

Original Poetry.

ADDRESS TO BRITAIN.

Hail, Britain!—Empress of the earth, all hail!
Hail to thy glory, majesty and might,
Thy heart-born faith and palms of rich renown!

MILTON.

(From Blackwood's Magazine.)

MILTON owned and shewed himself a son of the time. Gifted with powers eminently qualified for severe investigation—apt for learning, and learned beyond most men—of a temper ardent and rebellious...

The purpose of the Paradise Lost is wholly religious. He strikes the loudest, and, at the same time, the sweetest-toned harp of the Muse with the hand of a Christian theologian.

The justifying answer he reads in the Scriptures. Man fell, tempted from without by another, but by the act of his own free-will, and by his own choice.

The narrative of the Fall, delivered with an awful and a pathetic simplicity to us in a few words in the first chapters of Genesis, becomes accordingly the groundwork of the Poem; and these few words, with a few more scattered through the Scriptures, and barely hinting Celestial transactions, the War and Fall of the Angels, are, by a genius, as daringly, as powerfully creative, expanded into the mighty dimensions of an Epic.

Unless the Paradise Lost had risen from the soul of Milton as a hymn—unless he had begun to sing as a worshipper with his hands uplifted before the altar of incense, the choice of the subject would have been more than bold—it would have been the daring of presumption—an act of impiety.

“Self-knowing, and from thence Magnanimous to correspond with heaven” that capacity of song which nothing but sacred Epics could satisfy. Didadi asks him, “Quid Stules” and he answers, “Meherele, Immortalitatem!”

Another letter, dated the same year, from the Rev. James Scovell, is too instructive to be omitted. He says, July 6, 1767:—“The church people in my cure appear to have a serious sense of religion, and a hearty love and affection to our excellent church, which makes them greatly lament the deplorable condition of the church in these parts, for want of resident bishops, to ordain, govern, and confirm those of our own communion. They who live in England, where the church is truly militant state here in New England, where the dissenters take occasion to insult and revile us, even for want of that discipline which they so unjustly and clamorously oppose. Though they would be thought the greatest friends to liberty, yet I doubt not they would think it a great degree of oppression, and even persecution, to be obliged themselves to go 3000 miles for what they judged essential to the perfection of their church, and I trust in God we are as conscientious in the profession of the truth and adherence to the most pure and primitive church in the world, as they can be in their errors. They have plentifully reproached us with the hated name of Jacobites, persons disaffected to the present royal family, of blessed memory; but when the stamp act brought our loyalty to the test, I think God the scale turned greatly in our favour. While we sensibly feel all these disadvantages, it fills us with grief and concern to find the venerable Society declining to open any more missions in New England. They, under God, by their generous bounty and pious liberality, have been the nursing fathers and chief supporters of the languishing church in this land, for which unexpressed favour our warmest sentiments of gratitude and duty will always attend them; and we most humbly and earnestly beg the continuance of their patronage and kind assistance, so long as our circumstances continue upon all accounts so truly pitiable.”

The following address to the Society from the clergy assembled in annual convention, states some particulars which are worth recording; but is now quoted to shew that the clergy of New England had more correct views as to the best mode of binding a colony to the mother country than statesmen and politicians at home:

LABOURS OF THE EARLY MISSIONARIES IN AMERICA.

(From the British Magazine.)

[CONTINUED FROM OUR LAST.]

CONNECTICUT. The following address to the Society from the clergy assembled in annual convention, states some particulars which are worth recording; but is now quoted to shew that the clergy of New England had more correct views as to the best mode of binding a colony to the mother country than statesmen and politicians at home:

“Rev. Sir,—The clergy of this and the neighbouring government of Rhode Island, both missionaries and others, being now together at their annual convention, beg leave to mention to the Society some few things relative to these churches. In general, the missions of these governments are in a laudable state, but we are sorry to say that Christ Church, in Boston, is still affected, and greatly suffers by the divisions that prevail in it. The church at Cambridge, which has been in an unsettled condition ever since Mr. Apthorp's resignation, is now happily supplied by the arrival of the Rev. Mr. Sergeant.

“At Taunton, Mr. Lion is labouring very diligently, and not without good success, supported only with the small encouragement of 30l. sterling per annum and his parsonage. His labours are likewise extended to Bridgewater, the distance of ten miles, and sometimes to Middleborough, about fifteen miles.

