

THE BURIAL SERVICE.

"Jesus said unto her, I am the resurrection and the life; he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die."

THE SIGN OF THE CROSS.

In the persecutions in the primitive Church, the martyrs, who were hurried to tumulterous executions, and could not be heard for the noise, in excusing themselves of treason and sedition, and crimes imputed to them to make their cause odious, did use, in the sight of the people, (who might see a gesture, though they could not hear a protestation,) to sign themselves with the sign of the Cross, to let them know for what profession they died.

THE CHURCH.

COBourg, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 26, 1839.

The intelligence of the week most interesting probably to the great body of our readers, is the arrival at Quebec of the new Governor General of British North America. This is the first instance, we believe, in which this high office has been held by any other than a titled civilian, or a person of distinguished military rank; and that any titular honour or hereditary privilege can add in the least to the inherent qualifications for that important post, but the principle seemed to have been recognized at home, and it was respected here, that the Representative of royalty in this extensive and valuable portion of Her Majesty's dominions should bear some affinity to royalty itself in hereditary and inalienable rank.

When upon the recall of the Earl of Gosford, it was announced that Lord Durham was to be his successor, the Conservatives of these Provinces naturally received the intelligence with distrust and alarm. His Lordship bore no character for distinguished talent, much less for tact and prudence, in his native land: as a statesman, he was below mediocrity; and his radical propensities gave him notoriety rather than fame.

This arrogant and shallow nobleman will only be remembered by future generations in Canada for the mischief he has done; and now, as if in envy of our comparative good fortune, Sir John Colborne—the beloved and trusted of the loyalists and the feared of rebels—must be superseded by one in whom the first can have no grounds for confidence, and whom the other, in the recklessness of despair, will regard as their advocate and friend!

We trust, however, that both the one and the other will be disappointed in the new Governor General of the Canadas. Firmness and consistency, while they will conciliate the regards of the true-hearted, will frustrate the machinations already plotted by the rebellious in the expectation of countenance, at least of indulgence from a "liberal." We pity the bearer of this name when, from a suspicious laxity of political principle, it is

bestowed by others; we pity him much more, if it is voluntarily assumed and exulted in. But we shall hope for the best; and it is the duty of every loyal subject, until facts give the lie to their hopes, to receive with respect and to aid with their honest energy the individual to whom our gracious Queen has delegated the honour of being her representative in the British Provinces of North America.

But we must not delude ourselves, nor shall we attempt to deceive others, by expressing confidence in promises or resting our dependence upon hopes which, in the very nature of things, must be hollow and evanescent. No permanent good,—whatever may be the speciousness of the momentary promise,—can result from a system which is based upon falsehood and infidelity, and which is not rooted and grounded in the fear of God. Such is the system, we grieve to say it, of the Whig Radicals who now unhappily control the destinies of our beloved country; and we dare not be blind to the dealings of Providence or to the warnings of Scripture, as to believe that any permanent good can result from a system so ungodly and unchristian. Instead of guarding, with the might and fearlessness of truth, the Church and the Throne, they are fostering, rewarding and pampering those who are labouring to upheave them both from their foundations. Not only is this conspiracy against the Altar and the Throne viewed without any effort at counteraction; but its unhallowed agents are, even by those who should be the foremost defenders of both, furnished with weapons for their destruction.

But we shall not despair. There are others who watch their secret machinations, and will put forth their might, in the coming day of trial, to frustrate their attempts. We are not left without seven thousand in our Israel who refuse to bow the knee to the Baal of infidelity and to the idols of Popery: we are not without a great and increasing band who stand firm and true to the principles of our Protestant Constitution against this current of anarchy and blasphemy; and we believe that—a few years of further purification in this fiery ordeal, perchance a few months having passed—they will, with the blessing of Providence, have the honour of redeeming our country from its present degradation, and rendering the reign of Victoria as bright upon the historic page as that of Elizabeth.

