

more now that he is fallen, prone to transgression, environed with temptations, ready to forget the Lord altogether, does he require at least all the original appliances by which a love of virtue may be cultivated, a knowledge of truth acquired, and a guilty, empty, ignorant soul taught how its iniquities may be pardoned, and its heart replenished with the love and fear of the Eternal. In process of time, when religion had become altogether corrupted in the earth, God in mercy to the world gave his acts to Israel, and revealed his commandments to the tribes of Jacob. On Sinai, amid blackness, and darkness, and tempest, the Lord came down to proclaim his law, and there amid scenes more awfully sublime and terrifically grand than earth had ever witnessed before, or shall witness again, till the heavens and the earth flee away before the face of the omnipotent Judge, was the Sabbath law announced and enshrined amid the precepts of the decalogue, making it the grand connecting link between the two tables of duties as having a bearing on both, and so placing it amid the ten commands that it could not in its principles be removed, without the arch of the decalogue crumbling into ruins. And what is our argument here?—that every moral principle in the law of God is immutable, and necessarily so; and that whatever of moral principle there is in the law of the fourth commandment must remain in all its force to the end of time. Now what is there that is moral in that statute? 1st, That a certain determinate space of time must be set apart for sacred duties; 2d, That man is not the judge who is to determine what that amount or portion of time shall be; and, 3d, That the supreme Lawgiver, in the exercise of perfect wisdom, hath decreed and determined that one whole day in seven—a day to be measured precisely as the other days of the week are—actually a seventh portion of time—shall be hallowed, consecrated, set apart as His, for Him, for His service—and that decree, that determination He hath never recalled. I know how easy it is to meet this argument by attempted railery, and unmerited ridicule. If you are, say they, for the Sabbath law as given at Sinai, then you must take it as you find it among the Jews: there must be no kindling of fires, you must put the Sabbath-breaker to death, and adopt all the strictness and severity of the ceremonial age. Men who argue thus have need to be taught the distinction, so admirably made by Dr. Symington, between the moral and the positive, or between that which is moral, and, therefore, universally binding, and that which belonged to the political economy or the peculiar ritual of the Jews, and therefore, national or temporary. We contend not for the latter, it has passed away. Of what was written on the tables of stone by the finger of the Almighty, not a jot or tittle is gone. The ceremonial law was buried in the grave with Jesus, and buried there for ever. His cross stood as a gravestone above it—it had served its end—it had fulfilled its period, it was but the shadow of the good things to come, and it passed away, but the law remaineth in all its integrity; Christ came not to destroy that, but to fulfil it. Let but this reasoning be applied to the other commandments, and it will make havoc in the decalogue. Are there no judicial findings regarding idolatry, regarding theft, regarding fraud, regarding murder, &c., are these to be still enforced? Are we to have the worshippers of images stoned?—the eye for the eye, the tooth for the tooth? Or if not, are the commands regarding these evils to be held as antiquated, Jewish, ceremonial? There men easily distinguish between the immutable morality of the precept, and the injunctions adapted to the times, and the same rule of judgment will lead to a right conclusion regarding the law of the Sabbath. Passing down to the days of our Lord, we find the Sabbath kept by the blessed Saviour, and the Lord's-day, as you have heard in the able address of Mr Thomson, observed by the apostles, the disciples, the early church, and generally by Christians to the present time. True, the day is changed, but not without warrant and reason; the change, however, did not in the least affect the principle of the Sabbath law—it was made not by the will of man, but by that authority which alone is competent to order or appoint the alteration. The change of the day, already well argued out, does not come directly within the line of my argument, but I have no difficulty in meeting the questions, by whose authority was that alteration made, and when was it made? I answer, by the authority of Him who is Lord of the Sabbath, and immediately after his death on the cross. If this be denied or disputed, then, either the Jewish Sabbath is still binding and obligatory, or no Sabbath at all, except one sanctioned by human will; or if it is maintained that the Redeemer, by his death, abolished absolutely the whole of the Sabbatic law as previously existing, and that the apostolic church gradually introduced a new ordinance, grafting it on the old stock of the fourth commandment; then there was a period when God's commandments were reduced to nine, and the full complement was made up to ten by ecclesiastical power—and the Sabbath ceases to be the Lord's, so far as authority is concerned. And, verily, if we are to have our business and recreations, our profit and pleasure, followed out on that sacred day, it will be the merest mockery to talk of the obligations of the fourth commandment. I remember to have read in the history of the times when the Book of Sports was received in England, and its precepts inculcated by princes and pastors, that a minister, when catechising a parishioner of shrewd intellect and caustic wit, having asked the question, "How many commandments are there?" was answered, "Eight." "No," said he, "there are ten." "Nay, there are but eight, for the images in the churches have done away with the second, and the Book of Sports has abolished the fourth." Or leaving the history of the day, let us glance at the rea-

