



## CHARGE

To the Clergy and Churchwardens of the Archdeaconry of York, at a Visitation holden at Thornhill, on Thursday, April 22; at Hamilton, on Tuesday, April 27; and at London, on Thursday, April 29, 1852; by the Ven. A. N. BETHUNE, D.D., Archdeacon of York.

Concluded from our last.

## REV. BRETHREN, AND MR. CHURCHWARDENS:

How completely, my brethren, do facts like these disprove the arguments that are, in these days, so loosely and recklessly advanced against an established and national provision for religion! How entirely do they overturn the allegation, so wildly put forth, and so strangely credited, that a national provision for God's Church is a national sin; and that, by such an application of the worldly resources of a people, a national curse is provoked, rather than a blessing ensured! What God has thus appointed, must surely be right—State endowments for religion, or call them by what name we will, cannot be wrong, when enforced thus explicitly and positively by a Divine command.

God, it is evident, settled this amongst His ancient people for the consolidation and perpetuation of His Church in all after times, rather than because it was demanded by present wants or circumstances. At the time when the whole economy of the Church was thus regulated and completed, we should hardly imagine amongst the people of Israel an indisposition to make bountiful and sufficient offerings for the service of their heavenly Benefactor. It was a time in which they were under the influence of continual miracles—when signs and wonders were being wrought perpetually for their deliverance; a time in which, of all others, the voluntary system would have worked prosperously. Yet, God, nevertheless, for the benefit of His Church in all future ages, fixed for it a permanent endowment. And we can understand, that where a completeness of organization was settled for the State, it would be derogatory to, and a slight of God, if the same care and pains were not given to the structure of His Church. The comparison would, at no time, be advantageous, if men should see an orderly and systematic, and well-balanced arrangement of what was to contribute to their temporal welfare; but what affected their souls' interests and pertained to them as immortal beings, left to individual impulse or caprice. The contrast would, at no time, be edifying or beneficial, if the State—of man's erection and for man's welfare, as a mortal being,—should exhibit every care and liberal provision; while the Church of God's appointment and for God's honour, should be left like a child in the wilderness, without position or resting-place, to be sustained by a passing charity, and with nothing but the impulse of a sympathetic benevolence to keep it from famishing.

3. It is strange that Christian men should be found speaking against the lawfulness of State endowments for religion, and asserting that they are in contravention of the Divine command, with such facts as these before them. But, they will argue, this was a condition of things applicable to the Jewish economy, and not calculated for the purity and simplicity of the Christian dispensation. We are bound, however, to affirm in reply, that if the principle be correct in the one case, it cannot be inapplicable in the other: there is nothing in the nature of things which can justify the distinction that is alleged to exist between the two. We might be affected by such a presumed distinction, if we discovered in the New Testament one word prohibitory of that principle—one word there which went to say or teach that public appropriations for religion were, under the Gospel, not to be made. We must infer, indeed, quite the reverse from several facts and incidental statements in the New Testament itself. We read there of the existence in the earliest days of Christianity, of a common fund for charitable and ecclesiastical purposes; because a voluntary and impulsive generosity—giving to-day, and withholding to-morrow—was not deemed effectual to that end. Moreover, we find St. Paul frequently speaking of the obligation of Christians in this respect, in a way that assures us that the analogy with the Jewish dispensation was meant to be kept up: for example this, "The Lord hath ordained, that they who preach the Gospel should live by the Gospel;" that is, peremptorily and positively, and not as a whim or mere feeling might dictate. It does not appear to be left to individual liberty or choice; but a constraint and obligation, by a Divine ordinance, is imposed.

And if we should not find, in the New Testament, any very express directions, or any formal arrangements, upon this point, it was from the same cause that minute directions upon some other subjects were omitted there,—because it was unnecessary to be thus explicit. It was unnecessary to inform men, in a minute and detailed manner, of the way in which they were to maintain the ministers of the Church; because, from all antecedent rule and custom, they were sufficiently instructed in that duty. They would naturally act upon that rule, and carry it out fully, as soon as it was in their power to do so. And history teaches us that they did so. When circumstances warranted, gifts increased. The "common fund" became, in time, a systematic organization: individuals or congregations did not act upon separate impulses, but all their gifts and offerings flowed into this common treasury. And that it might have this common aspect and influence, the Bishop of each Diocese was placed in charge of it,—to be allotted and distributed, under his direction and according to his judgment, for the maintenance of the ministry and other ecclesiastical objects. Here, then, was an endowment; the best which, under circumstances, Christians could make. Those were days of persecution, when such concentrated or tangible pro-

perty as landed reservations, for instance, would,—as is unhappily the case now,—very speedily be seized upon, to gratify the spite of pagan priests or satisfy a private cupidity.