“The globe of Taunton may be worth about 6l. sterling per annum, and the people have lately built a new and very decent parsonage-house, and in other respects have faithfully exerted themselves towards Mr. Lion's support; we cannot therefore but hope the Society will encourage their attachment, and his industry and usefulness by making some further provision for his maintenance. We understand by the Rev. Mr. Bailey that the Society have agreed to establish a mission upon Kennebec River, when the people can find a suitable person to recommend for that purpose. They conceive they have now found such a one, and have accordingly recommended Mr. W. Wheeler, the bearer of this, who is well known to several of us, and deservedly bears the character of a person of sound principles and good morals, firmly attached to our government and constitution, both in church and state, and from whom we conceive the Society may promise themselves a faithful and prudent missionary, if they shall think proper to employ him.

It is, however, a great discouragement to those who would offer themselves to the service of these American churches that they are still obliged to submit to the danger and expense of a voyage of one thousand leagues long to qualify themselves for that service. Since the first settlement of Christianity, so large a continent as this was never known without a resident bishop. We flattered ourselves that such an extensive territory was heretofore possessed, and hath since been added to the British dominions by the late war, would certainly have been followed by some provision of this kind; but especially the late popular tumults in these colonies, we imagined, would have strongly pointed out the necessity of such a step towards the uniting and attaching the colonies to the mother country, and have silenced every objection that could be raised against it.

“We are too remote and inconsiderable to approach the throne, yet, could his Majesty hear the voice of so distant a people, the request for American bishops would appear to be the cry of many thousands of his most faithful subjects. We do, however, think ourselves happy in this, that the Society will omit no favourable opportunity of representing the advantages that may accrue to these colonies, to religion, and to the British interests, by condescending to this our request.

“We bless God for the great and good effects of the Society's care and attention to these colonies, and hope it will please God that they may become instrumental in obtaining this further invaluable blessing of resident bishops for America.

“We are, with great veneration, the Society's dutiful and obedient, and, Rev. Sir, your most humble servants,

- EDWARD BASS. JOHN CANER.
EDWARD WINSLOW. JOHN USHER.
S. FAYWEATHER. EBENE. THOMPSON.
JACOB BAILEY. WILL. M'GILCHRIST.
J. WINGATE WEEKS. JOHN TROUTBECK.
A. WALLER. W. SERGEANT.
JOHN LION. JAMES GREATON.

“Boston, June 7, 1767.” The missionaries kept up for three-quarters of a century their importunate demand for resident bishops; and these appeals and remonstrances, though unavailing for the time, may not be without their use for the statesmen and churchmen of a country which is still mistress of so many of our colonies.

“We cannot but flatter ourselves that our superiors will be made sensible of the importance and necessity of settling an episcopate in America, in regard to the interest of religion, the obliging their best friends, the safety and security of the Government, when we have so powerful and reputable a body as the venerable board to solicit in our favour. God have mercy upon us, if the provinces here should throw off their connection, dependence, and subjection to the mother country; for, how much sorer they are divided in religious sentiment among themselves, yet they can unite heart and hand to oppose and check, if possible, the growth and progress of our holy church, which, like rising Christianity, springs up and flourishes, out of their religious confusions; and extremely sorry, indeed, we were to find the venerable board so reluctant to establish any more new missions in and about New England, in consequence of late clamours; whereas I think it impossible the present missionaries can supply the spiritual wants of the people.”

Another letter, dated the same year, from the Rev. James Scovell, is too instructive to be omitted. He says, July 6, 1767:—“The church people in my cure appear to have a serious sense of religion, and a hearty love and affection to our excellent church, which makes them greatly lament the deplorable condition of the church in these parts, for want of resident bishops, to ordain, govern, and confirm those of our own communion. They who live in England, where the church is truly militant state here in New England, where the dissenters take occasion to insult and revile us, even for want of that discipline which they so unjustly and clamorously oppose. Though they would be thought the greatest friends to liberty, yet I doubt not they would think it a great degree of oppression, and even persecution, to be obliged themselves to go 3000 miles for what they judged essential to the perfection of their church, and I trust in God we are as conscientious in the profession of the truth and adherence to the most pure and primitive church in the world, as they can be in their errors. They have plentifully reproached us with the hated name of Jacobites, persons disaffected to the present royal family, of blessed memory; but when the stamp act brought our loyalty to the test, I think God the scale turned greatly in our favour. While we sensibly feel all these disadvantages, it fills us with grief and concern to find the venerable Society declining to open any more missions in New England. They, under God, by their generous bounty and pious liberality, have been the nursing fathers and chief supporters of the languishing church in this land, for which unexpressed favour our warmest sentiments of gratitude and duty will always attend them; and we most humbly and earnestly beg the continuance of their patronage and kind assistance, so long as our circumstances continue upon all accounts so truly pitiable.”

