

most step, a year afterwards, was the closing of the places of worship themselves of these congregations, as belonging to no religious community "recognised and paid by the State." The assemblies were, therefore, illegal, under the decree of the 25th of March, 1852, prohibiting all meetings whatever, unless of "recognised" bodies, or by "previous authorization," and placing all infractions of the decree under the jurisdiction of the police. The question was, as I think I mentioned at the time, brought before the Court of Cassation, when the police first interfered with religious assemblies, and was by it decided in favour of the police authorities; on which occasion it was, if I mistake not, that a distinguished counsel, ex-Procureur-General of the court, took his robe in open court, declared that there was no longer law or justice in France, and has never since appeared in the ranks of the bar. Perhaps the decree and the decision might be a necessity of the times in order to enable the Government to put down assemblies of demagogues under whatever pretence, but it is evident that the law was intended only to be held in *terrorem* over the heads of certain parties, not to be taken advantage of and forced into an instrument of persecution against those whose proceedings were known to be wholly innocent. Hard, however, as the decision bore upon the consciences of those persons, the law was scrupulously respected so long as a remedy appeared open to them in the shape of a formal application to the civil power for the requisite "authorization préalable" to hold their religious meetings. Every effort was made through the usual channels to obtain this; but although the applications were at once most respectful and respectable, although not a shadow of suspicion existed as to any political object whatsoever being involved in the rest and its followers, and although it was known that they differed in no respect, except in their refusal to accept the stipend of the State from the rest of their Protestant brethren, every attempt to obtain the necessary authority to celebrate public worship in their own way proved unsuccessful. Then such consequences as usually follow from the adoption of such a policy began to show themselves. The meetings were held first in private houses, then in the open field, and then in the woods. Decrees of the Prefect appeared prohibiting the assemblies, and *procès-verbaux* were drawn up by the Commissioners of Police. At last an action was commenced against the ministers and certain members of their congregation. The culprits presented themselves before the tribunals, surrounded by vast numbers of their co-religionists from all the neighbouring villages, of all classes, sects, and ages, with an advocate of the Paris bar at their head, and accompanied by M. de Presseur, one of the best known of the ministers of the Evangelical persuasion in Paris. No attempt was made to deny the accusation; on the contrary, and declared openly that they had attended these meetings as a duty of conscience, and one very aged, grey haired man in particular informed his judges that "he had not gone very often to the preaching, but always as often as he could." The whole scene is described as having produced a very profound impression in the locality where it took place, even upon those who differed entirely from the persons concerned. It was distinctly shown that there was no difference in the doctrine, teaching, conduct, or mode of exhibiting their public worship, between these and other Protestant bodies. The instigators of the prosecution—or rather persecution—were certainly not their brethren of the national establishment, who have constantly afforded them commiseration and support, though deprecating their separation. There can be no doubt to what influence these proceedings owe their origin, and one is at a loss to decide whose conduct is the most pitiable—thy who, from a spirit of persecution, take advantage of the letter of the law and call in the force of the secular arm to their aid, or the conduct of the civil authorities in allowing such a possibility of abuse to continue to exist. The culprits were, of course, condemned and fined by the tribunals. I am glad to be informed, however, that the fine has been remitted by the Imperial clemency; but the fact of such prosecution being instituted at all is disgraceful in a country where liberty of conscience and religious liberty are so often boasted of by the present powers as one of the first and most glorious fruits of the principles of the "great revolution."—*Corresp. of London Guardian.*

A Berlin despatch says that discontent in Poland and the Ukraine has risen to a very serious height at two successive calls for enlistment, and that a survey is about to be made to see if Poland can furnish sufficient corn for the supply of the army during another campaign, and the result will greatly influence Russia as to the continuance of the war.

UNITED STATES.

The Examiner (the Baptist Paper of this city) quotes a late article of ours in which we say, (referring to some Baptist comments upon the Methodist Bishops)—

Do those who "ordain preachers" among the Baptists "derive their power" from any but a "human source?" Or, instead of originating in the New Testament, have they any better source of power than the Methodist "Bishop" ordained by John Wesley?

