




**IMAGE EVALUATION
TEST TARGET (MT-3)**



**Photographic
Sciences
Corporation**

23 WEST MAIN STREET
WEBSTER, N.Y. 14580
(716) 872-4503

0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

**CIHM/ICMH
Microfiche
Series.**

**CIHM/ICMH
Collection de
microfiches.**



Canadian Institute for Historical Microreproductions / Institut canadien de microreproductions historiques

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

© 1983

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
- Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée
- Covers restored and/or laminated/
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque
- Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur
- Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- Coloured plates and/or illustrations/
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents
- Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin/
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distortion le long de la marge intérieure
- 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.
- Additional comments:
Commentaires supplémentaires:

- Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur
- Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées
- Pages restored and/or laminated/
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
- Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
- Pages detached/
Pages détachées
- Showthrough/
Transparence
- Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression
- Includes supplementary material/
Comprend du matériel supplémentaire
- Only edition available/
Seule édition disponible
- Pages wholly or partially obscured by errata slips, tissues, etc., have been refilmed to ensure the best possible image/
Les pages totalement ou partiellement obscurcies par un feuillet d'errata, une pelure, etc., ont été filmées à nouveau de façon à obtenir la meilleure image possible.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12X	16X	20X	24X	28X	32X

The copy filmed here has been reproduced thanks to the generosity of:



Library of the Public
Archives of Canada

The images appearing here are the best quality possible considering the condition and legibility of the original copy and in keeping with the filming contract specifications.

Original copies in printed paper covers are filmed beginning with the front cover and ending on the last page with a printed or illustrated impression, or the back cover when appropriate. All other original copies are filmed beginning on the first page with a printed or illustrated impression, and ending on the last page with a printed or illustrated impression.

The last recorded frame on each microfiche shall contain the symbol \rightarrow (meaning "CONTINUED"), or the symbol ∇ (meaning "END"), whichever applies.

Maps, plates, charts, etc., may be filmed at different reduction ratios. Those too large to be entirely included in one exposure are filmed beginning in the upper left hand corner, left to right and top to bottom, as many frames as required. The following diagrams illustrate the method:



L'exemplaire filmé fut reproduit grâce à la générosité de:

La bibliothèque des Archives
publiques du Canada

Les images suivantes ont été reproduites avec le plus grand soin, compte tenu de la condition et de la netteté de l'exemplaire filmé, et en conformité avec les conditions du contrat de filmage.

Les exemplaires originaux dont la couverture en papier est imprimée sont filmés en commençant par le premier plat et en terminant soit par la dernière page qui comporte une empreinte d'impression ou d'illustration, soit par le second plat, selon le cas. Tous les autres exemplaires originaux sont filmés en commençant par la première page qui comporte une empreinte d'impression ou d'illustration et en terminant par la dernière page qui comporte une telle empreinte.

Un des symboles suivants apparaîtra sur la dernière image de chaque microfiche, selon le cas: le symbole \rightarrow signifie "A SUIVRE", le symbole ∇ signifie "FIN".


Les cartes, planches, tableaux, etc., peuvent être filmés à des taux de réduction différents. Lorsque le document est trop grand pour être reproduit en un seul cliché, il est filmé à partir de l'angle supérieur gauche, de gauche à droite, et de haut en bas, en prenant le nombre d'images nécessaire. Les diagrammes suivants illustrent la méthode.

re
détails
es du
modifier
er une
ilimage

es

errata
to

pelure,
n à



TEN LETTERS

ON

THE CHURCH

AND

CHURCH ESTABLISHMENTS;

ADDRESSED TO

THE HON. W. H. DRAPER, M. P. P., &c. &c. &c.

BY AN ANGLO-CANADIAN.



Toronto:

PRINTED AT THE COMMERCIAL HERALD OFFICE,

1839.

27

1887

1887

1887

1887

1887

1887

1887

1887

1887

1887

1887

1887

1887

1887

1887

1887

1887

1887

1887

1887

1887

1887

TEN LETTERS

ON THE

CHURCH AND CHURCH ESTABLISHMENTS.



LETTER I.

TO THE HON. W. H. DRAPER, M. P. P. &c. &c. &c.

INTRODUCTION.—On the evil of being governed by mere Popular Majorities.

SIR,

The Rev. Egerton Ryerson having addressed a series of elaborate communications to you, I am desirous of engaging your attention, and through you, that of the public, to what I consider the fallacies of some of his fundamental principles, especially as they are brought to bear upon the question of an Established Church.

I would, however, remark in the commencement that I have no personal feeling against Mr. Ryerson. Far otherwise; I admire his talents, I believe him honest, and I honor his fearlessness, while at the same time I must confess I regret what I cannot but consider his versatility, deplore his violence, and deeply lament that in his treatment of our Colonial officials, he should be too frequently in danger of forgetting the dignity and propriety of the Minister in the partizanship of the mere Editor. But yet, Sir, do I equally regret the way in which he and the highly respectable Christian body of which he is at present the accredited organ have been treated by their political opponents; it is not by coarse vituperation and unfounded calumnies that he is to be silenced, or his *anti-Church* efforts neutralized amongst a people by a portion of whom he is held in very high esteem; indeed I regret to know that in many cases the gross attacks that have been made upon Mr. Ryerson and the Wesleyan Methodist Church in this Province have done more to excite unkind feelings towards the Church of England, and to cherish prejudices which are but too easily excited against the very principle of an ecclesiastical establishment, than any thing that has appeared in the columns of the *Christian Guardian*.*

It is, perhaps, possible to charge men with disaffection, and to stigmatize them as rebels, until they really become soured in their feelings and are led to view with comparative calmness proceedings which would once have excited their utmost abhorrence. The Wesleyan

* I deeply regret that, after a more extended examination of the Rev. Writer's most objectionable course I should feel bound to acknowledge that some parts of the above paragraph have no longer my entire concurrence.

Methodists are not rebels, care should be taken not to make them so, and the Reverend Editor of the Guardian himself, is most certainly favorable to a *Durhamized*† connexion with Great Britain, notwithstanding his recklessness as to what may be the result of his violent opposition to a Canadian Ecclesiastical Establishment. Mr. Ryerson is not a man to be despised or treated with contempt, view him in what light you may, and to attempt it does but recoil on the individual doing so, and injures the cause, however excellent, which he may be upholding; Mr. R. must be met with firmness, respect; and sound reason, and then he is vulnerable, for there is certainly no small share of sophistry in much of his writing; the Body also to which he belongs might have been, and I would fain hope may yet be won to a complacent feeling respecting that Christian and truly British institution, an Established Church, while it is but too evident that scorn and contumely will never drive them, unless it be to *desperation*.

With Mr. Ryerson's legal writings and opinions respecting the Clergy Reserves, &c. I do not intend to meddle; as "an Anglo Canadian, I can hardly be expected to cope with him on that subject; and then the question at issue has always appeared to me to be one that should be considered and settled on much higher ground than any mere legal technicalities can suggest—to belong rather to a court of christian equity, than one of mere civil law. I purpose to confine myself, therefore, principally to a consideration of the great religious and political principles involved in this question, and their bearing upon the community of this Province; and more especially as they have been referred to by the talented Editor of the Guardian.

One of the most popular arguments against a Church Establishment in this Province, and one upon which Mr. Ryerson lays great stress, is, that a majority of its inhabitants are opposed to any such an establishment, and that in every free country the wishes of the majority of the people should govern the decisions of the Legislature. The latter part of this proposition is so generally received as an incontrovertible maxim, that to attempt to oppose it is to run the hazard of considerable obloquy; and yet upon a candid examination it will be found to require much restriction in its practical application; it is in fact one of those specious aphorisms with which many modern political economists are so fond of dazzling their followers, but which are yet far more brilliant than solid; they have too much alliance with the dangerous doctrine of innate human perfectibility, a doctrine as dangerous in politics as it is in theology. If the will of the majority, of even the electoral portion of the community, is in every case to be a rule of legislation, then are the individuals they elect no longer representatives, but mere *delegates*, and king or president, peers, senators, or councillors mere unnecessary and cumbersome appendages to the constitution; while our halls of legislation, no longer the arena of solid political discussion, and of the deliberations of senatorial wisdom, are degraded to mere offices of popular

† When this term was used, though then sufficiently questionable, it was not so decidedly anti-British as since the publication of his partial and slanderous Report.

reg
lon
fair
clos
Ath
peo
the
thro
dice
to b
cies
hav
be
com
mu
star
the
exp
uns
the
Am
him
cha
of
with
in t
uga
pre
stri
we
me
blis
look
cop
ver
S
ver
ting
wis
stor
stit
gu
Re
enc
con
siv
tha
het
wit

registration. Indeed, if such is in fact the practical maxim of our Colonial Government in the present day, we have already bid adieu to the fairest features of the British Constitution, and approximated very closely to the fickle, ungrateful and passionate government of ancient Athens; for what was that but a constant appeal to the *majority of the people*? and what was the result even to sage and polished Athens, but the natural one of incessant perils, frequent oppressions, and final overthrow? How is it that men will be thus deaf to the honest and unprejudiced voice of history! Surely your able correspondent does not need to be reminded that fallen humanity still retains the same evil tendencies? I cannot but believe, as the wise and great in almost all ages have taught, that the popular mind is far too unsettled and corrupt to be thus intrusted with the reins of government or the interests of the commonwealth. You will remember, Sir, a remark of Plato, on the murder of the Six Athenian Generals—"The Commonalty is an inconstant, ungrateful, cruel, suspicious animal, incapable of submitting to the government of reason." Harsh as this language is, does not all experience prove it but too true? How frequently have we seen the unstable character of the populace manifested in England? Who were the greatest supporters of Lord North in his pertinacious Colonial American war, and then supported his bitter foes in their opposition to him?—The People! The Rev. Editor will also remember their changeable conduct in regard to Wilkes; and their striking exhibition of fickleness under Pitt's administration with respect to the excise laws; with the still more painful proof we have of the want of sound principles in the public mind in the former violent bitterness of spirit manifested against the professors of Roman Catholicism, as contrasted with the present cold and almost infidel indifference with which the rapid strides of popery both in Church and State are beheld, though all that we hold most holy and dear is unquestionably periled. Let him remember too the wild enthusiasm of the people in support of an Establishment, and the consequent Church and King Riots of '91, and then look at the malignant hatred of a portion of them in '39 to both, and the consequent dangerous state of disaffection; still every thing, even our very salvation, is to be periled on the mutations of such majorities!

So far as I have been acquainted with the principles of sound Government, I have always imagined that it should rather aim at promoting the real interests of the people, than merely consulting their passing wishes, and have been led to view it, in common with Delolme, Blackstone and others, as one of the most striking beauties of the British Constitution, that its House of Peers and Imperial Veto presented a safeguard against the violent impulses to which it was imagined even the *Representatives* of the people might occasionally be subjected by influences from without. But yet I imagine it was expected that while the connection of the Commons with the people would give them an extensive acquaintance with their wants, and a deep interest in their welfare, that for the most part, their own liberal education, rank in life, and heavy stake in the country, would prevent their being equally liable with their constituents to inconstancy or petty selfishness; and that con-

sequently, while they paid a respectful degree of attention to the wishes of the community, and this their wish to be re-elected would insure, that they would yet ever regard themselves rather as the *guardians* than the *hirelings* of the people, consulting what themselves considered for the public *good first*, and for the public *gratification second*: if this be not the principle and working of our Constitution, then I repeat, Queen, Lords and Commons, or Governor, Conncillors and Representatives, are all but an useless paraphernalia, and we had better at once substitute a democratic Assembly somewhat after the Athenian model; for if we are to be ruined by popular incapacity and recklessness, let it be with our eyes open!

Another decisive objection to making the *dictum* of the public the law of legislation is, that from their very limited means of information, and their natural irritability, which is greatly increased by their ignorance, they are at the mercy of any acute and talented agitator who finds it to his interest to flatter their vanity, and work upon their evil passions. I fearlessly appeal, Sir, to all history, whether or not in nine cases out of ten, what is ostentatiously trumpeted as the voice of the people, be any thing more than the mere echo of the opinions of a few favorite demagogues; the result of feelings that originated not with the public, but with their agitators. Perhaps there is no question in which this evil is more strikingly visible than in the one under consideration, as has been abundantly manifested in the history of its discussion in this Province. Where did the opposition that is manifested by a portion of the inhabitants of this Colony, against an Established Church, commence? Certainly not amongst the people themselves, but with selfish, unprincipled ambitious men, or with mistaken sectarian partizans. Indeed the controversy is one which opens on the one hand a singularly wide field for the display of adroit agitation, and affords a fine opportunity to *appeal to many of the baser feelings*, while on the contrary, to the advocates of our Ecclesiastical Establishment, little is left but a class of *highly christian motives* by which, alas, too few are impressible. In fact, so far from being myself influenced by these triumphant appeals to the wishes of the majority, which are so frequently made on this question, I would be content to hazard the decision of the propriety of all such appeals, upon the result of an investigation respecting the class of motives by which this very majority, if such really exist, has been created, as to whether they have been honorable and virtuous, or, in the general, diametrically the opposite; for it surely does not need any lengthened argument to prove, that if the suffrages of the people be gained by unworthy means, that, at least in that case, they are not deserving of attention; and I appeal to the well-informed Editor of the Guardian himself, whether he does not believe that the voice of the people is far more generally, and *more easily* gained by inflammatory appeals and selfish motives, than by any other method? I verily believe it was nothing more than the ordinary selfish fickleness of universal human nature, that made the same people who had hailed our Blessed Redeemer with "Hosannas," afterwards, when excited by the selfish threat of

the
Nu
wit
to t
of c
rat
atio
as a
Sir,
will
peo
Cle
ina
bea
pea
form
exc
me
Ry
be a
furt
fean
Gu
in a
gro
love
nee
was
who
hav
very
wer
pre
from
ces
has
but
brin
it is
imp
unh
ter
pro
she
peo
If t
Ch
pas

their leaders, that the "Romans would take away their place and their Nation," backed by an hypocritical appeal to their zeal for God, cry out with shocking unanimity, "Crucify him, crucify him!" But to return to the matter more immediately under consideration, namely, the *kind* of opposition excited in this Colony against the Church of England, or rather against the principle of an Established Church: for all consideration of the character and treatment of the venerable English Church, as a distinctive Ecclesiastical Body, I, at present purposely waive. Now, Sir, let any unprejudiced person examine these hostile arguments, and will he not find them continually appealing to the pride and envy of the people, by warning them how much greater and richer the Established Clergy will be than either themselves or the Ministers of other Denominations? by arousing their independence by insinuations of the overbearing and interfering character of such an Hierarchy?—or by an appeal to that unhallowed dislike of all lawful government, which in some form or other, is an inherent feeling of fallen humanity, endeavoring to excite dislike and distrust against such a Clergy, representing them as mere state hirelings? Whereas, as I hope to show in considering Mr. Ryerson's eighth letter to you, their connection with the State ought to be an additional reason for rendering them respect and affection. But further than all this, an attempt has been made to arouse the avaricious fears of the community; and I regret that the respectable Editor of the Guardian should have been found handling so unworthy a weapon, and in a way too, for which he ought to have known there was no proper grounds; indeed, an appeal, in a christian controversy at least, to the love of money is *always wrong*, and goes far to impugn the cause that needs it; but in this case we can hardly help suspecting that not only was it wrong in principle, but deceptive in fact; for surely the persons who made the loudest cry respecting "Tithes and Church Rates" must have known that there was no manner of danger of either, for that the very highest Church party in the land is fully willing to support an Act, were any such needed, that should receive Imperial sanctions, for ever preventing their collection: and indeed they must have been aware that from the first the Clergy Reserves were designed to supercode their necessity. Another weapon which I have deeply regretted to see used, has been evil speaking,—I do not mean now, false speaking,—but an attempt by the exhibition of individual improprieties, to bring into discredit the entire Ministry of that Church which it is sought to establish. Now, I am aware, Sir, that some of these improprieties have not been confined to one party merely in this unhappy discussion, I therefore advert to them, not to injure the character of those who have been unhappily betrayed into the use of such improper means, in order to obtain their wishes, but for the purpose of showing that it has been by working upon the "baser passions" of the people, that their aversion to a Church Establishment has been excited. If those who may be conscientiously opposed to any connection between Church and State, had enlisted the popular feeling on their side by dispassionate argument and cool reasoning, then indeed ought the public

voice to have been listened to by a wise and liberal Legislature with respect, and have had its due influence on their decisions, but has not the contrary, as I have been endeavouring to shew, been notoriously the fact? I have had considerable intercourse on the subject with a large number of *the people*, and I regret to say, that while I have heard abundance of complaint, vituperation, and violence, and beheld a disgusting display of selfish dislike and grovelling avarice, rarely have I seen this Anti-Church spirit founded on any thing that deserved to be dignified with the character of conscientious scruples; in truth I feel persuaded that there has seldom been so powerful an opposition got up, professing to be founded on moral principles, that was yet so principally the result of mere agitation or selfish prejudices. Such then being the facts of the case, it adds another to the long list of proofs that have gone before, *that* the will of the majority is at all times a very questionable rule of legislation, and that especially in the present instance, it behoves the Legislature to act upon higher principles than those of mere expediency; and that while they take special care to prove their firm determination to guard the rights and privileges of all classes of Her Majesty's subjects, and manifest a desire even to meet their *wishes* as far as possible, is essential that at the present crisis, they evidence their determination *to do right at all hazards*, and leave results to the God of Nations.

I cannot help flattering myself, however, that the present violent opposition to an Established Church will gradually evaporate, not merely, as in most popular excitements, from the exhaustion of the public mind, but from a growing conviction of the honest intentions of Government towards them, and of the *harmlessness, at least*, of a modified Establishment; I feel sure that this will be the case, if a few of its leading opponents would for once sacrifice party zeal and private ambition on the Altar of their Country, not to say the Altar of their God.

But I must, at present, conclude, for my engagements are too numerous to allow of my following your elaborate correspondent through all his lengthy communications, I hope, however, to be able to answer successfully the objections in his last letter to you; and thereby prove that an established Church is *an injury to no one*, and that, too, in consistency even with his great Doctor, the EXPEDIENT Paley; and, perhaps, I may ultimately endeavor to show, on the broad ground of public utility and scriptural consistency, not only the propriety but the obligation of the State to uphold, defend, and support the Church. But, Sir, I must beg the exercise of your kind forbearance towards my letters, as I have positively no time to re-write, and scarcely to read them.

In the meantime, I have the honor to be,

Sir, with sentiments of respect,

Your obedient Servant,

AN ANGLO-CANADIAN.

March 1, 1839.

LETTER II.

TO THE HON. W. H. DRAPER, M. P. P. &c. &c. &c.

Remarks on Rev. Egerton Ryerson's attack on the authorities; a covert conspiracy against the Constitution; the friends of the Church not a minority; its modified establishment advocated; Emigrants chiefly churchmen; the question of an Established Church only to be settled by an appeal to principle; The exclusive appropriation of the Reserves no "Tax"; Church Endowments not given as personal favors, but for the public good; arbitrary laws not needed to protect an Establishment; Mr. R's unprotestant sentiments with respect to the endowment of the Papal Church.

SIR,

In proceeding to examine the positions of Mr. Ryerson's Eighth Letter, I shall endeavor to do so as briefly as it will possibly admit, as I feel anxious to enter upon the consideration of that gentleman's last; and very *specious* communication to you.

To the appeal for an *impartial* hearing with which your correspondent commences the Letter under consideration, I most heartily respond, as it is only the frequent efforts that are made to work upon the passions and prejudices of the people of which I stand in fear; and I cannot but wish, Sir, that the Reverend Writer would not endeavor to incapacitate his readers from rendering that impartiality to others which he seeks for himself. The direct attack upon our constituted Authorities, contained in the preface of that letter, were its insinuations even borne out by fact, Mr. Ryerson, as a Minister, ought to know, is neither consistent with Scriptural submission, nor constitutional loyalty; or, if it be, then plain unlettered men, must sit down hopeless even of being able to discover the "hair drawn line" between what is right and what is wrong in these matters; and the danger is, lest the multitude should *foulishly* (?) imagine that what he has a right recklessly to attack with his *pen*, they have an equal right to assail with their, *perhaps less dangerous weapon*, the *sword*. But what is it upon which the complaint in question is grounded? Not, certainly that the wishes of the people on these subjects, have been neglected, for several are the Ecclesiastical requests they have made which have been acceded to; no, Sir, the real source of discontent is, *that our Constitution has not been violated*, by making the House of Assembly, not merely the supreme, but the *only* governing Estate! No one knows better than Mr. Ryerson, that the refusal to let any one branch of the Legislature control and overawe the others, is no infringement of constitutional rights; otherwise the two branches so overruled would be virtually extinct, and our boasted Constitution of "*Three Estates*," so long the admiration of the world, *become a mere name*. Let the matter be fairly understood, for I holdly assert, that, whatever may be the merits of the present controversy, there is a *most determined, though covert* attack being made in *this Province*, against the very first principles of the *British Constitution*;

and that not, as is vainly pretended, by the Executive Government, whatever may be its fallings, and I am not blind to them, but by those, who, whether styled "Reformers" or otherwise, are evidently, firmly resolved to annihilate the undoubted prerogatives of Her Majesty's Representative and the Legislative Councillors, making them the mere echo of the House of Assembly, while they seek to degrade *that* itself into the miserable creature of a popular majority; these then are the men who whether designedly or no, are the real "traitors" to our unrivalled Constitution; yet it is for its opposition to such a withering conspiracy as this, that your correspondent so heavily charges the Administrating Government. I rejoice to believe, Sir, that party zeal has beclouded his, otherwise, clear mental vision, rather than corrupted his heart.

Passing by for the present, Mr. Ryerson's professed admissions, but implied doubts; I hasten to notice his first objection, that "an exclusive endowment of the Episcopal Clergy, would be a violation of the great principle which has been conceded by the ablest advocates of Establishments, namely, that they must *include a majority of the population.*" In the first place, it would be by no means evident, that the majority of the people are not more or less attached to the Church of England, even though it should be proved that they were averse to its legal establishment.* In the second, it is to be observed that this is not a question to be settled by the authority of names however great, but upon the moral rights of the case.

