

practised for devotional purposes, in public worship—but not enjoined by the existing formularies of the church, nor by general usage—give offence to several members of the church, distract their attention from their devotional practices which are so enjoined; we, the undersigned, do earnestly recommend that all such un-enjoined practices be forthwith laid aside, as unnecessarily increasing suspicion and disunion among us; and that beyond bowing at the name of Jesus, enjoined by the 18th canon, and turning to the east at the creeds, no other devotional practices than those enjoined by the prayer book and canons ecclesiastical—or, where they are defective or doubtful, by general usage, or the authority of the diocesan—be adopted by either clergy or laity in public worship.

Advent, 1854.

We are so deeply impressed with the necessity of some such measure as this, that we could, with a good conscience, publicly invite such men as Mr. Gresley, Dr. Pusey, Mr. Keble, Mr. Liddell, and Mr. Isaac Williams, either to sign this declaration, or to show cause why they decline to do so; but we will content ourselves with placing it before them. We see no reason, indeed, why even their lordships the bishops should refuse to set the example, for it is quite within the bounds of probability, we think, it would put an end to much mischief and annoyance to churchmen in general, and to ourselves in particular, without doing any harm, in any way. The work would come more properly and gracefully from those whom we have thus alluded to, but if they continue to decline it much longer, it will, we firmly believe, be done without them, and against them, by much rougher and unfriendly hands, and with a much greater admixture of evil, as regards both the manner, and the result.

BEARINGS OF THE EUCHARISTIC CONTROVERSY.

The last mail from England brings news of no new step in the Denison case. We believe there is, on all hands, a general acknowledgment of the technical correctness of Lord Campbell's decision, refusing to issue, from the Court of Queen's Bench, a Prohibition of the Archbishop's proceedings. Archdeacon Churton sends a letter to the *Guardian*, in which he says:—

"It is now supposed, and indeed seems to be admitted, that the proposition opposed to Article XXIX. is considered by those who assert it to be an unimportant and 'subordinate statement,' not at all affecting the Church's doctrine of the Real Presence. As to the doctrine of the Real Presence, it is a mere false alarm to suppose that it can be in any danger."

We are glad to see such a statement from such a highly respectable source. It is the direct opposite of the views expressed by Dr. Pusey and Mr. Keble. But which of the two opinions in regard to the practical bearing of the Denison case is the better founded, it is not so easy to determine.

A final decision against the Archdeacon would probably have no effect technically, in point of positively erroneous theology, but a very decided effect in the popular apprehension, adverse to what has been hitherto claimed as the undoubted intent and teaching of the Church. This popular apprehension results more from considering the anti-sacramental views of those who are prosecuting the Archdeacon than from any true understanding of the theological bearings of the question. When all the Low-Churchmen and Dissenters are united on the one side, the Church's doctrine of Sacramental Grace has small chance to escape in its triumph. Some three or four societies are already in operation for Liturgical revision, all of which contemplate altering the Offices of the Eucharist and of Baptism, to make them conform (as they ignorantly express it) to the doctrine as stated in the Articles.—And how far their anti-sacramental *furor* might be carried, is evident from the case of a consecrated Chapel in the Diocese of Litchfield, which has positively no altar at all, no communion-table of any kind, nor is the Holy Eucharist ever celebrated there from one year's end to another, although it is open for Prayers and Preaching every Sunday! And indeed, if the Eucharist be only a Memorial, why should it be administered? The people are put in mind of the Death of Christ by praying "through the mediation" wrought by that Death; and they are also put in mind of it, it is to be hoped, by the preaching they hear; and if a "memorial" be all that is wanted, surely prayer and the ministry of the Word are enough, and "bread and wine" ought to be ranked with works of supererogation. Moreover, why is it that those who contend that it is only a "memorial," are so bitterly opposed to its frequent reception? Is it too much that Christians should be put in mind of the Death of Christ every Sunday? or even every day? Or is it likely that that man will profit much, spiritually, by the death of his Saviour, who is not put in mind of it oftener than once a month, or as in some parishes, once a year.

