

ter lifting up his voice in decided terms against the misnamed liberality of the day, "a spirit which confounds all distinction between Truth and Error, and absolutely tends to nullify the effect of Revelation," his Lordship observes,

Before dismissing the subject of the uncompromising maintenance of principle in opposition to that which passes in the world for liberality, I must offer a very few observations relating to what are sometimes called the peculiarities of the Established Church. I shall not occupy your time by an endeavour to refute the shallow and unscriptural notion that Christian unity and charity consist in the establishment of a commodious sort of understanding among parties divided in religious communion, that they agree to differ. Certainly they ought to endeavour to live in peace, and the interchange of all Christian good offices; and it is equally certain that each ought to rejoice in every instance in which another may promote the cause of Christ, and be ready to put the most liberal construction, (I do not avoid the use of the word, for true liberality is a beautiful feature of the Gospel) upon all the proceedings of separate bodies, or individuals belonging to them. We ought to honor and to imitate all who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, although they walk not with us. And it would be as difficult to deny as it would be criminal to wish to deny that the blessing and grace of God is often with those whose ministry we regard as irregularly constituted. But with all this, I conceive that we place ourselves in a very false position, and fail to act, in one point, the part which God has assigned to us in the world, if ever we adopt that language or lend ourselves to those proceedings in which the Church is regarded as a Sect among Sects. It is quite foreign to my purpose to argue here the question of Episcopacy: but if we believe that the Apostles founded and framed an Episcopal Church; if we trace the plan of such a Church in the Scriptures; if following up our enquiries to throw light on the question by comparison of Scripture with early ecclesiastical records, we arrive at that conclusion which enables us with the incomparable Hooker to challenge the opponents of our System, that they shew but one Church upon the face of the whole earth, from the Apostolic times to the Reformation, that was not episcopal; if all the remnants of ancient Churches now existing in the East have preserved this constitution from their beginning, and our own Church has opened interesting communications with them which may be designed to lead the way to their renovation in holy communion with ourselves; if the real strength of Rome consists only in the multiplied divisions and unseemly disarray of the Protestant Churches; if this can never be cured, so long as the vicious principle is admitted that christians may lawfully form new Societies, and create new Ministries at will; if it was the singular blessing of our own, among other Churches, at the Reformation, to preserve the ancient order and the uninterrupted succession of her hierarchy; if lastly these principles are so pointedly recognized, so fully received and acted upon in her practice, that we accept the Orders as valid, of a Romish Priest who recants, although we re-ordain all Protestant Ministers who pass over to us from non-episcopal Churches, then, with this chain of facts before our eyes, I do conceive that we are wanting alike in our consistency as Churchmen, and our duty in the Church universal, if, swayed by the stream of prevailing opinion, studying an ill-understood popularity, or even prompted by an amiable spirit of conciliation, we consent to prejudice the exclusive character of our Ministry, and voluntarily descend from the ground which we occupy with our people and other Protestant Episcopalians, as a distinct and peculiar body among the Churches.

And is this to exalt ourselves, and to preach ourselves instead of Christ Jesus our Lord? Far otherwise than this if rightly considered, our claims to Apostolic order and succession, as is well pointed out by a late excellent Colonial prelate*, should humble us in the dust under a sense of the greatness of our calling so far above our worthiness and strength. Whatever affords a heightened view of the office which we hold, and the part which we have to sustain in the Church of God, can only—or should only,—prompt us to deeper earnestness in seeking that sufficiency which is of Him alone.

*Bishop Heber.

I bless God that there is not wanting good evidence among us of our having recourse to that sufficiency—but what a field is before us! how ought we each to labour that we may gather with our Lord, and how importunately to pray that more labourers may be sent forth into the ripening harvest which spreads itself around us; that larger blessings may descend upon those Institutions at home, (foremost among which we must mention the venerable and munificent Societies for the Propagation of the Gospel and Promoting Christian Knowledge) and those endeavours upon the spot, of which it is the object to supply our destitute settlements. I am disposed also to think, and I shall take occasion, from our meeting, to follow up the suggestion, that we might, with much advantage, establish in this Diocese, a Church Society similar to that which has been framed under the auspices of an able and zealous Bishop, in the neighbouring Diocese of Nova Scotia.

The disease upon the ordinary occasions of life, of a distinguishing ecclesiastical dress, is a departure from wise and venerable rules, from which our Clergy ought never to take licence to depart farther than, according to the now received usage, they are obliged to do. They should never betray a disposition to secularize the character and office which they hold.—And in the actual performance of any ecclesiastical function, no deviation can be justified for which the plea of necessity cannot be advanced. No needless irregularity should be suffered to creep into our performance of official duty which may settle by degrees into a precedent.

