

CHRISTIAN GUARDIAN.



DEVOTED TO RELIGION, MORALITY, LITERATURE, ECONOMY, AND GENERAL INTELLIGENCE.

PUBLISHED UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN CANADA.—E. RYERSON & W. SMITH, EDITORS.

VOL. II. NO. 40.

YORK, SATURDAY, AUGUST 20, 1831.

WHOLE NO. 92.

GUARDIAN OFFICE.

King street, nearly opposite the Court House and Jail.
W. J. COATES, PRINTER.

GOD WITH US.

(By the Rev. R. Watson.)

Our last illustration shall be taken from the revival and extension of religion.

We are truly taught, that the good done upon earth is done by the Lord; that, though Paul plant, and Apollus water, 'God giveth the increase'; that when the Lord buildeth up Zion, he 'appears in his glory'; that it is the Lord who 'sends forth his labourers into the harvest'; and that 'in the latter days' there are promises which relate to the 'pouring out' of his Spirit. These declarations bring God very near to his church. Perhaps, indeed, the most illustrious instances in which our God makes 'bare his holy arm in the sight of all the nations,' by throwing off that veil of mystery which so often hides it, are found in the struggles and triumphs of his religion. 'The history of his church, is, for this very reason, chiefly, the most magnificent part of the world's story.' The trials and the contests of the truth, of which she is the ground and the pillar, considered in connection with its endurance and unfailing vigour; the holy blood which has consecrated, the virtues which have illustrated, the great characters which have advocated it; the darkness it has dissipated the enmity over which it has triumphed; the blessings it has showered upon earth; the number of our race it has glorified in heaven;—these and many other views might be taken, which so powerfully tend to maintain in us the conviction that there is in the church, a nightly and constant working of him 'that filleth all and in all,' as to forbid the intrusion of any creature into this hallowed enclosure, except as the most humble instrument in his hands. Yet, even here, also, is God often put far from us, or so many other agents are placed between, that our sense of his immediate operation, is either destroyed or greatly enfeebled.

Christianity, it is allowed, is to become the religion of the world; but then its ultimate prevalence may be easily accounted for, because Christianity is a rational religion, and the world is becoming enlightened by education. Great characters appear at intervals to revive and restore the faded lustre of truth, and the languishing influence of piety; but then, as it has been said of Luther, nature planted in him the elements of vigorous character; success flattered his first attempts to resist his superiors; political circumstances favored the changes which he meditated; and thus we have the whole philosophy of the Reformation! A Wesley appears; he is naturally 'ambitious'; circumstances give to this mental quality a religious and a beneficial direction; he has the skill to turn them to account; and here is the complete rationale of the whole revival of religion in our day, and these lands! Missions to the Heathen will succeed, because they derive their influence upon barbarous and semi-civilized nations from the superior intellectual power with which they are associated, the arts they communicate, and the connection which they establish, by means of commerce, with nations far in advance as to all the useful and refining institutions of society!

Such are some of the views on these solemn subjects with which men amuse themselves; but I see nothing in them answering to the import of the text, 'In Him we live, and move, and have our being'; or to the declaration, that he 'worketh all in all.' On this point, indeed, as on several before mentioned, we allow, that in what is thus urged there is much truth; but the truth is either distorted, or turned into efficient error by the absence of other truths with which it ought to be connected.

True, Christianity is a rational religion; but if it is to make its way by the force of that consideration alone, why was it not at first most readily received by the wisest and best-disciplined minds, rather than by the unlettered and superstitious? True, circumstances have an influence upon the characters and conduct of men; but the characters and actions of holy, gifted, and devoted men, create circumstances which they do not find, and that by the grace of God, which is mighty in them, and which works in their hearts and lives, that holiness, love, and zeal, by which, under the preparing influence of God, great masses of men are influenced. True, missions to the Heathen derive, in many cases, great aid from superior intellectual power in the instruments; from the knowledge of useful arts which they introduce; and the connection into which they bring nations in an inferior state of civilization with the more cultivated states of the world; but then do we need nothing more direct than that divine arrangement which has associated these circumstances together in the way of providential government, to convert a soul from the error of his ways, to turn the Gentiles 'from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God,' that they may 'obtain remission of their sins, and an inheritance among them that are sanctified'?

Surely, my brethren, God is not thus 'far from us' in reviving, restoring, and diffusing the influence of his religion. For what is that religion? Not 'the letter,' but 'the Spirit'; 'a ministration' of the Holy Spirit himself. What are its ministers? They are indeed men; but not men left to be formed or influenced by mere circumstances; they are 'called,' separated unto the Gospel of God, and derive their energy as instruments, when it is saving, from him who has promised to be 'with them always, even to the end of the world,' and to use and overrule all circumstances for the accomplishment of their high vocation. If God is not in his church, where then shall we find him? But he is there by peculiar habitation; by special operation. To make this manifest, he descended in the visible tongues of fire on the day of Pentecost; to assure us of it, he hath said of Zion, 'This is my rest for ever; here will I dwell; for I have desired it. I will clothe her priests with salvation, and make her saints joyful in goodness.'

To show what he has to do in raising up eminent instruments, he met with Saul of Tarsus on his persecuting errand to Damascus, seized, in the very camp of the enemy, the instrument fitted by natural endowments for his purpose, and bound the energies of that great and ardent mind to his own cause for ever. To show that he is in his church, he has defended it against united earth and united hell; to convince us that a power above all that is human is there, often when it has been 'minished and brought low,' and its root has been almost invisible in the earth, it has shot up into growth without human aid; and, in despite of human scorn and neglect, waved its branches in the winds, and again, defied the force of all the storms of heaven. To show that he is in his church, the mighty primitive power of the Gospel, which is characterized as 'the power of God unto salvation,' remains unabated to this day. It still 'pricks men in the heart'; it wounds, and it heals; it converts and sanctifies; it raises its shield of determined integrity against all temptations; it quenches earthly desires; it lifts the soul to holy converse with God; it gives a triumph over death, as complete and glorious as when Stephen 'fell asleep, calling upon God, and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit'; and it affects all these wherever it is preached in simplicity, and in recognition of the immediate co-operation of God with the instrument, and there only. Nor is the scene of its trial, the grand experiment, if we may so call it, confined to one place; it erects the monuments of its saving efficacy on all the shores of earth, and among the various tribes which inhabit them, that all the world may know that 'God is with us, and that the shout of a King is among us.'

From the New England Christian Herald.

CHRISTIAN PERFECTION.

The question has frequently been asked, 'Can a Christian live without sin?' There are many, and no doubt some truly pious persons, who suppose it presumptuous to admit such an idea. And should an individual profess to have arrived at that state, it would be proof to them, that he had never acquired a correct knowledge of his own character. It is not denied that some who have professed to have made this attainment, may have been mistaken, and it is quite as probable, that those who deny its possibility, do thereby essentially err; the truth of this latter sentiment will perhaps, appear in the course of these remarks.

The difference of opinion on this subject, arises partly from misapprehension, but more from the want of examination. That it must be understood with qualification, its most strenuous advocates allow; nor ought they in justice, to be held responsible for the distorted opinions which have sometimes been charged upon them. They believe that in one sense, it is possible to live without sin; while in another, they believe it quite impossible. If by sin is meant the transgression of the law given to Adam, when in a state of innocence, it is at once evident that in this sense, man can never live without sin. This law required not only the uninterrupted exercise of perfect love, but also, the perpetual exercise of perfect powers, such as were Adam's, when he first came out of the hands of his Maker. That degree of moral excellence to which the gospel makes it our privilege to arrive on earth, does not imply the full restoration of man's natural powers to their primitive state. And on this account, man cannot now perform such an obedience, as Adam did, before the fall. But does not the gospel require this obedience? It may be answered, that so far as the moral powers are concerned; it does; but that it requires the exercise of man's natural faculties, in the same perfection and to the same extent, remains to be proved. As man from the inability, of his nature, is now obliged to violate the Adamic law, he must therefore while on earth, in this sense be a sinner.

But it may be asked, can the law of God require any thing less than perfect uninterrupted obedience? Certainly not. It has already been admitted, that man must, on account of the imperfection of his natural powers, always plead guilty to the violation of the Adamic law, and for these violations, will always need the atonement. But can God require of man the exercise of such powers as he does not possess? I answer it is not the fault of God, that man does not possess these powers. He had them when he first came from the hands of his Maker. For their loss, God cannot be made responsible, nor can he lower the claims of his law to meet the debilitated state of man. But he can pardon and save the sinner, who takes refuge in Christ, on whose account he can accept that obedience that springs from love, which filling and abiding in the soul, constitutes Christian perfection. But for all his natural weaknesses, his frequent mistakes in judgment, and consequent errors in practice; the Christian is in a certain sense guilty, and for these, needs an application of the atonement. For these sins he exercises that genuine contrition, which constitutes the repentance of a believer. A repentance, which, as it is altogether unlike, so it is much deeper than any regret of the unregenerate for their wilful rebellion. There can therefore, be no natural perfection in the present life, but there may be a perfection in love. The Christian may love God with all his heart, may enjoy the assurance that he is now accepted of God,—that should he now die, he would through the merits of Christ, find his way directly to heaven.

But while we have granted that in one sense, that is in the view of the Adamic law, man must always be considered a sinner, we have intimated that in another sense, he may live without sin. By this is meant, that he may be so completely conformed to God, as to be able to fulfil the great command, thou shalt love God with all the heart; and consequently, his neighbour as himself. He who does this, though he may err in judgment and of course in practice,—though he may be conscious of many weaknesses and infirmities, both of body and mind, does not violate the law of love, and in this sense is not a sinner. Of such it may

be said 'there is no condemnation.' They are not condemned for the violations of the Adamic law; for these, proceeding from the weaknesses and infirmities of their nature, there is an all atoning sacrifice, ever before the throne: They are not condemned for violating the law of love, for they they through grace are able to keep.

It is lamentable, that among professed Christians, there is so great a want of holiness. Even of those who profess to believe it to be their privilege to love God with all their heart, how few enjoy, uninterruptedly, this blessing. Does not this arise in part from viewing the attainment of this blessing more as a privilege, than as a duty? Do we believe that God imperiously requires that we should be holy? Or believing this, are we not inclined to defer its attainment to some future period, before, or at death? And all this while, the gospel offers us a perfect cleansing, and requires us to be holy now. Generally, those who are not earnestly seeking for holiness, with a firm persuasion of its truth and importance, do not retain the evidence of their justification. Though they may have been members of the church for many years, they have advanced no farther than the first principles of the doctrine of Christ. They are but little, if any more experienced in the things of God, than they were a few months after their conversion. Their minds are perplexed with doubts and fears, and barren of divine enjoyment, and the private duties of religion, are to them a task. In prayer, the most exalted privilege, that God has bestowed upon man, on earth, there is little feeling, and perhaps no divine communion and fellowship with the adorable Trinity; and of course, they are but seldom cheered with a lively hope of heaven.

Would it not be well for the professed disciples of Jesus, prayerfully to examine this subject, and be fully persuaded in their own minds? Ought they not to look at it now, as they will in a dying day? Is it not the fact, that many, very many professors, and some who have been reputed for piety, find themselves awfully deficient as they approach eternity? Is it not for the want of prayerful investigation, that there is so much confusion of mind on this subject among Christians, and so great a destitution of deep, religious experience? When the church shall put on the beautiful garments of holiness, she shall shine fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and be as terrible to her enemies, as an army with banners.