The opinion of Archdeacon Paley, however, is far from being, as Mr. Ryerson seems to suppose, strongly in favor of his position, even granting him his assumption that the Church of England is a minority; the Doctor's statement is, that in such a case, "the Establishment itself ought to be altered or qualified;" now this *qualification* our liberal Legislature is fully prepared to accede; and I hope to be able to show that *this*, and not "*alteration*," is precisely what the peculiar state of this Province requires. 1. An important matter for decision in this controversy is whether the Provincial opposition to the Established Church be fictitious, that is, the result of mere excitement, from evanescent causes, as was the case during the Commonwealth in England; or whether it be the result of deep rooted and conscientious prejudice, as in Scotland; now it is self-evident that the *former* class of oppositionists can have little right to expect that degree of respectful attention from the Legislature, which, yet, the *latter* might reasonably hope to receive. Now, Sir, after some years residence in this Co-

* I have little doubt that Mr. Ryerson is egregiously mistaken as regards the feelings of the people respecting the Church of England. As far as I have yet learned the returns of the late census they are largely in favor of the Establishment; I have now before me the returns of two Wards of the City of Toronto, and in the one the friends of the Church are upwards of four to one, and in the other upwards of three to one. What are we to think of the accuracy of the Ex-High Commissioner or his panegyrist, Mr. Ryerson, when they represent the Church as a small minority?

lony, I am perfectly satisfied that the enmity which is felt by some of its inhabitants to the Church of England, is, in the vast majority of cases, of the *former* description, the result of interested or mistaken agitation. 2. Another important fact to be adduced in answer to the objection under consideration, and one which your correspondent seems in no wise anxious to bear in mind, is, that we are but a fractional part of a mighty empire, and that it is, therefore, certainly but fair, if we must be governed by *majorities*, to give some heed to what is the feeling of the collective Empire; and there is one fact especially as connected with the popular bias at home in favor of the Church of England, that seems to me, in all fairness, to furnish, at once, an answer to the objection under consideration, and it is, that we expect our forests to be peopled not so much by the natural increase of population, as by the influx of emigration from Home; and that consequently our Legislature is called upon not merely to consider what is, but also, what, according to all human calculation, *will be* the feeling of the public mind.* Now, Sir, I have some acquaintance both with England and Canada, and I think, a little with human nature, and I confidently predict that let there be a "qualified" Establishment in this Province, supplied with an active, pious Clergy, and left quietly to work its own way in the affections of the people, and a very few years will behold it not only tolerated, but loved and respected. I am not ignorant of the partial alienation of feeling from the English Church, by which too many of the English and Irish peasantry are affected, or rather I should say the former only, as the Protestant Irish are, in the general, too well aware of the value of their Protestant Establishment to be easily shaken in their attachment to it; but our rural English population also have still such a lingering attachment to the Church of their Fathers, that unquestionably the mass, even of the disaffected amongst them, would hail, on these distant shores, with real satisfaction, an Establishment that would so strikingly *anglicise* their new home, especially as it would, in this Province, be freed from those peculiarities that had excited their dislike in the Parent Institution; nor let this feeling be underrated, its effects I am sure would be powerful, the English and Irish mind when not corrupted by republican associations, is strongly imbued with *veneration and respect*, it is in this respect, as every acute observer of the various shades of character, must have remarked, altogether different to the more matter of fact, and calculating disposition of our American neigh-

* I confess I am perfectly at a loss to understand the common honesty of the assertion in the Earl of Durham's recent report that the "great proportion" of emigrants from England *will be dissenters*! I have perhaps had as much intercourse, and of a much freer character, with the class of emigrants that usually come out to this country as has his Lordship himself, and with a very few exceptions, I have found all of whom I have asked the question had been attendants on the Church before they came hither! Does the Earl, or do his supporters in these opinions know that according to calculations formed from data furnished by themselves, the dissenters are only about *one twelfth* of the English community? Such statements therefore, as the above are characteristic specimens of the Noble Earl's usual want of fairness.

bours. But, though I have endeavored to prove that, even on Mr. Ryerson's favorite principle of *majorities*, the sound and true balance is in favor of an Ecclesiastical Establishment, yet would I not wish to be understood as admitting that this is the proper ground upon which to rest the settlement of the question, as I am fully convinced that the real benefit of the people, and the proper national recognition of the supremacy of Almighty God, ought ever in this, as in every other duty, to be the only ruling principle with *those* Powers who "are ordained of God." I cannot conclude this section of the argument better than with what is one of the fundamental principles in the moral Philosophy, of even the *accommodating* Paley, namely, "that it is lawful for the magistrate to interfere in the affairs of religion, whenever his interference appears to *him* to conduce, by its general tendency, to the public happiness."

2. Your correspondent states as his second objection to the exclusive appropriation of the Reserves, "That it is taxing the entire population to support the religion of the minority." I do not wish at the present moment to interfere with the question of the propriety or impropriety of "the exclusive appropriation of the Clergy Reserves," but to draw your attention to the singular incorrectness of the argument here adduced against it; I can scarcely help imagining that the Rev. writer must have blushed with conscious shame, as he wrote an argument so manifestly founded on gross misrepresentation. To talk of any appropriation of the Reserves being a "Tax" upon the people, is really a little too bad. Did they originally belong to the Crown or not? And were they, or were they not appropriated for a specific religious purpose? How then can it be taxing *the people* to apply them to that purpose? Mr. R. says "that as the labours of the people have given the Reserves their value, they therefore have the only right to dispose of them;" but Sir, a child must see the unworthy fallacy of such an argument, as any increase in value which the Reserves may have received is purely accidental; the cultivators of the neighbouring farms, having had no design to improve them, nor ever having bestowed any labour upon them, cannot in common honesty have any claim upon them; supposing for instance, an individual should erect mills in any neighbourhood previously destitute of them, and thereby encrease the value of the surrounding property 25 per cent, then if Mr. Ryerson's argument be founded on the immutable principles of justice, the owners of the said property are bound in equity to give the proprietor of the mills the said 25 per cent on their various properties; on the same principle, the first settlers in every township have a large individual claim on the proceeds of the lots that afterwards are sold. Will even your sophistical correspondent defend a principle like this?

3. In considering the third objection, that an appropriation "bestows invidious and unmerited favors upon a minority of the population, to the exclusion of the great majority," I shall not in this place attempt to answer Mr. Ryerson's disparaging comparison of the labours and success of the English Clergy in this Province, but leave it for future consider-

ation, as it does not legitimately belong to this stage of the argument, I shall content myself with observing, that the Reverend Gentleman seems to misunderstand the very principle of Ecclesiastical Endowments, or otherwise wilfully to misrepresent them, as they, as you are aware, Sir, are by no means designed as *rewards* or *favours* to any Church or any sect of men, but are entirely and solely appropriated in principle with a reference to the general welfare, and the glory of God; the peculiar privileges of the Endowed Clergy, are merely the accidents connected with the necessary arrangements of an Establishment; and to represent them therefore, as the result of an "invidious" partiality, is neither just nor honorable.

4. The Reverend Gentleman's objection, that the "exclusive appropriation of the Reserves would create a necessity for penal laws, for partial and arbitrary government," is in keeping with many other of that writer's insinuating and startling assertions. It is, Sir, unquestionably true, that such an appropriation would call for protecting laws, (call them *penal*, if you will,) and so it would if they were given for Education, or any other purpose. The assertion that it would call "for partial and arbitrary government," I must be allowed to declare to be totally incorrect: your *clerical* correspondent is most assuredly possessed of sufficient political acumen to know that the firm support of any and every part of the Government, as by law established, even though it should unhappily be requisite to resort to harsh measures, has in it nothing "partial and arbitrary," for that it is the duty of the Executive at all times, and under all circumstances, to maintain the Laws as it finds them. I do not, therefore, like this frequent juxtaposition of such obnoxious epithets with the Authorities, it looks very like a concealed attempt to bring them into discredit. But, Sir, though I have thought it necessary to rebut the insinuation, that the resort to *even harsh* measures in support of the Law, constitute a Government "partial and arbitrary," yet I am far from imagining that such measures would be eventually requisite to maintain the peace of this Colony in case of a full and efficient Ecclesiastical Establishment being adopted.

I shall pass by Mr. Ryerson's argument against a *division* of the Reserves, with many of which I confess my entire agreement, because my engagements forbid my giving that time to the subject, which the different circumstances of your indefatigable correspondent so amply permits to him, and I feel particularly anxious, as far as in me lies, to neutralize his bitter opposition to the principle of an Ecclesiastical Establishment. But before I conclude this letter, I beg your attention to what certainly appears to me a most singular remark respecting the rights of the Roman Catholic Church, it is this, as a *statesman*, (says he,) and as a member of an enlightened and impartial Government, I conceive it is your duty to show no favor to Her Majesty's Protestant Subjects, that is not equally shown to Her Majesty's Catholic Subjects." Now, Sir, I venture to say, that had a Divine of the English Church uttered such a sentiment, unconnected with this particular subject, your Reverend Correspondent himself would have been amongst the first to exhibit with

his own peculiar force, the fearful indifference manifested by such a sentiment, to the essential interests of the Church of Christ. And, Sir, allow me to ask *him*, whether he really believes the Legislators of a Christian Land are indeed exonerated from all consideration for the moral and spiritual interests of the community? whether it be in truth, in his estimation, the fact that Rulers are "a terror to evil doers, and a praise to them that do well," only in respect to the gross breaches of social order? I confess I have not so learned Scriptural truth. The Letter is already long, or it were easy to show that there are connected with the Papacy, *political* as well as *religious* evils, which should prevent the philanthropic as well as the Christian statesman, from granting it that sanction which they readily accord to Protestantism.

Yours, &c.

AN ANGLO-CANADIAN.

8th March, 1839.

LETTER III.

TO THE HON. W. H. DRAPER, M. P. P. &c. &c. &c.

The Provincial Establishment of the Church of England greatly dependent on the present decision of the Local Legislature; cannot exist as an Establishment without being endowed; injustice to England of alienating the provision already made. Why Establishments do not answer in the States; the necessity for one here; why the Church has been unpopular because slandered; why not more influential here; reasons for American Ministers being first here; the evils of mere voluntarism shown in the early history of this Province. Unpleasant questions for Mr. Ryerson. Want of liberality in the friends of the Voluntary System; speedy attachment of the people to an Establishment, if left to themselves. Voluntarism does not prevent Religious discord in the States; but to the want of an Establishment is to be attributed their unsettled political condition.

SIR,

The first assertion contained in Mr. Ryerson's Ninth Letter, namely, "That the application of the Clergy Reserve appropriation to educational purposes, has nothing to do with the assumption of any Church as an Establishment of the Empire," if not absolutely false, certainly appears to me, to be based on an unworthy misrepresentation; for though it be true that the Establishment of the Church of England in this Province, does not *legally* depend upon its retaining the Clergy Lands, no one knows better than your Correspondent, that in *fact* the question of a

State supported Church does, it is to be feared, greatly hinge on the class of principles to which the Colonial Legislature may now give its sanction. I ask the *ingenuous* Editor of the Guardian, whether his eager desire for the Educational appropriation of the Reserves, does not spring from the hope that he may thereby give a mortal stab to the principle of an Establishment, rather than from his deep interest in Education; if so, how *true* and *just* "are the statements of high Church partizans, that the advocacy of the Educational appropriation of the Reserves is an attempt to uproot the Established Church."

2. The second assertion is equally disingenuous with the former; for though the Educational appropriation scheme may not, on the face of it, be an attack against the Church as a part of the Constitution, yet it is so in fact; for though a Trading Company may be chartered without being *endowed*, of what is the Charter of an Ecclesiastical Establishment to consist, if it is not *endowed*, as it is admitted on all hands that such an Establishment shall have no influence over other Churches whatever? The opposition to an *endowed* Establishment, therefore, is an opposition to the very *principle* of Establishments, and such the Reverend Writer must have known it to be. Alas; then, Sir, who is that "Impugner" who will have to answer for his "false witness and disgraceful calumnies against his neighbours?"

3. It is true, that this "proposition does not *directly* interfere with any grants which the Imperial Parliament may think proper to make to the Clergy of the Established Churches. But, Sir, it is self-evident that if such appropriations are right, and it is upon this supposition that the above statement is founded, then common consistency requires that when they have been once made, they ought not to be dissipated, simply because we have the *power* to do so, in the expectation that the Parent State will make up the loss occasioned by such malversation. Can any honest man believe this would be acting justly by Great Britain? Does Mr. Ryerson think that any conscientious supporter of an Establishment, can ever righteously acquiesce in such an "unfair" proceeding?

4. The involved sentences of the first paragraph of the fourth section, are more than I have ability to unravel; I shall therefore proceed at once to notice the remarks upon the voluntary system, as being "the only hope of this Province." Save the mark! Mr. R. says, that it is the only system that will answer where the people are as much divided in religious sentiments as they are here, and instances the New England States where State appropriations were tried and failed. I have long been convinced, Sir, that it must be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to maintain an Established Church under a Democratic Republican Government; and to this defect in the Government, and not to the divided state of public feeling, is to be attributed the failure of such appropriations in the States. Is there not in England a very considerable degree of religious difference, and yet how does the Establishment there exist and flourish? 2d. The argument is certainly a somewhat singular one; that because the Reserves will not be sufficient for the support

of all the Provincial Ministry, that therefore they shall be given to none. This may be a reason for not dividing them, and yet even then, I should suppose they might serve as an adjunct to the voluntary system, but at all events it certainly can be none against appropriating them to *one Church exclusively*, but directly in favor of so doing. 3d. I am as well aware as Mr. Ryerson can be, that this Province owes much to the *voluntary system*; but because either from unavoidable circumstances or criminal neglect, the Church of England has not, in former years, been the blessing it ought to have been in this Colony, that is surely no reason why it should not now be enabled to do its duty. For I can hardly imagine that your Reverend Correspondent will say the labours of its Clergy are unnecessary; if he does I, though only an "*Anglo-Canadian*," must beg to tell him from personal experience, that he is entirely mistaken.

But, Sir, I must also be permitted to demur at the attack he here makes, not only upon the English Church, but upon the British Government also, as being alike disrespectful and incorrect. If there have been unpleasant feelings created in this Province respecting an Established Church, methinks truth would lead us to look for the cause, not in "the odious assumptions and exclusive spirit of the Episcopal Clergy since 1827," much as I regret the intemperate spirit in which the interests of the Province, as connected with them, have occasionally been maintained, but that the solution of such a feeling must be sought in the unfair, untrue, and scandalous system of warfare which has represented and denounced all persons as *tyrants* and enemies of the rights of the people, who are upholders of the endowment of the Episcopal Church. "Such impugners have much to answer for to their Maker, and to the public, for their years of false witness and disgraceful calumnies against their neighbours!" I cannot but think that christian candour should have found a different answer to the "unpleasant" questions which are asked in the Letter under consideration, to that which is there implied. Mr. Ryerson brings very heavy charges against the Establishment for having neglected the spiritual interests of this Province in its earlier history, and then *most charitably* attributes it to there being richly endowed Rectories at that period. What then makes the difference now? Is there yet any prospect of making a *gain* of godliness even by the Rectories? Mr. Ryerson knows to the contrary, he knows that at present, and for long to come, the Rectories themselves can be expected to yield little or nothing. Surely it is long since the Reverend Gentleman read the thirteenth chapter of the the 1st Corinthians, or been actuated by the spirit which it so beautifully inculcates, even that Charity that "thinketh no evil," or surely he must have remembered that the very nature of the English Established Church, is such, that it recognizes no provision for the Ecclesiastical Establishment of any country but what is appropriated by the Executive within itself; every extraneous effort, therefore, even for the aid of Colonial Establishments, must be as voluntary with the Church of England, as with any Dissenting Body; consequently, whatever, may be the force of Mr. Ryerson's

sarcasms, they lie, not against Establishments, but against the *voluntary* principle! And in this censure, be it remembered, that every British voluntary Church is as deeply implicated as the Church of England, as they had the same kind of means at their command to send the Gospel hither, as the Establishment itself; nor should it be forgotten that it was yet the Church of England, if I be not misinformed, that did first send the Christian Ministry from England to Canada!

With respect to the fact which has been so loudly proclaimed as the triumph of voluntaryism, namely, that in *British Canada* the Gospel was first proclaimed by *American Preachers*; it may be remarked, that if we have had the truth it has certainly not been the whole truth which has been presented to our view; for without wishing to disparage, in the slightest degree, the pious ardor of those zealous men, who, from the neighbouring States first brought the "Lamp of Life" to this then "benighted" land, still candor requires that the great difference between their relation, as men and Christians, to this Province, and that of the British Churches should be distinctly marked; at all events it will be no difficult matter to show, that whatever gratitude may be, and undoubtedly is due to *individual zeal*, as connected with the early propagation of the Gospel in this country, *that a very small share can be claimed on that account by the voluntary system; nay that its very failure in that particular instance, in the United States, as well as at Home, is, of itself, sufficient to prove the necessity of State appropriations, even for the express purpose of supplying the spiritual wants of Colonial possessions.*

1. When this Province was first settled, it was by the children, brothers, and friends of those who remained in the States, and in coming to this land they might be comparatively said to be scarcely out of the sight, or at least, to remain the neighbors of their Christian and relative connections; now as national prejudices will seldom stand before natural affection, and are even still more easily dissipated by true Christian feelings, it was surely to be supposed that American Christians would have a tenderer interest in, and a more active zeal for the immediate welfare of their relations and neighbors in this Province, than could possibly be expected to exist in the bosoms of the inhabitants of Great Britain, who at that time had little or no acquaintance with this country, and no connection but the comparatively cold one of Empire. 2. But notwithstanding the consanguinity and contiguity of the United States, let it *not* be imagined that it was to the *voluntary efforts of its Christian Inhabitants in general*, that this land owes its first Christian light; for if I am not very greatly mistaken, the first American Preachers came here, urged by no motive but their own individual Christian zeal, and *supported by no arm but that of the Almighty*, that is, having no pecuniary aid from the land or Churches they left. So that it seems, Sir, after all the flourish of trumpets respecting the wonderful effects of American zeal, backed by the magic influence of American *voluntaryism*, that the sober facts of the case are, that a few holy men, under the influence of personal religion and relative affections, came, where it was most natural they should come, to their immediate

neighbours and friends, to preach Christ, but that they came alone, bringing with them no proof whatever of the blessings of voluntary Church zeal, or voluntary Christian liberality. I confess, Sir, that as a Briton, I feel upon the examination of this matter not a little ease of mind in finding, that though we have been far too tardy in awaking to our duty as respects this Colony, that yet, unlike our boasted American neighbours, when we were made to feel our duty, notwithstanding the want of suitable State provision, our Ecclesiastical Hierarchy failed not to cry to its ministerial servants, "Go preach the Gospel," and at the same time, unaccustomed as it was to the voluntary system, yet, in lack of other means, it provided by *voluntary exertions*, a proper provision for the supply of *their temporal wants*. 3. Yet, when after all the voluntary efforts that have been made, not only in America, but at Home, both by the Church of England, and by many other Churches also; and in later years among ourselves likewise, for the spread of Divine truth, we behold the great moral destitution that still exists in the Province, I should certainly have imagined, was I not, alas, too well acquainted with the withering effects of prejudice, that not only would every man of sound understanding, have been thoroughly convinced of the *necessity* of a Religious Establishment, but that every Christian philanthropist also would have vehemently urged on a too indifferent government, its immediate erection. The truth is that the spiritual wants of this people are strikingly great; very many settlements, and even numerous Townships, are scarcely ever visited by accredited orthodox Ministers, and thousands more are little better than heretical Protestants; *surely then the condition of this Colony is of itself sufficient to show the inefficiency of the voluntary system.*

I might also ask "unpleasant questions," and with rather more propriety than your self-excited correspondent. Does he suppose that the tumult raised by his own agitation is to be the ruling voice of the nation? Is Sir George Arthur, after having been the administrator of a Colonial Government for a long series of years, and deservedly earning a reputation of the highest order, to be bearded as though he had nothing at stake, and were alike ignorant and unprincipled? Are Honorable Members of the House of Assembly to be branded with impunity, as being bribed by Government Officers "to disregard the settled and well-known wishes of their Constituents?" Is it right for a private individual, and that individual a Minister, to misrepresent either the method by which this Province first heard the Gospel, or its present condition, in order to uphold a favorite theory? And because Mr. Ryerson may be thwarted in his unconstitutional wishes, is he therefore to loosen the affections of the people from the Executive, and thereby *practically*, as he must well know, from the constitutional Government itself?

Mr. Ryerson returns to the charge by once more repeating his beloved argument, that "the voluntary system is the only one that can give general satisfaction to the inhabitants of this Province." I have already endeavoured to show what attention is due to mere *majorities*; and shall therefore content myself with observing, that though, when the wish of the

majority is founded on due knowledge and calm judgment, it should meet with every consideration as far as can be consistent with the real public interest; still, it is entirely unworthy of notice when the mere result of faction, and the majority may be factious, and that this is greatly the case in the present instance is but too evident. Were the friends of the voluntary system actuated by any other than selfish and envious interests, certainly they would be led to support the principle with zeal and liberality; but what are the facts of the case? Probably not more than one in fifty at present pays a shilling for the voluntary support of the Christian Ministry, and of those a very small portion indeed pay more than five shillings per annum! Is it then to gratify such conscientious and liberal supporters of the voluntary system, that a venerable and constitutional Establishment is to be laid prostrate in the dust, and the Scriptural principle, that "Kings shall be the nursing Fathers, and Queens the nursing Mothers" of the Church to be sacrificed? 2. It is further intimated that opposition to this principle will either endanger the stability of the Government, or render it tyrannical. Now, Sir, there would be no danger of the former evil were there no "stirrers up of strife;" for it may be taken as an universal axiom, that the people will never be dissatisfied, IF LEFT TO THEMSELVES, so long as their persons and families are unmolested, their houses are their castles, their consciences are unshackled, and their property not immoderately taxed;— your correspondent, ready as he is to hazard bold assertions, will, I think, hardly venture to say that even the hated principle of an Established Church, will interfere with any of these rights. I again, therefore, repeat what I have before stated, that if free from unrighteous agitation, the community at large would ere long feel the utility and bless the defenders of a "qualified" and pious Ecclesiastical Establishment; and if so, as all factious opposition would be at an end, the very temptation to arbitrary measures would cease, and consequently all the repeated threats of "tyrannical government" vanish into thin air! The note from Dr. Mathewson, of London, (who by the way, seems almost as thoroughly British in his feelings as Mr. R. himself,) calls for a moment's attention. Dr. M. tells us as a striking fact, that because American Churches are totally unconnected with the State, that therefore they have no political strife. Were it so, such an apparent truism would afford no stronger an argument, than it would to advise a blind man to make no effort to recover his sight, because vision was frequently deceptive. But the truth is, paradoxical as it may seem, that this absence of State patronage does not prevent political discord. It is only a very few years since, that when visiting the States, I was I confess, somewhat amused by accidentally laying hold of a pamphlet discussion between a Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and if my memory serves me correctly, a Minister of the Congregational Church, as to which of their Churches was the most favorable to Republicanism! And I would ask the Reverend Editor himself, whether he does not believe that at this moment it is perfectly well understood in the United States, that the Protestant Episcopal Church is decidedly Federal in its political bias, while

certain other Churches are as decidedly *Democratic*? Ex-President Adams writes in 1823, "The most afflictive circumstances that I have witnessed in the lot of humanity, are the narrow views, the unsocial humours, the fastidious scorn of all denominations excepting one—there are in and about the Town of ———, nine Clergymen, Ministers of nine Congregations, not one of whom lives on terms of civility with any other, will admit any other into his pulpit, nor be permitted to go into the pulpit of any other." So much for the freedom of Republican voluntary Churches from political prejudices and party strife. But even if it were to be admitted that American Churches had gained some measure of freedom from political strife, by being totally separated from the State, yet is it an interesting inquiry how far the State has suffered loss, and through it the people at large been injured by this unnatural disunion. The length of this letter, as well as the thread of the argument, forbids my entering now upon this examination, I shall content myself, therefore, with simply stating my firm conviction, that this alienation of Church and State is one of the very fruitful sources of that unsettled and turbulent condition for which the neighboring Republic is so remarkable; not only as subjecting it to the displeasure of him who looks for a public recognition by every Nation, of the great truth, that he is the "King of Kings, and Lord of Lords;" but also from the fact that the absence of all Ecclesiastical sanction, as immediately connected with the Government, leaves it shorn of that which will ever be found the firmest support of a Scriptural Government, namely, the feeling of Christian veneration for its authorities, and of religious attachment for, and deep gratitude to the guardians of our holiest privileges; it is an admitted fact, that there are even no prejudices so powerful as those that spring from religious prepossessions; and, Sir, be assured, that when the constituted authorities neglect to ensure these in their own favor, by watching with a parental eye over the spiritual interests of the community, they will *sooner or later* find that they have lost the "lock of their strength." Listen, on this subject, to an American Prelate, Bishop Doane, in his Conventional Address, in 1834, where he says:—"Already it begins to be felt, *that for the want of a pervading religious principle*, the institutions which have cost so much, and promised so well, fail of their expected result; and wise and good men of all parties, and of every name, unite in the conviction, that unless, AS A NATION, we seek the blessing of the Holiest, the best hopes of humanity must suffer disappointment!"

I remain with sentiments of respect,

Your obedient Servant,

AN ANGLO-CANADIAN.

March 14, 1839.

LETTER IV.

TO THE HON. W. H. DRAPER, M. P. P. &c. &c. &c.

The Voluntary System apt to have an injurious influence on the Ministry.— Persecution an evil to the Church; the frequent results of voluntarism a still greater evil; the loss of the Church in consequence of the inefficiency of the voluntary system; the writer no enemy to it in its proper sphere; useful to aid an Establishment; proper as the support of Dissenters; reasons why; voluntarism works best where there is an Establishment; Mr. R's tests and reasons for his boldness; considerations of the causes why the Primitive Church was not established; arguments to prove that Ecclesiastical Establishments are of Divine institution and still binding upon rulers.

