically to give that power in spiritual things to the Colonies, you now joined in the cry that, in giving a parallel power in matters temporal, we were doing anything short of a direct act of justice." Now, my Lord, this plea and comparison are entirely deprived of their force, when the fact is recollected that the power in spiritual things designed to be conceded last year to the Colonies was a power to the members of the Church of England, and to them alone, to regulate their own ecclesiastical affairs, with a due regard to the supremacy of the Crown, and all other established rights and usages, in such manner as might best conduce to the welfare of the Church within the same. The Bill now before Parliament, which unfortunately receives your Lordship's support, is to yield to the opponents, we may add the hereditary enemies, of the Church of England the power to legislate, without control or restriction, upon property which by law and the right of possession belongs to the Church. The parallel, therefore, does not hold; what would be simple justice in the one case would be direct spoliation in the other.

Your Lordship, I am bold enough to say, fails in adducing a single argument to show that the Canadian Legislature have a shadow of right to demand the control over the Clergy Reserves, or a single word to prove that this property is not by law and equity exempt from this jurisdiction by an anterior adjudication and settlement of the whole question. The plea of want of finality in all human legislation, has no moral support: it is begotten generally not by a sense of the right of things, but by what a popular and often dangerous impulse may insist upon: it is one which if shifted, with equal facility, to other great questions must endanger the throne and threaten destruction to our national faith. The right conceded in the Constitutional Act of 1791 to the Legislature of Canada to "vary or repeal" its provisions, was by the testimony of the judges of the land, only prospective; and the self-government, on the larger scale which of late years has been enjoyed, was conceded after the period in which a final, and what was intended to be an irrevocable, settlement of this Church question, was made. What, then, becomes of the plea of consistency, so steadily asserted, in throwing this property into their hands? What of the plea of justice, which appears to be the only plausible ground upon which the surrender is proposed to be made?

*Fiat justitia, ruat cælum*, is a heathen adage which your Lordship adduces in support of the course which, in this Church question, you have been pleased to pursue. All we ask is the fair, and faithful, and courageous application of that rule. Let justice come, we say, however terrible be the consequences. Let justice be done to the Church and to Protestant Christianity, even if the threat—which every body knows to be an impracticable threat—should be carried out, that the Province of Canada will disown the supremacy of this empire unless the control of the Clergy Reserves be vested in its Legislature.—Let truth prevail, and faith be kept; let trusts be maintained and guarantees respected, though the

enemy should come in like a flood to destroy them all.

There must be some point at which Imperial surrender must cease; some defined line to mark out the distinction between a colony and the parent state; something to maintain, if not the filial dependence of the former, at least the parental supremacy of the latter. Let it be recognized here, in the maintenance of Imperial control over a property which is strictly its own—the purchase of its blood and treasure, before an inhabitant existed, of those who now demand the disposal of the whole. The parent, during his lifetime, does not usually make over his property to his children, to the total deprivation of himself; and the Imperial Government should not surrender its whole right to its property within a Colony, unless it is prepared to affirm that the entire independence of that Colony is henceforth conceded. Rather let the Canadian Legislature be told, mildly, yet firmly, that this was from the first your own property; that it was more than sixty years ago set apart for a particular use, the Propagation of Protestant Christianity; that, in accordance with that first allotment, its revenues have been in part transferred to various religious bodies; that the maintenance of religion by a fixed and inalienable provision is an established principle of our constitution; and that you will not shift this sacred trust, where there is not even a practical ground for the transfer, to other and uncertain hands: do this, and take the word of every loyal and reasonable man in Canada, there will be no resistance to the Imperial determination.

Be no party here to such a surrender; avert the injustice to the Church in Canada, and avoid the danger of the precedent to the Church in England. If the Colony should insist upon this concession, and even make the declaration of their independence the alternative of your refusal, rather take this alternative than risk the responsibility and incur the peril which must grow out of it to the most sacred institutions of this land. There must be a time to stop, for the time will come at last when you will be obliged to make the resistance; and rather stop with the maintenance of an ancient and solemn national principle, than yield at last when the great moral safeguard is gone, which the protection and encouragement of the principles of our holy Church would have secured.

Your Lordship, with that charitable indulgence which befits your station, expresses the hope that, when once the boon of self-government in the disposal of the Clergy Reserves is conceded, the Canadian Legislature will be fair and liberal in their dealing, and assure to the Church the justice that she so irresistibly claims. There is just a possibility that it will be so; but the late dealing of that Legislature with ecclesiastical questions forbids that hope. The Common School law in Canada, except in the case of Roman Catholics, makes no recognition of religion; only three years ago, an University, after its royal Charter had been recklessly set at naught, was wholly stripped of its religious character; and the cry in many quarters is supported by motives of interest with those who care comparatively little about religion, that this church property should be wholly applied to the support of ordinary and secular education. We have little, then, in past legislation in the Colony, to encourage the belief that there would be much respect paid, in the future allotment of this property, to its first great object, the dissemination of Christianity.

*Ruat cælum*.—When this calamity comes as the result of a spurious justice, there will be an overturn indeed of all that is sacred and holy—a waste and barrenness again in our wilderness, when it had begun to rejoice and blossom. There, as vacancies occur—when, from time to time, the toil-worn laborer has gone to his rest—the bereaved flock will look in vain for a Pastor to continue his faithful ministrations. In our distant and scattered settlements, where the people are poor and too much separated to concentrate their energies, when their Pastor is called to his Heavenly reward, there we shall witness year after year the closing of Churches—congregations scattered—the once faithful and steadfast shifted about by every wind of strange doctrine—and many for very peace sake, tempted at last to throw themselves into the bosom of an assumed infallible Church, or in very despair giving themselves up to a reckless infidelity.

