



A  
**PASTORAL LETTER**  
FROM  
THE CLERGY OF THE  
CHURCH OF SCOTLAND IN THE CANADAS,  
TO THEIR  
**PRESBYTERIAN BRETHREN,**  
ON THE SUBJECT NOW AGITATED  
BETWEEN THEM AND THE CLERGY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND,  
RELATIVE TO THE  
*APPROPRIATION OF THE LANDS*  
RESERVED FOR THE SUPPORT OF  
A PROTESTANT CLERGY IN THESE PROVINCES

---

**Montreal :**

PRINTED AT THE HERALD OFFICE.

1828.

# A PASTORAL LETTER

FROM

The Clergy of the Church of Scotland  
IN THE CANADAS,

TO THEIR PRESBYTERIAN BRETHERN,

*On the subject now agitated between them and the Clergy of the Church of England, relative to the appropriation of the Lands reserved for the support of a Protestant Clergy in these Provinces.*

BRETHREN!

**WERE** the present simply a question of temporal provision, and affecting solely our own interests, we should not have deemed it our duty to address you on this occasion; but, to use the language of our opponents, the question is one which “nearly affects the interests of our Church,” and which involves, if not her immediate existence, at least her respectability and permanence, in these Provinces. To abandon our claims, therefore, without a struggle, would be not only pusillanimous, but a dereliction of a solemn duty—it would be to prove ourselves unworthy of the invaluable inheritance which was purchased for us with the best blood of our brave and pious ancestors.

Were we to notice the many undisguised attacks that have been made upon us—leaving out of the question those that have been clandestine and insidious—it would abundantly appear how little prone we are to controversy, and how much hitherto we have sacrificed to peace and charity. Indeed, we are little moved by anonymous pamphlets and anonymous communications in public journals; and when recently a celebrated Chart drew upon its author the indignation of the whole community, though we considered it an object meriting the severest censure, we are in no way responsible for any vehemence or acrimony it may have been the cause of eliciting. We, on our part, can truly say that we have never attacked any party, nor done any thing calculated to create excitement or provoke controversy. We did, indeed, in the year 1820, petition His Majesty’s Government for protection and support to our Church, and claimed, in virtue of what we believe to be our Constitutional Rights, a participation in the Clergy Reserves. In no other way can it be alledged, with truth, that

we occasioned the present controversy; and we submit, with confidence, to the judgment of the candid and unbiassed, whether there was any thing in the spirit and tenor of our petition to warrant the violence and hostility which were manifested on that occasion by our opponents. We will leave it to the impartial, who are aware of the representations made, and pamphlets published by our opponents, to decide which party has most reason to complain of attacks sustained, and of the spirit and manner in which these attacks have been conducted.

If we enquire into the circumstances that have recently revived the controversy, it will appear equally manifest to which party the blame is fairly to be attached.

The Ecclesiastical Chart, framed by Dr. Strachan, having been transmitted to this country, and having been published in the newspapers of the Provinces, occasioned a degree of excitement in all quarters, which will surprise no one competent to judge of the statements it contains. It roused into indignant exertion even those who were previously passive in the matter; and, as the only means of detecting and exposing its inaccuracies was by giving it publicity, it must be considered the immediate and sole cause of all that has lately been done or written on the subject. But, however much we may—and we *do* most sincerely deplore any excitement or violence that has arisen—we must be permitted to say that they alone are responsible for these unhappy consequences, from whom such unguarded statements have emanated, or who have in any measure been the advisers and abettors of that system of which the Chart forms a part. We regret to observe, that the Bishop of Quebec has, in no part of his Circular, disavowed or reprobated such misrepresentations in the manner that was to have been expected from the well known integrity of his character.

To those who are aware of the correspondence which we have been carrying on for years with the Colonial Office, and of the many encouraging promises that have been held out to us, but never realized, it will not be matter of surprise or reprehension, especially when they take into consideration the recent attempt of the Archdeacon of York to deprive us of the due support of Government, that we have at last resorted to the only effectual means of enforcing our claims, and of exposing and repelling such machinations. Indeed, the only charge against which it might be difficult to defend ourselves, would be that, in a matter so deeply affecting the vital interests, or rather the very existence of our Church, we had so long remained passive, while the utmost activity, vigilance and zeal were displayed in opposing our claims. We must be permitted to say that, having thus been compelled to exert ourselves in self-defence, we cannot help viewing it as somewhat strange to be now assailed with the charge of aggression and violence.

Such is a fair view of the circumstances that gave rise to those pro-

ceedings which seem to have drawn forth the Bishop of Quebec's Circular—and that silence may not be construed into an admission of error, apathy, or guilt, we now feel ourselves called upon to expound our views, and to vindicate what we deem our just claims.

We feel unfeigned and profound respect for the truly Apostolic character, and the meek and Christian spirit, of the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop; and it is our anxious desire to observe towards him, in this controversy, that reverence which not only his rank and office, but still more his piety and virtues, must impress on every good mind. And, however much we may prefer our own more simple and, as we deem it, more Apostolical mode of worship and Church Government, this sentiment of preference does not blind us to the merits of the Sister Establishment, whose high desert and real excellence as a Protestant Church we frankly and cheerfully acknowledge. With this perfect good feeling and frankness on both sides, we hope and are persuaded that the present controversy will not engender any bitterness or rancour between us.

That we may not be thought to have made unwarrantable pretensions in claiming for our Church a participation in the reserved lands, it will be necessary briefly to notice the heads of argument which his Lordship has stated in his Circular.

With regard to the allegation that the Religion of the State must be some *one* form which the Government must recognise and identify with itself, we are constrained to say, that we do not believe this to be, in theory, an axiom or self-evident truth; and in point of fact, we are far from thinking that it is verified in the History of Nations. While we admit with the Bishop that it is the duty of a Christian State to support Christianity, and by the most proper and effectual means to diffuse and promote Christian knowledge, piety and morals, we by no means think that it follows from this, as a necessary consequence, that it must recognise and identify itself with *some one* form, and establish and uphold *that* to the exclusion of every other,—and we wonder that a fact so obvious as the existence of two equal and independent Religious Establishments in Great Britain, should not have forced itself on the attention of his Lordship.

The true idea of a Religious Establishment appears to us to be, that a fixed and permanent provision be made by the State for affording religious instruction to the people, and that the Established Religion be that which is professed by the majority of the governed. In this opinion, we are supported by the authority of that eminent Philosopher and Divine—Dr. Paley.

