

inhabitants of a British Province into the adoption of a form of government which they not only desire not, but unequivocally dislike. At this moment, a band it may be of 800 men, nineteenth of whom are ascertained to be citizens of the American republic, are actually in arms in the British territory, abetting the infamous designs of a refugee from justice, who promises to those who join his standard the partition amongst them of the lands and property of the loyal subjects of their Queen!

Well—we may mourn indeed the march of intellect and the progress of freedom, if such are amongst its vaunted fruits,—if, at this advanced stage in human civilization and religious light, the murderer and incendiary is to be taken by the hand as a patriot, and men and the munitions of war furnished by the citizens of a country, whose watchword is liberty, for the destruction or slavery of those who are true to their sworn allegiance, and religiously adhere to the laws of their choice!

While we love the institutions and cling to the altars of our fathers, we have no desire to underrate the grounds of attachment to their civil polity which Americans may feel. They prefer the institutions of republicanism, and we leave them unblamed to the freedom of their choice: we prefer the monarchy under which for centuries our father-land has flourished, and grown into invincible greatness. It may be true that in adhering warmly, enthusiastically, religiously, to the government of our Queen, there is a spirit of romance and chivalry mixed up with the devotedness of our loyal love; yet this will be understood and appreciated when it is known that, from the days of Alfred to the present hour, such has been the polity under which our fathers lived,—such the spirit of patriotic attachment which, through long centuries, has been transmitted from generation to generation, growing with their growth and strengthening with their strength. Such has been the form of rule, blessings upon which have mingled with our prayers from childhood's lisping days to the extremest limit of old age; and it would require assuredly more than physical force to tear away what has become entwined with all the fibres—the finest and most expanded—of our moral frame.

But there is more than the chivalry of loyal devotion,—more than the romance of love for what our ancestors cherished,—more than the glow of honest pride at beholding what centuries of experiment have hallowed and strengthened,—to make us cling to the monarchy of England. We have religious grounds for preferring the civil polity under which we are so happy as to be governed. We know it to be most analogous to the divine government; we know it to partake at least of the spirit of that which prevailed in the simplest and purest ages of the world; we know it to be that for which alone we have the precepts and the precedents of the Scriptures of God.

But if, from these high reasons for our preference, chargeable as they may be with the antiquarianism which hallows and beautifies,—if, from these holy sanctions, claiming as they do the intensity of our heart's love, we descend to the practical benefits of the government of our choice, how much is there for which to rejoice and be thankful in the guarantee for stability and endurance which it furnishes! While, since the days of England's first kings, republics have sprung up and vanished in all quarters of the world, Britain, under her kings and queens, still remains, not stationary in her physical strength and moral advancement, but striking deeper and wider the roots of her power and grandeur, and shewing with every receding age the growth and expansion of her might.

We have said that we have no wish to disparage the deliberate and unfettered choice which others may have made of their form of government; but, as a defensive argument which we are fully warranted in employing, we must unhesitatingly aver, as our solid and unchangeable conviction, that without an Aristocracy and an Established Church—not to omit the executive power of the monarch—the elements of permanence and stability are, in any government, wanting. To stay the "madness of the people," there is needed an antagonist influence, a balancing of power, such as an hereditary peerage offers; and to throw over all that moral weight and religious effect which will bend the selfish mind and ambition to an obedience to higher and holier principles, there is needed the hallowing and purifying influence of a National Church. To her enlightened nobility, and above all to her Protestant Establishment, is England indebted for her present proud position in the grade of nations; and were it not for these, she might, yes, within a few years, have sunk down into the degenerate anarchy of a mob, driven headlong by fanaticism or steeled against every holy impulse by the blighting creed of infidelity.

