

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

Coloured covers/
Couverture de couleur

Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur

Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée

Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées

Covers restored and/or laminated/
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée

Pages restored and/or laminated/
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées

Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque

Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées

Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur

Pages detached/
Pages détachées

Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)

Showthrough/
Transparence

Coloured plates and/or illustrations/
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur

Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression

Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents

Continuous pagination/
Pagination continue

Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin/
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la marge intérieure

Includes index(es)/
Comprend un (des) index

Title on header taken from: /
Le titre de l'en-tête provient:

Blank leaves added during restoration may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming/
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées.

Title page of issue/
Page de titre de la livraison

Caption of issue/
Titre de départ de la livraison

Masthead/
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

Additional comments: /
Commentaires supplémentaires:

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below /
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	14X	18X	22X	26X	30X
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12X	16X	20X	24X	28X	32X

Quod Semper, quod
Ubique, quod ab Omnibus
Creditum est tenemus

Her Foundations are upon the Holy Hills



En necessariis Unitas,
En dubiis Libertas,
En omnibus Caritas.

THE CHURCHMAN'S FRIEND,

FOR THE DIFFUSION OF INFORMATION RELATIVE TO THE

United Church of England and Ireland Her Doctrine and Her Ordinances.

EDITED BY CLERGYMEN.

VOL. II.—No. 7.]

WINDSOR, C. W., APRIL, 1857.

[Published Monthly.

Church News.

CANADA.—The Lord Bishop of Toronto has intimated his intention of holding Confirmations in the western portions of his Diocese during the ensuing summer. From the fact that this will almost certainly be the last time that this aged and venerated servant of God will visit the parishes included in the future Diocese of London, the occasion will be one of even more than usual interest and solemnity. We cannot doubt that the youthful members of the Church will be eager to avail themselves of the privilege of having laid upon their heads, with solemn prayer and benediction, those hands, which the Almighty hath so blessed and prospered in their work.

Upon the motion of the Hon. J. H. Cameron, the correspondence between the Home and Colonial Governments respecting the Church Synod Bill has been laid before the country. The Imperial Government acknowledges that "it is their duty to advise Her Majesty to give her assent to the bill; but,"—in fact the thing has got into the "Circumlocution Office."

ENGLAND.—The Convocation of the Province of Canterbury met on Wednesday, February 4, at Westminster.

The first subject which engaged the attention of the Upper House was one of vast importance,

and of especial interest to the clergy in all parts of the Anglican Church. The Bishop of Chichester presented a petition from a large number of the clergy, setting forth the difficulties they felt in reference to the burial service with those who died in impenitence and sin, and praying that Convocation would take some measures for their relief. A discussion ensued in which the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Bishops of Winchester, Oxford, Exeter, St. David's, and Llandaff took part. It is most gratifying to find that these distinguished prelates were entirely unanimous in their opinions on this most important question. We have made it the subject of a separate article, and shall not therefore dwell any longer upon it here.

Another most interesting debate arose in the House of Bishops upon the reception of a message from the Lower House, requesting their Lordships to consider the expediency of making fresh exertions for sustaining and extending the missionary efforts of the Church both at home and in foreign parts. The Bishop of Oxford spoke with his accustomed eloquence and power, and the Bishop of St. David's with that practical good sense for which he is distinguished. But the true solution of the difficulty seems to have been suggested by the Bishop of Lincoln, the experienced and laborious Jackson. "It has been," he said, "a growing conviction in my mind, that the only way by which the Church

can meet that want (of money), is *by recurring to the use of the weekly offertory*—a mode most agreeable to the practice of the early Church—a mode adopted by almost every Church in the world, except our own—a mode fitted for the various conditions of our parishes—well adapted to congregations of manufacturing parishes, where large gains are made in short periods, and where each one who feels disposed to return to God in proportion to the way in which he has been blessed, has the opportunity weekly of doing so—well adapted, also, to agricultural parishes, where the farmers' gains are made by the aggregate of small savings, and where they may have the opportunity of giving their weekly mite—well adapted to the poor, who have the right to be presented with such an opportunity of giving. It is the only means, in short, that I know of by which a large result can be produced without those constantly recurring excitements which cannot be kept up without a great effort." The Bishop of Salisbury (Hamilton) followed with practical instances of the success of the Offertory in his diocese, and we cannot forbear quoting one striking passage in his speech:—"I have been told that parishes were so small that it was scarcely possible to make a collection worth sending to a society. My answer has always been—it is not the amount of the gift, but the giving to the poor of our flocks an opportunity of contributing their mites that is the great object; and that, if a parish could only send half-a-crown, I would rather receive that half-crown, through the love of Christ animating the clergyman and his people, than that the name of the parish should not appear in the list of the contributors." Even the Archbishop could not refrain from adding his testimony in favour of this true mode of Christian almsgiving, although he added a caution, which is, we believe, entirely needless: "With regard to the Offertory, I think it should be strongly insisted on, though the clergy should be left to judge, whether in their own parishes it is likely to succeed; for we know that in many instances great unpopularity has attended that measure."

In the Lower House the most important topic brought forward was the admission of the laity into the Convocation. The Rev. Mr. Seymour proposed: "That an address be respectfully presented to his Grace the President and to their

lordships of the Upper House of Convocation, requesting their lordships to take into consideration the following propositions:—First, that the law of God, as revealed in Holy Scriptures for the government of His Church, and witnessed to by primitive antiquity, while it vests the authority and power to govern, primarily, in the spirituality, does not forbid, rather does it encourage them, to call and admit faithful laymen also to their councils in Synod, at such times and in such manner as they shall judge best for the welfare of the Church. Secondly, that the circumstances of the present times present certain urgent reasons why the Church of England, in taking steps for the renewal of her synodal functions, should take advantage of the liberty, and should provide some more formal and regular opportunities than at present exist, whereat the counsel and co-operation of the faithful laity may be secured to the proceedings of Convocation."

The discussion was long and animated, but the motion was finally negatived. But the active interest now taken by laymen in all questions affecting the interests of the Church, and the steady growth of the synodal-movement are a guarantee that the question will not be allowed to rest here. It must not however be supposed that the opponents of Mr. Seymour's motion were actuated by any jealousy or fear of lay interference. The opposition was based upon the ground that the laity, through their representatives in Parliament, have already a preponderating influence in the decision of all matters connected with legislation for the Church, in the appointment of bishops and other dignitaries, and even, through the Committee of the Privy Council, in doctrinal decisions. Whenever the Church becomes independent of State control, the question will assume a totally different aspect; and the whole body of the clergy will gladly avail themselves of the co-operation of the faithful laity.

The papers announce the death of Robert Isaac Wilberforce, formerly Archdeacon of the East Riding of Yorkshire, who about two years ago unhappily seceded to the Church of Rome. He was known in the Church of England as one of her most earnest and devoted ministers, and one of the ablest of her controversial writers. Since his secession he (like Newman) has produced nothing worthy of his former reputation. "He lived," says the Morning Post, "to fall into

errors against which he had warned so many, to forsake the communion whose battles he had so ably fought, and to die in that faith whose claims he had so forcibly shown to be unfounded."

UNITED STATES.—The Hon. Mr. Dix, a highly esteemed Churchman, has published an able defence of Trinity Church Corporation. But still, placing all their acts in the most favorable light possible, it is but too apparent, even from his statement, that they have committed one great and capital error. They have employed their vast resources in providing luxurious church accommodation for those who could and should have helped themselves; and have thus disabled themselves from fulfilling what was their true mission, the relief of the spiritual necessities of the vast dissolute population swarming in the lower parts of the city.

The New York papers contain a very interesting account of the opening of a "Church School" for boys. The wretched insufficiency of the godless School System is forcing itself more and more upon the attention of all thoughtful men.