The attempt of his Lordship to support his argument by a reference to the Jewish Economy is utterly unavailing. The Mosaic Dispensation was extraordinary and miraculous. The Government of the Jewish State was a Theocracy, and their Civil and Religious Institutions, prescribed by the same Divine authority, were comprised and blended together in one and the same code. To this very peculiar consti-

tution of the Jewish State, in which their religious economy was identified with their civil polity—and the administration of both vested in the supreme magistrate—we find no parallel except in the Mahomedan States, in which the Khoran serves at once as the directory of Faith and rule of Civil Government. Besides, his Lordship should have recollected that the dispensation of Moses was abrogated and superseded by that of the Gospel. The latter, indeed, stands every where contrasted in the Sacred Writings with the former; Antithesis would, therefore, in this case, have been a much better ground of argument than analogy. Were the principle of assimilating the Christian to the Jewish economy admitted, it would lead to the revival of circumcision, sacrifices, &c.

The argument from the establishment of Christianity, in the fourth century, under Constantine, is equally feeble. For this was the age in which “the interests of virtue and true religion suffered grievously. Two monstrous errors, which were almost universally adopted, became a source of innumerable calamities and mischiefs in the succeeding ages.” Of these maxims one was—“*That it was an act of virtue to deceive and lie, when by such means the interests of the Church might be promoted;*” and the second, equally horrible, though in another point of view, was—“*That errors in religion, when maintained and adhered to, after proper admonition, were punishable with civil penalties and corporeal tortures.*”\*

Nor is the Bishop more happy in his attempt to strengthen his argument by claiming for its support the sanction of our early Reformers. Most of our Reformers, as is now universally admitted, entertained very erroneous notions with regard to religious liberty; and holding the latter maxim—relating to the justice and expediency of punishing error by civil penalties and tortures—considered it the duty of the civil magistrate to enforce by these means the true religion, (that is, what they esteemed such) as well as to oppress and destroy all who dissented from it or opposed it; and, in consequence, became the advocates of intolerance and persecution, and displayed one of the worst features of that Church whose corruptions in other respects, they had so successfully laboured to expose and correct.

The question with respect to the construction of the Act of Parliament is one into the details of which we shall abstain from entering, as it belongs rather to the province of the lawyer than of the divine. Suffice it to say, that we believe His Majesty's Scottish subjects in a British Colony have a just claim to equality of rights, privileges, and advantages, civil, commercial and religious, with their fellow subjects from England and Ireland, or natives of these Provinces.

On the 4th article of the Union of the two Nations, we consider our right to be founded as upon a rock; for, if there is any faith in the most sacred treaties and covenants between nations, we are persuaded it is most solemnly pledged in this contract—which, be it observed,

\* Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History—Book 2, Part 2, Chap. 3, Section 16.

was ratified severally in the Parliaments of England and Scotland, and lies at the foundation of the British Constitution. Whatever, therefore, would violate any article of this treaty, would go virtually to dissolve this union of which it is the basis. For, was it not a treaty between two independent nations? Did it not equally secure to both, within their territories, as they stood at the time of the treaty, their respective religious establishments? And is it not palpable that, in territories acquired since that Union, there must be an equality and reciprocity of all rights, privileges and advantages whatever, unless some article in the treaty can be pointed out which clearly and distinctly makes a reservation or exception; and if this be the just construction of the treaty—had it been silent on this point—how unreasonable must we regard the doubts that have been expressed by some, notwithstanding the clear and express terms in which the fourth article of it is conceived.\* Whatever stress may be laid upon the word “territories,” in the same Act, it will bear no construction that could warrant its application to those Colonies or Plantations which have been acquired since the Union, and which are territories, not of England, but of Great Britain and Ireland.

The argument next adduced, that another establishment pre-occupies the ground, by which we presume is meant the Church of England, (for the Church of Rome preceded both) is no better than a *petitio principii*, or a begging of the question; for if, by the fourth article of the Union, we are entitled to an equality of rights, privileges and advantages, it will follow, by consequence, that our Church must stand on the same footing as the Sister Establishment, at least in every British Colony. If we refer to the debates that took place in the British Parliament when the Quebec Act was under discussion, we shall find that, at the last reading of the bill, this construction was put upon the words “a Protestant Clergy” by Mr. Fox—nor was he contradicted in this view of it by any of the Ministry. Indeed, it is only a few years since the exclusive claim to the Reserves was advanced by the Clergy of the Church of England, at least in a public manner; and the Scottish inhabitants of the Colony were not apprised of their views in this respect, until the appearance, in a Quebec paper, in the year 1820, of an advertisement with respect to a Clergy Corporation for the management of these Reserves.† Soon after, the Clergy of the

\* Article IV. of the Act of Union says—“That all the subjects of the United Kingdom of *Great Britain* shall, from and after the Union, have full freedom and intercourse of Trade and Navigation to and from any port or place within the said United Kingdom, and the Dominions and Plantations thereunto belonging; and that there be a communication of all other rights, privileges and advantages, which do or may belong to the subjects of either Kingdom; except where it is otherwise expressly agreed in these Articles.”

† The following is the advertisement cut out of the Official Paper—the *Quebec Gazette* :

**C**LERGY RESERVES.—His Majesty having been graciously pleased to erect and constitute a Corporation, consisting of the Bishop of this Diocese and the

Church of Scotland drew up a memorial to the Government, in which, in terms most respectful to the Sister Church, they urged their claims to a participation in the Revenues of these lands.

The special clauses of the Act on which the Bishop is pleased to dwell, as if they constituted an argument that the general term, "a Protestant Clergy," was intended to be limited and restricted to that of the Church of England, prove only that conditional authority was given for carrying the provision into immediate effect as regards the Church of England, while it was left to be settled afterwards by Government with regard to the Church of Scotland. In fact, the term, "Clergy of the Church of England," adopted in the special clauses of the Act, affords corroborating evidence in favour of our construction of the term, "a Protestant Clergy;" for how can we account for the variation of the terms, if there be no difference in meaning?

The powers of a Bishop in this Colony, we humbly conceive, are to be measured, *not* by the powers which belong to a Bishop in England, but by the laws and constitution of the Colony. Have we not a Catholic Bishop vested with extensive powers, and a Catholic Clergy recognised and established by law, and in actual possession of the tithes? Under these circumstances, it is altogether unavailing to argue, from the condition of the Protestant Clergy in England, that they have, or are entitled to have, the same *status* in these Provinces. But we commit, with confidence, to abler and more impartial men, the true construction of the Act, and the determination of the rights of British subjects, whether of the Church of England, or of the Church of Scotland in a British Colony; and shall proceed to weigh some other points of argument which the Bishop has touched upon, and of the justness and force of which the people of Canada are better qualified to judge.