To such a country we belong: under such a government we live and are content. God forbid that it should be yielded to the traitor and the plunderer, or that the fair proportions which mark its civil polity should be exchanged for the lawless rule of the ignorant, the reckless, the unprincipled! That any free-born Briton should, for a moment, think of exchanging such a blessing for such a curse, his love of country forbids, all his generous affections disallow, the loud and awakening principles of his holy faith refuse. Never, never shall we submit to encroachment or outrage upon this heritage from our fathers:—with a martyr's patience we can face the struggle, and in defence of our country and our creed, we shall have cheerily in view the martyr's crown.

We publish to-day the last of the series of Letters addressed by the Ven. the Archdeacon of York to the Hon. William Morris, begotten by the inaccuracies contained in the recently published Correspondence of that gentleman. How far our Venerable friend has, in these letters, been successful in vindicating our Church from the unfounded accusations against her, we have heard too many strong expressions of satisfaction from our readers to render necessary a word of comment of our own. In relation to the various documents from the pen of the able Archdeacon, which have of late appeared in our columns, we are glad to adduce the following testimony from that excellent advocate of our common cause, the Boston "Christian Witness." In quoting the concluding paragraph of the Archdeacon's Address to the Clergy, our contemporary says:—

After further reflections on the firm and unshaken position which the Church ought to take and maintain in this time of trial, the able Archdeacon closes with the following observations, distinguished alike by good sense, deep spirituality of feeling, and an unalterable attachment to the order and stability of the Church. "The most bitter enemies of the Church of England can hardly help feeling a little relenting after reading these. Infidelity itself is powerless and dumb, when confronted by such vigour of mind, armed with such weapons of love.

Next week we propose to publish *entire* an Address from the Venerable Archdeacon to the Clergy and Laity of Upper Canada, comprising the substance of the opinion transmitted to Lord Glenelg on the subject of the Rectories, as required by that noble Lord.

For the Church.

ON THE NUMBER OF OUR COMMUNICANTS.

It is a frequent enquiry made by our clerical friends and others, "And how many communicants have you?" For the answer to this question is regarded as the best criterion of the minister's success in his parish. It is not to the popularity he may have established, or to the outward attendance on his ministrations,

that we must look; but to the number of attached and pious individuals whom he has gathered around him, and brought into regular communion with his church. And should he in answer to the enquiry be obliged to confess that the number of his communicants is but small, the conclusion may be fairly drawn, that religion is at a low ebb in his congregation; or that there is some radical defect in his method of procedure.

I am aware that we are all too apt to ascribe this failure to causes independent of ourselves. "The Methodists entice away my people, as soon as I have been enabled seriously to impress them. Besides the mass of the surrounding population are sectaries: not merely Methodists—Episcopalian, conference, and primitive—but Presbyterians, Baptists and Roman Catholics; and though many of these come to hear me, they never of course, stop the sacrament. Of those also who are attached to the church, the majority are unconverted characters, drawn together by their previous attachment to the established religion, but not having sufficient love to divine things, to induce them to attend so solemn an ordinance as the Lord's supper."

Now it is possible that all these counteracting circumstances may exist: and yet they may not be the real cause of the non-attendance of which we complain. This, in all probability, is to be ascribed chiefly to ourselves. And perhaps by proposing some such queries as those which follow, we may be led into more accurate views on this important subject.

1. Do I give sufficient prominence to the sacrament in my ministrations, requesting, urging or expostulating with my people, as the case may be: and do I occasionally read that impressive exhortation in the service of our church addressed to those who are backward in their attendance?

2. Do I try to remove scruples from the minds of the timid, encouraging them to break through their difficulties: and to come without hesitation provided that they are simply desirous of obtaining through Christ Jesus the blessings of the Gospel?

3. Do I strive to convict the careless and neglectful absentee, of positive disobedience to the Saviour's injunction, "This do in remembrance of me:" an injunction imperative and binding on all his professed disciples: and which cannot without criminality be wilfully omitted?

4. Do I expostulate with those who absent themselves from the consciousness of their still living in sin: shewing them that if unprepared for the sacrament they must be equally unprepared to die?

