Nor is it sufficient that religious opportunities are afforded; that churches are within a few doors of our scientific institutions, and chapels within the walls of colleges, inns, and hospitals. Men ought to meet religion in their every-day studies, in their secular walks, in their literary pursuits. They have, especially in youth, no natural inclination for her instruction, and therefore will make no effort to find her; yea, even the plainest lessons of natural religion will be overlooked, if not denied, by a captious mind that has never been disciplined in the ways of holiness, and whose ambition has perhaps been fed by the applause of the debating room, and the conceit of a little superiority in that "knowledge which descendeth not from above," in that "knowledge which puffeth up." Whilst on the contrary the pious youth, whose mind is, with the truest alchemy, turning all the works of God into the pure gold of His praise, reasons with a philosophical poet of the seventeenth century, Dr. Henry More:—

"When nothing can to God's own self accrue,
Who's infinitely happy; sure the end
Of His creations simply was to shew
His flowing goodness, which he doth outsend
Not for himself: for nought can him amend;
But to his creature doth his good impart.
This infinite *good* through all the world doth wend,
To fill with heavenly bliss each willing heart,
So the free sun doth 'light and 'liven every part."

C. A. H.

THE CHURCH.

COBOURG, FRIDAY, AUGUST 2, 1844.

CONTENTS OF THE OUTSIDE.

First Page.
Poetry —Columbus.
The Fire-Mark of the Lord in the Flames of Hamburg.
The Primitive Church in its Episcopacy.

Fourth Page.
The Consecration of Science.
Henry Howard—Chap. ii.
Garner.—Dean Swift; Rev. H'y. Wharton; Rev. S. Charnock; Archbishop Tillotson.

APPOINTMENTS FOR CONFIRMATION IN THE WESTERN PART OF THE DIOCESE OF TORONTO.

The Bishop of Toronto begs to inform his brethren of the Clergy, that he intends (D. V.) to confirm at the several Missions and Stations in accordance with the following list:—

August 29,—Thursday, Brantford, at 2 P. M.
" 30,—Friday, Norwich, at 11 A. M.
" 31,—Saturday, Ingersol, at 11 A. M.
September 1,—Sunday, Zorra, at 11 A. M.
" 2,—Monday, Woodstock, at 11 A. M.
" 3,—Tuesday, Woodstock, ———
" 4,—Wednesday, Blenheim, at 11 A. M.
" 5,—Thursday, Woolwich, at 11 A. M.
" 6,—Friday, Stratford, at 11 A. M.

A prominent subject of discussion in our English files received by the late arrivals, is the present condition of the Conservative body in England; and the very freedom with which that discussion is pursued is an indication,—generally felt, we believe, even by the opponents of that party,—of their more matured strength, and increasing confidence.

We always regarded it as a triumphant day for the United Empire, when it became disenthralled from the Ministers who preceded the present advisers of the Queen. Not that they had been capable of inflicting a tithe of the mischief to which their relaxed principles of administration would have disposed them; for Her Majesty's Opposition were a powerful phalanx, and the closeness of the division on all occasions in which any constitutional question was at issue,—not to speak of the many positive defeats which were sustained,—rendered them cautious about the proposal of measures to which the moral weight and genuine voice of the nation was opposed. But a government which conducts itself with a show of moderation and prudence from the mere impulse of fear, can never be respected; and few will say that the late Whig administration possessed any great share of the confidence of that portion of the people of the United Kingdom who may, under Providence, be regarded as the conservators of its honour and prosperity. Nor will any careful observer of the times deny, that, in bringing about the late revolution of parties, and in substituting a Conservative for what was, in many respects, a Destructive government, the CHURCH had a vast, perhaps a preponderating influence. The movement of the few preceding years,—the multiplication of churches, the spiritual care of the poor, the better understood principles of ministerial authority and ecclesiastical discipline,—prepared and disposed the public mind for the great and happy change which, in despite of many adverse circumstances, was effected. And it must be equally apparent, that if a Conservative ministry are to be maintained in power, it must be mainly through the sound religious feeling of the country, directed by the National Church.