These arguments turn all upon the great and increasing numbers of the Church of England, the facility of conversion to her communion, the alacrity with which proselytes resort to her from all quarters, and especially the great number of teachers, licentiate,

**CLERGY** of the Church of England holding benefices within this Province, for the superintending, managing and conducting the Reserves made or to be made for the support of a Protestant Clergy within the Province, PUBLIC NOTICE is hereby given, that all Leases of such Reserves will in future be granted by the said Corporation; and that applications for the same are to be made either to the Secretary of the Corporation at Quebec, or to the Clergyman of the Church of England residing nearest to the lot to be applied for.

Notice is also further given to those persons—whether holding Clergy Reserves, under Lease, or occupying them without title—who are in arrear in the payment of rent for the lots respectively held by them, that the Ministers of the Church of England residing nearest to such lots, are severally authorised, on the part of the Corporation, to receive arrears of rent, or in cases where such arrears shall be large, to compound for them: such composition to be subject to the approbation of the Principal and Directors of the Corporation:

And all persons, so in arrear, are called upon to make payment forthwith accordingly, and to prevent, thereby, the necessity of further proceedings against them.

By order of the Corporation,

ANDREW WM. COCHRAN, Secretary.

Quebec, 13th June, 1820.



and ministers of other denominations, who are continually offering themselves as candidates for Holy Orders.

As to the number of members of the Church of England, we would judge of them much rather, if we might be permitted, by those who are communicants, than by those who attend public worship; for the latter we know in many instances to be utterly fallacious, as a criterion of the number of her members. Many of the members of the Scotch congregations recently formed in these Provinces were previously in the habit of attending the Church of England, and some no doubt were members, and continued to be so until they obtained ministers of their own persuasion. This, indeed, will appear palpable from the vast disproportion between the number of hearers and communicants, as stated by the Clergy of the Church of England themselves. On the other hand, the number of the members belonging to our church will never be fully known until we are provided with an adequate supply of pastors.

The Bishop has mentioned in his Circular that there are large congregations in his Diocese unsupplied—that the congregations of the Church of England are the most considerable—and that he is disposed to believe that her disciples outnumber those of any other communion. In forming this estimate we must be permitted to say, that we apprehend many included in it will be found of a different communion, and attend the Church of England because they have no minister of their own persuasion. And if, indeed, there are large congregations unsupplied, it argues a want of judgment or care in the distribution of her pastors, since it consists with our knowledge that there are many whose congregations are small and inconsiderable, and who, therefore, we conceive, might be transferred with advantage to those situations where there is an adequate field for their ministerial labours. We could bring unquestionable proof that certain congregations, consisting of not more than 50 hearers, and 15 communicants on an average, have pastors enjoying the usual emoluments of £200 or £300 per annum. In one word, we should be much satisfied could we obtain, from proper authority, a census of the communicants in the Church of England, as this seems to us the only sure and undeceitful criterion of its progress; and on the comparative number of communicants in each of the Churches we should be willing to rest the decision of the question.

We might also propose another criterion which appears to us to form a good test of the disposition or tendency of the people with respect to the different forms of religion, viz: What voluntary contributions could be obtained in the different settlements in favour of each of the established Churches. Let us suppose that the Government and the Society for propagating Christian Knowledge should withdraw their support, and leave the Church of England to depend entirely, like the Sister Establishment, on the free-will offerings of her members, we would ask them to tell us candidly, of the Churches and Clergymen now existing, how many would continue under such cir-

circumstances to be supported. It is not to be taken for granted that, where there is no Church or minister of our communion established, there is no scope for establishing one; on the other hand, in many places where a Clergyman of the Church of England has long officiated, the desire of obtaining a Clergyman of our communion, is scarcely less ardent or less general than in other places where no Church has ever yet been established.

We can also easily account for the alleged facility of conversion to the Church of England, and tendency to enter her communion,—for so long as the policy avowed and recommended by her Clergy is followed out, viz: to withhold support from all other denominations—necessity, and the want of a more congenial form of religion, will induce many to join her communion, who have no feeling of predilection, or attachment to her forms.

In a similar way it is easy to account for the number of licentiates, teachers and ministers of other denominations who have been drawn within her pale.

The difference of doctrine between the several denominations of Protestants is not so great as wholly to preclude the operation of prudential motives; and where there are on one side poverty and neglect, and on the other comfort, independence, patronage and promotion, those who are acquainted with human nature will not wonder to see even a greater comparative number of proselytes from among the Clergy than the Laity of other denominations; and should wealth or patronage at a future day shift sides, we might find, without much surprise, the case reversed.

Indeed, 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 priests' office "for a piece of silver and a morsel of bread."

In fine, when we consider that the Church of England has been hitherto almost entirely supported by Government and the Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts—that her Clergy in many settlements have been long established, and for many years have officiated without any competition on the part of our church—when all the advantages they possess from long pre-occupation of the ground, and from the zeal and activity with which they have availed themselves of their controul over the funds and institutions for education in the colony, and every other means of proselytizing, are taken into view—it is matter of wonder that they have not made greater progress.

We readily concur with his Lordship, that unity is most desirable among Christians—that it is delightful to every reflecting and well constituted mind—and when principles are not compromised it is worth some sacrifice of habits and prepossessions to avoid division. But, as it appears to us, his Lordship confounds two ideas widely different, and having different terms in our language appropriated to express them, viz: unity and uniformity. There is unity among Christians, of whatever name or denomination, when they are all possessed and penetrated with the true spirit and vital influence of Christianity, especially with the spirit of charity and brotherly love. In this sense, unity is opposed to schism, sectarianism, or division; although, from a confusion of ideas, and consequently of language, on the subject, we frequently find one denomination of Christians charging another with the guilt of schism, because they cannot conscientiously conform to the external order and institutions of some particular Church. In this case, it is evident that uniformity is mistaken for unity, and an undue stress consequently laid upon it. There may be uniformity without unity. “They are not all Israel who are of Israel.” To be one in our outward profession, and conformity to any external order, is far from being a phrase identical with our being one in Christ Jesus—that is, in the true faith and spirit of our religion.