sons for its observance. God's right of property in our time, has that been changed? The necessity for providing for man's moral and spiritual culture, has that been diminished? God's blessed example in resting from all his works, has that been invalidated? Jehovah's blessing promised to all who keep his Sabbaths, is that less valuable now than heretofore? No, sir, our motives, our obligations to keep holy the Sabbath, are stronger far under the Gospel than ever they were under the law—and the mighty redemption achieved in the death and resurrection of Emmanuel, demands that it be held in perpetual remembrance, by a Sabbath on earth and a Sabbatism in heaven. Take the simplest reason for the original institution, the commemoration of the power and wisdom of the Creator expressed in his works: His word had gone forth, and the earth in its levelness, and the sky in its glories, started into being. No event so magnificent as creation had hitherto occurred in the universe of God, and the Sabbath which crowned that mighty work, was a monumental pillar Divinely raised up to perpetuate the remembrance of what the Lord had done; and as each week rolled on, it repeated its sacred testimony, of the wisdom, the goodness, the power, the glory, of the Great Architect of all. But, by and by, there was a new, a grander display of the attributes of Jehovah—God was manifest in the flesh—the brightness of the Father's glory became incarnate—Gethsemane, Calvary, the graveyard of Joseph of Arimathea, wrapped up in their glory, that excelleth all the wonders of the original creation. Redemption, embodying far more of God than the making of ten thousand worlds, by its very reticence obscured the brightness of his former work, and the new creation demanded a new memorial to the praise and glory of the God of our salvation. Yes, if the formation of the earth exhibited the workmanship of the Omnipotent, and unfolded a little of the resources of his wisdom, and goodness, and power, the salvation of the soul, through the atoning sacrifice of the Messiah, and its re-creation after the image of infinite purity by the power of the Holy Spirit, displays his compassion, and mercy, and love, and grace. The one allows us to witness the operations of his hands, the other opens up to us his heart of parental love, the meltings of his infinite tenderness, and the treasures of his rich and abounding grace. And to lessen or lower down the monument to his praise, to diminish under the new and better economy, the time for sacred rest and divine contemplations, is in our judgment to rob God, and be guilty of the basest ingratitude.

HIGHWAY ROBBERY.

On Saturday afternoon, about five o'clock, more than two hours before sun-set, Mr. W. Gratton, school-master, of St. Catherine's, was stopped in his sleigh, on his way home, on the steep ascent of the road leading from Sherbrooke Street towards Cote des Neiges, by two men, armed with pistols, who robbed him of fifty dollars. A few moments after the commission of the robbery Mr. Sheriff Coffin and His Honor Judge Day came in sight. Mr. Coffin had overtaken the Hon. and learned Judge, and whilst stopping to exchange a few words with him, the attention of both was directed towards Mr. Gratton's sleigh; and they observed a man coming down the hill, followed by the man who had driven the sleigh, who ran up to Mr. Coffin, exclaiming, "Mr. Sheriff, that man has just robbed my passenger." At this moment Mr. Coffin perceived that the man referred to held a large pistol in each hand, he rode at him, summoning him to stop and surrender, on which he ran down the hill. At this moment Mr. Coffin observed another man hastening down the hill, some twenty yards in advance, clad in a blue jacket and broad-brimmed white hat. Mr. Coffin called upon him in the Queen's name to aid him in arresting the man with the pistols, at the same time telling him that he was the Sheriff. This man turned round to the other, who by this time was close to him, saying, "give them to me," taking the two pistols from him. Mr. Coffin now became aware that he had to deal with two instead of one, but as they were both close together, on the edge of the deep snow, he rode at them, in the hope of knocking them into the snow, and so disarming them. The man with the white hat levelled both pistols at Mr. Coffin, who, seeing his intention, tried to force his horse upon him, and rose in his stirrups to strike him with his whip. At this moment the ruffian fired his left hand pistol, the ball from which perforated the right breast of Mr. Coffin's coat, passing through several letters and papers in his breast pocket, but without wounding him. The robber staggered from the effects of the blow, but Mr. Coffin's whip flew out of his hand, and both the men ran down the hill, pursued by Mr. Coffin and Judge Day.

In the distance from between Mr. McGregor's gates and the new brick house at the top of Sherbrooke street, Mr. Coffin charged at them several times, in the hope of knocking them into the deep snow, and exhausting them. Each time Mr. C. charged, the man with the white hat snapped the other pistol at him, and at length finding it would not go off, attacked him with the butt end, and endeavoured to knock him off his horse. He struck the horse several times, and gave Mr. Coffin a violent blow on the knee, inflicting a severe contusion. By this time they had reached the brick house at the corner of Sherbrooke street; the man in the white hat ran along Sherbrooke street—the other had fallen a short distance behind. At this juncture Mr. Coffin espied an officer, whom he recognised as Mr. Young, son of Col. Plover Young, to whom he shouted for assistance. On this the ruffian ran back, calling to his companion, to whom he gave one of the pistols, to