M. N.

GOD'S PEOPLE CONSIDERED AS A MOVING TRAIN.

Though the Church of God has been designated by many beautiful and apt similes, yet, I think, there is room for many more; and though some of your readers may be acquainted with the following idea, I hope it will be new and interesting to the majority.

Compare the people of God, while on their earthly pilgrimage, to a moving train. We see it headed by Adam; who is quickly followed by a loving partner, and devoted children. While we pause, and drop a tear over the fatal conduct of Cain, we behold the numbers increase and the limits extend. It fluctuates. Deserters are seen, and only a little solitary company remain, to tell us that truth has not taken her final leave of this polluted world. At length, bursting out with all the grandeur and sublimity of an Enoch, we see the lovely procession extending. And, though passing onward, we behold the dark cloud of futurity for ever, as it were, grasping the leaders from our visionary hold; we see others enlisting, and a glorious ray of divine pleasure beaming throughout the increasing army. But enriched heaven causes a mournful breach. Enoch is gone! The awful deluge reduces the procession to eight! But now the standard bearers advance. And, while we picture in our mind's eye the achievements of hoary patriarchs, faithful prophets, and devoted kings, we are naturally led down to the Gospel era. The majestic train now is headed with all the grandeur and retinue of the second Adam. The contest against the powers of darkness is begun. Idols bow, temples crumble into dust. The horrors and treachery of priestcraft are laid bare, and madly seek a covert for their shame. Judaism is dethroned. In a word, the trembling pinnacle of human guilt seems to totter on its weakened pedestal, and gradually sinks into the chilling horrors of perpetual night, before the victorious arm of Immanuel. So let us follow the heavenly company, with all its changes, down to the present day. What a period is this! The swellings of Jordan now overflows its poudrous banks, and the whole earth receives the influences of its streams. Who are the leaders now?—Who bear the colours?—Who sound the Gospel cry?—Who compose the train? The powerful and lengthened army now seems to wield the sword of success. We see with delight, and hear with astonishment, the victory of the Redeemer's arms. But methinks I see some backsliders in the line. They shrink and yield an easy victim at the sight of Satan. How ill their armour fits them! Such we see falling into the chaos of eternal perdition, when about to join their fellows in triumphantly entering the portals of Jerusalem!

MILES CHRISTI.

WE MUST EAT, TO LIVE.

Two friends, having in the country, met together at the village church, a little way from their dwelling. "What is the use of going to church so often," said the younger to his companion, "since we always hear nearly the same thing?" "What is the use," replied the other, "of taking your meals so regularly every day, since they are composed of nearly the same dishes?" "The cases are very different; I must eat to nourish my body, which would otherwise perish." "Not so different as you suppose; for what food is to the body, the exercises of worship are to the soul; and spiritual life will soon languish, if we cease to support it by the means which God has graciously given us." "But how happens it," says the younger, "that all men have not the same re-

lish for these exercises, as they have for their food." "You mistake again," replied his friend; "All men, it is true, receive their food with pleasure, when they are in health; but when they are sick, food becomes not merely tasteless, but disgusting. It is the same with the soul. That is in health, while it has peace with God through the redemption that is in Christ. Then, it desires the exercises of religion. It enjoys them, and cannot consent to omit them. It is sick, when it is hardened in sin. It has then no appetite for spiritual food; it avoids opportunities of receiving it; the sanctification of the Sabbath is a burden, and the conversation of Christians is unpleasant. The resemblance goes further still; for as sickness of the body, if not cured by medicine, ends in death, so also the corruption of the soul, that disease with which all men are infected, ends, unless God heals it, in spiritual and eternal death; that is in the exclusion of the soul from the presence of its God."

AN INSTRUCTIVE ALLEGORY.

One of the fathers has an allegory to the following effect:

A hermit was conducted by an angel into a wood, where he saw an old man cutting down boughs to make up a burthen. When it was large, he tied it up, and attempted to lift it on his shoulders and carry it away; but finding it very heavy, he laid it down again; cut more wood and heaped it on, and then tried again to carry it off. This he repeated several times, always adding something to the load, after trying in vain to raise it from the ground. In the mean time the hermit, astonished at the old man's folly, desired the angel to explain what this meant. "You behold," said he, "in this foolish old man, an exact representation of those Christians, who, being made sensible of the burthen of their sins, resolve to repent, but soon grow weary, and instead of lessening their burthen, increase it every day. At each trial, they find the task heavier, than it was before, and so put it off a little longer, in the vain hope that they will by and by be more able to accomplish it. Thus they go on adding to their burthen, till it grows too heavy to be borne; and then in despair of God's mercy, and with their sins unrepented of, they lie down and die. Turn again, my son, and behold the end of the old man whom thou sawest heaping up a load of boughs." The hermit looked, and saw him in vain attempting to remove the pile, which was now accumulated far beyond his strength to raise. His feeble limbs tottered over their burthen; the poor remains of his strength were fast ebbing away; the darkness of death, was gathering around him; and after a convulsive and impotent attempt to lift the pile, he fell down and expired.

THE TWIN SISTERS.

The following interesting incident occurred at a recent Presbyterian Camp-Meeting held at Walnut Hills, Ohio, and is extracted from a letter published in the N. Y. Observer of the 30th ult., giving an account of the meeting.

Among the anxious inquirers, who were very numerous, were a pair of twin sisters, fourteen years of age, daughters of an elder in one of the churches, who came forward at the same instant and in company, overwhelmed with a sense of their need of pardoning mercy, and virtually asking—what shall we do to be saved? The father witnessing this movement in his daughters, and filled with such emotions as might be expected at such a sight, could not refrain from making some attempts to speak with them, as they sat together, weeping for their sins. As a matter of convenience, their heads being low, he knelt before them on one of his knees—and no sooner did they perceive it was their father, than both of them fell simultaneously upon his neck, one upon one shoulder and the other upon the other, his head between theirs—and each with an arm about the father's neck—and in this condition the father and his twin daughters remained, as if chained, and wept, and wept, and wept. And all, who witnessed the spectacle, wept. And those dear children, born into the world in one hour, were in one hour born into the kingdom of Christ, and in the same hour enabled to hope in the glory of God. What a picture! It was a sight, which angels might covet to see—a sight, which probably never happened before, and very likely will never happen again in a form so interesting, so perfect, so sub-

ANECDOTE OF THE REV. ROBERT HALL.

A remarkable instance of the religious ardour of this great man occurred on a visit to Arnsby. On the way from Leicester his mind was filled with recollections of his father, and the scene of his earliest days. No sooner did he enter the house, than he hastened into the parlour, fell upon his knees, and poured forth the most fervent and humble supplications. Wishing not to interrupt these sacred moments, the two or three individuals who witnessed the intensity of his feeling, withdrew. Soon afterwards he went into the burial-ground, and drooping on his knees at his father's grave with his hands extended over the top of the monumental stone, and his eyes closed, but at intervals lifted up to heaven, he offered up a most remarkable prayer. It showed that a holy fire was burning within, and was characterized by simplicity, pathos, earnestness, and humility. He breathed forth an impassioned desire to "join the blessed company above;" entreated that he might be permitted to know "his departed father, and that their united prayers on earth might then be turned into praise, while they beheld their Redeemer face to face together."—Related by Dr. Cox.

ANECDOTE.

Rev. Samuel Wesley, Sen. while residing in London, went one day into a coffee-house, to obtain some refreshment. There were some gentlemen in a box at the other end of the room where he was; one of whom, an officer of the guards, swore dreadfully. Mr. Wesley saw that he could not speak to him without much difficulty. He, therefore, desired the waiter to bring him a glass

of water. When it was brought, he said aloud, "Carry it to that gentleman in the red coat, and desire him to wash his mouth after his oaths." The officer rose up in a fury, but the gentlemen in the box laid hold of him, and cried out, "Nay, Colonel, you gave the first offence. You see the gentleman is a clergyman. You know that it is an affront to swear in his presence." The officer was thus restrained, and Mr. Wesley departed.

Some years afterwards, being again in London, and walking in St. James' park, a gentleman joined him, who, after some conversation, enquired if he recollected having seen him before? Mr. Wesley replied in the negative. The gentleman then recalled to his remembrance the scene at the coffee-house; and added—"Since that time, sir, I thank God, I have feared an oath, and every thing that is offensive to the Divine Majesty; and as I have a perfect recollection of you, I rejoiced at seeing you, and could not refrain from expressing my gratitude to God and you."—Moore's Life of Wesley.

ORIENTAL ILLUSTRATION OF PSALM XXII, 5.

"I confess," said Captain Wilson, "that since my return from India, I have been forcibly struck with several things, which prove the scriptures to be an eastern book. For instance, the language of one of the Psalms, where David says, 'Thou anointest my head with oil, my cup runneth over,' most likely alludes to a custom which continues to this day. I once had this ceremony performed on myself, in the house of a rich Indian, in the presence of a large company. The gentleman of the house poured upon my hands and arms a delightfully odoriferous perfume, put golden cup into my hand, and poured wine into it till it ran over, assuring me at the time, that it was a great pleasure to him to receive me, and that I should find a rich supply in his house. I think the divine poet expressed his sense of the divine goodness by this allusion."

INDUSTRY.

Man must have occupation, or be miserable. Toil is the price of sleep and appetite, of health and enjoyment. The very necessity which overcomes our natural sloth is a blessing. The world does not contain a briar or a thorn that Divine mercy could have spared. We are happier with the sterility which we can overcome by industry, than we could have been with spontaneous plenty and unbounded profusion. The body and the mind are improved by the toil that fatigues them. That toil is a thousand times rewarded by the pleasure which it bestows. Its enjoyments are peculiar. No wealth can purchase them—no indulgence can taste them.—They flow only from the exertions which they repay.

EVERY MAN RESPONSIBLE.

He who is the means of converting and instructing a solitary youth in this age, kindles a star in the moral horizon. The faithful father, mother, or teacher "casts bread upon the waters to be found many days hence." But he who by bad principles or example injures the youth of this generation, does in so far as his influence extends, throw poison into a river at the fountain on both of whose shores a whole population must drink and die.

TRUE DIGNITY.

Little minds endeavour to support a consequence by distance and hauteur. But this is a mistake. True dignity arises from condescension, and is supported by noble actions. Superciliousness is almost a certain mark of low birth and ill breeding. People who have just emerged into greatness think it necessary to maintain their superiority by a proud look and a high stomach. The consequence is, generally, hatred and contempt. In fact, this proud, high-bearing reserve is a great crime.

FEMALE TEMPER.

It is particularly necessary for girls to acquire command of temper, because much of the effect of their powers of reasoning and of their wit, when they grow up depends upon the gentleness and good humor with which they conduct themselves. A woman who should attempt to thunder with her tongue, would not find her eloquence increase her domestic happiness. We do not wish that women should implicitly yield their better judgment to their fathers, or husbands; but let them support the cause of reason with all the grace of female gentleness.

A man in a furious passion, is terrible to his enemies, but a woman in a passion is disgusting to her friends; she loses all the respect due to her sex, and she has not masculine strength and courage to enforce any other kind of respect. These circumstances should be considered by those, who advise that no difference should be made in the education of the two sexes.