Besides her Hookers, her Chillingworths, her Taylors, and her Palleys, there will be found in the Church of England some, who like Archbishop Laud, are scarcely to be denominated Protestant; and have there not been, and are there not still, some in her communion who dishonour the Protestant name, and belie their Protestant profession, by inculcating, if not in express terms at least in effect, the worst doctrines of that Church against which we have protested—“implicit faith and passive obedience!”

In the same manner there may be unity without uniformity. We trust that there are many true disciples of Christ on both sides of the Tweed; and not only so, but in many of the various denominations of the Christian world; and so far there will be unity, though certainly not uniformity.

While, therefore, we agree with the Bishop in the importance of unity, and its essential and indispensable necessity to constitute a Christian Church, we may be allowed to doubt whether it would serve the interests of Christianity to merge all its different forms in one, thereby establishing a perfect uniformity.

The Church of Christ has been beautifully likened, by the great Apostle of the Gentiles, to a system composed of different parts, all harmonising to a common end; and the particular example which he selects, and which affords a happy illustration of his subject, is the human body and its members; “for as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body, so also is Christ.”

May not the different forms and modes of external Christianity be well and wisely adapted, by Divine Providence, to accomplish the great ends of its institution, and to diffuse and impress its influences on all the various orders and classes of mankind, until the "leaven shall have leavened the whole lump?" There was union and combination of resource, and in one sense no division or waste of the means for building up Religion, in the Church of Rome during the very height of papal supremacy and domination. But did this state of things in fact conduce to the strength and prosperity of true religion? The enlightened and liberal Roman Catholic will be the first to answer, No!—There is union and combination of resource in Spain and Portugal at the present day; but will it be alleged that they have conduced to the advancement of true Religion?

But, in order more properly to develope our views of the Ecclesiastical Policy of the Church of England, we shall consider the system in its influence—1st, on Patriotism—2d, on the prosperity of the Colony—3d, on civil and religious liberty—4th, on piety and morals—and finally, in its influence on the character and ultimate progress of the Church of England herself.

With regard to Patriotism, we are persuaded it has a very intimate connection with the particular form of religion in which men have been trained up, and the services to which they have been accustomed in their native land. Take from a Scottish Emigrant the particular form of worship practised in his own country, and the service of the Church which he loves and venerates, and you will make him neither more British in his feelings, nor more Christian in his character. Whatever may be the sentiments or conduct of some of our countrymen in Quebec, Montreal and York, whose facility in adopting a new faith, we have reason to believe, arises in some instances from indifference to Religion, rather than any serious conviction or enlightened preference—the Bishop has sufficient knowledge of the Scottish peasantry to be aware of their heart-felt attachment to the Church of their native land, and that, under the destitution of the peculiar ordinances of their own worship, they would be like the captive Jews by the Rivers of Babylon—their hearts and their lips would refuse to join in a service which, however excellent in itself, is foreign to their feelings and habits. It is not the service of their native land—It is not the worship of their fathers—It is not the song of their own Zion—And the piety and the patriotism of the Scottish peasant would both languish and wither under the privation of his national Religion.—We cannot, therefore, hesitate to pronounce that a shallow and heartless policy which would oppose the effectual establishment of the Scottish Church, and an adequate provision for its support, in these Colonies.

We agree with Dr. Strachan that it is desirable to promote English feelings and habits in these Provinces—but we beg to explain in what sense we understand the word English. It has acquired two significations: in the one it applies to that part of Great Britain strictly so

called—in the other, and more extended sense, to the whole of the United Kingdom; and in this latter acceptation is synonymous with the word British, which, in fact, is the only proper term. If it were a legitimate object of policy to superinduce English habits and feelings in the restricted sense of the term, (the only sense of it which will suit the views of our antagonists) we foresee much difficulty in accomplishing that object, and are unable to perceive why it might not be as wise and liberal policy to cherish and promote Scottish feelings and habits, since the Scottish people form a much greater proportion of the population. If we stigmatize as faction and party spirit all attempts to keep alive national prejudices and distinctions in the latter case, why not also in the former? We humbly conceive that the views of an enlightened statesman would be far more comprehensive and generous, viz: to give full scope to the diffusion of British (i. e. English, Scotch and Irish) feelings and influences, and not to obstruct any of those channels by which they may be communicated, and more especially such channels as are likely to convey them most copiously, and to extend them most widely. All true and enlightened patriots—all men possessed of British feelings—all who love not only their country, but mankind—all who are not more solicitous for the extension of a particular Church than the advancement of Christianity—will be heartily desirous to see every way opened, and every facility afforded, for the intellectual, moral and religious influence of our common country to spread and prevail to the utmost ends of the earth.

To what degree the north part of the Island of Great Britain might be made subservient to the advancement of the greatest glory and the noblest empire to which a nation can aspire, we leave to our adversaries themselves to judge.

But we object to the exclusive system, not only as unjust and partial, but as impolitic and highly prejudicial to the interests of the Colony. The most essential requisite to promote the prosperity of new settlements, is to make a provision for Churches and Schools suitable to the wants and wishes of at least the majority of the population. This, we are persuaded, is the prime cause of the prosperity of the United States, and of any superiority which they may possess over these Provinces. The worthiest and most respectable Emigrants will, in choosing their place of settlement, be influenced in the greatest degree by a consideration of the comparative advantages with respect to the religious instruction and education of their family; and many, influenced by this consideration, will forsake Canada, which, as a British Colony, would otherwise have obtained a preference from them.

We believe that, if due encouragement were given to our Church, and to schools in connection with it, in the Canadas, this Colony would possess all the advantages of education and religious instruction in the same degree as Scotland itself, and the best influences of the Pa-

rent Country would be extended and diffused throughout the most distant parts of the Empire.

The redundancy of young men, educated at Scottish Universities, if the least encouragement were afforded them, would be sufficient to fill the Colonies with men of education, and to raise the standard of learning and morality in the British Colonies almost to a level with that of the Parent Country. It is a well known fact that, in these Provinces, the most useful and eminent teachers have been Scotsmen; and that the greater part of those who are now distinguished by talent or office in the country owe to them their education. We need only mention the names of Doctor Strachan, Mr. Skakel, Mr. Wilkie and Doctor Whitlaw.

How much the prosperity of the Country would, therefore, be advanced, were the present exclusive system abandoned, and the same support and encouragement extended to teachers, licentiates and ministers, in connection with the Church of Scotland, as to those of the Sister Establishment, may be inferred from the obligations under which Canada lies to the few who have repaired to it under all the discouragements and disadvantages of the present system.