Calumny Refuted.

ONE of the most common weapons employed by the enemies of the Church against her ministers is misrepresentation and falsehood. It is of course easy to refute these; but unfortunately the refutation does not often reach those to whom the calumny has been repeated, and frequently the persons aggrieved by the calumny remain ignorant of the charges made against them. We have before us a case in point. The Rev. Dr. O'Meara, Missionary to the Indians on Lake Huron, accidentally saw, while travelling, two numbers of the Methodist paper, the Christian Guardian, which contained a communication from a preacher of that denomination at the same place. Dr. O'Meara has addressed a letter to the editor in reply, of which the following is an extract:

"The part of your correspondent's first letter to which I would confine my strictures, commences with a falsehood. It states that four young Indians whom he saw drunk and disorderly at Garden River, had been reclaimed from Heathenism by Mr. McDougal, and enticed from him by the exertions of the missionary of the Church of England; now, though your cor-

respondent does not name the young men of whom he reports so unfavorably, still I have no hesitation in saying that no persons answering the description exist at Garden River. Had your correspondent given the names of the young men in question, I have no doubt those names would be found in my baptismal register; but what is, doubtless, the history of these cases? they were baptized and brought up members of the Church of England; five years ago the demon of proselytism reared his head at Garden River, and these young men, offended, doubtless, by some reproofs of their missionary, in order to show their independence of control, and their contempt of wholesome spiritual restraint, went over to the new comer; by him they were made much of, asked to pray in public, their vanity pleased, their love of novelty gratified; but before long some thing or other had occurred to make them repent of their rash change, and then they yielded to the remonstrances of their lawful missionary, which never have been, and I trust, as long as the system of proselytism adopted by your body at Garden River continues, never will be spared towards those who have been so drawn away. I make the above statement, not because I have the slightest idea who the four individuals are, but as covering every case to which reference can be made in the statement published by you. If it be otherwise, it remains for your correspondent or his informants to descend to particulars, stating names of individuals, date of conversion from heathenism, &c. . . . It is always unpleasant to have to meet assertions by counter assertions, because you feel that for a time at least, your readers cannot know which assertion to believe; but far more pleasant is it when your adversary himself furnishes you with the materials with which to overthrow him; such is the case with the remaining part of the letter in question. Your correspondent brings the sweeping charge against the Episcopal teaching at Garden River, that its tendency is to produce drunkenness and immorality, and what is the ground on which he builds this? that he saw four young men, who, he was told, belonged to the Episcopal Church, drunk and disorderly, (for as to his informant's assertion that all but two of the members of the Episcopal Church had been known to be subjects of intoxication during the past winter, it is, I hesitate not to say, a malicious falsehood; the burden of proving it to be otherwise, will by all right-thinking persons be allowed to lie with the assertor and propagator of it). Let us see how Methodist missions will bear the application of your correspondent's principle. I think it was about the time of your correspondent's visit to Garden River, and if I mistake not, while he was still there, that I was one evening on my way up the river, in company with the Rev. Mr. Chance, our missionary there, when a young man in a de-

plorable state of intoxication came running along the bank on the American shore, demanding admittance into Mr. Chance's boat, and showing by his language that he had somewhere or other learned English enough to *suear*. I was grieved to find that he was a young man who, having been baptized by myself, had been known to me as a nice quiet lad till his parents, led astray by the wonders they heard would be done to their children by their admission to Alnwick Industrial School, commenced attendance at the Methodist chapel, soon after which the boy was sent to the above-named school, from which he had just returned at the time that he appeared before us in his deplorably altered character.

Again, I was present this summer at a council held by Captain Anderson, Indian Superintendent, at Nawaush, Owon's Sound, when a young man was called out by the superintendent from the crowd of Indians present, and informed that for his incorrigible wickedness he was to be deprived of the chieftainship which he had inherited from his father; he too had been at Alnwick school, which is entirely in the hands of the Methodists. If your correspondent's principle be correct, I am more than warranted in arguing from these instances, that the tendency of Alnwick school is to produce drunkards, swearers, and incorrigibly bad characters.

"But again happening to be visiting some Indians of our church in the neighborhood of your mission at Saugeen, I was present at another council held in the Indian village there, at which the superintendent considered it to be his duty to reprove the person holding the situation of schoolmaster in connection with your mission there, for habitual drunkenness, and for being in a semi-intoxicated state while acting as writer to the Indians at the council; and soon after my return to this place a Roman Catholic Indian from Wegwamekoong, the Jesuit settlement, came to me to beg that I would interpret for him a letter that he had just taken from the post-office. It was addressed to his wife and written in English; and what, sir, was the character of it? it was the letter of an adulterer to his paramour, and the writer was the same schoolmaster appointed by the Conference to teach reading, writing, religion and morality to the Indian children at Saugeen, and the most powerful motive that he made use of in that letter to entice the unfortunate woman from her injured husband was the comfortable salary that he enjoyed from the Missionary Society for teaching the children the above-mentioned branches of education! For the sake of our common Christianity, sir, I am deeply grieved to be forced to drag such circumstances to the light, but your correspondent has compelled me, for surely if the principle on which he comes to the conclusion that Episcopal missionary teaching tends to produce drunkenness and disorder, be correct, I am again far more than authorized

to conclude that the missionary system of Methodism tends to produce drunkenness and adultery. I need scarcely say that I draw no such conclusion from the above facts, but only use them to show the utter absurdity of your correspondent's reasoning on the fact of which he states that he was cognizant."

Reasons for Returning to the Catholic Church of England;]

IN A CONVERSATION BETWEEN MR. SECKER, A CHURCHMAN, AND MR. BROWN, A METHODIST.

DIALOGUE VII.

Mr. Brown—Since I last had the pleasure of seeing you, Mr. Secker, I have been looking over some notes I have made of our conversations, and I find that there is scarcely one objection to an entire and humble return to the bosom of our holy Church which you have not most satisfactorily answered; but yet do not think me captious if I advance a few arguments which Dissenters in general, and especially Methodists, are in the habit of adducing in defence of their conduct. For instance, the Methodists say that *they* do not break the unity of the Church, inasmuch as they are still willing, when opportunity serves, to worship in the Church, and even to receive the sacraments at the hands of its ministers; and that therefore it is the Church itself that breaks the unity, by refusing in return thus to associate with them in terms of Christian fellowship.

Mr. Secker—You are quite right, Mr. Brown, in seeking to be fully persuaded in your own mind. I know how to sympathize with you; I have myself felt all these doubts and anxieties in no little degree, and have not got clear of them without, I trust, sincere and careful examination; and if I have gone far from Methodism, it is not, as I fear some of my friends think, from any feeling of unkindness, but from a sorrowful conviction of its dangerous departures from Church unity and scriptural order. Indeed, I believe, I shall carry down to my grave sentiments of high esteem and deep affection for many persons and many things connected with British Methodism; nevertheless, personal excellence or collateral good can never justify our remaining in a communion, the distinctive fundamental principles of which are radically wrong.