The following address to the Society from the clergy assembled in annual convention, states some particulars which are worth recording; but is now quoted to shew that the clergy of New England had more correct views as to the best mode of binding a colony to the mother country than statesmen and politicians at home:

the effecting of which, if the degeneracy of the age is such that the political and religious interest of the nation cannot prevail, what other arguments have we reason to hope will?”

“I will only add, for the sake of the best of churches,” says Dr. Johnson, 1769, “that, though I am sensible nothing can be done as to providing an American episcopate, in the present unhappy condition of things, yet I do humbly hope and confide that the venerable Society will never lose sight of that most important object till it is accomplished, for, till then, the church here must be so far from flourishing, that she must dwindle and be contemptible in the eyes of all the other denominations.”

THE CLERGY AND LAITY.

(From Poole on the admission of lay members to the Synods of the Church in Scotland.)

Every true Christian Church is a body of men associated for religious purposes, and composed of two distinct classes,—the clergy and the laity: the clergy especially and divinely set apart for sacred offices: the laity exercising the duties, and receiving the privileges of religion, in the midst of temporal occupations and secular affairs. But the clergy are thus set apart not for their own benefit only, but for the benefit of the Church in general, and their lay brethren among the rest; and the laity also are bound to employ their temporal opportunities not for themselves exclusively, but for the Church in general, and for their clerical brethren among the rest. They who minister at the altar, minister for those who partake of the altar; and this is one out of a thousand applications of the general principles of communion, and of the reciprocal rights and privileges on which it is founded.

Compacted by these reciprocal duties and privileges, but still more truly and effectually by ordinances and sacraments, and by a Divine and mystical agency which animates all with one spirit, and sanctifies all with one grace, clergy and laity together form but one body. The clergy alone no more constitute the Church, either in a spiritual, in an ecclesiastical, or in a political sense, than do the laity alone; and the Church has no existence, no duties, no rights, no authority, except as it is composed of both clergy and laity. It is because they forget this that they continually hear persons speaking of the Church as if it were only an hierarchy. If regulations of any kind are proposed for the prosperity of the Church, they start at the sound as if it meant the abridgement of the clergy: if the Church is said to be in danger, they only think of the fall of mitres and the impoverishing of benefices. The real truth is, that the Church's privilege and authority belong to the whole body, whoever may be their immediate recipients and executors; and whoever maintains them, whether he be lay or clerical, maintains his own rights and his own patrimony.

And the part of the laity in the Church is no more purely political, than the part of the clergy is purely spiritual. Nothing could be less just than to deny to the laity a spiritual character, although they are not appointed to spiritual offices. The sacraments which the ministers distribute, and the laity partake with them, are spiritual; the one (that is Holy Baptism) originating the other (that is the blessed Eucharist) continuing a spiritual character in the recipients. The minister offers up spiritual lauds and prayers for his flock. Even external discipline has a spiritual object, and would be both absurd and unjust, if exercised over those who are not members of the Church spiritual as well as visible. And finally and principally, the ever blessed Fountain and Stream of a true spiritual character, without whom no external sacrament or rite can be to any purpose, even the Holy Ghost, is purchased by Christ for His whole Church; and sent from Him and from the Father, not exclusively upon any order of men, but upon all, from the highest order of the clergy to the least and lowest of the laity who maintain their spiritual character. As the precious unguent poured upon Aaron's head, flowed not only over his own beard, but even to the skirts of his clothing; so does that spiritual stream of a holy character, flow from the Head of the Church, not on those only whose office is sacred, but on those also whose character is sanctified: not only upon those who are just it is to govern, but on those also who minister in spiritual things. And so it is that the mystical temple of Christ “grown together in Christ, which is the Head: from whom the whole body fully joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body.”

And this is, indeed, the right clew to the interpretation of those passages of Scripture in which all Christ's people are designated as priests, and which have been perverted into an authority for the exercise of clerical functions by the laity. It is the spiritual character, not the spiritual office, of every Christian, of which St. Peter speaks, when he says: “Ye also, as living stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices unto God by Jesus Christ.” And again: “Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people.” So also when St. John says: “Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God the Father: to Him be glory and dominion for ever and ever;” and when Moses declares of the Israelites, as they typified the Christian Church: “Ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation.” They convey an assurance to us not of the priestly office, but of the spiritual character and privileges of every member of the Church of Christ.