The case was different when the Emperors became Christians, and when Christian influence, from the vastly increased number of converts, was extended far and wide. Then gifts and offerings were proportionally larger, and the ancient rule of maintaining religion by specific appropriations of a tenth, or even more, not only came to be universally acted upon amongst Christians, but received the sanction of law, and was made binding in a fixed and unalterable way.

4. It was, my brethren, in accordance with the sacred principle always believed in, and acted upon, until comparatively a very late period, that a provision was made here, in this Province, for the steady and permanent maintenance of the blessings of religion as taught and diffused by the National Church. In devising a new Constitution for this Province, care was taken that its religious welfare should be provided for,—that means should be set apart by which the teaching of Christian truth, through all time, should be ensured. If we are correct in saying, that the Clergy Reserves in this Province were the gift of that excellent monarch George the Third, because he sanctioned the appropriation with all the heartiness which befitted a Christian and virtuous king; we are equally right in saying that they were the gift of the British nation, declared by a solemn enactment of the House of Lords and Commons. It was not a mere act of the Royal prerogative, but the joint work of the three branches of the Imperial Legislature.

I need not review the question of right as touching this property, nor the hard struggles and fierce contests to which it has given rise. It is needless now to do so, because a settlement of the protracted dispute has long since been effected by Imperial legislation; for whatever may have been our conscientious objections to the Act of 1840, the Church of England in this Province with one voice accepted the decision which it made of the "vexed question," and regarded it as a final adjudication of the whole dispute. It was also generally believed that the public mind would now for ever be at rest upon this matter, and that we should henceforth enjoy the priceless blessing of religious peace. But we have been disappointed. Worldly politics, and the anti-Christian schemes and unscrupulous devices into which a war of party disputes, combining so many temptations to personal aggrandizement, are wont to drive men who engage warmly in them, opened again this question to the heat and strife of the worst days of the past.

The Church could not stand still in the warfare that raged around her; but, with gentle mien and forbearing temper, assumed her strong shield of faith, and her invincible weapons of truth. The conflict, through the blessing of heaven, has thus far not been detrimental to her, nor shaken her in the least from her position of strength. The recent appeal to the country,—backed, on the part of the enemies of the Church, with every calumny that could excite the popular prejudice against her,—has resulted in a considerable gain in the number of her zealous friends in the popular branch of the Legislature, and the significant exclusion of those who, during the last two years, had, in our Legislative Assembly, taken the prominent lead against her.

5. The most unhappy and repulsive feature in this recent agitation is the  *motive*  by which those profess to be actuated who have been the most forward in it. It has not been a mere strife of sect, nor a jealousy as to the manner of partition; it was not the claiming by one of what was considered to be too largely held by another; no honest rivalry, as we might call it, as to which religious body should have it in their power to effect most good by means of this public provision. No; but, in opposition to all Divine Revelation, in contravention of all Christian practice, the declared motive and the industrious effort has been to alienate this property entirely from religion, and separate it from every use that might bear upon the welfare of the Church of God.

The plea is,—and that will catch the fancy, because it affects the personal interests of many,—that the property, called Clergy Reserves, should be appropriated for the benefit of general education; for the wider extension of that knowledge, which, without the sanctifying influence of religion, only increases man's capacity and power to do mischief. But, taking up the arguments of the mere utilitarian, if an education merely for the work and enterprises of the world be important,—and we do not deny it—should not efforts incomparably greater be made to secure a religious education,—an education for the soul and for immortality? Is it not a general admission, that we should never get on, in law or jurisprudence, or in the commerce of life, without the application, in some way and to some extent, of a moral and religious restraint. We are obliged, in many things connected with the transactions of life, to rely upon the force of conscience; in many cases, to depend upon the solemn value attached to an oath. But where would be the efficacy or meaning of an oath without a religious conviction? How soon would its solemnity disappear, and itself become a mere word and formality, if there should be no engrafted religious belief? We depend, then, as a people, upon the value attached to religious obligations; and we virtually affirm, as with one voice, that such obligations are to be taught, and urged, and deepened, and diffused. And yet persons, avowing this very conviction, will recklessly fling away the means for maintaining and perpetuating the knowledge of these obligations, and even rob the Church of God—the appointed agent for upholding and diffusing them,—of the heritage assigned her for that very end.