We have seen, on a few occasions latterly, Sir Robert PEEL left in a minority in Parliament, through the temporary defection of his own supporters; but if, in consequence of this, the hope in one quarter, or the apprehension in another, has been begotten, that the Conservative tenure of power and patronage in England is shaken or declining, we believe we can safely affirm that never was a greater miscalculation made. If Sir Robert Peel ever finds himself deserted, on any particular question, by his usual supporters, it is not because the great principles which guide them have lost ground, or that they are veering about to what is termed the more "liberal" policy of their political opponents; but because the impression with them is strong and irresistible, that their leader has allowed himself to be betrayed into an occasional forgetfulness of those great principles, and that he has adopted, without constraining or sufficient cause, views of public policy which he, in common with themselves, had not long before abjured. It is because, in questions of high national concern,—where the moral standing and spiritual benefits of the nation are involved, and where Christian humanity presents its claims and warms with its holy impulses,—they rise superior to the prejudices of party,—abjure even the tie of a political name, and deal with legislative subjects for the public good without reference to official patronage or individual aggrandizement. In other words, the rising moral might of England,—the elevated tone of its religious feeling,—the better subordination of the temper and spirit of the people to the teaching and authority of the Church,—is shewing itself even within the walls of Parliament; and it is a might and an energy which can and must resist the mandate even of a prime-minister, when he ventures, either through indifference or timidity, to disregard its dictates. This is a sentiment which may be developed in questions that have apparently no connection with religion or its obligations: but even in discussions upon topics purely utilitarian, there is an under current of solemn and sanctified feeling which keeps in the very foreground of debate principles of Christian benevolence, and a prospective regard for interests beyond the passing day or even the present world.

It is, then, a cause for congratulation rather than of apprehension, that we have a House of Commons who hold their duty to their country to be higher and stronger than their obligations to party,—that the moral, the eternal interests of their fellow-creatures are paramount with them to every individual and selfish claim,—that the Ministry, in short, who exist by their choice and stand by their suffrages, must be undeviating in their respect for the great principles of the Constitution, and carry out especially the holy and philanthropic influence of the Church of the realm, or they cannot be ensured in their support.

This appears to us the full amount of the rebuke which Sir Robert Peel has recently received; and the past history of this highly gifted statesman, and, as we believe, estimable man, proves that he does not by any means stand above the necessity of these occasional admonitions. We cannot forget the apostacy of 1829; and the re-awakened clamour for Repeal, the late seditious meetings in Ireland, the trial and condemnation of O'Connell, and the unmitigated discontent and distraction of that country, are fruits,—fruits which will go down with augmented bitterness to posterity,—from the disastrous concession of that memorable year. The timidity, the irresolution, which bent beneath threats and intimidation then,—although religious truth and religious peace was the fearful sacrifice,—may shrink as surely from another storm of trial, and at a time, too, when the result of timid compliance may be more immediately calamitous.

We grieve not, then, to see sound-hearted Conservatives,—men, as we believe, guided by religious principle, and desirous to see the Church of Christ, as originally planted in the land by Apostolic missionaries, exerting her legitimate influence,—we cannot, indeed, but be rejoiced to see them true to their faith as Catholic Christians, even though its uncompromising maintenance should offend, or estrange from them, so distinguished a political leader as Sir Robert Peel. For with all his greatness as a politician, and all his estimable qualities as a man, if we cannot say with the *Achill Missionary Herald* that he is but a child in religion, we are free to confess, notwithstanding some apparent advances lately in that most essential knowledge, that he evinces too often a painful deficiency in the adaptation of its great principles and practical workings to the well-being of the empire and its distant dependencies.

There is a class of statesmen, bearing the designation of Conservatives, who, as respects their allegiance to the Church, are *high* in some ill-digested theoretical opinions, which, with all their crudities or deficiencies, time has riveted and established; but *dry*, it is to be feared, as respects the practical operation of those principles, and their adaptation to the rules and duties of every-day life. The system of the Church is to them, professedly, an object of unfeigned admiration and reverence, provided it be allowed to stand there in fruitless nakedness, or with such application as their own loose or stinted rules of Christian duty may prompt them to make. But when it is proposed to carry out this system,—the subject ostensibly of universal regard,—in the spirit and in the letter; to render practical devotion, self-denial, and Christian almsgiving, something more than theory and a name; then we have these "high and dry," amongst our other religious and political speculators, in sad consternation at alleged novelties, and in loud condemnation of imputed heresy.

If, then, in respect to social and civil relations, "England expects that every man will do his duty," much more, in despite even of prejudice and in defiance of obloquy, is the Church of England Christian called upon to be firm and true to the faith of his fathers, and to shew its influence not in wordy declamation only, but in the active and self-denying labours of the Christian life. Then, we may venture to say, will England be "young" again,—not from the influence of any designation or communion of party, but young in her moral and spiritual might; always fresh and green; putting forth continually new blossoms of promise and hope; evincing a steady regeneration of spring, after every wintry time of darkness, dreariness, and doubt.

We have been for some time in possession of a very excellent Sermon, entitled "AUTHORITATIVE MINISTERIAL TEACHING," preached before the Convention of the Diocese of Maryland in May last, by the Rev. Thos. Atkinson, Rector of St. Peter's Church, Baltimore.

