

things taught in one of the meeting houses in Newcastle. "Souterites," or the people who sit or stand there, for I am told that nobody adopts the "superstitious, antiquated, [ancient] practice of kneeling upon their knees, a devotional posture of the body recommended by the example of THE SAVIOUR, King David, the Prophet Daniel, St. Paul, (or Paul as the Bishop of Chester and Presbyterians would say) and others of whom the world was not worthy? or think you that your Rev. brother, the as yet unauthorized champion of the so-called Presbytery of Miramichi, would be too well pleased if I were to nickname his preached Prayers and his Sermons—Archibaldism—and his beloved and attached people Archibaldites. Do M. G. think of all these things; and if not too proud to receive a hint, you may in future adopt the phrases 'Tractarian Opinions,' and 'Tractarians' in lieu of 'Puseyism' and 'Puseyites.'

Well, in the first paragraph of your first epistle, you are desirous to know 'upon what ground' the 'Houses of Prayer' 'lately erected in the Parishes of Richibucto and Blackville, are entitled to the imposing appellation of the Parish Church,' either of the one place or the other? Now I have already given you a very capital and Catholic reason, which, let me assure you, is not taken from 'Tractarian Writings,' that 'that Building is the Parish Church whose Altar is served by a Priest, both Catholic and Protestant, ordained by a Bishop, the rightful successor of the Apostles.' As you appear to be quite dissatisfied with the foregoing reason, I presume you are in want of a few references to human laws, whereby the Anglo-Catholic Church is 'deemed and taken to be' the PARISH CHURCH of the various Towns and Hamlets throughout the Province. Now (thank God) that branch of the Church to which I belong, can do very well without the aid of the Laws of Man, but with such geniuses as M. G., X. and G. M. of Bathurst, statute law, has very great weight indeed; and in truth I cannot much blame your love or struggling for this Law; for you know right well that it is Law and Law alone which elevates you in Scotland one inch above 'the dear dissenting Brethren and friends' of the Apostolic Church in that country. If I do not greatly err, an Act was passed prior to the separation of New Brunswick from Nova Scotia, declaring the Church of England to be 'the Established Church of the whole Province, that is, of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick; it is certain too that this enactment has never been repealed; on the contrary, it was confirmed during the first session of the Legislature, thereby plainly recognising the Church of England as ALREADY established as a matter of course, vide Colonial Statutes—XXVI. Georgii III. Cap. IV.—being 'An Act for preserving the Church of England as by Law Established in this Province, and for securing liberty (licentiousness) of conscience, in matters of Religion;' by referring to that Statute it will be perceived, that the Church of England alone is mentioned, while not the least reference is made to the human law established Presbyterian Kirk of Scotland, indeed it (the Presbyterian Kirk) appears to be amalgamated with the mass of Dissenters to whom liberty, or licentiousness of conscience is kindly permitted: I may also mention that the said enactment is frequently referred to and quoted throughout our Statute Book. In the third clause of Cap. I, XXIX. Georgii III., it is enacted 'that the Parishioners of the said Parish [St. John] shall on the first Monday after Easter \* \* \* assemble and meet together at the said Parish Church [Trinity Church]. V. Georgii IV. Cap. XII. is an Act to provide for the permanent interment of the remains of the late Lieut. Governor Smith, within the walls of the Parish Church of Fredericton.' In the preamble of this Act it is stated, that the late Lieut. Governor enjoined his Executors to have his remains interred under the said Church in Fredericton; plainly recognising it to be THE Church of Fredericton.

By V. Georgii IV. Cap. XIX, Clause II, it is enacted 'That the inhabitants of Carlton shall, &c. &c. assemble and meet together at the said Parish Church of Carlton.' By I. Gulielmi IV. Cap. XXIII, Clause II, it is enacted 'that the inhabitants of the several and respective Parishes in this Province, who shall be owners or proprietors of Pews in the Church of the Parish, wherein they shall or may be resident,' &c. &c. By II. Gulielmi IV. Cap. XVI, clause I, it is enacted 'that each Pewholder in the said Parish Church of Saint Andrews'—vide also V. Gulielmi IV. Cap. V, again referring 'to the Parish Church of St. Andrews.' By VI. Gulielmi IV. cap. III, clause IV, it is enacted 'that Grace Church shall be deemed and taken to be the Parish Church of the Parish of Portland' [near St. John].

By an attentive perusal of the preceding extracts from, and references to, the Colonial Statutes, I think it will appear very evident to every body, but Presbyterian Teachers, that the Anglo-Catholic Churches in St. John, Fredericton, St. Andrews, Carlton and Portland are the Parish Churches, or the Churches of the aforesaid Towns and Villages.