6. While such, my brethren are the devices,

and such the open warfare against us, it does not become us to be passive or silent. It appears, in this emergency, to be most desirable that each parish should exhibit, in its leading members, at least, an organisation which would be ready for any action when danger is threatened, and where constitutional resistance is imperatively called for. Combination and union for the protection and welfare of the Church is, under such circumstances, not only justifiable but necessary.

7. There is nothing, in this warfare against our sacred cause which has distressed us more than the fact that a British statesman should, for an instant, have countenanced this popular delusion, or have uttered a word that could favour a scheme of spoliation so entirely at variance with the spirit of the British constitution, and so adverse to the teaching of God's holy word. We shall remember that this lamentable concession was not made without some words of accompanying regret, but these were neither pointed nor strong, and the sacrifice of what should be held most sacred, was ready, it appears, to be made.—But let us hope that due reflection upon the injustice, the grievous sin, of such an abandonment of a property on which the spiritual welfare of millions may depend, will only confirm the resolution and make the determination irrevocable, never, while British faith and justice can claim to be respected, to divert one acre of those lands, or of one shilling of their revenue, from the sacred cause to which they have been assigned. We cannot, for an instant, admit the plea that the people of this country may, of right, deal as they please with this property; because it is not now a public property, but one solemnly set apart, and specially dedicated to holy uses: it has for years been employed, in part at least, for religious purposes; and it cannot, without the most flagrant violation of justice, be diverted from such uses, unless it can be proved that it has been perverted to objects hostile to the State, and such as threaten to overturn the moral order or social peace of the country. Nor have we any confidence in the assertion that the Parliament of this country are the best judges of the manner in which this property should be applied any more than that they have the best right to make such an appropriation of it as they may deem expedient. We doubt the one while we deny the other. We doubt the fairness and soundness of the judgment which would be affected by local prejudices, narrow partialities or aversions, and popular impulse and agitation.—And we emphatically deny the right to be inherent, as they contend, in a mere section of the inhabitants of a great Empire. Often, when our worldly interests are concerned, and the bearings of trade and commerce are discussed, we claim to be esteemed and treated as part and parcel of the Empire,—like the inhabitants of one of the counties of England. Let the claim, then, of our fellow subjects in Great Britain and Ireland be treated as reciprocal: let the privilege be conceded to them which we ask for ourselves. Let the principle be admitted and acted upon, that the Clergy Reserves are not the property merely of the inhabitants of this Province, but of the Empire at large,—on the high ground of constitutional right, and for weighty practical reasons also. Our Province is receiving continual accessions of population from the Mother country, and those emigrants, we contend, have a right to every existing privilege in the Colony. It were, therefore, on the part of this Province, an arbitrary assumption of right to make laws or statutes which would abridge them of any such privilege,—of that high religious privilege, especially, which might be thought to reconcile them most to their expatriation from their native land. To alienate this property, then, would be to dispose of that, for some temporal and selfish advantage, which belongs to the millions of our fellow subjects in the United Kingdom, as much as to ourselves. And more,—to alienate this property, would be to deal in a most high-handed and arbitrary way with an inheritance which belongs as much to posterity as to the present generation. It has come to us, emphatically, with an entail,—stamped and bound as such by the most solemn pledges and engagements: and we should be in the last degree presumptuous and unrighteous in exercising a fraud upon, and a palpable injury of posterity, by destroying of our own free will that entail.

Our neighbours in the United States appear to deal more sacredly and righteously with such questions. With them it is held to be unconstitutional to interfere with property conveyed to corporate bodies in trust for sacred purposes. It would be mortifying, if we should be forced to place British justice in unfavourable contrast with republican integrity.

III. But while we contend for a provision for the maintenance of religion which shall be beyond the reach of hazard and uncertainty,—beyond the capriciousness and risk of the voluntary system, as that is now commonly understood and acted upon; we must not, my brethren, under-rate, or feel ourselves relieved from, the obligations which that system, legitimately viewed, undoubtedly comprehends. Christians, it will hardly be denied, are under a constraint just as strong as were the Jews to contribute of their substance to the cause of God; and there is nothing in the force or claims of the Gospel dispensation so low or inferior in comparison of that of the law, as to make us hesitate about the duty of giving at least as large a proportion of that substance now, as they were required to do then. It matters not whether this be an obligation forced upon us by the letter of the law of the land, or not: we are compelled to its exercise by the law of conscience and the law of God.