The danger of such a system to the cause of civil and political, as well as of religious liberty, will be equally obvious to every intelligent and reflecting person.

How formidable, in this respect, would be a numerous body of Clergy, such as Doctor Strachan prospectively contemplates as likely to exist at no distant period of time, supported by funds altogether independent of the people—we might almost add of the Government or the State—and having not only the exclusive possession, but the exclusive management of the Church Lands and their Revenues—invested at the same time with the whole controul and direction of education, and, by natural consequence, connecting exclusively with their own establishment, and rendering subservient to its aggrandizement, Universities, Colleges, Schools, &c. Add to all this the political influence which they could not fail to possess, and to exercise in the Legislative and Executive departments of Government through their Episcopal head; and the no less formidable influence which would be united in their collective body, in virtue of the particular, personal, and local influence exercised by their numerous members, from the greatest to the least, distributed through every part of the country, and from the peculiar constitution of the Church of England, possessing every facility for combining, extending and perpetuating that influence! Such an establishment would become doubly formidable in a country where there is no check or counterpoise to the clerical order in the splendour of royalty, in the weight and dignity of a hereditary aristocracy, or in the spirit, virtue and independence of a numerous and enlightened gentry. Such an exclusive establishment, it must not be disguised, would be as perilous to the civil as to the religious liberties of this country; and in saying this, we mean not to cast any, the

least reproach on the Clergy of the Sister Church, who, we believe, are as disinterested and moderate as any other Clergy in the world. We reason from the general principles of human nature—from the acknowledged laws of the moral world—from the uniform experience of past ages—which all teach that, though men individually may be capable of disinterested and generous conduct, communities have always been invariably selfish and inordinately ambitious.—Nor does Ecclesiastical history warrant the conclusion, however pleasing it might be, that clerical communities form any exception to the general law, or that a Protestant hierarchy, if scope and opportunity were given for that purpose, might not tread in the footsteps of Papal ambition. The History of Scotland during the reign of the Stuarts, and the past and present state of Ireland, afford a melancholy proof that the same causes, in similar circumstances, will produce the same effects.

The influence of the system on piety and morals, is also extremely unfavourable. How many are by it deprived altogether of religious ordinances, or have access to them only in a form and mode to which they are unaccustomed, or even utterly averse ! Had the same encouragement been given to the Church of Scotland, she would, at this moment, when the sister Church is represented by her warmest advocates as merely beginning to take root, have embraced within her pale, a vast majority of the inhabitants of the Colony ; and if we may be warranted to form a judgement from the circumstances of the Parent Country, would have greatly narrowed the field of dissent, and united in one communion, all the different denominations of Presbyterians, Scottish, English, Irish and American.

It will be readily admitted that forms of Religion are far less important than its spirit and power ; and enlightened Christians will feel little desire to withdraw their brethren from any particular communion which is not disfigured or corrupted by gross errors and superstitions. On the other hand, they will be averse to change, and pause before they attempt to withdraw men from the faith and worship of their fathers—knowing how much piety and devotion depend upon association, and how much their power and influence are heightened by being mingled and combined with the tenderest feelings of the heart, and associated with the endearing recollections and charities of home and country—of kindred and ancestry. Give to people religious instruction in that form and manner which is most congenial to their feelings and habits ; and though you may not thereby extend the bounds of any particular Church, you will ultimately accomplish much good to the cause of Christian Piety and Morals.—Indeed, it appears to us, that the melancholy prevalence of infidelity and apathy, with regard to Religion, is owing, in a great measure to the want of an appropriate and congenial mode of religious instruction ; and they must lay an undue stress, assuredly, on religious modes and forms, who would sacrifice to them the spirit and substance of Christianity.

We come next to consider the influence of the system with regard to the Church of England itself. The progress of a Church is not to be estimated by the multiplication of Clergymen and places of worship, where the great body of the people are of a different communion. Such a system is artificial, impolitic and prejudicial to its respectability and permanence. It creates, indeed, a body of Clergymen whose number may be indefinitely extended so long as assistance continues to be afforded from the funds of the society, and the liberality of the government.

But if the mode of instruction is not congenial to the inhabitants of the Colony, the whole fabric, like an inverted pyramid, will become more unstable the higher it is raised. The inducement of a comfortable living, will draw Teachers of other persuasions, notwithstanding some predilection for the faith of their forefathers, into the communion which offers such advantages. But let it not be supposed that ever they will be actuated by the genuine spirit of Church of England men. Attracted, as it may be feared, chiefly by temporal considerations, they cannot be expected to infuse into the Church, into which they enter, any vital influence. If they do not sink into lukewarmness and apathy, they will, at least, be actuated by a bastard zeal, the offspring of self-love and secular interest.

Such were the principles of the system, which, in the time of the Stuarts, was practised in Scotland for the purpose of establishing Episcopacy among our forefathers. The celebrated Archbishop Sharpe, was originally a Presbyterian Clergyman, whom ambition or covetousness made a proselyte to the very faith which he previously had stood the foremost in opposing. Promoted to the Archiepiscopal See of St. Andrews, he proceeded with a blind and precipitate zeal, to impose an uncongenial religion upon his country. What was the consequence? Episcopacy became, under his auspices, utterly and universally odious to the nation; and at last, was in a manner extirpated by the reaction produced by the very agency which was employed to promote it. Some features of resemblance, may perhaps be discerned between the policy recommended and pursued in the days of Archbishop Sharpe, and that which has recently been publicly avowed by the leaders of the Church of England in Upper and Lower Canada, and of these, none is more remarkable than that Scotsmen, and Proselytes from Presbytery to Episcopacy, should, in both instances, be the chief instruments.

With such views as we have now stated on the subject of our constitutional rights in a British Colony—in regard to the construction of the Quebec Act—and the spirit and tendency of the system pursued by the present leaders of the Church of England in these Provinces—we can do no less than avow, in the most public manner, and impress on our Presbyterian Brethren in the most emphatic terms, our unanimous conviction that it is our bounden duty, and that of all who belong to our communion, both from considerations of piety and patri-



otism, from regard to our rights as British subjects, and members of one of the established Churches of Great Britain, as well as from regard to the interests and liberties of this, our adopted country, to which we have come out in the confidence of enjoying, unimpaired, all our rights, privileges and advantages, whether civil, commercial, or religious—to stand forth in temperate, but firm resistance to a system, which appears to us, fraught with the greatest evils. Believing that the system, in its nature and tendency, appears to the venerable and amiable Prelate, who is at the head of the English Church, and to many of the Clergy of that Church who defend it, in a very different light from what it does to us, we are far from imputing to them the moral blame which attaches to its unprincipled advocates and abettors.

