

Such is the Christian's confession, and such the temper in which it is expressed: the church then instructs him in the object for which it is made,—that he MAY OBTAIN FORGIVENESS OF THE SAME—forgiveness of the sins which, in this contrite spirit, he acknowledges. "Remission," says a late writer,* "is the 'one thing needful' to an awakened mind.—Go to the dying traveller, stretched on the burning sands of Nubia; offer him gold and silver and gorgeous apparel; and, if he has sufficient strength left, he will express his astonishment at your folly, or his abhorrence of the insult shewn him. The refreshing draught is the boon he wants. So when a sinner is divinely convinced of sin, the pleasures, profits, and honours of the world, become tasteless. The lectures of the philosopher, and the exhortations of the moralist, are insults to his misery—forgiveness of his sins is the object of his fervent wishes." Nor is he allowed by the Church to forget the source from which this plentiful redemption flows,—from THE INFINITE GOODNESS AND MERCY OF GOD. He may seek this peace to his soul amidst the promises of the flesh and the world, but he will seek it in vain: amongst them he may wander, like the dove of Noah, without finding rest for the sole of his feet; and after all his trials and all his efforts, he will come back weary and disappointed to the only ark of shelter,—the 'infinite mercy and goodness of God.' There alone will he find a cordial for his spirits, or a refuge from despair.

And if confession of sin be a necessary duty, it is never an unreasonable one: AT ALL TIMES WE OUGHT HUMBLY TO ACKNOWLEDGE OUR SINS BEFORE GOD. Many may think the duties of religion are appropriate to the Sabbath-day alone; that then it is to be assumed like a Sunday garment, and put off when the day of toil returns. But such is not the spirit of the Gospel, nor is it the spirit inculcated by our Liturgy. Religion, according to this teaching, is to be a daily, a perpetual work: at all times its duties are appropriate; "in season and out of season," it is a necessary business. The sentiment of the real Christian, like that of David, is, "My sin is ever before me;" and with this humbling consciousness never separate from his mind, he thus resolves with the same holy individual, "At evening and morning and at noon-day, will I pray and cry aloud."

But if the duty of confession is never out of season, it is peculiarly indispensable WHEN WE ASSEMBLE AND MEET TOGETHER for the express purpose of the public worship of our God. For why do we thus assemble? what is the purport of our meeting? In the first place, TO RENDER THANKS FOR THE GREAT BENEFITS WHICH WE HAVE RECEIVED AT GOD'S HANDS; but this tribute of thanks would assuredly be deficient and cold, unless it was prompted by a deep and constraining sense of our demerits. We meet, too, TO SET FORTH HIS MOST WORTHY PRAISE; but the voice of melody springing from the heart would be faint and dull, unless excited by a conviction of sin and a persuasion of the infinite goodness and mercy of God in pardoning it. "It is fabled of the nightingale," says the writer last quoted, "that she sings most sweetly with her breast upon a thorn; and so the sinner who has felt most deeply the effects of the fall, will celebrate most gratefully the riches of the grace of God. The new song, mentioned in the Revelation of St. John, could only be sung by those who were redeemed from the earth; and redemption can only be duly celebrated by the captive who has felt the galling chain, who has tasted and remembers the bitter taste of the wormwood and the gall of sin, and who has experienced deliverance through grace." We meet, further, TO HEAR GOD'S MOST HOLY WORD; but this is a word of condemnation to the unrepentant sinner—sharper than a two-edged sword to him who hears without conviction of his iniquity, prayer for pardon, and hope of forgiveness through Christ. And, lastly, we meet TO ASK THOSE THINGS WHICH ARE REQUISITE AND NECESSARY, AS WELL FOR THE BODY AS THE SOUL. The selfishness of man may render him eloquent in the petition for his bodily wants; but unawakened, unconvinced of sin, how can he feel the wants of his soul, or ask as he should for their supply? Without contrition, without confession, in short, every office of public worship is deficient.

The minister of Christ having thus affectionately exhorted to this duty, concludes, in the same strain of loving entreaty, with inviting his hearers to the actual confession of their sins. WHEREFORE I PRAY AND BENECH YOU, are the words which he is instructed to use: still the same courteous manner of address; imitating him who, although an "ambassador for Christ," and speaking "in Christ's stead,"—prayed and besought his converts to "be reconciled to God." They "pray and beseech" the bold and careless to cast away their pride—the self-excusing to abandon their vain pleas—the dejected and sorrowful not to be discouraged because they have staid so long, but to hasten now because "the time is short." AS MANY AS ARE HERE PRESENT, whatever be their temper, whatever be their practice, are invited to this hearty confession of sin.