The spiritual desolation which looms too distinctly in the future, should this unwise measure be carried out, was experienced in its full bitterness by the Church in the United States after the successful revolt of the colonies. And if now there is a godly array of Bishops and Clergy in that vast territory, and many thousands of the Laity who gladly seek their ministrations, let it be recollected that as a consequence of an inadequate stated provision for religion in that country, and the confiscation of much that had been supplied the members of the Church in the United States number only one twenty-fifth of the whole population. That the Church there has no nationality, no universally-felt influence or widely diffused power, is further evident from the fact that millions of its inhabitants are the prey of most extravagant sects, and even millions profess no religious faith whatsoever.

And this is what is destined for Canada, should the present measure of Government become law: this is the wreck, and ruin, and desolation which must follow upon the maintenance of a hollow, and delusive, and unsubstantiated plea of justice.

Having been for nearly thirty years a labourer in the Church in Canada, and identified with its best interests, with a knowledge that cannot be questioned, of what the Church and Churchmen there require—with an experience which there cannot have been many better opportunities of acquiring, of the public opinion of that country,—I do not shrink from telling your Lordship that

the Bill now before Parliament for conveying the Clergy Reserves to the Legislature of Canada, and of which your Lordship is a supporter, is not by members of the Churches of England and Scotland only, but by thousands of right-thinking and sound hearted men of other religious persuasions, unhesitatingly denounced as unwise, unrighteous, and striking at the root of true religion in that country.

I have the honor to be, my Lord,  
Your Lordship's obedient and faithful serv't,  
A. N. BETHUNE, Archdeacon of York, Canada.

## THE JEW BILL.

As shortly intimated in a former number, this most objectionable, and anti-Christian measure has been rejected by the House of Peers. Would that that illustrious body had acted with a corresponding regard to principle, when legislating upon the Clergy Reserves! As the *English Churchman* pertinently observes, the "noble House has barely done its duty in one respect; in another it has violated its trust as a part of the Imperial legislature, on a question which in spite of the Bishop of Oxford and Mr. Gladstone, is an Imperial one."

The debate did not present any fresh features of interest. As specimens of the manner in which the promoters of the Bill advocated their views, we may simply refer to the speeches of Lord Albemarle, and the Archbishop of Dublin. In justification of the measure the former quoted the example of "that great protestant prince, Oliver Cromwell!" and placed the present opposition to the Jews in the same category as the ancient prejudices of Englishmen against the Scots. The Archbishop, again, contended, that the qualifications of their nominee ought to be created by the electors; and that the right of election involved an unrestricted choice. Carry out this theory, and a constituency would be justified in selecting a representative from amongst the demented tenants of Bedlam!

His Grace of Dublin, further alluded to the ground taken by the opponents of the Bill, that to take away this last bar which operated for the exclusion of Jews from Parliament, argued an indifference of religion, and thus tried to confute the objection. He said, "if that argument were a sound one, and he were asked whether in admitting Roman Catholics and dissenters to Parliament he was indifferent to protestantism and to the Church to which he belonged, he did not know what answer he should give." We think that so accomplished a logician as the Right Rev. Prelate confessedly is, would have no difficulty whatever in returning a satisfactory reply to such a question. The real matter at issue is, ought a Christian nation to tolerate as legislators, those who openly, and *ex animo* deny Christ before men. There was something so solemn and arousing in the speech of the Earl of Winchelsea—so much of the high toned principle which ought ever to characterise the British Senator, that we willingly transfer it to our sheet:—

"The Earl of Winchelsea held that the question before the House was, whether it was incumbent on a Christian Legislature and a Christian people to alter the Parliamentary oaths for the purpose of admitting to the Legislature those who denied the Saviour. What had been the cause of the heavy judgments which had fallen on the Jewish people, but their unbelief in so denying the Saviour? The question, however, had been stated as one involving freedom of election. But were there not restrictions, such as that of age, imposed on persons seeking admission to Parliament, as well as the restriction which was imposed by the words of the oath of abjuration? all that the opponents of the Bill asked was that the Christian character of a Christian Legislature should remain. The Jews still remained a distinct and peculiar people. It was a fearful act in the face of Heaven which was contemplated by the Bill. The Jews could not be admitted to make our laws because they denied the very foundation on which those laws rested; and if their Lordships consented to this measure, a most severe blow would be inflicted on the religious interests of the country. If the measure were to be carried by the votes of the Right Rev. Bench—if ever the day should arrive when the Right Rev. Prelate abandoned the sacred duty of supporting Christian interests, they might depend upon it that the day would arrive when the country would cry out, and justly cry out, for the separation of Church and State, and they would no longer occupy the situation they held within the walls of that House. If that day arrived, and, under the circumstances he had stated, that question were mooted, he should heart and soul, support such a measure. On the ground he had stated he should oppose the attempt now made on the part of the other House of Parliament to unchristianize the Government of this country."

## Correspondence.

## THE PROTESTANTISM OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

To the Editor of the *Canadian Churchman*.

STR.—Mr. Neale further charges Protestants with using the word "in a different sense from that in which the sixteenth century employed it," because we call all who separated from Rom.