In connection with this eucharistic controversy, the Bishop of Manchester, at a late public meeting, has been uttering some doctrine, which no American Churchman can possibly endorse, because it is flatly contradicted by our American Communion Office. The contemptuous terms in which the Bishop spoke of the Episcopal Church of Scotland, as "the Episcopal sect in Scotland," will hardly be considered as doing him any honor. He was presiding (the first time any Bishop had so presided) at a meeting of "Protestants of different shades," united in a "Religious Tract Society"; and said, drawing down, as will be seen, "loud applause" for thus denouncing sound doctrine:—

"I believe that we may be led away farther from the simple and sincere truthfulness of our glorious, and I may say, and do say, all but inspired reformers, to adopt errors the most deadly, and a doctrine the most fatal. We have lately had within the Church a discussion which has involved the doctrine of the Sacraments. We have had a discussion which involves the other; and I do say, with the earnestness which the deepest and sincerest conviction: with the most prayerful and anxious consideration of the subject, with the most minute investigation of every point connected with it, abstain from the slightest notion of *oblation* or *offering* in the doctrine of the Eucharist. (Loud applause.) I am prepared, on proper occasions, if it be necessary, to show not only

that the Church of England has ever repudiated and disregarded that doctrine, but I am also prepared to show that when it was suggested to her she deliberately rejected it. Whoever embraces it is on the second or third round of the ladder which leads him inevitably to Rome; and it is because I desire to direct the earnest exertions of those who distribute tracts, and tracts such as those which are issued by the Society of which we are advocates to-night, that I do urge them to give no faint, no doubtful, no equivocal, but the most clear, distinct, and unequivocal, unmistakable denials to *heresies* like that which I have alluded to."

That will do for one dose. Our American Communion Office contains a Prayer of Consecration, one part of which is distinctly called "The Oblation;" and opposite to this marginal title are the words, spoken of the consecrated elements, "which we now offer UNTO THEE." If this be not the full expression of "the notion of *oblation* or *offering*," we know not what it is. Yet here this Bishop, who tells us that he speaks "with all the earnestness which the deepest and sincerest conviction, with the most minute investigation of every point connected with it!" can produce, declares that the notion of an oblation or offering is "an error the most deadly," a "doctrine the most false," a "heresy" (!) and that "whoever embraces it is on the second or third round of the ladder which leads him inevitably to Rome." We must surely be in a bad way on this side of the water! Really, if this be what they call Low-Churchism in England, we have none of it in America. We find nobody that we know of, among us clamoring for a reform of our Communion Office; but all men, of all parties known among us, agree in landing and using that admirable Office as it is. Can it be possible that we are all Romanizers and heretics? Or is it only another proof that there is no longer Low Church party (worthy of the name) in the Church of America?—*Church Journal, New York.*

Ecclesiastical Intelligence.

DIocese of MONTREAL.

Church Society's Office.
January 3, 1855.

A meeting of the Central Board of the Church Society was held this day, in accordance with the constitution. The Dean of Montreal is in the chair.

The report of the Lay Committee, presented at the last meeting of the Central Board, was considered, and the following resolutions were passed: To grant £25 to the church at St. Charles, as recommended by the Lay Committee. To pay £25, being one half of the grant made 4th January, 1854, to the church at North Shefford, provided the church be notified of the assistance of the Church Society, as soon as the funds will permit.

It was resolved that £50 be granted to the Book and Tract Committee for the purchase of books.

The following sums have been received since the last meeting: Subscriptions at Longueuil, £1 7s. 6d.; collection at sermon at Maningville, 10s.; ditto at Waterloo, £4 6s. 10d.; ditto at West Shefford, £1 8s. 10d.; Rev. A. Whitwell's annual subscription, £1 7s. 6d.; collection at Frost Village, £2 14s. 6d.; Rev. A. Row's annual subscription, £1 6s.; remittance from Rev. T. Machin, 24 s. 6d. 10d.; collection at Verdun, £3 2s. 6d.

E. J. ROGERS, Secretary.

ENGLAND.

LONDON UNION OF CHURCH MATTERS.

At the Annual Meeting of the London Union of Church Matters, held on Thursday last, at their rooms, 4, Adam-street, Adelphi, the following Report was received, and ordered to be printed and circulated:—

The Committee of the London Union of Church Matters, in presenting the Fifth Annual Report, have to observe, in looking back at the suggestions which they have made in their Monthly Reports, that although a few things were discussed, and others called for vigilance on the part of Churchmen, yet that the reasons for encouragement predominated and showed a slow but sure progress of right principles. This view is confirmed both by the more general retrospect, which they now take, and by the events which have occurred since their last Monthly Report.

Your Committee will first allude to the great subject of legislation for the Church. They have more than once congratulated the Union on the progress made by the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury. That body has shown signal forbearance in not pressing its claims too far or too loudly; while, at the same time, through the appointment of Committees to consider its own reform, and the more pressing duties of the Church, it has shown a singular facility and anxiety for business. In such a kind as to demonstrate that the expectations of its opponents were groundless, when they declared that it would discuss those subjects which were likely to divide the Church, rather than those which would strengthen and unite it. This is not the occasion for a detailed examination of the contents of the Reports made to Convocation, neither is it, perhaps, desirable for the Union to undertake such a task. Amid much detail that may be criticised probably in opposite ways by different persons, the Committee think that the Union will recognize the substantial wisdom of the whole, and thankfully rejoice at the prospect of vigorous life for the Church, with which they trust God will bless deliberations so directed.