And great and peculiar is the privilege of the Christian! Under the Law, the priest alone entered into the temple to burn incense, while the people remained without; and to the mercy seat, to the most holy place, none might enter but the high-priest, and he only once a year. But now of Christians it may be said, "ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God;" every man is, as it were, a priest to offer up his own prayers and praises, and that not without; he is led in by the hand to the very throne of grace by one who is the representative of Christ; he has liberty to speak freely for himself before the King of Heaven. No longer is he required to send in his petition by the hand of a servant, but the messenger of God earnestly invites him to ACCOMPANY HIM TO THE THRONE OF THE HEAVENLY GRACE—to accompany him who has the same errand for himself, and who, therefore, is likely to be the more concerned and importunate.

But both he and they must be cautious in their approaches to the foot-stool of their God. They must proclaim their acknowledgment of sin WITH A PURE HEART; because the dissembler cannot hope to be heard, the unfeeling petition can never reach the mercy-seat. They must express their contrition WITH AN HUMBLE VOICE; because that were an evidence of inward compunction, an indication of the secret sorrow of their souls.

"In other prayers," says an old divine, already quoted, "it will be sufficient to seal them with an AMEN, and set our name at the bottom; but this must be all in our own words and under our own hands, to justify God, to take shame to ourselves, and to encourage our brethren." SAYING AFTER ME, and not content with a mere declaration of assent at the conclusion, is what the minister of God requires of his brethren in the office of confession. And who, when thus solemnly and affectionately called upon, will refuse the invita-

* Rev. T. F. Biddulph.
† Dean Comber.

tion? Who, upon this appeal, will be silent? If, after such a summons, the tongue will be mute, we must infer, either that those who hear are confident of their innocence, or obstinate in their wickedness, or fearless of the threatened punishment of sin. But if none, in the awful presence of God, will presume to plead their innocence; if, conscious of their offences, they are resolved to turn away from their wickedness and live; and if, looking to the terrors of the Lord, they are persuaded to repent,—let not the tongue be silent, but let confession be made, humbly yet audibly, of their manifold sins and wickedness. C. R.

AN ARCHBISHOP TO HIS CLERGY, 1738.*

Indeed with respect to us, the rule which most of our adversaries appear to have set themselves, is to be, at all events, as bitter as they can: and they follow it, not only beyond truth, but beyond probability: asserting the very worst things of us without foundation, and exaggerating every thing without mercy: imputing the faults, and sometimes imaginary faults, of particular persons to the whole order; and then declaiming against us all promiscuously with such wild vehemence, as in any case but ours, they themselves would think in the highest degree, unjust and cruel. Or if sometimes a few exceptions are made, they are usually made only to divide us amongst ourselves, to deceive one part of us, and throw a greater odium on the other. Still, were these invectives only to affect us personally, dear as our reputations are and ought to be to us, the mischief would be small in comparison of what it is. But the consequence has been as it naturally must, that disregard to us hath greatly increased the disregard to public worship and instruction: that many are grown prejudiced against religion: many more indifferent about it and unacquainted with it. * * * * *

Yet, however melancholy the view before us appears, we have no reason to be discouraged; for let us take care of our duty, and God will take care of the event. But we have great reason to think seriously what our duty on this occasion is, and stir up each other to the performance of it; that wherever the guilt of these things may fall, it must not fall on our heads. For it must needs be that offences come, but woe to that man by whom the offence cometh. Our grief for the decay of religion might be attended with much comfort with regard to ourselves, could we but truly say that no faults or infirmities of ours had ever given advantage against it. But though, God be thanked, we are far from being what our adversaries would represent us, whose reproaches perhaps were never less deserved than now when they are the most violent, yet it must be owned we are not by any means even the best of us, what we ought to be; and the present state of things calls loudly upon us, to correct our mistakes, to supply our deficiencies, and to do all in our power for the honor of God and the happiness of mankind. If we can be unconcerned now, we have neither piety nor common prudence in us. And if we are concerned in earnest, we shall be very desirous both to avoid all wrong methods of shewing it, and to make use of all right ones.