SIR,

In continuing the strictures upon Mr. Ryerson's ninth Letter I proceed to remark upon his third principle proposition, in which after some of his usually bold, but entirely unsupported assertions, he states as the argument, that the Voluntary System "is the most efficient agency in promoting the great ends of religion in the country, and no evil consequences, either to the souls or bodies of men, will ensue from its adoption by all denominations." The admissions by which this argument is succeeded are pleasingly candid, but most certainly they appear to me to go very far, when fairly examined, to disprove both the assertions contained in it. "In reference to the Clergy I admit," says he, "that their support may not be always sure or even adequate;—that they may sometimes suffer want, on account of which their labors and usefulness may be circumscribed;—that their temporal circumstances are not in general so comfortable, and what is usually termed respectable, as when they derive their support from the State;—that they may sometimes be compelled to work with their hands in order to supply the lack of voluntary liberality on the part of others." This witness is true. I am very far from wishing to disparage the labors, or undervalue the sacrifices of a large portion of the voluntary clergy; I know that the world is greatly indebted to their pious zeal; but in proportion as I honor them must I stand in doubt of a system which leaves them subject to these painful personal trials, and presents, Mr. R. himself being judge, such serious obstacles to their usefulness. Let us look at what are the moral effects of such a state of things. The absence of a certain and respectable support by confining the attention to trifling cares, and disturbing the soul with petty anxieties has a powerful tendency to contract and degrade the mind; a minister in such circumstances, also, being in the too frequent habit of appearing before his charge with the groveling shame of conscious dependence, is shorn of that dignified self respect which ought ever to be one of the ornaments of his sacred office, and is therefore in danger of being in a measure unfit for the firm discharge of his onerous duties. How can it be other-

wise so long as he is often actually dependent for the morsel of a day upon the caprice or selfishness of his people? And Ministers are men "of like passions with others," what then must be their frequent throbbing cares respecting the want of proper provisions for their wives and families? But further, as your correspondent very justly states, it sometimes happens that the only way of meeting these cares is by personal bodily labour. Now can it be for a moment imagined that these tender anxieties, or the dissipation and exhaustion of secular business will leave the subject of them in that calm and collected state of feeling requisite for the proper discharge of the solemn duties of the Christian Ministry? No, sir, the Reverend Writer may point us to the Apostles, and threaten us with charges of infidelity, but this is not the age for such miracles or inspiration. God has otherwise provided, and the God of Wisdom has taught us to pray "lead us not into temptation"; it is therefore as deep a wrong to the Church of Christ to place its Ministers unnecessarily in circumstances that render them peculiarly liable to depression of mind, secularity of feeling, or avarice and meanness, as it would be wantonly to inflate them with worldly ambition, or corrupt them with exorbitant wealth. Mr. Ryerson asks whether "the graces of the Christian Ministry have not been more developed by a subjection to these trials, than by independence and endowment." This is neither more nor less than to say, that because the Great Head of the Church can bring good out of evil, we are therefore to *prefer* the evil to the good; and that consequently Nero and Queen Mary were two of the best friends Christianity ever possessed! There seems indeed to be a very strange misconception in this day respecting the effects of persecution on the Church of Christ, even as though this fearful evil had become, in its own nature, converted into a powerful blessing; the truth is, however, that though it may frequently tend to purify the virtues of the real christian, and has occasionally been overruled by the Great Head of the Church even for general good, yet still, without all question it has greatly retarded the spread of the Gospel; *not advanced it*. But the kind of evils which your Reverend Correspondent seems to think so beneficial to the Christian Ministry, are even more injurious to their integrity, spirituality, and sober zeal than those that arise from without; yes, sir, I fearlessly assert that in the majority of cases, that so far as such unpleasant circumstances have any influence, it is a degrading and injurious one; indeed I imagine that Christianity always suffers more when subject to the neglect, avarice, or selfishness of its professed friends, than it does even from the malignity of its avowed enemies,

Further, the working of the Voluntary System is not unfrequently as injurious to the Church itself as to the Ministry. It begets a feeling of disrespect to the latter which has an obvious tendency to paralyze their usefulness. How can it be otherwise, especially in this country? You are probably aware Sir, that among those Churches which most vehemently uphold the voluntary principle, not only are the priesthood dependent upon the people for their support, but too frequently it is dealt

out in such miserable pittance, and in so undignified a method, as to make them appear more like objects of charity than the honored and venerated Ambassadors of Christ; while human nature is as readily affected by outward circumstances as it is, a Ministry in such circumstances, will rarely command that deep respect, which is requisite in order to the most extensive and permanent usefulness. The system under consideration also fosters a selfish and avaricious disposition; paradoxical as this assertion may seem. It leads the Members to calculate *how little* they can get a Minister for, and then the wretched mite that most of them contribute too often satisfies their consciences, and leads them to plume themselves upon the blessings of the voluntary system, even though it leaves their pastors in indigence, and themselves hoarding their miserable pelf, comparatively heedless that the world is perishing and that the poor are cold and hungry. It is further in danger of causing these Churches to erect a very false and degrading standard of Ministerial excellence leading them to value their Pastors according to the degree in which they shall conform themselves to their prejudices, succumb to their dictations, and confine their expences within the bounds of penury, rather than by their talents, their learning, or even by their elevated tone of piety itself. Another of the principal evils connected with this system, and the last to which my necessarily brief review will permit me to allude, is, that it elevates the people into a most unnatural and improper relationship to their Ministers since as their *immediate* supporters, they easily imagine that they have a perfect right to sit in judgment on their Teachers as respects not only their talents and piety, but even their appearance, family, or expenses, nay to pry into their most secret concerns; in short it is in danger of giving almost the death blow to that highest reverential awe with which the Minister of the Sanctuary ought ever to be regarded. It was surely a fear of such evils that lead the great Apostle of the Gentiles himself, to prefer even providing for his own necessities rather than receive the voluntary aid of the Christian Church. Hear, Sir, before we quit this subject, the testimony of a great republican divine. "The most melancholy boding," says the late Dr. Mason of New York, "presses on the mind when we behold a large portion of the talents which the Head of the Church has bestowed on her ministry for her edification, unoccupied, languishing, and expiring. This, brethren, is too common an occurrence in our day. A fault there must be somewhere; perhaps in different quarters. But there can be no doubt whatever that one great cause of this evil is the inadequate support afforded to ministers of the gospel, and *particularly the tardy and irregular manner* in which it is not unfrequently furnished. The effects of this ill-judged parsimony is alarming. When the ministers of the gospel find it impossible to devote themselves to reading, study, and research—when, like the Levites in the days of Nehemiah, they have fled to their fields to labor for their bread; instead of waiting on the service of the Sanctuary—the inevitable consequence is that *leanness and poverty must mark their public ministrations*. It cannot be otherwise; people deceive themselves if they imagine that their

minister can bring out of his treasure things new and old—that he can be a workman who needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth—on any other terms than on habitual and vigorous application to the study of divine things, and that two under the favorable circumstances of competent talents and a competent library.” Such are the views of the powerful Mason of some of the effects of precarious ministerial support; and how generally that support is precarious, where the voluntary system only prevails, let Mason and Ryerson declare!—Permit also the English Dissenters to add their testimony to the frequent effects of this system, in some of their own recent tracts they thus speak of “many congregations” that “they are chargeable with *shameful meanness, criminal supineness, yea, idolatious covetousness*, in refusing to part with a due proportion of their substance for the support of the Gospel, and the maintenance of their pastors; that it is often difficult for them to raise the *miserable pittance* by which their ministers who have families are prevented from STARVING.” May we not then more than question the correctness of those statements of Mr. Ryerson, which appear at the head of this letter? and declare instead, that the voluntary system is far from being a sufficiently efficient agent in spreading the gospel, and that especially if left to work alone, it is clogged with many very serious evils which are deeply injurious both “to the souls and bodies of men?”

I would not wish to be misunderstood, I am no enemy to the voluntary system in its proper place and under proper restrictions, as I think its inherent evils, may, under certain circumstances, be greatly remedied; but I fear its friends have very generally, on this continent, mistaken its right sphere, and neglected to surround it with suitable guards. I am convinced, Sir, and I hope to succeed in convincing you and my other readers, that the system under consideration will never work successfully in any country as the *only*, or even as the *principal* means, of maintaining and spreading the truths of the Gospel; this duty I have no question belongs to the State; and, were I writing didactically instead of controversially I would endeavor at once to point out those *direct* arguments by which this duty may be easily proved, but at the present I must go whither I am led, content with the humble task of striving to negative objections. I am ready to admit however that the voluntary principle may be brought into very useful operation as an ally in the great work of Christian evangelization. And there is ample room for the display of the most unbounded Christian benevolence even by the members of State-supported Churches, in those various charitable institutions which are the glory of our age, and especially in that one great work of “preaching the Gospel to all nations.” But yet the grand field for the operation of the voluntary principle lies in the various bodies of Dissenters; if, as I am endeavouring to maintain, it be the solemn duty of the State to support the religion of Christ, it is of course bound, as far as the collective wisdom of the empire will enable it, to select the purest form of that faith, and having done so to *sanction* no departure from it. I am aware, Sir, that such a sentiment as this is

in danger of calling down upon me no small share of indignation, and that I shall be told that Kings and legislators are but men, and so on; all this I know, but though they are but *men* before God, they are *rulers* before us, and as such are called upon to guide us in what *they conceive* to be the way of truth, and to afford us no countenance, no aid, in departing from it; yet, let the word I use be borne in mind, namely, that they cannot righteously "*sanctio*:" any departure from the established faith. Still as it is yet *possible* rulers may be wrong, and individuals right in their dissenting modes of faith, or what is yet more frequently the case, that such individuals may be really conscientious in their dissent, and compulsion could only make them hypocrites without really changing either their hearts or their views, it is evident *toleration* should be absolutely unshackelled, without the slightest approach to any thing like persecution; but while, as men who must answer for themselves at the bar of God, they have undoubtedly a right to claim thus much, yet if King and Queens *ARE* to be the nursing fathers and mothers of, what they "believe, the purest and most efficient branch of the Church of Christ, and are to answer to them accordingly, *more than this Dissenters cannot claim*: to expect Government sanction, or Government aid to *dissent*, were to ask their rulers to betray the trust reposed in them by the King of Kings, and to violate their consciences in order to please others. Yes, Sir, here is the proper place for the voluntary system. It is right that the faith of the Lord's Anointed, of the State, and of the Nation should have some defence against the mere caprice of its members, namely, that when they forsake its pale, the care and expense attending another mode of worship and the support of another ministry should devolve upon themselves; and surely no sensible or conscientious individual can object that the Government, which is to watch over him for good, should lay so gentle an obstacle in his way, in order to prevent his leaving that fold which it considers the purest and best; being his guardian it could not do less and discharge its duty, being itself frail and mortal it ought not to do more, lest haply it might be wrong; let it also be remembered that no stigma accompanies this, far otherwise, for by incurring this slight pecuniary sacrifice, it affords some proof that the dissenter is conscientious in leaving the Church of his fathers.

Under such circumstances the voluntary system is not near so liable to fall into the errors to which we have been previously alluding; inasmuch as the regularity and dignity of an Establishment *does*, as all experience proves, form a useful check upon the ardent and perhaps, sometimes, mistaken zeal of voluntary and less trammelled Churches. The respect and attention which a State supported Clergy generally receive from the members of their Church has also a most salutary, though perhaps unperceived, influence upon the non-established Churches as regards the respect of their members for, and attention to, the wants of their own Ministers; the respectable portion of such Churches become convinced that, in order to maintain their own standing in the Christian world, their Pastors must be placed in circumstances to rank

in society, in some measure at least, with the Clergy of the Established Church, and to enable them to procure the advantages of learning and literature. Another way in which, notwithstanding their bitter opposition, the Dissenters are profited by an Establishment, is, that their own Ministers are thereby stirred up to a virtuous emulation both of literature and usefulness; and that by seeing the dignified character of the Christian Ministry as upheld by the Established Clergy, they are in a measure, guarded against that degradation of feeling and want of official self-respect which the voluntary system is too apt to superinduce.

In support of the proposition under consideration, your correspondent triumphantly says "I will not stop to investigate the divine, the true philosophy of the answer to this question; (that is, whether religion has flourished most when sanctioned or neglected by the State?" "let the history of the Church, says he, during the first three centuries, and then the next fifteen centuries—let the history of high Churchmen in England on the one side and Non-Conformists on the other, from the reign of Elizabeth to that of James II. inclusive—let the history of the Church of England at the time that Wesley and Whitfield appeared—let the history of voluntary Churches in England at this hour compared with endowed parish Churches—let the history of Methodism for the last century—let the former and present history of the United States—let the history of this Province—let each and all these give the appropriate reply." There is nothing easier than to ask questions, make broad assertions, and the mischief is that when asked in a bold tone and with a hectoring air, they are almost universally received by the multitude as being undoubtedly true in the affirmative; now I am well persuaded that a calm and dispassionate examination of these various tests would give a most decided triumph to the principle of an Establishment; but then the Rev. writer knows full well, that he is safe from any such danger, as newspapers do not present a suitable medium for so elaborate an investigation, and there are few who could find time, or command the means necessary for doing it. But yet I am so heartily weary of hearing such bold assertions, and unblushing one-sided misrepresentations, especially with respect to early christianity, that I will endeavor briefly to show their fallacy.

It is truly painful to witness the way in which even the great and good are frequently led astray, by the deleterious influence of party prejudice, if it were not so, there could never have been so much *great nonsense* uttered to prove—that because Christianity had no *immediate* State provision by direct Divine appointment, and was consequently without it for the three first centuries, that therefore it has no Scriptural or righteous claim for it now. Before proceeding to examine Mr. R's tests, I beg your attention for a moment to the consideration of this imaginary difficulty. The circumstances connected with the rise of Christianity, are surely forgotten by those who clamour so loudly respecting its freedom from State protection; it was not A NEW INSTITUTION, but the legitimate fulfilment of an old one, for "to Him gave all the Prophets witness," and consequently had not the Jewish Hierarchy refused him

who "was the end of the Law." Christianity would, of course, as was its undoubted right, have become possessed of all the honors and protection of that Ecclesiastical Establishment which Jehovah had himself appointed; and which, so far from being necessarily doomed to overthrow, was, I venture to assert, admirably adapted to the support and spread of Messiah's Kingdom. And it is to be remembered that though they rejected the Lord of Glory, yet was a further space granted unto the Jews for repentance, their place and name not being finally overthrown till upwards of thirty years after our Lord's Crucifixion; now it is evident, that to have made any opposing national provision for Christianity, without waiting to see whether the Jews would nationally receive it, had been virtually to cast them off before the appointed time of their probation was fulfilled; there is much meaning in the Declaration "He came to his own, and his own received him not." Again, since his own rejected Him it afforded a consistent opportunity of giving a splendid proof that though Jehovah usually uses all proper human agencies, that yet, whensoever he chooses, he is a God that can work with the meanest and least efficient instruments, or with none; such a display was peculiarly suitable in the early history of the Religion of Jesus, in order that the spirituality of its nature, and the high blessedness of its soul-renewing influences, even under the most discouraging circumstances, might be exhibited to the world as contrasted with the formality of Judaism and the degradation of Paganism. But further and especially; as it was not the Divine intention to uphold Christianity by a continued succession of miraculous interferences, and that only nation which could have vouched for its truth, as the legitimate and acknowledged fulfilment of their Heaven-sanctioned dispensation, having utterly rejected it, it then seems highly proper that it should, in the first instance, be ushered into the world, in such a manner as to shield its professors from every suspicion of being actuated by worldly or secular motives, and to afford them an opportunity of displaying to the world by their mildness and patience the astonishing effects of Christian principle and Christian consolation;—while at the same time the firmness with which they suffered the loss of all things for the Gospel of Christ clearly manifested the integrity of the sufferers, and consequently the truth of the things which they had affirmed.

Had not experience strangely proved the contrary, I should have imagined that it must have been sufficiently obvious to every one, that the Church of the Living God could not have been designed to remain any longer in a condition so outwardly forlorn, than was absolutely requisite to lay its foundation, under the peculiar circumstances in which it was placed through its desertion by its natural protectors, the Jewish Hierarchy. And, Sir, it is evident to me, that such only was the intention of its Great Head; for though I admit that there is no direct or explicit command in the New Testament respecting the State support and endowment of the Church, for which I trust I have assigned sufficient

reasons, still how could any Christian Ruler possibly interpret the general tenor of the Word of God in any other way, than as committing the Church to his care? In the first place, the example of Jehovah himself in the establishment of the Jewish Hierarchy, must, I should think, to an unprejudiced and unsophisticated mind be decisive of the question of duty; you know, Sir, that it is not the sneering at an argument that negatives it, otherwise, I confess, that the one under consideration were not worth notice; but often as I have seen it treated with contempt!—never yet saw it fairly met. If I mistake not, it is Professor Lee, of Cambridge, who says,—“To this argument in favor of a National Religious Establishment, drawn from that of the Jews, *no solid answer ever has been, or ever can be given.*” I am, of course, aware, that in many things, there is a great difference between Judaism and Christianity, and I am very far from contending for a similarly arranged Hierarchy; but *great principles are immutable, it is the mode of carrying them out only that can vary.* If therefore it were right and consistent, in one age of the world, for the pure spiritual worship of Jehovah, to be connected with and upheld by the State, I conceive it must be so still, for the very same principles are involved, and those only, in this day as in that. And *there is not in the whole of the Sacred Volume, the slightest intimation that the principle of this Divine example is not to be followed out by us, but, on the contrary, it is left on record, stamped with all the infinite importance of the Divine approbation, in those very Scriptures that are expressly declared to be written “aforetime for our instruction;”* and that too, in connection with repeated declarations of the duties of Rulers respecting the Church, and the memorial of the very decided approbation of Jehovah, of those who in the old time used their regal power to uphold and advance His Church, with the most glowing description of that care and attention with which they shall watch over its interest in the LATTER days of its glory. Does not all this clearly prove that the great Head of the Church had before hand so ordained, that yet, notwithstanding the fearful defection of its natural guardians, when Christianity had once been tested and given evidence to the world of its truth and Divine origin, it should then, without interfering with existing political institutions, by the force of the Divine example, and the general tenor of the instructions contained in the Sacred Scriptures, at once secure the protection of Christian Governments? And was not this singularly brought to pass, as it would seem, by the immediate interposition of Divine Providence? For it is to this hour most questionable whether Constantine was any thing more than a nominal Christian, influenced by political motives. It is evident the early Christians so read the word of God, as I have above, and so interpreted the sacred precedent of Judaism; it is to the wisdom of modern times and the influence of republican notions that we owe these unnatural efforts to disunite what, verily, “God hath joined together!” Whose then are the “infidel objections;” and whose the “infidel theories?”

I have got already to too great a length and must therefore leave, till next week, the examination of the effects that resulted from following this Divine example, and obeying these sacred intimations.

With sentiments of respect,
I have the honor to remain,
Sir, your obedient Servant,

AN ANGLO-CANADIAN.

March, 26th, 1839.

LETTER V.

TO THE HON. W. H. DRAPER, M. P. P. &c. &c. &c.

The folly of trusting to history as to the propriety of connecting Church and State; the corruptions of the Church before Constantine—testimony of Moshem Eusebius and others; Church property not from State but individuals; the question spread through its connection with the State; its corruptions owing to superstition; moral danger not to prevent our doing positive good; the importance of State protection proved by the rapid decline of those early sects that were without it; the want of it caused early Reformers not to succeed; the sanction of Princes eminently serviceable and necessary to the establishment of the Reformation.

SIR,

In proceeding to examine Mr. Ryerson's tests of the comparative spiritual prosperity of the Christian Church when connected with the state, and when not so connected it cannot, as has been before intimated, be expected that I should attempt more than to give a very cursory review of the facts, and point out a few of the fallacies connected with such a mode of reasoning.

The line of argument founded upon historic details upon which we are now entering, and upon which your able but plausible correspondent places so much dependence, is in great danger of having too much importance attached to it, as the question of the propriety of state support for the Christian Church is not one of *expediency*, but of *religious principle*, and is therefore not to be settled by *our opinion* of its effects or results, either one way or the other, but by the infallible Word of the Living God. There is, moreover, a peculiar fallacy in making the voice of history the umpire in such a matter; for, as all who have read the history of the Church must know, it is absolutely impossible to form any correct estimate, from such records, of the real spiritual condition of its members, as even ecclesiastical historians seldom carry their researches into those humbler walks of life, where genuine piety is most commonly found. Hence it is, that their incorrectness is all in favor of

our opponents, for while they thus very generally overlook those humble matters, which form many of the real blessings that flow from the Imperial favor when shown to the Church, such as the vast increase of the lower ranks of religious teachers, many of whom, at least, must be supposed zealous for God, and the quiet opportunity afforded for the multitude to hear, and hearing, for many of them certainly to feel those blessed truths, to which, in troublous times, fear caused them to refuse even to lend an ear; on the other hand they emblazon the evils which are confessedly too frequently associated with court patronage; as the pride or avarice of some of the ecclesiastical leaders, with the pomp and circumstance of courtly, or too timeserving ceremonies, because being connected with those who occupied the highest seats, they are sure to meet the eye of these moral painters; still though they cannot but mourn over the dark unhallowed scenes, which they feel obliged to pourtray, they ought not so readily to overlook the rich and holy, though humble facts with which they might adorn their pages from the history of scores amongst the undistinguished throng. It is evident therefore, that the uncertain and partial information which is to be derived from such details, will furnish us but little data, sufficiently correct, to test the merits of an Established Church; though, notwithstanding all these disadvantages, I doubt not that even ecclesiastical history itself will give a verdict in its favor, when fairly appealed to.

1. Mr. Ryerson says, "Let the history of the Church during the first three centuries, and the next fifteen centuries," answer as to the comparative usefulness of established or voluntary churches; I echo; "Let it answer!" First, as to the comparative purity of the Church before and after Constantine, I am at once ready to confess that after its connection with the state, as there was a wider field for ambition, pride and avarice, so there were many especially of the higher Clergy, who fell victims to their ruinous influence; but this is merely allowing that there is no earthly good without its attendant evil; and I positively assert my belief, that this court corruption was comparatively circumscribed in its influence. How could it be otherwise? even now, it is a very few of the state clergy who are, methinks, in any danger of injury from courtly influence; poor men, it is well for them if they can live; surely then, in those times of haughty arrogance, the most of the provincial clergy were in little danger of being seduced by the attentions of the great. But the proof that court degeneracy was never by any means universal, is, that Monkery and Asceticism, which, whatever may be their folly, are certainly not luxurious vices, greatly and rapidly increased, and that too under circumstances of real poverty and privation, after the Church had been taken under Imperial protection. In truth, my sober conviction is, that the deleterious effects of state patronage have been strangely overrated, and that the lamentable corruption of the Church must be sought for in something else than court favor; for it appears to me that the decline from primitive simplicity was, at least, as rapid while yet the Imperial purple was dyed with the blood of the Christians, as it was in those happier days that

succeeded. In the third century, for instance, while Paganism still ruled the world. Moshom charges the bishops with ambitiously violating the rights, both of the people and presbyters, and even of corrupting the pure doctrines of Christianity, in order to maintain their usurpation. "Many" says he, "were sunk in luxury and voluptuousness, puffed up with vanity, arrogance, ambition, &c.," and had already "appropriated to their evangelical functions the splendid ensigns of temporal Majesty; a throne surrounded with ministers, exalted above his equals, the servant of the meek and humble Jesus, &c. &c.;" and all this, be it remembered, before even a single potentate had, in any measure, sanctioned Christianity!—In this century also, marriage began to be discouraged through the vain and heathenish traditions of the rulers of the Church.—About the same time too, images were introduced into the churches, and incense into the worship; in short, superstition, that fruitful and real parent of most of the evils that afterwards so terribly overran the Church, was now making rapid strides. Such indeed was the state of the Church at the close of this century, that Eusebius and others, attribute the bitter persecution "which afflicted it during the latter half of Dioclesian's reign, to the anger of God at beholding the growing corruption of its members—the great mass of whom were daily sinking lower and lower in sensuality."—"Sloth, negligence, envy, discord, fraud and malice, form the sad catalogue of sins with which the Bishop of Cesarea charges the believers of this age."—Paul of Samosata, Bishop of Antioch, was a *civil judge*, and is described as "a vain and arrogant man, whom riches had rendered insolent and self-sufficient."—It is surely unnecessary to multiply proofs to shew that the outer courts of the Church were becoming deeply corrupted, long before its connection with the Purple. Another evidence of its rapid decline shall suffice, and that is to be found in its frequent, and about this time, peculiarly dangerous heresies; in addition to the various schisms that had existed before, this century gave birth to the monstrous heresy of Manes, who taught, among other absurdities, that the evil one was the creator of man;—no less than three sects approaching nearly to the doctrines of our modern semi-infidels, the "rational" or Socinian Christians, arose at this time, these were the Patripassians, the Sabellians, and the Paulianists; the great Arian schism also, which rent, as it were, heaven itself, and so clearly displayed the unsound state of the Christian Church, took place too soon after this period to have been caused by its Imperial friend. Now, Sir, however much, or however conscientiously certain individuals may be prejudiced against an established church, it does puzzle my christian charity exceedingly, to know how with facts before their eyes, and whole volumes besides of similar details, of the state of the early Christian Church in those palmy days of voluntaryism, when it received nothing from the state but persecution, I say when they see such proofs of its already rapidly declining outward condition, I do feel perplexed to know how honest men can so boldly attribute its continued corruption to its being taken under the protection of the state; that, as I before observed, doubtless, had

its peculiar dangers and evils ; but, as doubtless, they were far out-balanced by the good ; at all events, it is clear, that whatever corruptions were found in the Church after the days of Constantine, they had their foundations laid broad and deep in its bosom long before his day.

