

REVIEW

OF THE

PASTORAL LETTER

OF THE

CLERGY

OF THE

CHURCH OF SCOTLAND

IN THE

CANADAS.

MONTREAL:

PRINTED AT THE MONTREAL GAZETTE OFFICE,
25, NOTRE DAME STREET.

1828.

P R E F A C E.

THE following Review was drawn up for the No. of the Christian Sentinel published this month, but circumstances rendered it impossible to include it.—It will appear in the No. to be issued in July. In the mean time, feeling that, in its present shape, it requires the apology of haste, and that *incudi reddere* is a task which it is out of our power to undertake, we are anxious to lay it before the public at once.—We should be sorry also to permit any needless retardation in the steps of a controversy which we heartily desire to see brought to it's close. It is for these reasons that it is now printed as a separate pamphlet for distribution in proper quarters, in anticipation of it's appearance in the Sentinel.

6th May, 1828.

REVIEW

OF THE

PASTORAL LETTER

OF THE

Clergy of the Church of Scotland

IN THE CANADAS.

CONTROVERSY, in itself one of the most distasteful to us of all possible occupations, is an employment in the prolongation of which we never would needlessly engage, and if the Letter of the Bishop of Quebec to the Clergy and Congregations within his Diocese, were perfectly fresh in the recollection of our readers, we should regard it as a needless prolongation of controversy, to notice the present reply to it; for we do conceive, after an attentive and, we trust, a candid perusal of this publication, that if the two are compared paragraph by paragraph, the Episcopal Letter will be sure to remain unanswered throughout and to stand in its unaltered strength.

But we believe that an interval of full five months has elapsed since the appearance of the former pamphlet, and such ideas as would be now formed of its contents from the manner in which it is noticed by the divines of the Church of Scotland, would, in our humble opinion, be most essentially different from the results of a reference back to its own pages. We do not mean that it is *intentionally* made to appear different; nor do we mean in any manner

Carey
1226

Carey
1262

Carey 1226

whatever to speak disrespectfully of the present performance—far less of its authors. We believe that they have only failed to answer the arguments of the Bishop, because they *cannot be answered*—only seen them in a discoloured light, because if they had seen them truly, they must have surrendered more perhaps than in the present state of this unhappy difference, can be expected from human prejudices.—But although the Bishop has apparently conceived it by no means necessary to put forth the *whole* strength of the case of his own Church, we should hardly desire anything more than such a reference back as we have mentioned, if we thought that it would be faithfully and candidly made, wherever the recent *Pastoral Letter* finds its way. This patient and pains-taking examination of the merits of the question, is, however what we cannot expect to be exercised.

Without dwelling, then, upon the circumstance that whereas the Episcopal Letter was simply official address to the Clergy and Congregations, issuing from Ecclesiastical authority, and recommending a certain line of conduct in a certain trying conjuncture, as well as exhibiting a certain view of the claims of the Church, this publication, which professes to come forth in the same character, should, in accordance with its contents, have rather been announced under the name of *Strictures upon the Letter of the Bishop of Quebec*,—we proceed to our task ; and the first subject of our animadversion, is the most unexpected intimation which has been ventured upon, that the English Clergy are the aggressors—that they are chargeable with unprovoked violence and hostility, and that to them is to be ascribed whatever acrimony has been engendered in the contention !

Upon this point we need occupy but little time.—We shall only remark, 1st, that such a reflection was wholly uncalled for, and 2dly, that it is pointedly contrasted with what those who are the subjects of it have fairly deserved.—First, It is uncalled for, because the Bishop's Letter contains no charge nor insinuation whatever

that the Ministers of the Church of Scotland are the authors of any of the calumnies and scurrilities which have been vented against the Church of England. We are far from putting any such construction as *qui capit, ille facit*—but if the origin of that spirit of rivalry which unhappily exists, and the manner of its development on either side should become the subject of discussion and enquiry, we are bold to say that it is not the Church of England that will suffer by the facts to be elicited ; and here, we leave this particular question to rest *till it is again stirred by other hands*.

But secondly, the reflection is pointedly contrasted with what those who are the subjects of it have deserved;—for although in the Bishop's own words “ our own *defenders* may *occasionally* have been betrayed into some heat or impropriety,” we know from a *variety of quarters* that the dignified and Christian moderation of the Church of England in general, persecuted as she has been by the tongue and the pen, in the quarrel raised against her, has every where produced a strong favourable effect upon men of thinking minds.—For some years she may truly say that she has “ lain among the children of men whose teeth are spears and arrows and their tongue a sharp sword.”—A seemingly organized system of attack,—a bitter persevering and often unscrupulous as well as artful hostility has been at work to pull her down, and to possess the minds of men against her, at home and in the colonies—but her proceedings, *as a whole*, and with very slight exceptions, have been those which become the disciples of a Master who “ when he was reviled, reviled not again,” and although wounds have been inflicted upon her and mischief has been felt, her conduct in the trial has greatly tended to repair what her enemies have made her to lose :

Per damna, per cædes, ab ipso
Duxit spes animumque ferro.

The next point to be noticed is the intimation that the Bishop's integrity was concerned to undo public impressions produced by statements too favorable to the Church of England, and bearing hard upon other religious donominations.

Casey 1261
Casey 1223
 The authors of the Pastoral Letter had not seen Archdeacon Strachan's speech delivered in the Legislative Council of Upper Canada, when they animadverted in the manner which they have here done, upon his Chart published in England.---It may be sufficient to refer them now to that *speech* for satisfaction as to the *justice* of their remarks upon the *Chart*.--But it would at any rate, have been rather a singular piece of knight-errantry on the part of the Bishop, while he was compelled to stand, like the Jews in the days of Nehemiah, building up with one hand the walls of his own Zion, and holding a weapon in the other, to sally forth as a volunteer in defence of other communities, where there was no call for his interposition.—The Bishop's letter was written, we believe, with a knowledge that Dr. Strachan was preparing his own vindication, but, be this as it may, his Lordship's mind was rather too full of the necessity of defending a Church whose character was aspersed, whose views misrepresented, whose comparative numbers understated in such a way that, (to take *one example out of many*) her members* in the representative body of Upper Canada were affirm-

-* This word is not here used to express a communicant, as it is sometimes taken upon this continent, but simply denotes a *professed adherent*.

