

us what we would view as a CRIME. I hope, therefore, you will withdraw it; if not, with every disposition to be respectful, in my own name and that of my brethren and our people, I pronounce it a SLANDER.

Of your remarks on Mr. Roaf's speech I take no notice, because Mr. R. is very able to answer for himself should he deem any reply necessary; and because the position which you occupy not merely entitles you, to defend your principles and your brethren when you judge them unfairly dealt with, but imposes their defence on you as a duty.

Begging, (what I conceive I might claim as an act of simple justice,) the insertion of this in your paper at your earliest convenience, I subscribe myself,

Yours respectfully,

A. LILLIE,
Secretary to the Congregational Union
of Canada West.

Toronto, 20th June, 1842.

The Harbinger.

MONTREAL, JULY 15, 1842.

SPIRIT OF "THE CHURCH."—We elsewhere insert a letter from the Rev. A. Lillie of Toronto, to the Editor of the "Church," in contradiction of a calumny which the latter ventured to advance against the Congregational body,—and which, after the lapse of a sufficient time to deprive him of the plea of unreflecting haste, he has repeated in terms still more offensive. But for the "stubborn fact" that it is otherwise, we should have deemed it impossible that any one pretending to so much historical knowledge as might suffice even for a partizan, could call in question, much less deny, the loyalty of a body so distinguished for the virtuous and high-minded support which they have ever given to the just claims of civil government, and who, from the revolution of 1688 to the present hour, have been the warm, devoted, and self-denied upholders of the throne of England. This Editor must, indeed, be much at a loss for materials wherewith to make good his unrighteous accusation, when he resorts to the stale and hackneyed witticism of *Salmasius*, touching the death of that "glorious martyr," Charles I., and attributes this to the operation of Congregational principles!! Yet consistency, even in error and absurdity, claims some measure of respect, and the interests of society, controlled as they are by a wisdom which "out of evil still educes good," may ultimately be promoted by this Editor's characteristic disregard of truth and honesty.

We are therefore, rather pleased than otherwise to find him in a foot-note to Dr. Bagot's episcopal charge, speaking thus of the infamous *Laud*—"Archbishop *Laud*, of blessed and glorious memory." *Blessed and glorious* indeed! although the meek and lovely *Leighton* was condemned by him, as the punishment for his protest against prelacy, and for this alone, to lose his ears, to have his nose slit, and his forehead branded with the initial letters of the words "*sedition slanderer*,"—and after all this cruel mutilation, to pay a fine of £10,000! In such records of tyranny and blood, the "*blessed memory*" of *Laud* has long been embalmed, and, now that England has become ashamed of the "*glorious*" deposit, our consistent contemporary claims the honour of preserving it. Who shall dispute his claim? Where could the admirers of the "*glorious*" Archbishop find a more befitting cenotaph than the pages of "*The Church*?"

CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLES.

NO. II.

OUR first paper concluded with an explicit disclaimer of all human authority, in matters of religion. Such authority, by whomsoever asserted and maintained, is a direct and presumptuous usurpation of the Divine prerogative; and is, besides, as foolish and as futile, as it is positively criminal. The mind of man, cannot, in any instance, be the object of legislative enactment, since its thoughts and feelings, being beyond the reach of human observation, are to the same extent, and for the same reason, beyond its jurisdiction. Human authority, indeed, when aided in its exercise by civil power, may prescribe certain forms of words, and certain external practical observances; and in the event of disobedience, may exact its penalties, and inflict its punishments; but, in the absence of words and actions, it has no means of judging, as to the existence or non-existence of religious sentiment; and every page of history demonstrates, how easily hypocrisy can impose upon the keenest perspicacity of man, and how, when human authority, civil or ecclesiastical, has dared to enact laws for conscience, and arrogate the right to rule over "the thoughts and intents of the heart"—the effect has been either to engender duplicity and reduce religion to a mere routine of barren formalities; or else, to rouse the spirit of resistance to a species of tyranny, of all others the most revolting, because