Your Committee have on two occasions referred to the Bills before Parliament for Synodical organization of the Colonies. The Church of which they were right in declaring that while the introduction of the former of these measures was of happy augury, its abandonment was no subject for regret, and that the simplicity of the measure of this year was its best recommendation. They know not whether it is intended to introduce any other measure of the same kind in the present Session of Parliament. Your Committee are not anxious on the subject, because they are satisfied that this great question is settling itself, as all such questions ought to be settled, not by a measure imposed by any central authority, civil or ecclesiastical, but by partial measures in each locality, dictated by the good sense of the Church itself, with a view to its wants and the circumstances of society with which it has to deal, and in conformity with its own principles.

The measure of last year was not unreasonably objected to on account of its unaccomplished completeness. It would have established provision not universally applicable by an authority which neither the Colonial Church nor society in the colonies could see interfering with its proceedings. Of their own free will they have satisfied that they were right in declaring that while the introduction of the former of these measures was of happy augury, its abandonment was no subject for regret, and that the simplicity of the measure of this year was its best recommendation. They know not whether it is intended to introduce any other measure of the same kind in the present Session of Parliament. Your Committee are not anxious on the subject, because they are satisfied that this great question is settling itself, as all such questions ought to be settled, not by a measure imposed by any central authority, civil or ecclesiastical, but by partial measures in each locality, dictated by the good sense of the Church itself, with a view to its wants and the circumstances of society with which it has to deal, and in conformity with its own principles.

The measure of last year was not unreasonably objected to on account of its unaccomplished completeness. It would have established provision not universally applicable by an authority which neither the Colonial Church nor society in the colonies could see interfering with its proceedings. Of their own free will they have satisfied that they were right in declaring that while the introduction of the former of these measures was of happy augury, its abandonment was no subject for regret, and that the simplicity of the measure of this year was its best recommendation. They know not whether it is intended to introduce any other measure of the same kind in the present Session of Parliament. Your Committee are not anxious on the subject, because they are satisfied that this great question is settling itself, as all such questions ought to be settled, not by a measure imposed by any central authority, civil or ecclesiastical, but by partial measures in each locality, dictated by the good sense of the Church itself, with a view to its wants and the circumstances of society with which it has to deal, and in conformity with its own principles.

Archbishop, which he has submitted to a Synodical Meeting with a view, after gaining their assent, to procure its enactment by the local legislature. The law officers of the colony appear to have assisted him in the preparation of it, and in the debates in his Synod.

Your Committee are disposed to refer with peculiar pleasure to the precedent thus set. They have formerly pointed out that any secular aid given in the Colonies to ecclesiastical authority must be derived rather from the local legislatures than from the Imperial Parliament; and that such aid as may be necessary will be given both in the colony of Victoria and elsewhere; and they look to the interference of Parliament only in those cases where the imperial law has imposed some disability which the Colonial Church and Legislature desire to remove, but cannot. We are therefore, into hypocrisy against those who disbelieve the doctrine Mr. Smedley calls that of baptismal regeneration, that it is to a certain extent a question of fact; and if the charge is to be maintained on the ground that they wish for a revision of the Liturgy, we have seen that it rests on very sandy foundation indeed.—*Clerical Journal.*

An impression had gone abroad that the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury would meet for the despatch of business on Wednesday next, and such an intention was, we believe, actually entertained at one time. We are enabled to state, however, on the best authority, that no meeting took place until the 6th of February next. The cause of synodical action is making rapid and satisfactory progress in our North American colonies. The dioceses of Toronto and Nova Scotia have set a noble example, by the organization of Church action on the purest and most judicious plan, which points are especially to be noted, the full recognition of the Apostolic power of government vested in the Episcopate, and the frank admission of the claim of the laity to take a share—by virtue of their membership, and according to the nature of the administration of the Church. These happy commencing in the colonial churches cannot fail to react with good effect upon the questions connected with the revival of synodical action in the Church at home.—*John Bull.*

NEW ADVERTISEMENTS.

Upper Canada College.
Owen and Wood—Coach Makers.

LETTERS RECEIVED TO JANUARY 10.