It would be perfectly endless to follow and expose all the mis-statements industriously made through the channel of the public papers, on both sides of the Atlantic, in order to injure the interests of the Church of England, but even where there are no direct mis-statements, the cause of truth may be almost equally prejudiced.—Thus, an article replete with violence and falsehood, which appeared in the London Times of the 6th of Feby, and at second hand in the journals of these Provinces, is fortified by an extract from certain information furnished and signed by two of the Ministers of the Church of Scotland in Upper Canada, stating the comparative numbers of Episcopalians and Presbyterians in a *particular tract of country* which happens to *consist* in a great measure of *Scotch Settlements*, and to have been *always destitute of an Episcopal Clergyman*, and this is set before the English public as a *sample* of the population!—A Protestant wishing to magnify the *proportion of Protestants* in the world, might with about equal fairness, adduce *Great Britain* as a *specimen*, from which to judge of the whole.

ed in the British Parliament to be *two* instead of about *twenty*,—to permit him to feel his integrity implicated if he did not labour to rectify supposed errors sent abroad which made for her advantage. —There does not breathe a man upon the earth more completely elevated above all shade of unfair or indirect proceeding to serve his purpose, than the Bishop of Quebec ; but if ever there was a work of supererogation in the management of human affairs, he would surely have performed one, under all the circumstances of the case, in affecting to regard any opinions prevailing upon the relative pretensions of different religious bodies, as *needing his correction*, in order to *prevent the Church of England from being unduly exalted*.—The Bishop has enough to do in this way on the other side of the question. The Ministers of the Church of Scotland are much deceived if they continue in the belief that the statements of comparative numbers, which they have themselves concurred in sending home, in faith of their correctness, are in all instances incapable of contradiction and exposure.

In the same page of the Pastoral Letter it is said that the *Arch-deacon of York* made a recent attempt to “*deprive the Ministers of the Church of Scotland of the due support of Government*,” and in page 9, it is declared to be “*the policy avowed and recommended*

In the returns of population in Nova Scotia, according to a Census recently taken, the *Church of Scotland* is made in the Newspapers to exhibit 37,225 members, and the *Church of England* 23,659.—From what we know of that Province we feel convinced, but are willing to be corrected if we are wrong, that *by far the greater part* of those ranked under the banner of the *Church of Scotland* are *Dissenters from that Church*.—The College at Poictou, which is a kind of nursery of Ministers, is certainly under the auspices of *Scotch Dissenters*.—In a similar way, even the *Independents* and *American Congregationalists* whose principles of Church Government are fundamentally different from those of the Presbyterian Church, are amalgamated here with the *Presbyterians*, to share in the meditated spoils of the Church of England.

by the Clergy of the Church of England to WITHHOLD SUPPORT from ALL *other* denominations."

The best commentary upon the correctness of these allegations will be found in certain extracts from the speech of Doctor Strachan himself, and from the Bishop's letter which was before the eyes of these writers at the time :

"Nor have I ever missed an opportunity, when in my power, of being useful to the Clergy of the Church of Scotland, or of treating them with respect, kindness, and hospitality.—*It has always been my wish to see a reasonable support given to them*, because they belong to a Church which is established in one section of the Empire * * * * and to this end *I have at all times advised the leading men of both Churches* to make respectful representations to His Majesty's Government for assistance*, leaving it to ministers to discover the source from which such aid might be taken."—*Archdeacon Strachan's Speech, page 22.*

"His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor of the Province, having represented in the strongest manner to His Majesty's Government the propriety of making some provision for the Clergymen in communion with the Kirk, and also the Roman Catholic Clergy resident in Upper Canada, *a reference was made to me on that subject while in London in June, 1826.—I enforced, as well as I could, the recommendations made by His Excellency in respect to both Churches.*" The Archdeacon proceeds to state that a delay being suggested till the Reserve-question should have been disposed of, he himself represented that there were four respectable gentlemen in the Province who might be inconvenienced in the mean time, and who deserved the protection of Government, and that an appropriation was ultimately made of which these gentlemen are now reaping the benefit.—*Ibid, page 21.*

Let us turn to another authority.

"There are privileges not conceded at home, enjoyed here by the branches of other Churches established in Europe, of which *I should be the last person*

* The Churches of Scotland and Rome.

on earth to wish them deprived.—In some instances, I should be heartily glad that the benefits extended to individuals of these Churches should be greater than they have yet been made.”—Bishop’s Letter, page 4.

We have reason to know that similar sentiments have been expressed in representations made at home by the English Clergy of these Provinces collectively.—But what is the sentiment of their Scottish Brethren?—Are we to understand from this and other passages of their pamphlet, that *they do not wish to withhold the support* which will be afforded by the Reserves *from all other denominations* than their own, except one which happens unfortunately to be in pre-occupation of these Reserves?—Do they mean to leave other religious bodies to suppose that their object in this contest and, *the policy which they have avowed and recommended*” has been to procure a *general division of the Reserves among all parties*?—If not, what is the difference between the two Churches, as the views which they respectively entertain affect the various OTHER denominations.

In the Episcopal Letter, all questions arising from differences of a nature purely religious, are kept wholly out of view.—This example has not been followed by the Scotch Ministers.—They have taken occasion to express their belief that their Church is the more *Apostolical* of the two.—That they should indulge such a persuasion is natural.—It is natural that the English Clergy should do the same.—We have no intention of pursuing the question here—but as it has been started on the other side, we will simply say that no ground of enquiry can possibly be chosen upon which the Church of England can be more perfectly ready to “meet all comers” than this.

“We wonder,” say the Presbyterian Divines, in page 4, referring to the arguments in pages 5 and 6 of the Bishop’s letter, “that a fact so obvious as the existence of two equal* and inde-

* We do not cavil at this expression, although we certainly regard the Church of England as being upon a *distinct footing every where out of Scotland*, because

pendent religious Establishments in Great Britain should not have forced itself upon the attention of his Lordship.”—

Let us hear the Bishop himself :—

“ At the time of the Union * * * * its own *Ecclesiastical* privileges were carefully secured to Scotland *within the bounds of that kingdom.*”—*Bishop's Letter, page 6.*

“ Although the Presbyterian Church is *established in Scotland*, the circumstance of its establishment *there*, so far from proving that it is entitled to establishment *here*, affords *support* to the *contrary* argument, for it is *there* according to what we conceive to be implied in the very nature of a religious Establishment, *exclusively* established, and it will hardly be denied that *another* establishment *here*, pre-occupies the ground.—*Id. Ibid.*

The subject of *wonder* is a little changed. The wonder is that persons passing remarks upon the pages which contain the foregoing extracts should have represented the Bishop as having entirely lost sight of “ so obvious a fact as the EXISTENCE of two equal and independent Establishments in Great Britain.”—His Lordship, indeed draws some obvious consequences from this obvious fact, which failed, it appears, to “ force themselves upon the attention” of the other party. He not only remembered the *existence* of these two establishments, but he remembered that they do NOT EXIST AS ESTABLISHMENTS CONJOINTLY WITHIN THE SAME LIMITS.—He remembered that, in either case, where one exists in the character of an Establishment, the other is excluded from the possession of that character.—

If the principle of Dr. Paley * were admitted, in which the Pres-

the *rights* of the Church of Scotland as an establishment in North Britain are precisely equal to those of the Church of England in the Southern division of the Island.