There can be no doubt that the great source of the divisions which now distract the Christian world, and which contribute, in no small degree, to bring discredit upon the Reformation itself, consists in a low and depreciating sense of ministerial authority, and, connected with that, of the ordinances which it is the office of the Christian ministry to dispense. The prevalence of such views leads to all the practical mischiefs in the Christian world which it is our misfortune, at the present day, to contemplate. Every man,—to apply the expression to a large body of professing Christians,—thinks himself authorized, in religious matters, to do that which is right in his own eyes: he pleads an internal movement; professes an impulse of which he alone can be conscious; affirms that he is animated by a spirit within which urges him to the propagation of the Gospel; and, under this uncertain direction, goes forth to that solemn work, and takes upon him not only to declare with authoritative voice the counsel of God, but to administer those precious sacraments and ordinances which it has ever been regarded as not less than profanity that uncommissioned and unauthorized hands should dispense. The effect of all this necessarily is, the destruction of the unity of the Church; and instead of a building fitly framed together, such as the Church was designed to be, the presentation of a multitude of distinct and incongruous fabrics, without connecting symmetry or association,—no voice of common symphony animating the whole; no united prayers or praises to betoken unity of purpose or communion of feeling. In these differing and disagreeing sections of professing Christians, it would be hard indeed to discern the followers of a common Lord: there may be an avowal of unity of belief, but even that is tortured and disfigured; while the best evidence of one constraining feeling and purpose is wanting, in the united worship, the joint communion, the every day fellowship which it was the glory and happiness of the early Church to manifest, and of which nothing but a correct and cordial appreciation of Christian truth prevents the realization now.

The sentiments which are expressed by Mr. Atkinson in the valuable Sermon to which we have referred, are so much in unison with our own, that we gladly transfer to our columns the following passage in testimony of the insufficiency of an internal call, apart from that outward commission and delegated authority which are, upon every Scriptural ground, essential to the valid constitution of a Christian ministry:—

"We have most unpalatable truths to utter, we have mysterious and superhuman revelations to communicate; who shall authorize us to declare these but God? And how shall we know that he has authorized us? Must we depend on the testimony of our own hearts? To have a full authority, we ought to have this testimony; we must trust that we are inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to desire this honour; but is this alone sufficient? Is every man who supposes himself to be called of God to preach the Gospel, necessarily so called? Is he, because of this persuasion, not only actually called, but likewise empowered and commissioned? Is that which passes in the heart of man necessarily the same with that which takes place in the council-chamber of God? Must the one ever be a transcript of the other? Are there no means of discriminating between enthusiasts, fanatics and pretenders, on the one hand, and God's true ministers and rightful ambassadors on the other? If so, then it would seem that the promises of God are not well ordered and sure, that the Church is not a city at unity with itself, that the Christian ministry is a mere form without any substance, a name without any corresponding reality. What is the testimony of Scripture on this subject? That 'no man taketh this honour unto himself but he that is called of God, as was Aaron'—that is called openly and visibly by an external, manifest, *verifiable* appointment of God. Are we encouraged by inspired men to act on important subjects merely on our own impulse; to trust entirely to the testimony of our own hearts? 'He that trusteth in his own heart,' says the word of God, 'is a fool;' 'the heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked, who can know it?'

"A right, then, to minister in the concerns of the soul, that rests merely on this evidence, must ever, to say the least, be uncertain. Where, then, shall we seek for a better or a surer right? Can man give it to us? Can man originate and transmit a power to act as the messenger and ambassador of God? He cannot confer such an authority on behalf of his fellow man; can he on the part of God? The question answers itself. I see not, then, how any thoughtful and conscientious person can venture on the work of God's ministers, unless he be assured that God has appointed him thereto. And it is difficult to conceive how he can be thus assured by any other than one of two methods: either God has authenticated His commission by a direct interposition of His own, a miracle, or a sign which sets His seal to the credentials of His minister; or the minister derives his powers from those who have been thus authorized, and who have been commanded and enabled to transmit their authority to others."

The following remarks on the manner of ministerial teaching, and the means by which it may be rendered effectual, as a portion of the office of the Lord's ambassador,—subordinate certainly to the more direct and proper duties of the sanctuary,—we are happy also to transcribe:—