I think that our second conversation, in which it was proved that *Methodism is schismatical*, gave a satisfactory answer to the Methodistic objection that Methodism does not break the unity of the Church; for what is schism but a "rending of the Church, the body of Christ?" That their schism is accompanied by remains of reverential regard for the Church, does not heal the breach which they have made; but, on the contrary, while it may excite in us lively hopes concerning their personal rectitude, it does but show more clearly, when viewed in its true light,

the inexcusable nature of their conduct. Whatever may be the fair professions, or even actual good feelings of Methodists, it is absurd for them to deny that they destroy the unity of Christ's Church, so long as they send forth a ministry commissioned by themselves in a manner unacknowledged by the Church in every age of its history, and in direct opposition to that true and living branch of it founded in their own land, and to which they formerly belonged; and so long as they erect altar against altar, and temple against temple. Equally, or even more, absurd is it to charge the Church with being the cause of this breach of unity by its exclusiveness. Nay, but let every one in this case bear their own burden. Who was it that withdrew from the Catholic Church? Who sent forth a new ministry, and set up rival altars? Now, because the Church cannot, in her conscience, acknowledge this Methodistic ministry, nor reverence its altars, nor lightly esteem that sin of schism, of which she believes those who have separated from her to have been guilty, shall she therefore be blamed as though *she* destroyed Christian unity? But really, Mr. Brown, I am sure that you will agree with me that such a pretence is all too shallow to admit of being rebutted by grave argument. That this "exclusiveness," as the Dissenters are pleased to term it, should subject the Church to many false and unkind charges of haughtiness and pride is to be expected; but surely if she were to act otherwise, she would be unfaithful to the trust committed to her. Even dissenters must acknowledge that it is the duty of the Church to maintain both doctrine and discipline of Christ in their utmost purity; hence its ministers cannot do otherwise, as men of principle and piety, than refuse to hold religious intercourse with those whom they believe to be either corrupting the true faith, or violating the scriptural order of Christ's church. You know, with Dissenters, it is not so; because, as they profess to believe almost any form of Church government lawful, and to hold many points even of faith itself as indifferent, they can, of course, readily associate with those of other religious denominations; and as such conduct is quite in accordance with the very reprehensible liberalism of the day, it will meet with the applause of the multitude.

Mr. Brown—Your views are most certainly correct; and being so, they satisfactorily disprove the slander so frequently brought against the Church that its clergy and members are bigots.

Mr. Secker—Yes, indeed, never was there a more groundless slander than the charge of bigotry against the Church of England. For, while she steadily refuses her *sanction* or *connivance* to error, she does not attempt to interfere with the personal rights and privileges of any one; and, indeed, in the sound and high-principled churchman, how little do you see of

that bitter and intolerant spirit for which Dissent is so remarkable!

Mr. Brown—In truth, Mr. Secker, I think that the various parties within the Church itself are more severe towards each other than they are towards Dissenters themselves. This, indeed, is one of the matters respecting which I wished to converse with you. The evil course of Dissent, in separating from the Church, you know, I now fully admit, as being in direct opposition both to the Word of God and to the authoritative teachings of Christ's Primitive and Catholic Church; but still even the Church itself seems to be no remedy against schism and strife; for you know it is full of parties,—High Church and Low Church, Orthodox and Calvinistic, Puseyite and Ultra-Protestant,—surely all this is not consistent with that unity which ought to exist in the Church as the Body of Christ. These internal divisions, as they form one of the strongest arguments of the Dissenters against the Church, so they greatly contributed to prevent my seeing the evil of Dissent, inasmuch as it appeared that even the Church itself was not one.

Mr. Secker—The divisions to which you have alluded are, with sorrow I confess it, a most serious evil in our Church; and it is not to be denied that many of them at least in the extent to which they are carried, are cherished by the very same errors which give birth to dissent, namely, a want of due submission, in matters either of discipline or doctrine, to the teachings and injunctions of the Church. If members of the Church, either clergy or laity, will set up their own private opinions in opposition to her teachings, or by forced and un candid constructions endeavour to explain them away, they fall into the grand error of dissent, and we cannot, therefore, wonder that they should share in its evils. And, if I might presume to venture a remark respecting the doings of our clergy, I should say that into this evil I think both the Divines of the Oxford or Newman school and those of the ultra-Protestant school have fallen; they are, I fear, both of them disposed to bend the Church to their opinions, instead of humbly and scripturally submitting their judgments to her teachings.

Mr. Brown—Your remark strikes me as being exceedingly just; but yet the question presents itself, Where shall we look for the pure and distinctive voice of the Catholic Church?

Mr. Secker—Unquestionably in our own Prayer-book, Articles, and Homilies. *To us they* are the voice of the Church; and she refers us for her authority to the Bible and to the Catholic Church in its first and pure ages; and, unless we can prove that she contradicts these, we are bound to submit to her in all things, as to the injunctions of Christ and his Catholic Church; and that she is scriptural in her doctrines and primitive in her discipline her bitterest enemies

have never yet been able to disprove. It follows therefore from what has been said, that even if dissenters could show that unhappily there existed a measure of division within the bounds of the Church itself, yet this would not afford any justification whatever of their separation from it, any more than my being a whig would justify your becoming a positive rebel. But yet, Mr. Brown, while I candidly admit that very unjustifiable divisions do exist amongst ourselves, I think it would be very unjust to suppose that they are equally sinful with positive dissent or with schismatical separation; I speak now in the general, because it is very possible that there are individual clergymen who do so decidedly set themselves against the intentions of our Church, fairly interpreted, that in them it would be more honest altogether to withdraw from her communion; but these are only the exceptions. Some one, I forget who, has made a homely but striking remark respecting our internal divisions as contrasted with dissent, namely, "that they are splits which do not go down to the bottom;" it is exactly so, we are yet *essentially one*; these fissures are to be exceedingly deplored, because they are both unsightly and dangerous, and tend, in no small degree, to keep dissenters, and especially the Romish dissenter, from returning to the bosom of the Catholic Church, inasmuch as their teachers carefully point out to them these our imperfections, while at the same time they as cautiously hide from their view the far more violent internal animosities and divisions existing amongst themselves; but yet, Mr. Brown, I again repeat we are "essentially one." Our worship, in its distinctive features, is one, the *authoritative* doctrines of our Church are every where the same, and the supreme ecclesiastical authority is vested in the same hands.

Mr. Brown.—And yet you cannot deny that not only do the private opinions of the different clergy vary, but even their public teachings are by no means all of one character. For instance, to give you a case in point: A few weeks ago, having reached Windown on Saturday evening, and not of course wishing to travel on the Sunday, I heard their very highly respected Rector, Mr. Wilberford, preach on the subject of baptism; and I must say I was startled to hear how very distinctively he set forth the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, openly declaring that "our Lord Jesus Christ doth not deny his *grace* and mercy unto baptized infants;" but this is a doctrine which, you know, the clergyman of our own township does not at all preach; indeed I do not think he believes it. Now it appears to me that it is of great importance whether such a doctrine as this be true or false; and yet even here you see our clergy do not agree.

Mr. Secker.—Mark, I do not defend this dissimilarity of teaching, for assuredly it ought to

be most cautiously avoided: yet the circumstance itself to which you have alluded, shows how much less is the evil which results from such divisions in the Church, than that which is consequent upon absolute dissent from it; as even those clergymen who might have no objection to explain away some of the doctrines of the Bible as taught in the Church, are yet obliged to use those very forms in which they are set forth; and thus there is much less danger of the Church ultimately straying far from the truth. Indeed, I have personally proved this in the very case you have mentioned. It appeared to me that the teaching of our worthy pastor on the subject of Baptism, scarcely agreed with the Baptismal Service. And here you may see the different effect of partial division within the Church, and total separation from it. While a Methodist, my views of this sacrament were never distinct, though I always esteemed it more important than many of those around me did; but having nothing more distinctive to fall back upon than what our preachers taught, I remained satisfied in unsound views of the matter: but I had not been long in attendance upon the Church Services before I became aware, as I have just stated, of a discrepancy between the views of our clergyman and the Prayer Book on Baptism; and, notwithstanding that he taught exactly the doctrine to which I had been accustomed, still I could not rest without knowing what was the doctrine of the Bible and the Church on this important matter. Thus as a separatist I had nothing to prevent my resting in unsound doctrine, while in the Church even imperfect teaching did not prevent my arriving at a knowledge of the truth. So important to the maintenance of sound doctrine is even outward unity of worship, especially when accompanied with the authoritative use, as in our own Church, of a sound liturgical service!