* This, we cheerfully admit, is a very great name, but we presume that our Presbyterian brethren are not upon all points *addicti jurare in verba* of Doctor Paley.

byterian Divines proceed next to avow their concurrence, “ that the Established Religion ought to be that which is professed by the majority of the governed,”—it would follow that Christian Powers, who are ordained by Almighty God to be the “ nursing-fathers and the nursing-mothers” of the Church, must not only afford protection, which they plainly ought to do, to the religious rights and liberties of *all* their subjects, but must solemnly become parties to the propagation of whatever corruptions or errors may happen to inhere in the predominant belief of the country.—Religion is the Truth or the supposed Truth of God, and an *Established Religion* is, in a manner, *recognized as Truth*.—

It would also follow from the admission of the same principle, that the Established Religion is to be changed according to all the fluctuations which may happen in the respective preponderance of different systems of Faith. Different religious parties may exist in something like equal numbers under the same Government, and, from a variety of causes affecting either population or opinion, the excess of one above another may at one time be upon this side, at another upon that ;—the privilege, therefore, of establishment must be shifted backwards and forwards accordingly.

We do indeed regard it as a very undesirable state of things that a great provision should exist for any Religion professed by a small number of the inhabitants of a country, and still less if it operates as a burthen * upon the disciples of another system. But it has

* This, however, is only in appearance the case with respect to any part of the tithes secured at home to the Church of England.—Nothing, we believe, is more decidedly ascertained than that where the Farmer pays no tithe, or only what are called the small tithes, to the Church, he generally pays either a *higher* tithe to the lay-impropriator, or an increased rate of rent which more than makes up the difference.—The tithes, therefore, constitute in fact a *deduction* from the estate of the landed proprietor, and amount to the same thing as a Reservation of Lands.—Add to this that a vast proportion of the tithes themselves is not now in the hands of the Church.

been shown from calculations made at different times, which we cannot now afford to exhibit in detail, that, in the words of the Bishop's Letter, (p. 8.) "the reserves, according to the fairest computation which can be made of what they are likely to yield, will be far from constituting an immoderate provision for such a body of the clergy of the Church of England, as the wants of the people, (if she is freely encouraged to take root), will absolutely require."—And in Lower Canada, where the reserves do *not* amount to *one fourteenth* of the conceded lands of the province, although a considerable body of Protestant Clergy must be required within the part which contains no reserves, * it must be anticipated that they will yield an inadequate provision for their purpose.

Of the arguments advanced by the Bishop which are next noticed by the Presbyterian Ministers, they pronounce one to be "*utterly unavailing*,"—another "*equally feeble*"—a third to be "*not more happy*"—and a fourth to be "*a mere begging of the question*."—pp. 4, 5, and 6 of the Pastoral Letter.

Voyons un peu.

"His Lordship should have recollected,"—this refers to his argument in favour of the alliance of church and state drawn from the incorporation of the civil with the religious polity of the Jews, and the controul of their Kings over the ordinances of worship,—“that the dispensation of Moses was abrogated and superseded by that of the Gospel.”

We rather incline to a belief that his Lordship had not forgotten this circumstance.—We see no reason to conclude that he entertains the opinions of the old *Judaizing Christians*.—But, seriously, do the Presbyterian divines intend to maintain that because the *Gospel* is in certain points "contrasted" with the *law*, no analogy is to be instituted in *any* point between them?—that the Jewish Church is not a type of the Christian?—that nothing in Christian

* At this moment three-fifths of the English Clergy in Lower Canada are situated within the Seignourial tracts.

communities whether of a civil, religious, or legislative nature is founded upon principles drawn from the Old Testament?—that, where circumstances admit of its fair adaptation to the existing order of things, no precedent can be taken, no argument deduced from the declared will and established system of the Almighty under the old covenant? as well might we argue on the other side that *because* the Redeemer of the world declares that he came *not to destroy*, but to *fulfil* the law, *therefore* it is actually in all its parts now in force.

The Bishop, coupling the precedent of the Jewish Church and the example of direct regulation and controul of religious matters by royal authority, *subsequently to the original institution of the Mosaic Ritual*, with some prophetic intimations that Christianity should be fostered and protected by the state, argues, *generally*, in favour of the principle of an alliance of church and state.—Is it any answer to this argument to say that the Government of the Jewish State was a Theocracy, and the Mosaic dispensation extraordinary and miraculous?—These circumstances could only *diminish* the necessity of such an interference as we read of on the part of the Ruling Powers upon earth, in a way neither extraordinary nor miraculous, but such as it is competent to men of modern times to exercise.—Viewing the subject in this light, we might argue that if such an interference was permissible then, it is *à fortiori* permissible now.

But it is a remarkable feature of this controversy that the Church of Scotland, *founding her whole claim* upon the circumstance of her being *established* in one portion of Great Britain, avails herself of arguments against some exclusive claims of the Church of England, which, if they have any force at all, are subversive of the principle of religious establishments altogether.

When the Christian church ceased to be persecuted and the ruling powers of the Roman Empire became Christian, it was natural and right that the church should be recognized and pro-

tected by the state, and established in mutual relations with the civil power. This subject is placed in so clear and convincing a light by Archbishop Magee, in a charge from which extracts have been given in a former number of this work, that we think it can hardly fail of affording satisfaction with respect to the general principle itself.—The Bishop in his letter refers to the first *establishment*, (in *this* sense of the word), of Christianity.—So far from being implicated, as it is attempted here to represent him, (*Pastoral Letter* p. 5.), in whatever errors of principle the Christians thus enjoying establishment were guilty of *in the whole course of that age*, he expressly adverts (p. 6.) to “changes and abuses which grew out of” the connection with the Roman Empire.—The *Pastoral Letter* has, therefore, failed, if it was the object to leave open a reflection upon the sentiments expressed by the Bishop.—The only other inference to be drawn from the remarks which its authors have made upon this passage, is a general objection to religious establishments, and one, consequently, which is fatal to the very grounds of their own pretensions.