The happiness and influence of women both as wives and mothers, and indeed, in every relation, so much depend on their temper, that it ought to be most carefully cultivated. We should not suffer girls to imagine that they balance ill humor by some good quality or accomplishment; because in fact there are none which can supply the want of temper in the female sex.

Many persons maintain, that before Christians seek to evangelize the heathen, they ought to settle their discrepancies on points of doctrine at home. Perhaps it never occurred to such objectors, that the era of the most perfect uniformity in this country was the era when nothing was done; and that, on all essential matters, there is amongst the supporters of missions the most solid, fruitful, practical unanimity.

To cure the disorders of life the first rule is to rectify and purify the heart. "Keep thy heart with all diligence, for out of it are the issues of life." "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God."

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

From the Christian Advocate and Journal. Extract of a letter from the Rev. Bishop Hedding, dated Onondaga, N. Y., Aug. 3, 1831. "I am on my way to attend the western and southern conferences. I have been visiting the churches, and preaching to the people from place to place, since I left home until I reached this place. There have been wonderful revivals of religion through this country since I visited it a year since. It overwhelms me with gratitude to see what the Lord has done for the Methodists."

Extract of a letter from Bishop Soule, dated Le Roy, N. Y., Aug. 3, 1831. "Dear Brethren.—Enclosed I forward you the minutes of the Genesee Conference, which closed its session an hour past. Great peace and harmony have distinguished the session, and the year has been one of unparalleled success in all our borders. Bishop Hedding was with us over the Sabbath, and set out for Pittsburg in good health. Yours with much respect, JOSEPH SOULE."

Extract of a letter dated Ancaster Aug. 4, 1831.—"Religion is on the rise in this circuit generally, and as a proof, there is not only an increase in numbers but an increase of interest manifested by the people, in the extension of the Redeemer's kingdom. We held an anniversary of the Missionary Society in Hamilton last Sabbath, at 10, A. M. and at 3, P. M. at the old Meeting House, near Mr. Bowman's, and at both places we had large congregations. Many persons at both places, came forward and united themselves to the Society, the Missionary cause is on the rise here. We had to regret not having the reports to lay before our friends."

TEMPERANCE.

(For the Christian Guardian.) York, Yonge-Street, August 6th 1831. "This day the Yonge Street Temperance Society held its first annual meeting. It being a busy time in harvest our assembly was small, but the most part of them manifested a considerable degree of interest in the good cause of temperance. Mr. John Conner was called to the chair. The Rev. Ezra Adams and others addressed the meeting. An invitation was given to as many as would, to come forward and enroll themselves members of this society, ten voluntarily came forward and gave in their names. A few resolutions were adopted and the meeting brought to a close. We are happy to state that although the death of our Society has been announced, it is now in the prime of life, and we do not hesitate to say that it will live through the Divine blessing to see the enemy temperance banished from our houses, our farms, our towns and our country."

ABRAM JOHNSON Secretary.

Extract of a letter dated Ancaster August 4th 1831. "The cause of Temperance is rising in this place, and as evidences, I would inform you, that two of our brethren have put up large frame barns without ardent spirits, Messrs. Jacob Smith and William Jarome, both of Glandford. Mr. Philip Spatter has reaped nearly 60 acres of wheat in his barn than four days without a drop of ardent spirits. A noble example. I am told that a man in the Township of Ancaster not 50 miles from where I now write, who professes no Religion, has used no whiskey during haying and harvesting, and advised his close neighbour, who is a member of our society not to use any spirits in harvest. This I think should be noticed. Shall those who have no religion, nor profess any, do some of those who profess Religion? O may heaven forbid!"

MAKERS AND SELLERS OF ARDENT SPIRITS WHAT ARE YOU DOING? You are creating and sending out the materials of disorder, crime, poverty, disease, intellectual and moral degradation. You are contributing to perpetuate one of the sorest scourges of our world. And the scourges can never be removed till those deadly fires you have kindled are all put out.

CHRISTIAN GUARDIAN.

YORK, SATURDAY, AUGUST 20, 1831.

"God with us."—The article under this head, on the first page, contains a masterly refutation of one of the prevailing errors of the day. It is the attributing of the revival and extension of religion to natural causes. This is practically the same error, (a denial of the Divine Agency in the diffusion and establishment of Christianity,) with that of the elegant historian, Gibbon, who, in his History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, has assigned five (natural) causes for the first establishment and rapid progress of Christianity in the early ages of it, by which he has undertaken to prove that Christianity, like other impostures, might have made its way in the world, though its origin had been as human, as the means by which he supposes it to have spread. Bishop Watson's excellent Apology for Christianity, in Reply to Gibbon, is more than an antidote against the subtle poison of that ingenious sceptic, and ought to be in every instance read as an appendix to the History. We repeat, it is the same scepticism which attributes the religious revivals of the present day, to the cupid-ity and deception of artful and designing men. This miserable shift of infidelity is clearly detected and exposed in the article referred to. It was predicted that the Messiah's name should be "God with us;" which prediction was most beautifully paraphrased by Mr. Wesley, who with his dying breath exclaimed, "the best of all, God is with us." And upon the reality of this fact alone is it, that a satisfactory reason can be assigned for the great revival of religion in his day—a work, the fruits of which, we believe, are seen in most of the religious and benevolent operations which, with such astonishing magnificence and rapidity, and to such a wonderful extent, on both sides of the Atlantic, are spreading the blessings of Evangelical truth. On this point the Rev. R. Watson, in his new life of Wesley, published about three months since, makes the following excellent observations:

"When the Messrs. Wesley, Mr. Whitefield, and their early coadjutors entered upon their itinerant career, it is a matter of fact and history, that no general plan for the illumination of the nation were either in operation, or in contemplation of any one. Nothing had this bearing. There were no persons associated in such institutions of any kind, making this a common object. The pious labours of a few zealous clergy-men, (and few they were,) and the ministers of other denominations, were confined to their own parishes and congregations. There were no means of general application in existence, to remove the ignorance and correct the vices which were almost universal. The measures taken by the founders of Methodism to correct existing evils were on a large scale. They acted in concert; they conceived noble designs. They visited the large towns; they laboured in the populous mining, manufacturing, and commercial districts; they preached in places of public resort; they formed religious societies, and inspired them with zeal for the instruction and salvation of their neighbors; they employed men of zeal, character, and competent acquaintance with practical and experimental religion, to assist them in this work as it widened before them; and they gave it their vigilant superintendence. The benefits they were the means of producing were not confined to individuals; they influenced whole neighbourhoods. Religious knowledge was spread, and religious influence exerted. The manners of the rude were civilized; barbarous

sports and pastimes fell greatly into disuse; and a higher standard of morals was erected, of itself of no small importance to the reformation of manners.

It is a matter of history, that besides those means which were afforded by their personal labours, and by the auxiliaries they brought forward to their assistance, in order to review and extend the spirit of religion in the nation, for a great number of years no other means of extensive application were employed to promote this end. The effects which were thus produced began, however, after a considerable time had elapsed, to operate collaterally as well as directly. Many of the clergy were aroused, and the doctrines of the Articles and the Homilies began to be heard more distinctly and more frequently in their pulpits. Holy and zealous men in different denominations began to labor for the public instruction and reformation. The institution of Sunday Schools, though devised by a Churchman, was, at first, but slowly encouraged. The Methodists and Dissenters were carrying those schools to a great extent when the members of the Church followed; some from a fear, laudable enough, lest the body of the poor should be alienated from the Establishment; others, as perceiving in the institution the means of conveying instruction and religious influence to those who most needed them. The circulation of the Scriptures by Bible Societies followed; but still that was an effect of the new order of principles and feelings which had been introduced into the nation. These principles of zeal for the moral improvement of society farther led, at a later period, to general measures for the education of the poor by the two great national education societies, which promise so much benefit to the country. All these efforts for enlightening and moralizing the people may be traced to several intermediate causes; but it is only justice to the memory of such men as the Wesleys and Whitefield, men so often flippantly branded as enthusiasts, to state, that they all primarily sprung from that spirit which, under God, they were the means of exciting in a slumbering Church, and in a dark and neglected land. This is a point not to be denied; for long before any of those efforts for public instruction and reformation which could be considered national were called forth, those asperged men were pursuing their gigantic labors among the profigate population of London, and of the principal towns of the kingdom; among the miners of Cornwall, the colliers of Kingswood and Newcastle, and the manufacturers of Yorkshire and Lancashire; whilst the preachers they employed were every year spreading themselves into dark semi-barbarous villages in the most secluded parts of the kingdom; enduring bitter privations, and encountering, almost daily, the insults of rude mobs, that they might convey to them the knowledge of religion."

THE SCOTCH AND PRESBYTERIAN CLERGY. (From the Rev. William Bell, Presbyterian Minister, to the Editor of the Christian Guardian.) Perth, 6th August, 1831.

REV. SIR: As some of the statements contained in your paper of the 23rd of July, seem to be called in question, I send you the enclosed copies of correspondence, which, if you think proper, you may lay before the public; they will then be better able to judge how far the charge against you is well founded.

FROM THE REV. HENRY ESSON, OF MONTREAL, TO THE REV. WILLIAM BELL, PERTH. Montreal, 13th December, 1827.

REVEREND SIR: I am instructed by the Committee in Montreal, appointed to promote the interests of the Presbyterian Church in these Provinces, to communicate the enclosed resolutions, passed by them at a meeting held on the 3rd inst., and at the same time to express to you and our other Presbyterian brethren in Canada—who, though not in actual communion with the Church of Scotland, are united to us by a community of sentiment on all points of Doctrine, Worship, and Church Government—our earnest desire to cultivate that mutual good will and confidence which become those who have only slight grounds of difference.

It appears to this Committee, that in the present crisis, all Presbyterians are called upon to act with unanimity and vigour in adopting measures for the protection and maintenance of their common faith—that faith, the enjoyment of which, with all its inestimable blessings and privileges, they have inherited from their forefathers; and which, if not unworthy of their descent, they must feel it their first and most solemn duty to transmit unimpaired to their children. The Committee, therefore, feel a confidence, that all denominations of their brethren, forgetting minor differences, will, with a spirit worthy of their cause, unite their zealous exertions for the security and advancement of the Presbyterian Faith in these Provinces.

I have also been instructed by the Committee, to communicate to you a copy of a petition to the Imperial Parliament, to which, if it meet with your approbation, it is requested you will exert yourself to obtain the signatures of the Presbyterians in your settlement; and at the same time procure answers to the accompanying queries.—Should you not approve of the petition: as it now stands, it will be easy to draw up another in such terms as may appear to you suitable.

The Committee also request an answer to this communication at your earliest convenience; and beg leave to be favored with your correspondence in future on all points pertaining to our cause.

I have the honor to be, REVEREND SIR, Your obt. humble servant, (Signed.) H. ESSON.

ANSWER. Perth, 13th December, 1827. REV. DEAR SIR: By last Post I received with much pleasure your letter, dated 13th instant; but the resolutions and petition to which you refer I did not find enclosed. The former, however, were soon supplied by my friend, Mr. Morris, who, a few minutes after I received your letter, called with a copy.

The proceedings of the Committee, as stated in the Herald of the 12th instant, I heartily approve, and shall with great pleasure concur and co-operate with them in the measures they appear to be pursuing. I am convinced, that not only the faith but the interests of all classes of Presbyterians in these Provinces are the same, and that both will be best promoted by uniting their efforts.