I have already stated that one grand source of the corruptions of the early Christian Church, was a dark and gloomy superstition, the natural offspring of a barbarous and ignorant age, the next great cause was undoubtedly its accumulating so great wealth. But it is again wonderful that men of intelligence and extensive information, should so frequently fall into the gross error of supposing that this wealth came from its Imperial Protectors, it is certainly the fact that it was principally the result of the superstitious generosity of individual devotees, so that the connection of Church and State is in no wise answerable for either the good or evil that has accrued to the Church from its large possessions. Dr. Dealtry says—"but all the estates of every description, whether belonging to bishoprics, colleges, cathedrals, or parishes were voluntary donations ; and if kings contributed, they did it from their own private means." It is moreover evident, that when persecution ceased and the profession of Christianity gained the smiles rather than the frowns of the great, that vast numbers would join the Church from slight convictions of the importance of its truths, and consequently would be early drawn aside from the paths of virtue and piety, by the seductions of the present world, and thereby bring a stain upon the purity of Christianity ; while many others would call themselves by the name of Christ, and conform to the Church from motives altogether secular ; from such what could be expected but shame to the Christian name ? It is to these circumstances, after all, far more than to any general spiritual loss amongst the true believers themselves, that the idea has arisen of the declension of true religion in the Christian Church after the days of Constantine.

2. Mr. Ryerson will himself allow that the Imperial sanction was, under God, the great cause of the rapid diffusion of the Christian Religion. It immediately became the Religion of the vast Roman Empire, including nearly the whole of the then civilized world. It did not, however, by any means stop there, but continued, upheld by the favor and aided by the wealth of the great and noble, to spread on every hand. Chrysostom, Patriarch of Constantinople, writing towards the close of the fourth century says, "The Syrians, the Egyptians, the Indians, the Persians, the Ethiopians, and a multitude of other nations, having translated this Gospel into their own languages, the barbarians have learned to be philosophers." At the same time the Emperors were anxious to increase the spread and reading of the Sacred Writings ;—"Eusebius informs us," says Dr. Townley, "that he himself was ordered by the Emperor, to provide *Fifty Greek Bibles*, or more probably, only the principal books, at the public expense, for different Churches,"* those who are acquainted with the enormous expense attending the transcrib-

* Townley's Illustrations of Biblical Literature, vol. 1, page 132.

ing, in that day, of large volumes will readily admit that this was indeed a "munificent order." In the fifth century the Emperor Theodosius was remarkable for his attachment to the sacred volume, and transcribed much of it himself. About the middle of the same century the Emperor Justinian ordered, that in the congregations "the Scriptures should be read in the language of the country, whether Hebrew, or Greek, or Latin, or any other." Now is it to be believed that this rapid spread of the Knowledge of Christianity, accompanied as it was for long by the word of God, WAS A CURSE TO THE WORLD? Let those who can, believe the monstrous absurdity; but do not let them charge us with "infidelity" because we verily believe that in the midst of much mere profession, there was a real and extensive increase of true piety; how could it be otherwise, by the efforts of the state, the Gospel of Christ in its native beauty and truth, was brought before thousands whom yet that terrific spectre, court influence, could never reach? A capital mistake into which not only your correspondent falls, but also most of those who entertain his views, is, that they look in the high places of the Hierarchy, amid the fascinations of a Court for the beneficial effects of an Established Church; it is true they will find many of them even there; but yet clearly to discern the extensive and most salutary influences of such an establishment, they should certainly look to the great ameliorating change which society at large underwent, and to that mass of individual piety which would most assuredly be found, and that not merely in the humbler walks of life, on the régular introduction of Christianity. Injurious as wealth and splendor too often are to the growth of individual piety, yet it is really astonishing how often, nay, how generally, this secular influence has been exerted, in order to stem not increase, the fury of superstitious zeal, or soften the bitterness of party animosity; to this superintending care the Church owes much. Papal corruptions were the effect of superstition; not of princely interference; *the great strides of the Church to ruin, were after she trampled upon the secular power, rather than sought its protection.* The fact is, a Church possessed of real piety, will use that Government patronage, with which it may be favored, in endeavoring to uphold the pure Gospel of Christ, and by increased instruction, to deepen its influence, while on the other hand, an extensive or influential Church, destitute of vital Religion is far too dangerous an engine to be left uncontrolled by Executive authority. And, Sir, allow me to ask your Reverend Correspondent, if it be any proper test of a Christian's duty; to ask whether such and such circumstances may not possibly lead him into danger, while it is at the same time obvious that there is a positive good connected with them? Is it not his duty, in that case, fearlessly to enter upon them, and to trust in his God, seeking his protection against either the fascination or the troubles incident to the circumstances in which he may thus be placed? Our Blessed Saviour seems to have thought so when he said, "I pray not that Thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that Thou shouldest keep them from the evil." That money and the moral influence of human sanction are both absolutely requisite to pro-

pagate the Religion of that Being who doeth as seemeth Him good," and who sees fit to work by means, is, I should imagine, sufficiently evident both by the past history and present proceedings of that very respectable Christian Body to which the Reverend Gentleman himself belongs. It is, therefore, no sound argument against the connection of Church and State, to say, that there is danger in such an association, so long as it can be proved, that, if the Church do its duty, large and important benefits to the cause of Christianity must be the result of such connection; consequently were even the voice of history silent as to these beneficial results, which, however, as we have already seen, and shall see still further, is very far from being the case; still even then, if human patronage and temporal wealth be in themselves advantageous to the diffusion of Christianity, the advocates of an Established Church would be impregnable. Believe me, Sir, most serious is the responsibility which those individuals take upon themselves who venture to oppose it; ah! let them beware, lest their brother's blood be required at their hands!

3. The important effects of that protection and aid which the State has afforded to the Church in the later ages of its history are also clearly displayed in the facts connected with the rise and fall of those of numerous sects which have in almost every age disturbed its peace; and especially in those circumstances by which, through the grace of God, the Reformation in England and Europe made such rapid progress.—These are details, however, into which, as already intimated, circumstances prevent my entering at any length. Permit, me to ask, however, how it is that the seven Apocalyptic Churches, with almost the entire of Asiatic Christianity, have been lost amid the gloom of Pagan darkness, or destroyed by the pestilent heresy of Mohammed? Will it be answered that "they were unfaithful, and therefore their candlestick was removed?" True, but what was the human agency, for others have been unfaithful, and yet they flourish still? I must believe, Sir, that they fell, humanly speaking, for want of the protecting care of the civil arm; Popery in its darkest days had that protection, and it yet exists; has given birth to Protestantism, and I hope may yet undergo an entire regeneration within itself.—Where are the early sects to which I have alluded; some of which were perhaps even purer than the Church from which they sprang, as Nestorianism, for instance? Echo answers, where are they? for the very name of most of them has almost perished from the earth, and the rest are hardly to be found, even after diligent search. They also are withered, blasted by the frown of the "Lord's Anointed." What is the present state of the parent Greek Church?—Let the erudite Moshien answer, "licentiousness and impiety," says he, "not only abound among the people, but also dishonor their leaders; and the calamities that arise from this corruption of manners, are deplorably augmented by their endless contentions and divisions.—Their religion is a motley collection of ceremonies, the greatest part of which are either ridiculously trifling, or shockingly absurd. Yet they are much more zealous in observing and retaining their senseless rites,

than in maintaining the doctrine or obeying the precepts of the religion they profess," and yet Mr. Ryerson certainly cannot accuse the poor Greeks of having been corrupted by Court favor! I cite these instances, Sir, to show that so far from princely care having been upon the whole an injury to the Catholic Church, it has been the principle agent in preserving it from still greater evils than those into which it has unhappily fallen, and perhaps even the means of saving it from entire destruction. The same truth will be yet more strikingly exhibited if we glance at the effects of regal influence on the reformation of the Church.

It is a fact worthy of especial consideration in a discussion of this nature, that it is to the fostering care, or arbitrary enactments of Sovereign Princes that we owe the happy maturing of the blessed Reformation itself. The celebrated Wickliffe, of England, in the fourteenth century, and the Bohemian Reformers, John Huss, and Jerome of Prague, in the fifteenth, endeavored in vain to purify the Church, though the former succeeded in obtaining numerous followers, and the latter sealed their testimony with their blood. How shall we account for the entire failure of these good men, nowise inferior probably to those more successful Reformers who succeeded them? In candor is it not to be attributed to the fact that they were unsanctioned by the civil power? How is it that the comparatively pure and simple Vaudois, who after having existed for ages, spread, in the twelfth century, aided by the pious zeal of Peter Waldo, so rapidly over many parts of Europe, should in the nineteenth be reduced to a small number not exceeding 20,000, who are under the spiritual direction of thirteen pastors? Because, instead of being nurtured, they have been frowned upon and discouraged by a bigoted Court. Few nations gave fairer promise at the time of the Reformation, of a religious regeneration than did France; some of its Royal Princes, and many of the very flower of its Nobility, with vast multitudes of the people, cordially embraced Protestantism, and yet few countries, with the exception perhaps of Spain and Portugal, were eventually brought more completely again under Papal influence; I think your well-informed correspondent must, *maugre* his prejudices, be convinced that this, at least, was owing to the want of regal support and countenance; especially as with the apostacy of Henry IV. the hopes of Protestantism in France were sunk for ages. How different was the success of Protestantism in Saxony, Switzerland, Geneva, Sweden, Denmark, England, &c. *in all of which it was aided, sup-*

*The Reverend and very respectable Editor of "The Church" in one of his flattering notices of these letters, points out an inaccuracy which had escaped my observation. In the former impression of this letter it is stated that the Vaudois *arose* in the twelfth century, it should have been *arose to eminence*; for, as he very justly remarks, they were in existence long previous to that period, probably even before the time (the beginning of the 9th century) that that gentleman himself states. M. Sismondi says that their enemies allow that their opinions "had been transmitted in Gaul from generation to generation, almost from the origin of Christianity;" and the Inquisitor Reinerius Saccho, admits that the Waldenses flourished five hundred years before Peter Waldo.

ported and advanced by the public authorities? Indeed had it been otherwise, there is little rational ground for supposing that the Reformation would at that time have been brought to so glorious an issue, I appeal to Mr. Ryerson himself, whether excellent, venerable, and mighty as were the Reformers, he does not believe that the violence of Luther, the severity of Calvin, the timidity of Melancthon, the simple purity of Zuinglius, and the courtier-like pliancy of Cranmer, presented far too discordant materials ever to have expected extensive lasting benefit to the Church, had they not been variously controlled, checked, or sustained, as occasion required, by the regal power. In concluding this letter allow me to direct your attention to the singular and most important fact, that wherever you find the Reformation permanently successful, you invariably find it maintained by the princely and righteous agency of an Established Church!

If these things are so, I would solemnly warn the opposers of such Establishments to take heed lest haply they be found fighting against God.

Flattering myself that I have satisfactorily proved that even the history of the Church for the last fifteen centuries, is decidedly advantageous to the principle of an Established Church, and that in a very high degree? I leave the question of the state of the Church of England, &c. till next week, and remain,

With sentiments of esteem,
Your obedient Servant,

AN ANGLO-CANADIAN.

March, 29th, 1839.

LETTER VI.

TO THE HON. W. H. DRAPER, M. P. P. &c. &c. &c.

Comparison between Churchmen and Non-conformists; Non-conformity itself a proof of the piety of the Church; Non-conformists under Cromwell and in America; Mr. Ryerson, and the conduct of the Hierarchy under Charles I. and James II.; intrepid conduct of the Prelates; different conduct of Non-conformists. The Church and Dissenters in Mr. Wesley's day. The increasing heresy of Dissent.

SIR,

I have already admitted that an union of Church and State, like every thing else connected with humanity, is liable to abuse; and in this evil I regret to know the Church of England has but too greatly shared; that at the present moment she is trammelled, especially at home, by many things which tend to cripple her usefulness, none more deeply deplore, or are, I believe, more anxious to remedy, than many of her own worthy dignitaries; but while I freely make these admissions, I should

yet have no fear of triumphantly meeting Mr. Ryerson's test as to the comparative purity and usefulness of Churchism. Nonconformity, &c. if I could only command sufficient literary leisure, and were more fully possessed of what Dr. Mason would style "a competent library." I do not despair, however, notwithstanding these deficiencies of being able to show that England owes, under God, her present high Protestant and Christian eminence, in a very principle degree, to the Church of England; I shall endeavor to do this with all brevity, as the primary intent of these letters is not a defence of any one form of ecclesiastical polity, but an effort to impress you, Sir, and my readers in general, with a deep sense of that righteous obligation which rests upon our Colonial Administration to maintain inviolate, in the disposition of the Clergy Reserves, the vital principle of a National Church, upheld by Executive countenance and support; as you will perceive, Sir, I seek to enforce this duty by the general argument, that while such establishments are liable to error, they yet have afforded most important aid to Christianity, and are evidently in accordance with the Divine model, and accompanied with His sanction.

I have no wish to speak evil of any body of Christians, I have ever esteemed it a very questionable mode of advancing the interest of any Church, to endeavor to erect it upon the ruins of another; on Mr. Ryerson, however, rests the responsibility of compelling me occasionally to present the darker shades of Nonconformity, as he it is, that has challenged the comparison between it and Churchism, high or low, it will not make the distinction, I mean Churchism proper, as by law established, and Nonconformity proper, as acknowledged by Dissenters. But I must be permitted to beg your attention to a little earlier period in history than your prudent correspondent seems to desire—not merely to the reign of Elizabeth, but to that of *Mary*, when five of the English Bishops out of twenty-six, and twenty-one Clergymen suffered martyrdom; these witnesses for the truth, were the ministers and dignitaries of an establishment, and that too, just as it was rising from papal pollution; at a time when the principal part of the Puritans or Nonconformists had fled to Frankfort, and other parts of the Continent. If, however, as desired, we pass to the days of the imperious Elizabeth, we shall, it is too true, have to regret the adoption of harsh and unwarrantable methods, in order to produce uniformity; but were these the maxims of the ruling, or English Church only? Hear the dissenting Neal, in his able history of the Puritans, "both parties (says he) agreed too well in asserting the necessity of an uniformity of public worship, and of calling in the sword of the civil magistrate, for the support and defence of their several principles, which they made an ill use of in their turns, as they could grasp the power into their hands; but neither party were for admitting that liberty of conscience, and freedom of profession which is every man's right, as far as is consistent with the peace of the government under which he lives;" this statement of Nonconformist intolerance, will be abundantly borne out by fact as we proceed. It is therefore matter of regret that it should be the infirmity, if not the sin of

party prejudice, to charge as the necessary result of the working of those systems to which we may be opposed, evils which the exercise of a little candour, would enable us at once to perceive, are the effects of altogether different, though collateral causes. Into this serious error the opponents of the Church of England have very generally fallen, inasmuch as they affect to view the intolerance of her Hierarchy in certain stages of her history, as the natural consequence of her association with the State, whereas it was evidently the sin of the age, not of the Church. Could we reasonably expect men to emerge at once from that moral darkness and mental ignorance, in which Papal superstition, and the want of the means of knowledge had enveloped the world; could we expect them at once to behold the sun in its glory? No, Sir, while we must admit the weakness, and lament its effects, we cannot wonder, and ought gently to blame. But even in Elizabeth's reign, while the Nonconformists were torn to pieces by internal divisions, the natural effects of their bitter and narrow prejudices, the national Church was progressing in its righteous labours; the great English Bible printed at that time for the especial use of Churches, commonly called the "Bishop's Bible," was the result of Archbishop Parker's care, aided by the Bishops and other learned and dignified Clergymen, most of whom had suffered, and many of them severely, for the sake of Christ, in the preceding reign; the revision of the Liturgy, with the appointment of regular lessons to be read out of the Scriptures every Sunday; the great efforts that were made for the improvement of the ministry; the means adopted for the religious and scriptural instruction of the people, all prove the zeal and sincerity of the Ecclesiastical Dignitaries of that day. And, Sir, whatever may have been the sin of an half awakened Court, and the profligacy of an unenlightened people, did time and space only permit me to exhibit the pious labours of the Protestant Hierarchy at large; could I even give you the Scriptural and praise-worthy Proclamation issued in 1559, and especially Archbishop Grindal's faithful letter to Queen Elizabeth, which displays at once the faithful Minister, the loyal subject, and the laborious Bishop, you would have little desire to share the feelings of those who can behold such vigorous and pious efforts to regenerate the Nation, and yet scowl upon the Church by whose means it was effected.

The arbitrary conduct of certain of our Sovereigns, by which so many Clergymen were ejected from their livings, is continually brought forward to prove the evils of an Established Church; but the force of such an argument I have never been able to perceive; they were the acts not of Ecclesiastics, but of Monarchs, who, exulting in their newly acquired power over the Church, perhaps sometimes exercised it in a tyrannical or vexatious manner; but this had no connection with the principle of an Establishment, for this power was as freely exercised on Dissenters as on the Hierarchy; but on the other hand it clearly shows the honorable degree of freedom from interested or secular moves, which must have existed amongst the ejected Clergy; and therefore reflects much honor upon the Church which had nurtured them. Sir Richard Phillips states that "The Act of Uniformity passed in April, 1559, (by Eliza-

beth) was opposed in person or by proxy, by *every one of the Bishops*, who afterwards refused to put it in force, and were deprived, as well as twelve Deans, twelve Archdeacons, fifteen Masters of Colleges, fifty Prebendaries, and eighty Rectors and Vicars; surely this was integrity even in the high places of an Establishment! Under James I. five hundred Ministers resigned their livings, and when Charles II. passed the second famous Act of Uniformity, near two thousand Clergymen suffered the loss of almost all things, sooner than violate their consciences. Now, Sir, to me these facts speak loudly in favor of the Church, inasmuch as they prove a vast amount of real principle, uncorrupted by State influence, to have existed even in that period of injudicious State interference, and general profligacy; and this is a legitimate ground of exultation, because their forsaking the Church was no reflection upon her, whatever it might be upon the too rigid civil authority which drove them, as it was the consequence of weak and narrow prejudices, which magnified the non-essentials of surplices, written forms, innocent ceremonies, &c. &c. into matters of vast importance, even if it was not the result in very many cases of the most wild and unscriptural notions, or positive disloyalty; but still we revere the integrity of many among them who doubtless made these costly sacrifices for conscience sake, and take it as a token for good, that such principle was found in the Establishment; especially as we must hold it as strong presumptive evidence that a large proportion of the same christian fidelity existed also in the bosoms of those stronger minded men who were left behind.—Meanwhile the “fierce Nonconformists,” as Fuller calls them, were waxing wrath against the constituted Authorities, irritated, it may be, by the high-handed Archbishop Laud, of whom, however, the sceptical Hume testifies, saying, “Sincere he undoubtedly was, and, however misguided, actuated by religious principle,” and yet he is the individual to whom you would be pointed as the very acme of High Church iniquity; but the truth with respect to the Nonconformists, and especially the Independents among them, as Dr. Cook observes, is that, “When we consider their Religious form of Government, we shall see evidently that a possible analogy, (which influences the sentiments and imaginations of men much more than is generally supposed,) must naturally have led the greatest part of them to Republican notions of Civil Government; and it is further to be observed that, from a Republican Government they must have expected much more protection and favor than from a Kingly one; hence we behold in 1649, the hideous spectacle of a Monarch murdered by the wild fury of those perfections of purity—the non-Established Churches; a more fearful and open violation of Scriptural doctrine can hardly be conceived. Have they repented? No—they glory in their wickedness at this day.” Well may even the phlegmatic Moshem cry, “such are the calamities that flow from religious zeal without knowledge, from that enthusiasm and bigotry which inspire blind and immoderate attachment to the *external unimportant parts of religion*, and to certain doctrines ill understood.”

The Nonconformists, it is well known, exercised a despotic sway du-

ring the Protectorate, and sought a regular establishment from Cromwell, while they razed the English Church to the ground; ejecting no fewer than seven thousand Clergymen from their livings, because they would not swear to extirpate Episcopal Church Government; "so faithful," says Southey, "were the great body of the Clergy in the worst of times;" they pursued also many of them to prison and banishment; "the treatment indeed of the loyal Clergy was to the last degree inhuman;"—and took up the bones of the just and venerable Archbishop Parker, the lover and translator of the Bible, and cast them on to a dunghill!" Such was their regard for one of the Fathers and Confessors of Protestantism, who, if he was occasionally betrayed by the spirit of the age, into arbitrary measures, yet he gave orders not to present the oath acknowledging Elizabeth's supremacy, a second time, to such of the Popish Clergy as had refused to take it, in order that he might save them from the severer penalties consequent on its second rejection; so did he return the persecutions with which they had assailed him and his brethren. And yet this was the man whose remains the Dissenters of that day, treated with such foul indignity. Such was the conduct of those Churches, many of the leaders of which undoubtedly commenced in real, though mistaken piety, but who yielding themselves to a stubborn obstinacy even in non-essentials, firm in their own sufficiency, had too rashly separated from, and opposed themselves to the "powers ordained of God." What was the effect on the Nation? They led them in a wild and gloomy path of superstition, almost as dangerous as the Popish thralldom from which they had so recently escaped, and which was certainly one very principle cause of the terribly profligate re-action that took place under the dissolute Charles. Nor is this the only opportunity we have had of learning the dangerous character of unrestrained Nonconformity; about the very same time the Congregationalists of New England were passing laws against the Quakers and Baptists, "and many of both sects were imprisoned, fined, whipped and banished. Among the latter was the illustrious Roger Williams. Two Quakers were put to death." I feel, loath, Sir, to speak unkindly, but candor requires me to state my conviction that low dissent, like democracy, is necessarily intolerant; this reminds me of a remark of Coleridge, who gives it, when speaking of the Church of England, as his firm conviction, that an *Establishment is absolutely requisite, in order to maintain true liberty of conscience.* I know that in a darker age the supporters of the Church of England have been intolerant; but now that the light of Christian day has well nigh put out the torch of persecution, where will you meet with the most painful displays of the bitter animosity of party prejudice? Not, certainly, in the Church of England.