So also the visible union of the Church in its formularies, sacraments, and authoritative doctrines greatly tends to peace and concord amongst the people, even when their teachers are not in all things agreed.

And then, as I before observed, the unity in the government of the Church places its divisions on altogether another footing to those of dissent. So long as this is maintained, the Church must remain vitally *one*. The importance of this principle has been strikingly evidenced in the suppression of the Oxford "Tracts for the Times" by Ecclesiastical authority, when their views were considered to have become dangerous. This fact appears to me one of the noblest evidences of the scriptural unity of the Church which its history exhibits: here was no positive heresy, no personal misconduct, no professed teaching of anti-church principles, and yet, in submission to the proper authorities, these writings are at once stopped.

In fact, view the matter in any way you like, and there is the most marked difference between some division in the Church, and open separation from it: the former, to a certain extent, may be only an infirmity incident to human nature; the latter, I fear, is sin, and partakes of the nature of spiritual rebellion.

Mr. Brown.—I could feel half ashamed, Mr. Secker, of saying so frequently that I entirely agree with what you advance, and with professing myself so fully satisfied with the answers made to my objections; it almost appears as if I had no settled opinions of my own.

Mr. Secker.—Really, my dear Sir, I do not think that you need to have any such feeling; remember they are not answers of mine, but of the Church of Christ. And need we wonder that when two persons are honestly inquiring after the truth, and are content humbly to submit to the Word of God as interpreted by His Church, that they should arrive at the same conclusions? Surely not. The reason why it is not more frequently so, is because men seldom seek for truth with a single eye; there is almost always more or less of party mingled with their feelings; whereas in all such inquiries, as it is Christ we profess to seek, so if we would find him, we must receive what He and the Church, which He has given authority to teach, declare to be His truth, however it may strike our prejudices, or overturn our preconceived notions.

Mr. Brown.—(Mr. B. gives his hand to Mr. Secker, and with deep and serious feeling says) —Here then I bury all my opposition, and henceforth hope, by God's grace, to be enabled to manifest my faith in, and love to, our blessed Saviour, by walking zealously, yet quietly and obediently, as a humble member of the Church of England, in which I was, as you know, baptized; and which I now believe to be the purest branch of the Catholic Church of Christ. And to you, Mr. Secker, I cannot say how grateful I feel for the successful effort you have made to place these matters in the clearest manner before me.

Mr. Secker.—Indeed, Mr. Brown, I am fully repaid for any little trouble I have taken, by its resulting, through Divine goodness, in your return to the bosom of the Church.

But as I see that we have half an hour to spare, there are one or two further remarks which, with your permission, I will make, as I think they afford much evidence of the scriptural character and primitive simplicity of our Church.

One of the important peculiarities of our English Church is, that at its Reformation it introduced no novelties, but cast off many which the Romish superstition had caused it to adopt. This freedom from novelties appears to me no mean proof of its holy and apostolic nature; and I think it is a characteristic almost, if not

quite, peculiar to our English Church. Amidst the Romanists, pure Christianity is almost buried under a heap of superstitious novelties—adoration of images, worship of the Holy Eucharist, prayers to the Saints, auricular confession, penances, &c., &c.; while the Protestant Dissenters who have separated from the Church are also overlaid with novelties of various descriptions—errors concerning infant baptism, the nature of both the Sacraments, the distinctive character of Christ's one Holy and Catholic Church, and all hold novel and unscriptural ideas respecting the nature, authority, and valid ordination of the Christian ministry. But, through the very gracious and indeed most remarkable over-ruling of Divine Providence, the English Church on the contrary has been saved from the novelties both of Romanism and Dissent, and conformed, with a surprising degree of accuracy, to the Apostolic and primitive model; so that it is perhaps not too much to say, that there is no branch of the Church equally scriptural and primitive in its doctrine and discipline. Is it not then alike both the duty and privilege of all true and simple-minded Christians to seek her communion?

But, Mr. Brown, permit me to ask, have you fully satisfied yourself respecting the nature and necessity of Episcopal Ordination, in order to a minister's being duly qualified for his sacred office?

Mr. Brown.—To a considerable extent I have done so; the books you recommended are, I think, unanswerable; but to this subject I intend to give a yet more thorough investigation upon my return from the West, in order that I may be able the more readily to meet the objections of those about me. As respects myself, the following considerations have satisfied my mind on the subject:

1. I cannot suppose that Christ, who is infinite in wisdom, would leave his Church without some Divinely appointed government, by which its doctrines might be authoritatively taught, its ordinances administered, and its unity preserved to the end of time, especially as in all His own conduct and that of His apostles, I see such an earnest wish that His people might be "one;" let those who can, therefore, believe that He would make no provision for their being so!

2. I cannot find any form of Church Government, excepting Episcopacy, which can show a single clear scriptural argument, or establish one example of primitive usage in its favour. Indeed, I have observed that nearly all the arguments of Presbyterians and other Dissenters are *negative*, namely, based on supposed objections against Episcopacy; while their attempts at *positive* evidences in support of their own views are exceedingly few and feeble. Now, Mr. Secker, it appears to me that, as a general rule, that must be a weak and unsound cause,

the strength of which depends upon *negative arguments*.

3. I find in the Old Testament that our own Christ did, as the Jehovah of the Jewish Church, establish a ministerial polity exceedingly like that which, in all ages, has prevailed in the Christian Church. I therefore judge that it was from the express command of Christ to his Apostles that such a polity was established in the latter Church, because it seems exceedingly probable (nothing being in scripture to the contrary) that, as the same ends were to be accomplished in the Christian as were purposed in the Jewish Church, the same Infinite Wisdom would use the same means; the *manner* of the ministerial succession, only, being changed, so as to suit the change which had taken place in the Church itself, as being no longer peculiar and national, but universal in its character.

4. The facts related and the instructions given in the New Testament only admit of a *fair* and *reasonable* interpretation, on the ground that Episcopacy was that form of Church government which then existed; and which it was designed to perpetuate.

5. Lastly, the universal prevalence of the Episcopal office, and of the doctrine of the Apostolic Succession for nearly fifteen hundred years,—and these facts, I believe, many of the most learned Presbyterians themselves admit,—does appear to me conclusively to prove that Episcopacy must be Apostolic in its origin, and therefore absolutely binding upon the Church in all ages. Those who say otherwise are bound, in all Christian honesty, to tell us *when* and *how* so strange an innovation was introduced, and how it came to be so universally adopted, and to point us to the most unquestionable ancient authorities for what they may state respecting these things; all this, I believe, no one has yet dared even to say that they have done. And, till this is done, I confess it appears to me to manifest a spirit little consonant with either the humility or the piety of the gospel to neglect—nay, as many do—to pour contempt upon an institution which, if it be of Christ, must be so vastly important as Episcopacy, and the evidence of the divine origin of which is drawn, as I have just stated, from the dictates of sound reason, the absence of all *positive* competition, the analogy of the Jewish Church, the statements of the New Testament, and the universal consent and faith of Christ's Church for fifteen hundred years.

Mr. Secker.—It is very evident, my dear Sir, that the vastly important questions, What is the Church of Christ? and who are His duly appointed ministers? have employed your very careful and, I doubt not, devout attention; and believe me, it is with the most heartfelt gratification that I congratulate you upon the exceedingly happy termination of all your investiga-

tions. Your analysis of the arguments which establish Episcopacy is also pleasingly clear and sound.