Soon after I came to this country, more than ten years ago, I felt a strong desire to see all the Presbyterians in the Canadas united in one body, and, as you are aware, have not ceased to recommend it to my brethren in both Provinces. Should this actually take place, I shall consider it one of the happiest events in my life.

The Committee have discovered much wisdom and liberality at the commencement of their labors, and by pursuing the same course they cannot fail to secure the blessing of God, as well as the aid of every sensible Presbyterian in the country. The prospect of seeing all our Churches in the two Provinces united in the same communion must strengthen the hands and rejoice the heart of every person who loves the peace and prosperity of Zion, and be a blessing not only to the present but to future generations.

The only thing in the plan of the Committee about which I have any doubt, is the propriety of sending home an agent immediately. The Imperial Parliament is now or soon will be in Session, and whatever they intend to do will be done before the agent can reach London.—Would it not be better to wait till we hear what they have done, and till a census of this Province can be taken, a bill for which Mr. Morris has engaged to bring forward

in the ensuing Session of the Provincial Parliament? A letter might in the mean time be despatched to the Colonial Secretary, explaining what was about to take place and requesting his aid. If the object of the resolutions of the 3rd is gained in the General Assembly at their first meeting, an actual union of all the Presbyterians in the two Provinces might be effected in June or July; and then an application of the whole, in a body, would have more influence with Government than that of detached parties. I am willing, however, to concur in any plan the committee think best for the general interest.

Our Presbytery meets at Brockville on the 23rd of next month, when, I have no doubt, the different subjects referred to in your letter will be taken into consideration. In the mean time, it is my fervent prayer, that both you and we may be directed to such measures as are best fitted to promote the glory of God and the interest of his church. I have the honor to be, REV. DEAR SIR, Yours, affectionately, (Signed.) WILLIAM BELL.

It may be proper here to observe, that similar letters were sent to all the members of the Presbytery of Upper Canada, and similar answers (in purport, at least) returned. Printed letters were also received at the same time, to which the names of five Ministers, professing to belong to the Church of Scotland, were attached, calling upon us to assist in raising the pecuniary expense of sending home an Agent. In compliance with their wishes, we not only procured numerous signatures to the petitions, but collected money; and from Perth I sent them about 50 dollars to assist in sending home an Agent, expecting of course that he was to promote the interest of the whole. Judge then of my surprise at receiving (after sending away the petitions and the money) from Mr. Morris the following letter, written, it appears, by Mr. Harper, of Kingston:

Kingston, 14th February, 1833.

DEAR SIR: I am requested by the Rev. Mr. Machar to hand you enclosed three copies of the petition agreed upon by the Committee at Cornwall, as the most suitable, under present circumstances, for the Upper Province; it varies very little from one sent formerly from Montreal hope they will reach you in time. One of them is intended for Mr. Smart, to be put at the head of the signatures collected by him—which list he had better head "Johnstown District." Another is intended for Mr. Bell, at Perth, and the other for you to send to any other place you may think proper. As the lists are finished, have the goodness to forward them to the Rev. Mr. Urquhart, at Cornwall, who is to attach them all to the written petition, commencing from the Eastern District to the Western. I hope you will use your influence to get the lists finished as soon as possible, as Mr. Grant is nearly ready to start, and expect all the documents will be finished in a fortnight—we have commenced here and are getting on fast—others have been sent up the country. Mr. Machar is of opinion with me, that to show this new petition to all who signed the former one with you and Mr. Bell would only be opening a door for discussion with people who will not quickly understand it, and that it will be better to explain the reason for the alteration to Messrs. Smart and Bell, who will see the object of it at once.

The Committee of Clergymen have written to the Committee of the General Assembly to memorialize the Government to erect a Presbytery in the Canadas, which, I have no doubt, will be granted, when all will goon well. I understand that the Episcopalists have stopped their petition, on the grounds that it would be placing them on a par with the Dissenters, were they to petition Government, and that they would stand on the ground they have taken and defend all attacks. Please let me hear how you go on, that I may report to the Committee here.

Believe me, DEAR SIR, Yours truly, (Signed.) FRANCIS ARCHD' HARRER. Messrs. A. & W. MORRIS, Brockville.

Along with the above letter I received a copy of the new petition, and I shall not attempt to describe my surprise at finding, that instead of the words "PRESBYTERIANS" and "PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH," used in the former petition, the words "CHURCH OF SCOTLAND," were introduced in the new one. Mr. Morris did not explain to me "the reason for the alteration," as his correspondent had requested. It was not necessary—"I saw the object of it at once." But I did not see all I have since seen. Will it be believed, that even at this time a plan was arranging by a secret correspondence with some of these very persons professing such friendly feelings, to break up my congregation by introducing a petition of their own? Yet such was the case; and since then, three of our congregations have been attacked in a similar way. And though we were invited to correspond with them in future, not one of our letters to any of their ministers, so far as I know, have been answered. These facts will speak for themselves.

Your remarks on this subject have been denounced as uncalculated for; but how otherwise should you obey the precept, Bear ye one another's burdens, and thus fulfill the law of Christ?

Yours truly, WILLIAM BELL. REMARKS BY THE EDITOR OF THE GUARDIAN.—Our readers will now be able to judge of the correctness and propriety of our remarks of the 23rd of July, which have brought upon us a shower of abuse from sceptics and self-styled friends of the Kirk—a strange combination. The loss, however, lies on their side of the question, not on us, and is of their own creating. Our remarks were made as an act of common justice, as an act of public duty, and with a view to develop the real principles of a system, which, under plausible pretences, is being introduced into Canada, and which contains the fruitful seeds of contention, dissatisfaction, commotion, infidelity, and misery to the country.

We beg to offer a few remarks on the above correspondence. It is well known that our Presbyterian Brethren, with ourselves, the highest Law Officer in the Province, our Provincial Parliament, and the Canada Committee of the House of Commons, have maintained, that according to the 31st of George III, the several other Protestant denominations were entitled to a share of the Clergy lands of this Province with the Church of England. Accordingly, many of the Presbyterians and their Ministers, in 1827-8, presented their claims for their proportion of this provision, whilst a general petition was circulated in this Province, praying that the Clergy lands might be exclusively appropriated to the purposes of Education and the improvement of the country, and that all Clergymen might be left for support to the contributions of the members and friends of their respective churches. This latter policy has become so universally popular, that we believe Presbyterians, both Clergymen and laymen, are as unanimous as others, that the Clergy Reserves should be applied to the objects just mentioned. From the Rev. Mr. Bell's letter to the Rev. Mr. Esson, it appears that Mr. Bell was favorable to the distribution of the Reserves among different denominations, and, as a Presbyterian, he and his friends resolved to urge their claims. This Mr. Bell proposed to do, not merely upon legal grounds, but, as appears from his letter, upon that of numerical strength and the voice of the people. He therefore proposed, that a (religious) census of the province should be taken, and the Presbyterians be called upon to express their sentiments in a body. This policy (as well as his

whole letter) reflects the highest honor on Mr. Bell's integrity, and shows how far it was from his heart to practice the least deception upon the British Government. Mr. Bell wished, in the first place, to have a census of the population, so that the British Government might know the numerical strength of the several denominations of Christians—and not that the great Kirk advocate, Dr. Lee, should misinform the King's Government upon information which Dr. L. said he had received from Canada) that there were 150,000 members of the Kirk of Scotland in Upper Canada!!! In the next place, Mr. Bell was desirous that the wishes of the Presbyterians in a body might be expressed on the subject; so that the British Government might know the sentiments as well as the number of their adherents. This is all that we have desired of either the Episcopal or Kirk Clergy—and had this open and honorable course been pursued by the leading advocates of the Kirk and the Church of England, how much would have been saved to the character of the sacred ministry, to the credit of religion, and to the honor of human nature. But nay, an expression of opinion from even their own congregations, would not answer their purposes. We have always asserted that they had the same right to express and maintain their sentiments that their opponents had; and deserved equally respectful treatment; but what we have to complain of is, that they have resorted to the use of unfair and dishonorable means to carry their views into operation, by slandering the characters of other religious bodies, by falsely stating the numerical strength of different religious denominations, and by misrepresenting the state of public sentiment and the proceedings of our House of Assembly in regard to their measures and the principles of their policy.—The Kirk advocates formerly called upon us to second their efforts, against the very policy they now support—we advanced the same doctrine then that we do now—they highly approved of it—we have proof of the fact—do they approve of it now? Who have changed their course, they or we? If they have stepped into the shoes of the Church of England, which they then opposed (as appears by extracts from their publications given in our last week's paper), and now supplicate His Majesty's Government for a co-monopoly with the Church of England, they ought not to complain if we step forward in defence of our own rights and the religious and political interests of Canada against their encroachments as well as against those of the Episcopal Clergy. It is not the men, as such, that we oppose—it is the system, and the men as honorable or dishonorable promoters of it.

We know that the Church and State advocates—after having failed in their attempts to destroy the religious character and political standing of the several denominations of Christians—would be very glad to have us drop the question—may they complain very loudly that we do not do it and leave them in quiet possession of an unlawful weapon of wealth and power, which has already like to have proved the ruin of the country, which is a continual moth upon the moral and civil interests of the people, and which may one day make Canada with its beautiful climate and fertile soil, what Ireland now is. But this will not do. There is no safety while the monster retains his sting and is left to run at large. We can not, nor will we, thus vilely betray the cause of religion—the cause of education—the cause of rational liberty—the cause of public tranquility—the cause of general industry—the cause of national prosperity and happiness.

To return to the correspondence, on which we beg to add two remarks. 1. Notwithstanding our sentiments and acknowledged sympathy on the question, notwithstanding the base manner in which we have been treated by certain misguided champions of the Kirk—which we wish to be understood as imputing to none but the authors of it—we are perfectly willing to open our columns to any unambiguous remarks on the Kirk side of the question, under the proper name of the writer. This we think is due to the Rev. Mr. Bell, who seeks no mask in bringing the affair before the public. Nor do we except our own observations from a similar order.

2. Our thanks are particularly due to the Rev. Mr. Bell (to whom we are personally unknown) for the prompt and kind manner in which he has gratuitously stepped forward, upon his own responsibility, to vindicate us from charges as malicious as they were unjust. And we are happy to say, upon the authority of information heretofore derived from our presiding Elder and other Ministers of ours who have laboured in the vicinity of Perth, that the amiable and Christian spirit that breathes throughout the above correspondence, is but an index of Mr. Bell's daily life; which shows that although differences of opinion on some points may obtain among the labourers in a common vineyard, under the direction of a common Master, and with a common object in view—the glory of God and the happiness of mankind—they can still keep the unity of the Spirit, love as brethren, and be helpers of each other's joy. We gladly hail the peaceful harbinger of that day when all Zion's Watchmen and children shall see eye to eye on the great doctrines and objects of agreement, and agree to disagree on the minor points of disagreement, which do not affect the practice of christian duty, the enjoyment of Christian privilege, or the entire reliance of Christian faith upon the Lord Jesus Christ as our Wisdom, Righteousness, Sanctification, and Eternal Redemption.