The Rev. Editor of the Guardian, in an article on the state of the Church in the days of the Charles' and James II., brings very heavy charges against the Hierarchy, as the principal cause, or at least the warm supporters of the arbitrary measures of the unhappy Charles I. A little less prejudice would have enabled that gentleman to see that these, once more, were the evils of the age, not of the Church;

It is, as before remarked, the misfortune of humanity that every good has its attendant evil; so in this case, the recent emancipation from popery had introduced a latitudinarianism of feeling, which too generally led every man to imagine he was fully able to be his own guide, and had an indefeasible right to be his own lawgiver; this produced a most unscriptural opposition to the constituted authorities, and thereby unhappily drove those authorities to too rigorous extremes; but before your correspondent ventures any more such unwarrantable attacks, by whomever supported, I beg him to say whether even Charles, aided by Laud and Strafford, sought any greater power than had been uniformly possessed by his predecessors, especially Elizabeth and Henry VIII. However dangerous, therefore, the prerogatives claimed might be to the liberty of the subject, it is wrong, I restrain stronger language, to charge to the connection of Church and State, what is so obviously the effect of altogether different causes. Look at the blindness of party prejudice; our Editor, speaking of the measures of King Charles I., says, "all pious ministers having been thus driven out of the Church." Now to say nothing of the modesty or christian charity of this assertion, as regards the 12 or 15,000 ministers left in the Church, it is almost amusing to witness how, in the height of his improper feeling towards England's venerated Hierarchy, he has entirely forgotten the 2,000 Nonconformists of the second Charles' reign, for surely they were "all, all honorable men." Let it be remembered, also, that however we may regret the rigorous enforcement of the act of uniformity at such a time, that yet in itself there was nothing either false in principle or oppressive in fact; the evils arose from want of judgment on one hand; and violent prejudice, not unfrequently mixed with much natural obstinacy and unsound political principle, on the other; even good men are intellectually the creatures of circumstances, and the worthies of that age on every side, undoubtedly still suffered much from the deleterious effects of the lingering mists of superstition. The Reverend Editor then proceeds to point, with feelings of evident exultation, to the Episcopal Clergy as the prime movers in, and chief supporters of the revolution of 1688, and adduces it as a conclusive proof that the high principles they maintained under Charles I. were merely the result of interest, as they could so readily sacrifice them in order to dethrone James II. when they feared themselves were in danger; while at the same time he holds up the Nonconformists to our admiration, as loyal men, almost content to suffer rather than rebel, or at least, as only yielding an assent to revolution as a *dernier ressource*. I imagine, however, that a candid examination will entirely change the picture. But I must be permitted to demur at the strange inconsistency committed by the Reverend Editor, in quoting the deistical Hume as an authority, when inquiring into the motives of any body of Christian Ministers; alas! when once we imbibe false principles, to what strange associations are we frequently driven in order to uphold them; and none more markedly and injuriously than the dissenting and democratic opposers of Church or State. But to return to a consideration of ecclesiastical conduct

at the Revolution. 1. Observe the high churchism and passive obedience doctrines of Charles the First's day had reference chiefly to civil submission. 2. Scriptural as I must believe these views, in a great degree, to have been, there is yet sufficient proof that they were not entertained by a large number of the Clergy; and, certainly were not in general carried to matters of faith. 3. The leaders of the Hierarchy, Archbishop Laud and his cotemporaries, were passed away before James II. ascended the Throne. Admitting these premises where was the inconsistency of the Established Clergy abetting, on religious grounds, a change of the reigning dynasty? Deeply do I regret to see an attempt to attribute mere sordid interest as the motive which actuated the dignitaries of the Church in that important affair. Can any one imagine, or in any way work themselves up to believe, that when the Universities refused to listen to James's request, and many of the Fellows were in consequence ejected, that they were seeking their own worldly interests? Or that the noble firmness of the Bishops whereby they staked, not only their fortunes and honor, but risked their personal safety, was the result of selfish avarice, or low ambition? Nay, let Mr. Ryerson answer, as to what were their prospects of success, when it is well known that the Prince of Orange was so coldly received even after he had actually landed, that writes Mr. R. himself, "Impatient of disappointment, he is said to have publicly declared his resolution to permit the English Nation to settle their own differences with their King; and to direct King James where to punish, by transmitting to him the secret correspondence of his subjects;" why, this extract itself proves the perilous nature of the enterprise upon which the dignitaries of the Church entered, that when they undertook to oppose their arbitrary King, they did indeed take their lives in their hands, and it is most unfair, therefore, to charge them with other than conscientious motives. But, Sir, such unworthy insinuations became doubly painful when we examine a little further into the actual facts of the case;—the truth is, that Sancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury, with the seven other Bishops who led the van in constitutional opposition to James, and who were in consequence committed to the Tower, and afterwards tried at Westminster, all, with the exception of Trelawney, Bishop of Bristol, *became non-jurors*, refusing to take the oath of allegiance to the Prince of Orange, afterwards William III. and of course, in consequence lost their Bishoprics and benefices; as though they had felt bound to oppose their Monarch's attempted inroads on Protestantism by all lawful means, these loyal subjects, sound christians, and intrepid prelates, were no less conscientiously determined not to sanction what they considered a wicked rebellion against their lawful, however faulty, Sovereign. I envy not the moral sensibilities of those who can feel it in their hearts, lightly to impugn the character of such noble and *disinterested* champions of the vital truths of Christianity. But surely Mr. Ryerson ought to be aware, that the Clergy in general, when the opposition to James commenced, to their immortal honor be it spoken, had little expectation, and less desire, that the throne should be subverted. Belsham, an ultra-Whig writer, says, the generality of the

Tories, including almost the whole body of the Clergy, highly offended with the unexpected advancement of the Prince of Orange to the Throne, adopted the famous distinction of a King *de facto*, and a King *de jure*. I confess, that even the cursory examination into which I have entered, of the conduct of the Church of England at this trying crisis, has greatly increased my esteem for her,—her *firmness, where firmness was christianity, and her submission, where submission was scriptural duty, is perhaps hardly to be equalled, to the same extent, in the annals of the Church.* I must advert for a moment to the Non-conformists, for so the challenge runs. They, it must be remembered, professed to believe opposition to tyrannical Princes lawful, consequently the Editor of the Guardian is beside the mark in lauding them for their submission, for as they looked upon James as a tyrant, quiescence in them was not virtue, but cowardice; the proof of which is, that no sooner did others stand in the fore front of the battle, than they were content to bring up the rear!

We are also referred to the days of the venerable Wesley; alas, I know that England lay in a stupid lethargy; I will not stop to enquire the cause, content that it was *not* a National Church, for dissent was in a still sounder slumber. But the awakening of England was owing under God to its Established Church; not only were the Wesley's, Whitfield, and others, Clergymen of that Church; but from whence did they gather their converts? Was it not in the vast majority of cases from the Establishment; and for this simple reason, that they had a way to the hearts and consciences of her children by means of her Liturgy, Articles, Homilies, &c. which they did not, and could not find, to the hearts of those who did not acknowledge their authority; thus as far as human sagacity can do it, the admirable Establishment, by the purity of its doctrines, the immutability of its creed, and its hold, as a National Church, upon the affections of the people, provides for its own regeneration; far otherwise, is it with the dissenting Churches.

One of the most astonishing things connected with the views of the present and recent state of the English and Non-conformist Churches, which is taken by many, is, that they do not seem to discern this marked and vital difference between them, namely, that while both were in a painfully lethargic spiritual condition, the one (the Nonconformists) was also theologically depraved, having too generally fallen into ruinous heresy; the following testimonies, will, I imagine, be sufficient to cause those who "love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity" to feel deeply grateful to the King of Kings that he did not leave us, as a nation, subject to the uncertainties and mischievous consequences of Nonconformist and voluntary Churches;—Brown, in his "Religious Encyclopediu," says, "But after the Revolution, many of the Presbyterians (Nonconformists) first veered towards Arminianism, then revived the Arian hypothesis, and by degrees *settled in Socinianism.* Some of the Independents and Baptists on the other hand, leaned to the Antinomian doctrines."—Professor Palfrey, of Cambridge, United States, states that "of the old connection of general Baptists in England a majority are

acknowledged Unitarians. The Presbyterian Churches also throughout England, are understood to be, with scarcely an exception, occupied by congregations of this sort. Their number is reckoned at more than two hundred." Sir Richard Phillips says, "Most of the English Presbyterians, and many Independents have joined them,"—the Unitarians. And again he states, that in England and Wales there are 1663 Independent Congregations, and 258 Presbyterians, and that one-third of them are Unitarians.—It is also greatly to be feared that a large proportion of the Quakers are sinking into deism. *If I mistake not, at this very hour the pulpit of even the devoted and orthodox Matthew Henry, is filled by a Socinian Teacher!* Alas, alas! may a gracious Heaven save us from the unhallowed machinations of those who would consign us for ever to the gloomy prospects of dissent. Such, alas, are some of the results of Nonconformity; and they are amply sufficient to make every real lover of pure Christianity shudder at the idea of leaving the religion of any country to the care of such unstable, and too often ungodly hands; and pardon me, Sir, for saying, that surely great must be the guilt of any Legislator, who, under any circumstances, would sanction such a measure. I have not quite done with the character of the English Church, but must postpone it till next week.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your faithful obedient Servant,

AN ANGLO-CANADIAN.

April 4th, 1839.

LETTER VII.

TO THE HON. W. H. DRAPER, M. P. P. &c. &c. &c.

Church and Nonconformists—noble conduct of Clergy, respecting Catholic Relief Bill—necessity of an Establishment to guard the Scriptures from sectarian corruption—comparison of the Literary labours of the Clergy and Dissenters—Remarks on the Voluntary Churches of the Establishment—Methodism indebted to the Church—Contrast between the former and present condition of the United States—Doubtful character of Republican evidence against Establishments—testimony of an American Bishop as to their necessity.

SIR,

I have already alluded to the noble integrity in the hour of danger, of the dignitaries and Clergy of the Church of England; there is, however, another instance to which I would have alluded, had not my last letter extended to so great a length, it is to the conduct of the

Bishops in the House of Lords respecting the Catholic Relief Bill. This Bill, it must be remembered, was introduced by His Majesty's Ministers, and a Ministry too, that were esteemed highly conservative, and that in their hands, of course, was held the entire Episcopal, and much of the other valuable church patronage, yet under these trying circumstances did the Episcopal Bench with one or two unhappy defections, supported by nearly the whole of the Clergy, firmly resist by every *constitutional* means, as in the days of James II., this too successful inroad upon that Protestantism of which they thus, once more, proved themselves the firm and disinterested, as well as natural guardians; laying not only their temporal prospects, but their dearer reputation, also, as a sacrifice upon the altar of pure Christianity, sustained only by the Wesleyan Methodists; while the Dissenters (Non-conformists) were very generally found supporting the claims of the Romish Church, ready to sacrifice the interests and safety of true religion, to their democratic principles and spurious liberality. Indeed the general unflinching political and legislative integrity of our Protestant Hierarchy, has often excited my admiration; they have again and again thrown themselves into the breach when the constitution, or especially the orthodoxy, of the state has been endangered; whereby they have continually manifested a firm determination to be governed by the dictates of *principle*, and to resist at every hazard, the encroachments of a wretched *expediency*.

It ought not to be forgotten in a comparison of the relative usefulness of the Established and Nonconformist Churches, that the former are as it were, from the very necessity of their constitution, a kind of *body-guard* to the Sacred Scriptures. It is not so with the Nonconformists; I do not wish to insinuate that the Dissenters are in general corrupters of the Word of God, very far from it, I honor many of their worthies, admire their talents, and love their piety, but I cannot shut my eyes to the truth that we have not from them, and cannot have, any security that the Sacred Volume will not be corrupted under the pretence of more correct translations, &c.; already we have had to lament over a whole host of attacks on the authorised version, evidently manifesting that were it not for those Christian enactments, which in Britain prevent the ready publishing of spurious editions, we should have been overrun with them; as it is we have had the garbled "New Version" of the Unitarians, and in the United States the translation by the Baptists, purportedly designed to support their peculiar views; besides many others of a like nature. Of the same stamp was the Liverpool Liturgy, published by the Presbyterians in 1652, of which Mr. Orton says, "It is scarcely a Christian Liturgy—in the collect, the name of Christ is hardly mentioned; and the Spirit is quite banished from it." These are facts, to which happily, as you are well aware, Sir, no parallel can be found in the history of the Church of England; individual Ministers of that Church may become heretical, but then its creed as well as itself being under the protection of the civil power, they have either to leave it or conceal their heresy and are consequently prevented sowing the seeds of death within its pale, by their false administrations, their cor-

ruptions of its Liturgy, or yet more dangerous alterations and perversions of the Sacred Oracles. Speaking of the Church a modern writer remarks,—“ It seems, moreover, if rightly understood, *to be a fitting safeguard and centre of spiritual unity in the truth of the Bible*, to those who love the Saviour and yet see not their way into our portion of his earthly fold.” That most salutary law forbidding the common printing of the Bible, without note or comment, and its yet more valuable provision which prevents the ordinary distribution of any but the authorized version, we certainly owe to the influence of an establishment. I know it may be argued that such laws may be passed without an establishment. I know it may be argued that such laws may be passed without an established church, but the question is, will they? and they? I trow not, look to the much lauded neighbouring States. No, sir, the very feelings that rise in opposition to a state supported church, would very soon cry down such a *tyrannical* legislature! But this is not all, the “ Word of the Living God ought ever to be surrounded by those whose duty and interest are both involved in guarding its purity, and watching its fate,” while they are engaged in spreading its precepts. I do not, and cannot believe, that in an age of licentious free thinking, like this, it can be the will of Heaven to leave its Records to the sport of every deistical witing; it has required all the care of an Established Church, first to prepare and to disseminate the Sacred Volume, and afterwards to maintain it pure amid the efforts of the deistical or dissolute to corrupt it, and all this care, it is but too evident, is still needed for the same vitally important ends; and this, it is clear, can be efficiently done by none but an establishment, armed with a measure of authoritative influence. Such an Hierarchy, were it only for such a purpose seems to me all-important. The learned Dr. Adam Clarke asked the question “ What would our nation have been, if it had not had a version of the Sacred Writings *established by the authority of the laws?*”

Permit me to adduce one more comparison between the parties under consideration, and then, I will pass on to another part of your Reverend correspondent's letter. Mr. Ryerson, I doubt not, will admit the vast importance of bringing the mightest powers of the human mind, improved by all the adventitious aids of the most elaborate cultivation, to bear on the infinitely important matters connected with revealed and practical religion, and yet admitting this, where is the consistency of denouncing that only system of ecclesiastical polity whereby we can reasonably hope to secure a fair proportion of such ministers? He surely cannot expect it amid the uncertainties of the voluntary system? Has such a ministry been found there? Where then are we to look for the mass of erudition, the Leviathans of theological literature? Where, in the common sense of the thing, but where there is literary leisure, and freedom from pecuniary care? The Dean and Chapter of Winchester, in an appeal to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners in behalf of even one of the most questionable appendages of the Establishment, thus powerfully plead: “ It was by those very appointments,” say they, or by appointments of that class, which it is now the fashion to stigmatise as sinecures, that the

giants of English theology were reared; and that they were enabled to give to their own age, and to posterity, their great and inestimable services. It was to the sinecures (as they are invidiously termed) connected with the church, and in no mean degree to those of cathedrals, that we are, under Providence, indebted for our Cranmers, and Ridley's, and Jewels, and Whitgifts, and Hookers, and Davenants, and Halls, and Ushers, and Lightfoots, and Pearsons, and Cudworths, and Patricks, and Barrows, and Tilottsons, and Stillingsfleets, and Pococks, and Fleetwoods, and Gostrells, and Gibsons, and Waterlands, and Sherlocks, and Seekers, and Newtons, and Balguys, and Lowths, and Horsleys, with a multitude of others, who are the admiration of foreign churches, and the glory of their country, and will ever be regarded amongst the greatest lights of the world; and we confidently appeal to them as witnesses on behalf of such sinecures as those for which we plead, *and we claim them as never dying advocates for our venerable institutions,*" and as the learned Dr. Adam Clarke observes, "no Church since the Apostle's days has been more honored in this way, than the British Church; and the same writer says "we cannot help adoring the good Providence of God, that taken as a body, they have been an honor to their function, and in general men of great learning and probity, and the ablest advocates of the Christian system, both as to its *authenticity* and the *purity* and *excellency* of its *doctrines* and *morality*. I am not ignorant of the talent, erudition, and labor that have been displayed in very many of those numerous works, which are the honor of the non-established clergy, nor have I any wish to undervalue them; but it cannot be denied that they are rare exceptions? How can it possibly be otherwise? To expect any thing else of a ministry, who, however, we may honor their frequent piety and usefulness, it must be admitted, are too generally limited in their education, circumscribed in their means, and worn down with too excessive ministerial and pastoral labors; "who have no access to libraries, and no leisure to use them," to expect such a ministry to be frequently found amid the higher walks of theological literature, and defending by their learned labours and ponderous efforts, the outworks of our sacred citadel, were indeed to display our own entire ignorance of the nature of literary pursuits, and, Pharaoh-like, to require men to make bricks without straw. Now, Sir, notwithstanding my own entire inability to do justice to such a subject, and all those other drawbacks which I have stated, I still feel that upon a review of the statements contained in my last letter, and in this, I may venture to repeat your Reverend correspondent test, nor tremble to place my cause upon the issue,—“let the history of High Churchmen in England on the one side, and Nonconformists on the other, from the reign of Elizabeth to that of James II. inclusive—let the history of the Church of England at the time Wesley and Whitfield appeared—let each of these give an appropriate reply,” as to the comparative usefulness and success of established or non-established churches. Once more I say let truth and candour decide.

My letters having already become more numerous, and much more lengthy than I anticipated, I do not design to enter at all into the discussion, at least beyond a simple statement or two, of the other tests to which Mr. Ryerson appeals; but hasten to consider his elaborate statistical statements, rather, however, as regards their *moral* than their *numerical* accuracy.

The fact that England contains many voluntary Churches, belonging to the Establishment, to the history of which your correspondent refers as an argument, if I understand him correctly, against State Endowments, is worthy of consideration. In the first place, *I am not opposing the voluntary system as an adjunct*; and in the second, these very Churches and their Ministers as forming a part of the Establishment, are secured, excepting in the matter of income, all the advantages of that Establishment. In these Churches the Minister's salary is managed in a manner far less objectionable than in most dissenting Churches, mainly, if I am not greatly mistaken, from the *Pew Rent*, not from what can be strictly called voluntary contributions. 2. The Ministers of these Churches also, cannot, I believe, be removed at the pleasure of the Congregations, any more than the incumbent of a regular Parish.

3. It must also be borne in mind, that these voluntary Clergymen owe their large Congregations, not only to that undoubted piety and talent which many of them possess, but to the moral influence attached to their characters as Clergymen of the Established Church. A second consideration of importance is that, of course, they *have received the same education, are subject to the same control, and professors of, and bound by the same creed* with the rest of their brother Ministers. In a word, the public good which is derived from an Establishment, must be felt from these voluntary Churches to a very principal degree, as in their great essentials they form a part of it, while the evils that are so apt to be felt from the voluntary system by the Clergyman himself, and his immediate Congregation, are in this case very materially obviated, not only by the facts above stated, but also by that indefinable, but most unquestionable feeling of respect which so strongly appertains to every thing that is connected with Monarchical Institutions, and consequently to the Established Clergy, even apart from the veneration due to their sacred office, as one of those Institutions; a feeling so singular and thrilling, and yet so powerful, that I can only account for it as a mysterious guard placed by Divine Providence around a form of Government so peculiarly in accordance with his revealed will.* It should also be borne in mind that these Churches, the support of whose Ministers is voluntary, are generally built by the State, and in many cases the Minis-

* Sir Francis Palgrave has the following striking remarks upon this important, but too little observed feeling. "The respect rendered to ancestry, the influence which it bestows, is a dispensation of Providence in the moral government of the world; not a conventional institution resulting from human authority. It is a talent cast upon the owner, for which he is awfully responsible. Shame fall upon him if he misuse the gift; but disgrace is his, and the gift itself is unstained. It is a possession which cannot be acquired by those to whom it has not been granted."

ters are regularly aided in their salary out of what is called "Queen Ann's Bounty."

With respect to Methodism, I have already remarked, that under God it owed its rapid spread in no small degree to the influence of the Church of England which resulted from its being an Establishment;— and I am further prepared to hazard the assertion that often the zeal and piety of the Wesleyan Ministry themselves, the most powerful conducive to their prosperity, is still to be found in the orthodoxy produced by the Establishment, and in that literary emulation which has been produced by their being placed in continual juxtaposition with the regularly educated Clergy of the Establishment: while the same, I trust, sacred competition has led the people on their part to endeavor to place their Ministers in such a situation as shall enable them to take a suitable and useful stand in society; these things have had a far deeper though partially unobserved influence on the success of Wesleyan Methodism in England than is generally supposed, especially as a gracious superintending Providence has hitherto preserved amongst them that noble conservative feeling which is at once so conducive to their respectability and sound piety, and which has also led them while they upheld the principle of the Established Church, to copy whatever seemed excellent in its institutions, as far as was practicable.†

by the Father of mankind. It is a pre-eminence which may be rendered more useful, or more illustrious, by wealth, or intellect, or station; but which neither wealth, nor intellect, nor station can impart. It is a power not conceded either by King or by people, and which neither the arbitrary tyranny of the despot, nor the still more arbitrary will of the multitude, can obliterate. Man cannot bestow dignity of birth—man cannot take it away. Whatever results from time is incommunicable, and cannot be supplied by any other element. Hence, nobility of birth is an authority before which man's natural rebellion humbles itself most unwillingly, and which, however ineffectually, the 'spirit of the age' seeks most anxiously to destroy."

† An able Wesleyan Minister (the Rev. Richard Watson,) in his "Institutes" makes the following remarks, which go to prove at once both the feeling of British Methodism towards the Church, and the sufficiency of her ordinances, even for her most pious and devoted members, all insinuations to the contrary notwithstanding:—"It may also be asked, who are the persons whom the Methodists have alienated from the Church? In this too, the Church writers have laboured under great mistakes. They have 'alienated' those for the most part who were never in any substantial sense, and never would have been, of the Church. Very few of her pious members have at any time been separated from her communion by a connection with us; and many who became serious through the Methodist Ministry, continued attendants on her services, and observers of her sacraments. This was the case during the life of Mr. Wesley, and in many instances is so still; and when an actual separation of a few persons has occurred, it has been much more than compensated by a return of others from us to the Church, especially of opulent persons, or their children, in consequence of that superior influence which an Established Church must always exercise upon people of that class. For the rest, they have been brought chiefly from the ranks of the ignorant and the careless; persons who have little knowledge, and no experience of the power of religion; negligent of religious worship of every kind, and many of whom, but for the agency of Methodism, would have swelled the ranks of those who are equally disaffected to Church and State. If such persons are not now Churchmen, they are influenced by no feelings hostile to the institutions of their country."—*Life of the Rev. J. Wesley.*

The truth is, that these things prove, not that "voluntaryism," whether disciplinary or financial, is suited to stand alone in any land, but that in the present imperfect condition of all things human it may be, and is, when properly regulated, an excellent auxiliary to an Establishment.

With respect to the present and former religious conditions of the United States, I cannot, consistently with the limits I have prescribed to myself, attempt to enter into an examination of them. Suffice it to remark that while the infancy of Colonies, from a variety of obvious reasons, is always unfavorable to religion, that still I think it would be difficult to prove that the children of the "pilgrim fathers" are either as pious or as orthodox, as even their Nonconformist progenitors. But will your *Americo-Canadian* correspondent himself venture to compare the present moral condition of the New or Western States, not to mention some of the Southern, as Louisiana for instance, with that of the Eastern States, when they were English Colonies; yet the former are under the voluntary system in all its glory, while the latter had their Established Churches. It is here, as Mr. Ryerson well knows that the comparison to be just, must be drawn, and not between the infancy and maturity of the same States. And where is it, permit me to ask, that at the present hour Unitarianism on the one hand and Popery on the other, are making the most rapid advances? Let Boston and Baltimore answer.* But even take the older States themselves, and are they indeed provided with religious instruction as abundantly as under the old and maligned regime. Professor Emerson and Dr. Wisner, of the United States, say, "Many of the first Churches of New England, though small and poor supported two able Ministers. The first ten towns in Connecticut enjoyed the constant labors of ten Ministers, making an average of one Minister to fifty families, or to two hundred and sixty or seventy souls." In the present day, which Mr. Ryerson would fain make us believe is so far superior, he himself gives the average as one Minister to every THOUSAND souls! Dr. Dwight, an American Presbyterian, speaking of the depreciated condition of the United States, owing to the introduction of voluntaryism as a national system, instead of the former plan of State provision for the Christian Ministry thus writes: "Further the rapid decrease in the number of ministers, compared with the population, is shown. In 1753, in New-England, there was 1 minister for every 628 persons. In 1806, in the United States, there was not one well educated minister to 6000 souls! But in many cases where churches formerly existed, they are no longer to be found. The members are dispersed, the records gone, not a vestige of the church to be found!" He adds "It is quite clear the example of America can never be again quoted as a proof the success of the voluntary system. Such facts speak volumes; to multiply words were idle! But, Sir, what must we think of your correspondent's controversial fairness, who in the face of such facts, can studiously endeavor to make his readers believe that

*For a more particular account of Popery and Socinianism in America see Letter X.

in the States; under the voluntary system, ministers are proportionably more numerous, and the means of religious instruction more abundant than when under British rule, and enjoying the privileges of Established churches! Surely wretched must be the cause that needs such defence! If such be some of the first fruits of voluntaryism even in once protestant and puritan America, what shall the end be? Could I draw the veil from a very few years, I greatly fear I should not need to ask what they had gained by dissevering Church and State; already do we behold portents, that cannot be mistaken, of an awful political tempest amongst the people who have never been taught that they "must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake;"—while the triumphant pæons of Pope and Infidel exulting over their rising prospects give melancholy presage of an approaching religious struggle in this Republic.