Mr. Brown.—I most sincerely thank you, my dear Mr. Secker, for all your friendly feelings and conduct; and I do trust that they have not been lost upon me, for my return to the Catholic Church of England has arisen, I assure you, from no lightness of feeling, but from deep convictions of the divine origin and apostolic authority of her ministry—of the scriptural purity of her doctrines—of the holiness and safety of her sacraments—of the primitive character of her worship and discipline—of the vast importance of the divine commands enjoining Church unity—and of the great evils, ecclesiastical, social, and spiritual, connected with the sin of schism.

And now, as I see it is late, "farewell." To-morrow I intend to set off on my Western journey.

The Covenanters.

It is a common subject of platform claptrap and declamation to lament over the sufferings of Scottish Covenanters of that period (1677) as martyrs for the Gospel, and to eulogize them as having laid the foundation of British liberty and freedom. There cannot, however, be a greater mistake. The conduct of these men was mutinous and seditious in the extreme; and from their intractable obstinacy they were the real cause of all the arbitrary laws, and of their severe administration. By compelling the Government to enact and enforce such severe laws, but especially the Letters of Intercommuning,* the Covenanters not only subjected themselves to restrictions upon their civil and religious liberties, but they exposed those who were both by principle and practice obedient to the laws, to the same restrictions. From their peaceable and benevolent habits, the Episcopalians were much more liable to incur, through ignorance, the penalties attached to the relief of intercommuned fanatics, than their own friends were, who knew their haunts and their persons, and so could avoid both. The harsh and arbitrary proceedings of Lauderdale and the Privy Council did not proceed from cruelty, or from any design to persecute the Covenanters; for they showed an extraordinary wish to satisfy them by granting them a toleration which, in fact, amounted to an establishment. Yet with every liberty which no other Government ever conceded to any dissenters, the Covenanters were not satisfied; nay, they would not peaceably enjoy even the freedom which was thrust upon them. They would not confine themselves to preaching in the parish churches to which they were inducted and exempted from episcopal con-

* Letters of Intercommuning forbid the covenanting rebels to be harboured.

trol, but they collected mobs of men and women to retired places at a distance from their cures, and to which the men went fully armed, or to use the native expression, *in effeir of war*. This was a breach of the king's peace, and also of express acts of Parliament; and it was a violation of the ministers' solemn engagements to the Privy Council at the time when they received their indulgences.

Had the Presbyterians lived, as in duty they were bound to have done, in obedience to the laws, none of those severe statutes would have been enacted, and they might have enjoyed their own Gospel without let or molestation from either the civil or the ecclesiastical rulers of the kingdom, whom they called the priests of Baal. But they would neither live peaceably themselves, nor allow their fellow-subjects of the established Church to live in peace, but harassed them, particularly the clergy—Wadrow (a bitter Presbyterian) and Bishop Burnet (an egotistical semi-Presbyterian latitudinarian) being witnesses,—by every species of annoyance, robbery, and personal maltreatment, which the former of these authors delicately calls *riots*; and the latter says that in *no other Christian country could it have been paralleled*. The Covenanters were never called in question for their religion, in which they were indulged and established; but the punishments by fine and imprisonment with which they were visited were wholly and entirely for their *political* sins of sedition and obstinate breaches of acts of Parliament. There could not be any conduct more opposite to the principles of Christianity than that of those dissenters. . . . The first Christians were most eminent for their submission and subjection to a heathen Government and heathen laws.

* * * * *

The chief design and object of the Solemn League and Covenant (of the Scotch Covenanting Presbyterians) was not only to break the unity of Christ's Church, but to *extirpate* it from the face of the earth; and the Westminster Confession (emanating from the Scotch and English Puritans) solemnly declares that there is "no ordinary possibility of salvation" out of the pale of Presbytery, Independency, and the other sects that composed the Westminster Assembly. The true visible Church of Christ is but *one*, and it is an article of the creed common to the Christian Church, to believe "one holy Catholic and Apostolic Church." The true visible Church of Christ can be but *one*, because Christ is but one, and one head can have but one body—one husband can have but one spouse; and there can be but one church erected on one Chief Corner Stone. There is but one Mediator and but one Christian Covenant; but *one body of laws* given to all. Christians, therefore were intended to make but *one* society which is altogether quickened by one spirit.—Stephens' Church of Scotland.

The Burial Service.

THE discussion in the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury, which is mentioned in our summary of Church News, cannot fail to be productive of the most beneficial results, and is a first and important step towards restoring to the Church some measure of her ancient rule of discipline. It is a most gratifying fact, and a cheering sign of an earnest and fearless spirit, that, with regard to the principle involved, there appears to be perfect unanimity of sentiment between men of different theological schools; the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of Winchester expressed their entire concurrence with the Bishops of Oxford and Exeter.

The discussion arose upon the presentation of a petition from a large number of clergy, setting forth the difficulties they felt in reference to the rite of the burial service over persons who had died in impenitence and sin. The Archbishop of Canterbury mentioned that all the bishops had received petitions of a similar kind, "signed by many thousands of the clergy;" so that the clergy are evidently as unanimous on the subject as their bishops.

And no wonder that it should be so. What clergyman has not been called upon, again and again, to stand by the grave of one whose whole life, even to his dying hour, had been one continued violation of his baptismal vows, and who expired without giving one token of contrition or repentance? What clergyman, in such cases, has not felt that he was acting a strange and inconsistent part; inconsistent, we mean, with all his convictions, and all his preaching, when he asserted in the face of the congregation, that it had "pleased Almighty God to take unto Himself the soul of our dear brother here departed," and prayed that "when we shall depart this life, we may rest in Him, as our hope is this our brother doth."

We well know the answer by which our objection to the use of these words of glowing Christian hope is wont to be met. They are, it is said, but the words of hope, and you can have no knowledge that God, in His wonder-working mercy, may not, even in the last moments of ebbing life, have changed the hard heart, and washed the sinful soul in the blood of the Eternal Lamb. God forbid that we should desire to set any limits to that ever open fountain of

mercy, or doubt the efficacy of that all-atoning blood. We judge no man, and have no wish to raise the awful veil with which God, in His wisdom, conceals the secrets of futurity. But have we a right to express the confident hope that God will do that, which would be contrary to all that it has pleased Him to reveal respecting His dealings with mankind, here and hereafter? For consider what the expression of that hope amounts to; it is not our hope as individuals to which we give utterance; it is the hope of the Church. As individuals we may, in the depths of our own hearts, cherish more or less hope, according to the varying circumstances of each case; but, as priests of God's Church, we have no right to express the hope that the Almighty will do what in every page of the oracles committed to her He has declared that He will not do, save alive the soul which has lived, and, so far as the Church has any means of knowing, died in sin and impenitence.

We have said that every clergyman has had experience of such cases; and in order that there may be no doubt respecting the kind of cases to which we allude, we will explain our meaning by referring to three such, which have occurred to a single clergyman within a very few weeks.

There was a young man, a member of an ancient and wealthy family; for years he had led a life of sinful intemperance; destroying all the glorious faculties of body and mind with strong drink; a daring blasphemer; never seen within the walls of a place of worship. He set out, while in a state of intoxication, to cross a deep river on the ice; some persons who observed his rash attempt followed him to warn him of his danger; he turned round with curses on his lips; at the same instant the ice broke, and in four minutes he was taken out a corpse.

Some weeks afterwards the same clergyman received a Coroner's warrant to bury a woman who was found drowned. She was a stranger; even her name unknown; but she had been in his parish some weeks; leading a life of open profligacy; living notoriously in deadly sin, though a white woman, with several coloured men; utterly shameless; daily reeling through the streets, or found lying insensible on door-steps. She was last seen alive under the influence of liquor, and there can be no doubt that in crossing a plank over a gully, which the re-

cent thaw had converted into a rushing stream, she slipped, and was instantly drowned.