I. And here, first, let us accurately understand what is the nature and origin of the law of the land upon the subject, where such law exists. Kings and private individuals, out of a property which was undeniably their own, solemnly dedicated to God that proportion of its fruits or revenue

which, from the beginning of time, appears to have been rendered back to the great Giver by the temporary earthly proprietor. That special consecration, made voluntarily and rightly by themselves, they rendered permanent and perpetual by the sanction of law: they bound upon their posterity,—upon all who should hereafter be the possessors of that property,—the same appropriation for pious or charitable uses: it went down from generation to generation with that well-understood and acknowledged entail of one-tenth for God and his Church. Let none say, then that either individuals or the state have power to alienate that entailed appropriation; it is as much the property of God's Church, as the rent or revenue claimed by the owner of any ordinary estate from those to whom he may lease it.

2. But passing by this question, I contend that the obligation of some such appropriation for God's service, rests upon us all; and to our own Master we shall stand or fall, as we obey or neglect that duty. There is a beauty, too, in this voluntary exercise of the obligation to render our dues to God: in the free working of this part of charity, we are better testifying the influence of its whole grace in our hearts. And this indebted appropriation can be given fully and unostentatiously through the medium of the ordinary and long-established channels. It can be made through the annual pew-rent,—the offertory alms,—the direct contribution for the maintenance of ministers,—the fixed allotment to Church Institutions. Through all these it can be distributed fully and equitably. Yet, with the best intentions, there will be but a capricious and doubtful, and perhaps a scant appropriation to God's cause and service, if the rule of "laying by in store," be not acted upon rigidly and conscientiously. There must be an habitual reservation, a systematic setting apart of what thus belongs to God; else, when the claim is presented, and this most sacred of all dues is called for, it may not be ready, and there will be perchance a shuffling excuse, and at last the hard-hearted denial of the whole.

3. In speaking of the channels and agencies through which that bounty may be made to effect its pious end, I cannot refrain from mentioning specifically that valuable institution, the *Church Society*; in and through which the alms and offerings of Churchmen may be made to work in harmony for God's glory, and the welfare of our fellow Christians. But this Society has been too long and too well known amongst us, to require from me here any urgency of appeal in its behalf: it works for a large variety of pious and benevolent purposes; and if, like other institutions of human construction, and upon which human infirmity and temptation can be brought to bear, it should have its season of shadow and adversity, we shall rather help to dissipate the cloud than suffer the darkness or distress to accumulate and deepen around it. Earnestly, then, would I urge the formation of an Association in every parish or mission where one does not already exist,—the appointment annually of active officers,—and the steady and vigorous working of the whole machinery which the constitution furnishes. And I would venture to speak strongly on the duty incumbent upon all Clergymen in the Diocese to make the collections in its behalf, or for its trusts, as near as possible to the time when they are required in the announcements made by the authority of the Bishop. I mention this, because in glancing over the lists of periodical acknowledgments contained in the Annual Reports of the Society, we observe many cases in which, for one or other, or perhaps for all, of such objects, no collections have been made. I do not think, my reverend brethren, that we have here any discretionary power. Whether the object of the collection accords, or not, with our own private opinion of its fitness or importance, our duty as Clergymen appears to be positive and clear,—to set forth the claim to our people as directed, and leave the result to their own appreciation, by God's help and direction, of its value or urgency.

IV. We have spoken of spiritual destitution,—many desolate places in the land,—a vast moral desert, and bleak solitude around us: while, then, we turn our anxious thoughts to the means and resources for maintaining those who are to cultivate and till it, we are bound to look, with equal earnestness, for those who shall be the labourers in this wide and fruitless region. If we had, at this moment, boundless pecuniary means at our command, we have, confessedly, not the men on whose maintenance they could be expended. It is vain to be looking to the Mother Country for an adequate supply of labourers in our Colonial vineyard: we may, now and then, at long intervals and in scanty supply, obtain those who can bring us from our father-land the knowledge and the experience which there are there so many better opportunities of obtaining. But the children of the Church in the Mother Country are alive to their own wants now, in a degree which a quarter of a century ago was unknown: the Church there is, on every side, lengthening her cords and strengthening her stakes; and, therefore, there are but few to spare for work in the Lord's vineyard beyond the seas. Moreover, the richest endowments of learning acquired in the unrivalled Universities of the Mother Country,—the invaluable experience obtained by judicious and faithful training in her admirable parochial system,—the knowledge of mankind gathered from association with the high and gifted and excellent of the earth,—all these, if transported to our shores, would not alone, or at once, compensate for the want of that local experience which is so essential to ministerial success; that sympathy with the feelings and habits and wants of the country, without which the best zeal and the highest talents would have comparatively a barren exercise. While, then, for an adequate numerical supply of ministers, we must look chiefly to ourselves, we are bound to seek for them, and encourage them,







## Original Poetry.

SABBATH SONGS.  
No. 9.