5. And do I strive as much as possible to restore to the holy communion that salutary discipline evidently contemplated by our church: not indeed by expulsion or refusal of admission, which in the present day would on no account be desirable—but by the equally efficacious method of serious expostulation:—shewing that the ungodly and wicked communicant instead of receiving benefit by his attendance, would only be hardening his heart, and provoking God's displeasure? And under such heart-searching appeals, would they not gradually disappear from among the number of the pious? And would not this hortatory discipline restore the sacrament to its evident intention, "the communion of saints?"

6. Have I also due respect unto the young among my congregation? What has become of those who from time to time have been confirmed? Have I left them to themselves: or followed up with assiduous endeavour, the rising purpose which was then forming in their minds? Have I by some specific meeting previous to the sacrament endeavoured to fit, train and prepare the young and others for communicating: giving due prominence to such meeting, and urging and recommending from the pulpit from time to time an attendance on it?

7. And to all my endeavours have I added serious heart-felt prayer to God, for grace to enable me to use every suitable means with untiring assiduity? And do I so value, and profit by, the sacred ordinance myself, as to make it evident to others, that while holding forth its blessedness for their acceptance, I speak from personal experience; having tasted, seen, and valued its inestimable privileges myself?

Were we thus occasionally to interrogate ourselves, I am persuaded we should find, that the fault is not wholly, or even principally, to be ascribed to the prevalence of dissent or the exertions of sectaries; but to our own unintentional and unperceived remissness. At least I am constrained to draw this inference with regard to my own procedures; and the queries which I have just penned have been those which I have frequently of late been putting to myself: though I am not without a hope that it will not be long before I am permitted to see an encouraging alteration in the number of my own communicants. And truly happy shall I be if the few hints here suggested, should prove in any way beneficial to others. For the prosperity of our church is most intimately connected with the estimation in which the sacrament is held. Let this be properly fenced, purified and enlarged: let this be felt and acknowledged as a select and holy enclosure for God's believing people: let us thus succeed in obtaining what has so long been considered as a desideratum among us,—"a church within a church"—a pious company of sweet partakers of that holy ordinance: and we shall then no longer be exposed to the taunting observation that we have in fact no church fellowship; that no common bond of union exists among our pious members; and that the chain which professedly binds us together is a mere rope of sand.

M. T.

HOW THE CHURCH BENEFITS THE STATE.

(From the Church of England Quarterly Review.)

And does the State receive no recompense from the Church in return for this protection which it affords? Is it nothing to have a pious, well educated, well informed individual, placed in every parish in the kingdom, devoted and set apart by his profession for the express purpose of promoting the worship of God; able, from his rank, and the moderate income which he possesses to strengthen his moral and religious lessons by the weight and influence attached to station and fortune, and invariably using these advantages in enforcing obedience to the laws, and loyalty to the sovereign? Is it nothing to have a people instructed in morality and religion, trained up in the observance of orderly and

