

dency to estrange people from our communion, and to increase the difficulties of the Church in her future attempts to collect her scattered children?

And what shall we say of the inconsistency of the Dissenters, in always endeavouring to procure a Churchman to preside over their Anniversary Meeting? Their pertinacity and perseverance under rebuffs and refusals, is, in this respect, astonishing. They first fly at the highest game, and if they cannot get a Judge, a Legislative Councillor, or some eloquent public speaker, they do the best they can, and, after a few failures, generally succeed in getting some respectable Churchman to take the chair for them. But why should they ask a Churchman? They are Dissenters, we presume, because the Church is not sufficiently spiritual for them,—does not sufficiently train up her members in the commandments of God. Yet, on the most public occasion of the year, when the treasury is to be replenished—when the fairest exterior and the most attractive names are to be presented to the public, they do not choose one of their own sect to preside, but enlist the services of some Churchman, whose religion makes him good enough to be their temporary president, but is not good enough for them to live by. And here,—without a particular individual in our eye, and expressly excluding those gentlemen, whose conduct of late has forced us into these remarks,—we take occasion to observe, that the Churchmen, selected to preside at Dissenting Anniversaries are by no means chosen with a reference to their moral or religious character, but merely in consideration of supposed popularity and influence, or their ability to make a speech. How ridiculous would it be, if, at the next general meeting of the Church Society, in June, we were to get a Presbyterian or Methodist layman to take the chair, instead

of the Bishop! And equally ridiculous is it for Dissenters to place a Churchman in the President's seat at their Anniversary meetings,—stationing him there as a decoy-duck, to entrap his brother Churchmen. Really Dissenters, in procuring the presidency of a Churchman at their Anniversary Meetings, must be considered as making either the one or the other of these admissions—that they have not a member of their own fit to take the chair, or that Churchmen, on the score of character and influence, are far more desirable.

We write frequently, and as strenuously as we can, upon this subject, because we deem it one of great practical importance, and involving essential principles. We have not advanced one-half of the arguments which suggest themselves to us, and shall probably be called upon to adduce those that remain to be urged, upon some future occasion. One additional observation, however, we must make before we close.

A Methodist Anniversary Meeting is held in a parish, and the most influential and respectable Churchman presides over it? The clergyman, if he has done his duty, has inculcated unity and undeviating fidelity to the church, and warned his flock against the sin of attending dissenting places of worship. How discouraging then to him, to perceive that his principal parishioner, the man who ought to help and cheer him, and set an example to the rest, has refused obedience to his teachings, and united, albeit for a few hours, with the enemies of the Church. Few circumstances can send a sharper pang into the faithful clergyman's heart, than to see his Parishioners thus neglecting his solemn warnings, and bestowing their countenance and subsistence upon men who revile him and his principles openly, or who stealthily seek to withdraw the sheep from his fold.