We have no hesitation in giving insertion to the letter of Mr. Slight, which appears in our succeeding columns,—much as we would avoid even the appearance of affording any encouragement to controversy. But the conductor of the Christian Guardian has manifested so much unfairness in his treatment of this correspondent, that we cannot deny him the justice which has been refused him in the quarter where he might naturally have expected its most cordial exercise.

This acting Editor, with no abatement of the virulence which has characterized the previous management of that journal, does by no means possess that amount of sophistical tact and cunning—ambitiously as he seems to aspire to the very questionable honour—which, in his predecessor, could sometimes, to the weak and inexperienced at least, make "the worse appear the better reason." It is lamentable that any professed Christian should be chargeable with the serious fault of putting upon the words and motives of an adversary a construction which it must be perfectly apparent they were never intended to bear; nor does the reason for this perversion of the truth diminish its sinfulness,—namely, that un-mortified pride which would persist in obliquity rather than acknowledge an error,—which would distort the language of an opponent rather than admit the correctness of his facts or the soundness of his reasoning. It is a sorry and distressing characteristic to attach to those who profess to adopt as their rule of life that Gospel system which so prominently inculcates in its adherents the simplicity of the babe and the harmlessness of the dove. The spectator of these incongruities will naturally regard them as an evidence that this profession of purity is hollow and fruitless, and that there lurks a revolting unsoundness behind this show of sanctity.

In the Christian Guardian we have been too much accustomed to this species of double-dealing to wonder at its appearance even towards one whom its conductors are bound more especially to cherish as a brother. We lament the degradation; the more so, because we believe the offence to be deeply-seated, and that it requires more than the interposition of human friendship to reach the seat of the disorder and correct its malignity. We are not concerned to notice all the distortions of facts and vituperations of individuals, which abound in that much mis-named journal; we can view without a feeling its imputation even of falsehood to a Bishop of the Church, against whom the breath of calumny has never heretofore been raised: we were content with a simple explanation—with a simple detail of facts; and if these must be tortured by a professedly Christian writer into a libellous aspersion of a character which has never been sullied, we grieve for the degradation of our common Christianity by those who should be the foremost in vindicating its honour and sustaining its purity.

If in these efforts to cloud the truth and pervert common sense, the Editor of the Guardian is likely to infect a single one of his readers with his own obliquity of vision, there is more of weakness or of prejudice amongst them than we had anticipated. If, indeed, they can impartially scan the general temper and tendency of that paper, without grief for its faults and prayer for its improvement, we must infer that more than a "blindness in part" has happened to that people. It is—that we hope that they themselves begin to discern it,—that they should be fed with wholesome and not with noxious food; that something tasteful and edifying in selection should take the place of its sorry gleanings against the Established Church; that something should be presented in its columns which will uphold the dignity of Christianity and foster the loyalty of the people.

THE MIDLAND CLERICAL ASSOCIATION held a very interesting session on Wednesday and Thursday the 16th and 17th instant, at the residence of the Rev. J. Grier, the respected Rector of the Carrying Place. Eleven Clergymen were present; and their deliberations,—which included a critical review of various passages in the Word of God, with a consideration of many points of practical and ministerial duty,—were animated and edifying. The weather was most auspicious; and the congregations attending the services with which the business of each day was closed, were numerous and attentive. The Sermon on the first day was preached by the Rev. A. N. Bethune on the Eighteenth Article of the Church; and on the second day an equally numerous congregation was most pleased and edified by a valuable discourse on the Service for the Churching of Women, by the Rev. R. D. Cartwright. The assembled brethren were very kindly pleased to express their sense of these exertions by requesting the publication in "The Church" of both the sermons delivered at this meeting;—a request with which, waiving all feelings of personal reluctance, a sentiment of respect for those who made it will naturally induce their authors to comply.

In the Ecclesiastical Intelligence communicated to our readers last week, it ought to have been mentioned that the Rev. M. Willoughby is appointed Visiting Missionary in the island of Montreal,—making, we believe,

the third clergyman now engaged in that capacity within the limits of that District.