To this the Examiner replies:—

Our answer to the first question here put, is this: The Baptists disclaim the right to exercise any church power that is derived from a merely "human source." Our answer to the second question is, that the power which we do exercise in ordaining preachers, or in performing any other act pertaining to the office of a church, flows from "the Law of Christ" alone; and that is a "better source of power" than the succession of "Methodist Bishops ordained by John Wesley," or the succession of Anglican Bishops transmitted by the Papal Church of Rome.

This sounds very plausible. But let us try it in practice. We find, for instance, a Mr. Jones, who is, as we are told, a Baptist minister. We consult "the Law of Christ alone," and we find not a syllable said about Mr. Jones. Mr. Jones, then, does not derive his ministry "from the Law of Christ alone." On inquiry we find that he was actually ordained by some other Baptist ministers. This is manifestly deriving his ministry from other ministers, and not "from the Law of Christ alone." It is a ministerial succession, just as completely as ours is, or is that of the Church of Rome. This first link implies logically the whole chain. And in as much as the whole chain is rendered useless if it fail to connect at the further end, it is of the highest importance to find out what the Baptist succession succeeds from? Does it succeed from Christ and his Apostles? or does it succeed from Roger Williams and Ezekiel H. Luman? It must succeed from somewhere or other: unless in "the Law of Christ alone" we can find out all about Mr. Jones.

The Examiner says again:—

The Law of Christ furnishes to every Church a clear warrant for the appointment of pastors, (who are also called Elders, and *episcopoi* or overseers) and for the appointment of Deacons. But it furnishes no warrant for the ordination, by human hands, of a class of officers who have authority over pastors, and who take rank with the apostles themselves as their official successors. This claim to an apostolic rank above the rank of pastors, is put forth by the Episcopal Bishops.

The Law of Christ furnishes no warrant for the appointment of pastors by the Church—meaning thereby, the congregation of believers. We read that Elders were ordained in every city, but they were thus ordained, not by the congregation, but by the Apostles. Nor were Deacons ordained by the congregation, though the persons to be thus ordained were thus chosen. But their authority as Deacons was derived solely from the Apostles themselves. "Look ye out among you seven men . . . whom we may appoint over this business" . . . "whom they set before the Apostles: and when they had prayed, they laid their hands on them."

As to a class of officers having authority over pastors:—we find that Timothy is to "lay hands *subtly* on no man," thus proving that he had the power of laying on of hands. He is to receive an accusation against an elder only under certain conditions: thus proving that he had the power of Discipline over them, as well as of ordaining them. Thus, also, another of this "class," was "appointed" to "ordain elders in every city"—precisely the same terms as are in other places used of the Apostles themselves. He is also told to "exhort and rebuke with all authority."

That they are to take rank with the Apostles themselves as their official successors, (and even as their official associates while they were still alive,) is evident from the fact of their being associated with them in the authoritative opening of the Epistles: "Paul and Timothy," (Ep. to Philom.) "Paul and Silvanus and Timothy" (1 and 2 Thessal.) &c. It is evident also from their being called "Apostles," with many others, as Barnabas, Andronicus, Junias, Epaphroditus, James (the Lord's brother) and Luke.

But were the members of this "class" ordained "by human hands?" Take Timothy for a sample. S. Paul said to him, "Stir up the gift of God, which is in thee, by the putting on of my hands." And S. Paul's hands, to suppose the Examiner will grant, were human hands.

"This claim to an Apostolic rank above the rank of pastors, is put forth by the Episcopal Bishops." Certainly it is. And they not only put it forth, but make it good, "by the Law of Christ."

But the Examiner says:—

We question this claim. Do they sustain it by

showing such proof as Paul exhibited when his apostleship was questioned? Do they say, as he did, "Truly the signs of an apostle were wrought among you in all patience, in signs, and wonders, and mighty deeds?" (3 Cor. 12: 12.) Can they adopt his appeal—"Have I not seen Jesus Christ our Lord?" (1 Cor. 9: 1.) Can they aver that they have received their commission directly from Him—"not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father who raised him from the dead?" (Gal. 1: 1.) When they can thus sustain their claim to apostolic authority, we will duly honor and obey them.