So again with respect to the reformers,—the Bishop points out that the above-stated principle was recognized at the Reformation.—But, say the Presbyterian divines, the reformers were exceedingly wrong in their notions of religious toleration.—If this reasoning is intended to weaken our confidence in the general principles of the Reformation, by saying that because the reformers were wrong in one point, we cannot trust them in another, the Church of Rome is much obliged to its authors.—And if it is intended to furnish an inference that the fallibility of the reformers, as shown in the article of religious toleration, was equally seen in the provisions made for the establishment of religion, the authors must again be left to reap the benefit of their own argument.

The arguments drawn by either party from the Act of Union may be seen in the upper part of page 6, in each of the two publications.

Now whether the Bishop has proved or has not proved his point,

—whether the authors of the *Pastoral Letter* have failed or have succeeded in shewing that the King and his Government and the Imperial Parliament have been all grossly violating the plainest rights of Scotland within these provinces,* for half a century together, and the Scotch acquiescing all the time in such a wrong, —still, as the Bishop has at least *attempted* to prove his point instead of *assuming* it, it is surely a mistaken use of words to say that his talking of the *prior* establishment of the Church of England, is a mere *begging of the question*, because, *according to an opinion which he had first combated*, no right existed to give the footing to that establishment which has been conferred upon it.—Neither do we conceive that it can appear more warrantable to any person who turns to page 7 of the Bishop's letter, to say, (*Pastoral Letter* p. 6.), “by which, we *presume*, is meant the Church of England.” No *presuming* is very necessary to discover what church the Bishop speaks of, as having been established by the King of England and his Parliament; and the previously existing establishment of the Church of Rome is expressly noticed in his argument.

The language of Mr. Fox in the debate upon the act which sets apart the reserves, appears to be incorrectly understood by the authors of the *Pastoral Letter*. (p. 6.) Mr. Pitt spoke of the establishment of an Episcopal See, most evidently as *part of the plan*; and it was accordingly formed. Mr. Fox, in reply, deter-

* The Church of England is also established upon a distinct elevation in the East and West Indies, and in New South Wales, &c.—In the East Indies, the Church of Scotland having received protection and assistance from the Board of Controul, made claims for a recognition of equality with the Church of England — The Board plainly and unhesitatingly declared in the instructions which they sent out in reply, that the Diocese of Calcutta had been established by the King's Prerogative, and that it was wholly out of the question to regard the two churches as being upon the same footing in that Diocese. Was there ever an example, unless perhaps under the Protectorate, of a Presbyterian Chapel of the British Ambassador at a Foreign Court?

mined, of course, to differ from his antagonist at all hazards, declared his opinion that it ought to be a *Popish* or a *Presbyterian*, not an establishment of the *Church of England**—never, it would seem, contemplating the possibility of *two* co-ordinate establishments within the same limits.

In the same page of the Pastoral Letter it is said that “the Scottish inhabitants of the Colony were not apprised of the views” of the Church of England with respect to the reserves, till the appearance of a certain advertisement by authority of a clergy corporation :

Let us put a case.

A has an estate, devised to him by will and secured to his heirs by entail.—While he is a minor, he is a ward in Chancery and the estate is managed by other hands, upon a clear understanding that it is *his*.—As soon as he is of age, the title-deeds are put into his hands, and the power conveyed to him to manage his own property.—It is not long before he gives certain notifications to the tenants.—Soon after this, B, forming another branch of the same family and residing where the property of A is situated, having had the means of informing himself of the nature of all the previous transactions—starts up for the first time and says that he has a right to a share of this estate. He endeavours to find flaws in the title of A, and because in one part of the will the benefit of the *family* who were to be benefited *in the person of A*, is mentioned in a way conceived to be *capable* of an application to its other branches,—although without a hint of the *existence* of B, and although the following clauses and all other proceedings connected with the subject, decisively fix the intention of the will upon one particular branch and that alone, namely upon A,—he regards the exclusive claim of A as an usurpation, and declares that he was “never apprized of

* Tomline's *Life of Pitt*.

the views" of A upon the subject, till he was made acquainted with them by means of the notifications issued to the tenants.

We have dwelt so long upon these prominent points that we must endeavour to condense all that we have yet to say, and even if we should overlook entirely some of the arguments of the *Pastoral Letter*, we shall only follow the much more marked example of its authors who have wholly passed by several of the strongest points in the case made out by the Bishop, particularly in the lower half of page 7 of his Lordship's letter, and the top of page 8.—They are possibly ready with answers still.—We are ready also, as we humbly conceive,—although sorely unwilling to proceed in the contest,—to meet all and every argument which we may now omit to notice in the *Pastoral Letter*.

The authors, in page 8, departing (which we do not question their right to do), from the example of the Bishop, make their remarks upon the internal administration of the Church of England. But had they as extensive an acquaintance with the state of things in these new countries as their brethren of that church, they would never form an estimate of the number of persons who belong, or have attached or are truly attaching themselves to the system of the Church of England, from the proportion who have actually become *Communicants*.—Persons who have always belonged to that church, have lived perhaps in the wilderness in long disuse of the regular ordinances of religion, and do not soon recover the habits which make them susceptible of such high preparation as is requisite for a proper participation in the Lord's Supper. And all the heterogeneous materials of which new settlements are frequently composed,—persons whom the Ministers of the Church of England will never be deterred by any misapplied charge of a rage for proselytism, from seeking to "gather together in one" where they are found as "sheep having no shepherd,"—all these remaining to be formed and moulded, cannot at once *communicate* in a church whose ministrations nevertheless they often thankfully accept, in

the planting of which they cheerfully have their part, and whose cordial members they and their children ultimately become.

It is also recommended by the authors of the *Pastoral Letter* (page 8), that if there are, as the Bishop has stated, large congregations of the Church of England unsupplied, more judgment and care should be exercised in distributing the services of her pastors.—But in the Church of Scotland itself, can Ministers be moved about at pleasure from one station to another as local expediency may seem to require? Has there never been, in any one place, a concentration of the ministerial force of that church while remote Scottish settlers have been unprovided?—The commentary upon the Bishop's letter is here as elsewhere partial in such a manner that the *passage which is noticed* furnishes subject for reprehension while the *context which is unnoticed* would have supplied the means of wiping it away.—The authors of the *Pastoral Letter* have professedly informed themselves with great minuteness, of the state of the English congregations, and they advert to some examples of exceedingly small flocks of which the pastors receive “the usual emoluments of £200 or £300, per annum.” (We do not know upon what the, or £300, is founded—the usual emoluments are £200.)—But the page (8) of the Bishop's letter, upon which they are remarking, points out the fact that these pastors have generally other flocks to visit also, and often a wide range of country within their charge.

