To the Editor of Haszard's Gazette.

Sir;

I had just commenced to write a reply to another of the queries proposed by "Inquirer," which in consideration of the demands on your space, from the business of the country, I had delayed doing, when your paper containing a second communication over the same signature, in reply, ostensibly to my first, was put into my hands; which obliges me in the meantime to desist from my original purpose and turn my attention to it.

His vanity appears to have been wounded by my prefatory remarks; but beyond what the truth and a sense of self-respect required me to say, I had no desire to give offence. I did not indeed consider him a "respectable antagonist," nor one by whose advocacy the interests of any cause, be it good or bad, was likely to be promoted. It was easy to detect under the garb of an inquirer, the confident controversialist, whose eagerness to engage in the affray, cannot be better expressed than in the words of one of the disputants with Job; "*I will answer also my part, I also will shew mine opinion. For I am full of matter; the spirit within me constraineth me Behold my belly is as wine which hath no vent; it is ready to burst like new bottles, I will speak that I may be refreshed I will open my lips and answer.*" This, with the vagueness and indefiniteness, of the questions, proposed for solution and the difficulty of perceiving the object for which they were put, (and indeed I did not understand them, until after the second communication) bespoke a compound of ignorance, confidence and conceit, that deserves to be met with silent contempt, and but for the circumstances stated in my paper would have been. The impression produced by his first, is confirmed and deepened by his second apearance.

It will be observed that he accuses me of a want of *manly straight-forwardness*, and on two grounds; 1st. *I have replied to one query only*; 2d. *and to that in a peculiar way.* Now, as to the first, I ask, Did I profess to have done more? Was not my answer in reply to the first, long enough for a newspaper communication? Might he not, before preferring such an accusa tion, on such a ground, have waited a little to see, whether I would meet the objections that I conjectured to be involved in the remainder as in the first? And as to the second, the charge can apply in one way only, and a *very peculiar* way indeed—that the meaning, I attach to the terms of the Abrahamic covenant, is very different from his. In no other way can it apply. I did not take for granted the meaning of the terms as given by me; in endeavouring to prove it, I did not resort to any quibbling or artifice, neither did I seek to evade any conclusion I should come to, by a strictly logical process. The interpretatioh given is not peculiar. I am not aware that I differ from the opinions entertained on the subject by the various divisions of the Protestant Church; at least, if so, let any Clergyman, Episcopalian, Baptist, Methodist or Presbyterian, who has received an Academical education, and therefore is supposed to understand the views held by his own denomination signify his dissent from my interpretation; if he does, that there may be no mistake, I repeat the proposition embracing my view. I endeavored to demonstrate "*under the promise of the land of Canaan then was conveyed to Abraham and to his seed a two fold boon, one to be realized in the natural, and the other in the resurrection state—a mingled and temporary good before, and a complete and permanent one after, the restitution of all things by the Messiah.*" Among other reasons adduced in proof, I remarked, that we had a divine warrant for asserting, that Abraham himself understood the promise to relate principally to Heaven, which understanding was sanctioned by God, since the Patriarch's belief is recorded among the triumphs of faith, and that it was declared very plainly by implication, both by the Apostle Paul, and the Lord Jesus Christ, that the promise did involve the resurrection from the dead. I might have referred to authorities; so far as it is in my power to consult commentators, their voice is in my favour; but I have not chosen to rely on their opinions, much less called on the public to rest their belief on my assertion. I have argued the matter on scriptural grounds. This has been my way; now look to my opponent's way, he denies the correctness of my interpretation, but makes no attempt to prove that it is incorrect, and what is more strange offers no evidence in favour of the sense he attaches to the words that he is right and I am wrong, he calls on the world to believe on his *ipse dixit* "*it is a plain declaration*" he says "*about the earthly Canaan, there is no mysticism about it.*" What ideas he may attach to *peculiarity of way* and *manly straightforwardness* I know not. But I doubt, if the world will not concur with me in thinking, that he is the most *peculiar and manly person in his way* that has appeared for some time. The Scribes and the Pharisees loved, we are told, to be greeted with the title of Rabbi, and aspired to the highest honours and places of dignity, but with all their pomposity, they never ventured, notwithstanding their education, the best their age and country could give, to "*teach as having authority*"—they never asserted the prerogative to dictate to the people what they should believe. To this high and giddy eminence however "Inquirer" has attained? The designation he has chosen for himself is singularly inconsistent with his position; why should he not assume the honours and take the title which belongs to the man *who is wiser in his own conceit than seven men who can render a reason.*