And it is as partaking in this spiritual character with them that the laity share with the clergy in many other things. They have the same privilege of the Christian altar, and for their children the same privilege of the Christian font: the promises of God to them are the same; and spiritual benefits, both present and future, clergy and laity share together: their duties are almost all of them in common, varying principally in the external manner in which they are to be performed; and even when there is the most apparent exclusion of the laity from the ceremonial, they are by no means excluded from the authority which sanctions the ceremonial. It would be most wicked and presumptuous for a layman to take on himself the ordination of another, or the consecration of the Eucharist; but it would be nothing short of heresy, though a new heresy, to deny that the Bishop and the priest perform these acts with that authority which is vested in the Church, as a society of faithful men, lay as well as clerical. It is in the name, not of the clergy, but of the Church, that the Bishop confirms and ordains; that the minister pronounces absolution and a blessing; that discipline is enforced, and penitents are restored; and in all these cases the minister is the representative and instrument not of the clergy, nor of his individual Bishop, but of the Church at large. But it is not only in the authority and privileges of the Church, but in its responsibility also, that the laity are included. If a Church fall into heresy, or error of doctrine, or of practice, though the hierarchy may be the chief instigators and movers of such error, yet the laity, still maintaining their communion, are necessarily involved in their sin. And so, on the other hand, if the laity fall into spiritual error, the clergy also are responsible, and involved in the sin. It mattered not whether it were the heresy of the Nicolaitans, or the religious indifference of the body of a Church which had left its first love: the candle-

stick was removed not from the clergy only in the one case, nor from the laity only in the other, but all were swept away together. The laity among the Arians were not excused because they left the Catholic faith in company with their Bishops; nor were those of the clergy who, in later days, cast off episcopal authority because of the clamours of the people, thus justified. God only can precisely judge of the degree of sin in parties thus situated; but, as a point of sound theory in religion and theology, the clergy are concerned in the errors of their flocks; the laity are involved in the heresies and schisms, and other ecclesiastical crimes of their Bishops and pastors.

This mutual responsibility of clergy and laity would result even from the principles of a civil polity, of the nature of which the Church, as a society, necessarily partakes: but they follow still more manifestly among the consequences of her spiritual union; and are plainly stated in the sacred Scriptures, by the rules of which the Church is ever to be judged. Surely nothing can be clearer than the words of St. Paul:—“Whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; or one member be honoured, all the members rejoice with it; now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular.”

Thus we see that, in matters purely spiritual, the laity are very seriously responsible for the proceedings of the Church as carried on, well or ill, by its appointed ministers. How greatly they are interested in the same matters, needs not to be proved at much length; since the validity of the Sacraments, the soundness of doctrine, the catholicity of fellowship certainly concern them quite as nearly as the clergy themselves. But so soon as we take into consideration those matters in which the Church partakes of the nature of a civil polity, we find the interest of the laity in its regulations so much increased, that sometimes they are even more nearly concerned than the clergy themselves. A single line of George Herbert will illustrate these principles: he says—

“The Scriptures bid us fast—the Church says now.”

Here, in the scriptural part (the propriety and benefit of fasting), laity and clergy are concerned equally; but so soon as the Church exerts its authority in the way of polity (to determine the time), the laity, upon whose secular habits a religious exercise makes a greater incursion, are by far the most concerned. The same thing holds in every rule for the regulation of penance or communion, for the determining of the proper recipients of baptism, the proper candidates for holy orders, and the like. And to go a step farther: there are parts of the ecclesiastical polity which are spiritual only by accident, and indirectly, such as the means used in collecting funds for charitable or religious purposes, and for the carrying on of the government of the Church; and in these the immediate and direct interest of the laity is altogether paramount. These, which are the true Church principles on the subject of the clergy and the laity, will be sufficient to answer the charge of priestcraft against those of the clergy who enforce sound principles on this subject; and to make those of the laity who wish to act up to the high principles which they profess, feel that as Churchmen they possess a sacred character which must not be lightly compromised, and spiritual privileges which they may well worth contending for, against the low principles of dissenters and quakers.

ALLEGIANCE TO THE CHURCH.

(A letter from Bishop Hobart to a Lady who had come to the resolution of leaving our Communion.)

New York, March 19, 1813.