Surely then we may reasonably infer from the spirit of the foregoing enactments that 'the Episcopal Churches' in the Parishes of Blackville and Richibucto are respectively the Parish Churches thereof. Let me also ask,

is it not just as plainly declared by the first Statute referred to, that the Church of England is the established Church of New Brunswick? But even supposing that our Provincial laws were quite silent about this matter (as they might just as well have been) the principle of the British Constitution is, that 'the united Church of England and Ireland' is THE Church in all parts of the Home and Colonial Empire; except in that part of the Kingdom called Scotland. By the often quoted Act of Union (about which so much fuss is made) it is well known that the Presbyterian Kirk shall not be 'established,' nor be considered so! beyond the borders of the 'North Country,' or Scotland. I may now remark that if X's majority of Members in the County of Kent (where it is stated 'erroneously' I am sure) 'that Presbyterians are to Episcopalsians probably as three to one,' makes his dingy shabby-looking Meeting House the Parish Church, or if its priority of erection confers this Title, then it is quite certain that the Roman Catholic Priest in Richibucto (the Rev. Mr Pacquet) can take away all these honors from X, in behalf of the French Chapels, which are said to contain congregations ten times as numerous as that which frequents his (X's) Presbyterian Meeting House, and were undoubtedly built and completed prior to the latter. This argument, therefore (if it be an argument) must fall to the ground. M G appears to attach a very great and unjust stress to the opinion of the late Lieut. Governor, Sir John Harvey, who as he (M G) states, spoke advisedly (pray how is that circumstance known) when he called the Church 'that portion of the established Church of England in the Province' in his 'trumpety address to the Episcopal Clergy assembled at Fredericton some years ago.' Now every body knows that Sir John Harvey's idol was popularity; to obtain a goodly share of this thing, however degraded or short lived it promised to be, was his chiefest study—his chiefest ambition; like my poor friend Allsides, he was indeed 'all things to all men;' and even if he had the moral courage to have stated his honest convictions, he was neither Theologian, nor Lawyer. His valuable and weighty opinion was therefore worth as much as the writer would have esteemed it, if it had been against him. The quibble about the question of the Canadian Clergy Reserve was not whether Presbyterianism was so ordinately established with the Church in order to rob her of her undoubted property, but whether Presbyterians could have been entitled to the name Protestant at that time; if England's twelve Judges, (a batch of Laymen, by the way) had examined and searched the matter more thoroughly and deeply, their Lordships would have discovered that the Presbyterians were not at that time even called Protestants. The land was granted to a Protestant Clergy, not to an Established Clergy. Now it is scarcely necessary for me to remind a learned Divine like yourself, M G, that Methodists, and no infant Baptists, et hoc genus omne, are just as much Protestants, or rather ultra-Protestants, as Presbyterians, and consequently all sorts of Dissenters, (Presbyterians included) greedily pounced upon the Canadian Church property so dishonestly, yes, sacrilegiously wrested from the Apostolic Church in that country, and thrown to its enemies as a sop. In the second paragraph of the same letter, M G 'very strongly objects (and what Dissenter will not object) to several of the doctrines and views put forth in the article, &c. &c.' Now I rejoice in my heart that he does so 'object.' His disapproval is the best possible proof that I am not wrong in my doctrines and views. Indeed, so long as M G abstains from 'holding me up as a pattern and model for the Provincial Clergy,' I shall be impressed with the thought, that my principles (whatever my practice may be) are right; his dis-praise is therefore of far more service to me than his praise. Woe, indeed, to 'the Christian Pastor of whom all men speak well, for so did their Fathers to the False Prophets!' M G then proceeds to remark that I have 'imbibed the notions of the Oxford Tractarians' will he credit the statement that I have not in all my life read twenty of 'the Tracts for the Times?' But from what I do know of these celebrated publications, and from late conversations with those who have read them, and profited by them, too, I am quite safe in stating that 'this powerful sect' [surely M G must have had Presbyterianism in his mind's eye when he penned that word sect] 'is not rapidly 'corrupting the Doctrines,' nor is it 'dividing the Clergy and laity of the Church,' not of, but in England.

The principal authors of these Tracts have been writing to promote, not disunite, but oneness or union among the clergy and laity, and using their powerful pens to win back unhappy wanderers (Presbyterian teachers included) now feeding on ashes in the ranks of dissent, to a Saviour Shepherd's fold, where they will be duly cared for and nourished, with the pure milk of God's word.

