

Selections.

TORONTO.—*The Colonist* (Toronto), gives the following as the brief debate on the bill legalizing the Church Synod, published in the *Church Times* of last week:—

On motion of Mr. Gamble, a bill from the Legislative Council, to permit the members of the Church of England to meet in Synod, was read a first time.

Mr. Gamble then moved that the rules of the house be suspended, and the bill be read a second time forthwith.

Mr. Holton asked the leader of the House (Mr. Attorney General McDonald) if his attention had been given to this bill? He did not desire to throw any obstacle in the way of the bill, but he thought from the preamble a legal power was given to the Church of England to enforce a discipline. Did the Attorney General give his sanction to the bill?

Mr. Attorney General McDonald saw nothing objectionable in this bill. The Church of England stood in a peculiar position in this country, from being connected with the state in England, and there were existing disabilities arising from that position which prevented them from transacting their own affairs.—These disabilities this bill proposed to remove, and to place the Church of England in this country in the same position as all other denominations. The Methodists have their Conference, and the Presbyterians their Synod, and this bill is to allow the Church of England to exercise the same privileges that no bodies do. He had been accused of having on former occasion shirked a vote on this motion, but such was not the case. He abstained from voting on the address which was moved on this question, because he thought that it was an unconstitutional mode of proceeding, and that to obtain the object desired it would be proper to introduce a bill. As, however, he thought the object was a good one, he did not desire to oppose it, but as he thought that it would be recognizing the connection of Church and State, which they had just before declared against, he could not vote for the address. Now that the bill had been introduced, he saw nothing objectionable in it.

Hon. J. S. McDonald had no objection to this bill.— goes heart and hand for the inherent right of the people of this country to exercise their natural privilege.—country. When the Parliament of the mother country finds that the Parliament of this country is unanimous in recognizing these rights of the Church of England, there is no doubt they will concede what is required. But it is impossible to shut out ears to the fact that this legislation is directly in the face of an Imperial act. Such legislation has been attempted before, and the onus must be thrown on the Imperial Parliament of refusing what is required by the Parliament of this country for the well being of the Church of England.

Mr. Gamble congratulated the House upon the unanimity shown in according to the Church of England those rights she requires for her well government and discipline, for, as it is no doubt known, the Synod of the Church has no right to inflict punishment on members accused and found guilty of scandalous offences.

Mr. Brown and other members expressed their approval of the bill, and the principle on which it was based.

Mr. Gamble expressed his satisfaction at the unanimity displayed by the House with regard to this bill. He was very happy to hear the explanation of the Attorney General with regard to his not voting on the address of last session.

The bill was passed through all its stages, and read a third time, and passed unanimously.

The following gives a more distinct idea than is commonly realized in this country of the claims and the suffering of the Church in Scotland:—

It is well known how wonderfully the Episcopal Church of Scotland sustained her dis-establishment in 1589; how firm a hold she possessed on the affections not only of the higher classes, but especially in the north, of large masses of the lower. She had lost, indeed, the State: she had been degraded from her due eminence; her Bishops had been renounced and disowned; her pastors had been driven from their churches, and from their legal authority; still she existed, and we may even say, she flourished. We might well adopt the motto, *Nec ignem consumebar*. Expelled from the parish Churches, her ministers were not abandoned by their people; but chapels arose in every direction to accommodate the sincere adherents of the proscribed faith and order; and down to the mid-

dle of the last century, even in spite of the heavy blow following the outbreak of 1715, the Episcopalians of Scotland were both numerous and influential. But their general identification with the cause of the Stuarts, and their active efforts in the fatal expedition of Charles Edward, in 1745, entailed on the Church a still heavier and deeper blow. The conquerors of Culloden were permitted and encouraged to devastate the possessions of the Episcopalians. Houses were burnt and pillaged; Chapels were demolished by tumultuous mobs, assisted and encouraged by the soldiery; the ministers and their families were ill-treated and turned out destitute from their homes; and scenes of violence were perpetrated upon the Episcopalians—as such—more consistent with the persecutions of the early Christians by their heathen oppressors, than with the supposed civilization and asserted common Christianity of the actors. . . . As if there had been none but Episcopalians engaged in the enterprise of 1745,—as if no Romanists and no Presbyterians, even, had taken part in it,—and as if to believe in "apostolical order and evangelical truth" was necessarily synonymous with Jacobitism and rebellion, the full vengeance of the authorities was levelled against the Church; and it was determined to enact such repressive and stringent laws against its ministrations and its members, as, it was hoped, must lead to its entire extinction. Accordingly, by the 10 Geo. II. c. xxxviii sec. 1. &c., it was enacted that in order to the permission of any episcopal assemblies whatever, the pastor should produce certificates of their having "qualified;" that is, taken the oaths to government and registered their letters of orders at the general or quarter sessions according to the act of 10 Queen Anne; and that "unqualified" pastors officiating, should for the first offence be imprisoned for six months; for the second be transported for life; and if they returned from transportation, should be imprisoned for life. These provisions appear, at first sight, only to provide against the ministerial functions being exercised by any clergyman disaffected towards the existing government; but their severity and their sweeping tendency are to be judged by a succeeding section, which declares that "no letters of orders shall be deemed sufficient, or admitted to be exercised, but such as have been given by some Bishop of the Church of England or Ireland; and that such registration shall be void."—Mc-

"INFANT BAPTISM—WHY NOT EPISCOPACY?"—Under this title the *Episcopal Recorder* quotes the following paragraph from what it calls "an authoritative little work, lately issued from the Presbyterian press, entitled 'The Westminster Shorter Catechism, with Analysis, Scriptural Proof, Explanatory Inferences, and Illustrative Anecdotes.'"