We feel, however, that this circumstance only renders it more imperiously our duty to express our strong sense of its impolicy and danger in every point of view in which we can contemplate it.

In making this appeal to the public, we can truly say, that it is the first we have ever made; and that we have never, either from the pulpit or the press, promulgated doctrines or sentiments hostile to the sister Church. We have never, in any way, attacked her, or even breathed a spirit of unkindness or hostility towards her;—we appeal with confidence to all who have been in the habit of attending our public ministrations, whether we have not carefully abstained, not only from assailing those doctrines in which the sister Church differs from our own standard, but—in a spirit, as we may be permitted to call it, of exemplary forbearance—even from replying to those invectives which have been directed against us, both from the pulpit and from the press, by our Episcopal Brethren.—But though we may not have thought it necessary or useful, in such circumstances, to notice every petty attack, and every idle sarcasm, let it not be presumed that we are lukewarm in our attachment to our Church, or think that her cause may not be maintained with advantage against every adversary.—No! the faith which we inherit from our forefathers, and for which so many of them bled and died, is endeared to our hearts by recollections at once the most sacred and the most glorious,—by the inestimable blessings and privileges, civil, political and religious, of which it has been the source,—and by the intellectual and moral influence which it has widely diffused throughout the Christian world.

To this faith, the Scotsman assuredly owes whatever most honourably distinguishes his Country among the nations of the world. It is the influence of their Church, and her kindred institutions, that have imbued the hearts of the people of Scotland with their best feelings, and have made her peasantry the pride of her own land, and the admiration of the world.

To the Irish Presbyterian, we would say, what exhortations can be needful on our part, to maintain and strengthen your attachment to the faith of your fathers—that faith which has so happily averted

from Presbyterian Ireland, much of that ignorance and distress which prevail in other parts of your native land, and made it like an Oasis in the midst of the desert!

To all Presbyterians, of whatever Country, we would appeal whether they have any reason to be ashamed of that faith which led their fathers to stem the torrent of tyranny and despotism on the one hand, and to stand aloof from democratic fury, and wild licentiousness, miscalled liberty, on the other—of that faith, whose Apostles and Founders were the parents of civil and religious liberty, at the same time that they were the firmest supporters of the Throne and Constitution!

“By their fruits ye shall know them,” is the criterion of Christianity, which its Divine Author has himself laid down as the only infallible one; and if we apply this test to those countries which have adopted the form of Religion which we profess, we shall find that knowledge, learning and good morals have, in an eminent degree, been its accompaniments. Indeed, to the Presbyterians and Puritans, (a kindred race,) we shall find that mankind are almost exclusively indebted for the most inestimable benefit, that perhaps was ever conferred on the world, viz. the establishment of an effective system for the general diffusion of knowledge. They are the founders of national education; and possessing a wisdom as profound, as their zeal for Religion was ardent, they deemed that they could do nothing more effectual for the advancement of genuine Christianity, than to make provision for the universal diffusion of knowledge; assured, that in its course, all the influences of Christianity would necessarily flow as their natural and proper channel.

To them, therefore, belongs the noblest distinction which can be claimed by any of the benefactors of mankind, that of having laid the foundation of those admirable institutions for the advancement of learning, which form the peculiar glory of Switzerland, Holland, Scotland and New England. With such claims to the gratitude of mankind, it is impossible that any, save those whose minds are influenced by bigotry and prejudice, can refuse the due meed of praise to their merits, or stand forth in hostility to a system, of which the effects have been so diffusive and beneficent; and we conceive it impossible that any enlightened member of our Church, can feel ashamed to profess that faith which animated their exertions, and enabled them to bequeath so invaluable an inheritance to future ages.

But whatever may have been the fruits of the system in former times, and in other countries, it has been demanded by our adversaries, what has the Presbyterian Church done in Canada. To this, we frankly answer—as a Church, nothing. How could she? She has never been favoured with the means of operating in her corporate capacity.—Presbyterian Church government cannot be said to have as yet existed in these provinces. Had we been provided for in a suitable manner, we should have had, not only a competent number of Churches

and Ministers, but, which is no less essential to give full effect to a Presbyterian establishment, we should have obtained a connection with our parent Church—we should have been placed under her jurisdiction—we should have been enabled to form Schools for the education of our youth, and to have provided for, and superintended the education of such as might have been intended for Holy Orders—all which, to say nothing of the powers of licensing and ordaining, as well as of exercising discipline and government over our Ministers and members, so indispensable, not only to the effectiveness, but to the very existence of a Church,—have been hitherto unattainable by us, from the want of a suitable provision. How far the representations of our opponents have been instrumental in causing the failure of our applications for this purpose—if indeed we may not appeal to their own consciousness—we submit to the candid to judge from the tenor of their writings on the subject of our claims. One thing we are bold to affirm, that as circumstances over which we had no controul, have hitherto prevented us from existing as a Church, it is altogether unreasonable to blame us for inefficiency, or even to charge upon our Church, disorders or abuses which we are willing to admit may have arisen—or, as with equal propriety, we might have said, must ever, in the nature of things arise where ecclesiastical government and discipline do not effectively exist.

It is equally unfair to institute a comparison between our Church and the sister establishment, as the competition between us, in the present circumstances, is the farthest possible from being on equal terms; but insulated and disjointed as our Churches and Clergy have heretofore been, and acting without that concert and collective force, which can only be obtained by an ecclesiastical constitution—is it the fact that we have been altogether unserviceable, even notwithstanding all these disadvantages? Do not the names of the late Rev. Mr. Bethune, of Glengary, Dr. Spark, of Quebec, and Mr. Barclay, of Kingston, (to say nothing of the living,) plead somewhat in favour of the merits of our Church? Has the cause of education and learning in the Canadas, reaped no benefit from her Ministers and Members? Has Religion not gained by the able and faithful, and, so far as temporalities are concerned, the ill-rewarded labours of our Presbyterian Brethren in the Ministry, who, though not of the same communion with us, hold the same creed, are attached to the same discipline and form of Church government, have received the same education in philosophy and languages as well as theology, as the Judicatories of our Church require on the part of their probationers; and between whom and us, if there exist any points of difference, they are such as will be acknowledged to be slight and almost evanescent? Has nothing been effected by the labours of these pious and learned Ministers, presiding over numerous congregations, and, until very lately, exceeding in number the Clergy of the Church of England, while the collective number of their Members, we have every

reason to believe, will be found greatly to exceed those of that Church? We are bold to affirm, that but for the ministrations of those of our Presbyterian Brethren, who are stiled Dissenters, that Church would have been utterly impotent to stem the tide of infidelity and profligacy, which must have overspread the country.