Complaining of our superiors for those evils, which possibly they cannot prevent; or complaining of them with disrespect for what we may apprehend they could prevent, would both be unprofitable and imprudent conduct; would give our adversaries joy, and do our cause harm. Indeed to beg earnestly of God that he would direct the hearts of those who preside over the public welfare, and humbly to represent to them on all fit occasions, the declining state of religion, the importance and the means of preserving it, these things are unquestionably duties. But then we must always approve ourselves at the same time, conscientiously loyal both in word and deed, reasonable in our expectations, sincerely grateful for the protection which we are assured of enjoying and duly sensible that every thing of value to us in this world, depends upon the support of that Government under which we now live. We cannot be good men if we are bad subjects; and we are not wise men, if we permit ourselves to be suspected of it.

To speak unfavorably of liberty, religious or civil, instead of carefully distinguishing both from the many abuses of them which we daily see; or to encourage any other restraints on either than public utility makes evidently needful; can only serve to increase that jealousy—which being in former ages grounded too well, has been most industriously heightened, when there never was so little pretence of ground for it,—that the claims of the clergy are hurtful to the rights of mankind. It concerns us greatly to remove so dangerous a prejudice against us as this: not by renouncing those powers which the Gospel has given us, for we are bound to assert them; but by convincing the world that they are perfectly innocent: by avoiding all appearance of assuming what we have no right to; by shewing our abhorrence of tyranny, especially over the consciences of men; and by satisfying them fully, if possible, that we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord; and ourselves their servants for his sake. Then, with respect to the privileges which we derive from human authority; as on the one hand, receding from any of them without cause is only inviting fresh encroachments, and giving needless advantages to such as will be sure to lose none, so on the other, straining them too far is the likeliest way to destroy them all at once. Both our usefulness and security depend very much on our appearing plainly to desire nothing inconsistent with the common good: to have the truest concern for all reasonable liberty, and to be zealous only against licentiousness and confusion.

* From Archbishop Secker's Charges.

HISTORICAL ARGUMENT FOR EPISCOPACY.

Charles I. after his surrender to the Scottish army, being waited on by the Presbyterian divine Henderson, who was sent to combat his Episcopalian sentiments, the Anglican monarch defended his opinion by the following argument: The church government actually established by the Apostles must have been consonant to the meaning of the Scriptures.—But as far back as we can go in history, we find Episcopacy every where established: whence it is fair to infer, that it was the form established by the Apostles.

The above reasoning is completely borne out by proofs.—Previous to the sixteenth century, the records of Christianity, up to the most ancient date, invariably shew it subsisting under an Episcopal hierarchy. However different the people, the customs, the laws and the languages of the widely-distant countries where it existed, there is no evidence that any portion of the Church (before the innovation of Calvin) ever had a form of government other than the Episcopal.—This fact, in all its plenitude, meets us uninterruptedly as we

proceed from age to age, until we arrive among the contemporaries and friends of the Apostle St. John, and at a time when a host of the disciples of Apostles were still laboring in the ministry in every part of the world. If we cannot go higher into the first century, it is merely because no christian writings of that period, except the New Testament, have come down to us.

On the strength of such evidence, well might Charles refuse, as he did, to secede from the Church of England into any of the modern sects which have chosen to throw off the apostolical institution of Episcopacy. And as his inflexible determination to support so sacred an institution mainly contributed to bring him to the scaffold, he is justly termed, in the Liturgy for the 30th January, "our martyred Sovereign."

THE CHURCH.

COBOURG, SATURDAY, SEPT. 15, 1838.

Our attention has been drawn to a passage in the communication of our able correspondent 'Alan Fairford,' which we regret to learn has given offence to some of our friends of the sister communion of the Scottish Church. Although not directly responsible for the language or opinions of our correspondents, we are not disposed to shrink from a general accountability for the spirit and diction of the communications which they may furnish, and are fully alive to the duty of admitting nothing, from any quarter, into our columns, to the general purport of which we cannot at least subscribe. That to every portion of every communication, whether original or selected, we should yield an entire and unreserved assent, is impossible; nor, at the same time, can an editor be expected to reject such contributions to his journal, although while he cheerfully subscribes to their general tenor, there may be in them sentiments or expressions to which he cannot yield his unqualified approbation.

In the general strain of the communication just referred to, we discerned the warm, yet not passionate, excitement of a generous and devoted son of the Church of England, observing with indignant scorn the unhallowed combinations to level this glorious fabric with the dust; and while expressing in vigorous terms his abhorrence of the machinations of its foes, appealing with ardour to the slumbering sympathies of its legitimate defenders. Perceiving this to be the general spirit of the essay in question—and feeling that the provocation to a more than usual energy of expression was more than usually great—we did not think it by any means needful to recommend a revision or a softening which might allay the glowing fervour of so admirable and appropriate an article.