We understand that Mr. W. M. Godfrey, who came with letters Dimissory from the Archbishop of Halifax, in the absence of the Bishop of that Diocese, was ordained Deacon by the Lord Bishop of Montreal on Sunday the 13th instant; and on the same day, we understand that 169 young persons were confirmed in the Cathedral Church.

Our readers will be gratified by the perusal of the Speeches, in a succeeding column, in behalf of the Spiritual wants of the British North American Provinces.—Cordially as the Lord Bishop of Nova Scotia will be welcomed back by his attached and faithful clergy, the impression we know is strong in every mind that he is labouring indefatigably in our maternal land for the welfare of his Diocese and of the Colonial Church at large. The powerful eloquence of the Chief Justice of Upper Canada, it will be seen, has gained that admiration in England which it has always elicited here; and very delightful it is to contemplate these rare gifts employed to the honour of the gracious Being who bestows them.—The friends of the Church, and of the Constitutional cause in general, may congratulate themselves that they have an advocate of their interests so highly gifted and earnest as Chief Justice Robinson, in a quarter where his patriotic exertions are likely to be attended with the most important results.

In a late Gospel Messenger is contained a very pleasing account of the first Annual Convention of the Diocese of Western New York, which was held in Rochester on the 3d instant and following day. Amongst the numerous topics which presented themselves for discussion, our excellent contemporary remarks that there was not one which elicited a harsh expression or provoked to the slightest unkindness of feeling. We participate warmly in the joy of our esteemed brethren at this auspicious commencement of their Diocesan proceedings; and the prayers of none will be heartier than our own for the spread and prosperity of our Zion's principles in Western New York. To this Diocese there now belong 82 clergymen and 96 parishes, with the prospect of an early increase; and as an earnest of the zeal of the new Bishop, as well as of the success which has attended his labours, we are informed that, since his consecration in May last, he has visited 64 organized congregations besides other places; preached 82 times; confirmed 480 persons; and in the performance of official duties, travelled 3500 miles.

We have to offer our thanks to those of our brethren and agents who have so promptly responded to our late appeal on the subject of the subscriptions due to this paper. We trust that our friendly intimation of the pecuniary demands of our journal will meet with a general and early attention; for although the amount of our liabilities has been considerably diminished by late remittances, our disbursements still largely exceed the sum that has been received.

A commission for inquiring into and reporting upon the state of the several Public Departments in this Province, has just been issued by his Excellency the Lieutenant Governor. It consists of the following gentlemen; who are to report whether any change may be made in the system of conducting the public business in the respective Departments, which would be to the advantage of her Majesty's subjects in this Province, viz.—The hon. Robert Baldwin Sullivan; the hon. William Allan; the hon. Augustus Baldwin; the hon. William Henry Draper; the hon. Richard Alexander Tucker; the hon. Robert Simpson Jameson, Vice Chancellor; the hon. John Henry Dunn; the hon. John Macaulay, Inspector General; the hon. John Simcoe Macaulay; the hon. Levis Peters Sherwood; the hon. James Buchanan Macaulay; the hon. Jonas Jones, the hon. Archibald McLean, Justices of the Court of Queen's Bench; Christopher Alexander Hagerman, Esq., Attorney General; Charles Clibchester, Esq., Colonel; Henry Sherwood, Esq.; the Rev. John McCull, Principal of Upper Canada College; the Rev. Henry J. Graessett; Samuel B. Harrison, Esq., Civil Secretary; William Heppburn, Esquire, Registrar of the Court of Chancery; and James Hopkirk, Esq.

COMMUNICATION.

To the Editor of the Church.

REV. SIR,—Some time ago I thought it right to address a communication to you, on a few matters which I conceived needed correction, both in the Christian Guardian and your own journal, viz. a parallelism between Dr. Bunting and the Guardian, Mr. Wesley's connexion with the Church of England, and the position of the Methodists to the Church. I endeavoured to do this without any bitterness or bad feeling to either side, and in doing so I opposed no proceedings of the body to which I belong.