"A MEMBER OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH."—Under this signature a person, whom the Editor says is a "member of the Kirk," has published a philippic of two columns against us in last Saturday's Courier—being apparently ashamed of the officious champion under whose auspices a similar and equally unfounded tirade had been made against us two weeks before. This writer appears in worse plight than his editorial predecessor, and upon the whole, seems to be a tool without an edge—not what we should have expected under such a signature, which we cannot but think is unmerited. After nearly a column of general and vague insinuations, our censor proceeds thus:

"When Mr. Ryerson puts such language as the following in the mouth of government—'we must give £50 and £100 a year to the Kirk Clergy, to buy them and their followers over'—What can he mean? Granting that the British government were disposed to employ bribery," &c.

Now the language which this writer represents us as putting into the mouth of the "British Government," was attributed by us (as the reader will see by referring to our paper of the 23rd of July) to the active partisans of the Episcopal Clergy in originating this policy, whom we called "Rev. Conciliators." This writer, therefore, like his editorial patron and predecessor, stands detected of newspaper forgery, and his conclusions must, of course, partake of the nature of his premises.

As to "rival" congregations, let our Kirkman read the Rev. Mr. Bell's letter, in another column. Rivalship in congregations is not the point of discussion—because this obtains among all classes of Christians, and may consist with the most sincere and genuine christian fellowship—the point of discussion is, the policy pursued by the direct or indirect recommendation of the Colonial Administration respecting this rivalship. Strange that our Kirkman should be ignorant of this—to have known it would have saved him the labour and pain of bringing forth his swelling words of vanity. Again, this writer says, "the Kirk Clergy is a name that under such an ecclesiastical government as ours, must always designate the collective body of ministers with their elders"—that the Kirk Clergy never met in an organised body until June last—and consequently could not have made any proposals of Union with the Presbyterian Clergy.—He then deals out the epithets "falsehood," &c. upon us, with no unsparing hand, for our statement in regard to the proposed union between the two bodies. Suppose now, our Kirkman's statements and interpretation were true, would that authorise his inference, and render us justly liable to the charge of "falsehood?" Our statement on this point was founded upon the authority of the Brockville Recorder. We gave our authority, and explained our accounts, but the Brockville Recorder, in his weekly stated that at this point at issue was not between us and our accounts, but between them, the Presbytery of Upper Canada and the Brockville Recorder. Yet this writer repeats the already refuted charge of "falsehood" against us. If he has one spark of gentlemanly or honorable, not to say christian, feeling, ought he not to blush for shame? But what proof does this Kirkman give, that his interpretation of the terms "Kirk Clergy" is correct? None. We deny its correctness, and affirm it to be erroneous. If we had said Kirk Synod or Presbytery, it would undoubtedly have meant the "collective body of ministers and elders;" but the very term Clergy by the usages of all Christendom, applies to no others but Ministers, or persons set apart by ordination for the

service of God. What man of candour or common sense would interpret the Presbyterian Clergy of Upper Canada to mean both the Ministers and lay-elders of the Presbyterian Church?

The above detected misrepresentations are the premises of all our Kirkman's reasoning. He therefore fails in his object—our reasoning remains unanswerable—and he stands convicted out of his own mouth of what he manifests so much anxiety and unadvised zeal to fasten upon us. Two or three general remarks we are done. 1. This writer calls himself "a member of the Presbyterian Church," which (as he is a member of the Kirk) conveys the idea that there is no other Presbyterian Church in Canada, but the Church of Scotland!—2. This writer says "the Editor of the Guardian writes against the various Presbyterian Ministers in Canada." Now as, according to the Presbytery of Upper Canada, (but self-called) Kirkman does not acknowledge any other Presbyterian Ministers in Upper Canada, but those of the Kirk!!!—3. This writer says, we have "assaulted in turn the Church of England, the Church of Scotland, and the Roman Catholics." This statement is of a piece with the rest of his assertions, and is without the shadow of truth. Our readers can bear witness that we have never said one word against either the forms or doctrines of either the Church of England or Scotland—but have spoken of both in terms of high respect; and we made no reply to the numerous attacks of the Editor of the Catholic, until an agreement had been entered into by us and the Catholic Editor to publish each other's remarks, which, as for as we know, were begun and ended with feelings of friendship on both sides.—As a Church, or religious community, we have not opposed, nor do we feel a disposition to oppose, either the Church of England or Scotland; but as a State Establishment, we feel it our bounden duty to oppose them both—and our sentiments in this point of view are fully corroborated by the declarations of the Scotch Clergy (themselves—as quoted by us in last week's paper—and by innumerable testimonials to the same effect of professed members of the Church of England, among whom is Earl Grey, the head of the British Cabinet.

Our desire is that Ministers and members of different christian churches may live and labour harmoniously together for the destruction of infidelity, vice and idolatry, and the promotion of our common Christianity, and we have reason to believe our labours have in some degree been instrumental in breaking down the barriers of sectarian prejudice. But the past and present History of England and Ireland (and we may add, of Canada) affords melancholy proof that the Church and State Establishment is the deadly enemy of harmony and fellowship among different classes and bodies of professing Christians. Earl Grey himself attributes all the sufferings of poor distracted Ireland to this very union of Church and State. "This fact is full of instruction, and more than justifies all that we have said and done on this question."

THE UNITED PRESBYTERY OF YORK met in the Presbyterian Church in this town for the first time, on Wednesday morning last, agreeably to the appointment of the Synod, and was constituted with prayer by the Rev. Peter Ferguson, as Moderator. Seven ministers and five Elders were present. Among other matters which came before the Presbytery, we notice the following: The Rev. Mr. Harris reported, that agreeably to a former appointment, he had preached in Esqueping on the 2nd of August; and moderated a call, which was unanimously given for the Rev. P. Ferguson. Messrs Tho's Darber and Malcom McNaughton appeared as Commissioners from the Church in Esqueping, and handed in a call for the Rev. P. Ferguson, with 101 signatures and promising £100 per annum. Messrs. Adam Goodfellow and John Mathewson appeared as Commissioners from the Church in West Gwilliamsbury and handed in a petition praying that the Presbytery would not remove Mr. Ferguson from them, but that they would sustain him regularly as their pastor; likewise a subscription of £74 12s 6d per annum, showing an increased effort for his comfort and support. The parties having been heard, after considerable discussion, the Presbytery decided to install Mr. Ferguson over the Church in West Gwilliamsbury, and the Rev. Messrs Harris, Tall and McMillan, were appointed a deputation for that purpose. This installation to take place on the last Wednesday in September.—This decision we understand was in accordance with Mr. Ferguson's feelings; tho' his salary is less than it would have been in Esqueping. An example highly creditable to Mr. F. and should endear him to his congregation.

The Presbytery recommended to those congregations under their care, that have not hitherto used the Westminster Assembly's version of the Psalms, that they gradually introduce it by using it in their public worship one half of the day each Sabbath.

The Presbytery resolved to have four regular meetings in the year; namely, on the third Wednesdays in August, November, February, and May.

On Thursday morning, after having spent an hour in prayer for the special outpouring of the Spirit on the Churches, the Presbytery adjourned to meet at Nelson on the third Wednesday in November next.

TITLES.—Four Bills have been introduced into the House of Lords by the Heads of the Church; one for the composition of titles; the second against pluralities; the third for the benefit of curates; the fourth (by Lord Daer) "for the commutation of tithes in England and Wales." Earl Grey wished the consideration of these important measures to be deferred until the next Session of (we suppose a Reformed) Parliament. The London Morning Chronicle says, "it is as well to drop the subject at present, as no good can arise from agitating a matter in Parliament now, which can only be settled next year." From the remarks of the Chronicle and other London Journals, it is probable that titles and the question of Church and State will be the absorbing topics among the people of England, as soon as the Reform measure shall have been decided, and will probably govern the next elections. A proper time is it then for the people of Canada to co-operate with their fellow subjects in Great Britain. The advantage of such a co-operation will be mutual. The present is the juncture of time for Reform, and "England expects every man to do his duty."

THE ADDRESS TO THE KING, together with a short notice of the proceedings of the several township meetings in the Home District, will be found on the last page. The document will speak for itself. We have room for no further remarks, which we had intended to make.

The Debate in the House of Lords on the address to the King will be found interesting. Earl Grey's sentiments respecting Church and State Union are exactly what the friends of civil and religious liberty desire, nothing more or less. Our intended remarks on the noble Premier's Speech are necessarily deferred. In the House of Commons, the Irish Reform Bill, introduced by Mr. Stanley, was read the first time, June 30. On July 1st, the Lord Advocate introduced the Scotch Reform Bill, which was read the first time. They are the same as those introduced into the late Parliament, with a little extension.

LATEST NEWS.—Our English news are 11 days later than we had received last week, to the 8th July. We have been favoured by a friend with a file of London Papers from the 24th of June to the 6th of July, from which our notices of English affairs are taken.

IRELAND. The Coroner's inquest summoned over the bodies of the unfortunate people who fell in the affair at Newtownbury has adjourned without agreeing on a verdict, much to the discontent of the inhabitants of that part of the country. The Catholic Bishops of Ireland, now assembled in annual Synod in Dublin, have agreed to two petitions—about education, and the other in favour of poor-laws—to the two Houses of Parliament. The one upon education is to be presented by Mr. O'Connell in the Commons.—Dublin Freeman's Journal.

The real defect in the Irish magistracy arises from the non-residence of a sufficient number of persons qualified to fill the office.

FRANCE is in rather an unsettled and agitated state. The present Ministry are not popular—they do not answer the expectations of the La Fayette part of the nation.

In relation to the affairs of BELGIUM, we find, that Leopold has consented to accept the throne on condition that the Congress at Brussels consent to the 18 articles drawn up at the Conference of the "Five Powers" in London, and submitted to them.

BRUSSELS papers of July 6, had reached London.—There have been some stormy discussions in the Congress at Brussels, one party declaring for war, and the other recommending the acceptance of the terms of the Allied Powers, and of Prince Leopold as the Sovereign of Belgium.

From POLAND, there is nothing decisive—nothing on which can be argued the fate of that injured and enterprising country. We fear the Poles are not sufficiently united among themselves.

CHOLERA MORBUS.—The Cholera is stated has broken out at Archangel.—Riga dates of 16th June state the sickness, we are happy to say continues to leave us.

Letters received in London (says the N. Y. Com. Advertiser), on the 6th July, from various parts of the Continent, are full of remarks on the formidable military attitude of Austria and Prussia, which on the most moderate calculation, amounts together to about 400,000 men, all armed and equipped, ready to take the field immediately.

CHOLERA MORBUS.—The Cholera is stated has broken out at Archangel.—Riga dates of 16th June state the sickness, we are happy to say continues to leave us.

Upon the whole, the affairs of Europe wear rather a lowering aspect. Combustible materials are accumulating upon the continent—a general explosion may ensue—we hope not.

ENGLAND. A friend of ours in London, under date of July 6th, writes—"Trade is, I believe, rather prosperous, and the crops uncommonly fine and promising."

THE REFORM BILL has passed the second reading in the House of Commons, by a majority of 136. It may be considered as completely decided in the House of Commons.

Mr. McAuley (of whose history we know nothing more than his name) says the London Morning Chronicle of the 6th July "delivered last night the best speech which has yet been made on the question of Reform, and the effect it produced on the House was very great."

Lord Althorp said His honorable and Learned Friend (Mr. McAuley) had electrified the House with his eloquence. We make two extracts from Mr. McAuley's admirable speech, as reported in the London Morning Chronicle of the 6th July.—One of the most common arguments used by the enemies of Reform in this country and in England is, that English institutions are unchangeable, and in this immutability consist one of their highest excellencies, and that Reform is an unwholesome invasion upon the sanctity of those venerable movements of human wisdom.