Disposed as I am under all ordinary circumstances, to follow the rule observed by wise men in such cases, and to respect the privileges which belongs to persons of his order, of saying what they please without contradiction, the reasons already adverted to necessitates a departure from it, and to prevent the dispute from becoming unprofitable. I must recall his attention to the starting point; the first question to be determined is, what is there in the Abrahamic covenant which makes it a necessity that the Jews shall as a nation reoccupy the Land of Canaan. This question I have answered briefly—too briefly indeed to do full justice to myself or to the argument. The fact stated in the proposition I did establish though "Inquirer" says no, and if it be a fact that the *earthly Canaan* was neither designed nor understood to be the *ultimate* and *proper inheritance*, but merely a *type* of it, and if the occupation of the earthly Canaan by the natural seed be a *type* and no more than a *type* of this occupation by a redeemed church, then it may easily be seen by an intelligent public even if nothing had been said about it, that the typical relation of the natural seed to the Land of Canaan does not *of itself* require or properly admit even of a restoration to it. There may be reasons connected with the future purposes of God which require this restoration of the Jews as a people to their ancient territory, which reasons in so far as they ar edisclosed in prophecy, we shall by and by examine; at present we contend that there is nothing in their original connection with the land that does. The typical relation has ceased like all the other types to exist for the last 1800 years. What reason can be alleged for the revival of this one type that cannot be brought to prove the restoration of all the rest. There is just as much ground to expect at a future day from their typical character the revival of sacrifice, the rebuilding of the temple, the resurrection of the Levitical Priesthood, and the services generally which were ordained by the law of Moses as there is for the restoration of the Jews on the ground of their once typical relation to the land, or original connection with it arising out of the Abrahamic covenant. I am aware indeed that there are those who expect the rebuilding of the temple for its former purposes, and it is certain that "Inquirer" is of the number, else he employs language without meaning. But if any one will peruse the New Testament, the epistle to the Galatians in particular, or evon the statement of our Lord, that the "*hour cometh when neither in Jerusalem nor in this mountain shall men worship the Father,*" he will perceive that such expectation is vain. *A type contained within itself, a pledge of its own dissolution, and a standing promise of something infinitely better in its place.* That which Canaan as a typical inheritance promised was Heaven, the inheritance which is "*incorruptible, undefiled and*" *that* (not as the shadow had just done) "*fadeth not away*"

The law as we are told was a shadow of good things *to come*, and what is true of the whole must be true of all its parts. While the law stood the *good things* were *to come—future.* When those good things did come, the shadows *disapeared.* When the fulness of the time arrived old things *passed away*, and a new order of things *came in sight.* The decisive moment of change was that when the Lord bowed his head and gave up the ghost. As he exclaimed "*It is finished*" "*the veil of the temple was rent.*" The sanctuary transferred to Heaven, Jerusalem ceased to be the city of the Great King, Canaan His land, and the Jews as such His subjects, *their typical character and their typical relation or original connection with the land was dissolved*; and against the recurrence to such a state of things, the words *it is finished*, oppose an unsurmountable barrier. When Christ *died* all that was flesh in the Mosaic dispensation died too. In effect were uttered the words, which the forerunner was destined to cry, as he announced the immediate approach of the Messiah, *all flesh is grass, and all the goodliness thereof is as the flower of the field, the grass withereth, the flower fadeth, but the word our of God shall stand forever.* All that was carnal, all the beggarly elements of this world—the world as it stood before Christ should fade away, but the eternal truths shrouded in those carnalities should continue, The promise made to Abraham should be sure to *all* the seed through the envelope in which it was contained should be flung to the winds or trodden in the dust.