quiet habits, and taught to bear the evils incident to this mortal scene, with patience, contentment, and resignation? Is it nothing to possess, in every district and division of the empire, responsible individuals, to whom recourse may be had for statistical and other details; who may be able to communicate genuine information relative to the character and actual existence of persons connected with the public service; and to whom, as filling in some degree a public official character, application is so frequently made for many other particulars, of which it is necessary that the Government and other bodies should be cognizant? It is an actual fact, that no application can be made to an insurance office for remuneration of losses incurred by fire unless it be certified by the clergyman of the parish. If a member of a friendly society is attacked by illness, he cannot obtain relief from it without bringing a certificate of the truth of his statement, signed by the clergyman. In short, every one, no matter of what class, of what party or sect, thinks himself permitted, and even privileged, to apply to the clergyman for assistance and relief, and would consider himself entitled to remonstrate and complain, should his application not be attended to. Is it nothing for the poor, the distressed, and the destitute,—those who frequently possess no other friend,—to have, in every parish of the land, pious, benevolent, and charitable individuals, ready and willing to listen to the tale of misery and sorrow, to cheer and soothe the bed of sickness, to relieve the wants of the needy suppliant, and minister to his necessities; to raise the drooping family, verging on destruction, from the earth; to teach it once more to hope, and to place it in a state of comparative comfort by their timely aid? Is it nothing to be ever ready at the call of every charitable and benevolent purpose, whether it be of a private or public nature and whether it be for the relief of the churchman or the dissenter, to contribute to those objects to the very utmost of their ability, not only from their professional, but also from their private income as well? Is it nothing to devote their time as well as their money with the same boundless generosity, to the same benevolent purposes; to be always ready to advocate the cause of the different religious and charitable institutions of the country, with the most persevering assiduity and the most unrelaxing zeal, by discourses from the pulpit, by recommendatory statements from the press, by explanatory speeches at public meetings, by exhortations in private, and personal solicitations? Now all these various and discordant duties, involving frequently great personal trouble and labour as well as expense, are performed gratuitously, without any hope of fee or reward? What other individuals, we should like to know are there who would do the same without remuneration? Would the professional man give up his time? Would the tradesman take himself away from his business? Would even the private individual, unfettered by any occupation, sacrifice his amusement or his leisure for the same objects, without hope of reward? Far from it. He would expect to be recompensed; and if this should not be done, he would meet the application for his assistance with an instant refusal.

THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.

Manifold are the obligations which bind the members of the Anglican Church to the University of Oxford. We might refer our readers to the period when that ancient and religious incorporation maintained, almost single-handed, through evil report and good report, the holy warfare against the rebels and schismatics who dragged their Sovereign to the scaffold, whereon, as a blessed martyr, he fell by impious and accursed hands, testifying by his death an uncompromising devotion to the catholic and apostolic church, in whose communion he had faithfully lived, and to whose communion he had steadfastly adhered, amidst temptations and perplexities of no ordinary description or character. Or we might recall to their minds the time when the unfortunate and ill-advised son of that martyred prince attempted to impose the yoke of popery and chain of superstition upon necks and bodies accustomed to a service which was perfect freedom,—a service to that Master whose word is unerring and all-powerful truth. How critical, how fearful that moment! The religion and liberties of England all but prostrate at the feet of tyranny, her people paralysed, her King the betrayer of his trust!—Oxford fearlessly stood forth; the conflict was sharp, but short; the church, the nation were saved. How beautiful, how touching the sequel! Foremost in a resolute maintenance of religious principle, Oxford neither could nor would shake off her allegiance to the exiled Prince, and, utterly regardless of worldly or temporal advantages, encountered a chilling neglect,—nay, but too often worse treatment, from the immediate successors of the Stuart dynasty,—treatment conformable indeed to the precepts and examples of politicians of this world, but, by the blessing of Providence, unproductive of the slightest deviation from the even and consistent path of duty steadily pursued by the University, which has been the theme of our humble but hearty praise and admiration.—*Church of England Quarterly Review.*

Arrogance and pride generally belong to ignorance. Real knowledge does not stand in need of them. The more a man knows, the more he sees his insufficiency, and this teaches him to be humble.

Even the weakest intimations may not be neglected: a child, a servant, a stranger, may say that which we may bless God to have heard.—*Bishop Hall.*

LETTERS received to Friday, Jan. 5th, 1838:—

Rev. R. Whitwell, rem. and subs.; Rev. G. R. Grout, rem.; Rev. T. B. Fuller, subs.; Rev. W. F. S. Harper; Rev. W. M. Herchmer; J. Kent, Esq.; Rev. G. M. Ross, subs.; Rev. J. Shortt; Ven. The Archdeacon of York.

We have to apologize to our correspondents RUFUS and C. P. R. for the delay of their communications; but we trust very soon to be enabled to extend to them the attention which their merits deserve.

ERRATUM in our last. In the list of the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of York, the numbers annexed to the name of the Rev. W. MacMurray should have been placed opposite the name of the Rev. J. Magrath.