To the call for miracles, we reply by asking the Editor of the Examiner if he is a believer in "the Gospel?" If he is let him prove it by S. Mark. XVI: 17, 18. "And these signs shall follow them that believe; in my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents; and if they drink any thing deadly, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover." Now can the Editor of the Examiner cast out devils, drink poison unhurt, and heal the sick with a touch? If not, of course he cannot be a believer, because he has not the signs of a believer. He must therefore, (according to his own logic) be a hypocrite and an infidel.

That our Bishops now receive their commissions directly from Christ, we never were fools enough to claim: for we could then dispense with the succession. It is our Baptist brethren who claim to hold their ministry directly "from the Law of Christ alone;" and yet they can show us nothing in the Bible about Mr. Jones. Our Bishops hold their commissions—like Timothy, Titus, Silas, Barnabas, Andronicus, Junias, Epaphroditus, James, Luke, and others, by the laying on of the human hands of those who had duly received the same high ministry before them, in direct line up to the Apostles themselves.

If the Examiner will only give a full and honest examination to the Scriptural argument alone in favor of our Bishops, we have no doubt that he will soon "duly honor and obey them."—*New York Church Journal.*

Editorial & Miscellany.

There are a number of very bad boys in Halifax, as any one may observe, who witness their pranks on the wharves and in the streets, in the daytime and after dark. Many of them cannot be unknown to the Police, and they frequently come under the surveillance of the authorities for their misconduct. The case alluded to is one in which a little severity may produce some good: for it is evident that the injunction, "train up a child in the way he should go, &c.," has not been carefully attended to. A reformatory school in our city prison for precocious urchins, instead of the contamination of the society of old offenders, might have a good effect; and if all the young criminals that roam our streets had justice meted out to them, it would not want pupils, who might, in after years, bless the hands that, by a little wholesome severity of discipline, had rescued them from the path of destruction:—

A child, aged only ten years, was brought before the Mayor on Monday last for having stolen 42s. 6d. from Thomas Wallace. The money was taken from a box in a cart while standing in the street. The boy confessed taking the money, and gave a statement of its disbursement. With a younger brother and another youth about his own age, he engaged a conveyance, first to the railway depot, then to the three mile house, and subsequently to the Dockyard, paying for the whole, 10s. They called in at different places to regale themselves with wine and biscuit, sarsaparilla and spruce, and other luxuries,—the amount paid for all of which had been regularly noted and the parties who furnished the same summoned to the police office, where they were called upon to refund,—so that nearly the whole amount has been recovered. The father of the boy appeared, but seemed strangely in different about his fate, and the magistrates, who were much at a loss to know how to best act under the circumstances, ordered the boy in charge of the keeper of the Bridewell for the present."—*Ed.*

The Mariners Royal Benevolent Society, London, have awarded the Gold Medal of the Corporation to Capt. McKeen, and the silver medal to each of the men serving under him, for their exertions in rescuing the crew and passengers of the *Arcadia*, and of other vessels wrecked on the dangerous shores of Sable Island. The medals were forwarded for presentation to Miss Dix, who is now in Switzerland, and through whose representation the honor has been obtained, and were received in Halifax by the *L. R. M. Steamship* from England.

Belcher's Map of Nova Scotia, the second Edition, corrected by the latest surveys to 1855, and containing full road routes and other information, is now before the public, and can be had at the Bookstore of W. Goswip, 23 Granville Street.

Among the many officers of the British army with whom the citizens of Halifax have held familiar converse, who met their deaths during the campaign before Sebastopol, we have to regret the loss of Quarter Master John McDonald, of the 72nd Highlanders. The gallant soldier was shot through the lungs on the day of the final storming of the Russian works, from the effects of which he died within a week after receiving his wound. Mr. McDonald, although yet a young man, at the time of his untimely end, rose from the ranks in the 72nd, having been promoted to the rank of Quarter Master of that corps while serving in New Brunswick, 30 April, '52.—*Chron.*