I have already shown that the "state of this Province" does indeed afford a striking comment on the voluntary system, though of a far different kind to that which Mr. Ryerson would seem to intimate; to its inefficiency, let the thousands who never hear the "glad tidings" of the Gospel testify.

In drawing this letter to a conclusion I have only to remark that the testimony of Republicans on such subjects as that of a State supported Church, ought to be received with very great caution; as their political jealousy of all authority, to be consistent, must be extended to Ecclesiastical Institutions. Further, this unchristian impatience of all restraint being in exact proportion to the degree in which we think "more highly of ourselves than we ought to think," it is evident that the great bulk of a people whose every institution fosters this latter evil, are sure to frown upon all Church influence. It is also well known, that in that "land of the free" it is dangerous for any one, more especially for a Minister, to dissent from the "Sovereign People," and that consequently they are cautious not to offend; more particularly does this refer to the Clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church, of whom, as Mr. R. must be well aware, many of our democratic neighbors are already sufficiently jealous, as knowing that the true genius of their Church is soundly Conservative, not to say Monarchical! Bishop Hobart himself, in one of the extracts in your correspondent's Ninth Letter, is compelled to deprecate a disruption of the connection of Church and State in England, and such is the general feeling of his brethren of the United States. I know his excuse, and that of others, for making a difference between the two nations, is the importance of old associations, &c. &c. but I confess I cannot see how they can make what is black in America white in England, or *vice versa*; if such an Establishment be good in England, I cannot comprehend but that it must be so the world over; indeed the Reverend Prelate is hardly consistent, for if he really disapprove of the principle of State Endowments, how comes he and his Church to retain the appropriations made to them in former times by the British Government? But says Mr. Lorimer, "If Bishop Hobart, and other good men are opposed to Church Establishments, it is not unknown that there are

good men in America, aye, *bodies of Christians*, more sound than their neighbours, who hold the principle of a Church Establishment *sacred*, and lament that the State does not interpose on the side of God; and strange to say **THEY ARE INCREASING IN NUMBERS.**"*

The consideration of your Reverend correspondent's specious "Facts" in my next; in the meantime,

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

AN ANGLO-CANADIAN.

April 12th, 1839.

LETTER VIII.

TO THE HON. W. H. DRAPER, M. P. P. &c. &c. &c.

Mr. Ryerson's statements delusive; tenor of his ninth letter; **FACTS**—with respect to London; different situation of Canadians and Paupers of London; number of Places of Worship in England and America—and of Ministers; voluntarism best suited to towns—yet inefficient there; deficiency of Churches in England rather apparent than real; recent exertions of the Establishment in building Churches; Mr. R's. improper principles; present state of the Protestant Episcopal Church, with remarks of one of its Bishops; remarks on Education; its state in England; the different religious influence of, in England and America; remarks on Mr. Ryerson's controversial unfairness.

SIR,

I shall not attempt to follow Mr. Ryerson through all the elaborate statistics of his Ninth Letter, I flatter myself that without doing so I shall be able to show that they are entirely unsound in principle, and most delusive in detail. He states, in substance, that London, with the metropolitan diocese in general, is lamentably destitute of suitable religious instruction and accommodation, and that it affords a fair criterion whereby to judge of the rest; and proceeds to compare a few of our densely populated *manufacturing* towns with some of the leading cities of the United States, of course, to the disparagement of the former; he then says, that even "allowing the orthodox Nonconformists to afford instruction for as large a portion of the population as the Endowed Establishment, *one-fifth* of the population of the kingdom would still be without any place of public worship!" while on the other hand he exultingly points to the voluntary Churches of the neighbouring Republic, as affording "an average of one orthodox Minister, and one orthodox

* For further testimonials on this subject, see Letter X.

Church for every thousand persons." Now, Sir, what are the "FACTS" of the case, not merely the one-sided but the general facts? I will endeavour to present a bird's-eye view of them.

It is a matter of considerable pain to me to have so frequently to point out what I cannot but consider very improper misrepresentations in a ministerial writer; and yet what else can I call an insinuation like the following, where, after stating the painful evidence given by the Bishop of London, with regard to the religious destitution of his diocese, he adds, "Other dioceses throughout the kingdom cannot be supposed to be better supplied than that of London?" Did I not know the talent of your correspondent, and the fact of his having twice visited England, I should at once be ready to suppose it arose from a want of accurate information; surely Mr. Ryerson must be aware that the moral destitution of London is far, very far greater than any other portion of the kingdom; and for obvious reasons. The mighty metropolis must stand alone, it does not admit of being compared with any other city in the world, it is unique in its character; comprising a vast band of foreigners—a considerable number of Jews, perhaps 25,000—a large portion of the merchant princes of the world, and a pauper population of about 3 or 400,000, very many thousands of them the most debased characters in the world; in no large city are we to look for the special triumph of Christianity, as they are always the very focus of those who have given their souls to gain on the one hand, and of the idle, the abandoned, and the destitute on the other. Unless the Established Church is to be blamed for results, the legitimate consequence of the present corrupt state of the world, I cannot see the force of the argument brought against its usefulness, on account of the present state of the City of London; which, whatever its moral aspect may be, is rather to be viewed as the mart of the world, than as a city cherished under the guardian wing of the Church. I regret to say that from long experience, I know that the accommodation of Churches and Chapels, is superior to the attendance; I cannot but think the proper question is, what would London have been without an Establishment? Its Churches and Chapels are about as numerous as all the English Protestant Denominations put together; and if we take into consideration their large size, they will probably afford accommodation for *twice* as many as all the others. I do not like your correspondent's reference to Canada, as not being so destitute as London itself, it is calculated to mislead the people of this country, who are unacquainted with the peculiar circumstances. The destitution here, is that of a steady respectable class of yeomanry, who would attend the House of God had they the opportunity; whereas in London it is generally that of the debased and abandoned that will not attend public worship; and while, without doubt, increased efforts should be, and I rejoice to know are being made, in order to reclaim these miserable masses, still let the case be fairly represented. Is it right or fair to compare the situation of the farmers of Upper Canada, with that of the pauper or abandoned inhabitants of London, as though their moral destitution was owing to the same cause; while in the one case it is owing to their own depravity,

and in the other to the *want of efficient state care*, and active private benevolence in not providing suitable places of worship for those who are willing to attend.

But let us proceed to examine whether indeed the rest of England be equally deficient in suitable Churches and Chapels, or is equally lacking ministerial care. Sir Richard Phillips, a high authority in such statistics, states that in England and Wales there are 10,872 Established Churches or Chapels, and 7517 Dissenting and Methodist Chapels, exclusive of Papal Chapels, which gives a total of 18,389 Places of Worship, which, taking the population at the outside estimate of 14,000,000, gives one for every 761 of the gross amount, or as nearly, if not more than half the population cannot be supposed capable of attending Public Worship; the above statement shows that in England and Wales there is one Church or Chapel for every 400 of adult and able persons! and as most of these are of large size, many even of the new Churches being calculated to hold from 1,800 to 2000 persons, it may fairly be presumed that there is not only on an average sittings for all the inhabitants of England and Wales who are able to attend Public Worship, but positively a considerable surplus! Above *five-ninths* of the whole number of Churches and Chapels belong to the Establishment, and, owing to the greater size of their Churches, probably *three-fourths* of all the sittings. Now, is it right, with such an ample general provision as this, to talk of *one-fifth* of our home population being destitute of Places of Worship, while in fact they have such a surplus? Your *accurate* correspondent states the Churches in the United States to be as 1 to 1000 people, that is 1 to about 600 efficient persons; now I would put it to Mr. R. who knows how much smaller the public buildings are here than at home, whether these American Churches will on an average hold at the outside above 300 individuals? That then leaves one half of the population of the United States destitute of any place of worship, while much traduced England has numerically an abundant supply. Such then is one of the effects of the working of an Establishment, as contrasted with the Voluntary System.

Again, there are 36,000 Ministers in Great Britain, which gives one to every 83 families, or to about 444 individuals; while in boasted America, Mr. Ryerson gives an average of 1 Minister to 1,000 individuals; not half the supply of the United Kingdom, or perhaps about half, if we throw out the few who are not orthodox! And of this cloud of Ministers in Britain, nearly *one-half* are Clergymen of the two Establishments!

I confess, Sir, when first I saw your correspondent's "curious" statements I did feel a little startled, though I had my suspicions that a careful examination would put a somewhat different face on the matter, yet I scarcely expected to see the tables so completely turned, as I now hope we shall before I finish this letter. With respect to the statistical comparison in the letter under consideration, of certain cities and towns in England with others in the United States, it is sufficient to observe that, if the voluntary system will work any where, it will be in towns; as

that spirit of enterprise which distinguishes commercial communities, has also a marked influence upon their religious proceedings. 2. Because as they have much more to do with money transactions, they naturally acquire a readier liberality. 3. The inhabitants of towns are more actuated by a feeling of conventional pride, and personal emulation, than country residents, and consequently thousands of them erect Churches, and uphold the outward ordinances of religion from mere respectability of character.

Yet after all, though on a mere glance at the numbers, some of the *Cities* in the States seem to be as well provided with Places of Worship as in England, there is yet, in fact, a very essential distinction arising from the different character of their populations; while the proportion of paupers or very indigent poor is extremely small in America, owing to circumstances to which I shall shortly advert; in England they are nearly *one-third*; it is obvious, therefore, that had it not been for an Establishment, supposing that the voluntary system had proceeded with us in the same ratio that it has in the United States, our religious deficiencies would have been probably near *that one-third* more than at present; but if we only take the increased religious destitution at *one-fifth*, that would give in Nottingham for instance, one Church to every 2,500 persons, instead of, as at present, one to every 2,000; or to reverse the picture, had Philadelphia a mixed population like that of England, instead of having one place of worship to about 2,400, and one Minister to 1,180, a supply, methinks; meagre enough! it would afford only one Church to 3,000 individuals, and one Minister to 1,700; which supposing, what is no wise probable, that on an average these Churches as being in cities, and therefore large, would hold 700 each, still that would leave *three-fourths* of the inhabitants destitute! while the utmost destitution of which Mr. Ryerson complains in England is *one-fifth*! Such would be the effect of the voluntary system even in the land of its glory, were it in the situation of old, manufacturing and populous countries. May it be saved from the weakness of voluntarism long ere that day shall arrive! But I am ready to admit, and to lament the local deficiencies, which, notwithstanding the abundance of the average supply, are found in certain of our large towns; and yet, after all, as I have before intimated, it is rather an apparent than a real deficiency; for if unhappily a certain class of the people cannot be persuaded to attend, it were useless to erect Churches for them till they are imbued with better feelings; and that such is the case, your correspondent's own quotation from the Rev. Hugh Stowell amply proves, where he says, "The truth is, that the multitude of our labouring classes, and our poor have become so utterly estranged from all reverence for the Sabbath, and all inclination for the sanctuary, that the mere contiguity of the ordinances of religion, would affect them but feebly; they will not of their own accord come to the Gospel;"—hence it would seem that it is rather religion than churches that is needed; and again be it remembered, that the largest proportion of this utter contempt of religion and its ordinances, is found amongst a class of the com-

munity of whom, in the nature of things, a new country can know little or nothing. But even for that want of Ministers and Churches, which is undoubtedly felt in a degree in many of our large towns, let not the Establishment be blamed; these towns have grown to their present size within a very few years, during which time *there has been every effort made to cripple the Establishment*, how then could she be expected to meet, as they ought to be met, the increasing demands upon her parental care? Yet in 1828, if I mistake not, a law was passed for the erection in England and Wales of 213 new Churches and Chapels, at an average cost of £15,835 each; in 1832 a grant was made for 78 new Churches, and for 58 in 1833; so that notwithstanding the frantic efforts of infidelity, democracy, and low dissent, in unhallowed combination, to overthrow the Church of England, all reckless, or a portion even triumphing in the thought, that by so doing they peril all the holy things not only of England, but of Christendom, nay, of the world itself, notwithstanding, I say, this wicked combination, yet has the venerable Establishment extended wider and wider the wings of her protection.* Al- low me then to ask, Sir, whether every fresh light in which we view the working of the Church of England as an Establishment, does not in- creasingly prove the deep guilt of those furious attempts which are making to overthrow and destroy her, and whether the vehement efforts to prevent her establishment either here or in any other place where her first-born, the British Constitution, holds the Sceptre of Government, are not likely to be most fatal to the real, moral, and civil interests of the country, and verily to call down the judgments of Heaven upon us as a people alike neglecting the *national* homage due to Jehovah, and that due care for the souls of the people, which is incumbent on all rulers?

The bold and self-opinionated manner in which Mr. Ryerson introduces his remarks on the operation of the voluntary system upon the Episcopal Church in the United States, is revolting.—“This is indeed, (he says) a matter of minor importance; it ought not to be even a matter of grave inquiry by an enlightened and impartial Government,” (he prudently says nothing about *Christian Governments*,) “whether its subjects are Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Baptists, or Methodists, &c.” (he should have added, of course, Socinians, Jews, or Turks!) “much less ought it, (he continues) to be a matter of patronage and legislation to elevate or depress, or interfere with any branch of the Christian Church, in the race of benevolent emulation and religious enterprise.” This, in a Christian land, from a Christian Minister, with the Bible in his hand! But happily the Rev. Egerton Ryerson is not the man; neither will wisdom die with him; and his dictum to the con-

* The Wesleyan Methodist Magazine for April 1834, alluding to these efforts of the Establishment thus speaks:—“So clearly was the insufficiency of the *voluntary system* proved, that the Legislature was *called upon* to interfere, and in the space of ten years more was done in building new Places of Worship under the Church Commission, than had been previously effected under the voluntary system in half a century!” If wealthy England had to call for State assistance to erect its Churches, what is to become of poor Canada if left to the voluntary system?

trary notwithstanding, some of us may yet venture to believe in common with thousands of the wise, and the holy, and the *inspired*, that Christian Rulers are bound to act as Christians, and to use all their influence, personal, acquired, or official, in order to be nursing fathers and mothers, in every instance, and by every possible method, to the Church of Christ; and that, not actuated by a spurious liberality, which opening its arms to all, betrays a false-hearted scepticism; but, while imbued with the charity that "hopeth all things," to manifest a zeal according to knowledge, and "proving all things, holds fast *only* that which is good;" (i. e. which they consider *best*;) no righteously honest Ruler can go further, where the essentials of true religion are involved; and where is it that they are not more or less involved?

With respect to his observations on the state of the Protestant Episcopal Church, I have only to remark, that though I doubt not its rising prosperity, still viewing it as I do, as one of the principal bulwarks of sound orthodox Christianity, I can say little in its present circumstances but what is calculated to cause increased dissatisfaction with voluntaryism, *as a national system*, and disgust at the government that upholds it as such. The Rev. Mr. Boyle, of Boston, a distinguished Clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, states the number of its present Ministers to be only sixteen Bishops, and six hundred and forty-eight other Clergymen; which at the large average of 700 hearers to one Minister, gives a total of about 450,000; while Roman Catholicism boasts, in these same States, 800,000 members, under the care of 1 Archbishop, 11 Bishops, and 350 Priests; and the Unitarians and similar heresies number at the lowest calculation 1,300 Ministers, which at an average of only 500 hearers to each, makes the alarming amount of 650,000 adherents to those heretical teachers. Would the Protestant Episcopal Church have made such a melancholy and meagre figure beside Popery and semi-Infidelity, had it been nurtured by the fostering care of the State? The Protestant Episcopal Bishop of New Jersey, who will be considered an authority on this subject, thus writes in 1834:—"But that our Church is half as influential as it might be *under other circumstances*, or that the Ministers of Religion of any Sect, who act among the better conditioned part of our population, experience the respect, and have the authority necessary to the effect of their office, is not to be asserted!"* Are not these facts, instead of being cause of exultation, as your correspondent seems to think, sufficient to prove the absolute necessity of State patronage and support to those Churches whose doctrines are the most scriptural and pure; as is still true that "the world will *only* love its own?" And the truth is, that the very purity of

* The following remarks by the Editor of the (Wesleyan) London "Watchman," in October, 1837, anticipate similar evils to those to which the Right Reverend Prelate refers, he says:—"Let the principle of an Established Church *once go*, and we shall soon see an *end put to those religious decencies*, which invest magisterial authority with an additional claim to reverence in the eyes of the people. This is no surmise of ours, but the assertion of what is verified by a recent fact which has taken place at both."

the doctrines of the Protestant Episcopal Church, especially in matters of civil government, is what keeps it down.

But let us follow out a little more generally, the facts adduced above. It seems that the Papal and regular Heterodox Churches in the United States comprise at a low estimate about 1,450,000 souls, which is *one-ninth* of the entire population: in England and Wales, on the other hand, the same Churches, at a liberal calculation, do not amount to 600,000, or *one-twenty-third* of the entire population, not greatly more than *one-third* the proportion in the States; were the calculation accurately made, probably not a third! Such is again the comparative result of the working of the voluntary and establishment principles. Must not every enlightened lover of our Zion then cry "all hail" to the latter principle? Let these "facts" also be my answer to your correspondent's sneer, (*lover of Britain as he is!*) at the moral and intellectual condition of the "masses" in good "old christian England;" let him "look at this picture, and then at that."

I had intended not to advert to the subject of *Education*, as whatever he and the State of New York may think, "good old christian England" has ever been foolish enough to suppose that *religious instruction* was incomparably more important than mere intellectual cultivation, and has acted according; but the preceding allusion having brought it before us, I will just remark that the two subjects, namely, an Established Church and the Endowment of Common Schools, being no way necessarily connected, I cannot but feel as though he had introduced the subject of Education for the mere sake of effect, and in order to create a feeling of disgust in the minds of the inhabitants of this Province against the English Church, though with a most reprehensible disregard of the justice of the ground on which he did so. I regret, perhaps as deeply as Mr. Ryerson, that there is not more Legislative provision for Common School Education, in this Province; but Heaven forbid that the Church of Christ should ever be spoiled of her possessions, for what would then become, so unholy a purpose. But, Sir, though I seek brevity, permit me a statement or two, as I imagine that the state of British Education is from being as bad as Mr. Ryerson's partial report would indicate. I have lived for many years in our manufacturing Districts at Home, and for some years in London, and have had considerable intercourse with our poorer classes of society, and *very rarely* indeed did I find an individual that could not read, scarcely one amongst the young; and I know not that I ever met with any one who had not the opportunity of learning, if they wished to do so, and generally not only reading, but also writing and accounts. But hear Sir R. Phillips, an author on this subject, perhaps equal to any Parliamentary Committees. "In 1828, 487 Parishes in England contained 3,260 unendowed Schools, educating 105,571 children. These 487 being a 21st part of the whole number of parishes, it is inferred that there are from 65 to 70,000 unendowed Schools, educating above 2,300,000 children at 30 to a school. (About one fourth of the population are between five and fourteen years, making 3,250,000 children in England in 1831.) Sun-

day Schools in 1828 educated above half a million ; (now doubles above a million.) *These and the Endowed Schools (4167) make up nearly (now above) the whole juvenile population!*" Of the above Schools 30,000, though not endowed, are aided by public or charitable funds.—“ But for Education” says Sir Richard, who, it may be observed, is no great friend either to Britain’s Church or State—“ But for Education the distressing circumstances of the country, (England) since 1825 would have increased crime ten-fold.” How much reliance then can be placed on partial reports and prejudiced representations? Mr. Ryerson lauds at some length the connection in the United States of Education with Religious Institutions ; I was fully aware, Sir, that that gentleman is peculiarly happy in his efforts to make the worse appear the better cause, but I confess I hardly expected to see the boasted Republic held forth as an example of the *expediency* of connecting Religion with any thing secular ; I always understood that its *evangelical* government held religious principles too sacred to be allowed to influence them any where, save in the Church ! But to be serious, where is the religion, where even the acknowledgment of Christianity in the conducting of the 9000 Common Schols which are supported by the Legislature of New York ? In England, on the contrary, from the Universities down to the humblest National School you will find a regular recognition of revealed religion, and, if I mistake not, regular Divine Worship even in the National Day Schools : the legitimate and glorious results this of an Established Church ; and the same influence is felt throughout even the vast majority of private Educational Institutions. I know not that I was ever in either a Private, Boarding, or Day School where domestic Worship was not regularly attended to ; and the resident Pupils regularly taken to one stated Place of Worship with their Tutors. Such are the principles upon which Education is conducted in Christian England.

Before I conclude this Letter I wish to advert to Mr. Ryerson’s great unfairness ! 1. That in his comparisons between England and the United States, he seems carefully to keep out of view the different character of their populations. Now if he really loved Britain, as a Briton ought, and such he is, being born in a British Province, why does he carefully keep back “facts” that would redound to her honor, or serve as apologies for her defects ; while at the same time he certainly appears to throw into the fore ground of his picture, whatever is to the credit of our Republican neighbors. I hope I love impartially, and I think these letters have proved it, as sincerely as Mr. R., but I confess I have no fellow feeling with the cold-hearted cosmopolite, as a son of Britain I wish to cherish the affections of a son for her. Does not your correspondent know, as before remarked, that owing to an abundance of unoccupied land, and wood, and water, and to the comparative absence of extensive manufactures, perhaps not more more than one-fifth of the American population are employed as manufacturing or agricultural laboures, and that their destitute poor are a mere fraction ; such are the advantages of a new and agricultural country, which, though not advantageous to the acquiring of wealth, is most favorable to competence ;

while on the other hand, in England, the laboring, manufacturing, or destitute poor are upwards of one-half the inhabitants. Now, when speaking of our Religious or Educational provision, Mr. Ryerson certainly ought to have stated this inequality, and have made the large requisite deductions necessary to make his calculations fair to the Empire of which he is a subject;—and how triumphant would it have made it appear. I have already shown that even without such consideration the “land of our fathers” and its Ecclesiastical Government may proudly challenge any and every comparison. 2. Again I complain of the want of fairness in not attributing whatever deficiencies may and do exist in our supply of Churches and Ministers to the right cause. I can hardly conceive how so well-informed a writer, notwithstanding all his prejudices, could possibly attribute, in common candor, those deficiencies as the legitimate results of an Established Church. Why, Sir, he cannot but know, that whatever else he may charge such Hierarchies with, it cannot be with neglecting to supply the people under their charge with Ministers and Churches. Let him look at Spain, Portugal, Italy, or any other of the Papal Hierarchies; do these Establishments lack either Priests or Churches? Let him look at England prior to the Reformation, and then let him mourn over the dissipation of sacred wealth, which instead of being so, I fear, unrighteously alienated, should have been expended in holy uses, only through purer channels; and thus will he in part discover the secret of the partiality inefficient condition of the Protestant Hierarchy; and then let him listen to that infuriate cry, raised at the instigation of most unhallowed agitators “raze her, raze her to the ground!” and he will no longer be at a loss where to lay the sin of whatever degree of inefficiency may attach to her, if he be only *willing* to charge it aright.