Yet, as some of our friends of the sister church—persons with whom we have ever lived in the interchange of courteous and Christian offices, and whose good opinion we should always be gratified to deserve—have expressed their concern and grief at the introduction of the quotation in reference to 'Major Bellenden,' we have to remark that if this be regarded as a national insult, it was an insult provoked by another much more grave and unaccountable. In a clerical memorial, presented to our excellent Lieutenant Governor—himself an Englishman and like other Englishmen not likely to observe such needless taunts with complacency,—a memorial, too, which has been widely circulated throughout these Provinces, it is stated that "England first consented to receive from Scotland a King, and then sought to be incorporated with it as a nation!" One national sarcasm usually provokes another: a 'Bannockburn' will be met by a 'Flodden-Field'; and if the thistle display its ungainly prickles, the rose can protrude its thorns!

The subject is not perhaps worthy of any very serious observation; and we shall content ourselves with saying what we feel assured none will more heartily acquiesce in than 'Alan Fairford' himself, that most wantonly as this rejoinder was provoked, we much regret that the manner of its application should for an instant wound the feelings of those towards whom we entertain no other sentiment than that of Christian respect and good-will.

It is true we differ—widely differ—from the members of the Church of Scotland upon the unhappily litigated question of the Clergy Reserves. They have advanced claims to a property which we conscientiously believe to be legally and indivisibly our own; and in the prosecution of those claims they have frequently exhibited a violence into which no Christian body should have suffered themselves to be betrayed. They have appealed to the worst passions of the community for the adjudication of a question which, convinced as we are of the incontrovertible justice of our tenure, we have ever calmly expressed a willingness to submit to a tribunal where it can be discussed and decided upon without the intervention of personal or local excitements. They accuse us of rapacity because we contend for the maintenance of that which we honestly believe the law and the Constitution have awarded to us, at the same moment that we are willing to give them the benefit of any legal doubt by a reference of the whole question to competent judicial authority. They violently attack the establishment of the Rectories, expressly provided for by the Constitutional Act; while they receive a pecuniary grant from the profits of the Reserves, which that Act does not expressly provide for, and in arbitrary predjudication we must deem it of the very doubt which we are willing to refer to a legitimate decision.—They vehemently protest against the powers which, by inference, they consider to be attached to the Rectories, at the same time that they directly petition the Imperial Government for the possession of synodical and parochial powers as extensive as can possibly pertain to the Rectories. And, pending the judgment to which we are content to bow from a sufficient and dispassionate tribunal, they are now entering into a league with the very enemies of all Establishments; they are uniting with those who are adversaries as much to their principles as to ours, in the appeal to popular passion and in the endeavour to extort by angry agitation the judgment which they are unwilling to wait for from a sober, christian-like, and what in the end would prove a more satisfactory process.

Such is the state of the question: but let us be fully understood. We need not say that we respect the Church of Scotland; nor need we appeal to the readers of this journal whether its editorial observations at least have ever contained an expression which could be construed into a forgetfulness of its claims to our Christian reverence and esteem. And we say further, what the clergy and people of the Church of England have again and again declared, that we recognize their claims, as the establishment of Scotland, to the favourable consideration of the Government in every colony where their members are to be found. We deny that, in the Colonies, the rights of an Establishment, *per se*, extend to the Church of Scotland, nor will we allow that any other than

what is recognized at home as the Church of the Empire has the privilege of being so regarded in the Empire's colonial appendages. Yet so far from viewing with an envious eye any pecuniary boon which, in this or any other Province, the Government may think fit to extend to them, we should rejoice to see it bestowed to the fulness even of their own most sanguine wishes,—provided that our property be not infringed upon, and that our rights and privileges remain unimpaired.

We said that the Church of Scotland had solicited from the Imperial Government the very ecclesiastical powers which are thought, by implication, to be annexed to the Rectories; and next week we shall commence the publication of the documents which embrace that petition. Their publication may remind their own body of the inconsistency of the course they are pursuing; they will enlighten other religious denominations as to the real sentiments of the allies with whom they choose to unite for the overthrow of the Church of England; and they will shew to the members of our own establishment, that we are not without precedents, even in the example of our opponents, for a vigorous adherence to the rights and privileges which the Constitution guarantees to us.

We beg to state, with a mixed feeling of pleasure and regret, that owing to the success which has progressively accompanied us from our earliest commencement, we shall be unable—unless to a limited extent—to furnish back numbers of 'The Church' to our new subscribers.