Again let me tell M G that 'the Tractarians do not attach a superstitious importance to 'antiquated (ancient) forms,' nor do they (if I am not misinformed) 'set the authority of the Fathers' on any points, above that of the Holy Scriptures themselves.' Like myself, these Clergy have a reverence for the ancient forms of the Church, and a very great and honorable respect and regard for the weighty and solemn opinions of these learned men, every one of whom movingly cautions the faithful against the commission of, or partici-

pating in the sin of schism, which is just as much a sin, as murder, drunkenness, or adultery. Again—'Tractarians do not hold in the most unqualified sense Baptismal regeneration;' but every sound churchman does adhere to that Scriptural doctrine in some sense or other; and that to partake of the Holy Eucharist with a true faith in Christ and a penitent heart is a very great means of attaining salvation. M G. then states that Puseyites (Tractarians) further hold 'that no clergyman who has not received Episcopal Ordination can rightly and duly dispense either Baptism or the Lord's Supper.' Does M G require to be told that the Clergy in this Province are frequently called upon to baptize infants and adults, once 'named' (to use the expression of a neighboring brother Presbyter, who is not a Tractarian) by Dissenting Teachers? Is he not aware that infants alleged to have been baptised, or so 'named' by himself, have subsequently had the sacrament of Baptism 'rightly and duly dispensed' to them by a lawful minister; and must he be told that no clergyman could refuse to withhold Baptism from a person so 'named'? Does he not know too, that if a Roman Catholic Clergyman, and a Presbyterian teacher, and a Layman, seek office at the same time in the Church of England, that the former is received, while each of the latter is duly ordained by a Bishop, the only rightful and known ordainer in the Church for the first fifteen hundred years? And why all this? Because the Church and not Tractarians alone, consider the Roman Catholic clergyman as having already had ordination, whereas the Presbyterian Teacher is viewed by her merely as the Layman, and ordained accordingly. Now I will not undertake to assert that if a man's commission is not valid, that his acts are invalid too; although I believe, that this is the opinion maintained by mankind with regard to earthly matters. 'No; to his own master the uncommissioned Teacher standeth or falleth.' But from what has been stated, I do think that the Church [not Tractarians only] consider Presbyterian orders to be invalid.

In the next sentence, M G displays his usual ignorance by stating 'that with the view of adding importance to their Liturgy, they [the Tractarians] lay more stress upon the reading of prayers, than the reading of God's Word, and the preaching of the everlasting Gospel.' Now that prayer is more beneficial to the soul of sinful man is not the opinion of the Tractarians alone, but that of the whole Church, which certainly always did, and to this day does, lay more stress upon prayer AND the reading of God's Word, than upon preaching. Does not M G know that four fifths of that 'carnal' thing the Prayer Book, is taken from the Bible; and is he not aware that more of God's Word is read [by the confession of honest minded dissenters] in the Church, than in any meeting house whatsoever. But what says Holy Scripture about Prayer? let us see. 'Men ought always to pray;' 'pray without ceasing;' 'praying always with all prayer;' 'God forbid that I should sin against the Lord in ceasing to pray for you;'—'we will give ourselves continually to prayer;'—'he knelt down upon his knees three times a day, and prayed and gave thanks before his God as he did aforetime;'—'in the evening and morning, went out and departed into a solitary place, and there prayed;'—'he continued all night in prayer to God.' Holy 'Anna the daughter of Pannuel departed not from the Temple, but served God with fastings and prayers night and day;'—'good Cornelius prayed to God always.' Now, according to God's own Word, which do you, M G, honestly think is 'the most solemn and essential part of public Worship.' Prayer to the Most High, or man's preaching? if you cannot decide this point, others will readily do it for you. Let us now look into the Prayer Book, (if you do not fear being contaminated thereby) and ascertain what is the opinion of the Church on this matter—'All Priests and Deacons are to say daily the morning and evening prayer either privately or openly, not being let by sickness, or some other urgent cause;'—'and the Curate that ministereth in every parish Church or Chapel, being at home, and not being otherwise reasonably hindered, shall say the same in the parish Church or Chapel where he ministereth, and shall cause a bell to be tolled thereunto a convenient time before he begin, that the people may come to hear God's Word, and to pray with him.'

From this injunction, [not too well observed just now] it will be perceived, that the sacrifice of Prayer and praise is to be offered up twice every day throughout the year, except there be some reasonable cause to the contrary. In the Prayer Book we also meet with the Titles 'the order for Morning and Evening Prayer daily throughout the year.' The Rubric, or rule preceding 'the Collects for Peace and Grace' at Morning Prayer, and the Rubric before 'the Collects for Peace and Aid against all Perils,' at every Prayer enjoin those short and very ancient prayers to be said at Matins and even-song daily throughout the whole year. Even the poor wanderer on the deep is not forgotten, for the Church enjoins that morning and evening service is also to be used Daily at sea. By the fifteenth Canon and a Rubric, the Litany, that 'wonderful remembrancer of human wants,' is commanded to be sung or said upon all 'Sundays, Wednesdays and Fridays.' From these few references to the Prayer Book, our authorized

Fomalaries—and from the circumstance that the Church does NOT erjoin a Sermon to follow Evening Prayer, you may, or may not perceive that the whole Church sets more value 'on Prayer than Preaching.'