I hope next week to be able to conclude this lengthened series of letters with some general remarks upon the unrighteousness of appropriating the Clergy Reserves to Education, or to any other use than that of a direct support of the Christian Church and its ordinances.

I have the honor to remain,

Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

AN ANGLO-CANADIAN.

April 22nd, 1839.

LETTER IX.

TO THE HON. W. H. DRAPER, M. P. P. &c. &c. &c.

Contrast between His Excellency and Mr. Ryerson—Extract from His Excellency's speech—Extracts from Mr. R.—Strictures on—Duty of a Legislator—Reasons against appropriating Reserves to Education—from necessity of Religious Instruction—duty of Rulers to provide for it—the sustaining of Law depends on it—No government stable unless connected with the Church—such appropriation would sanction infidelity—Education without Religion, a curse—such principles stab Religion—injurious effect at Home of giving up an Establishment here—Destitution of this country forbids such appropriation—Extract from Rev. R. Alder.

SIR,

With Mr. Ryerson's Tenth Letter or Appendix, I do not intend to interfere, further than a very few remarks; I dare not trust myself to expose its most unconstitutional tenor, and unministerial vituperation, as I fear that were I to do so, my deep regret that the Reverend writer should have so far forgotten himself, and that the columns of the *Christian Guardian* should have been so prostituted, would betray me into expressions which I might afterwards regret, and as stated in my last, I wish to enter upon a consideration of the evil of an educational appropriation of the Clergy Reserves, I must, however, crave your patience, while I make one or two observations upon it.

The remarks of His Excellency Sir George Arthur, respecting the disposition of the Reserves, call forth in that letter the most violent language; but, Sir, notwithstanding your Correspondent's very improper effort to attribute unworthy motives and intellectual incapacity to His Excellency, let any unprejudiced man contrast that document of a *Christian Governor* with certain passages in this letter of a *Christian Minister*. His Excellency says:—

“The strongly excited feelings to which the long agitated question of the Clergy Reserves has given rise in this Province, have sensibly impaired that social harmony which may be classed among the first of national blessings and have augmented the hopes of the enemies of the country in proportion as they have created divisions amongst its defenders. It is painful to reflect that a provision piously and munificently set apart for the maintenance of religious worship should have become the cause of discord, among professors of the same faith, and servants of the same Divine Master; and I feel that, on every account, the settlement of this vitally important question ought not to be longer delayed: I, therefore, earnestly exhort you to consider how this desirable object may be attained; and I confidently hope that if the claims of contending parties be advanced, as I trust they will, in a spirit of moderation and Christian charity, the adjustment of them by you will not prove insuperably difficult. But should all your efforts for the purpose unhappily fail, it will then only remain for you to re-invest these Reserves in the hands of the Crown, and to refer the appropriation of them to the Imperial Parliament, as a tribunal free from those local influences and excitements

which may operate too powerfully here. My ardent desire is, that, keeping in view as closely as you can the true spirit of the object for which these lands were originally set apart, this embarrassing question may be settled on equitable principles, in a manner satisfactory to the community at large, and conducive to the diffusion of religion and true piety throughout the Province."

Such is the mild, dignified, pious, and evidently sincere language of the "Constituted Authority."

Now, Sir, your Correspondent "—and the Queen (says he) is known to have personally (except by the sanction of her name) little more to do with State affairs, than any other young lady of 19 years of age."—Such is his method of increasing the respectful loyalty of Her Majesty's Canadian subjects; respecting the correctness of the statement, I say nothing, let those who can believe it.* Again Mr. R. thus speaks of His Excellency—"yet the recommendation of Sir George Arthur flatly contradicts the maxim of Lord Glenelg—a fact that irresistibly forces upon us the conviction that, whatever may be the excellent virtues of Sir George Arthur's head and heart, and whatever may have been his intentions and proclamations, *he is not a statesman, nor does he recognize the principles of, and therefore is not a friend to civil and religious liberty.*" Such is this Reverend Gentleman's complacence with the scriptural injunction "not to speak evil of dignitaries." Again he then writes:—

"To designate and treat an unchanging and overwhelming decision of the Province through all the conflicts and variations of party, for fifteen years; as mere "local influences and excitement," is an insult such as was never before inflicted upon the inhabitants of Upper Canada from the same quarter, and shows that how highly soever, Sir George Arthur may rate their loyalty, he has a very low opinion of their understanding, and very little regard for their sentiments and wishes."

This, then, is Mr. Ryerson's way of teaching the people to love and reverence those "Governors that are sent out by the Queen, as supreme." Once more he writes thus:

"And yet again we are told that our only hope for the future is our own ability to repel and punish hostile aggression, and that the militia laws are to be revised in order to raise the largest possible force at the least possible expense; yet with the prospect of again needing the country's services, and perhaps some of its best blood to defend the Government, the head of the Government tells the people's representatives that they are to pay no regard to the country's prevailing opinions and feelings. The intelligence and loyalty of the country are eulogized when the Government and its officers apprehend danger, and are alarmed for their places; proclamations of large promises are officially issued and distributed throughout the Province; but, as in the days of Charles I., the moment that danger is past and fears are allayed, the mountain promises bring forth a single paragraph of a

* Since the above was written, a letter from Mr. Stevenson, the American Minister at the British Court, which gives a very pleasing description of Her Majesty, has been going the rounds of the papers; the following extract from which will show how far the above *respectful* and *loyal* insinuation of the Rev. Writer was correct. Mr. Stevenson says, she "devotes herself to business till 2," and then adds, "her attention to business is such, that I understand, if a despatch comes while she is at dinner, she *commonly* rises and attends to it. She has a turn and capacity for business, and will, as she advances, doubtless take even a deeper interest in affairs of state than she does at present."

speech which proposes to slich from the country the disposal of one seventh of the fruits of its industry and loyalty. The moment this recommended act of spoliation and robbery against the Province is committed—committed under vice regal dictation on the one hand, and legislative subserviency on the other; that moment the inhabitants will know their future doom; that the six-sevenths majority are to be subservient to the one-seventh minority; that executive intimidation, clerical patronage and political bribery are to be the order of the day; that the resources of the country are to be absorbed in the payment of debts and the enrichment and elevation of certain families and parties; that the country is to stagger on under the weight of accumulated debt and internal weakness, with no other hope or prospect than increased expense to England progressive diminution in credit, in trade, in the value of property, and in the enjoyment of public safety and social happiness—"as an oak whose leaf fadeth, and as a garden that hath no water." Should the rash the suicidal recommendation of His Excellency be adopted by the legislature, how can any member of the Assembly ever look his constituents in the face? With what face can the Government ever call upon the inhabitants to turn out in its defence? With what kind of a response will such a call be likely to meet, if we may judge from what occurred last November in comparison of the occurrences of the preceding December? Will not nine-tenths of the country feel themselves justified and authorized (by the lauded facts of British history, and by the best theological and political standard writers) in refusing to lift a hand in support of the local executive until the Imperial Government shall have restored their pillaged property and redressed their unprecedented wrongs, and secured their heretofore acknowledged rights?"

Sir, this paragraph is most painful in its character, containing at once, charges the most incorrect against His Excellency—inflammatory misrepresentations the most dangerous—and implied threats of the most revolutionary character; indeed it is so unquestionably improper, that I should have been ready to hope it was a mere angry ebullition of disappointed feelings, had not its being reprinted stamped it with the writer's calm approval, I have therefore quoted it for the purpose of shewing the contrast between His Excellency and the individual who thus fiercely attacks him, and with him, as a perusal of the letter in question will too clearly prove, all our Constituted Authorities—Queen, Ministers, Lords, Bishops, Commons, Governors, local Executive, and local Legislature!—That they may thence be able to judge what degree of attention is to be paid to a writer who can so groundlessly attack His Excellency for the expression of wishes that do him honor, alike as a consistent christian, a prudent statesman, and a sound conservative; and so recklessly pour contempt on all those "powers that are ordained of God." With these remarks, I gladly leave your Rev. Correspondent's Tenth Letter, its arguments, if such they may be called, are *nil*. I have already stated that to rail against other branches of the Legislature, having their due weight in the settlement of this (the Clergy Reserve) or any other question, is to rail against the Constitution, hence the glaring impropriety of Mr. R.'s repeated attacks upon the Lords, spiritual or temporal, as composing the House of Peers at Home. One word more, and I will leave this subject, Mr. Ryerson charges the House of Assembly with a "breach of good faith," should they take any steps not sanctioned by their constituents; I have in an early part of these letters shown that an honest and fearless representative is bound to consider the *interests*, rather than the *wishes* of his

constituents, *maugre* their frowns, or the *unconstitutional threats of newspaper editors*; in confirmation of this, let Blackstone speak:—
 “And therefore he (the Member) is not bound, like a deputy in the united provinces, to consult with, or take advice of, his constituents upon any particular point, unless he himself thinks it proper or prudent so to do.” And this is grounded on the previous observation that, “the end of his coming thither (to parliament) is not particular, but general; not barely to advantage his constituents but the *common wealth*.”

In proceeding then to notice some of the leading objections against the appropriation of the Clergy Reserves to Education, I shall content myself with little more than their bare statement, leaving them to speak for themselves. 1. The first grand objection against such an alienation of the Reserves from their original design, is the sin of leaving the Christian Church without any suitable national provision for the support of its Ministers, and the erection of its churches. That such a provision is absolutely requisite, the voluntary system being altogether inadequate to meet the wants of the people, has, I think been made sufficiently clear in the preceding letters; as also that if such a temporal provision be not made, it is impossible to maintain that peculiar moral influence which is connected with an established church. I have further endeavored to show that such establishments have proved an incalculable blessing to the church and the world, and that, in short, it is our imperative duty still to uphold them. There are, however, two or three other arguments, to which I beg to advert, that satisfactorily prove the impropriety and evil of an Educational alienation of the Reserves. 1. Let it not be forgotten that rulers derive their authority, not from man, but from God, “by HIM kings reign, and princes decree justice,” is the unvarying language of Scripture, and that to talk, therefore, of an *original compact* between the governors and the governed, is as heterodox in theology as it is false in fact, and I cannot but hope the days will yet come when sincere Christians will be ashamed of such unscriptural sentiments; it will then surely be evident that, in sober reason, it must be no small part of the duty of such rulers to teach their subjects to reverence that Being whose vicegerents they are.— It is also equally clear that, since Jehovah, in all his dealings with men, has their present spiritual improvement and eternal happiness immediately in view, he *cannot* have instituted the most important of all civil relations, that of Princes and their subjects, without any such reference; it would in truth be such a solecism in the Divine proceeding that I can hardly conceive how any believer in Revelation can imagine it to be the case, especially since we have such direct and frequent intimations in the sacred volume of the public religious obligations that rest upon governors. It will not do to say that these duties are to be fulfilled by the sanctity of their private life, this is a disgraceful evasion, for as Dr. Adam Clarke has well remarked, “A king may be a *good moral man*, and yet a *weak*, and indeed, a *bad and dangerous prince*. He may be a *bad man*, and stained with vice in his private life.

and yet be a *good prince*." The very instructions to parents "to train up their children in the way they should go," when taken in connection with the parental appellations, and characteristics given by inspiration to kings and governors, strongly intimates the obligation that rest upon them to do likewise. But how are rulers to fulfil these sacred duties, but by using their official influence and executive authority, in the support of an orthodox church, and pure ministry? Could Mr. Ryerson therefore prove, what he has so vigorously attempted, that every ecclesiastical establishment had hitherto proved a curse rather than a blessing, which, thanks be to God, neither he nor any other man ever did or ever can prove, yet would it avail little as an argument for alienating the Reserves; for so long as scripture and reason directly, or by evident inference declare it to be the duty of Christian rulers to provide for the religious instruction of the people committed to their care, they are imperatively bound to do so, let the apparent results, at the time, be what they may;—obedience belongs to man, consequences to God. 2. Another of the arguments for an established church which has not been advanced in the preceding letters is, that Christian governments profess to base their legislation on Christian principles, and do most certainly seek the sanctions of revealed truth to give weight to their laws, and terror to their penalties. In the common matter of giving evidence on oath, for instance, why is the evidence of an avowed unbeliever refused but because it is supposed, that rejecting christianity, the oath which is founded upon it will have no moral hold on him.—The pains and penalties for drunkenness, swearing, and blasphemy, are obviously entirely founded on the same principles, that we are to be governed by revealed religion.* Even the punishment of death, itself, is supposed to gather its most fearful terrors from the awful realities of that eternity which is brought to light by the Gospel. Now Sir is not a solecism in legislation thus to acknowledge Christianity as a most important part and parcel of our jurisprudence, inasmuch that we look to it as the great prevention of crime, and yet to have no legal provision for its diffusion among the people or for their efficient instruction in its tremendous truths and sacred precepts? Why what should we think of that tyrant who should enact laws which he never cared to promulgate, and yet should severely punish his subjects for breaking them? Just as unjust and unreasonable is the conduct of those who profess to desire a government upon Christian principles, and who yet would forbid any national provision for their diffusion. Nor are these mere abstract speculations; the fact is, government cannot be maintained without religious influence of some kind; even pagan nations discovered this truth, and hence their rulers ever sought the sanction of

* On this subject an able modern writer thus speaks:—"Even in the sordid view of mere pecuniary expense, the benefit (of an Established Church) is too plain to be denied. If there were no such influence at work, must not our prisons be multiplied, and our police be increased, and the whole system for the prevention and punishment of crime be enlarged and extended? And can this be done without a corresponding increase of taxation?"

the prevailing superstition, however indifferent they themselves might be to them. 3. From these considerations it will also follow that no government will be so stable or enjoy so large a portion of the public esteem as one that is entwined with their religious associations, and to whom they feel themselves indebted for their acquaintance with their religious creed and the knowledge of their future hopes, and to whom they feel themselves bound by that most endearing tie, a community of faith. Sir, men may theorise as they will, but no government whose superstructure is not raised on this foundation will long stand; no other bond ever was, or ever will be, sufficiently strong to bind the various elements of society together. Let the voice of History teach us wisdom. Compare the different quietude and stability of even papal to infidel France. Look at England during its seven or eight ages of community of faith, faulty and degraded as that faith frequently was, and compare its comparative tranquility during those ages with its tempestuous tossings during the hundred and fifty or sixty years that succeeded, till the nation again found peace in the settled establishment of the Protestant Church of England; contrast also that refreshing loyalty which resulted from a general and ardent attachment to the Church in the days of Queen Ann, when after the release of Sacheverel, as Belsham, a violent whig, writes, "These rejoicings were succeeded by numerous addresses expressive of a zealous attachment to the Church, and an utter destation of all anti-monarchical and republican principles." Let these sound, safe, and conservative feelings be contrasted with the proceedings of the torch-light chartists—the O'Connell destroyers of protestantism, and the smooth tongued Durham revolutionists,—so smooth, so insiduous and so flattering that one is ready to fear the very elect will be deceived;—look at these things and say what have we gained by shaking the connection of church and state, by patronizing instead of tolerating dissent and by the courtly sanction of a rabid hostility to the venerable establishment. What have we gained? Why confusion, and trembling, and infidelity and riot, if not eventually ruin! Again, look at the neighbouring republic, and who does not see that it must come to pieces? What tie upon earth is there to hold it together?—Their religion is all sectarian, and therefore a matter rather of disunion than union to the mass of the people; they have no acknowledged gradations of society, therefore the scriptural injunctions of submission to masters, rulers, &c., are lost upon them; and the government being altogether unsupported by immediate religious sanction is unconnected with their best and holiest feelings, and their strongest prejudices; a people thus politically free from all religious restraints, must sooner or later, fall a sacrifice to the ungovernable fury of democratic pride.—Again therefore I fearlessly assert, that all experience, all christianity, and all sound philosophy prove that no government can be permanently secure and prosperous without being directly sanctioned by religion, and intimately connected with its institutions.

2. Another weighty objection against such a mal-appropriation of the Reserves is that it would give a very improper currency to the infidel

motion, already too rife, that General Education is as important, if not more so, as religious instruction. I confess I cannot see how any one, much less a christian minister, can sanction an error so derogatory as this to the Gospel of Christ. Education, unaccompanied by religious principles, is only calculated to make devils of men. And if the Reserves were to be given to education it would have to be without any important religious guards of conditions; as were it otherwise little or nothing would be gained even in peace, by the costly and unhallowed sacrifice, for then would war be immediately proclaimed, as to how many or how few of these religious restraints were to be placed upon education, and the contest would end, like the ever-to-be-blushed for Irish Education Bill, in a ruinous amalgamation of Pope, Infidel and Churchman, worse, a thousand times, than the present open strife. Or were it to be divided amongst all denominations for education, about the same amount of evil would be done, our Government thereby becoming the avowed patroniser and foster parent of every imaginable form of low pretension, and open heresy, while our youth would, a large majority of them, be trained in error, if not in avowed scepticism; for even your Correspondent must allow that in a world, fallen as ours is, error is much more general than truth, and that men are far more apt to follow evil than good, unless there be some strong counteracting influence.

Of the value of education I am as fully convinced as any man *ought to be*, but I must confess that so far from believing it a substitute for religion, I do and must believe that without the influence of Christian principle, intellectual acquirements are only calculated to make their possessors tyrants in their families, rogues in commerce, rebels in politics, and infidels in religion, in a word—it leaves them monsters where it found them men! And is it then for this that our legislators and even our ministers are ready to insult the Gospel of Christ by practically admitting its inferiority, and for which they are content to retard its progress by a violent alienation of these Reserves so piously set apart for its support by that Christian King, and “nursing father” of the Church; George the Third. Much I fear me that the fathers are setting the “children’s teeth on edge,” and treasuring up for themselves filial curses, deep and bitter, in *that Day* when their children will be judged not by the measure of their intellect, but the purity of their minds.—Will it be believed, Sir, in that time which, despite of these unhallowed proceedings will sooner or later arrive, when all shall love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, that in the middle of the nineteenth century professing Christians deliberately, and with the Bible in their hands and Christ on their lips, preferred to secure for their children, whose brows were yet moistened with the water that solemnly dedicated them to God, the heritage of a literary education, content to leave their instruction in the sacred duties they owed to God—on the due performance of which their eternal happiness depended—to the uncertain voluntary provision of our ungodly world. One such fact, seems to me, a more mortal stab to the cause of Christ than it was ever in the power of Voltaire or Rousseau to give; is it not crucifying the Redeemer in the house of his

friends. Most sincerely do I pray "Lord lay not this sin to their charge."

3. Results the most important frequently spring from apparently trifling causes, and insignificant as our internal provincial affairs may at first sight appear, in reference to the parent state, still I am afraid of the consequences at Home should the *principle* of an ecclesiastical establishment be sacrificed *here*. England has already felt the effects of false colonial policy;—to the Republicanism of the United States may be traced much, not only, of British, but even of European troubles in general. The "movement party" at Home know full well how to avail themselves of any mistaken measures in colonial policy, I cannot but think that at the present moment every sound Christian and true Briton may learn a most important lesson from the Earl of Durham's Report, the partiality of which is perhaps unrivalled in the history even of diplomacy itself; let it not be imagined however that a production so labored, so clever, and so insidious was written for Canadians only or even principally; oh no! His Lordship is moved by higher aims and nobler expectations;—it is well known that he is looked upon as the leader of the movement party at Home. It is not for naught therefore he seeks every opportunity of applauding the Reformers, while he has steadily frowns upon every betrayer of British feelings. It is not for naught that the neighbouring republic is so incessantly the theme of his ardent admiration and her citizens the subjects of his smiles—it is not for naught that the Catholic priesthood and the dissenting ministry are pronounced as "blessed, while the Clergy of the English Church are represented as few, dishonored and useless—yes, well does the ex-High Commissioner know how his "sayings and doings" will gratify the democratic dissenters and infidels at Home!—well has he calculated that if he can induce the Imperial Government to give up the *principle* of an established church here, it will be a mighty step towards the prostration of the Established Church in Britain, full well does he know that once left to stand merely upon the grounds of *expediency*, "the spirit of the age"—"the march of intellect"—"the relicks of superstition"—"equal religious privileges"—"dominant Church oppression"—"the priest ridden poor" &c. &c. will serve as sufficient mottos for the O'Connels, the Durhams, and Humes, and Molesworths, to urge her entire overthrow. Sir, I would not fear that the "gates of hell" would ever prevail against the Church, but where shall we look for succour when her own sons, ministerial and legislative, assail her foundations? Why, Sir, the blast of the Lord shall wither them, and a people holier than they shall man the walls of our Zion!

4. But, Sir, there is yet another reason why I mourn over such a ruthless spoliation of the Church of Christ; it is that our numerous townships and destitute thousands have not yet heard the Gospel. Here, Sir, I need enter into no particulars, it is too well known to be contradicted, that very many townships are not even gladdened with the face of an ambassador of the Gospel of peace; how can we possibly expect it to be otherwise than poor and irreligious, and therefore unable, or not

willing, to maintain a ministry for themselves; and long will it be, I fear, before missionary efforts will fully do it. And can it be right to take away that provision that is already made for their instruction in righteousness, and leave them to be provided for by a mere precarious charity? Shame! shame! upon the men who can thus defraud the souls of their brethren. Blood! blood is in danger of being upon the skirts of their garments! The very want of the associating influence of an establishment would prevent their being able in thinly inhabited townships to support a minister. Hear the Rev. Robert Alder, a distinguished Wesleyan Minister, and one of the General Secretaries of the Wesleyan Missionary Society in London, who referring to some place in the States, in 1835 writes thus:—

"I found there is in this as in many other places in the United States, in consequence of indifference, and the influence of sectarian feeling, and other causes, no Christian minister settled amongst them. This is one of the evils growing out of their national laws and institutions, which make no provision for the religious instruction of the people, who in many cases make none for themselves on account of the difference of sentiment which prevails amongst them on religious subjects. This difference, though it often exists in reference to things non essential (as, for instance, infant baptism, or the peculiarities of Calvinism) prevents them from uniting in the choice of a minister, and because they cannot find one to please all, they remain without any; or if they do engage a preacher for a short time, they seldom agree long. Hence, if you ask "Have you Divine Service to day?" "No," is the reply; we had a man hired for a few months, but he has left us. I guess, however, we shall soon have another." This is an evil and a source of evil to individuals and communities. The Sabbath is neglected and God is forgotten. In order to form a correct estimate of the working of their system, it is necessary to visit their small and remote settlements, and also the recently occupied districts in the State of Ohio Illinois, Alabama, and the Michigan Territory, where there are thousands and tens of thousands who have neither Christian instruction nor Christian ordinances. I confess these things have made a strong impression on my mind in favor of the Ecclesiastical Establishment of our own country. It secures a place of worship, at least, in every parish, the regular reading of the scriptures in the hearing of the people, and the decent and due observance of public devotion. This is a testimony for God.—[See Wesleyan Methodist Magazine for 1835.]

I must crave your indulgence to another brief concluding letter.

I have the honor to remain,

Sir, your obedient Servant,

AN ANGLO-CANADIAN.

April 27th, 1839.

LETTER X.

TO THE HON. W. H. DRAPER, M. P. P. &c. &c. &c.

The Writer's painful feelings ; Voluntaryism in the United States ; testimony of Americans on the subject ; even Americans not united on this subject ; flourishing state of Socinianism in the United States ; Voluntaryism does not even beget mercy, witness American Slavery ; Voluntary System in England—testimony of Dissenters to its inefficiency ; Writer's views of that system ; Remarks respecting Wesleyans ; extracts from Mr. Wesley—showing his opinions and remarks upon—testimonies of Wesleyan Ministers ; appeal to Wesleyans ; Writer's apology for these Letters.