R. G. Manners, rem. vols. 17 and 18; W. O. S. Catherines; Rev. Dr. McN., Bowmanville, rem. vols. 17 and 18; Dr. B. Merton; H. J. W. Morrisburg, rem. vols. 17 and 18; Rev. J. W. Darlington, N. B. rem. vols. 17 and 18; W. C. Fredericton, N. B. L. P. Springfield; Rev. E. P. Cornwall, rem. for magazines; Rev. J. K. Deal Town; Mrs. A. Hamilton, rem.

The Church.

TORONTO, THURSDAY, JANUARY 11, 1855.

NEWCASTLE DISTRICT BRANCH OF THE CHURCH SOCIETY.

The Annual Parochial Meetings of this District Branch of the Church Society are appointed to be held as follows, viz:—

Cavan, St. Paul's, Tuesday, January 30, 3 P.M.
Cavan, St. John's, Wednesday, ... 31, 10 A.M.
Manvers, St. John's, ... 31, 3 P.M.
Cartwright, Thursday, February, ... 1, 11 A.M.
Darlington, ... 1, 11 A.M.
Clark, St. George's, Friday, ... 2, 11 A.M.
Port Hope, St. George's, ... 2, 7 P.M.
Cobourg Annual Meeting, Thursday, ... 7, 7 P.M.
March, ... 1, 7 P.M.

By order of the Managing Committee.
T. WILSON, Secretary.
Grafton, Dec. 11, 1854.

GORE AND WELLINGTON DISTRICT BRANCH OF THE CHURCH SOCIETY.

The following arrangement was adopted for holding the Parochial Meetings in this District at the Managing Committee Meeting in Hamilton, on Tuesday, 12th December:—

Elora, ... Tues. Jan. 23, 6 P.M.
Geoph, ... Wed. " 31, 7 P.M.
Galt, ... Thurs. Feb. 1, 7 P.M.
Paris, ... Friday, " 2, 7 P.M.
Georgetown, ... Mon. " 5, 7 P.M.
Milton, ... Tues. " 6, 7 P.M.
Darlington, ... Wed. " 7, 11 A.M.
Oakville, ... Thurs. " 7, 7 P.M.
Wellington Square, ... Thurs. " 8, 7 P.M.
Ancaster & Dundas, ... Friday, " 9, 7 P.M.
Bramford, ... Tues. " 27, 7 P.M.
Mount Pleasant, ... Wed. " 28, 11 A.M.
Upper Cayuga, ... Thurs. " 7, 7 P.M.
Hamilton Annual Meeting, Thurs. March 8, 7 P.M.

T. GAMBLE GEORGE, Secretary.

HOME DISTRICT BRANCH OF THE CHURCH SOCIETY.

APPOINTMENTS FOR PAROCHIAL MEETINGS.

Weston, ... Tues. Jan. 23, 2 P.M.
Epsom, ... Wed. " 24, 11 A.M.
Sydenham, ... Wed. " 24, 11 A.M.
Springfield, ... Thurs. " 25, 11 A.M.
Streetsville, ... Thurs. " 25, 11 A.M.
Brampton, ... Thurs. " 25, 11 A.M.
Tallmore, ... Friday, " 26, 11 A.M.
Bewick, ... Friday, " 26, 11 A.M.
Bolton's Mills, ... Thurs. " 30, 12 P.M.
Lloydtown, ... Thurs. " 30, 12 P.M.
York Mills, ... Tues. Feb. 27, 7 P.M.
Thornhill, ... Tues. " 28, 7 P.M.
St. Alban's, ... Thurs. Mar. 1, 2 P.M.
Burlington, ... Thurs. " 1, 2 P.M.
Unioville, Markham, ... Frid. " 2, 2 P.M.
St. Paul's, L'Amoreaux, ... " 6, 6 P.M.
Christ Church, Scarborough, ... Tues. " 6, 11 A.M.
Whitby, ... " 7, 7 P.M.

Arranged at a meeting held at the Church Society's house on the 13th December.
J. G. D. MCKENZIE, Secretary.

THE CHURCH, THE ONLY DULY APPOINTED CHANNEL OF GRACE IN THE LAND.

We have so frequently heard persons who have not well considered the subject express the same opinions as those set forth in "Robert Brown's" letter to the editor of the *Scottish Episcopal Journal*, that to the exclusion of other matter, we insert the letter and the exposure of the fallacy, which leads to their adoption, contained in the December number of that orthodox and excellent periodical, so entirely do the views of the writer coincide with our own.

"THE CHURCH, THE ONLY DULY APPOINTED CHANNEL OF GRACE IN THE LAND."