"When we are told of the admiration of distinguished foreigners of all ages for the constitution of England, it seems to be thought that their applause has been bestowed upon the same institutions which, in the lapse of centuries, have undergone no change."

"The great Charter, the first Assembly of Parliament, the Petition of Right, the Revolution, and, lastly, this great measure [cheering and counter cheering from both sides] are all proofs of my position—of all progressive stages in the progress of society, and I am fully convinced that every argument urged against the step we are now called upon to take might have been advanced with equal justice against any of the other great changes I have enumerated [cheers]. It is the principle of 'Home's History,' as every body knows, that the Stuarts governed better than the Tudors but suppose any man had risen in the Convention Parliament and said, 'How great and happy we are—we have ten times as many inhabitants, and merchants ten times as wealthy as under the Tudors; we have been most admirably governed—we are not slaves under the Dey of Tripoli, but free subjects of a generous Monarch, and why should we change? The answer is plain:—If we had been slaves of the Dey of Tripoli, we should not have known better, but the change in our situation has educated us for improvements in our institutions [hear, hear]. At the present moment we every where see society outgrowing our institutions. Wherever we turn our eyes we behold a nation great and civilized—with a soil cultivated to a degree of fertility un-

known in other countries—with the perfection of all discoveries in physical science, to promote the conveniences of life—standing pre-eminent above the civilized world in every thing that depends upon the skill and intelligence of individuals, or a combination of individuals—and yet, with laws and institutions that little command the respect and admiration of mankind.

"The following concluding paragraph of Mr. McAuley's speech expresses, with equal beauty and force, his valuation of the Reform measure and the eventfulness of the present era in the political history of England, and the foolish madness of any Government in resisting public opinion under the pretence that it is nothing but sedition—a lesson which may be useful in the Colonies as well as in the Mother country."

"It is well to talk of opposing a firm front to sedition, and of using vigorous means to put down agitation. Those phrases are used very properly, when they refer to some temporary excitement—to some partial disturbance, as in 1789—to stifle which, the show of force and determination on the part of a Government is alone needed. Then it is well to show a bold front; but woe to the Government which cannot distinguish between a nation and a mob [cheers]—woe to the Government that thinks a great and enlarged movement of mind is to be put down at a moment [cheers]. This error has been twice fatal to the Bourbons; it may be fatal to the Legislature of this country if they should venture to foster it [cheers]. I do believe that the irrevocable moment has arrived. Nothing can prevent the passing of this noble law [laughter]; this second Bill of Rights [long and continued laughter, and cheers]. I do call it that second Bill of Rights; and so will the country call it; and so will our children [cheers]. I call it a greater charter of the liberties of England. Eighteen hundred and thirty-one is destined to exhibit the first example of an established, of a deep-rooted system being removed without bloodshed or violence or rapine—no points being debated—every punctilio observed—the peaceful industry of the country never for a moment checked or compromised—and the authority of the law not for one instant suspended [cheers]. These are things of which we may well be proud, if they continue to us the blessings which we now enjoy. These are things which make us look with confidence and good hope to the future destinies of the human race [cheers]. These are things that enable us to look forward to a long series of tranquil and happy years, in which we shall have a popular Government and a loyal People; and in which, if it were inevitable, shall find us a united nation [cheers]—of years pre-eminently distinguished by the progress of arts and science, and of knowledge generally—by the diminution of the public burthen, and by all those victories of peace, in which, more than in the most splendid military successes, consist the true prosperity of States and the glory of Statesmen [cheers]. Sir, it is with those feelings and with those reasons that I give my most cordial assent to the measure, considering it desirable in itself, and at the present moment, and in the present temper of the people, indispensably necessary to the Reform and to the stability of the empire. [The Hon. Gentleman resumed his seat amidst loud cheers, which were continued for some moments.]"

power—he would tell the noble earl that the church had very seldom exercised that power with advantage to themselves, seldom to the cause which it advocated, and often with great detriment to the public.

The Duke of Cumberland would not have intruded himself on their lordships' notice, had not the noble lord opposite chosen to charge him with being adverse to the liberties of the people. He denied the charge, and now stated, before their lordships and the country at large, that no member of that or the other house would fight more strenuously for the liberties of the people than the individual who now addressed them.

Lord Grey was not aware that he had spoken of the noble duke as an enemy of the liberties of the people. What he thought he said was, that the illustrious duke prided himself on his consistent opposition to every measure for improving the rights, consolidating or extending the liberties of the country; and that, on this ground, he concurred in the opposition to the reform bill, which had been designated as revolutionary. Those, he believed, hection of the lordships; and those words he could not retract nor deny. Every measure that had been brought forward, whether for the extension of religious or civil liberties, had uniformly met the decided opposition of the illustrious duke.

Lord Warrington said, that, judging from the terms of the King's speech, the reform bill of the last session would not again be brought forward; but if it were, and were carried, it would indeed do away, with the improper influence of their lordships, but it would also give such an influence to the Commons, that the House of Peers would be annihilated. He saw nothing in the speech or in the address which called for amendment, for, with such good sense and moderation, ministers had said nothing in praise of the dissolution; if they had, no power on earth should have kept him from moving an amendment.—[Cheers.] His lordship then denied that the late House of Commons had stopped the supplies, and contended that the unfounded assertions of the Lord Chancellor, that it had done so, had possessed great influence in the result of the elections. There were, undoubtedly, also a number of persons in the country who were favourable to a measure of reform, most extensive in its nature; but for their consideration was fraught with danger to the state they had but one line to pursue.—[Cheers.]—they might reject it.—[Cheers.] For his own part, he would rather return to his situation as a simple English gentleman than support the bill, if it assumed as dangerous a form there as it had in another place.—[Cheers.] He would forfeit all his dignity rather than betray his God, his Country, and his King.—[Cheers.] If he really believed the bill was against it.—[Loud cheers.] If they were to vote for a measure which they conceived to be the first step towards the subversion of the state, from any motive of personal fear, he would rather see the house wiped away at once, than that it should drag on for a few years in impotence and contempt.—[Hear, hear.]

The Marquis of Lansdowne said that the sense of the people had been most unequivocally expressed in favor of the reform bill, and if any thing were needed to demonstrate the soundness of the advice which His Majesty's ministers gave, it would be found in the history of the elections.—[Hear, hear.] He denied that any part of the just authority of the house would be taken away, and maintained that none of their just rights and privileges would be affected by the bill. The bill would do more than restore to the House of Commons their just and constitutional privileges, and it was nothing more than a recurrence to the principles under which the constitution of England had flourished. If he could even now be convinced that there was any thing in this bill which could weaken the just privileges and prerogatives of the House of Lords—any thing which could affect its civil faculty—he would have no hesitation in declaring that he was in the wrong, and joining the noble lords opposite in declaring the bill would be a subversion of the constitution.

The Marquis of Londonderry said, that the reform bill was not the work of Lord Grey, or any of the cabinet ministers, but of some of the underlings in their departments, and he thought it unworthy of ministers to adopt a measure introduced under such auspices. He declared, that never was there, in his opinion, a measure less called for, or more fraught with evil than the reform bill.—[Hear, hear.] He was glad to see the noble earl [Grey] decorated with that riband, but he was really at a loss to know for what public services it had been bestowed. There was no point in their whole policy, foreign or domestic, in which His Majesty's present Government could fairly claim the approbation of the country. He had heard the speech read from the throne, or the speech that was put into His Majesty's mouth, and he must say that he had never read a speech which was framed so ingeniously as that was, avoiding all topics which might lead to discussion on any essential point.—[Hear, hear, from the ministerial side]—and the only point it contained, was with reference to the cholera morbus. [Cheers and laughter.] The speech and address were so couched, that it was impossible to move an amendment, but still he might say that he considered the course pursued by Government to be most pernicious to the country.

The Lord Chancellor maintained, that the vote of the House of Commons, on the 21st of April, was tantamount to a refusal of the supplies, and what he had said on the day of the dissolution was that if any thing were necessary to justify that dissolution, the conduct of the House of Commons, the preceding night was such as to afford that

justification.—[Continued cheering on both sides.] His lordship then entered, at some length, into the history of the dissolution, and, in speaking of the power taken away by the reform bill, reminded their lordships that the noble lords on the ministerial side of the house lost more of the bad influence to be taken away, than noble lords on the other side of the house had to part with.—[Hear, hear.] In speaking of the late general election proceedings, they had been reproached with making use of the King's name in favor of the bill, when it is most largely used against that bill; and when they were told, over and over again, that the King would disavow the use of the King's name, what right had others to utter the foulest falsehoods? They committed the double crime of improperly using the King's name and falsely using it; and, on the principle that two negatives make an affirmative, so, he presumed, they thought that two parliamentary irregularities make one parliamentary regularity. His Majesty had proved himself a most gracious and paternal monarch, and had become, from the first moment of his reign, a most popular King, nor would he tarnish the virtues for which he was distinguished, by allowing any use to be made of his name which he did not think would conduce to the interests and the happiness of his people.

Lord Farnham maintained, that the disturbances in Ireland had proceeded from political causes, and charged ministers with having entered into a compromise with Mr. O'Connell.

Lord Plunkett said, that the reason why Mr. O'Connell had obtained the power he now possessed, was not because Catholic emancipation had been granted, but because it had been so long withheld.—[Hear, hear!] and denied that there had been any disturbance in Ireland, and that there was nothing in them political; they were purely a servile war, in which the occupiers of the land determined to take the law into their own hands, against the owners of it; and its practices were exercised indiscriminately against Protestant and Catholic.—[Hear, hear!] He was, however, happy to state that, before he left Ireland, he received assurance that the excitement had greatly subsided, and that the people were returning to a proper obedience to the laws. The means that had produced this restoration to tranquillity were acts of a wise and firm Government, and not the shifts of those who were unwilling to look at ultimate effects; and he would say this—they could not pay a country by prosecutions; their duty was to look at the cause, and look for an efficient remedy for that cause.

The Earl of Winchelsea disclaimed any intention of imputing revolutionary principles to the noble earl. The Duke of Cumberland would not have intruded himself on their lordships' notice, had not the noble lord opposite chosen to charge him with being adverse to the liberties of the people. He denied the charge, and now stated, before their lordships and the country at large, that no member of that or the other house would fight more strenuously for the liberties of the people than the individual who now addressed them. In what act of his, during the thirty years he had been in the house, had he ever shown a spirit of hostility to the liberties of the people? He trusted his warmth of manner would be excused, but in the situation in which he was placed, and acting with the friends around him, who were all strenuous friends of liberty, he felt it necessary to vindicate himself from the charge of being an enemy to freedom. He was for maintaining the King, the constitution, and to act for preserving to the King, to the aristocracy, and to the Commons, the enjoyment of just and equal rights and privileges. With respect to the reform bill, he took a totally different view of it from the noble lord opposite. Whenever another measure on the subject should be brought forward, he neither pledged himself to oppose nor support it; he would listen with attention to the arguments, and make up his mind impartially on the merits of the case.