The third case was that of an old man, a poor harmless creature, but who for years had given himself up, body and soul, to the same deadly sin of drunkenness. For weeks, it is believed, he had taken no wholesome nourishment, living, literally, upon strong drink. One morning, not many days since, he wandered into a neighbour's house, and sank down in a state of insensibility, which in a few hours terminated in death.

Now here were three cases, occurring in the experience of one clergyman within a very brief period, in which, according to all that we can see or know, repentance was most improbable even granting that repentance, in the very hour of death, must necessarily be efficacious. What the individual clergyman may have thought or hoped is not the question. But, we imagine, there can be no doubt that the Church never intended the strong expressions of hope,—we had almost said of confidence,—which are embodied in her Service for the Burial of the Dead, to be used in such cases as these. She could not have intended it for these reasons:

First, it is clear from those very expressions themselves, that they are intended to be applied only to those, who "died in the Lord." These in the words of Scripture, she pronounces "blessed". For these she thanks God, that "it hath pleased Him to deliver them from the misery of this sinful world." Of these she affirms that it hath pleased Him "to take their souls unto Himself". But to the hardened and impenitent such expressions can never have been intended to apply. They would have no meaning; they sound almost like a solemn mockery.

Secondly, the use of this language of hope in such sad cases must necessarily have a very mischievous effect upon the living hearers. The Church, morning and evening, commences her holy worship by calling men to repentance, and holding out the comfortable promise of pardon to "the wicked man that turneth away from his wickedness that he hath committed, and doeth that which is lawful and right." And this is the spirit that runs through all her services; everywhere she teaches that repentance is a necessary condition of pardon for sinful man; everywhere she teaches him to pray God to "make in us new and contrite hearts, that we,

worthily lamenting our sins, and acknowledging our wretchedness, may obtain of the God of all mercy perfect remission and forgiveness." But if, on the most solemn occasion on which a congregation can assemble, she makes assertions directly contrary to these; if she then declares that God hath taken unto Himself a soul, which all who stand around the grave believe to have departed without giving one sign of repentance, without having uttered one cry for mercy,—must it not weaken the force of her daily warning, and confirm the living in that fatal security and carelessness, that vague unscriptural reliance upon the supposed mercy of God, to which they are ever tempted by the world without, and their own hearts within.

And again the indiscriminate use of the Burial Service cannot but detract from its soothing and comforting influence upon those who have committed to the ground the remains of their beloved dead "in sure and certain hope of the resurrection to eternal life." Some gentle spirit has departed from our midst, and we stand around the open grave, mourning, but not as men without hope; for every word of that beautiful Service leads our thoughts onward to the hour, when that "corruptible shall put on incorruption, and that mortal immortality." But next day, perhaps, the tolling bell summons us again to the churchyard; and lo, the same words of glorious hope are uttered over the body of the drunkard, the blasphemer, the adulterer! If, then, as we have sometimes been told, regard for the feelings of their relatives should induce us to overcome our own repugnance to the use of the Burial Service, shall we have no sympathy with the relatives of the holy dead? Shall we not fear to chill their hearts, and to deprive them of somewhat of that comfort, which the Church in those consoling words evidently intended to inspire?

The Church of the United States has got rid of the difficulty which our clergy experience; she has carefully struck out every word that speaks of hope. But at the same time she has destroyed the touching beauty of the Service. She has made it equally applicable to the hardened sinner, and the humble penitent. But it no longer thrills so sweetly on the ears of the stricken mourners, and pours the soothing balm of holy comfort into their bleeding hearts.

For these reasons it seems clear that the Bu-

rial Service, as the Bishop of Exeter emphatically declared, "ought not to be used in the case of persons dying in deadly sin." The clergy of England are, however, placed in circumstances of considerably difficulty. The rubric provides that "this office is not to be used for any that die unbaptized, or excommunicate, or that lay violent hands upon themselves." Now the power of formally pronouncing excommunication is a part of that godly discipline which the Church is prevented from exercising; but yet it cannot be doubted that a person notoriously living in deadly sin is *ipso facto* excommunicate, or cut off from the communion of God's people. No clergyman would admit such an one to partake of the Holy Sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood. If then he be not counted among the Lord's faithful people while living, "until he hath declared himself to have repented, and amended his former naughty life," surely, unless there is reason to believe that he has so repented and amended, he ought not to be counted among God's saints, when dead. In England, nevertheless, the Church is in bondage to the State; and the clergyman who would refuse to read the Burial Service over the most abandoned profligate that ever disgraced the Christian profession, renders himself liable to severe penalties. So that even that fearless man, the Bishop of Exeter, when consulted by one of his clergy as to the course which he ought to pursue, could only say—"I tell you what I should do, but I cannot advise you to take such a course. No earthly reason should induce me to speak the words of Christian hope over the corpse of such a man." It is this which gives such value to the expression of the unanimous sentiments of the English Bishops. It is impossible to conceive that these laws will ever again be put in force.

Whether these laws ever were validly binding in Canada, we do not know and we do not care. The State, happily for us, has disclaimed all connection with the Church; and there is no law which can compel us to recognize any one as possessed of the privileges of membership, or entitled to the ministrations of the Church, whose own wilful unbelief, or whose own evil life has plainly cut him off from the communion of the faithful. Let our clergy then act with all prudence, with all love and tenderness; but at the same time, with firmness and decision.

They may, for the moment, draw down upon themselves ill will and persecution; but they will secure the respect of all good and honest men, and prove even to scoffers and gainsayers, that the Church is truly the pure bride of the Redeemer, clothed in the white robes of faith and holiness.

The Western Diocese.

In our January number we ventured to express the hope that within a period of three months we should be called upon to proceed to the organization of the new Western Diocese, and the election of its first Bishop. And now it is with feelings of no ordinary gratification that we make the announcement, that, in all probability, before the next number of the Churchman's Friend is issued, our sanguine hopes, our earnest wishes will have been fulfilled; one more will have been enrolled among the successors of the Apostles; one more will have been added to the number of Canadian Dioceses; a new element of strength will have been infused into the Church of Christ; all our parishes will be instinct with new life and vitality.

But as the churchmen of the proposed Diocese contemplate the approaching change, it ought not to be,—it cannot be,—that their feelings are all of joy and hope. There must be sorrow; there must be an awful sense of responsibility. What member of the church, be he clergyman or layman, can contemplate without emotion the severing of those ties, which have so long subsisted between themselves and that aged and venerated servant of God, who has administered the spiritual affairs of all Upper Canada, during the most critical period of her history, with an ability seldom equalled, with an energy never surpassed, with an unwearied zeal, and a holy self-devotion, which put to shame the feeble exertions of men who number less than half his years;—with a justice, a forbearance, a kindness, which make us regard him rather as a father and a friend, than as a ruler and superior.

And to him likewise the separation must be a painful one. He desires it doubtless; because he sees that it will conduce to the prosperity of that church for which he has ever been ready to sacrifice all personal considerations. Yet there must be sorrow in his heart, as he thinks upon those many village churches, those humble

school-houses, where so often he has laid his hands, with solemn prayer, upon his "beautiful flock"; where so often he has spoken the kind earnest words of Christian exhortation; where so often his approach has been looked for with eager anxiety, and crowds of young and old have gathered to gaze upon his venerable form, and win, perchance, one bright look, one smile of recognition, or one kind word, as he passed on his way. Long may he be spared to the Canadian church; and though increasing years lay their burden upon him, though afflictions be sent to make yet more conspicuous his faith and trust, may he find comfort in the love of his people,—until he is called from his labour to his rest, and hears the awakening words, "Well done thou good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

There must too, we said, be a deep sense of responsibility. We are in a few weeks to assemble for the purpose of organizing the Diocese and electing its first Bishop. We are to be called to the exercise of privileges which the Church, in no part of the British dominions, for more than a thousand years, has ever enjoyed. Not upon ourselves only will the consequences of our proceedings fall. Not we only shall be affected, for good or for evil, by the wisdom, piety and toleration, or the rashness, party-spirit, and irreligion which we may exhibit at this eventful crisis. The eyes of our brother-churchmen are upon us; the malice and jealousy of our enemies, the anxious interest, the hopes and wishes of our friends will be on the alert; and all we do and all we say will be cited as precedents, to influence the future destiny of the church through all the dioceses of the British Empire.