This letter called forth a rude attack from the acting editor of that paper (had the editor himself been present I verify believe it would have been otherwise).—I supposed the remarks were so ungenerous, and uncalled for, and at the same time so different to what truly correct feeling could sanction, that the public in general would expect me to reply to them. This I attempted, and altho' severe in some remarks, which the occasion really required, the public will judge whether it indicates anything like smarting "under our necessary and just rebuke," or whether it manifests anything like "choler" or "excitement." As the attack was made in the Guardian, I supposed the reply ought to appear there also.—The acting editor, however, has thought good to refuse it an insertion; but yet, after keeping it upwards of a week, has published an article, animadverting upon its contents, and adding to the injustice of his former attack. It strikes me that such a course is very unusual, and cannot have the sanction of any good man.

Under these circumstances I have taken the liberty of sending my letter to you, begging an insertion in your able columns. I do not, for a moment, suppose that you feel any inclination to meddle in any matter which does not concern you; but I do conjecture that you will be disposed to further the cause of justice, although a person indifferent to you is concerned in it.

I am, Reverend Sir,  
Yours respectfully,  
BENJ. SLIGHT.

TO THE ACTING EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN GUARDIAN.  
REV. SIR.—In opening the Christian Guardian of the 25th of September, my eye was attracted by a certain prominent heading, including my name in capital letters, which called my attention to a republication of a letter, I lately thought it my duty to address to "the Church newspaper," together with your remarks thereupon. Under reading it, I did not, with yourself, conceive myself under any optical delusion, but did feel greatly surprised.

It has been said that the desire of self preservation is a fundamental law of nature; but I think, if we give it a little further consideration, we shall find even this feeling of our nature has an originating cause, viz. self-love.—I mean self-love distinct from selfishness. From this there will naturally follow socialness,—which Puffendorf calls a fundamental law of nature. In the same rank is also self-defence. Now while I possess this which I call the first principle of our nature, in common with universal man, so I trust I have ever, "as far as in me lies (endeavoured) to promote

and preserve a peaceful socialness with others, agreeable to the main end and disposition of the human race in general."† But without any violation of this feeling, I am now driven to the exercise of my kindred branch,—self-defence.‡ Thus, I am confident, is all the apology this letter needs with all reasonable men.

The very heading itself, which you gave to your insertion, occasioned surprise. "Letter of the Rev. Benjamin Slight—against the Christian Guardian." It is true that letter corrects an error or two of the Christian Guardian, but is it therefore AGAINST it? Again, it may be opposed to certain views of the Guardian; but is it because of that to be considered antagonist to the Guardian, viewed as a CONNEXIONAL paper? Besides, not half of that letter had any reference to the Christian Guardian at all! How then could it with justice be headed, "against the Christian Guardian"? You are fond of Virgil, and therefore he shall admonish you: "Discite justitiam moniti, et non temere divos."

There are many other things in your remarks which occasioned some surprise; some of which I shall name. You say, "Now it is not our intention to reply at all to it: we insert it, and let it speak for itself." Notwithstanding this solemn assertion, what is the fact? Why you have denominated my letter a "long" one, and your reply is nearly two thirds the length of it. Please just refer back again to the maxim of Virgil given above. Thus while you profess to let it alone, your strange "silence" speaks a great deal either for or against it,—evidently intended to be against; but I think candour will decide it to be for it. And only let candour sit on the judgment seat, and decide on my "consistency," and how far the course I have adopted is "judicious;" and I fear not the result.

You denominated the step I took a "strange course." But why? Is it strange that a man should state his opinion to the public on matters which have been publicly mooted? I can see nothing strange in it. I said with Eiliu, "I will also shew mine opinion." And I had reasons similar to those of Eiliu. But is it strange that I should object to some things in the Guardian? Because one man thinks in a certain course, is another obliged to think so too? Were your sentiments never strongly opposed to those of the Guardian, and to those of the present editor of it? Besides, supposing I had addressed it to the Guardian, could I suppose it would have been attended to?—From past experience I was convinced not. You may perhaps say, I might have addressed it privately to you as a friend. You are aware, I have tried this method, and that I only excited your ire, and you angrily said, you should not have cared so much if I had done it publicly. And having declined grappling with any particular, or noticing the tendency of the observations, you go on with general assertions, which may apply equally well to the subject in hand or to a hundred others. I confess this is a much easier way than calmly weighing arguments, or considering their consequences.