Vox Populi; Vox Dei.

When Earth was young, and infant Time  
Brush'd the young flowers, in nature's prime,  
Upon the virgin sod,  
The young world soon grew old in blood,  
Till heaven in vengeance sent the flood,  
The people's voice brought them no good,  
Was it the voice of God?

As heaven its wrath on nature hurl'd,  
The frantic death-shriek of a world  
Sank gurgling in the tomb;  
Where was this mighty power hid then,  
This godlike voice of dying men,  
Alas! 'twas feeble, useless, when  
Earth met her fearful doom.

The people's voice on Shinar's plain,  
Bellowing with rage, belched forth again,  
To brave the chastening rod;  
But Babel's top ne'er reach'd the sky,  
A mightier voice spoke from on high,  
How powerless then the people's cry,—  
Which was the voice of God?

God's only Son, came from above,  
His mission peace—His labour love,  
Creation own'd his nod;  
Like fiends again the people cry,  
Condemn'd by this great voice to die,  
The Lord of all, they crucify,—  
Was that the voice of God?

It never stops the march of death,  
The people's voice!—it is but breath  
Evanishing in air;

It cannot clothe our fields with grain,  
The blasted ear restore again,  
Soothe the quick-throbbing pulse of pain,  
Or make the future fair:

Famine's wan cheek,—want's haggard look,—  
The step of age by palsy shook,—  
Yet o'er creation lower,  
Old earth still quakes,—fierce lightnings flash,—  
The frantic comets onward dash,—  
Empires fall prone with fearful crash,  
Unchecked by mortal power.

And when resigned to vengeful fire,  
Nature's last breath in flames expire,  
The people then shall call  
On rocks and mountains in affright,  
To shield them from the dreadful might,  
The burning gaze, the piercing sight  
Of the Great Judge of all.

The fatal creed then banish hence;  
The people's wit, the people's sense,  
Need the Almighty's care:  
No more the evil doctrine tell,  
But send it back with fiends to dwell  
And let it wither there!

WILLIAM OSBORN.

St. Catharine's, April 12th, 1852.

## Review.

**DAILY STEPS TOWARDS HEAVEN**; or practical thoughts on the Gospel History, and especially on the Life and Teaching of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, for every day in the year, according to the Christian seasons, with titles and characters of Christ; and a Harmony of the four Gospels. First American, from the third London edition. New York: Gen. Prot. Episcopal School Union; Toronto, Henry Rowsell, 1852.

When we say that this beautifully printed, and tastefully bound little volume completely realizes its title, nothing need be added by us in the shape of commendation. As our contemporary the *Calendar* observes "it is an admirable union of the outward form, and the inward spiritual life of the Gospel." The incarnate word, is the mighty theme which it celebrates. Christ in infancy and childhood—Christ in His passion—Christ in His glorious resurrection and ascension—Christ in the wonderful gifts which He shed down on His Church—Christ in His life, miracles, and doctrine.

Sincerely do we trust that "DAILY STEPS" will become as popular in this Colony, as it is in the Mother Country.

**THE COLONIAL CHURCH SOCIETY AND ITS ADVOCATES.**(From the *Colonial Church Chronicle*.)

Objecting altogether to the principles upon which the *Colonial Church and School Society* is founded, as being, in our judgment, subversive of the fundamental laws of Church order and Church government, we have of late more than once alluded to it in a spirit of fair and open controversy as every Society in this country must be prepared to confront, ought to confront, and will survive, if its constitution has within it a germ of life and health; for controversy, rightly defined, is the activity of the human intellect seeking truth by comparison and counter-reasoning, or proving such as it has already received; and in this sense controversy is frequently beneficial.