Such is the argument from the Abrahamic covenant on the original connection with the Land of Canaan, the typical relation of the people with the land contained within itself a *a pledge of its dissolution never to be renewed.* I do not say, it required that the land should not be inhabited by the people after such dissolution and events have proved it did not forbid their dispossession. For aught I can see so far as this branch of the argument is concerned, the Jews might have continued to possess the land, in the same sense as the inhabitants of France possess France, provided they had con formed to the new order of things, embraced Christianity and turned their Temple into a Christian Chapel. But when they refused to receive Christ or consent to the peaceful abrogation of the Mosaic services, Infinite Wisdom judged it proper, among other reasons, for this to remove a stumbling block from the Christian Church, to cause them to be abolished by force which involved the dispersion of the Jews to the four winds of heaven; and now being as they are, nothing can be inferred from the Abrahamic covenant as to the intentions of God with respect to them. We cannot certainly infer from it, that they will or will not be restored in whole or in part. It leaves us totally in the dark except on one point. It forbids the idea, that they shall be restored wholly or partially to the same state they were before the same typical relation to it. Whether God has given grounds to believe they will be restored in whole or in part to dwell in the land, as we inhabit P. E Island; we shall see when we come to the prophecies.

But I have not forgotten that "Inquirer" disputed the symbolic character of the word Canaan in the covenant on its reference to Heaven. Let him shew it has no such reference. Let him shew, that the reasons I gave in my last have no force. When he has demolished my reasoning in respect, to this let him answer the following objections to his view: 1st. How is the veracity of God then to be defended. 2d. How can that be an everlasting possession to individuals, who at best can live but a moment in it and must exist throughout eternal duration apart from it? 3d. How came the seal of the covenant to be discontinued after the Messiah and at the date of dispersion? What token or seal have the Jews (on his principles) exclusively the seed to which they can refer as an assurance of their hopes? Why should God not be ashamed to be called their God, when he had provided nothing better for them than a place on earth, in which to dwell for *a few days* and those *full of evil*?

He asks (Query 2) with great confidence, if the promise has been fulfilled and he tells us in his 2d paper, it has never been; from which he infers it will be. No such inference can be drawn but if he is right in his definition (*a plain declaration about the earthly Canaan*) one of two things must follow. 1st. God having promised the land, the whole land, and nothing less, and confirmed the same by oath, to Abraham and his seed in the line of Isaac, has not redeemed His promise (as he says himself he did in the case of Abraham, Genesis 35, 12; though "Inquirer" says, he did not nor yet to his seed to this day,) then it is not true that the seed (*to all of whom the promise is sure*) are out of the land, and it is a libel on God to say they *need to be restored*; if neither, then "Inquirer" is utterly ignorant of the matter.

Pastor.

(*From the Church Witness.*)

Sir,—After a careful perusal of a letter published in a local paper in answer to my last, by the Rector of St. Paul's, I am still in some doubt as to my interpretation of it.

Alluding to the Bishop and the Bible Society, he says—The Bishop never objected to any clergyman taking part in it; but the position in which a Rector, in his own parish, may be placed, is what seemed to the Bishop inadmissible; and further, that he (the Rector) had heretofore waived the consideration due to his office as Rector of the Established Church; but as the Bishop viewed his presence under such circumstances in a different light, and as his his objections seemed to him to embrace a point of Church discipline, he yielded, &c., and yet after this, he tells us that though it was the Bishop's prescribed course of action which virtually kept him from the platform at the Bible meeting, it was "not at *all clear* to him that the Bishop intended it should do so."

Now from this and other parts of his letter, I seem only to gather a confirmation of what I before believed, viz.: that the Bishop *does* object to the attendance of Rectors (and, I suppose I may say, the clergy generally) at any public meetings of the Bible and like societies, presided over by laymen, unless what he conceives their right to conduct the devotions of that meeting above and before all ministers of other denominations, be acknowledged and allowed.

It would be well, if the Bishop or Rector would explain on what ground a claim so novel and preposterous is founded; and what consideration is due to a Rector of the Established Church in his parish, which is not *equally* due to every other minister of the gospel then and there present. Of what real value is the Bishop's declaration, that he has never objected to any clergyman taking part in the Bible Society, or the Rector's assertion, that his lordship does not expect the clergy to separate from it, when their attendance is shackled with a condition so offensive to other ministers and their people, and which the Bishop must know can never be submitted to by them? Does he not thus virtually nullify his declared non-objection?