To strip your language of all figure, and to consider it in its plain meaning, I am reminded that a member of the Conference was censured and almost excluded for similar acts. This is your way of representing things:—to hit upon the thing, or something resembling it. I ask, was that member of Conference censured for similar acts? I deny it. Trial for the act of writing was objected to; it was waived altogether: the trial proceeded upon the ground of the sentiments contained in the publication; not upon the bare act of writing. Now, I am not aware of any law, or usage, Divine or human, that I have broken in stating my sentiments to the public. I believe no man could innocently sanction such a law.—For instance, the Guardian might contain treason, infidelity or blasphemy; and would it not then become the duty of every man to oppose it? And even if I had opposed it in matters not of that character, but in those in which I conscientiously differed, I might judge it my duty to do so. I should be very sorry to belong to any body of people which attempted to prohibit such an act. And if it really were the case, the sooner such a connection ceased the better: and so I believe will judge every thinking man. I shall use my birth-right as a Briton, and shall ask no man's consent who I shall write, or where I shall make it public. Of course, I am amenable, first to the laws of my country, and then to the laws of the body to which I belong. If anything I may write transgresses those laws, then I must submit to the penalty; i. e. if I publish anything treasonable, then I must account for it at the tribunal of my country; if anything against the doctrines, or discipline of Methodism, I must account for it at the bar of the assembled conference.

In language reduced to its plain import, I am told I shall be censured and condemned at the next Conference! Was there ever anything like this in all the tomes of jurisprudence! Condemned! not simply arraigned, but before accusation is even alleged in a tangible form, or evidence taken, I am told I shall be condemned!—Thank you: I know your mind. But who authorised you to give your "veto" on this subject? Although you have ascended the editorial chair, you have not yet mounted the judgment seat! But condemned for what? The "House of mercy"—the Inquisition—never went so far as yet. When a person is suspected of having published heresy, propositions are deduced from his writings, which are pronounced to be heretical, and on these he is tried. But out of my "long" letter not anything is attempted to be put in the tangible form of a proposition worthy of denunciation; and I am not apprehensive that even inquisitorial ingenuity could screw anything into that shape. According to my own apprehension of what I have written, it is only of the same nature with what has been written by hundreds of Methodist preachers before me; men who are numbered amongst the excellent of the earth. And if, after having been myself a Methodist preacher for nearly a quarter of the century just expiring, I am to be excluded for doing what they have done, be it so; I am still classed with good company.

But who is there who, on reading your remarks, can regard it in any other light than that of intimidation? Intimidation indeed! do you not know that he who once with a warm heart called himself your friend, and who shewed himself friendly, would "scorn to tread upon a worm, or sneak to an Emperor." I can assure you you will fall in your object.

But then in addition to intimidation, you use a little innocent and pointless bantering and ridicule. Here you will fall again! It is so unnatural that it does not apply. It retorts upon yourself, and casts ridicule upon your own attempt. Upon unduly sensitive minds it might have an effect, but it will pass over my head without resting upon me. A man cannot be made to appear ridiculous without he really is so. I would only remind you, your attempt is ill-judged. The subject is grave, and your duties responsible;—and every body will perceive that such an effort does not stand in the place of an argument. And, further, you mistake the point materially. I do not affect fine writing: I express plain truth in plain words; and generally, in the judgments of those on whom I more depend than on that of yours, succeed to render myself understood. That on that there is such a thing as beauty, as the object of our intellectual faculties, I allow; but can you give me a definition of beauty? It often depends on circumstances, or even on mere caprice. The idea of it at one time, and in one place is different, to what it is at another time and in another place. Suppose then you, or some one else, were to think some of your attempted rhetorical flourishes were fine: I might think them ridiculous, and by the same rule, I might be acquitted where you condemn.