We print the subjoined letter *entire* (notwithstanding some harsh expressions that might have justified its rejection, or required a modification of its terms); and we do so, partly because of the evident earnestness of the writer, and partly because the views which he, in common with others, entertains, seem to require some public correction, we desire to place those views before our readers precisely in the form in which they were presented to us. Our correspondent's letter is as follows:—

"I am writing to you, Sir, with much respect, your most obedient servant, 'ROBERT BROWN.'"

We insert this letter here, because we believe that the FALLACY which it contains is very common, and is not only among members of other Protestant communities, but also among members of the Church both in England and Scotland, who, while they consider themselves good Churchmen, yet conceive that they should be wanting in the charity which all Christians are called upon to exercise, if they maintained that the Church to which they belong is "the only duly appointed channel of grace in the land." Now, however transparent this fallacy may appear to many of our readers, its wide-spread currency in many quarters gives it importance; and we accept the opportunity which our correspondent's communication offers of showing in a few words how entirely unsubstantial the grounds are upon which it rests, how inconsistent its terms are with real charity, and how irreconcilable its maintenance is with the existence of our Church, and with our position as members of it.

Those who maintain the position of our correspondent assume that to assert that the Church is the only duly appointed channel of grace in the land, is to annihilate and exclude from the pale of salvation all individual Christians, and to exclude from us. This is an entire and false assumption. Assertion with regard to matters within our knowledge never implies denial with regard to matters beyond our means of information. And this particular assertion (however nearly the fact asserted may concern the members of the Church, and indirectly relate to individuals at all, even within the Church. It refers solely to systems. Of these we know something, because God has been graciously pleased to make a revelation concerning them. Of the relative or actual states of grace of different individuals (whether within or without the Church) we know nothing, and shall not know nothing till the great last day, and it would be the height of arrogance and impiety to assert or deny anything respecting them.

It is this confusion between persons and systems that renders members of our own Commu-

never seems to have occurred to him that a statement may be philosophically true in the mind of the original proposer, and have been rightly understood by those to whom it was immediately addressed, and yet in the lapse of time have come to mean something so different, that, while it may be conscientiously acquiesced in by those who are acquainted with its origin, it may, nevertheless, be highly expedient to change it for the sake of those less deeply read in history and archeology. As to the charge of Popery brought against those who entertain what Mr. Smedley calls the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, we must leave them to combat him as they best may; this is a matter of theological controversy, and one, therefore, into which we decline to enter, as to the charge of hypocrisy against those who disbelieve the doctrine Mr. Smedley calls that of baptismal regeneration, that it is to a certain extent a question of fact; and if the charge is to be maintained on the ground that they wish for a revision of the Liturgy, we have seen that it rests on very sandy foundation indeed.—*Clerical Journal.*

An impression had gone abroad that the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury would meet for the despatch of business on Wednesday next, and such an intention was, we believe, actually entertained at one time. We are enabled to state, however, on the best authority, that no meeting took place until the 6th of February next. The cause of synodical action is making rapid and satisfactory progress in our North American colonies. The dioceses of Toronto and Nova Scotia have set a noble example, by the organization of Church action on the purest and most judicious plan, which points are especially to be noted, the full recognition of the Apostolic power of government vested in the Episcopate, and the frank admission of the claim of the laity to take a share—by virtue of their membership, and according to the nature of the administration of the Church. These happy commencing in the colonial churches cannot fail to react with good effect upon the questions connected with the revival of synodical action in the Church at home.—*John Bull.*

NEW ADVERTISEMENTS.

Upper Canada College.
Owen and Wood—Coach Makers.

LETTERS RECEIVED TO JANUARY 10.

R. G. Manners, rem. vols. 17 and 18; W. O. S. Catherines; Rev. Dr. McN., Bowmanville, rem. vols. 17 and 18; Dr. B. Merton; H. J. W. Morrisburg, rem. vols. 17 and 18; Rev. J. W. Darlington, N. B. rem. vols. 17 and 18; W. C. Fredericton, N. B. L. P. Springfield; Rev. E. P. Cornwall, rem. for magazines; Rev. J. K. Deal Town; Mrs. A. Hamilton, rem.

The Church.

TORONTO, THURSDAY, JANUARY 11, 1855.

NEWCASTLE DISTRICT BRANCH OF THE CHURCH SOCIETY.