If, as I have intimated in the course of these observations, we stand as a distinct and peculiar body, in virtue of our being a branch of the Episcopal Church, this is not the highest or the most important peculiarity by which we should be marked. Our distinction as Episcopalians will very little avail us, unless we take heed that we are not behind others in the genuine characteristics of the people of God; a peculiar people in the language of one Apostle, zealous of good works—a chosen generation according to the description of another, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people, who shew forth the praises of Him who hath called us out of darkness into his marvellous light. This is the mark which we should set before our followers, and to the attainment of which we should seek to lead them on. We should keep clear and conspicuously bright the lamp of Holy Truth, which, as the Priests of the temple, we are appointed to watch; holding forth constantly to view, (for this is the life and light of the Church, and in exact proportion as it is obscured, our Ministry fails of its purpose,) the salvation of Sinners through the free Grace of God in Christ Jesus. We should magnify the love which was displayed in the rescue of a guilty race, and in the gift of the Spirit of Holiness we should press these things home to the bosoms of our hearers, and teach men to make them their own:—we should labour night and day to awaken those who are plunged in the sleep of sin, and to dissipate the dreams of those who smooth over the Doctrines of the cross, and are satisfied in conscience, because they satisfy the nominally Christian world: we should regard it as the business of our lives to be instrumental in 'turning men from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God.' And even if it were to please God that we could turn but one, shall we not think the labour of our lives to have been better spent than in the pursuit, however successful, of any worldly object, when we remember, for our encouragement, the value of one immortal soul, as set forth in the declaration of Him who paid its ransom—that there is 'joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth?'

TORONTO.—The population of this city is stated at 12,133, of whom 5702 belong to the Church of England.—It is also stated as a fact, established by Returns—

That in all the towns and townships of the Province where the ministrations of the Church have, for any length of time, been regularly supplied, its members form a very large majority over any other single sect, and in many places constitute nearly a moiety of all the inhabitants. We need not advert to the evidence which these returns have already furnished in disproof of the assertion so recklessly

made, that the members of the Church of England in Upper Canada formed but "a fraction of the population;" but they establish *a fortiori* the truth of what we so often expressed, that place her upon the foundation which her obvious wants require, and she would very soon be the Church of a majority of the people.—Church.

GOOD AUTHORITY.—We copy from the "Church," the following remarks on a subject which is somewhat troublesome to those whom it convicts of irregularity, but must be satisfactory to the members of the Church of England who can trace up their Episcopacy to the fountain head of all spiritual authority:—

It has been frequently asserted in England and in this Colony, that the Apostolic Commission is a tenet confined to what is usually designated the High-Church Party, and repudiated by their Evangelical, or Low-Church, Brethren. That such might in some degree have been the case a few years ago, we are not altogether prepared to deny; but to say that it is the case at present, we have no hesitation in asserting to be incorrect. The distance between these two religious divisions is rapidly diminishing, and the line of demarcation between them has grown so faint as to be barely visible. The High-Church are becoming more Evangelical—and the Evangelical, more High-Church. The alarming strides which schism has been making of late, has driven good men, of all shades of opinion within the Establishment, to study the question of Church-government more attentively and the result has been on the part of the Clergy, a more open and decided profession of the Divine Right of Episcopacy, and a bolder exposition of it in their pulpits and publications. Even within the walls of Parliament, it has been promulgated without cavil or contradiction. In a recent debate, in the House of Lords, on the Church Discipline Bill, while the Bishop of Exeter was delivering himself with his accustomed eloquence against the measure, the following interlocutory conversation occurred between him and the Archbishop of Canterbury:—

"The Bishop of Exeter.—He would now turn to the right Rev. prelates and ask them whether they did not believe that bishops had by divine right a jurisdiction over their clergy? He had ventured to hope, in putting that question, that he should have received the ordinary indication of assent commonly given to a truism. It was painful to him that it should seem to be doubted.

"The Archbishop of Canterbury.—No one can doubt it.

"The bishop of Exeter.—He rejoiced to hear the right Rev. prelate say, no one could doubt it."

From this it will be perceived that the Divine Right of Episcopacy is not a fiction, springing from the brains of a few enthusiastic, cloistered priests, but that it is a truism assented to unhesitatingly by the Primate of all England, and tacitly acquiesced in by his right reverend brethren, the bishops present. We now briefly advert to it, in the hope that the laity of our communion will devote some portion of their reading to this most interesting and important question,—that thus they may learn how great a privilege and good fortune it is, that they were born or have become members of a Church, which dispenses the sacraments with an efficacy that, as a general rule, can only attend them when administered by authorized hands,—and that thus, also, they may be led to entertain more scriptural notions on the subject of schism, and to perceive that by countenancing it in the slightest degree, they are acting in opposition to the Word of God.

DIED.

At Liverpool, N. S., on the 3d inst., in the 58th year of his age, John Roberts, Esq. a worthy member of society, highly esteemed by all who knew him. His death is most justly and sincerely regretted by his family and a large number of relatives and friends.

On the 13th June, at Boulogne, in the 67th year of her age, Mrs. Mary Belcher, consort of the Hon. Andrew Belcher, late of Halifax, N. S. a lady highly esteemed.