We call then upon the clergy and lay-delegates to prepare themselves, by earnest prayer, and calm inquiry, for the exercise of the important trust which is committed to them. We call upon them to lay aside all motives, aims and objects, except the truest interests of that Church, at whose altars they eat the bread of life. And we call too upon the members of the Church at large to take heed to whom they commit that trust. On Easter Monday a new election of Lay-Delegates is to take place in every parish. See to it, Churchmen of Canada, that you choose men, who shall indeed be your true representatives. Choose not men for their wealth, their station, their eloquence, or their

display. Choose men whom you see always in their place at church, and constantly kneeling with humble reverence at the Communion of their Saviour's Body and Blood. Choose men whose religion is not one of the lips and of the tongue, but of the heart and the life; men who do not talk much of their love for the Church, but who show, by their steady adherence to her principles, their joyful use of her ordinances, their liberal support of her ministrations, and the ready sacrifice of their time, their pleasure and their ease, that they are indeed zealous in her cause, and will never betray her interests. Let our Lay-Delegates be such men as these, and with God's blessing upon our deliberations, the Church in Canada will enter upon a new era in her existence, and will extend her influence and scatter abroad her blessings, and "the wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad for them, and the desert shall rejoice, and blossom as the rose."

Church Matters at Clackington in 1875.

CHAPTER XX.

THE resolutions which had been passed at the meeting described in the last chapter, were duly forwarded to the Bishop, who, by the same post, received communications from Mr. Slowton and Mr. Crampton. By putting these various documents together, he arrived at a very correct estimate of the state of feeling prevailing in Clackington; and at once addressed to the inhabitants thereof a Pastoral letter characterized by so much kindness towards all parties—so much good sense and unanswerable argument that it did a good deal towards calming the excitement which prevailed.

He spoke in terms of respect and regard of Mr. Slowton; and showed that not only had the proposed arrangements been entered into with his free consent, but that in carrying them out, every possible regard was had to his comfort, privileges, and rights. At the same time he uncompromisingly stated what his own rights were; and having proved that in the case in question there was most sufficient reason for exercising them, he expressed his determination to act upon them in a tone of quiet firmness that made the Clackingtonians feel that resistance, even if it would be desirable, would be in vain. A good deal of correspond-

ence ensued between the Bishop and Mr. Slowton; and on a visit which the latter paid to the Cathedral city, final measures were taken for the proper division of the parish by laying down the territorial limits which pertained to each.

When things came to this point, Mr. Slowton could not but acknowledge to himself that the measures which the Bishop had resolved on were really a great relief to his mind and conscience. The line which marked off the new parish was so drawn as to relieve him of all the worst part of the town—the Railway station, the workshops, the laborers' houses, and the bustling and business portion of the place. The part which was left under his own charge included the residence of his oldest friends and most wealthy parishioners, and formed decidedly the aristocratic quarter of Clackington. So much indeed was this the case that with the exception of Messrs. Crampton and Jackson and a few others, there were hardly half a dozen families who lived in the new parish who regularly frequented the Church. Mr. Slowton therefore felt that the separation of the parish hardly involved any separation of formerly existing ties and associations.

The part of the town that formed the new parish lay along the river, and the ecclesiastical boundary on the side opposite to Mr. Slowton's parish was left undefined, and all the inhabitants who resided in that direction were regarded as parishioners, even although they were at some distance from the town. Within this indefinite boundary, however, a faint line was drawn which would ultimately subdivide the new parish into two, when the increase of the place and people seemed to justify such a step. In the meantime, distinct names were given to each of the parishes, Mr. Slowton's retaining, of course, the name of the original church, which was St. Paul's, while the new clergyman (when he should be appointed) should for the present hold the joint incumbency of St. John's and St. Jude's, which latter however consisted, for the present, of green fields.

When these arrangements had been completed, the Bishop wrote to Mr. Slowton, calling upon him to make such arrangements as he found possible for the celebration of worship in the new parish, and inclosing a letter to Mr.

Crampton, whom he advised him to consult, as from his authority over the buildings of the Railway, he seemed the most likely person to assist in finding a suitable place.

Following the advice of his Diocesan, he called upon and took counsel with Mr. Crampton, who at once placed the upper portion of a large storehouse at his disposal, and readily undertook to make such arrangements, and to provide such things as would be necessary for the reverent celebration of public worship.

'The Bishop says that he hopes very soon to be able to find a clergyman to take charge of this part of the town, so I suppose you may proceed as soon as you please to arrange the place for service. It is very fortunate for the prospects of the new parish, that such a commodious place can be secured.'

'Yes, indeed,' replied Mr. Crampton. 'It can be made into a very decent looking church, and if you give the word, we shall proceed without delay to put it in proper order.'

'Oh, I have nothing to do with it,' said Mr. Slowton. 'The Bishop has relieved me of all care or authority over you in these parts, and has taken you into his own hands.'

'Not at all; he intends of course, with your own consent, to relieve you of this part of the town; but until he sends another clergyman, you are our pastor still, and to you we are bound to defer; and therefore I say again, it is for you to give the necessary directions in this matter, and it is for us to obey them.'

'Well, well,' answered Mr. Slowton good humoredly, 'work away, but don't ask me *how* it is to be done. I leave it in your hands, and I dare say it will be all right. And if not, I'll hand you and your misdemeanors over to the new Incumbent when he arrives.'

'Very well,' replied Crampton with a smile, 'but still I hope you'll look in upon us and give us your opinion of our proceedings. I hope to do nothing but what will meet with your approbation.'

That evening Mr. Crampton invited a few of his friends who felt with him in Church matters, to meet at his house for the purpose of discussing the proposed arrangements.

He told them of the authority he had received to go forward in the work of preparing the storehouse as a temporary church, and means were at once forthcoming to meet the

expense which would be required in carrying out the plan which they contemplated.

The plan was very simple in itself; but owing to the fortunate shape and character of the room, it was in its results very effective. The storehouse, like railway buildings in general, was long and narrow, and, being the upper story, the open timbered roof rising sharply from the low walls gave an appearance to the place which was by no means inappropriate. Mr. Crampton set two or three carpenters to work and raised at one end of the room a good wide platform, elevated by four or five steps above the general level of the floor and extending across the entire width of the apartment. This he covered with a good carpet, and on it he placed a communion table against the end wall, which the ladies of his family covered with a rich cloth ornamented with the cross and monogram wrought in needlework. A small and simple lectern stood well forward towards the front of the platform from which to read the lessons and to preach, and on it lay a handsome bible. A small prayer desk, like the litany desk in an English cathedral, stood on one side of the communion table, though a little in advance of it, and was so placed that the face of the person reading the prayers should be directed across the room, and not towards the congregation.

Shortly after a very beautiful set of silver communion vessels, intended for the use of the future church, was presented by Mr. Jackson, while another gentleman ordered a very large and handsome stone font, which, though like the communion vessels destined ultimately for the church, was until its completion to be used in the temporary place of worship. A number of plain benches were provided, which were ranged along the room, leaving a good wide passage up the middle; and when at the end of a few weeks the arrangements were completed, people who came in were astonished at the church-like effect which had been produced; in fact Mr. Slowton himself acknowledged that in many particulars, as well as in its general effect, the loft of the railway storehouse was more really ecclesiastical than his own church.