While we feel under lasting obligations for the substantial encouragement we have received from many persons and places, we must not omit to make particular mention of the city of Toronto. The metropolis of the Province is honorably conspicuous for the number and the zeal of the churchmen it contains. Since the commencement of our second volume, it has furnished us with more than forty additional subscribers; and from the exertions now in progress we have the fullest assurance of a large and steady augmentation.

It is announced in the *Quebec Mercury* that His Excellency the Governor General has appointed the Rev. G. Cowell, Chaplain to the Forces, to perform Divine Service to his Excellency and family, at the Government House, because, as some of the papers remark, the Clergy do not preach in terms agreeable to his Excellency. To attribute so unworthy a motive to the Earl of Durham is, we think, extremely inconsiderate and unfair. A nobleman has a legal right to appoint three or more chaplains, according to his rank; and we are happy to observe that there is many a British peer who avails himself of this privilege for the purpose of having Family Prayers read both morning and evening by a clergyman of the Established Church. It is, we presume, with this view, that Lord Durham has selected the Rev. Mr. Cowell for his chaplain; and we much rejoice to see so illustrious a person as the Queen's Representative in British North America setting so becoming an example of attention to domestic religious duties.

We have been informed that, either in the *Hamilton Express* or *Journal*, there has appeared a statement to the effect that the Bishop of Montreal makes a gain of the business of consecrating churches, in the shape of exorbitant fees! If any such statement has really been made, we are bound to say that there is not a particle of truth in it. We ourselves have been concerned in the consecration of two churches in this province, and in both of those cases we know that no fees were received by the Bishop. So far from the exercise of the Episcopal functions being attended with any emolument beyond the stipend attached to the Bishopric, it is invariably attended with considerable expense.

We recollect reading in a London Journal a short time ago a similar statement to the prejudice of the Bishop of London, and the prompt and official contradiction of it by his Lordship's Secretary or Chaplain, together with a remark that instead of receiving fees whenever he consecrated a church, he was obliged to defray himself the expenses of travelling to the place. Instead of benefiting, in a worldly point of view, by the opening of a new church, the Bishop is often one of the most liberal contributors towards its erection.

It will be but doing an act of common justice for the Journal, if any, that circulated this report, to insert this our unqualified contradiction of it.

His Lordship the Bishop of Montreal held an Ordination in St. John's church, Woodhouse, on Sunday, the 9th inst., when the Rev. Frederic Augustus O'Meara was admitted to the order of Priests. Mr. O'Meara proceeds, we understand, as Missionary to the Indian post at Sault St. Mary, formerly under the charge of the Rev. William McMurray. The latter gentleman has been appointed Assistant Minister to the united charges of Ancaster and Dundas; the health of the incumbent, the Rev. J. Miller, being such as to render necessary his present relinquishment of all parochial duty.

A public discussion has lately taken place in Dublin, which seems to have thrown the religious mind of Ireland into a state of strong excitement. The subjects of debate were the points in dispute between the two Churches of England and Rome:—the champion of the Protestants was the Rev. T. D. Gregg, a young clergyman; that of the Romanists the Rev. T. Maguire, a controversialist of established reputation. The former chose the Rev. E. Nangle, a clergyman of the Establishment, as his chairman; the latter nominated the Rev. Justin Macnamara, a Roman Catholic priest; and under their joint presidency, the discussion was conducted.

The conditions were that the disputants were to continue the controversy from day to day, before a mixed auditory—each being allowed to speak half an hour at a time—until it was the decision of the chairmen that the discussion should terminate. These conditions were adhered to by both parties for eight days, when on the ninth (the 7th June) the Rev. J. Macnamara withdrew his friend Mr. Maguire from the contest, contrary to the declared will of the Rev. E. Nangle, whose joint consent was necessary to terminate the discussion.

The Protestants of Ireland consider this result as an undoubted triumph; and in every direction meetings are held and subscriptions received, for the purpose of presenting Mr. Gregg with a becoming testimonial of Protestant gratitude and admiration. It is a welcome proof of the good feeling prevailing between Churchmen and Wesleyans in Ireland, that "Methodist preachers" are to be found coming forward to swell this tribute to the Protestant champion.

The *Dublin Record*, in announcing the conclusion of this exciting controversy, remarks, that "Mr. Gregg has occupied a place, and performed a great undertaking, for which he has shewn himself eminently qualified, and to which he