"Our main business is to teach, not to argue; and, indeed, if we teach aright, there is not much necessity for disputation, for there is a correspondence between that evangelical truth which God inspired, and the soul of man which He created. The truth has its evidence in itself, and the proof of its divine origin in its adaptation to our nature and our needs. 'In it,' as an illustrious philosopher has said, 'is light for every man, and life for as many as give heed to it. In it we find words for our inmost thoughts, songs for our joy, utterances for our hidden griefs, and pleadings for our shame and our feebleness.' Our office is to bear witness to this truth, to teach it plainly and positively. Do you not perceive how this characterizes our Lord's discourse, and imparts a peculiar authority to it? He came not as a sophist, to argue, but as an herald to announce; as a teacher, to instruct. Read, in confirmation of this, His Sermon on the Mount, or that which He spake to His disciples in 'the night in which he was betrayed:' not only all truth, but almost every affirmation a positive truth, a new ray of light shining in on a world that lay in darkness. And for this, among other high purposes, was his Church constituted, to wit, as a teacher, 'the pillar and ground of the truth,' upholding it, maintaining it, declaring it. And ecclesiastical history testifies that the Church has, as might be expected, answered the purpose for which she was designed; that it has been her characteristic in all ages, to preserve the whole truth in harmonious union; while it is a note of the sects who fall off from her to reject a part of the truth, and to take some other part as a substitute for the whole. Just as in the judgment of Solomon, the false mother is willing to divide the body which she claims, while the true mother yearns over it, and will not consent that it shall be otherwise than entire. Trace religious error to its sources and you will almost always find it to flow from mere unbelief, to be a simple negation of something which God has positively declared. The most scriptural, then, the most becoming, and the most effectual way of combating error, is not directly to assail it, but in faith and patience, with purity and with fulness, to preach the truth.—And I have ever observed that not those preachers produced the deepest impression, who exhibited the richest imagination, or the most subtle logic, but those who declared the gospel simply, clearly, positively, after the manner of witnesses speaking that which they knew, and testifying that which they had seen.—Of course this manner is utterly inconsistent with anything like affectation or a desire of display. He who speaks to please his hearers or to advance his own reputation, can never speak with authority: he comes in the manner of a petitioner, not of an instructor; ultimately, he is sure to defeat his own selfish and unworthy objects. There is such a sense of fitness in the human mind, that that class of compositions, which may be characterized as *pretty sermons*, intended to fall sweetly and softly on ears polite, which are utterly an abomination before God, are also exceedingly offensive to the taste and feelings of men. All consider that if truth, reality, simplicity, fervor, were to be banished from every other spot on earth, they ought at least to find a refuge and dwelling place in the pulpit."

We have been asked, in reference to a late piece of Provincial Legislation, which provides for the disfranchisement of a large portion of her Majesty's subjects in this Province, whether, in contravention of a hackneied rule that there is to be "no taxation without representation," the "ministers of all denominations," who are now excluded from exercising the common right of British subjects in voting at Elections, are expected to bear their share in contributing, by taxes or imposts of any kind, to the sustentation of a government which thus arbitrarily shuts them out from a privilege which all other classes are permitted to exercise. When a Legislative Assembly decides upon such an act of exclusion, and arbitrarily disfranchises a large portion of the community, there should, on a well-understood principle of justice, be some immunity or favour imparted in lieu of the forfeiture which has thus been imposed. If such be not contemplated or designed, we may well complain of the palpable want of that "equal justice to all her Majesty's subjects," which the authors of this despotic piece of legislation have always been amongst the foremost in insisting upon.

We can hardly feel surprise at the fact of such an enactment passing our Colonial Legislature; but we cannot repress our amazement that the Imperial Government should sanction so wanton and uncalled for a trespass upon the liberties and just rights of any portion of the loyal subjects of the Queen. There can be no question that the Act is unconstitutional, and openly and palpably at variance with the established principles of our "Magna Charta," and that no Legislature is competent, in this invidious and partial way, without cause or provocation, to filch from the subjects of the Crown a privilege of which they have ever been in the undisputed enjoyment, and which, by the very Constitution of Parliament, is solemnly guaranteed to them.

That some strong and decisive action will be taken to remove this most despotic encroachment upon individual rights, we cannot entertain a doubt; although the decencies of legislative obligation will, we must believe, spontaneously effect the abrogation of this outrage upon liberty and propriety, without any formal interposition of the parties aggrieved.

The excellent dialogues upon "Private Judgment," by our correspondent S. D., are brought to a close in this number; and if the advocate of the loose principle which is embodied under that name has not been convinced by the arguments of his opponent, it is not because they have not been stated with fairness, force and ability. There is much, besides the present instance, to shew that it is more convenient to shun and retreat from an argument, than to meet it, and that where men will not be convinced of the truth, they often voluntarily close their ears and hearts against it. We trust that these excellent and ably written dialogues will have many attentive readers, and that their sound and judicious author will be repaid for his exertions by the diffusion of more correct and clearer views upon this controverted question, through their instrumentality.

The communication in another column upon the duty of contributing to the "Church Society," is well worthy of an attentive perusal. We trust that the judicious suggestions which it offers, will be widely acted upon; and that, from the recommendations which are so powerfully offered by the Society itself, no stinted measure of support will in any quarter be accorded to it. In this day's impression will be found the Act of Incorporation of this excellent Society; and we repeat our hope that the new and more influential position which it is now made to bear, will prove the harbinger of its wider and more abundant success.