But it might excite laughter if I saw a person affect the sublime, when it was only bombast. And did I laugh when I read your representation of my sentiments as "novel, lamentable, and laughable!" I always had thought that lamentations and laughter had different sources; and if so, how can one thing be at the same time novel, lamentable and laughable! That my sentiments are not novel, you might—yet ought to know, for they are in accordance with the most eminent Methodist preachers, especially with those contained in a pamphlet by the Rev. T. Jackson; and if they are lamentable, then they are not laughable, and vice versa: if they are either one or the other, then so also are those of Mr. Jackson.

You direct your readers to that part of my letter wherein I say in reference to your want of precision, "that Mr. W. never was

out of the Church"; and then represent it as inconsistent with what I say in another place, that "necessity was laid upon Mr. W. in his irregularities." Now, is, or is not Mr. W. to be believed when he says repeatedly that he never was out of the Church? And how can you, or I, or any one else show him to be consistent in any other way, than on the consideration that "necessity was laid upon him." I know a little of Mr. W's writings, and I know that he never attempted to vindicate himself on any other ground: this forms the ground-work of all his reasoning when he is defending himself against his opponents, in consideration of establishing field-preaching, lay-preaching, &c. &c.; and this is the sum and substance of my remarks in my letter. Notwithstanding these "irregularities" Mr. W. did, to his dying day, reckon himself, whether consistent or not, to be in the Church; and there the business ends, so far as I am concerned in it.

You are mistaken again concerning my views of the final arrangements of Providence in reference to the destiny of Methodism. I had said after Watson, Jackson, and others, that we did not see it our duty as yet to amalgamate with the Church; but that if God should so continue to bless the Church of England as to make her such an agent as was still needed in converting the British Empire, and the world, that in that case I would not even hazard a conjecture what the Great Head of the Church would do with us, or with the Church of England itself. And this I said on the consideration of what I and others have always viewed the providential calling of Methodism;—that we were raised up, as our venerable founder always said, for a special purpose. And is not the arrangement of the Church universal in the hands of Jesus Christ, and what great changes he may yet make I cannot tell; but I do believe things will not go on as at present, Judah vexing Ephraim, and Ephraim vexing Judah. Now mark you, I have said, I would not hazard a conjecture on this subject;—you represent me as intimating that Methodism will some time or other be a forlorn, useless orphan, and lost beyond the possibility of being found! Did you think the intelligent reader would not see the nature of such a representation? I sincerely lament such derelictions; whether they are wilful, or from want of penetration, I will not take upon me to say.

But how could you mistake the sense of the "Church's" remarks in my letter. You say "the most ludicrous part of the whole affair" is that the Editor of "the Church" and myself are "standing opposite each other as enemies." I would wish to avoid saying that here is a wilful perversion. There is nothing in the common sense meaning of the passage to make you think so; and I have evidence to the contrary which you can know nothing of. I say, Mr. S. did not of course believe that the Editor of the Church would entirely coincide in his views; but he sent it to him, believing that he is a gentleman and a Christian, and that he would not expect a sincere Wesleyan to entirely coincide with him in every respect. Hence he says that although he agrees with my letter as a whole, yet, "we cannot retract any of our observations on which he touches with so gentle and Christian a hand." That is, he still maintains Mr. W. as a Churchman was inconsistent; he cannot admit the force of my argument for the providential arrangement of Methodism. Mr. W. knew, and I firmly believe, he could not be vindicated on any other ground than that of a special call. On the ground that he had such a call, the Rev. Editor of the Church and I differ, and the difference is stated in a friendly, and even affectionate manner; and yet you absurdly say we are enemies; that if you were to write half a dozen columns it would not be as conclusive as this (possibly not!) and then to render yourself as ridiculous as possible you pretend to mingle your mock sympathies for my having received such a castigation. The sensible reader could never swallow this. Do not suppose that your pen, however "eloquent," has the power of a magic wand, so as to change the natural order and appearance of things.