Our present concern, however, is not with the *Colonial Church and School Society*, widely as we differ from its principles and its conduct. The advocacy by which it has recently been supported is infinitely more deplorable than either. To that we turn for a moment with mingled feelings of sadness, and shame, and indignation. Had the advo-

cacy to which we refer consisted merely in the termagant vituperations of some clerical Thersites, or in the small oratory and ambitious but commonplace eloquence, warmed by the romance of Missions, which in general form the staple commodity of platform rhetoricians, it would not have been worth while, or worth the cost of ink and paper to notice it. But it is none of these. It is a grave, deliberate, solemnly asseverated charge of heresy—or worse, a nefarious plot to suppress Christianity—raised by the well known Mr. Close, of Cheltenham, against the Colonial Churches and the Colonial Bishops, with the exception of those in the British dependency of Hindostan, and in the West Indian Islands.

From the *Bristol Mirror* of Saturday, the 28th of February, 1852, it appears that the ninth annual meeting of the Bristol and Clifton Auxiliary, in connection with the *Colonial Church and School Society*, was held on the previous Monday at the Victoria Rooms, in the latter place; when the Rev. Francis Close, M. A., Perpetual Curate of St. Mary, Cheltenham, with another gentleman, attended as a deputation from the Parent Society. Mr. Francis Close seizes the opportunity—not to kindle in the hearts of his hearers a desire to co-operate with the *Colonial Church Society* in its endeavours to spread the Gospel in the Colonies; for such we presume to be the object which this Society has in view, but—to arraign the Church and its chief Pastors under the following indictment. We copy the newspaper report *verbatim* :—

"He felt deeply concerned to say what he was prepared to prove on oath before a Committee of the House of Commons, that from investigations he had made, and from facts that had come to his own knowledge, the Church of England in some of our Colonies—indeed, in all, with the exception of Hindostan [just as if Hindostan was a colony!] and the West Indies—was being worked for the suppression of Gospel truth and the extinction of vital religion." And the reporter goes on to record that those awfully wicked words of the man of God were received with "cheers" by well-to-do Christian citizens of Bristol, and by devout valetudinarians of Clifton.

But this is not all. Having by these adjurations excited the utterly antichristian passions of his auditory, Mr. Francis Close proceeds to hound them on to a copartnership in his sin by a reiteration of the charge: he said, "The Episcopate of the Colonies was being worked for the suppression of Gospel truth; and he would support the charge by one or two facts which cannot be denied."

It is to be hoped there are very few persons, at least outside the charmed circle of St. Mary, Cheltenham, prepared to accept Mr. Francis Close's statement as "facts." His Tasmanian "fact" is very satisfactorily, as well as very manfully disposed of by the Rev. John Philip Gell, for nine years a resident in Van Diemen's Land, and Chaplain to the maligned Bishop. The other fact is without name, date, or place, and therefore we defer the investigation of it until he produces these particulars in his evidence on oath before a Committee of the House of Commons. Before that Committee Mr. Francis Close has pledged himself, unless the reporter has misrepresented him, to prove on oath that the Church of England "was being worked"—(happy, graceful, and dignified phrase!) in sixteen out of twenty-four Colonial Dioceses "for the suppression of Gospel truth, and the extinction of vital religion."

Language such as this—uttered with an appearance of anxious sincerity, not by a headstrong, impetuous youth, but by an elderly clergyman in the heart of a great commercial city—language such as this cannot be excused as mere careless declamation, intended to convey only a general meaning. Mr. Francis Close, if not a powerful or correct, is at all events, an habituated speaker. He attends a meeting of a Society whose practice it is to supersede Bishops by the substitutions of "superintendents,"\* of its own appointment; and his facts he is prepared to prove on oath. What does all this, when fairly analysed, come to? Not less than this—that the Rev. Francis Close, M. A., Perpetual Curate of St. Mary, Cheltenham, being duly sworn upon the Holy Evangelists of God, saith as follows:—That George Augustus, Bishop of New Zealand, who has hitherto been esteemed a man not to hold his life dear unto himself, so that he might lift up to heathens and idolaters the Cross of his Saviour, and who has just been gathering, in a voyage of 4,000 miles, savage boys from the scattered islands of the Pacific, for the purposes of Christian instruction at Auckland, is nevertheless

\* For the benefit of those clergy who are disposed to transfer their natural allegiance from the authority which the Church, following the Holy Scripture, has set over them, to the "Lord's many," who are to govern them, in the name and on the behalf of the Colonial Church and School Society, we copy Mr. Close's views of Church government:—"For himself, he would say, he preferred the Colonial Church and School Society to the Propagation Society, because the latter, when it sent out missionaries and catechists to our Colonial possessions, contented itself with merely paying them their salaries, and leaving them entirely at the disposal of the Bishop of the diocese. That (Colonial) Society did the very reverse (no doubt of that). It said, We find the men and money, and we have a perfect right to know where our agents go, where they settle, what they are doing, and to maintain a direct communication with them."

