

the well-tuned fervour of James Montgomery.—Such are the authorities who hold sway over us. Such are the men of influence to whom we cannot refuse homage. Almost each of them is what Homer calls Agamemnon, *anax andron*—a king of men.

Now, the sum of the whole matter is this—that in the formation of opinion touching points of speculation, policy, or practice, we are to yield a wise deference to authority, but still to push our investigations, and to mature our judgment, both in a spirit of independence and in a spirit of sobriety, not afraid to think amiss, for no opinion can be formed without incurring proportionate responsibility.

Then in regard to the highest and holiest, the counsel is—"Prove all things, hold fast that which is good." On this principle, you may become, under the favour of God, true men and true christians. Up from the lethargy of unthinking submission to self constituted authority! Dare to be free—prove all things—cast your soul on the trial and examination of whatever presents itself to be accepted or approved. There is dross, but there is also fine gold. Hold fast that which is good.

POPERY.—CURIOUS FACTS AS TO THE SETTLEMENT OF LORD BALTIMORE.

QUEBEC, 9th Dec., 1852.

MR. EDITOR,—

Nothing is more common than to hear Roman Catholics and lax Protestants, lauding to the skies the supposed liberal and tolerant spirit of Lord Baltimore, and the settlers of the colony of Maryland, in contrast with the opposite features of the Puritan settlers in New England. It may not be generally known—at least not so generally as it ought—that the charter granted to the Calvert family, in 1631, conceals entirely the fact, that that family belonged to another communion than the Church of England, and represents the only object of the charter to be "the extension and support of the Christian religion;" and it gives the *patronage of all the churches* to the proprietor, not only such as were then built, but all such as "might hereafter happen to be built;" and mark what follows: "the same to be dedicated and consecrated according to the ecclesiastical laws of the kingdom of England!" Moreover, Baltimore was to hold all the privileges, civil and sacred, that appertained to "any Bishop of Durham in the kingdom of England" and these rights and immunities every one knows to be very extensive indeed. Here is a fine specimen of Popish duplicity and Jesuitical fraud, at the very opening of this much lauded colony of Lord Baltimore—this field on which alone the fruits of liberty and toleration were supposed to grow, while all the rest of the land was naught! Could such a charter have been granted, had the truth been known to the rulers of England in those days? or was there a conspiracy betwixt Baltimore and the Ministry at home, for an iniquitous and base end? Take it either way, the fact is discreditable to the parties who enacted it, and it adds just another specimen to the numerous instances of Popish cunning and Jesuitical chicanery.

I do not mean to question the fact, that the laws for the settlement of the colony and its government were, many of them, pure and liberal, and that toleration was granted and enjoyed in it, at a time when in other colonies of the west a different scene was exhibited. We know, however, that many who were not Roman Catholics were subjected in those colonies to great oppression; and we need not be surprised to find that a colony really, though not openly, destined for the reception of Roman Catholics, should have taken care to secure for them the most ample privileges. The late meeting at Dublin, of the "equality" men, Lucas of the *Tablet*, and others, throws some light on this matter; and the refusal of these people, even to look at the plain pleadings of Sir Culling Eardley, in the case of the Ma-

diais, affords an affecting exception to the claim of liberality and toleration, so dazingly put forward by the Popish faction. If the Baltimore platform was really so excellent, let Lucas, Cahill, and Cojust follow it out more faithfully, and they and we will never quarrel on that subject.

But the fact must not be overlooked, that from the earliest period of the settlement, *slavery*, in its worst form, was set up in Maryland! In the laws of Maryland, (1638,) it is expressly enacted, that the citizens and settlers shall consist of "all Christian people, *slaves only excepted*;" and this has been a sad plague-spot ever since.

The colonists of Massachusetts were specially invited to send a portion of their people to settle in Maryland, with a promise of the free exercise of their religion; but this proposal was coldly refused by the New Englanders, thus clearly proving, that even those who were feeling the severity of the intolerant laws of New England, rather chose to remain under them than connect themselves with a Roman Catholic colony, under the fairest offers of liberty. Nor need we want an explanation of this, from the very words of the Maryland Legislature, in 1649, who passed an act, in which occur the following clauses:—"Denying the Holy Trinity or the Godhead of any of the three persons, shall be punished with death." "Persons using reproachful words in speeches, concerning the blessed Virgin mother of our Saviour, for the first offence to pay five pounds sterling, or be publicly whipped and imprisoned; and for renewed offences of the kind, to forfeit lands and goods, and be for ever banished from the province." The apparently tolerant constitution of 1639, was thus substantially overthrown by that of 1649, and in 1676, we find these last regulations confirmed by public deed of the rulers of the province! History is assuredly the best exponent of Popery.