Indeed, I could not say, even if I were disposed, that you have made a wilful perversion. I have several times reflected on your remarks, and have tried to find out whether you really did understand the "Church" so or not. I have often thought you can reason very well, when you happen to hit upon the right premises.—But it is well known you often miss.

As to your remarks about "Bishop Straehan"—"the rectory, gown, and bands,"—let them pass for what they are worth. But why did you make them, if you believe, as you say you do, that I hope to remain a Methodist preacher. I have had occasion to consider this point many years ago. I expect to see you in possession of these things as myself. A man who can be swept one way, may another way: he who has swerved in one point may in another; while, on the other hand, he who has stood firm at one time, may be reckoned as likely to do so again. May you and I always be found in the way of Providence. And still I beg to be considered as, yours truly,  
BENJ. SLIGHT.

ECCLESIASTICAL INTELLIGENCE.

SOCIETY FOR THE PROPAGATION OF THE GOSPEL.

The following gentlemen have recently received appointments as missionaries from the above society:—  
For Van Diemen's Land.—The Rev. Gregory Bateman, M. A. Trinity College Cambridge.

For Upper Canada.—The Rev. R. J. C. Taylor, B. A., Trinity College, Dublin; Rev. John Radcliff.

For Newfoundland.—The Rev. W. Bowman, Perpetual Curate of Queenborough; Mr. Johnstone Vicars; Mr. Thomas Boone.

For Jamaica.—Mr. Robert Robinson, B. A., Queen's College, Oxford.

SOCIETY FOR THE PROPAGATION OF THE GOSPEL IN FOREIGN PARTS.—The friends of this venerable society will be gratified to hear that the mission of the Rev. S. Wilberforce, on behalf of this society, has been attended, hitherto, with a greater measure of success than its most sanguine supporters could have anticipated. Additional subscriptions and donations have, we understand, been received by the Rev. R. Luney, the local secretary here, almost daily, since our anniversary meeting. Similar results have also followed the meetings which have been held in other parts of the diocese—at Liskeard, Callington, Lifton, Tavistock, Milton, Bodmin, and many other places. At the Liskeard meeting, the bishop, in the course of a very forcible address, stated it to be his earnest wish and desire, that every clergyman in his diocese should form his own flock into a parochial association, for the support of this venerable society.—Plymouth Herald.

BEDFORD SEPT. 10.—A most satisfactory meeting of the county of Bedford was held this day (after a sermon in St. Paul's Church, by the Bishop of Ely) for the benefit of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. The collection after the sermon and meeting amounted to nearly £100, independent of annual subscriptions, equal almost to another hundred. The resolutions, approving of the objects of the society, and pledging the district of Bedford to further exertions in its behalf, were moved by Lord Charles Russell, Baron Parke, Rev. Dr. Russell, Rev. H. Hayne, Rev. J. H. Brooke Mountain, &c. The sermon was thoroughly orthodox, and the speeches were exceedingly eloquent, particularly those of Dr. Russell (Rector of Bishopgate) and the Rev. J. H. B. Mountain. The speech of Lord Charles Russell was extremely good, and everybody present regretted that he was not a Conservative.

BISHOP OF WINCHESTER.—On Saturday last the Bishop of Winchester held an ordination at St. Heller's, Jersey, when Mr. Samuel Wright was admitted to priest's orders. On the same day, being the anniversary of the horrible massacre of St. Bartholomew, when 70,000 French Protestants were ruthlessly massacred in cold blood by the Roman Catholics by order of Charles IX., the Rev. Dr. Jeanne, Dean of Jersey, preached an eloquent sermon, specially relating to that fearful outrage on humanity, when priestcraft stained the altars of a God of love with hecatombs of his creatures, who could not subscribe to the mockery of transubstantiation. On Monday the bishop confirmed several hundred of the youths of both sexes in the parochial church of St. Heller and in All Saints Chapel. On Tuesday the same ceremony was performed at St. Lawrence, for the parishioners of St. Lawrence, and St. Mary's; and at St. Peter's, for those of