The Annual Parochial Meetings of this District Branch of the Church Society are appointed to be held as follows, viz:—

Cavan, St. Paul's, Tuesday, January 30, 3 P.M.
Cavan, St. John's, Wednesday, ... 31, 10 A.M.
Manvers, St. John's, ... 31, 3 P.M.
Cartwright, Thursday, February, ... 1, 11 A.M.
Darlington, ... 1, 11 A.M.
Clark, St. George's, Friday, ... 2, 11 A.M.
Port Hope, St. George's, ... 2, 7 P.M.
Cobourg Annual Meeting, Thursday, ... 7, 7 P.M.
March, ... 1, 7 P.M.

By order of the Managing Committee.
T. WILSON, Secretary.
Grafton, Dec. 11, 1854.

GORE AND WELLINGTON DISTRICT BRANCH OF THE CHURCH SOCIETY.

The following arrangement was adopted for holding the Parochial Meetings in this District at the Managing Committee Meeting in Hamilton, on Tuesday, 12th December:—

Elora, ... Tues. Jan. 23, 6 P.M.
Geoph, ... Wed. " 31, 7 P.M.
Galt, ... Thurs. Feb. 1, 7 P.M.
Paris, ... Friday, " 2, 7 P.M.
Georgetown, ... Mon. " 5, 7 P.M.
Milton, ... Tues. " 6, 7 P.M.
Darlington, ... Wed. " 7, 11 A.M.
Oakville, ... Thurs. " 7, 7 P.M.
Wellington Square, ... Thurs. " 8, 7 P.M.
Ancaster & Dundas, ... Friday, " 9, 7 P.M.
Bramford, ... Tues. " 27, 7 P.M.
Mount Pleasant, ... Wed. " 28, 11 A.M.
Upper Cayuga, ... Thurs. " 7, 7 P.M.
Hamilton Annual Meeting, Thurs. March 8, 7 P.M.

T. GAMBLE GEORGE, Secretary.

HOME DISTRICT BRANCH OF THE CHURCH SOCIETY.

APPOINTMENTS FOR PAROCHIAL MEETINGS.

Weston, ... Tues. Jan. 23, 2 P.M.
Epsom, ... Wed. " 24, 11 A.M.
Sydenham, ... Wed. " 24, 11 A.M.
Springfield, ... Thurs. " 25, 11 A.M.
Streetsville, ... Thurs. " 25, 11 A.M.
Brampton, ... Thurs. " 25, 11 A.M.
Tallmore, ... Friday, " 26, 11 A.M.
Bewick, ... Friday, " 26, 11 A.M.
Bolton's Mills, ... Thurs. " 30, 12 P.M.
Lloydtown, ... Thurs. " 30, 12 P.M.
York Mills, ... Tues. Feb. 27, 7 P.M.
Thornhill, ... Tues. " 28, 7 P.M.
St. Alban's, ... Thurs. Mar. 1, 2 P.M.
Burlington, ... Thurs. " 1, 2 P.M.
Unioville, Markham, ... Frid. " 2, 2 P.M.
St. Paul's, L'Amoreaux, ... " 6, 6 P.M.
Christ Church, Scarborough, ... Tues. " 6, 11 A.M.
Whitby, ... " 7, 7 P.M.

Arranged at a meeting held at the Church Society's house on the 13th December.
J. G. D. MCKENZIE, Secretary.

THE CHURCH, THE ONLY DULY APPOINTED CHANNEL OF GRACE IN THE LAND.

We have so frequently heard persons who have not well considered the subject express the same opinions as those set forth in "Robert Brown's" letter to the editor of the *Scottish Episcopal Journal*, that to the exclusion of other matter, we insert the letter and the exposure of the fallacy, which leads to their adoption, contained in the December number of that orthodox and excellent periodical, so entirely do the views of the writer coincide with our own.

"THE CHURCH, THE ONLY DULY APPOINTED CHANNEL OF GRACE IN THE LAND."

We print the subjoined letter *entire* (notwithstanding some harsh expressions that might have justified its rejection, or required a modification of its terms); and we do so, partly because of the evident earnestness of the writer, and partly because the views which he, in common with others, entertains, seem to require some public correction, we desire to place those views before our readers precisely in the form in which they were presented to us. Our correspondent's letter is as follows:—

"I am writing to you, Sir, with much respect, your most obedient servant, 'ROBERT BROWN.'"

We insert this letter here, because we believe that the FALLACY which it contains is very common, and is not only among members of other Protestant communities, but also among members of the Church both in England and Scotland, who, while they consider themselves good Churchmen, yet conceive that they should be wanting in the charity which all Christians are called upon to exercise, if they maintained that the Church to which they belong is "the only duly appointed channel of grace in the land." Now, however transparent this fallacy may appear to many of our readers, its wide-spread currency in many quarters gives it importance; and we accept the opportunity which our correspondent's communication offers of showing in a few words how entirely unsubstantial the grounds are upon which it rests, how inconsistent its terms are with real charity, and how irreconcilable its maintenance is with the existence of our Church, and with our position as members of it.