We have much pleasure in acknowledging the receipt of a work just published by W. Scott Burn Esq. of Toronto, and for some time advertised in this journal,—viz. "The principles of Book-Keeping, explained in an Address to a Student of Upper Canada College; and an Elementary Course of Book-Keeping by Double Entry."—It has long been complained that the systems of Book-Keeping from time to time published, and comprehended in the instruction of pupils designed for a mercantile life, have not, by any means, been adapted to its actual practice, and that the knowledge thus communicated has been in a great measure thrown away. And perhaps one cause of this was, that the writers of such treatises were not themselves conversant with the details and actual practice of the business on which they designed to communicate instruction; while the modern improvements in that respect,—the benefits of experience which every day is realizing, especially in the vastly increased extent of the commercial dealings of the Mother Country,—have, in such publications, been almost wholly overlooked. It is believed, however, that the present work will be found to meet that objection, and to evince that much practical experience, aided by a close observation of the changes and improvements introduced in this branch of business in later times, has been brought to bear upon the important science of Book-Keeping.

We heartily recommend the work to all who are engaged in the instruction of youth; and we cannot but feel that it would form a profitable subject of study as well to the professional student, as to him who is designed for a mercantile life.

It gives us much satisfaction to acknowledge the receipt of the first number of the *British Canadian*, published at the office of Messrs. Watson & Stanton at Toronto. The quarter from whence it proceeds is a strong guarantee, that its principles will be found in accordance with those of the loyal subject and honest conservative of the great principles of Church and State. We cordially wish to this new and respectable ally to the constitutional cause, a large circulation and the most abundant success.

"A Lover of the Good Old Paths," with the pamphlet accompanying, has been received; and we shall probably notice the subject in our next.

☞ A Collector will proceed eastward from this office, on or about the 15th August, instant, and will solicit the outstanding dues to *The Church*, through the Newcastle, Prince Edward, Victoria, Midland, Johnstown, Bathurst and Eastern Districts, as far as Cornwall inclusive,—and we trust his reception will be every where satisfactory.

A Collector will about the same time visit the Townships lying between Cobourg and Toronto, as well as the northern portion of the Newcastle District, and the District of Colborne.

Communications.

ON PRIVATE JUDGMENT.

NO. V.

C.—The last remark you made has, I must confess, sounded harsh in my ears ever since we last met. You said, "I think we have had enough of it as a Parliamentary Establishment." Why cannot you, as Christian men, speak fairly and candidly as those who know that they must render an account to the Judge of all? I shewed you, from the authentic documents of the national statutes, that the Church had reformed herself after the civil power had abolished the usurped jurisdiction of the Pope, and that Parliament did no more than ratify by law what the Church herself declared to be her constitution, doctrines and usages, and yet you are so uncandid as to say that she is only a Parliamentary Establishment, as if Parliament had, in fact, created her. But your observation is not, in reality, more injurious to us than it is to Dissenters themselves; for when you taunt us with being but a Parliamentary Establishment, what will you do with the Act of Toleration? That Act has established you, and gave the sanction of law to secure you the collection of your voluntary subscriptions, as much as if they were tithes or rent-charges. What will you say of the laws of Henry VIII., which abolished the jurisdiction of the Pope and all appeals to Rome? Had the power of the Roman Pontiff still remained in force in England, where would you be able to place your societies? They would not have a foot-hold in all Christendom. But I wish you to tell me what you really mean by "the Church of Christ."

D.—That I will most readily, but remember that I will confine myself to the statutes of the New Testament, and shall have nothing to do with human laws. I say then, in strict accordance with the Scripture idea of a Church of Christ, that it is a congregation or voluntary society of Christians, who commonly meet together to attend gospel ordinances in the same place. And they think every such society has a right to transact its own affairs according to the judgment and conscience of the members thereof, independently of any other society whatsoever, or without being accountable to any but Jesus Christ, or restrained by any laws but his. This is the idea entertained, so far as I know, by all Protestant non-conformists, of a Church of Christ, and I think it is the only idea which the New Testament, rightly and honestly interpreted, conveys to an unprejudiced mind, but what a wreck it will make of your Parliamentary Establishment!

C.—I have now got your view of the Church of Christ, and must offer you my thanks for calling it "an idea," for it is truly "an idea," a perfect phantom of the imagination. With your leave I will run it over and bring it to the test of Scripture, and see how it will agree with the law and testimony.

D.—Do so. I shall be curious to hear how you may contrive to set it aside, for I know you will do it some way or other.

C.—1st. I beg leave to observe, that your "idea of a Church of Christ" is untrue in more respects than I will, at this time, take the trouble of pointing out. The Presbyterians and Methodists are non-conformists, but they are not independent of other societies,—they are not Congregationalists,—and all sects, without exception, deny or disguise it as they may, are law-makers, and are therefore governed and restrained by laws of their own, —laws which Jesus Christ never made. Your "idea" then is not true.

2nd. Your "idea of a Church of Christ" agrees, I will not say to how many sects, but I think it agrees exactly to four sects that differ essentially and fundamentally from one another, and cannot, therefore, be a true "idea of a Church of Christ," unless, contrary to St. Paul, we suppose Christ to be divided, and to have promulgated more than one Faith, one Lord, and one Baptism. The "idea" agrees with what Congregationalists, Baptists, Unitarians, and Universalists, call "a Church of Christ," so that, according to your "idea," every and each of the four is a true Church, though it cannot be pretended that they have one faith. The New Testament never speaks of but one flock,—one kingdom,—one household of faith, —one vineyard,—one body, as there is but one Lord, one faith, one hope, and one King, to proclaim but one law equally for the stranger and home-born.