Lord Grey was not aware that he had spoken of the noble duke as an enemy of the liberties of the people. What he thought he said was, that the illustrious duke prided himself on his consistent opposition to every measure for improving the rights, consolidating or extending the liberties of the country; and that, on this ground, he concurred in the opposition to the reform bill, which had been designated as revolutionary. Those, he believed, hection of the lordships; and those words he could not retract nor deny. Every measure that had been brought forward, whether for the extension of religious or civil liberties, had uniformly met the decided opposition of the illustrious duke.

Lord Warrington said, that, judging from the terms of the King's speech, the reform bill of the last session would not again be brought forward; but if it were, and were carried, it would indeed do away, with the improper influence of their lordships, but it would also give such an influence to the Commons, that the House of Peers would be annihilated. He saw nothing in the speech or in the address which called for amendment, for, with such good sense and moderation, ministers had said nothing in praise of the dissolution; if they had, no power on earth should have kept him from moving an amendment.—[Cheers.] His lordship then denied that the late House of Commons had stopped the supplies, and contended that the unfounded assertions of the Lord Chancellor, that it had done so, had possessed great influence in the result of the elections. There were, undoubtedly, also a number of persons in the country who were favourable to a measure of reform, most extensive in its nature; but for their consideration was fraught with danger to the state they had but one line to pursue.—[Cheers.]—they might reject it.—[Cheers.] For his own part, he would rather return to his situation as a simple English gentleman than support the bill, if it assumed as dangerous a form there as it had in another place.—[Cheers.] He would forfeit all his dignity rather than betray his God, his Country, and his King.—[Cheers.] If he really believed the bill was against it.—[Loud cheers.] If they were to vote for a measure which they conceived to be the first step towards the subversion of the state, from any motive of personal fear, he would rather see the house wiped away at once, than that it should drag on for a few years in impotence and contempt.—[Hear, hear.]

The Marquis of Lansdowne said that the sense of the people had been most unequivocally expressed in favor of the reform bill, and if any thing were needed to demonstrate the soundness of the advice which His Majesty's ministers gave, it would be found in the history of the elections.—[Hear, hear.] He denied that any part of the just authority of the house would be taken away, and maintained that none of their just rights and privileges would be affected by the bill. The bill would do more than restore to the House of Commons their just and constitutional privileges, and it was nothing more than a recurrence to the principles under which the constitution of England had flourished. If he could even now be convinced that there was any thing in this bill which could weaken the just privileges and prerogatives of the House of Lords—any thing which could affect its civil faculty—he would have no hesitation in declaring that he was in the wrong, and joining the noble lords opposite in declaring the bill would be a subversion of the constitution.

power—he would tell the noble earl that the church had very seldom exercised that power with advantage to themselves, seldom to the cause which it advocated, and often with great detriment to the public.

The Duke of Cumberland would not have intruded himself on their lordships' notice, had not the noble lord opposite chosen to charge him with being adverse to the liberties of the people. He denied the charge, and now stated, before their lordships and the country at large, that no member of that or the other house would fight more strenuously for the liberties of the people than the individual who now addressed them.

Lord Grey was not aware that he had spoken of the noble duke as an enemy of the liberties of the people. What he thought he said was, that the illustrious duke prided himself on his consistent opposition to every measure for improving the rights, consolidating or extending the liberties of the country; and that, on this ground, he concurred in the opposition to the reform bill, which had been designated as revolutionary. Those, he believed, hection of the lordships; and those words he could not retract nor deny. Every measure that had been brought forward, whether for the extension of religious or civil liberties, had uniformly met the decided opposition of the illustrious duke.

The Marquis of Lansdowne said that the sense of the people had been most unequivocally expressed in favor of the reform bill, and if any thing were needed to demonstrate the soundness of the advice which His Majesty's ministers gave, it would be found in the history of the elections.—[Hear, hear.] He denied that any part of the just authority of the house would be taken away, and maintained that none of their just rights and privileges would be affected by the bill. The bill would do more than restore to the House of Commons their just and constitutional privileges, and it was nothing more than a recurrence to the principles under which the constitution of England had flourished. If he could even now be convinced that there was any thing in this bill which could weaken the just privileges and prerogatives of the House of Lords—any thing which could affect its civil faculty—he would have no hesitation in declaring that he was in the wrong, and joining the noble lords opposite in declaring the bill would be a subversion of the constitution.

The Marquis of Londonderry said, that the reform bill was not the work of Lord Grey, or any of the cabinet ministers, but of some of the underlings in their departments, and he thought it unworthy of ministers to adopt a measure introduced under such auspices. He declared, that never was there, in his opinion, a measure less called for, or more fraught with evil than the reform bill.—[Hear, hear.] He was glad to see the noble earl [Grey] decorated with that riband, but he was really at a loss to know for what public services it had been bestowed. There was no point in their whole policy, foreign or domestic, in which His Majesty's present Government could fairly claim the approbation of the country. He had heard the speech read from the throne, or the speech that was put into His Majesty's mouth, and he must say that he had never read a speech which was framed so ingeniously as that was, avoiding all topics which might lead to discussion on any essential point.—[Hear, hear, from the ministerial side]—and the only point it contained, was with reference to the cholera morbus. [Cheers and laughter.] The speech and address were so couched, that it was impossible to move an amendment, but still he might say that he considered the course pursued by Government to be most pernicious to the country.

The Lord Chancellor maintained, that the vote of the House of Commons, on the 21st of April, was tantamount to a refusal of the supplies, and what he had said on the day of the dissolution was that if any thing were necessary to justify that dissolution, the conduct of the House of Commons, the preceding night was such as to afford that

justification.—[Continued cheering on both sides.] His lordship then entered, at some length, into the history of the dissolution, and, in speaking of the power taken away by the reform bill, reminded their lordships that the noble lords on the ministerial side of the house lost more of the bad influence to be taken away, than noble lords on the other side of the house had to part with.—[Hear, hear.] In speaking of the late general election proceedings, they had been reproached with making use of the King's name in favor of the bill, when it is most largely used against that bill; and when they were told, over and over again, that the King would disavow the use of the King's name, what right had others to utter the foulest falsehoods? They committed the double crime of improperly using the King's name and falsely using it; and, on the principle that two negatives make an affirmative, so, he presumed, they thought that two parliamentary irregularities make one parliamentary regularity. His Majesty had proved himself a most gracious and paternal monarch, and had become, from the first moment of his reign, a most popular King, nor would he tarnish the virtues for which he was distinguished, by allowing any use to be made of his name which he did not think would conduce to the interests and the happiness of his people.

Lord Farnham maintained, that the disturbances in Ireland had proceeded from political causes, and charged ministers with having entered into a compromise with Mr. O'Connell.

Lord Plunkett said, that the reason why Mr. O'Connell had obtained the power he now possessed, was not because Catholic emancipation had been granted, but because it had been so long withheld.—[Hear, hear!] and denied that there had been any disturbance in Ireland, and that there was nothing in them political; they were purely a servile war, in which the occupiers of the land determined to take the law into their own hands, against the owners of it; and its practices were exercised indiscriminately against Protestant and Catholic.—[Hear, hear!] He was, however, happy to state that, before he left Ireland, he received assurance that the excitement had greatly subsided, and that the people were returning to a proper obedience to the laws. The means that had produced this restoration to tranquillity were acts of a wise and firm Government, and not the shifts of those who were unwilling to look at ultimate effects; and he would say this—they could not pay a country by prosecutions; their duty was to look at the cause, and look for an efficient remedy for that cause.

The Earl of Winchelsea disclaimed any intention of imputing revolutionary principles to the noble earl. The Duke of Cumberland would not have intruded himself on their lordships' notice, had not the noble lord opposite chosen to charge him with being adverse to the liberties of the people. He denied the charge, and now stated, before their lordships and the country at large, that no member of that or the other house would fight more strenuously for the liberties of the people than the individual who now addressed them. In what act of his, during the thirty years he had been in the house, had he ever shown a spirit of hostility to the liberties of the people? He trusted his warmth of manner would be excused, but in the situation in which he was placed, and acting with the friends around him, who were all strenuous friends of liberty, he felt it necessary to vindicate himself from the charge of being an enemy to freedom. He was for maintaining the King, the constitution, and to act for preserving to the King, to the aristocracy, and to the Commons, the enjoyment of just and equal rights and privileges. With respect to the reform bill, he took a totally different view of it from the noble lord opposite. Whenever another measure on the subject should be brought forward, he neither pledged himself to oppose nor support it; he would listen with attention to the arguments, and make up his mind impartially on the merits of the case.

Lord Grey was not aware that he had spoken of the noble duke as an enemy of the liberties of the people. What he thought he said was, that the illustrious duke prided himself on his consistent opposition to every measure for improving the rights, consolidating or extending the liberties of the country; and that, on this ground, he concurred in the opposition to the reform bill, which had been designated as revolutionary. Those, he believed, hection of the lordships; and those words he could not retract nor deny. Every measure that had been brought forward, whether for the extension of religious or civil liberties, had uniformly met the decided opposition of the illustrious duke.

The Marquis of Lansdowne said that the sense of the people had been most unequivocally expressed in favor of the reform bill, and if any thing were needed to demonstrate the soundness of the advice which His Majesty's ministers gave, it would be found in the history of the elections.—[Hear, hear.] He denied that any part of the just authority of the house would be taken away, and maintained that none of their just rights and privileges would be affected by the bill. The bill would do more than restore to the House of Commons their just and constitutional privileges, and it was nothing more than a recurrence to the principles under which the constitution of England had flourished. If he could even now be convinced that there was any thing in this bill which could weaken the just privileges and prerogatives of the House of Lords—any thing which could affect its civil faculty—he would have no hesitation in declaring that he was in the wrong, and joining the noble lords opposite in declaring the bill would be a subversion of the constitution.

The Marquis of Londonderry said, that the reform bill was not the work of Lord Grey, or any of the cabinet ministers, but of some of the underlings in their departments, and he thought it unworthy of ministers to adopt a measure introduced under such auspices. He declared, that never was there, in his opinion, a measure less called for, or more fraught with evil than the reform bill.—[Hear, hear.] He was glad to see the noble earl [Grey] decorated with that riband, but he was really at a loss to know for what public services it had been bestowed. There was no point in their whole policy, foreign or domestic, in which His Majesty's present Government could fairly claim the approbation of the country. He had heard the speech read from the throne, or the speech that was put into His Majesty's mouth, and he must say that he had never read a speech which was framed so ingeniously as that was, avoiding all topics which might lead to discussion on any essential point.—[Hear, hear, from the ministerial side]—and the only point it contained, was with reference to the cholera morbus. [Cheers and laughter.] The speech and address were so couched, that it was impossible to move an amendment, but still he might say that he considered the course pursued by Government to be most pernicious to the country.

The Lord Chancellor maintained, that the vote of the House of Commons, on the 21st of April, was tantamount to a refusal of the supplies, and what he had said on the day of the dissolution was that if any thing were necessary to justify that dissolution, the conduct of the House of Commons, the preceding night was such as to afford that

justification.—[Continued cheering on both sides.] His lordship then entered, at some length, into the history of the dissolution, and, in speaking of the power taken away by the reform bill, reminded their lordships that the noble lords on the ministerial side of the house lost more of the bad influence to be taken away, than noble lords on the other side of the house had to part with.—[Hear, hear.] In speaking of the late general election proceedings, they had been reproached with making use of the King's name in favor of the bill, when it is most largely used against that bill; and when they were told, over and over again, that the King would disavow the use of the King's name, what right had others to utter the foulest falsehoods? They committed the double crime of improperly using the King's name and falsely using it; and, on the principle that two negatives make an affirmative, so, he presumed, they thought that two parliamentary irregularities make one parliamentary regularity. His Majesty had proved himself a most gracious and paternal monarch, and had become, from the first moment of his reign, a most popular King, nor would he tarnish the virtues for which he was distinguished, by allowing any use to be made of his name which he did not think would conduce to the interests and the happiness of his people.