Those who maintain the position of our correspondent assume that to assert that the Church is the only duly appointed channel of grace in the land, is to annihilate and exclude from the pale of salvation all individual Christians, and to exclude from us. This is an entire and false assumption. Assertion with regard to matters within our knowledge never implies denial with regard to matters beyond our means of information. And this particular assertion (however nearly the fact asserted may concern the members of the Church, and indirectly relate to individuals at all, even within the Church. It refers solely to systems. Of these we know something, because God has been graciously pleased to make a revelation concerning them. Of the relative or actual states of grace of different individuals (whether within or without the Church) we know nothing, and shall not know nothing till the great last day, and it would be the height of arrogance and impiety to assert or deny anything respecting them.

It is this confusion between persons and systems that renders members of our own Commu-

nication, or our correspondent, unnecessarily sensitive of the language used by Presbyters and Ecclesiastical writers; makes members of other religious communities look upon Episcopalians as uncharitably exclusive, or arrogantly presumptuous; and, worst of all, causes the just claims of the Church sometimes to be misrepresented, at other times to be surrendered.

As far as regards our own pages, we entertain no fear that many of those who read them will either pronounce judgment upon our orthodoxy from one isolated passage, or, giving a fairer hearing to the evidence which these pages contain, will pronounce an unfavorable judgment upon the point at issue. We have ever endeavoured, while maintaining the true position of the Church firmly, to do so in a charitable spirit towards all who differ from us, and while speaking plainly of things, to do so without pharisaically condemning, in *foro conscientie*, individuals. We might expect to many passages where we have not scrupled to commend the personal purity of life exhibited by Presbyterians. In truth, we have, ere now, received remonstrances from well meaning people for having gone too far in that direction. But we are not a little concerned, at present, for the reputation of this *Journal*. It is the injury which the *TRIS* CHURCH suffers from a misconception of what she really is that renders the question of importance.

Now what is this CHURCH? A *Divine Institution* to which we owe obedience, and which means *human partnership* which we may enter or not as we please? No Episcopalians can hesitate in his reply, if he is one upon Episcopal principles. Indeed, as has been often remarked, the *Divine Institution* of Episcopacy, of the Church, of the Catholic Church, as Presbyters, must either be maintained by Scottish Episcopalians, or they must defend themselves from the charge of schism in remaining separate from the established religion of the country. We do not imagine that our correspondent, or any other member of our community, has doubts upon the subject; but we wish to show, first, that the reasonable, nay, inevitable result of the Episcopal view, is just such an assertion as we ourselves made,— "The Church is the only duly appointed channel of grace in the land;" and secondly, that this assertion, in its respect to the injunction which bids us "judge" no man.

Assuming, then, as we well may, that the Church is a *Divine Institution*, intended to be regulated by fixed rules delivered to the Apostles, and that our Communion Office is a continuation of the Scriptural and Apostolic ordinances in regard to this matter, it follows that in this country our Church is the ONLY DULY APPOINTED CHANNEL OF GRACE IN THE LAND. For it is a *Divine Institution*, and Apostolically instituted, channel, and if only one such organization was instituted from the first, then, of course, it would differ from ours in the fundamental characteristics are without due appointment, i.e. Scriptural and Apostolic authority. Thus, if we assert the Church system to be Scriptural and Apostolic, and therefore *duly appointed*, the necessary consequence is, that we must assert that of the Church stands upon the same footing as to *appointment*. All other Ecclesiastical systems but our own, in this country, plainly want the distinguishing marks of the Apostolic Church, and therefore we are not only warranted, but are bound, to regard them as *not for truth*, and that highest charity which truth alone can consecrate, to say, that the Church of our Blessed Saviour's appointment is the ONLY DULY APPOINTED CHANNEL OF GRACE.

Churchmen, high Churchmen, as those who are true to Church principles are often called, are not to be surprised at the results of the *Divine Institution* of Episcopacy. We shall therefore here appeal to none of the many authorities whom we might quote with the risk of such a suspicion, but we shall take the words of one whom no one, of any party, can accuse either of error or of partiality, and whose thoughts, Dean Ramsay of Edinburgh thus speaks in his *Catechetical Manual*—and we shall add no more, as his assertion is identical with our own:—

"On this subject, what may be considered a prevailing fault or misconception of the present day is, that a tendency to overlook the fact of the Church being thus constituted. 'What is the natural result of such a mistake?' 'People lose sight of the Church as the means, instrument, or organ through which their spiritual blessings are appointed to flow.'"