SIR,

I would that it were in my power to convey to you and your Legislative compeers, something of that intense anxiety that pervades my own, respecting the subject to which these Letters have referred, and which has increased ten-fold, as I have written, and read, and thought upon the matter ; I have found the Canadas much more than I expected when I left the "land of my fathers." I have formed my dearest connections here, and I have felt proud in calling Canada my home, but I begin to feel as though it were about to be robbed of its dearest privileges, and all connected with it left, as the Ostrich leaveth her eggs in the desert to perish, unheeded, beneath the foot of the spoiler. A fearful moral darkness seems creeping over the land, and already I could imagine that an indignant God had written "Ichabod" upon this fair "land of promise," which I had once hoped might have proved a "city of refuge"—a *Pella* to thousands when he shaketh the nations as trees in autumn. But shall it indeed be said of us, "the glory is departed?" Shall our Province verily become the seat of the Infidel scorner, or the arena of baited sectarian strife? O, Sir, I cannot but hope that the Head of the Church, the Almighty Friend of Britain, has not yet cast us off, but that the Church will yet out-ride the storm, and rising in all its majestic beauty, be at once the ornament, safe-guard and blessing of our infant kingdom. If in righteous severity Jehovah has otherwise decreed then in hopeless sorrow I feel ready, trusting to the guidance of a Gracious Providence, to bend my steps to seek some other land, if such may be found, whose princes cherish, and whose people rejoice in, the worship of the Lord Almighty, and Church and State, are one in Christ! Let these honest feelings of my soul be my apology for a few further statements respecting Religion in the neighboring States ; some additional remarks on voluntaryism ; and a few observations to Wesleyan Methodists.

With regard to the United States I wish to show, from the testimony of her own children how the voluntary system works there as a *national plan*, even after having been aided by establishments in the first instance. Dr. Dwight, an American Presbyterian Minister, says that where Presbyterian Ministers were supported by law in the States, they were as

one to every 1364 inhabitants; while in those States where their support was voluntary, they were only as one to every 19,300! Again he says, "a sober man, who knows the United States, can hardly hesitate, whatever may have been his original opinion concerning this subject, to believe that a Legislature is bound to establish the public worship of God." Whose testimony shall we receive, Dr. Dwight, an American, opposing the prejudices of his own people, from his own knowledge and extensive travels among them; or Mr. Ryerson, a Canadian, who has seen only a few of their populous cities, and has an object to gain by his representations? The Rev. T. Mills, American Independent, writes respecting the West, that were the Presbyterian and Congregational Ministers "equally distributed throughout the country, there would be only one to 10,000 people; but now there are districts of country containing from 20 to 50,000 inhabitants, entirely destitute;—while with respect to the Protestant Episcopal Church in the same district, the Bishop of Ohio states, "among all the million of Ohio, there are at present only thirty Episcopal Clergymen; in Michigan only five; in Indiana and Illinois there is but one!" The American Tract Society Report of 1833, says, "It is estimated by those who have the best means of judging, that not far from five millions of our population are now unblest with the means of grace!" What becomes of your correspondent's, *boasting representations of their ample supply?* Bishop Doane, an American Prelate, thus writes, in 1834, on the necessity of Establishments, on account of their moral influence:—"On the contrary it is manifest, that as a body, the Christian Ministry in this country (America) have very little of that proper moral influence which the patronage and countenance of civil government, cannot but give in aid of the best possible character and intentions of the ministry. In short, we want strength amidst all our show of popularity; nor do I believe that our own ministry, or any other (in America) is half as useful and honored as it would have been if the Constitution of our Government, after the Independence of the States was gained, had incorporated with its provisions some requisitions by which every one, not by profession a Jew or Turk, should be made to contribute to the maintenance of Christian Institutions of worship and instruction." These are the convictions of a Prelate speaking from sad experience not from theory, nor is he alone; ask the late Dr. Dwight's ministerial pupils, many of whom are Congregationalists; ask the Rev. Mr. Nettleton—look to all the Reformed Presbyterian Churches. "These Christians are all Church Establishment men." What then becomes of Mr. Ryerson's representations of *the anti-establishment unanimity of our neighbors?*

Dr. Dealtry, of Winchester, states that "so scanty is the support commonly afforded to Ministers, that one-third of the Churches actually in existence appear to be unsupplied." And Dr. Dwight says, "a voluntary contribution, except in large towns, is as uncertain as the wind and a chameleon only," (who can change to please the whims of his people) "can expect to derive a permanent support from this source." If such be some of the results of a national voluntary system in the com-

paratively old and rich States, what would it be, both spiritually and temporally, in these uneducated and poor Colonies?*

The first "Church of the Socinians" was planted at Portsmouth, United States, long after they were free from the tyrannical yoke of establishment protected Britain, and well have they flourished since; not only in their proper distinctive character as separate Churches, but perhaps equally or even more injuriously by infusing the poison of their heresies into Churches of other denominations formerly Orthodox. The Rev. Mr. Lorimer says, "they have now spread extensively through nearly all the Northern, and Southern, and Eastern, and Western States, and are at this day (1833) the most numerous of all the general Baptists." R. Potter, Esquire, M. P., stated in the House of Commons, August 6th, 1833, that "he could declare that the spread of Unitarian opinions in America had been rapid. There was now hardly a town in that vast country, in which there was not a Unitarian Chapel; in the large towns two, and in the town of Boston there were no fewer than sixteen professing Unitarian belief." In England these semi-infidels "are poor and weak; in America they are many, and rich, and strong."† Well might a venerable Presbyterian Divine in Philadelphia, exclaim to Dr. Burns, a Scotch Minister:—"Oh! you live in a happy country, where the true Religion has got the imprimatur of the State—here, where my lot is cast, a Synagogue of Satan would just have as much favor from the powers that be, as the purest Church in the whole land!" And yet it is to the wretched care of such a system that the Rev. Egerton Ryerson, supported by his coadjutors, dissenters, anarchists, and infidels, would consign the eternal interests of his fellow-countrymen.—But "by their fruits ye shall know them." Corrupt as the Church of England is said to be, she yet taught her children to "do justly, and love mercy," and, at a cost of twenty millions sterling, England bid her slaves, "be free," while out of America's "twenty six States, eleven of them are at

*The following weighty remarks of one who lived amid the fearful troubles of the unhappy Charles, are the result of a sad experience;—"It was well said by Sir Benjamin Rudyard, one of the most upright men of that age, that poverty must needs bring contempt upon the Clergy, among those who measure men by the acre and weigh them by the pound, which indeed is the greatest part of men; that to plant good Ministers in good livings, was the strongest and purest means to establish true religion; that the example of Germany ought to be a warning to us, where the reformed Ministers, though grave and learned men, were neglected and despised by reason of their poverty; and that it is comely and decent that the outward splendor of the Church should hold a proposition, and participate with the prosperity of the temporal estate."—*South's Book of the Church.*

†The following extract from a Sermon by Mr. Charles Berry, a Socinian teacher, at Leicester, speaks volumes:—"It is often said, that as a sect we are dwindling away from the public observation, which is most true. We do make progress in our own country, though it is but slow, because we have to contend against a host of prejudices, and the enormous influence of a wealthy and corrupt Establishment. But in the East the cause is advancing; and in the United States, where there are no obstructions to the progress of knowledge and truth, the spread of liberal doctrines has exceeded our most sanguine expectations."—Ay, destroy the Establishment, and the "rational" christians will crown you as the welcome herald of a universal scepticism!

(this moment slave States!)* Good reason had the honest Scotchman, when Mr. Thompson, the well-known Emancipationist, was expatiating upon Republican slavery (!) to cry out, "let us hear something more about that country where there's no religious establishment!" Oh! Sir, my soul sickens at the thought of leaving these fair and goodly Provinces—a part of the Empire of Christian Britain—to the desolating effects of such a system. It is a question this, Sir, with which the cold-blooded, half infidel, theorists of the Durham School have no right to meddle!

With respect to the working of the voluntary system, in England, hear what Dissenters themselves say, in their own authorised organs; "more than one-half" say they, "of the (dissenting) Ministers who have a wife and four children cannot live upon their income; and if they have no private property *must* run into debt." Again, so far from the system seeming to improve as it grows older, they say, that "it may justly be questioned, if there be one congregation in seventy, where the support of Ministers is equal to what it was fifty years ago; in the greater number of congregations Ministers with families could live then; now they cannot!" The Home Missionary Magazine also laments, "That persons should be so unaccountably backward in paying their pew rents by which means the Deacons of Churches often find difficulty in making up the very inadequate salary allowed to their pastors."—It adds, "this is a glaring and extensive evil in our Churches." "In Wales, where dissent is sometimes represented as eminently flourishing," the British Magazine for July, 1834, says, "the greater part of Dissenting Ministers there are either actual farmers or tradesmen, and most of those who are not so employed, are assisted annually from the dissenting fund in London." "Scotland tells a similar tale," but my limits forbid my reciting it; let one quotation serve:—"It is about 100 years ago," says Dr. Chalmers, "since the great dissent from the Church of Scotland commenced; and in this land of toleration, these have been at perfect liberty to traverse the whole length and breadth of that land. In a population of about half a million, the whole amount of the product arising from their exertions, the whole fruit of what has been called "*the voluntary principle*," has certainly not exceeded Churches wherein the stated Gaelic service is performed. The Establishment has contributed 160 Churches to that people!" Such is a little specimen of the miserable inefficiency of the voluntary system even in Britain itself. Is it possible

* "The author of 'Men and Manners in America,' asserts, that during a whole half century of peace and leisure, the United States have done nothing to ameliorate the condition of the slave, and raise him to the dignity of a rational and responsible being. Some States, indeed, have given up slavery, but only where its continuance was injurious to their interests. When Pennsylvania abandoned slavery, she sold her slaves to others. Maryland, and Virginia, and North Carolina, are now used as *Breeding-grounds* (!) to supply this vast waste of life in the above working States!! When will the United States sacrifice seventy millions sterling to emancipate their slaves, (upwards of 2,000,000) as Britain has done, to emancipate hers?"—(PART II. p. 73.)

therefore, that any man who has the spread of true religion really at heart, and is possessed of a sound mind, can really desire to see such a system national? Yet let it not be supposed that I am opposed to the voluntary system as an auxiliary, *far from it*, as the man of candour who reads these letters must perceive; *it is to voluntarism as a national system that I object*, believing it unchristian in principle—disgraceful in politics—and ruinous in religion. Permit me to quote a passage from Dr. Dealtry, which has my entire concurrence:—"Voluntary liberality" says the Dr., "is not only consistent with the form and nature of an establishment, but where there is an increasing population, is almost necessary to meet the additional wants of the country. The voluntary principle as opposed to establishments, we leave to others. Voluntary liberality, in aid of establishments we highly honor, and wish earnestly to promote." It is but just to observe, that from many of the objections which lie against voluntarism as found amongst dissenters, Wesleyan Methodism, especially in England, from the peculiarity of its economy is greatly free. I have long been convinced that if any Church in the world can bring the voluntary system into successful operation, it is that of the Wesleyan Methodists; their astonishing success and high respectability prove the truth of this supposition; but yet they would not be slow to acknowledge that they owe much of their financial success to their peculiar connection with the establishment; and to that general, though almost unseen influence which it has upon the community at large, and to which I have so often referred.*

As your correspondent professes to be a *Wesleyan* minister, and his writings are chiefly designed for the Wesleyan Body, I beg to offer a few observations to them. Being *myself a Wesleyan Methodist* and the

* The following extracts from the London "Watchman," for 1837, a paper published under the direct sanction of the British Wesleyan Conference, show with sufficient distinctness the views of that highly respectable and influential body on the question of voluntarism as a *national system*, the Editor thus writes:—"A new era, we are told, has burst on mankind, through the intervention of the voluntary principle, it is not obscurely hinted, that all those glowing predictions of the millennial age, so sweetly sung in Pore's *Messiah*, are on the eve of their accomplishment. We confess we are not so sanguine, but greatly fear the intervention first of those last days, when perilous times shall come, with all the melancholy fruits of a selfish, boastful, fierce, heed, high-minded, and perverse voluntarism. The deification of the human will is as much the sin of our times, as that of reason was at the period of the French Revolution." He goes on—"Hence when we are told that the compulsory system checks the full developement of the voluntary principle, and that the holy zeal and activity displayed by Churchmen, in building new Churches on that principle is a novelty, and the unfledged offspring of a new born zeal, we might be led to infer that voluntary efforts were wholly alien to the nature of an Establishment. Nothing, however, is more contrary to fact than such a representation." Again he concludes—"The argument against the efficiency of the compulsory system from its past neglect, is on a par with the excuse urged on behalf of the admitted deficiencies of the exclusively voluntary one, namely, that 'the full strength of the voluntary system is not yet developed.'" If this be true of the infancy of the one system, it applies with equal force to the suppressed energies of the other, whether that result from uncorrected abuses within, or obstruction from without.

son of a Wesleyan minister, alike loved for his sound piety, and honored for his successful labors as a Biblical scholar, I feel anxious not only that "my people" should discharge aright the duties they owe to the Church of England, but secure to themselves that Divine blessing which will, I believe, only rest upon them so long as they shall be what their venerable founder called "Church Methodists." Allow me then to give for "their instruction in righteousness" a few extracts from Mr. Wesley's own writings and those of a few of their leading ministers.—In the minutes of 1770 Mr. W. says, in answer to the question. "Are we dissenters? No;—We do not, *we dare not* separate from it. We are not seceders, nor do we bear any resemblance to them." But say some things in America are different to what they are in England.—Listen to how Mr. Wesley treated such pretension, "what they do in America, says he, or what their ministers say on this subject, is nothing to us; we will keep in the good old way." Speaking in 1789 of separation from the Church he says—"I do, and will do, all that is in my power to prevent such an event. Nevertheless, in spite of all that I can do, many of them will separate from it. These will be so bold and injudicious as to form a separate party, which, consequently, will dwindle away *into a dry, dull, separate party.* In flat opposition to these, I declare once more that I live and die a member of the Church of England; *and that none who regard my judgment or advice will ever separate from it!*" In 1777, or 1778, a friend asked him the question, "Sir, in case the Methodists should, after your death, leave the Church of England, what would you advise your friends to do?" He answered immediately, "I would advise them to adhere to the Church, and quit the Methodists;" but added he; "that will never be necessary; for if some quit the Church, others will adhere to it, and then there will be Dissenting Methodists and Church Methodists." How does this agree with the violent efforts of your correspondent to place the Methodists in unhallowed opposition to the Church? There have been frequent attempts of late to prove that while Mr. Wesley loved the Church, he was not attached to it as an establishment. On this subject the following facts speak for themselves:—One of his correspondents had said, 'There is an ecclesiastical order established in England, and it is a lawful one;' to which he answers, 'I believe it is in general not only lawful BUT HIGHLY COMMENDABLE.' As if he intended to refute the *idle plea*, that he was friendly to the Church of England as a part of the universal Church of Christ, but denounced its union with the State, he says in his letter to the Printer of the Dublin Chronicle, written only about eighteen months before his death, "Unless I see more reason for it than I ever yet saw, I will not leave the Church of England, AS BY LAW ESTABLISHED, while the breath of God is in my nostrils."—Let it be remembered that the above is taken from a work entitled "The Church and the Methodists," published at the request of the Conference by its ex-President the Rev. Thomas Jackson; the Editor for many years past of the Wesleyan Methodist Magazine. Let the Methodists of Canada remember their distinctive appellation of "Wesleyan"

and act accordingly, and give no ear to any, however once respected, or whatever their station, who would lead them from real Wesleyan principles; but they fear division of sentiment, if they stand by Church principles, let them do right and trust in the Lord; what said Mr. Wesley on this subject, also, "I will rather lose twenty societies than separate from the Church!" Let your correspondent read the following, and then console himself as best he can respecting his boasted consistency as a Wesleyan Minister—"You cannot be too watchful against evil speaking," says the truly scriptural and British Wesley in a letter dated February 17, 1787, "or too zealous for the poor Church of England.—By all means go to Church as often as you can, and exhort all Methodists so to do. They that are enemies to the Church are enemies to me. I am a friend to it and ever was." How are we therefore to escape from the fear that the Rev. Egerton Ryerson will be found an enemy to the venerable Founder of Methodism! for whatever he may say to the contrary every man of sound mind who reads his writings cannot but feel that he is "an enemy to the Church." Once more let your Rev. correspondent read Mr. Wesley's opinion of such conduct as his. 1, "It is strange," says he, "every one does not see, first, the sinfulness of railing at the Clergy; if they are blind leaders of the blind, then (says our Lord) LET THEM ALONE. 2. The foolishness of it, it never can do good, and has frequently done much harm.—Oh, that Mr. R. felt these truths as he ought to feel them; it might save himself much food for repentance, and the Church from fearful loss, if not from utter ruin. Many are ready to imagine that Mr. Wesley's attachment to the Church was the result of mere prejudice, it is however paying little respect to his strong intellects to suppose that for sixty or seventy years he was governed by mere prejudice; but hear the opinion of the Rev. Thomas Jackson, the Ex-President of the Wesleyan Conference, on this matter,—"his (Mr. Wesley's) regard for the Church of England is not to be considered as a mere sentiment, the result of prejudice and early habit, of which no rational account can be given. He saw that it had been an incalculable blessing to the nation, and was still capable of blessing it to an immensely greater extent.

It is not however in Mr. Wesley only that we find a staunch lover and friend of the Church, for though we may have to lament over the sad defection in this respect of some who hold important stations in the ranks of Methodism in Canada, it is not so at Home.—In the "Centenary of Wesleyan Methodism," a work recently published at the request of the British Conference by its President, its able author thus speaks in repelling an attack of Dr. Croly's:—"The Wesleyans are not the

*In his late work, "The Centenary of Methodism," Mr. Jackson says:—"A more loyal man than John Wesley never existed. His loyalty was not a sentiment, or a prejudice, but a principle. It was identified with his Christianity. He succeeded in impressing the same character upon the Societies that acknowledged him as their founder." What then would have been his feelings had he lived to hear a Wesleyan Minister talk of loyalty becoming a dead letter."—See *Guardian*, May 22.

people he describes. They have neither been 'neutral' nor 'inactive' in the cause of religion, morality, social order, and the institutions of the country. When one of their ministers a few years ago, assumed the character of an agitator against the Establishment, and refused to abstain from such work in future, *they dismissed him, and would do the same again, if there were the like occasion.*—Mr. Jackson in his work on the "Church and the Methodists" above alluded to, thus writes,—
 "The Church of England is a standing testimony in the Lord in favor of apostolic christianity—in opposition to every species of vice and error; and its literature is the richest that any section of the Church of Christ ever produced.—And it is *because she is an establishment*, that she has been able to cultivate learning, both theological and classical, upon a scale so splendid and extensive, and so immensely honorable and advantageous to the country.—But what words can describe the full value of her incomparable liturgy? He adds, "destroy her not, for a blessing is in her. Let the voluntary principle be carried as far as it possible can, in the advancement of Christian instruction; yet after all the country cannot do without the establishment, either in resisting Popery, Socinianism, and infidelity,—or in the maintenance of true religion and public virtue."* Is it because Canada is wiser or better than old and Christianized England, that makes some Methodists think we need no establishment here? Or are we sounder and better informed in our judgments than our fathers and brethren at Home? Dr. Adam Clarke exclaims, "Whatever the reader may do, the writer thanks God

*The following important admission should have appeared in a former Letter, to corroborate what is there said, as to the willingness of British Methodists to acknowledge their obligations to the Established Church, had I then seen the volume from which they are taken, which is written by the President of the British Conference:—"That the Church of England" says he, "has been of the greatest advantage to the Wesleyan connection, considered as a distinct community, is freely conceded. It was in the Church that the venerable founders of our societies were trained, and Mr. Wesley declares himself to have been more confirmed in the doctrine of salvation by faith, by reading the homilies than by any other means. Sellon and Fletcher, the ablest defenders of the Wesleyan theology against the attacks of the last century, were both clergymen. When the early Methodist Preachers went through the land declaring the necessity of inward religion, as distinguished from mere forms of worship, and from moral duties, **THEY FOUND THE WAY SO FAR MADE READY FOR THEM BY THE CHURCH, THAT AN APPEAL TO THE LITURGY, ARTICLES, AND HOMILIES, WAS ALMOST EVERY WHERE RESPONDED TO;** and a nominal Christianity prepared the way for that Kingdom, "which is not meat and drink, but righteousness, and peace, and joy, in the Holy Ghost." The incomparable liturgy of the Established Church is regularly used in many of the Wesleyan Chapels in England, and in all Mission Chapels in the West Indies. Translations of it have been made by Wesleyan Missionaries into various languages, for the use of their congregations, especially in the East. It is always used in the administration of the Lord's Supper, both at home and abroad. At the same time the sanctified learning which is displayed in the profound and orthodox writings of the Divines of the Church of England has ever been of the greatest benefit to the Wesleyan body, as it has to the more serious and religious part of the community in general. This is a debt which can never be repaid. The writings of Churchmen in opposition to infidelity, popery, and the Arian and Socinian heresies are beyond all praise.—*Jackson's "Centenary of Wesleyan Methodism,"* p. 174.

for the religious establishments of his country." The Rev. W. Bramwell, Wesleyan Minister says—"I esteem the Church of England because her Liturgy is the most scriptural form of prayer of human composition in the world; and rarely do I find my mind brought into a more desirable frame, than under the power of it;"—testimonies to the same effect are given by the Rev. R. Watson, and Dr. A. Clarke. A Wesleyan minister writing in the *London Times*, Dec. 20, 1833, thus speaks—"and I repeat for the sake of my brethren, that we are decidedly averse to that attack which some of the Dissenters are meditating against the Establishment." I will conclude these Wesleyan avowals with one worthy of a son of Wesley, by the Rev. Robert Alder—In his evidence before the Parliament he says—"I wish to state that we consider ourselves as a branch of the Church of England, both at Home and Abroad."* Wesleyan Methodists of Upper Canada, yo see your calling—what your fathers were, what your brethren are—friends, supporters, brethren, through good report and evil report of the Church of England!

Thus Sir, I have endeavored to counteract, as far as my humble ability and numerous engagements would permit, the dangerous tendency of the Rev. Egerton Ryerson's later letters to you, to vindicate the principle of an Establishment,—to defend, from the foul aspersions cast upon it, the character of the Church of England, and to point out the absolute necessity for its establishment here. If in any measure these letters have served to confirm some, and enlighten others with respect to the nature, importance, and blessedness of Church Establishments, I have not laboured in vain. My apology for troubling you with these letters I give in the language of Dr. Dealtry, Chancellor of the Diocese of Winchester. "Assailed as the Church now is by open as well as secret enemies, every man, who like myself believes her to be a great national blessing, has a right to step forward in her behalf; and if according to his means and opportunities he does not lend his aid, he is answerable, both as a Christian and a citizen for an abandonment of duty." To my Wesleyan friends my apology is, is that Mr. Wesley has strongly declared,—“They that are enemies to the Church are ene-

* In answer to an attack made by the Editor of the *Guardian* on the above statement, Mr Alder remarks, in a letter to that gentleman, dated so late as March 25th, in the present year:—"Some persons, indeed, thought and proclaimed that it was no longer the same; (that is the connection between the Church and Methodism;) "but when the hour of trial came, in the year 1834, the conduct of the Conference demonstrated that the spirit of our venerated founder pervaded the body, and that in every sense compatible with the ecclesiastical independence of Methodism, the Wesleyan community stand in the friendly relation to the Established Church of England, expressed by the entire remark which I made during the course of my examination before the Commons' Select Committee—a remark, the truth of which HAS NEVER BEEN IMPUGNED BY A SINGLE WESLEYAN MINISTER NOW CONNECTED WITH US IN THIS COUNTRY!" Who, after this, can trust Mr. Ryerson's correctness as a writer, when he so boldly asserted that not "one out of fifty, if one out of one hundred" received, or agreed in Mr. Alder's statement as made before the House?

mies to me: and says "you cannot be too zealous for the poor Church of England."

Trusting that the Great Head of the Church will spread over it, especially in this land, the shield of His Divine protection, so that none of the weapons formed against it may prosper,

I remain, with sentiments of esteem,

Your obedient humble Servant,

AN ANGLO-CANADIAN.

May 4th, 1839.

POSTSCRIPT TO THE READER.

The above Letters, the hasty productions of an humble individual, who felt anxious to lend his aid, however feeble, to stop that torrent of those unscriptural and disloyal principles which seem ready to destroy all that is noble in our Constitution, or holy in our religion, originally expected only the fugitive existence of a newspaper; when, however, a number of individuals stated their wish and intention to *reprint* them, the writer availed himself of the opportunity of making a few corrections and some *important additions*; but still without being able to give them any thing like that attention which under ordinary circumstances a proper respect for the public would demand—even for their corrections as they go through Press he is obliged to the polite attention of a friend.

A. C.