We perfectly concur in the spirit of the excellent remarks of the Bishop of Quebec, in guarding his people against all heat and violence in the agitation of a question of temporal provision; but we must be permitted to observe, that his advice would have carried greater weight, if it had not come accompanied by an unqualified assertion of the exclusive claim of the English Church to the Clergy Reserves. The same principles which have appeared to our opponents to warrant their adherence to the claim of an exclusive right to these Reserves, it is important to observe, apply to our case with equal force, and may, therefore, well justify our more humble claim to be admitted to a participation, while we have no wish to deprive the sister Church of an equitable share, and leave it to the wisdom of the Imperial Parliament to determine what portion may be commensurate with our just rights.

As his Lordship has inculcated the duty of moderation in such terms as preclude the necessity of any further advice on that point, we shall close the present letter, by offering some thoughts on the spirit which ought to be cherished by Christians of different denominations towards one another.

We cannot, in too earnest and unqualified terms, inculcate a spirit of liberality, important in all circumstances, but more especially in a country like this, where, in a manner, all the various denominations of the Christian world are brought into contact.—We must confess that we see so little symptom of any excess in this respect, that we are inclined to believe, from late occurrences, that we were never less in danger of what is termed *Liberalism*. Entertaining these views of the importance of cherishing a spirit of good will among the many different denominations of Christians, we cannot but enter our protest against that system of proselytising, which the Church of England has adopted and avowed, and which her present Head has ventured to recommend as wise policy, both in a religious and political point of view. In the Bishop's sentiments on this point, we must confess that we feel little disposed to concur—for we believe experience has proved, that while little good can be done to the cause of piety and morality by proselytizing—that is, gaining over from one external form of Christianity to another—it is in general apt to create, especially in the minds of the weak and ignorant, religious bigotry, or an inordinate and superstitious attachment to particular modes and forms as distinct from the faith and spirit of religion; and such bigotry once engendered, seldom fails to become a fertile source of heart burnings, jealousies and contentions; for, in the moral, as in the natural world, it will be found that action and reaction, are equal and contra-

ry, and that therefore the zeal of the proselytizer, will ultimately be met, and almost invariably repelled, by the no less furious zeal of resistance which it excites; while, unhappily, Christian peace and charity, if not destroyed, will at least be severely wounded in the conflict.

We believe, therefore, that if each particular denomination would labour within its proper sphere, and try to promote, in its own body, practical morality, avoiding, as much as possible, collision and controversy with other sects, the cause of real Christianity would be much more effectually served. We believe that Christian unity, and even ultimately the less important object of uniformity will be best attained, by not attempting, in the first instance, any change in the external forms of Christianity—not only because the bulk of mankind are often more attached to forms and appearances, than even to matters of real importance, but because different modes of instruction, may be suited to different classes of men; and all kinds of error and superstition, in whatever Church they may exist, will be most effectually, as well as most speedily eradicated, by not awakening selfish prejudices and angry passions, which are productive only of a spirit of hostility and rancour. Under this persuasion, we believe that there never will be repose or unity among the different Churches of these provinces, until effectual security be provided that there shall be no danger of encroachment on the one side, on the pretence of proselytizing, and on the other, no ground of jealousy, or apprehension of what they may be disposed to regard as usurpation and oppression. We deprecate a system of proselytizing, as subversive of Christian unity and brotherly love, and cannot cordially approve of any way of making converts, but by soundness of doctrine and purity of practice.

Much has been said and written on schism and sectarianism, and we have no desire to deny their evil tendency; at the same time, we do not think it superfluous to explain distinctly, what we understand by the terms schism and sectarianism—terms which we do not think it consistent either with Christian prudence or humility, for one denomination of Christians to apply to another—at least, without extreme caution. Indeed, we are far from thinking that differences merely in points of external form, afford, in general, a sufficient warrant for the charge of heresy and schism; for in this case, it might be applied to all the Churches of Christendom, because not one of them, even in the opinion of many of the most distinguished ornaments of the Church of England, is perfectly moulded according to the apostolical form.

We believe that the evils of schism and sectarianism, exist in the spirit which Christians entertain towards one another, rather than in the peculiar modes and forms to which they are attached; and in our opinion, it is doubtful whether any one form has been prescribed by apostolical authority. Without, therefore, depreciating the importance of such forms, we confess that we cannot give our assent to the

confident and reiterated claims to apostolical purity advanced by some Churches, chiefly on this ground. This is, indeed, a plea which may sound well in the ears of the ignorant, and of those who are superficially acquainted with the Sacred Writings, but to those who are critically versed in them, it must prove utterly unsatisfactory.

The best test of the purity and excellence of a Church, is obviously and unequivocally the spirit which it breathes, and the fruits which it produces; and of these fruits, humility and charity are the foremost. For “every one that exalteth himself, shall be abased, and he that humbleth himself, shall be exalted;” and “By this, shall all men know that ye are my Disciples, if ye have love one to another.” It is not by high claims and exclusive pretensions—it is not by a zeal for secular power and dignity, or for the extension and aggrandisement of any external establishment of Christianity—for this, though apt to be mistaken for that noblest of all principles, a zeal for pure and undefiled religion, is oftener what the Apostle has denominated, a zeal without knowledge, the offspring of pride and ambition, partaking more of the spirit of this world, than of the lowliness and meekness which are in Christ;—it is not by the assertion of apostolical purity and primitive excellence, continually urged from the pulpit and the press, and the dwelling habitually on topics of externalities, as if they were the very essence of Christianity;—*and still less*—is it by depreciating other religious communions, either by inuendoes or open avowals—that a Church gives evidence of her Christian purity and excellence.