The remarks in page 11 of the *Pastoral Letter*, which pronounce that both the PIETY and PATRIOTISM of the Scottish Emigrant must die, if he does not enjoy the particular mode of worship to which he has been accustomed, if they were just and well-founded, would be nothing to the purpose, because the Clergy of the Church of England would rejoice that settlements properly Scotch, and consisting of persons wedded in their attachments to the Church of Scotland, should have due provision made for the maintenance of pastors of their own communion. If they protest against the

Church of Scotland's coming forward at this day to help herself out of the patrimony of the Church of England, from which there is nothing to spare, the principle upon which they ground their objections is not that the regular flocks of the Church of Scotland ought to starve unless they are led to pasture by shepherds whom they only follow from necessity.—But the position itself that the *piety and patriotism* of the Scottish emigrant will wither if he joins in a new form of worship is one which we will most unhesitatingly venture to contradict.—To make the living principle which animates the believer in Christ and the duties and attachments which belong to the citizen and the subject, absolutely dependent, in the case of Scotchmen, upon their participation in a particular mode of worship, is doing an injustice to their character which we are persuaded that the authors of the *Pastoral Letter* will be ready to disavow. We can undertake, from our experience, to say that the Scotch, all national as they are, have nevertheless, in many instances, a remarkable faculty of adaptation to circumstances, which is happily subservient to their disposition to venture their fortunes abroad.—With respect to the alleged *extinction of piety* among those who conform to the Church of England, we shall select a single example out of a thousand, which may serve as an answer to such an assumption: It is taken from an account of the Mission of the Church of England at the Red River Settlement,* and may be perfectly relied upon.

“ We have two places of Worship * * * * three years ago the number of communicants was only six; they are now increased to *seventy-three*, out of which *twenty-four are Scotchmen*—half-breed natives, twenty-seven—Englishmen five—Indian females three—*Orkney-men fourteen*. All these, at their examinations previous to admission, gave the most unequivocal proofs of their being influenced by the love of Christ as a constraining principle.”

* Christian Sentinel. Vol. I. page 286.

With respect to the *extinction of patriotism*, we know that there are multitudes of instances in which gallant and loyal Scotch soldiers and sailors have conformed to the worship of the Church of England, and often continued from mere unconstrained choice, to attend it, after their retirement from the service, without impairing a particle of their feeling for their King and country.

We must be permitted also to say that the Scottish divines, when their attention was turned to the cases of their own countrymen who have joined the Church of England in Quebec, Montreal and York,—whatever may be the *instances* in which they have reason, as it appears, to impute unworthy motives to them, might have discovered *instances also* subversive of the principle which they were seeking to establish.

The *Pastoral Letter* was put together, we presume, by different hands, and although we have not the most distant suspicion who is particularly the writer of any particular portion of it from end to end,—there are some passages which we think the authors as a body will much regret to have put forth.—We think that they can hardly conceal from themselves that it is the character of these passages *spargere voces in vulgum ambiguas*—that they have a tendency, more or less direct, to throw an unjust odium upon the Church of England, to infuse into the popular mind a groundless jealousy of her progress,—to alarm new prejudices against her, to inflame those which have been studiously created by some of her enemies, and to identify the cause of the Church of Scotland in this contest with the feelings and interests of other parties, who would in fact not be benefited by her being admitted to share in the support derived from the reserves.

Civil, political and religious liberty are represented in p. 13, as in manifest and extreme danger from the prospect of a “*formidable and numerous body of clergy supported by funds, altogether independent of the people—WE MIGHT ALMOST ADD, OF THE GOVERNMENT OR THE STATE:*”

First, with respect to *the people*. Are not the clergy in *Scotland* supported in a manner which is, in a very great degree, *independent of the people*?—Is not their maintenance *secured to them by law*? Is it not compulsory upon the heritors of whatever denomination to contribute the quota imposed upon them for this purpose?—and are none of their pastoral charges in the appointment of the Crown or of private individuals of rank and fortune? The success of their particular party here, in the present attack upon the Church of England, is represented as almost essential to the liberties and the prosperity of these Provinces, yet, if they succeed, will not *their Ministers* be *equally supported by funds independent of the people*?—And will not the Crown exercise patronage if it confers endowment?

Quod mihi vitio vertis id tibi speras laudi fore.

Again, where is the real cause for alarm with respect to independence upon the *Government or the State*?—Do not the authors of the pamphlet know what the Government has done with respect to the reservation of patronage to itself?—Do they not know what influence and controul and inspection is to be exercised by the Government in the university of Upper Canada?—Do they not also know,—or if not, ought they not to have informed themselves before they raised a cry like this,—that the clergy-corporations are only the *Stewards* of the Government, and that, although the reserves are solely applicable to the support of the clergy, the whole charge, distribution and allotment of the proceeds is in the hands of the Crown?—We feel no alarm for the Government from any church in these Provinces—but least of all, surely, is it to be apprehended from the Church of England? Is it not a characteristic difference between the establishments in North and South Britain that the former disclaims a subjection in certain points to Government to which the latter, upon principle, submits?

The sort of parallel which it is attempted to institute between the policy by which it was attempted to force Episcopacy upon

the consciences of the Scottish people in the time of the Stuarts, and the policy, as it is called, of the Church of England in the Canadas in seeking to preserve to herself and her people her own rights and her own means of support, is one which in no single point can be maintained.—It is the fashion to remember all the sins of the Church of England, sunk into shade as they are by her glories, and to forget the sins of the parties with whom she contended.—The Protestant world at large was slow in thoroughly learning the principles of toleration.—Certainly they were not at all more understood by the Presbyterians or the Puritans with whom the Scottish divines of Canada claim kindred, (p. 17) than by the Church of England.*—The *blue laws* of Connecticut, framed by the very persons who had been driven abroad by persecution in England themselves, were marked by a spirit of the most bitter intolerance. If the cruel persecutions practised by some of the supporters of Scotch prelacy, are now to be made a handle against the Church of England, the Church of Scotland should by parity of reasoning be made answerable now, for all her past proceedings, which we presume she would very little desire, and if she is to identify herself, according to the intimation of the *Pastoral Letter*, with the republican and fanatical, opposed to the arbitrary and high-church party in the civil wars, she must take her share in the everlasting stain which lies upon men, who, under the assumption of extraordinary sanctity and professing to be the chosen cham-

* Neal, *himself* a *non-conformist* and represented by the translator of Mosheim who was a *Presbyterian*, to be *too favorable* to his own party, speaks thus of the Church of England and the Puritans :

“ *Both parties agreed too well* in asserting the necessity of an uniformity of public worship and of calling in the *sword* of the Magistrate for the defence of their several principles * * * *Neither party* were for admitting that liberty of conscience and freedom of profession which is every man’s right as far as is consistent with the peace of the Government under which he lives.”

pions of God himself, proceeded to gorge themselves with plunder and blood. When it is considered how their case was aggravated by the enjoyment of the light of the Gospel and by the assumption of the garb of Godliness, we do conceive that more horrible wickedness was never known than that which was seen in the regicide faction of those times.