MADAM,—I have no doubt that you do not suppose me ignorant of your disposition to leave our Church, and to join the communion of another. I have made some unsuccessful efforts to see you, in order to converse with you on this subject; and should have persevered in my intention, if I had not supposed that such an interview would not be agreeable to you. Considering, however, my station in the Church, and the relation which I bear to you as a minister of the congregation to which you belong, I hope you will not deem it a violation of esteem and respect, if I earnestly entreat you to review very seriously those considerations which induce you to forsake the Church which has been your spiritual home, and in which your first vows were made to God. In which Church, and in its doctrine, apostolic and valid in its ministry, and primitive, pure and evangelical in its worship, can never be justifiable. I make no invidious comparisons of our Church with others; but certainly, whatever may be the imperfections of the preaching of its ministers, its doctrines are sound and scriptural, and its ministry apostolic; and it possesses a blessing which cannot be too highly prized,—a pure, primitive and evangelical form of worship. In this Church, providence has cast your lot. To leave it because you think you derived more edification from the preaching of others, believe me, Madam, can be in no respect justifiable. Our communion with the Divine Head of the Church is to be kept up principally by a participation in the ordinances and the worship of that Church, and not merely by attendance on preaching. If any person does not derive edification from the service of our Church in every part of which Jesus Christ and his merits and grace are set forth as our only hope and strength, the fault must be in himself, and not in the service of the Church or in its ministers. But this plea of greater edification from the preaching of others, makes the feelings of each individual, and not his judgement, the performance of the minister, and not the nature of the Church, the standard by which he determines with what Church to commune. A Church may be very unsound and erroneous in its doctrine, and the constitution of its ministry, and the mode of its worship; and yet if a person thinks he is edified by the preaching of a minister of that Church, according to this plea of edification, he is justifiable in joining it. This same plea of edification may, therefore, lead a person to attach himself to any Church in which his feelings happen to be interested. I have known it urged as a reason for joining the Roman Catholic Church.

Let me then, earnestly and respectfully ask you, Madam, if you are able to prove that the Church in which providence has placed you, is unscriptural in doctrine—that its ministry is not valid—or that its mode of worship is not primitive and evangelical? Unless you are satisfied that this is the case, believe me—and pardon my plainness—in leaving that Church, you will discover to the world, a change of blessing which will cause you “good to be evil spoken of;” and you will be guilty of the sin of schism, which, however it may be considered by the world, an inspired apostle considered as a “deadly sin.” And, Madam, let me also respectfully remind you, that even if you were justifiable in leaving our Church, you would not be correct in joining any other, until you had read its confession of faith—and ascertained that all its doctrines, as well as its ministry, and mode of worship, were scriptural, apostolic, and primitive. I have thus endeavoured to discharge my conscience of the guilt which, I conceive, will be incurred in forsaking the communion of the Church; and believe me, that all my remarks have been directed by sincere esteem and respect for you. On this subject, you and I will both have to render an account to our Master in Heaven. To His grace and blessing I recommend you. I remain, very sincerely,

Your friend and brother, J. H. H.

THE CHURCH AT HOME AND IN THE COLONIES.

(From a Speech of the Bishop of Fredericton.)