'Really I shall grow jealous of you in your 'upper room,' for here, thanks to the railway and your skill, Mr. Crampton, you have in twenty days got a church nearly as large and appropriate for its purpose as I have managed

to get in twenty years. The difficulty in my mind seems where you are to get the people to fill it.'

'If the Bishop can find us the right man,' replied Crampton, 'I don't think that the difficulty of finding the congregation will be greater than that which we have already so easily overcome—I mean finding a suitable place of worship. The railway that found the church will do a good deal towards finding the congregation also.'

Mr. Slowton looked rather blank for a moment, as if he thought that Mr. Crampton intended him to feel that *he* was not the right man. A glance however at the open, kindly and gratified face of his parishioner banished the thought, and he replied:

'I am sure I hope the new clergyman may be more successful than I have been in winning your railway people to the church. It seems to me very hopeless work.'

'Why it would be hopeless work for any one situated as you have been,' answered Crampton. 'With a church hardly large enough to hold your old parishioners, and even that occupied by private property in the shape of pews, how would it have been possible for you to win them to a place wherein they felt that they had neither right nor room?'

'There is no doubt truth in what you say,' observed Mr. Slowton; 'and your open benches here will no doubt be a great help in getting them to attend to their duty; but still I can't see so very plainly the need of all this subdivision—if the people down here had shown any particular desire for the church services it would be another matter.'

'Ah, well, my dear sir,' said Crampton, 'we need not enter upon that subject again now that the measure is not only resolved on, but, I may say, completed, with the exception of the clergyman's appointment, which I suppose will soon take place now that'—

'It has taken place already,' interrupted Mr. Slowton; 'I have a letter from the Bishop only this morning, in which he says that he has found a clergyman whom he thinks well fitted for this sphere of labour, and who has consented to accept the appointment.'

Crampton's face brightened.

'I am sure,' he said, looking straight into Mr. Slowton's eyes, 'I am sure that you will not

misunderstand me, or think me rude or ungrateful, in expressing my great pleasure and thankfulness to hear these tidings, but I am so deeply convinced of the great need which exists for additional ministrations amongst us, and of the great relief it will be to yourself, and the great benefit and blessing it will prove to the souls of the people, that I should be guilty of insincerity were I not to express my pleasure and gratification at these tidings.'

Good Mr. Slowton, with all his short-comings, had a warm, soft heart, and taking Mr. Crampton's hand, he pressed it in a most friendly way. 'I believe you, my dear sir, from my heart,' he said. 'I never questioned your motives for a moment among all the hard things that have been said of late. I trust your new pastor may be a more 'able minister of the New Testament' than I have been, and I wish most sincerely that people would allow us all to get on more harmoniously than we do. I wish 'the fighting institution' could be abolished, at any rate in the church.'

'I heartily respond amen to that wish,' replied Crampton; 'but do you know anything, may I ask, about this new clergyman and when he is likely to arrive?'

'He has recently come from some other diocese in the provinces, and the bishop seems to have known something of him in other days; his name is Evenley—the Rev. Ernest Evenley—and he may be expected, the bishop says, in the course of a day or two.'

'Does he say anything about him further?'

'Not much, except that from his own knowledge of him formerly, and from his testimonials, he is disposed to place every reliance on his zeal and judgment.'

'Do you know whether he is a bachelor or a man with a family?' asked Mr. Crampton; 'it is a matter of considerable moment to us at present; it is not much to support one, but to maintain half-a-dozen in the comfort that befits their position is not so easy.'

'He is a bachelor, the bishop tells me,' replied Mr. Slowton; 'and what is more, he says that he has some private means.'

'Ah well; now we are all right,' observed Crampton, with a look of great satisfaction; 'if he will do his duty for a little while and teach the people their duty, we shall not require the best fit of his means as well as his services.'

The news of the expected arrival soon spread, and partly as a consequence of the late agitation Clackington was on the tiptoe of expectation.

One morning, not many days after the above conversation, Mr. Slowton was seen walking along the street with a very clerical looking personage, and immediately the word was given among the newsmongers that the new clergyman had arrived, which intelligence proved more than usually correct. He had come by the late train on the previous evening, and in accordance with Mr. Slowton's invitation had passed the night at his house. Mr. Evenley was by appearance nothing very remarkable—neither very tall nor very short, very plain nor very handsome—he nevertheless made an agreeable impression by manners perfectly well bred and by an expression of sincerity that was very taking. His face when at rest assumed a look of firmness almost amounting to sternness, but when speaking it lighted up with a smile, and such real and unaffected kindness as almost always ways to prepossession in his favour those with whom he came in contact. He was not particularly youthful, although a bachelor, and his general bearing was grave, quiet and deliberate.

Some of the sayings and doings which resulted from his arrival must be reserved for the following chapters.

EXTRACTS FROM WESLEY.

1746.—“I dare not renounce communion with the Church of England. As a Minister I teach her doctrines, I use her offices; I conform to her Rubrics; I suffer reproach for my attachment to her. As a private member, I hold her doctrines; I join in her offices, in prayer, in hearing, in communicating.”

1747.—“We continually exhort all who attend on our preaching, to attend the offices of the Church. And they do pay a more regular attendance there than they ever did before.”

1755.—“We began reading together ‘A Gentleman's Reasons for his Dissent from the Church of England.’ It is an elaborate and lively tract, and contains the strength of the cause; but it did not yield us *one proof* that it is lawful for us (much less our duty) to separate from it.”

1758.—“In this year Mr. Wesley wrote his ‘Reasons against a Separation from the Church of England;’ and in writing to Miss Bishop in 1778 he says: ‘These reasons were never answered; and I believe they never will.’”

The Rev. Charles Wesley says of this Tract: “I think myself bound in duty to add my testi-

mony to my brother's. His twelve reasons against *our ever* separating from the Church of England are mine also. I subscribe to them with all my heart. My affection for the Church is as strong as ever; and I clearly see my calling; which is to live and die in her communion. This, therefore, I am determined to do, the Lord being my Helper.”

1759.—“I received much comfort at the old Church in the morning, and at St. Thomas in the afternoon. It was as if both the sermons were made for me. I *pity* those who can find no good at Church! But how should they, if *prejudice* come between? An effectual bar to the grace of God.”

Psalm.

The Memory of the Dead.

O it is sweet to think

Of those that are departed,
While murmured Aves sink
To silence tender-hearted;
While tears that have no pain
Are tranquilly distilling,
And the dead live again

In hearts that love is filling.

Yet not as in the days

Of earthly ties we love them;
For they are touched with rays
From light that is above them:
Another sweetness shines

Around their well-known features;
God with His glory signs
His dearly ransomed creatures.

Ah! they are more our own,

Since now they are God's only;
And each one that has gone
Has left our heart less lonely.

He mourns not seasons fled,
Who now in Him possesses
Treasures of many dead
In their dear Lord's caresses.

Dear dead! they have become
Like guardian angels to us;
And distant heaven like home,
Through them begins to woo us.
Love, that was earthly, wings
Its flight to holier places;
The dead are sacred things
That multiply our graces.

They whom we loved on earth

Attract us now to heaven:
Who shared our grief and mirth
Back to us now are given.

They move with noiseless foot
Gravely and sweetly round us,
And their soft touch hath cut
Full many a chain that bound us.

O dearest dead! to heaven

With grudging sighs we gave you,
To Him—be doubts forgiven!

Who took you there to save you:—
May we have grace to love
Your memories yet more kindly;
Pine for our homes above,
And trust to God more blindly.