laboring for the suppression of Gospel truth; and he further saith on oath, as aforesaid, that Charles, Bishop of Melbourne, who found three clergymen in his diocese, and has in about four years, planted twenty-four spiritual shepherds to feed the flock of Christ in that vast moral wilderness, is nevertheless laboring for the extinction of vital godliness; that Robert, Bishop of Capetown, who spent nine months in visiting the wild tribes of Caffirs and Zoolus, and has quadrupled the number of his missionary clergy since he took upon him the oversight of his diocese, is in league, offensive and defensive, with the great enemy of souls; that the Bishop of Newfoundland, the first to bring within the fold of Christ the Esquimaux, and the settlers on the coast of Labrador; that that devoted servant of his Master, David, Bishop of Rupert's Land, who is content to cut himself off from intercourse with civilized man, for the spiritual welfare of wandering Indian tribes; that the Bishop of Victoria in his Chinese College; the Bishop of Adelaide in his efforts to reclaim the Australian Aborigines; that these Bishops, and all their fellows in Canada and elsewhere, are severally and collectively, engaged in a gigantic conspiracy, with design and settled purpose to destroy the faith of Christ. This, and not less than this, is what Francis Close has undertaken to substantiate upon oath.

Is it to be endured that any man, however gifted, should be permitted to deal out denunciations and anathemas after this fashion? "Death and lives," saith the Hebrew sage, "are in the hand of the tongue;" and adopting this bold imagery, we ask, Can "the hand of the tongue" be levelled against the lives of Christian men, by a Christian man, with animosity more deadly than that with which Mr. Close has invested it? Long suffering indeed must the followers and flatterers of this fashionable preacher be, if, after this, they can listen to his enforcement of the obligations of truth, or bear without disgust his commendations of charity.

Now, when an ecclesiastical person of some notoriety, (credulous, as it may be, of the covert insinuations of a disaffected or disappointed Colonial clergyman,) not with the overflowing love which adorns his sacred calling, but almost with the prepense cruelty of an energumen, steps out of his own proper sphere to indulge in these "railing accusations," it is but natural to inquire what peculiar qualifications such an one possesses thus to constitute himself the *Delator* of men, who in a high sense have done the work of Evangelists, proving themselves to be ministers of God, not in word, but in deed? Have his missionary labors ever extended beyond the well-carpeted drawing-rooms of a fashionable watering-place? or his his journeyings penetrated beyond the trim lawns of a pump-room? Has he ever passed a night "in defence of the Gospel," with the earth for a pillow and the firmament of God for a coverlet? But which of our Colonial Bishops, from Rupert's Land to Ceylon, has not watched the rising and setting of the stars during the silent hour of darkness, encountering "perils in the wilderness," without a friend to share, and so divide the danger; only because the Pierced Hand has touched their hearts with the love of those for whom the Lord died? Has he ever encountered a storm more violent than those gentle airs roused by the rustling of silken gowns, and the approving becks and smiles of sentimental admirers? But which of our Colonial Bishops—which of them, even the least self-denying—has not traversed the ocean for many a weary league, in tempest and in calm, only that he might be counted worthy to suffer for the Kingdom of God? Let him whose closing words at Bristol were hailed with "loud cheers" by a thoughtless multitude—let him answer the questions when he next begs for mercy—that mercy which even violated charity will desire for him. Surely, of all mankind, one nurtured in the lap of luxury is the last who is entitled to besmirch the labors, and the zeal, and the self-denial, and the FAITH of those who have had grace freely to forsake all and follow Christ! It remains to be seen whether the Bishops of the East and West Indies will be content to put up with this invidious and equivocal compliment at the cost, and to the dishonor of their fellow-laborers in the vineyard. Only, if there be a fragrant of truth, justice, honor, and human friendship, remaining to this world of sin and sorrow, they who think this charge groundless will of a truth discountenance it. There are other points noticeable in this speech of Mr. Close; but the refutation of them is so palpable and patent that for the present we forbear. To enunciate his sin is to condemn it. In a few weeks, as a condign punishment, the sin and its shame will be published, through our pages, in every Colonial diocese, and in every diocese of the United States. Then impartial judges will decide upon Mr. Close's veracity; and they will tell us no doubt that the poor Church of England had better far be attacked by manly and upright foes,—"the radical or the infidel, the socialist or the dissenter,"—than by a "son," self-outlawed, who, if he can retain any rank at all in the Christian commonwealth, can only be assigned a lot among those who are somewhere described as unloving or without natural affection.