The following passage we take entire from page 9 of the *Pastoral Letter*.

“It is easy to predict that if the LURE of two hundred pounds sterling a year continue to be held out to induce the teachers of other denominations to enter her communion, and if the EPISCOPAL CHURCH RECEIVE SUCH CANDIDATES WITH THE SAME FACILITY AS HERETOFORE into the priestly office, the number in all likelihood will continue to increase. *All those with whom moral principle and feeling have less influence than the love of this present world,* WILL RESORT TO THE BISHOP OF QUEBEC for orders, and will desire to be PUT INTO THE PRIEST’S OFFICE FOR A PIECE OF SILVER AND A MORSEL OF BREAD.”

The authors penned this remark and more to the same purpose after reading the subjoined passages in the letter of the Bishop of Quebec.

“Considerable numbers of the religious teachers themselves of other persuasions within this diocese, have, from time to time, offered to transfer their service to the Church of England and not a few of these have been approved and enlisted under her banners, *where they so acquit themselves as would do no discredit to any cause*:—If these ministers were to be regarded as they are often represented, in the light of interested apostates, and it were a reflection upon the Church of England to accept them, it would at least,—(AND THIS WITHOUT ADVERTING TO THE CASES OF THOSE WHO HAVE BEEN REJECTED),—be a *mutual* reflection, and carry reproach upon the community in whose bosom they were bred.”—*Bishop’s Letter p. 9.*

“If we cannot say that we possess any spirituality of mind or sincere devotedness of heart in the cause of Christ,—then let us lay our hands upon our

mouths, to stop the utterance of every claim and look for no favour from God or man. LET IT NEVER BE SAID OR SUSPECTED THAT WE HAVE SOUGHT TO BE PUT INTO THE PRIEST'S OFFICE FOR A PIECE OF SILVER AND A MORSEL OF BREAD."—*Ib.* p. 11.

This, then, is the quarter to which men are to *resort* for the purposes and with the views described in the extract from the Pastoral Letter. Are it's authors not aware that the documents now exist, and that the *liste nommée* can be produced showing the REJECTION of overtures made by Presbyterian ministers and others both Scotch and Irish, to the Bishops of Quebec?—Do they not know that men the most highly respectable, have been rejected solely upon the ground that they appeared to have a mere liberal sort of indifference as to forms of worship and church-government instead of a conscientious preference for the Episcopal Church of England?

The dangers to be apprehended from the preservation of her existing privileges to the Church of England—the power which she would acquire—the secular and ambitious views which she would be led to entertain—the spirit of domination which would be fostered within her bosom and felt heavily by all the children of the land,*—are pictures replete with *effect*, but they are *pictures only*—shadows which have no reality—phantoms conjured up at which no cool and judicious man will ever start.—We repeat that we do not apprehend danger from *any* church in these Provinces, and if there were grounds for such apprehension, the history of the past would teach us to suspect *ecclesiastical domination* just as much from the Presbyterian Church, invested with that extensive influence which her friends would persuade themselves that she would long ago have commanded but for want of means,† as from the

* See the last ten or eleven pages of the *Pastoral Letter*, *passim*.

† See bottom of p. 12, and middle of 14 of the *Pastoral Letter*.

Episcopal.—But we are persuaded that the tendency is all the other way. The representative constitution given to these Colonies—the fast root which principles of liberty have struck in the soil—the general and increasing desire for education—the stimulated spirit of improvement—the example, in many points, of the neighbouring States and the communication rather too great than too sparing, of their sentiments and habits of thinking to our people, are all pledges and safeguards against the encroachments and usurpations of *authority* of any kind, which more requires, we will honourably avow our opinion, to be supported among us than to be repressed. We think that there is in the Colonies,—if we may so express it, a youthful excess and a disposition to riot in the blessings of liberty, which we trust will subside into a settled principle of invincible freedom, coupled with a firm maintenance of order, and produce a well-balanced and prosperous state of things.—We do not believe that there is cause for alarms as if the new world were in danger of those shackles which belonged to the darker ages of the old:—We may indeed be mistaken in our calculations: but if such is, (which we do not undertake to say), the prevailing sentiment and language of our clergy, so far as they at all concern themselves with politics, it is not that they lean to those doctrines of “implicit faith and passive obedience,” which the Scottish divines have called the worst of the Church of Rome, but it is rather a proof that, having some “courage for the truth upon earth,” they would withstand encroachments upon the rights and consciences of their fellow-subjects, as they refuse to be carried away by the torrent of popular ascendancy. For, little as it is remembered in modern times, when the espousers of the popular side of every question assume to themselves alone all generous, expansive and high minded views, the character which the *civium ardor prava jubentium* can sway, is that which, in other circumstances, the *vultus instantis tyranni* would bend to its purpose.

Our Clergy are “men of like passions” with others—and if

there are any among them to whom p. 21 and some other parts of the *Pastoral Letter* can properly apply, we hope and pray that they may profit by the lesson.—But without pausing upon a remark which suggests itself that there may be a mixture of contentious and ambitious motives in asserting equal privilege with others who are in actual and exclusive occupation, as well as in maintaining that occupation or making it subservient to views more remote,—we may certainly say that it is at present no enviable pre-eminence which our clergy enjoy, and we may safely follow the Bishop in his declaration “that they have no private personal interest in the question, and that motives of self-indulgence and love of present praise would prompt them to open the door to their competitors.” We will add also that we believe they are not chargeable with any insolence of deportment in social life. We will farther add that we could name many among them whose *ambition* has been only the ambition of doing good, whose glory has been only the glory of their Master.—The marks of their ambition may be seen where they have shewn themselves “willing to *spend* and to be spent”—where our Zion rears her spires in the wilderness and the servants of God are walking in her ordinances, and “lifting their voices” to Heaven “with one accord,” who knew no stated guide till she sent her shepherds among them.—They may be seen—but for the present we forbear—yet perhaps we have not done, for we feel strong upon this ground,—stronger than the world has known that we have cause to be—and if we are “compelled,” no false delicacy shall withhold us from becoming “fools in glorying”—and no man living shall “stop us from this same confident boasting.”