3rd. Your "idea" sets out with a qualifying expression, which is partly true and partly false, but the sense in which it is false is that intended by you to be the true sense: "A congregation or voluntary society of Christians, who commonly meet together to attend gospel ordinances in the same place." How the truth is here obscured to the everlasting danger of thousands and millions of the human race! To be a matter of equal choice and safety to be or be not a member of the body of Christ!

D.—Is it possible that you, who profess to believe the Bible, can be opposed to the Gospel view that I have given of the Church of Christ? If you are, I really pity you from my heart, and pray the Lord that, to your knowledge of old musty Acts of Parliament, the productions of barbarous ages, you may add the knowledge of Scripture, which is able to make you wise unto salvation!

C.—I am thankful to you for your devout prayer in my behalf, and readily add to it my Amen. But, then, what do you mean by the word "voluntary?" I will tell you how I understand it. All Christians are the willing servants of Jesus Christ. "Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power."—Psalm cx. 3. "Now when they heard this, they were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and to the rest of the Apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do?"—Acts ii. 37. In answer to this all-important inquiry, the Apostle instructed them concerning the way of salvation through Jesus Christ, whom they had crucified; and through the blessing of God on his instructions, the result was this, "Then they that gladly received his word were baptized; and the same day there were added to the Church about three thousand souls."—Verse 41. In one sense, then, your word "voluntary" is perfectly true. All true Christians gladly receive the word of salvation, and consequently are voluntarily obedient to the Gospel; and so far as your "idea of a Church of Christ" comes under this view, I concur in it; but this is not the sense it bears in your "idea." Look at it again. You may say as much of any society. I may or may not, just as I choose, be a member of the Society of Odd Fellows, or of a trading company, or of a debating club, but if I refrain, I commit no sin, I come under no penalty, because there is no obligation in law or reason upon me to join. It is a matter of voluntary choice to do the one or the other, attended with no risk, because there is no obligation. Can you say that the Church of Christ is voluntary in this sense? I think not; for nothing short of this free choice will constitute a "voluntary society," in the sense of your "idea." I ask, is it the sense of Scripture? Very far from it, for it is utterly repugnant to Scripture; and as I am soon to break off from this conference, I will not leave you till I give you a brief exposition of my view. The Church, then, is not, and cannot be, "a voluntary society," in the sense of your "idea." For, to be "a voluntary society," as used by you, the society must be equally safe in rejecting, as in receiving the word of God; in disobeying, as in obeying the Gospel. Now the doctrine of Scripture is this: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned."—St. Mark xvi. 16. "He that believeth on him is not condemned; but he that believeth not is condemned already."—St. John iii. 18. "I said therefore unto you, that ye shall die in your sins: for if ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins."—St. John viii. 24. "I tell you nay; but except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish." —St. Luke xiii. 3, 6. "For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord."—Rom. vi. 23. "For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad."—2 Cor. v. 10. "Know ye not, that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God?"—1 Cor. v. 9. "Take heed, brethren, lest there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief, in departing from the living God; but exhort one another daily, while it is called to-day; lest any of you be hardened through the deceitfulness of sin. For we are made partakers of Christ, if we hold fast the beginning of our confidence stedfast unto the end."—Heb. ii. 12, 13, 14. "Now the just shall live by faith; but if he draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him."—Heb. x. 38. "Follow peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord."—Heb. xii. 14.

D.—Do you quote all these texts as being against my "idea of a Church of Christ"?

C.—I certainly do, and would many more, if you had not spoken, and also maintain that every one of them shews that the choice of the Christian is not between two ways equally safe, but between heaven and hell—sin and holiness—the favour and wrath of Almighty God—a member of the body of Christ, "the child of God, an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven," and remaining among the children of disobedience, to share with them at last in the reward of unrighteousness. It is not then left as a matter of free choice to be or be not members of the Church of God, as men please. "I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." (St. John, iii. 3.) Take this text in any sense you like, it destroys the "idea of your voluntary society." It proves that you must be a member of the body of Christ, or never see the kingdom of God. Yet, your friends who hold to your "idea of a Church of Christ," do thereby teach thousands and millions of perishing sinners that they may embrace or reject the Gospel, obey God or the world, live soberly, righteously and godly, or walk after the devices of their own hearts, as they please. For, if you make but that the Church is no more than a voluntary society, it follows that Jesus Christ has no Church until men be willing to make for him a Church. But the Church which Jesus Christ established is the purchase of his blood, and is therefore under the strongest obligations to love, serve and obey her Lord, and not obey or disobey, as she may choose.