## EVERY DAY MYSTERIES.

"I believe nothing that I do not understand," is the favorite saying of Mr. Pettipo Dapperling, a gentleman who very much prides himself on his intellectual perspicacity. Yet ask Mr. Pettipo if he understands how it is that he wags his little finger, and he can give no reasonable account of it. He will tell you—for he has read books and "studied" anatomy—that the little finger consists of so many jointed bones, that there are tendons attached to them before and behind, which belong to certain muscles, and that when these muscles are made to contract, the finger wags. And this is nearly all that Mr. Pettipo knows about it. How it is that the volition acts on the muscles, what volition is, what the will is—Mr. Pettipo knows not. He knows quite a little about the sensation which resides in the skin of that little finger—how it is that it feels and appreciates forms and surface—why it detects heat and cold, in what way its papillæ erect themselves, and its pores open and close—about all this he is entirely in the dark. And yet Mr. Pettipo is under the necessity of believing that his little finger wags and that it is endowed with the gift of sensation, though he in fact knows nothing whatever of the why or the wherefore.

We must believe a thousand things that we cannot understand. Matter and its combinations are a grand mystery—how much more so life and its manifestations! Look at those far off worlds majestically wheeling in their appointed orbits millions of miles off; or look on this earth on which we live, performing its diurnal motion upon its own axis, and its annual circle round the sun!—What do we understand of the causes of such motions? What can we ever know about them, beyond the fact that such things are so? To discover and apprehend facts is much, and it is nearly our limit. To ultimate causes we can never ascend. But to have an eye open to receive facts and apprehend their relative value—that is a great deal—that is our duty; and not to reject, suspect, or refuse to accept them, because they happen to clash with our preconceived notion, or like Mr. Pettipo Dapperling because we "cannot understand" them.

"O! my dear Kepler," writes Galileo to his friend, "how I wish that we could have one hearty laugh together! Here at Padua is the principal Professor of Philosophy, whom I have repeatedly and urgently requested to look at the moon and planets through my glass, which he pertinaciously refuses to do. Why are you not here? What shouts of laughter we should have at this glorious folly! And to hear the Professor of Philosophy at Pisa lecturing before the Grand Duke with logical arguments, as if with magical incantations to charm the new planets out of the sky!"

Rub a stick of wax against your coat sleeve, and it emits sparks; hold it near to light, fleecy particles of wool or cotton, and it first attracts, then it repels them. What do you understand about that, Mr. Pettipo, except merely that it is? Stroke the cat's back before the fire and you will observe the same phenomena. Your own body will in like manner emit sparks in certain states, but you know nothing about why it is so.

Pour a solution of muriate of lime into one of sulphate of potash—both clear fluids; but no sooner are they mixed together than they become nearly solid. How is that? You tell me that an ingredient of the one solution combines with an ingredient of the other, and an insoluble sulphate of lime is produced. Well you tell me a fact; but you do not account for it by saying that the lime has a greater attraction for the sulphuric acid than the potash has; you do not understand how it is—you merely see that it is so. You must believe it.

But when you come to life, and its wonderful manifestations, you are more in the dark than ever. You understand less about this than you do even of dead matter. Take an ordinary every day fact: you drop two seeds, whose component parts are the same, into the same soil. They grow up so close together that their roots mingle and their stalks intertwine. The one plant produces a long slender leaf, the other a short flat leaf; the one brings forth a beautiful flower, the other a short flat leaf; the one brings forth a beautiful flower the other an ugly scruff, the one sheds abroad a delicious fragrance, the other is entirely inodorous. The hemlock, the wheat stalk and the rose tree out of the same chemical ingredients contained in the soil, educate, the one deadly poison, the other wholesome food, the third a bright consummate flower. Can you tell me Mr. Pettipo, how is this? Do you understand the secret by which the roots of these plants accomplish so much more than all your science can do and so infinitely excel the most skillful combinations of the philosopher?—You can only recognize the fact—but you cannot unravel the mystery. Your saying that it is the "nature" of the plant, does not in the slightest degree clear up the difficulty. You can not get at the ultimate fact—only the proximate one is seen by you.

But lo! here is a wonderful little plant—touch it, and the leaves shrink on the instant, one leaf seeming to be in intimate sympathy with the rest, and all the leaves in the neighbourhood shrink—