"From whom are the rules and regulations of the Christian Church derived? 'From Christ himself.'"

"What was thought in the early Church of persons who separate themselves from the fellowship of the Apostles, or who refused to acknowledge the power of the Bishops who succeeded them? 'They were considered guilty of schism.'"

"But does the assertion that the Church the only duly appointed channel of grace, include the assertion that God will not permit His grace to flow through any other channel? If no man is to be limited by the will of the Omnipotent. We could not, with the evidence that is before us of the personal piety of many who are in the Church, assume that their piety is the work of anything but the grace of God Himself. And even if we had no such evidence, we might not form a correct opinion as to whether or not they are in the dark. But we may be sure that in such cases the gift is bestowed by God's infinite mercy, not because but in spite of the rejection of God's appointed means. With the knowledge we possess, we dare not, indeed, seek for or expect the promise of blessing either of the gift of grace, or of the grace which He has appointed. And while we rejoice that God does not, to others less instructed, deny a large measure of His Spirit, we will ever lament that any should, in ignorance, reject His appointed means, and thus be shut out from the blessing of the error under which they labor. In conclusion, we shall quote the words of our correspondent's own Diocesan, as setting forth, far better than we can, the sentiments which Churchmen should entertain both in regard to Presbyterians and Presbyterians:—

"When we look, indeed, on classes of men in the mass, we may fairly doubt whether we should not be more inclined to sympathize with the Presbyterians, as under that which we believe to be revealed—I mean the graces of love and gentleness, reverence and meekness, and unworldliness, and a lowly and childlike mind."

"At the same time I gladly and reverently bow before the fact, that under a system which wants, as I believe, (independently of other doctrinal objections to it) the authority and completeness of an Apostolic commission, the work of Divine grace is wrought, and the reign of Satan is broken. I see the mastery of passion checked and bridle amidst the temptations of youth, by a principle of love and duty to the Great Giver. I see the energy of manhood devoted to the pursuit of the noblest and most laborious of love. In the stillness and order which prevades for the most part, the great city where my lot is cast, on the Christian's Sabbath, to a degree in this respect perhaps unexampled, except in Scotland, I see a token of deep homage to the word and will of God, and of the influence of His Spirit upon the minds of men engaged in the most exciting and engrossing occupations. I see mourners endowed with the grace of resignation, and comforted by all the hopes and consolations of the gospel, and their sorrow sanctified by the growth of love. In the stillness and order which prevades for the most part, the great city where my lot is cast, on the Christian's Sabbath, to a degree in this respect perhaps unexampled, except in Scotland, I see a token of deep homage to the word and will of God, and of the influence of His Spirit upon the minds of men engaged in the most exciting and engrossing occupations. I see mourners endowed with the grace of resignation, and comforted by all the hopes and consolations of the gospel, and their sorrow sanctified by the growth of love. In the stillness and order which prevades for the most part, the great city where my lot is cast, on the Christian's Sabbath, to a degree in this respect perhaps unexampled, except in Scotland, I see a token of deep homage to the word and will of God, and of the influence of His Spirit upon the minds of men engaged in the most exciting and engrossing occupations. I see mourners endowed with the grace of resignation, and comforted by all the hopes and consolations of the gospel, and their sorrow sanctified by the growth of love. In the stillness and order which prevades for the most part, the great city where my lot is cast, on the Christian's Sabbath, to a degree in this respect perhaps unexampled, except in Scotland, I see a token of deep homage to the word and will of God, and of the influence of His Spirit upon the minds of men engaged in the most exciting and engrossing occupations. I see mourners endowed with the grace of resignation, and comforted by all the hopes and consolations of the gospel, and their sorrow sanctified by the growth of love. In the stillness and order which prevades for the most part, the great city where my lot is cast, on the Christian's Sabbath, to a degree in this respect perhaps unexampled, except in Scotland, I see a token of deep homage to the word and will of God, and of the influence of His Spirit upon the minds of men engaged in the most exciting and engrossing occupations. I see mourners endowed with the grace of resignation, and comforted by all the hopes and consolations of the gospel, and their sorrow sanctified by the growth of love. In the stillness and order which prevades for the most part, the great city where my lot is cast, on the Christian's Sabbath, to a degree in this respect perhaps unexampled, except in Scotland, I see a token of deep homage to the word and will of God, and of the influence of His Spirit upon the minds of men engaged in the