The co-ordinate establishment of the Church of Scotland would not produce such a state of things as is represented in p. 12, to be the prime cause of the prosperity of the United States.—That country, according to the view which is here taken, would still be just as much preferable to this. *Two churches equally and ex-*

clusively privileged, would never satisfy a population of mixed and multiplied religious professions, if they objected to *one*. Did the Representatives of the people of Upper Canada the other day, in expressing their objections to the present appropriation of the reserves, propose to substitute for it any communication of advantage from them to the Presbyterians? What is it to the Methodists, the Baptists or the Quakers who form so large a proportion of our Protestant population, whether the Church of England keeps what she has, or the Church of Scotland gets part of it from her?—The latter church figures very inconsiderably among the population of the Canadas, and if her marks of distinction from the dissenting Presbyterians fade under the sun of the western hemisphere into fainter shades of difference, it is because she wants certain *characteristics of establishment here*, which she enjoys *at home*. Give her those characteristics and you draw the line as strongly here as there.* The approximation of the different parties can ill be pleaded in aid of the claims of the Church of Scotland, if the admission of those claims would precisely be the thing to obstruct it. If the Church of Scotland, while aiming to be established equally with the Church of England, calls all the orders of Presbyterians her own, the latter church may as well magnify her strength by affecting to embrace the Methodists, of whom those who are connected with the British Conference,—(and

* We must not be understood as wishing to suggest reasons for the perpetuation of these differences.—We are persuaded, —more strongly than the authors of the Pastoral Letter,—that the multiplication of religious divisions is a mischief, and that the different bodies of Presbyterians *would do a wise and right thing to co-alesce*. If our recommendation could have weight, we would by all means recommend such a co-alition. We only enter our protest against urging on, or anticipating, for the sake of making head against the Church of England, what appears to be neither digested nor, by some of the parties concerned, understood.

measures have recently been taken to bring all the Methodists of both Provinces into this connection,)—for the most part, profess a membership with her and frequently break with her the bread of holy remembrance and love.*

In adverting to the Bishop's recommendations of unity, the authors of the *Pastoral Letter* have left out of sight the particular manner in which he applies to young settlements composed of mixed materials, a maxim to them unspeakably important, and one upon the adoption of which their ability to provide the highest of all blessings in any efficient manner must, in many instances, altogether depend,—namely that “unity and COMBINATION OF RESOURCE must plainly and most essentially contribute to the prosperity and vital strength of religion,” and “that *division* is always a WASTE OF THE MEANS FOR BUILDING UP RELIGION.”—Confining themselves to the general question, in what Christian unity truly consists, they charge the Bishop with having confounded the ideas of unity and uniformity,—a charge for which we can discover no ground in his Lordship's letter.—This they illustrate, as it appears to us rather circuitously, by placing Archbishop Laud,†

* Those who are called *Primitive* Wesleyans are now labouring, and, we believe, in Ireland with much success, to bring back the whole body to their originally closer adherence to the church. We have very decided objections to Methodism, which we have often candidly stated to its professors, and we regard their proceedings as inconsistent with the plainest principles of church-membership, but we do not despair, in God's good time and after some changes which we think are working, of an arrangement which would bring them regularly under the wing of the church.

We acknowledge, however, that in point of forms, the dissenting bodies of Presbyterians are much nearer to the Church of Scotland, than the Methodists to ourselves.

† The Scottish divines are not obliged to be intimate with the characters of those who figure in English ecclesiastical history, but most assuredly they are not correct in their account of Laud.—We believe that Southey in his *Book of the Church* has done him *very little* more than justice.

and others who hold or are assumed to hold similar principles, inconsistent with the spirit of Protestantism, in contrast with some other English divines whom they highly commend. (*Pastoral Letter* p. 10).

In the same manner, they say, there may be unity without uniformity. That the true spirit of *Christian love* may exist in the breasts of *individuals* where there is no *unity of external order and church-government*,—(for *uniformity* in the *mode of worship* is something perfectly distinct,)—we feel most thoroughly assured; and that *this unity* of order and government *may exist* where great evils and gross corruptions are to be seen, is what it is plainly impossible to deny.—Still it is unity, and although it does not *constitute* all the blessings of unity, there can be *no other genuine unity*, (whatever mutual good understanding may prevail,)—where it does not exist. The Clergy of the Church of England can never, in any consistency with the principles upon which their church is founded and framed, be drawn into an adoption of those popular and accommodated views of church-unity which in fact they were by no means aware to be the views entertained by the Scottish divines in the Canadas. They can live in peace with those who differ for them; they can hope well of their brethren who dissent; they can respect sincere piety wherever it is found; they can feel the unreasonableness of expecting (however they may rejoice when it occurs,) that the members of other national religious systems should all at once surrender their particular attachments and prejudices, and merge in a single church; they can lament deficiencies on their own side, or acknowledge excellencies on the other; they can charge themselves with their share of the blame in the causes which produce separation;* but never, never can they regard the formation ad libitum of new Ministries and systems of Doctrine as warranted by the word and authority of God, or as

* See Archdeacon Mountain's ordination-sermon, published at Quebec in 1826,

being otherwise than a sore and grievous evil in itself.—Never can they re-echo the cant which is rung forth in newspapers and trumpeted in the harangues of popularity-hunters who in their hearts “care for none of these things,” that a real *Catholic* spirit consists in a reckless abandonment of all preference in religious systems and that it is bigotry and intolerance to maintain, in however calm and christian a manner, the fences of orthodoxy, authority and order.—No—never can they think that when Christ prayed that his disciples might be ONE; that when the apostle charges it upon them that there should be no *schism* IN THE BODY; that they should *all speak the same thing*;—that there should be *no divisions among them*; that they should be *perfectly joined together in one spirit*; that they should remember the *one* hope of their calling, *one* faith, *one* baptism—that they should beware of calling themselves after particular founders of the opinions which they had embraced, “I am of Paul—and I of Apollos—and I of Cephas”—never, with all this before their eyes, can they think that a true picture of Christian *unity* is there presented where THE BODY consists of separate and independent parts; where an unlimited right is assumed of creating new ministers and new societies; where some reject altogether the sacraments ordained by Christ, others, as if by an authority above His, dispense with them as non-essentials, others again vary the application of them;—where the very bond of common adherence to essentials is uncertain, because one party may pronounce that to be essential which another regards as positive error;—and finally where “every one of them saith,” I am of Calvin—I am of Wesley—I am of Whitfield—I am of some other “Father or Master upon earth.” This state of things the Episcopal Clergy never can be brought to regard as a true picture of the family and the fold of Christ in it’s right state, or as reconcilable with the views of unity furnished in scripture; and so far from conceiving that they yield advantage to the cause of the Church of Rome by thus treating the divisions of

Protestants, they plainly see that these divisions with the licence now given to them by public opinion and the plausible inference afforded, that as *truth* is *one*, it cannot be possessed by those who are divided among themselves, constitute the sole available strength, and tend to aid the proselytism of that church, who could make no impression against the overwhelming power of divine truth with the auxiliary force of genuine ecclesiastical antiquity, if these could be brought more fully to bear upon her by means of one regularly coherent system of Protestant faith. It is a mere truism to say that mankind are prone always to extremes, yet how many men seem to think that, in order to be right, they have only to be as opposite as possible, and in all possible points, to that which is wrong ! and how is this remark exemplified in many proceedings connected with religion, in the present day, where, under colour of preserving the rights of conscience, and of renouncing the yoke of human usurpation, the most direct appeals are addressed to the old rebellious principle of human nature, thus chosen as the instrument to “work the righteousness of God !”