MR. EDITOR, YOURS, &c.

A PROTESTANT.

To the Editor of the Record.

ESQUENING, 18th Dec., 1852.

DEAR SIR,—

In the last number of the *Record* the reviewer of the *London Quarterly's* article on Dr. Hanna's life of the great Dr. Chalmers, has fallen into a mistake in making it appear that a certain Peter Taylor, a *grog-seller*, was the only person along with the patron that signed the call in favour of the intruder Young, to the parish of Auchterarder; this can easily be accounted for by the writer being taken up at the time with the still more atrocious Marnock case, where the *grog-seller* is displayed as a fossil formation of those errorists, who made provision "against the possible fallibility of the Church by the supposed infallibility of the court of Session!!" Dr. Buchanan's justly celebrated work, *the ten years' conflict*, (a work which ought to be read by every friend of truth,) is so rich and clear, in descriptive style, that a short paragraph from it on the Auchterarder case will not be uninteresting. "The signature appended to the deed of presentation was undoubtedly that of the patron, but not less undoubtedly the names adhibited to the call did not constitute, in any sense, the signature of the parish. Had the name of his Lordship's valet been the signature attached to the presentation, Lord Kinnoull could not have thought the Presbytery acted unreasonably, had they thrown the spurious deed over their table. And it should not have surprised either the patron or the presence, that this treatment was given to a call, which, taking to itself the style, title, and designation of 'we the heritors, elders, heads of families, and parishioners of the parish of Auchterarder,' a parish containing upwards of 3,000 souls, was signed by three individuals, only two of whom, a certain Michael Tod, and a certain Peter Clark, belonged to the parish! Sheridan's 'Three Tailors of Tooley-street,' were not a greater burlesque upon 'we the people of Eng-

land.' And farther he says, 'Michael Tod and Peter Clark were not the congregation of Auchterarder; and their call, though countersigned by the patron's factor, could never, without the grossest indecency, have been the basis of that solemn procedure, by which the Church of Scotland sets a man over the flock of Christ.'

Faithfully yours,

W. L.

We thank our friend from Esquening for his correction. Our mistake arose from the fact that, in quoting from memory, we confounded the two cases. Our error is amply compensated by the valuable appendix to our review, which the letter of W. L. contains.

ON THE ELDERSHIP.

From Lectures addressed to a Congregation.

No. I. EVIDENCE.

(Continued from last Number.)

3. Express statements of Scripture.

We have hitherto been arguing from analogy and by inference—but Scripture furnishes us with direct proofs in favour of the distinction we have been attempting to establish betwixt *teaching* and *ruling elders*. We appeal in the first place to 1 Cor., xii., 28. "God hath set some in the Church,—first, apostles—secondarily, prophets and thirdly, teachers—after that, miracles—then gifts of healings—*helps, governments, κωνομῶντες* diversities of tongues." In the preceding context the apostle institutes a comparison betwixt the Church of Christ and the human body. From the intimate union and mutual dependences existing amongst the members of the one, he illustrates the corresponding union and dependence which ought to exist amongst the members of the other. He adverts to the distinction subsisting betwixt the various members of the body, and the separate functions which they are severally appointed to perform—and then shows how the honour of the whole is involved in the efficient working of each individual part. It was natural for him therefore to apply the illustration by showing in the above verse—the similar classification amongst the members of the body of Christ, and the different offices which they are severally called on to fill. One of these classes he denominates "*governments*," by which we are plainly to understand those who govern in the church—or who act in the capacity of ruling Presbyters, as distinguished from those who rank third in the catalogue, under the title of "*teachers*."—That the two classes are separate from each other is clear from the preceding, but still more from the succeeding context "are all apostles, are all prophets, are all teachers,"—where their identity is explicitly denied, and the fact of their occupying different posts is as explicitly (by implication at least) asserted.

Rom. xii., 6—8. "Having then gifts differing according to the grace that is given to us—whether prophecy, let us prophecy according to the proportion of faith; or ministry, let us wait on our ministering, or he that teacheth on teaching; he that giveth let him do it with simplicity, he that *ruleth with diligence*," &c. The apostle here alludes to some of the leading offices which existed in the primitive church, and to the manner in which the duties of each ought to be discharged. Some of the members of the church at Rome, seem at this early period to have formed an overweening estimate of their own attainments, and to have regarded with somewhat contemptuous eye those of their brethren who did not occupy the same official station with themselves. The apostle therefore in one of the foregoing verses, affectionately warns them against "thinking of themselves more highly than they ought to think"—and exhibits the intimate relation in which as office bearers in the church they stand to each other, by the same illustration which he employs in the other passage to which we have