

should furnish His table with guests? Was it said by HIM to the poor or to the *respectable* "how hardly shall they enter into the Kingdom of Heaven"? Is it the poor that will find it easier for the camel to go through the eye of the needle—or the *respectable*—than that he should enter into the kingdom of heaven? Were his first followers chosen out of the *respectable* classes of society—or were they poor fishermen, publicans, &c.? Had not the *respectable* people to be his disciples "secretly"—for fear of losing their *respectability*—like Joseph of Arimathea, and Nicodemus?

The *respectability* of the Church is one of its greatest drawbacks. *Respectability*—(I will not go beyond our own Anglican branch) it is—which has prevented the Mother Church from doing much work for CHRIST. It was the kid-gloved *respectable* clergy of England—who drove zealous John Wesley out of the Church because Methodism was *vulgar*—fit for the common people—Kingswood colliers and such like soul-possessing—CHRIST-bought beings. It is the *respectability* of being the established Church which even now,—(comparatively low and CHRIST-like as she has become) hinders many good works:—which indeed to a greater extent are being done—but done by those who throw off the absurd pomposity of former days, and are found in the Courts and alleys, and Cholera Hospitals, and Fever Wards—pointing the poor and dying sinners to HIM who for our sakes became poor, instead of dancing attendance on some Squire or other specimen of *respectability*—in hopes of getting "a good fat living." Degrading thought! that a "cure of souls" in CHRIST's Church should ever have come to be commonly expressed by the term "a living"—as if the Shepherd were so *respectable*—he must have the *fleece* and the *meat* to clothe and feed himself withal—let what would befall "the sheep of His pasture" who gave him the charge. Is the *respectability* of the Church hurt when she provides for the "Publicans and harlots of St. George's-in-the-East," or of Whitechapel, or of Westminster—or of Clare Market in London? If *respectability* were considered would Mr. Hecker have established his ~~Messiah~~ chapel in a building as redolent of cattle as the stable in Bethlehem.

If *respectability* alone were to be provided for, what need of a Salem Chapel free to all the poor of Halifax? It is this *respectable* motive which St. James so positively condemns: "My brethren, have not the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ *with respect of persons*. For if there come unto your assembly a man with a gold ring, in goodly apparel, and there come in also a poor man in vile raiment: and ye have respect to him that weareth the gay clothing, and say unto him, sit thou here in a good place; and say to the poor, stand thou there, or sit here under my footstool: are ye not then partial in yourselves and become judges of evil thoughts? Hearken my beloved brethren, hath not God chosen the poor of this world rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom which he hath promised to them that love Him. But ye have despised the poor." Neither should the poor presume upon these words and despise the rich. The pious rich will never despise the poor,—witness the great Duke in St. James's, Piccadilly, at the early Lord's Supper. A poor man in patched garments—ignorant of the earthly rank of his fellow-worshipper, was kneeling down close beside him—when an officious Beadle bid the poor man move away or wait. Deaf as the Duke was he understood the movements, and laying his hand on his neighbour's shoulder he pressed him downwards, saying, "stay where you are my friend—we are all equal *here*." The faithful rich, no matter what their rank, will ever be humble and "esteem others better than themselves." King George the 3rd., it is well known—ran his pencil through the