Of some nearer *approximation* to a combined and harmonized Religion among the Protestant Inhabitants of this Diocese, than there now remains a prospect of beholding, the Church of England once fondly indulged the hope.—We have already been drawn on strangely to transgress our announced intention of condensing the latter part of our remarks, * and we must bring them to a close ; but if time and space were left us, we could furnish multiplied and striking instances not only of a kindly tendency to union in various religious parties, but of a cordial and holy attachment to Religion through the medium of an adopted Church. The claim with which the Church of Scotland has recently waked up, the noise

* The little time allowed us, has obliged us to send off successive portions of our manuscript to the press, and we have therefore had no possible opportunity of seeing our own work as a whole, and making such changes or retrenchments as we might have desired.

which her claim has made and the echo from different quarters which has answered it, have been the causes of dissipating a great part of this delightful vision.—It is in vain—it is vain that she would say that she has done nothing for the people of this Province because she had not the requisite powers and means at her disposal—for when did she begin to make the effort to acquire those powers? We should do a palpable wrong if we charged upon the authors and promoters of a claim which they persuade themselves to be just, and the ill-consequences of which they probably did not contemplate, all the evils to which it has actually given birth, but the claim itself, as it was timed and as Religion was circumstanced in the country, we regard as a great public calamity. We are *not* recommending a “*system of proselytism*” nor has the *Bishop recommended it*—we do not wish to see our Clergy go abroad to meddle with other folds regularly-constituted and duly provided with shepherds of their own—we are advocating *union*—and, while we bow to the divine assurance that “all things work together for good,” we still mourn over the partial ruin of the fabric which the hands of our brethren were raising up.

As far as we can judge from ourselves and those whom we best know, an ardent love of union,—a yearning of the heart to bring those who ought to be brothers in faith, to act in concert and to frequent the courts of the house of God together, (operating upon a conviction that the extension of their own establishment affords the truest means of effecting this object) is the predominant feeling which dictates what is termed the policy of our Clergy, and, if the direct interests of a particular Church which has claims upon our love and duty, have mixed themselves with our motives, we believe that we could name some other instances, in which precisely the same principle has been a sufficiently obvious ingredient of religious zeal. Alas! what a change have we seen!—How many new and unprovided communities are now unsettled in their religious plans waiting to see the issue of the struggle!—how many individuals who otherwise, in all reasonable calculation,

would have been gained to assist in planting the means of public worship, are hanging off, and perhaps defeating the whole object, because they actually doubt whether there is to be any Established Religion!—How many are, in a manner, intimidated or withheld by a false shame from violating a nominal adherence to some one or other of the modes of Religion, because the pride of consistency and the remnant of national or other prepossessions and associations, have been kindled into life by what has passed before the public in the contest between those who profess the Episcopal mode and the Presbyterian! How many evil passions have been set in motion! how many causeless suspicions engendered, how many hurtful misrepresentations sent abroad! how many malicious or careless hands have thrust in with their brand to set the flame running through inflammable prejudices and feelings which had no necessary connection whatever with the subject!

If it be said that had we of the Church of England yielded to the claim of our competitors, all would then have been peace, in the first place we absolutely deny this—and in the second we affirm that we had no imaginable right to consent to such a surrender.—Whatever credit we may gain for the declaration, it is with truth that we declare contention to be hateful to our souls—we, at least, who, in the midst of multiplied occupations, have by forced toil, prepared this hurried review, can say from our hearts that we have done it as a severe and painful duty; that in all contentions connected with religion, we are dragged against our nature and full often have borrowed the language of the Psalmist to vent in secret our longing for repose and peace, “O that I had wings like a dove for then would I flee away and be at rest!”

If it is indeed to be contemplated as possible that our church should have a rival to divide her honours and advantages in this diocese, let no apprehension be felt that, the thing once done, her clergy will seek to perpetuate the strife.—Whatever may be the issue we entertain the pleasing hope—and why should not

our hope embrace also our opponents?—that acquiescing in the will of providence, they will manifest neither the insolence of triumph nor the sullenness of defeat.—Their opinion on the question, we believe, can never be changed—nor will their endeavours be relaxed in maintenance of their cause—but they will seek to heal the sores which have been opened and set the example of living in charity with their antagonists, forgetful of the day of battle. For ourselves, if we then look back upon this our controversy, we will remember whatever kind things have been said of us by our opponents, and obliterate from our minds whatever may have caused us pain. We pray them also to forgive and hereafter to forget whatever here or elsewhere may have been said on our side, to offend their feelings. And so God defend the right!

ERRATA.

- Page 1, line 9, *for*, will be sure to remain, *read*, will be seen to remain.
- 2, mid. *for*, simply official address, *read*, simply an official address.
- 6, last line but two, *for*, another authority, *read*, the other authority.
- 11, line 6, *for*, as well, *read*,—As well.
- 13, last line, *for*, part of the plan, *read*, part of the same plan.
- 16, first line, *for*, have their part, *read*, bear their part.
- Ib, last line but two, *for*, attachments. *read*, attachment.
- 19, line 5, *for*, and are none, *read*,—Are none.
- Ib, line 6, from the bottom, *substitute* a period *for* the mark of interrogation.
- 20, line 7, *for*, she contended, *read*, she has contended.
- 22, fourth line from the bottom, *for*, suspect, *read*, expect.
- 23, line 10, *for*, honourably, *read*, honestly.
- Ib, mid. *for*, cause for alarms, *read*, cause for alarm.
- 28, below mid. *for*, creating new Ministers, *read*, creating new Ministries.
- 30, seventh line from bot. *for*, our love, *read*, their love, and *for*, our motives, *read*, their motives.
- 31, above mid. *for*, thrust in with their brand, *read*, thrust in their brand.