4th. The middle clause of your "idea" is equally objectionable, viz.: "Every such society has a right to transact its own affairs according to the judgment and conscience of the members thereof." Do the private judgment and the conscience of the individual members constitute the rule? Jesus Christ thereby is dethroned, and his holy word is set aside. Your "idea of a Church of Christ," has nothing to do with the Church which Jesus Christ and his Apostles have established in the New Testament. Yours is a voluntary society, may or may not be Christians—may receive as little or as much of the Scriptures as they please—may come together when it suits, and refrain when it does not suit—and when they come may transact their own affairs, or Christ's, as they choose; for your chief characteristic, *voluntary*, repudiates every idea of obligation.

D.—I have heard you enough. I will not stay to hear you another minute. You may speak to the walls for all me.

C.—I am sorry that you leave me in such ill humour, but I hope it will not last very long.

S. D.

CHURCH SOCIETY.

Rev. and dear Sir,—I am induced to address you on the subject of the "Diocesan Church Society," and to offer a few remarks for the consideration of its members. I fear that the proposition put forth, "that a subscription of five shillings yearly, from each member of the Church," will suffice for the wants of the Society, has had the effect of misleading some and of inducing others, in affluent circumstances, to suppose that they are not called upon to contribute in proportion to their respective yearly incomes. This amount of yearly contribution was only intended to apply to those whose means are *very limited*, —the small farmer, for instance, and the humble mechanic, —to those, in short, whose daily labours supply their families with the plainest fare and the coarsest apparel, not to those who are clothed in fine linen and are faring sumptuously every day.

We are willing to admit, that it is the duty of every son of the Church to contribute towards her support, and that none are so indigent as to be unable to give any thing; yet few of us, in judging of the means of our poorer neighbours, take into account our own yearly gains, when we give in our subscriptions to this great and good work. I call, then, upon "the rich among the people," to recollect that while they have been adding to their store, and building barns wherein to bestow their fruits, they have never been desired, until lately, to contribute towards the support of those who have laboured for their spiritual welfare. During all this time, they have been looked upon by the Societies at home as "destitute settlers!" Surely, then, they are *now* particularly called upon to return, not only that which they have received, but also to give, out of their present abundance, for the benefit of those *really* "destitute settlers" in the interior.

Allow me, for the guidance of those who are halting between duty and liberality, to enter into a calculation in which duty alone is considered; leaving it to the liberal to add thereto as inclination may prompt. The farmer, who raises grain or produce equivalent to 100 bushels of wheat, may surely afford to give, per annum, one bushel, or cash..... 5s.
He who raises 200 bushels 15
" " 400 " 30

The person whose income is £100 per annum, but who is compelled to purchase every thing for the support of his family, can give 5s.; where the income is £200, he may give £1; £400, £5; £600, £10; £800, £20; £1000, £25; and so in proportion. You will observe that these rates are intended for a person of a family: those who have small families to provide for, could afford to be more liberal. Bachelors, particularly the elder portion, might compound for three times this rate. This could be done quarterly without any inconvenience or injury. Which of the above class of persons does not pay out much more yearly for medical attendance on his family, or for insuring his property against damage from fire? Surely the soul's present health and future prospects are of much greater moment than body or goods.

Should this equitable rate be adopted *generally*, what would be the result? Almost every object contemplated by the Society would be accomplished. I beg of our Churchmen, then, to think on these things, and let conscience testify whether they be not "disposed in their heart to do so grudgingly or of necessity," for "God loveth a cheerful giver."

There is one thing, however, that can be done by the most indigent member of the Church: he can lend his assistance in making collections. Many persons, though generous in disposition, are negligent, if not solicited for their contributions; others, though unwilling, can be wearied by importunity or convinced by reasoning.—Pray let me ask how many are there of our communion who bestir themselves in this way? Is not this task imposed almost entirely on the Minister of the Parish? And are not the uninformed to apt to think that his zeal for the Society is not the conscientious discharge of a duty, but an officious intermeddling for his own benefit? Against the continuance of this evil, I do most solemnly protest, and I strongly, earnestly, yet affectionately, call upon the laity to relieve the Clergy from this grievous burden.

I am, Rev. and dear Sir,
Your obedient servant,
23d July, 1844. A LAYMAN.

Ecclesiastical Intelligence.

CANADA.

RECTORY OF DARLINGTON.

Darlington, July 25th, 1844.

Rev. and Dear Sir,—I trust that the following communication will not be read without interest by any of the members of our Holy Catholic Church, and that it will afford special gratification to those who were moved to aid our humble efforts to complete and embellish our parish Church, and thereby render it more worthy of Him to whose service it is dedicated.