Origen, who possessed more information than any man of his day, and who lived near the time of the Apostles, says: "The Church received a tradition or order from the Apostles to give baptism unto little children also." Augustino, who was born in the middle of the fourth century, affirms.—"The whole Church practices Infant Baptism. It was not instituted by Councils: it was always in use." Pelagius, who lived at the same time and who had visited the most noted Churches in Egypt, Asia, and Africa, declared that he never heard of any one, even the most impious heretic, who asserted that infants were not to be baptized. Dr. Gill himself one of the most learned of the Baptist writers, acknowledges that infant Baptism was the practice of every Church universally, from the third to the eleventh century.

Very aptly, for this, does our contemporary ask, "Is it not clear that if 'Infant Baptism' be struck out of the Paragraph and 'Episcopacy' inserted, the premises will be equally true, and the conclusion equally unanswerable? No doubt it is clear as the sun at noon. And so it of many other things in the Church. It is tradition: it is that which while no one must, as our XXVth Article says, 'openly break' it, through his private judgment, we are not to confine to one or two things in particular, but let us have its lawful application in all things.—Churchman.

NORFOLK ISLAND.—Captain Denham, R. N., of *H. M. S. Herald*, his recent Hydrographic Notice of the Islands and reefs in the South Western Pacific Ocean, writes of Norfolk Island:—

12th June, 1855.

"I may remark, in conclusion, that I found the island no longer penal settlement. The convict establishment withdrawn on the 7th of May; and is at present occupied by an assistant commissary store-keeper, with six hands engaged in rendering into

tallow the surplus sheep. The rest are intended for the Pitcairn Islanders, who are daily expected to occupy the island, and whose hearts and minds, simple though they be, will not fail to adore the Queen and country which put them in possession, with fostering sollicitude, of the most lovely island conceivable, with all the facilities for industry and comfort; comprising fifteen square miles of land capable of tillage, 800 acres cleared and fenced, beautiful roads intersecting it, eighty-one substantial buildings, including chapel, school-room, hospital, barracks, dwelling-houses, cottages, mills, and workshops; together with household furniture, artisans' tools, and agricultural implements; the gardens stocked with seed, and the farms with 2000 sheep, 300 cattle, swine, pigs, and poultry. A bounteous bestowal indeed."

CHANTING.—The following is an extract from the proceedings of the late New School Presbyterian General Assembly:

Dr. Duffield read a memorial, which at considerable length argued for uniformity in the use of a hymn book and especially a return to the simplicity of the Psalter so arranged according to the Hebrew in parallel columns for responsive singing. The tenor of the argument was that thus, instead of sentiment and rhetoric, truth would be impressed upon all worshippers, and especially the young. Moved that the Memorial be referred to the Publication Committee.

The Rev. Dr. Mills called the attention of the Moderator to a point of order. The main proposition is to commit. He wished an Amendment to express the sense of the Assembly upon the subject matter of the Memorial.

The Rev. S. McAfee, of Missouri, stated that, practically, chanting could never be introduced into the majority of our Churches. It was hardly worth while to waste time in this discussion, which practically can consummate nothing.

Dr. A. D. Smith informed the last speaker that many Presbyterian Churches in this city do chant the Psalms acceptably.

Dr. Duffield said he had heard 2,000 people chant prose acceptably.

EATING AND DRINKING.

An English gentleman of some note, on visiting New England, was struck upon the propriety of the Americans for good living. He said that the greatest difficulty which he had experienced since his arrival in this country, was how to resist the temptation to eat of the great varieties of rich food which surrounded him on every side. And this close observer of human nature was right. The Americans, as a people, are exceedingly fond of good eating and drinking. Indeed, this is their chief and most approved mode of testifying joy on an extraordinary occasion. If a distinguished man, a soldier or a statesman, is supposed to have deserved some mark of distinguished honor, he is invited to a public dinner, and he feasted to his heart's content, amid the cheers of his assembled and enthusiastic friends, who regard every appropriated mouthful of the choice viands, or swallow of sparkling champagne as a further extinction of the debt of gratitude which they owe him for his services.

And in private life, if a gentleman invites a few friends to assemble at his house, instead of providing an intellectual entertainment, such as would do honor to human nature, he cares merely to gratify the sensual appetites. Not only his most important, but his only care, is to provide for the occasion a great variety of expensive delicacies to tickle the palate—and the more successful he is in thus laying temptations in the way of his guests to eat and drink far more than nature craves, the greater is his own gratification and that of his guests, who laud him without measure for his excellent taste, and unbounded hospitality.

In like manner, if a lady gives a party, the first question she asks herself is, what entertainment she shall provide. She accordingly sets her wit to work to devise a variety of refreshments, which shall be abundant and genteel; and her pride and gratification are in direct proportion to the variety and excellence of the means produced to gratify the unnatural longing of an epicure. And the guests, for days afterwards, in canvassing the character of the entertainment, instead of speaking of any intellectual pleasure which they derived from the party, dwell with much gusto on the variety of cakes, ices, confections, syllabubs, fruit, wines, &c., which were produced and demolished on the occasion.

Eating and drinking, therefore,—to our shame be it