The sweeping accusation that 'the Possessors [Tractarians or sound Churchmen] are following the example of another church, into the bosom of which they are apparently fast hastening,' I must denounce as mere slander, however desirable it may be to unite with the other church, still I defy you, M G, with all your flimsy, pretended knowledge of what is going on at home, to produce a single instance of any clergyman holding Tractarian opinions, having joined, or manifesting any disposition to join, the Church of Rome as she is.

Let me now tell you, M G, that your Texts about 'Preaching' are nothing to the purpose. The Greek word, translated 'Preaching' in three passages of the quoted four, might be rendered with the strictest propriety, Publishing, Declaring Publicly, Proclaiming as an Herald; any thing therefore Publicly Proclaimed, or Heralded, [which is the more LITERAL signification of the original word] such as prayer, praise, or thanksgiving, is as much Preaching, as admonishing or exhorting is, and every body knows that the first step in planting Christianity among the Heathen nations would be to preach it in the latter way—for how could the Heathen or the unbelieving, join in the public prayers of the Church, the infinitely higher duty, until they were first enlightened by the lower and preparatory one of Preaching? I think it was the practice of the Clergy in the primitive Church, first to preach the Sermon, on the conclusion of which the Heathen were desired to withdraw; the Christians then engaged in the most solemn act of Prayer. Our mutual friends will now perceive that it was M G's stupidity, or his non acquaintance with the idioms of the English language [though he be Secretary to the Board of Education] which caused him to imagine that I UNDERVALUED the ordinance of Preaching— what I said and have just proved, was, 'that the Church of England, a Branch of the Catholic Communion, rests more on Prayer than Preaching.'

In the fourth paragraph of your AWFUL Epistle, you appear to sneer at the expressions 'rightly and duly administered' by the officiating Priests [?] The words between the inverted commas may be found in one of the most sublime Prayers in the Liturgy [the prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church Militant; here on earth] a Prayer, by the way, seldom read by the Clergy, tho' it is enjoined to be used every Sunday immediately after the Sermon or Homily. And now let me enquire, do you, M G, maintain that there are not any Priests in the Church of England? If you do not know this fact, 'you must be,' as the Editor of The Church would say 'grossly ignorant,' or grossly dishonest if you do know it, and conceal the matter; and as the same dread-nought gentleman would add, 'you may just take which horn of the dilemma you like best.' In the remainder of this [the fourth] paragraph, I cannot perceive any passages requiring explanation, except to remark, that what you are pleased to call 'Puseyism,' rank [stinking] Puseyism, mark the SPELLING too, is not the opinions of Tractarians, but the pure and undefiled Doctrines of the Church of England.

As you are already acquainted with my sentiments respecting the 'impertinent' cautions conveyed in the concluding part of your first letter, it is unnecessary for me here to repeat any expression of the same,—but if your memory is really defective on this point, I must in that case trouble you to refer at once to my first Communication.

I have just finished a few short notes upon your second letter, containing as many misrepresentations and blunders as the first, and intended to have added them to this communication, but I do not like to be too troublesome to the obliging Editor of the Gleaner; next week however, D V, you shall be gratified with a sight of them. Meanwhile let me assure you M G, X, G M, and all other kind friends, that all your benevolent endeavours to 'blacken' me and mine, as well as to injure my usefulness (such as it is) in this district, will be thank God—to no purpose; as long as that silent monitor within me approves, I shall continue to be perfectly indifferent, nay callous, to slander.

The 'whole host of [Presbyterian] Presbyters' one would fancy that each of them is a 'Philistino of Gath, a man of war from his youth, whose height is six cubits and a span, and having an helmet of brass upon his head, and armed with a coat of mail; the weight of the coat five thousand shekels of brass, with greaves of brass upon his legs and a target of brass upon his shoulders; and the staff of the spear like a weaver's beam, and the spear's head weighing six hundred shekels of iron.' I say 'the whole host of [presbyterian] Presbyters may come out against me, who am but a youth, 'having in mine hands, only a staff, a few smooth stones and a sling,' and trusting in the name of HIM who was with holy David when he went forth to meet 'the enemies of the armies of Israel.' Let me then once more tell you all; that with the Bible in one hand, and the 'noble old prayer Book and Apostolical and Catholic Tradition in the other, I fear not the whole [so called] Presbytery [?] of Miramichi.

Deeming it consistent with honorable frankness to annex my name to this communication, I shall as usual subscribe myself,