Lord Farnham maintained, that the disturbances in Ireland had proceeded from political causes, and charged ministers with having entered into a compromise with Mr. O'Connell.

Lord Plunkett said, that the reason why Mr. O'Connell had obtained the power he now possessed, was not because Catholic emancipation had been granted, but because it had been so long withheld.—[Hear, hear!] and denied that there had been any disturbance in Ireland, and that there was nothing in them political; they were purely a servile war, in which the occupiers of the land determined to take the law into their own hands, against the owners of it; and its practices were exercised indiscriminately against Protestant and Catholic.—[Hear, hear!] He was, however, happy to state that, before he left Ireland, he received assurance that the excitement had greatly subsided, and that the people were returning to a proper obedience to the laws. The means that had produced this restoration to tranquillity were acts of a wise and firm Government, and not the shifts of those who were unwilling to look at ultimate effects; and he would say this—they could not pay a country by prosecutions; their duty was to look at the cause, and look for an efficient remedy for that cause.

justification.—[Continued cheering on both sides.] His lordship then entered, at some length, into the history of the dissolution, and, in speaking of the power taken away by the reform bill, reminded their lordships that the noble lords on the ministerial side of the house lost more of the bad influence to be taken away, than noble lords on the other side of the house had to part with.—[Hear, hear.] In speaking of the late general election proceedings, they had been reproached with making use of the King's name in favor of the bill, when it is most largely used against that bill; and when they were told, over and over again, that the King would disavow the use of the King's name, what right had others to utter the foulest falsehoods? They committed the double crime of improperly using the King's name and falsely using it; and, on the principle that two negatives make an affirmative, so, he presumed, they thought that two parliamentary irregularities make one parliamentary regularity. His Majesty had proved himself a most gracious and paternal monarch, and had become, from the first moment of his reign, a most popular King, nor would he tarnish the virtues for which he was distinguished, by allowing any use to be made of his name which he did not think would conduce to the interests and the happiness of his people.

Lord Farnham maintained, that the disturbances in Ireland had proceeded from political causes, and charged ministers with having entered into a compromise with Mr. O'Connell.

Lord Plunkett said, that the reason why Mr. O'Connell had obtained the power he now possessed, was not because Catholic emancipation had been granted, but because it had been so long withheld.—[Hear, hear!] and denied that there had been any disturbance in Ireland, and that there was nothing in them political; they were purely a servile war, in which the occupiers of the land determined to take the law into their own hands, against the owners of it; and its practices were exercised indiscriminately against Protestant and Catholic.—[Hear, hear!] He was, however, happy to state that, before he left Ireland, he received assurance that the excitement had greatly subsided, and that the people were returning to a proper obedience to the laws. The means that had produced this restoration to tranquillity were acts of a wise and firm Government, and not the shifts of those who were unwilling to look at ultimate effects; and he would say this—they could not pay a country by prosecutions; their duty was to look at the cause, and look for an efficient remedy for that cause.

The Earl of Winchelsea disclaimed any intention of imputing revolutionary principles to the noble earl. The Duke of Cumberland would not have intruded himself on their lordships' notice, had not the noble lord opposite chosen to charge him with being adverse to the liberties of the people. He denied the charge, and now stated, before their lordships and the country at large, that no member of that or the other house would fight more strenuously for the liberties of the people than the individual who now addressed them. In what act of his, during the thirty years he had been in the house, had he ever shown a spirit of hostility to the liberties of the people? He trusted his warmth of manner would be excused, but in the situation in which he was placed, and acting with the friends around him, who were all strenuous friends of liberty, he felt it necessary to vindicate himself from the charge of being an enemy to freedom. He was for maintaining the King, the constitution, and to act for preserving to the King, to the aristocracy, and to the Commons, the enjoyment of just and equal rights and privileges. With respect to the reform bill, he took a totally different view of it from the noble lord opposite. Whenever another measure on the subject should be brought forward, he neither pledged himself to oppose nor support it; he would listen with attention to the arguments, and make up his mind impartially on the merits of the case.

Lord Grey was not aware that he had spoken of the noble duke as an enemy of the liberties of the people. What he thought he said was, that the illustrious duke prided himself on his consistent opposition to every measure for improving the rights, consolidating or extending the liberties of the country; and that, on this ground, he concurred in the opposition to the reform bill, which had been designated as revolutionary. Those, he believed, hection of the lordships; and those words he could not retract nor deny. Every measure that had been brought forward, whether for the extension of religious or civil liberties, had uniformly met the decided opposition of the illustrious duke.

The Marquis of Lansdowne said that the sense of the people had been most unequivocally expressed in favor of the reform bill, and if any thing were needed to demonstrate the soundness of the advice which His Majesty's ministers gave, it would be found in the history of the elections.—[Hear, hear.] He denied that any part of the just authority of the house would be taken away, and maintained that none of their just rights and privileges would be affected by the bill. The bill would do more than restore to the House of Commons their just and constitutional privileges, and it was nothing more than a recurrence to the principles under which the constitution of England had flourished. If he could even now be convinced that there was any thing in this bill which could weaken the just privileges and prerogatives of the House of Lords—any thing which could affect its civil faculty—he would have no hesitation in declaring that he was in the wrong, and joining the noble lords opposite in declaring the bill would be a subversion of the constitution.

The Marquis of Londonderry said, that the reform bill was not the work of Lord Grey, or any of the cabinet ministers, but of some of the underlings in their departments, and he thought it unworthy of ministers to adopt a measure introduced under such auspices. He declared, that never was there, in his opinion, a measure less called for, or more fraught with evil than the reform bill.—[Hear, hear.] He was glad to see the noble earl [Grey] decorated with that riband, but he was really at a loss to know for what public services it had been bestowed. There was no point in their whole policy, foreign or domestic, in which His Majesty's present Government could fairly claim the approbation of the country. He had heard the speech read from the throne, or the speech that was put into His Majesty's mouth, and he must say that he had never read a speech which was framed so ingeniously as that was, avoiding all topics which might lead to discussion on any essential point.—[Hear, hear, from the ministerial side]—and the only point it contained, was with reference to the cholera morbus. [Cheers and laughter.] The speech and address were so couched, that it was impossible to move an amendment, but still he might say that he considered the course pursued by Government to be most pernicious to the country.

The Lord Chancellor maintained, that the vote of the House of Commons, on the 21st of April, was tantamount to a refusal of the supplies, and what he had said on the day of the dissolution was that if any thing were necessary to justify that dissolution, the conduct of the House of Commons, the preceding night was such as to afford that

justification.—[Continued cheering on both sides.] His lordship then entered, at some length, into the history of the dissolution, and, in speaking of the power taken away by the reform bill, reminded their lordships that the noble lords on the ministerial side of the house lost more of the bad influence to be taken away, than noble lords on the other side of the house had to part with.—[Hear, hear.] In speaking of the late general election proceedings, they had been reproached with making use of the King's name in favor of the bill, when it is most largely used against that bill; and when they were told, over and over again, that the King would disavow the use of the King's name, what right had others to utter the foulest falsehoods? They committed the double crime of improperly using the King's name and falsely using it; and, on the principle that two negatives make an affirmative, so, he presumed, they thought that two parliamentary irregularities make one parliamentary regularity. His Majesty had proved himself a most gracious and paternal monarch, and had become, from the first moment of his reign, a most popular King, nor would he tarnish the virtues for which he was distinguished, by allowing any use to be made of his name which he did not think would conduce to the interests and the happiness of his people.

Lord Farnham maintained, that the disturbances in Ireland had proceeded from political causes, and charged ministers with having entered into a compromise with Mr. O'Connell.

Lord Plunkett said, that the reason why Mr. O'Connell had obtained the power he now possessed, was not because Catholic emancipation had been granted, but because it had been so long withheld.—[Hear, hear!] and denied that there had been any disturbance in Ireland, and that there was nothing in them political; they were purely a servile war, in which the occupiers of the land determined to take the law into their own hands, against the owners of it; and its practices were exercised indiscriminately against Protestant and Catholic.—[Hear, hear!] He was, however, happy to state that, before he left Ireland, he received assurance that the excitement had greatly subsided, and that the people were returning to a proper obedience to the laws. The means that had produced this restoration to tranquillity were acts of a wise and firm Government, and not the shifts of those who were unwilling to look at ultimate effects; and he would say this—they could not pay a country by prosecutions; their duty was to look at the cause, and look for an efficient remedy for that cause.

The Earl of Winchelsea disclaimed any intention of imputing revolutionary principles to the noble earl. The Duke of Cumberland would not have intruded himself on their lordships' notice, had not the noble lord opposite chosen to charge him with being adverse to the liberties of the people. He denied the charge, and now stated, before their lordships and the country at large, that no member of that or the other house would fight more strenuously for the liberties of the people than the individual who now addressed them. In what act of his, during the thirty years he had been in the house, had he ever shown a spirit of hostility to the liberties of the people? He trusted his warmth of manner would be excused, but in the situation in which he was placed, and acting with the friends around him, who were all strenuous friends of liberty, he felt it necessary to vindicate himself from the charge of being an enemy to freedom. He was for maintaining the King, the constitution, and to act for preserving to the King, to the aristocracy, and to the Commons, the enjoyment of just and equal rights and privileges. With respect to the reform bill, he took a totally different view of it from the noble lord opposite. Whenever another measure on the subject should be brought forward, he neither pledged himself to oppose nor support it; he would listen with attention to the arguments, and make up his mind impartially on the merits of the case.

Lord Grey was not aware that he had spoken of the noble duke as an enemy of the liberties of the people. What he thought he said was, that the illustrious duke prided himself on his consistent opposition to every measure for improving the rights, consolidating or extending the liberties of the country; and that, on this ground, he concurred in the opposition to the reform bill, which had been designated as revolutionary. Those, he believed, hection of the lordships; and those words he could not retract nor deny. Every measure that had been brought forward, whether for the extension of religious or civil liberties, had uniformly met the decided opposition of the illustrious duke.

The Marquis of Lansdowne said that the sense of the people had been most unequivocally expressed in favor of the reform bill, and if any thing were needed to demonstrate the soundness of the advice which His Majesty's ministers gave, it would be found in the history of the elections.—[Hear, hear.] He denied that any part of the just authority of the house would be taken away, and maintained that none of their just rights and privileges would be affected by the bill. The bill would do more than restore to the House of Commons their just and constitutional privileges, and it was nothing more than a recurrence to the principles under which the constitution of England had flourished. If he could even now be convinced that there was any thing in this bill which could weaken the just privileges and prerogatives of the House of Lords—any thing which could affect its civil faculty—he would have no hesitation in declaring that he was in the wrong, and joining the noble lords opposite in declaring the bill would be a subversion of the constitution.

The Marquis of Londonderry said, that the reform bill was not the work of Lord Grey, or any of the cabinet ministers, but of some of the underlings in their departments, and he thought it unworthy of ministers to adopt a measure introduced under such auspices. He declared, that never was there, in his opinion, a measure