Am I not, therefore, justified in saying, that the Bishop does, practically at least, hinder, if not denounce, those who would make their prayers for unity a reality? If this intolerant condition be made the rule, what manifestation of unity and fellowship can there be? the very first element of such fellowship requiring a mutual recognition of common brotherhood, as servants of that Master who cautions them especially against this assumption of superiority, and who only recognizes the greatness of those who are pre-eminent in humility; a grace as foreign to this assumption, as its enforcement would, I feel sure, be repugnant to many both of the clergy and laity of the Church of England.

I was not aware, that, in pleading the right of a clergyman to use his own judgment in things indifferent, I was setting aside the force of ordination vows, or that they required, as set forth by the Rector, the absolute surrender of all right of judgment to the will of the Bishop, *except* in the extreme case of *that* being contrary to the commands of God. If this indeed be the case (and it is a subject for grave consideration,) the apostolic injunction quoted by the Rector, "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind," seems a mere mockery, for of what avail will it be, to form a conviction which he may never be permitted to carry out.

It will be unnecessary for me to comment at any length on the remarks as to what took place at the late Bible meeting, as they are irrelevant to the subject of my letter, and as the only speech in which allusion was made to "High Church" will shortly be published. I shall therefore content myself in asserting my belief that when read, the sentiments expressed therein, so far from confirming the grave charge of "being injurious to the true interests of the Bible Society, and highly unchristian"—holding them up to public contempt, and perhaps hatred, because they do not give their five shillings or their pound where we give ours,"—will, on the contrary, find a hearty response in the breast of your readers, and be strictly consistent with the high and unsullied Christian character so universally accorded to the speaker by all classes in this community.

Viglanter.

Bermuda, April 3.—*Yellow Fever on board H. M. S. Argus—Death of two of her Officers.*—H. M. steamer Argus, commander Purvis, arrived on Sunday last from *Jamaica*, Havana. We are pained to learn, that the Argus had several cases of yellow fever on board, and that some seven or eight have terminated fatally. Among the deaths are Lieut. Wm. F Gallock, second lieutenant of the Argus, and Assistant Surgeon Daily, loaned from the Boscawen to the Argus. The bodies of Dr. Daily and two of the seamen were removed from the Argus yesterday and buried at Ports Island.

We understand that the Argus was sent to Bermuda by Admiral Fanshawe as soon as the fever made its appearance on board that vessel, and Captain Seymour of H. M. S. Pembroke, the senior naval officer here ordered her to Ports Island, to be thoroughly cleaned and fumigated. The Argus arrived at Halifax on Monday last.

Canada.—The Canada *Gazelle* announces the appointment of Hon. Etienne Paschel Tasche to be Speaker of the Legislative Council of the Province, in room of Hon. John Ross, resigned; and of Joseph Curran Morrison, Esq., Q. C., to be a member of the Executive Council.

A bill to make the Legislative Council elective by the people has passed the Canadian House of Assembly by the overwhelming majority of 81 to 12.

Flour and Wheat.—A late letter from Paris says:—"The number of barrels of American flour at this moment in store in Havre is 250,000; of wheat 251,082 hectolitre (a hectolitre is about 25-6 Winchester Bushels). To these figures add the quantities known to be on sea destined for the port of Havre, viz:—54,000 barrels of flour and 62,000 hectolitres of wheat, and the sum total will be 304,000 barrels of flour and 313,000 hectolitres of wheat."

Information has been received by the *Arabia*, that five regiments of the Line and two batteries of Artillery are to be immediately despatched from the Crimea to British North America. Two regiments, the 62nd and 63rd, will come to Halifax, and with the 76th, which will remain here for the present, will be under the command of Major General Sir Gaspard Le Marchant.—*Nova Scotian.*

The *Alexandria Sentinel* announces the death of Mr. George Wise of that city at an advanced age. He was the last survivor of the pall-bearers who officiated at the funeral of Gen. Washington.