The occasion on which we are met then is rendered doubly pleasant inasmuch as it shows the principle of expansiveness that belongs to it, and the growing power of our beloved Church. It shows that the time has come, when, if I may express it, God will lengthen her cords and strengthen her stakes. It shows that whatever divisions may arise among us,—and no man can lament these more than I do,—there is within the Church itself, a growing and fruitifying power that proves her sound at heart, and which could not be manifested did this soundness and healthiness not exist. We all know that in a person about to die, the coldness is first perceived about the extremities, and if therefore we find the extremities continue warm, we indulge the hope that there is a power about the heart sufficient to cause the vital organs to continue the performance of their functions. So also when we find the Church sending forth her missionaries to the distant colonies of the empire, and her Clergy and her Bishops giving to these their support, we may feel assured that God is also giving his blessing, and that in his good time and manner all will be found right at last. Of this I feel assured, that in going forth to a distant colony, unless we do this in the spirit of hope, we may as well not go at all. With what advantage should I go forth as a missionary of the Church, to a distant land, if I were in despair of the Church at home? Of what use would it be for me to attempt to carry out among colonists of New Brunswick the liturgy of the Church; to express an affectionate zeal for their welfare; to seek to multiply churches and clergymen among them; and to exhibit to them there the Church in all its fullness and imposing grandeur, if I felt at the same time that there was decay in the Church at home? But I have no such feeling. I am confident that the more we exert ourselves to give to those who are at a distance the Church in all its fullness and efficiency, the more surely will this be returned in blessings upon ourselves. I will now take the liberty of stating before you what the actual position in spiritual things of New Brunswick is. In doing this, however, I shall pass no censure on any, I shall neither look to the right hand nor to the left, but proceed simply to state that matters there having relation to the Church are totally dissimilar from any thing we find in England. The government, from whatever cause,—for I know not, neither will I stop to enquire,—are, in the colonies, acting rather upon the numerical principle,—giving assistance to various denominations of Christians, but scarcely recognizing the Church as an Established Church, only allowing her to take her own position as she may be able by her own exertions to attain it. Whether this be right or wrong, I repeat, I shall not stop to discuss. It is sufficient for me to know that the fact is so, and foolish would it indeed be if I did not consider this in all its effects and bearings, before entering on the subject of what ought to be done for the colonies, with a view to relieving these from a state of spiritual destitution. The disadvantages of a state of things such as this are obvious, and therefore, I need not dwell upon them for a moment on the other side, and consider the way in which the Bishop of a colonial church is affected by them.—It binds him at the outset to look not so much to his connection with the State, as to the spiritual power and authority given him by the Lord Jesus. It leads him to look far above the favour of princes and of monarchs, and strengthening the ties that bind him to his flock, causes him to feel that the more he can unite the several orders of these together, the more will his Church flourish, and that whatever earthly princes may smile or frown, he will still be enabled to carry out the Gospel of Christ, in all its fullness and Apostolic purity, and to make his Jerusalem a praise and a glory in the earth.

I again say that in these remarks I cast no censure on any. I do not do this either as regards the State, or individuals, and I beg of you that on this point I may be distinctly understood. I merely say this, that we cannot shut our eyes to, indeed should be wrong, did we endeavour to shut our eyes to the fact, that no distinction is made between truth and error, and when too it appears to be openly professed that the State cannot have a conscience. Then indeed it is that the Church must be taught more and more to rely on its resources, and the people of England must be plainly told that the due and proper support of the Church depends on their own exertions. In the colony of New Brunswick eighty-seven parishes, and there are forty-seven Churches and thirty Clergymen. Thus a single Clergyman has often the charge of two or three Churches,—these too at great distances from each other, and it does sometimes happen that one Clergyman has charge of a district of 120 miles in extent. Thus many parishes are left without the ordinances of religion, as far as regards these being ministered in a right way according to our opinions of the Church of England, or in such a manner as is most conducive to the purity and spread of the Gospel. I mention these things that you may see what is necessary to be done, and I trust, if God's blessing shall attend me, I may yet live to see the day when the same result shall follow, which gladdened the heart of my right reverend friend Bishop Coleridge in his own Diocese at Barbadoes,—when the clergy of New Brunswick shall be doubled,—may be tripled, as these ought to be at once in that country, to ensure even an approach to efficient pastoral superintendence. [Bishop Medley now, in his own name and on behalf of New Brunswick, thanked Bishop Coleridge for the most touching and affectionate appeal he had made in their behalf; and spoke of the pleasing recollection he should ever have of the time of meeting him in that place, in company too with one whom but lately he had been accustomed to look up to as his spiritual father in Christ. He then proceeded further to speak of the wants of New Brunswick.] It wanted men,—not the refuse of England, and those who cannot be employed at home, but the best blood of England it is that is wanted there. There is also wanted in that country efficient men for the Ministry,—not those who cannot pass the examination, before their Bishop in England, but men zealous in their calling, and anxious for the promotion of the Holy Communion to which they belong. Bishop Medley next spoke of the population of New Brunswick, now amounting to 150,000 souls, and this number continually increasing. And proceeding further to speak of New Brunswick, and the state and wants of the Church there, he concluded his address by taking an affectionate leave of the kind friends who were assembled there. He could not, he said, but recollect that life is short and uncertain, and hequeered as his had been with sickness and with sorrow, it might be God's will that he was taking leave of them for the last time. But however this might be,—wherever he might journey, or whatever came, while life remained in him, he should never forget that day.

UNITY OF THE CHURCH.

(From the New York Churchman.)

The question of union is demanding an answer.—It is forcing itself upon the minds of the thoughtful and the sober every where. In every sect, in every city, in every village, the learned and the unlearned are asking themselves, “Is this the true state of Christianity—this pitiful sect-struggle—this miserable sect partition? or should we all be one?” And whatsoever evasions or mock answers men have hith-