

and vicinity, for their services so readily given to the Bazaar,—to those Ladies at a distance who kindly contributed articles both useful and ornamental, and to those friends in Belleville, Coburg, Bowmanville and Emskillen, who contributed in the form of subscriptions—may a rich blessing rest on all who have helped forward the cause.

Com.

### THE COMING UNION.

"What a joyful event! and how devoutly desired by many thousands in our country! And yet there is reason to fear that the delight of witnessing the act of consummation must be forgone by many who are desirous to witness a sight they have never seen till now, and shall never see again. I believe it is allowed by many, that the place for consummating the Union is, unfortunately, too far removed from the centre of the churches. If the union question had been settled previous to the appointment of the Synodical Meetings in Montreal, the probability is that some place would have been chosen more central in its position, so that members residing in the remote places of the churches might have a privilege as nearly equal to that of members residing in central localities, as circumstances allow. A long journey and limited means consort but poorly.

Could no plan of easy execution, be devised to meet this inconvenience? Might not some plan like this do? Let a collection be called for in all the congregations belonging to the two Synods; let the sums thus collected all go to the formation of one common fund; and out of this fund let every member attending the Synodical Meetings in June, receive a part of the expense of his attendance. If there is any authority to put this plan in operation, there seems to be but little doubt of its efficiency, and we doubt not the rectitude of its principle. "Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ."

A MEMBER."

We copy the above from the *Canadian United Presbyterian Magazine*, for the purpose of expressing our decided approbation of some special effort being made to obtain funds for the purpose referred to by the writer. It is scarcely our part to recommend the mode, but, we most earnestly suggest, that before June some general and special movement should be made. Probably the joint committee on the arrangements with reference to the consummation of the union, may issue some proposal or recommendation. In the meantime, we trust the matter will not be forgotten.

### Communications, &c.

#### AN EXAMPLE.

To the Editor of the Record.

DEAR SIR,

Your are aware that we have a plain, neat, and very comfortable Presbyterian Church at Fisherville. It was opened for public worship by the Rev. Principal Willis, a warm friend of the united Congregation

of York Mills and Fisherville,—on June 1st, 1856. As is the case with too many Churches, a debt still remains upon it. The amount is a little over \$600.

A most appropriate conclusion to our thanksgiving services on the 6th inst. was the holding of a meeting to take steps to have this entirely paid off. It was unanimously agreed to, that some systematic method should be adopted by which the debt should be gradually reduced, so as not to interfere with the usual contributions to the schemes of the Church. The plan adopted was that of contributing monthly, or at the rate of so much per month, and appointing collectors to look after it. A subscription list was then taken through the meeting, and the result promises an extinction of the debt in less than three years, perhaps not much over two, though no special effort of any kind be made! Now, Sir, for a small congregation, with few of what might be termed the wealthy among them, this is excellent, and an example worthy of imitation. It is for the example's sake I write, that this "zeal may provoke very many." The monthly subscription ranges from \$1.50 downwards. But there is more yet. The debt is owing to two members of the congregation—one an Elder, and the other a Deacon. Though they began to charge interest only two years ago at the rate of six per cent, yet in the most generous and liberal manner they not only headed the monthly list, but said to the congregation—"if you make an effort and get it all paid off for your own sake as well as our's, in a reasonable time, in the way proposed, we shall charge you interest of only at three per cent on the whole time!"

How many of our debt burdened congregations will "go and do likewise,"—or better?

Yours truly,

R. JAMIESON.

York Mills, Dec. 10th, 1860.

### MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER UNLAWFUL.

To the Editor of the Record.

MY DEAR SIR:—It has occurred to me that, on account of the loose notions and great indifference which pervade the public mind on this subject, and even amongst those who are in connexion with our own Church,—the following remarks, which form the substance of an address delivered in Glasgow, by one of the greatest divines in Scotland, at a time that a bill was introduced into Parliament, to legalize the marriage of a man with a deceased wife's sister, might with great propriety be allowed to occupy a place in the *Record*. The remarks referred to are as follows: "The particular question now under consideration, has been long regarded as definitely settled. For fifteen centuries in the Jewish Church, and for seventeen centuries in the Christian Church, the law of incest was held to be fixed. When, at a comparatively recent period, the question was raised, whether a man might marry his deceased wife's sister, it took the people by surprise; it had not been before their minds; they had been accustomed to think that such was wrong, and of course, they were not in circumstances to pronounce on it a distinct judgment. Such, indeed, if we

are not greatly mistaken, is pretty much the state of matters at the present time. The majority of those we meet have never had their minds directed to the subject, and are liable to be carried away with specious representations on the one side, or to look at the whole case with indifference. Hence the necessity of giving it a full and public discussion. The full discussion of this subject involves a variety of points, touching respectively on the law of God, the law of man, the creed and discipline of particular churches, and the general interests of society. It is the first of these to which I am now to confine myself, the Scripture argument on this point. This, in some respects, is the most important, it lies at the foundation of all the rest. In discussing it we have to encounter some difficulties, arising, in part, from the peculiar delicacy of the subject itself, from the verbal criticism which it is necessary to introduce, and from the inferential character of the evidence that is to be adduced. There are some individuals who, on points of this kind, will not hear of inference. They must hear express law, and precept—so many words in the form of an explicit command or prohibition; but, as the Westminster Divines have said, and I believe all sober theologians are agreed, "what by good and necessary consequence may be deduced from Scripture," is as much "the counsel of God," as that which is set down in so many explicit words; and, in short, if we are to have nothing to do with inference, we shall, I apprehend, at the present time, get little good from the Bible. There must be an end, too, of all reasoning, as every argument supports an inference, and every syllogism an *Ergo*. With these preparatory observations, I address myself to the proposition—"That the proposed measure is contrary to the Word of God."

Before proceeding to prove the truth of this proposition, I would beg leave to call your attention particularly, to a few general principles which require to be understood, and admitted, in order to the right understanding of what is to follow. The first of these general principles is, that the law of marriage, by which every thing concerning it is to be determined, is to be sought for in the Scripture, and particularly in the 18th chapter of the book of Leviticus. There we find the law of God, and there we find the foundation of all the laws of man on this subject. If they are not there, where are they? I have no hesitation in answering nowhere. In short, the whole subject is thrown entirely loose, and left to the casualty and caprice of mere human legislation. The laws of men without this, have no basis on which to rest, except mere expediency, and thus each and all might do what they choose in the matter, without incurring the guilt of sin. We have no hesitation in saying, if the principle is denied that the law, with regard to marriage is to be found in the Bible, a man must be held to be at liberty to marry whatever woman he chooses, his own sister, or his own daughter. What law can take him up, if you do not go to the Bible for your authority? The law in regard to marriage, as contained in the portion of scripture to which I have referred, is a moral law, and not a ceremonial law. It has nothing in it peculiar to the Jews—it