

The Grand Division has acted with an enlarged and liberal spirit, in not merely distributing its funds, but has urged upon all subordinate divisions the necessity of sustaining this new and less trammelled organisation. I can see no reason why every division of the Sons of Temperance might not form itself into a branch league, and thus induce others in its vicinity to become members of the Anti-Liquor Law Association—as such additional work would give an interest and an impetus to the Division. Many thousands, who from various causes cannot become Sons of Temperance, would unite with them, heart and hand, and shoulder to shoulder, in a movement *exclusively* intended for promoting a Prohibitory Liquor Law.

I fervently hope that not only will every branch of the League send their representatives to the annual meeting on the 28th instant, but that numerous new branches will be organised, and elect their delegates for this important occasion.

I subjoin a list of the present governing officers, which consists of a President, twelve Vice-Presidents, a Secretary, a Treasurer, and an Executive Committee of twelve members, seven of whom form a quorum. These have all to be appointed at the next annual meeting, on the 28th inst.

*President*—JOHN WILLSON, Esq., London.

VICE-PRESIDENTS :

Hugh C. Baker, Esq., Hamilton.

Dr. Beatty, Cobourg.

Rev. R. J. Rogers, Kingston.

E. F. Whittemore, Esq., Toronto.

John Dougall, Esq., Montreal.

Hon. M. Cameron, Quebec.

Hon. John Prince, Sandwich.

Rev. R. H. Thornton, Oshawa.

Rev. J. E. Ryerson, St. Catharines.

Rev. Fras. Evans, Simcoe.

Geo. Pirie, Esq., Guelph.

W. Patrick, Esq., M. P. P., Prescott.

*Secretary*—G. P. ONE, Esq., Toronto.

*Treasurer*—R. H. BRET, Esq., Toronto.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE :

John McNab, Esq., Toronto.

Rev. Wm. Ormiston, do.

Wm. McDougall, Esq., do.

Rev. T. T. Howard, do.

John Cameron, Esq., do.

J. W. Woodall, Esq., do.

T. Nixon, Esq., Newmarket.

W. Barr, Esq., Niagara.

H. R. O'Reilly, Esq., Wellington Square.

Rev. Jonathan Short, Port Hope.

C. H. Vannorman, Esq., Hamilton.

A. Farewell, Esq., Oshawa.

A SON OF TEMPERANCE AND

A FRIEND TO THE LEAGUE.

PURITY OF COMMUNION.

The *Canadian Independent*, the new organ of the Congregational body, in this Province, publishes in its first number the Address delivered at the opening of the recent Session of the Congregational Union of Canada, by the retiring Chairman, Rev. K. M. Fenwick. In the course of this Address, the following excellent remarks occur on Purity of Communion, a subject to which we hope to see the attention of Christians of all denominations increasingly directed. Referring to the movements of the past year, Mr. Fenwick says:—

“Something has been done in diffusing correct sentiments in reference to the spiritual membership and constitution of the Church of Christ. Purity of com-

munion has been earnestly defended, and, it is hoped, to some extent practically exemplified. The peaceful advocacy of this important question has affected other denominations, and what once was openly and without hesitation pronounced chimerical, is now by many only considered impracticable. May we not anticipate an advance? With sincere and earnest Christians can it long rest thus? The will of Christ recognized and the testimony of Scripture understood, with the example of even numerically a few before them, it is only just to hope they will press on to the possession of a right standard of admission, and to its proper application. But what fidelity is requisite on our part! Without it, Congregationalism is the worst ecclesiastical form. It will become a stagnant pool or a fierce arena of strife. The glory will depart. It will be shorn of its strength. Without spiritual life, it will go to putrefaction. The love of Christ glowing in the renewed bosom is its only conservative principle. It is equally vital to the prosperity of the kingdom of Christ. Never will the Church, in its present mixed state, subserve the purposes of its divine author. A purer day must dawn. She must arise from the dust. She must come out from among them and be separate: “for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? and what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel?” Let us here recognize part of our mission, and rise in holy determination to the standard of Christian zeal which a work so arduous yet so sublime demands. Boldly, fearlessly, but with charity and love, let us proclaim the will of Christ, and with the Bible in our hands and on our side, let us reiterate the cardinal truth, that holiness in the Church is her only strength—that those who are the subjects of divine grace alone should be members of the Church which “Christ has redeemed with his own precious blood.” By such a course our membership may be limited, but our power will be augmented, and a high and honorable service will have been rendered for the kingdom of our blessed Lord.”

The following, relating to the same subject, occurs in the Minutes of the Congregational Union, under date Saturday, June 17th:—

“Dr. Wilkes read an essay on “Purity of Communion.”

“Resolved—That the cordial thanks of the Union be presented to the Rev. Dr. Wilkes for the very admirable and timely essay now read; and that the Union would impress on all its members that the Scriptural principles which it illustrates and defends, its close connection with the vital interests of the denomination, and the Church of Christ at large, be frequently made the theme of personal reflection, fully preached and faithfully carried out in all our churches, as was done by our fathers and the Apostles of Christ; and that Dr. Wilkes be requested to give the Union the manuscript for publication in tract form.

“Nearly 7,000 copies being called for by parties present, an edition of 10,000 was ordered.”

INVESTMENTS FOR CHURCH PURPOSES.

At the July meeting of the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Nova Scotia, a long and animated discussion took place on the propriety of raising funds to be permanently invested for the support of a Theological Seminary. On the one hand it was argued, that it was just as lawful for a church as for a private individual to accumulate a fund for some specific purpose. On the other, it was maintained that investments, equally with state endowments, were a contra-