It may appear to some who are unacquainted with the peculiar constitution of our Canadian parishes (for I know and am happy to bear testimony that the "Church" paper is read with pleasure and attention by many who know but little of Canada),—strange, that the comparatively small sum required could not have been raised without foreign aid. But it must be remembered that although the Church outnumbers any single body of professed Christians, yet Dissent is, in its aggregation, unfortunately strong, and being so long unmolested, it is no wonder that the members of our communion are in many places, comparatively speaking, but a small portion of the community, but rather a cause of thankfulness that so many have remained steadfast in their allegiance.

It should be remembered also, that as one country parish covers an area of about an hundred square miles, but a small portion of our members can attend the village Church, and that upon a few therefore the burden falls of providing the means to erect the sacred edifice.

In October 1838, I was sent to take charge of this parish, and found the Church in a very unfinished state: since that period we have annually raised amongst ourselves small sums for repairs and improvements, but I began to despair of ever seeing the Church completed, as I anticipated that in a short time all that we could raise would be expended in repairs only. Knowing, however, how much my congregation deplored the unfinished state of the Church, as likewise their inability to build or purchase a parsonage house, I felt confident that if I were enabled to hold out any hope of the possibility of accomplishing either object, that they would be stimulated to fresh exertions and sacrifices. I drew up therefore a statement setting forth the wants of the parish, its poverty, and what had already been effected, which the Lord Bishop was kind enough to recommend to the favourable consideration of the friends of my family, for to these he justly limited my application: this I enclosed to my sisters in Guernsey, and I requested them to solicit subscriptions from their friends in that island and in England. They replied that there were so many local as well foreign charitable societies supported in Guernsey, that they could not hope to raise a large sum for any particular friends: they guaranteed me, however, £50 Sterling; half to be applied to the Church fund, and the other half to the parsonage fund. Encouraged by this intelligence, the Ladies of the congregation determined to take upon themselves the task of endeavouring to raise the money required to finish the Church: they formed themselves into a sewing-society, and solicited donations of money and work, and the Lord blessed their endeavours. Several sums have been acknowledged at different times through the medium of the "Church" paper by the indefatigable and zealous Treasurer and Secretary, Mrs. Dr. Low; but as I have undertaken to give an account of the monies received by the Society, and of the manner in which they were expended, I have to request that you will again insert them, together with certain resolutions passed at our Vestry meeting in April last.

My most sanguine expectations have been surpassed, and I feel truly grateful. We have not been able as yet to obtain a suitable site for a parsonage-house, but a subscription list has been commenced, and my parishioners, I feel confident, will exert themselves to the utmost, and strive to embrace the first opportunity that offers of securing an eligible spot.

The pleasurable feelings excited in my own breast by a consideration of these matters, must be my excuse for inflicting so long a letter.

Believe me to remain,
Rev. and Dear Sir,
Your's most faithfully,
THOS. SMITH KENNEDY.

To the Editor of "The Church."

P. S.—With the balance in our favour we are about to repair the roof of the Tower, and then the surplus, if any, will go towards fencing the burial-ground.

Copy of Resolutions passed at a Meeting of the Vestry of St. John's Church, Darlington, April 8, 1844.

Proposed by Dr. Low, seconded by Mr. Jones—

1. This Vestry desire to record their gratitude to Almighty God, the Giver and Disposer of all events, for the almost unhoped-for measure of success which has attended their efforts to complete and embellish this Church.

Proposed by Dr. Bird, seconded by Mr. Neville—

2. This Vestry are desirous of recording the fact, that the Parish is greatly indebted to the praiseworthy and untiring exertions of the Ladies' Sewing Society, for the completion of the Church.

Proposed by Mr. Sutton, seconded by Mr. Dewey—

3. This Vestry being desirous of publicly acknowledging the debt of gratitude they owe to the several persons, who kindly by donations of money or work assisted them in completing and embellishing the Church, request that the Rector will forward these resolutions, together with a statement of the monies received and expended by the Committee, to the Rev. Editor of the "Church" paper, with a request that he will be kind enough to publish them.

Proposed by Mr. Jones, seconded by Dr. Cubitt—

4. This Vestry being informed that, at the request of Mr. Neville, Edwin Woodhouse Esq., of Leamington, County Warwick, England, has purchased a Communion Service for this Church, and that the same will be forwarded as soon as the navigation opens, request that Mr. Neville will convey their warmest thanks to Mr. Woodhouse for the same.

Proposed by Mr. Webster, seconded by Mr. Muirs—

5. This Vestry feel greatly obliged to Mr. Neville for his endeavours to excite an interest in favour of this Church among his friends in England; and that this Vestry likewise thankfully acknowledge the receipt of a Font promised by Mrs. Kennedy, as a thank-offering after the birth of her first child.

Sums subscribed and money received:

	£	s.	d.
His Excellency Sir Charles Metcalfe	25	0	0
Money per the Misses Kennedy	25	0	0
Lady Mary Bagot	5	0	0
Mrs. Strachan	2	10	0
Ladies of Kingston, per Mrs. Macaulay	7	10	0
Ladies of Cobourg, per Mrs. Calcutt	5	0	0