On the other hand, as previously avowed, we deem that a Christian Church affords the best evidence of her purity, when she manifests a spirit of humility and meekness towards all, and more especially towards those who differ from her—when she is more ready to commend the excellencies, than to point out and condemn the imperfections of rival establishments—when her virtues are not proclaimed as with the sound of a trumpet, but silently shine and manifest themselves to all by the brightness of their own light;—in fine, (for we think the same test applicable to Churches as to individuals,) the Church, in our opinion, which is least obtrusive in her pretensions,—least intolerant in her spirit—least selfish and exclusive in regard to her temporal interests and secular claims—“which seeketh not her own, but in honour preferreth others”—which rejoiceth in the good done by others, and so far from envying their success, or hindering their usefulness, is ever ready to encourage and support them—which urges no claims to superior veneration and attachment, but leaves her character and spirit to be estimated by the impartial judgment of others who are neutral, or even fearlessly commits it to the scrutiny of those who are opposed to her—and which seeketh the praise which is of God, rather than that which is of men—the Church, we repeat, which labours to advance the spirit and practice of true Religion on these principles, approximates, in our opinion, nearest to the standard of Christian purity.

To come up to the perfect standard, however, of the true spirit and character of a Christian Church, none of us are sufficient; at the same time, we should beware of putting up a false standard or criterion, for this would be a source of positive error. He, therefore, according to these views, is the sectarian—he is the bigot—he is the schismatic and the heretic, who wounds the spirit of charity—fosters spiritual pride and arrogance—begets jealousy and contention—destroys unity and brotherly love in the Christian world, by laying undue stress on external forms of Religion,—like the Jews of old, who were scrupulous in paying tithe of mint, and anise, and cummin, and all manner of herbs, but omitted the weightier matters of the law—judgment, mercy, and the love of God. Those Christians commit a similar error, who look chiefly at things external and adventitious, or at things which are not, certainly, essential and vital in Religion, as the test of its character. We would, therefore, conclude with this earnest advice to all, and especially to those who are under our pastoral charge, that they be mainly careful to preserve and to cherish the beautiful, the divine spirit of charity—that spirit which unites Christians as the members of one body, and notwithstanding little differences and external distinctions, establishes among them a perfect sympathy, so that if one member suffer, all the members suffer with it, or, if one member be honoured, all the members rejoice with it, so that there may be no schism in the body, but the members may have the same care one for another. The liberty which we claim, brethren, to ourselves, let us never envy to others. The rights and privileges which we feel it our duty, at the present crisis, to assert with temperate firmness and meekness, but with resolution, let us never even wish to infringe, under any circumstances, in the case of others—but contrarywise, in the spirit of that Religion, which teacheth us to seek not our own, but every one also another's good, let us ever be ready to assert and enforce, so far as we properly may, the rights of our fellow Christians, and even, if need be, of our adversaries. It is now full time for Christians to forget differences, and still more, ancient animosities,—(alas! that such a word should be applicable!)—and strive, henceforth, to “maintain the unity of the spirit, in the bond of peace;”—let us have only one rivalry and contention—who shall excel most in the spirit of charity and humility—who shall most promote, by preaching and by example, the pure spirit and benign influence of the Religion which we profess—of our common Christianity.

We have, it is true, brethren, like our forefathers, been compelled with painful reluctance, to struggle against opposition to our Church, and to what we deem her undoubted rights; but blessed be God, very different is the character of the contest, and very different, we trust, will be the spirit in which it shall be conducted on both sides. The same happy issue, we anticipate with confidence—knowing that we have an enlightened and paternal government to protect our rights; that we have the spirit of an enlightened age to support and

enforce the justice of our claims; and so long as we act with the moderation and forbearance, which we are conscious of having exercised in times past, we may rely with confidence that our claims will be favourably regarded, both in this, and the parent country.

Should we ever forget that moderation, and arrogate to ourselves more than our due, and betray a spirit of ambition and usurpation, we doubt not that public opinion will not long delay to inflict its just censure, and to crush at once, every attempt on our part, at encroachment and domination. But of this, there is no danger; if we should ever have the will, the constitution of our Church, happily, (for we are inclined to regard it as a real excellence,) while it has been proved abundantly effective for maintaining and promoting piety and morals; is peculiarly ill-fitted to serve ambitious views.

We will not, however, indulge in evil auguries, but rather conclude with expressing our confident hope, accompanied with our most fervent prayer, that the day may soon arrive, when these jealousies and bickerings shall cease, and when Christians of all denominations, in this happy land, shall, in the full enjoyment of rights, well defined and properly secured against encroachment, be enabled to forget the painful sentiments which may now in any measure have been excited—when all, having an ample field for their labours, and full scope for their usefulness, though none for ambition, will cheerfully co-operate, assured, that while they labour for the same great end, they shall not fail in their respective spheres, of promoting, in a degree proportioned to the purity of their zeal, and to the singleness and simplicity of heart with which they enter upon their work, the glorious cause of universal Christianity. Let us all remember the words of our blessed Lord, when his Disciples asked him, saying, “Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name, and we forbade him, because he followeth not with us; and Jesus said unto them, forbid him not, for he that is not against us, is for us.”

May God Almighty! the Father of all! the Father of peace! the God of love! hasten the arrival of that happy period, when Christians shall no longer say, “I am of Paul—I of Apollos—I of Cephas”—but when all shall make it their only glory, that they are of Christ, with whom there is neither “Greek nor Jew—circumcision nor uncircumcision—Barbarian nor Scythian, bond nor free—but Christ is all in all.”

Put on, therefore, as the elect of God, holy and beloved, bowels of mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, long suffering, forbearing one another, and forgiving one another. If any man have a quarrel against any, even as Christ forgave you, so also do ye; and above all these things, put on charity, which is the bond of perfectness. And let the peace of God rule in your hearts, to the which also ye are called in one body, and be ye thankful.

JAMES SOMERVILLE, Senior Minister, *Montreal, L. C.*,  
HENRY ESSON, Minister, *Montreal, L. C.*,



JOHN MCKENZIE, *Williamston, U. C.*,  
JAMES HARKNESS, D. D., *Quebec, I. C.*,  
EDWARD BLACK, Minister, *Montreal, L. C.*,  
ARCHIBALD CONNELL, *Martinstown, U. C.*,  
HUGH URQUHART, *Cornwall, U. C.*,  
ALEXANDER MATHIESON, *Montreal, L. C.*,  
GEORGE SHEED, *Ancaster, U. C.*,  
JOHN MACHAR, *Kingston, U. C.*,  
ALEXANDER GALE, officiating at *Laprairie, L. C.*

