

hardly say, that the assertion contained in the sentence above quoted is one that has long been stoutly maintained by the Romanist. Once prove that human power is not inferior to that of Heaven,—that the ability to forgive and punish rests equally with the Creator and the creature, and what sacrifices shall not be made to purify the soul, what bribes shall be sufficient to satisfy the greedy man in whom this power lives? If sins may be forgiven, forgiveness may be purchased, and if forgiveness may be purchased, sinfulness may be indulged. Not so, says Dr. Pusey; for "true repentance must precede the priest's forgiveness;" but true repentance has already gained the forgiveness of the sinner's Saviour. The pardon of the priest is useless, or is worse. If repentance is sufficient for pardon, priestly conflation is not required; if insufficient, priestly favour cannot be impartial, since it may be bought, and the rich only can make sure of the blessing.

THE KNOWLEDGE OF CHRIST, is his cleansing us from the guilt of sin; purifying our hearts by faith from the love of it; and clothing us with his perfect righteousness. This is his salvation.—*Adam.*

THE TRIUMPH OF FAITH.—Faith triumphs over self-unworthiness, and sin, and death, and the law; shrouding the soul under the mantle of Jesus Christ—and there it is safe. All accusations fall off, having nowhere to fasten, unless some blemish could be found in that righteousness, in which faith hath wrapped itself. This is the very spring of solid peace, and fills the soul with peace and joy.—*Leighton.*

THE BIBLE, THE SURE GUIDE TO PEACE.—O slighted Bible!—I feel—I feel that every deviation from the right way, every foolish and wicked thing that I have said or done, has been owing to a disregard of thy counsel; every misery and mischief into which I have fallen, has been through a neglect of thy warning! How true is that saying in my own experience, "Oh that thou hadst hearkened unto me, then had thy peace been like a river!" What peace would now remain if it were not for the Gospel?—When the heart turns away from the confusions and disturbances to which it is continually exposed, in a world of sin and sorrow, and taking wings flies to the bosom of God; when the voice of Christ, walking in the night on the troubled waters, is heard: "It is I, be not afraid;"—this is peace. And this, too, is his own direction for obtaining it: "In the world ye shall have tribulation, but in Me, ye shall have peace. Be of good cheer: I have overcome the world."—*Cecil.*

The Berean.

QUEBEC, THURSDAY, MARCH 5, 1846.

We have inserted an article from the London Times upon Dr. Pusey's recent sermon—not as if that journal were an authority on questions of doctrinal soundness, nor as if we wished to point it out as a safe guide in matters which concern the highest interests of man; but as possessing the interest which cannot fail to attach to the view set forth by a publication which has by far the largest circulation among English periodicals. Though the Times is sometimes called the Leading Journal of Great Britain, we believe that the prudence of its conductors makes it quite as frequently be led by the state of the public mind, as the public mind is led by the contents of its columns; and when it is recollected that the Times, for a considerable period, threw its weight into the scale for all the insinuations of the party to which Dr. Pusey belongs, but unexpectedly changed sides and has become its opponent, that variation will probably be with justice ascribed to a discovery generally which way the wind was blowing, as much as to the direct quarrel then arising between Mr. Walter, the leading proprietor of the Times, and his innovating parish-Clergyman.

We read the article from the Times, therefore, with satisfaction as indicating what is the prevalent feeling among the Laity, at all events, of the Church of England, with reference to the revival of Romish errors under the guise of English Churchmanship. We must hope that the University of Oxford and the Prelates of the Church will go to the extent of their power in rebeking Roman teaching in Anglican pulpits and lecture-rooms. The indications seem to become strong and numerous, of suspicion arising in the minds of the people of England, and the strong bond of confidence which used to attach them to the national Clergy being loosened; and the present Bishop of Oxford himself so faithfully uttered the note of warning while he held an inferior dignity in the Church (see Berean 9th of January 1845) that we may look with confidence for action corresponding with the results of his attentive observation, now when he fills a post of enlarged influence, of higher power, and of more solemn responsibility.

LONDON RECORD.—"We are sorry to see the old slander, on the Editor of the Record, contradicted and disproved not two years ago in our own and another Church Journal, revived by a correspondent and endorsed by the Editor of the Banner of the Cross. We do not by any means approve of all the views and measures of that fearless and ably conducted Journal. The Church of England and our Church in this country owe it, however, a debt of lasting gratitude for its early and manly and unequivocal hostility to Tractarianism; and its prompt and reiterated exposures of the tendencies of that system to Romanism. We receive it regularly among other publications from England, and we have yet to discover that its statements of

facts in general, are of a less reliable character than those of other English Journals."

We cut the above from the Southern Churchman, and as we have known the report respecting the Record to be circulated in this Province, even as it is sought to circulate it in the United States, we will just add that we have positive information of a recent date that the Editor of the Record is a member of the Church of England and GRADUATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD—that the Record has never been edited by any other than a member of the Church of England, and that it was once by an eminent Clergyman of the Church.

Least the tactics of those who are more zealous for success than scrupulous in the choice of means, should lead them to shift their ground to another charge, of which we heard some time ago, we will further give the intelligence which has reached us from the same respectable source to which we owe the former, that the Proprietors are all members of the Church of England, and no Presbyterian has anything whatever to do with the management or conduct of it.

There is no occasion for us, any more than for our respected brethren of the Southern Churchman and the Episcopal Recorder, to identify ourselves with the views or measures advocated by the Record any farther than as we readily give to the Conductors of it credit for zeal for the simple truth of God, and no small share of ability in defending it. The question is not about the merits of the publication at all; it is, whether grievous failings, suppose they were justly chargeable, would place its Editor beyond the benefit of that protection which God designs for every man's neighbour by the ninth commandment solemnly proclaimed from Mount Sinai, and more constrainingly enforced on the Mount where the Saviour unfolded the extent and the depth of the divine precepts.

The report has been taken up and propagated by those so respectable in station that it has come to the ears, within our knowledge, of two Bishops who were quite naturally led to mention it in conference with Presbyters under their jurisdiction who are readers of the Record. Now a communication of this nature, coming with the weight—as we believe it did in those cases—of the tenderest regard towards individual liberty, combined only with a jealous care against whatever hoists false colours, was likely to do the publication an undesired injury springing from a violation, in the originators, of the command of God.

Though neither called upon nor disposed to pronounce upon the merits of the London Record, we will offer a fragment of history which comes to our recollection as often as we hear of the great wrath which that paper has stirred up. The Elector Frederic the Wise having an interview with the learned and elegant Erasmus, asked him point blank what did he think of Luther—was he right or wrong? There was a smile upon the great Grecian's face, but he was reluctant to answer. The Elector, says Spalatnik who gives the particulars, opened his eyes wide, as was his wont when he looked for a straightforward answer; and at last Erasmus unburdened himself thus: "Luther has done two great wrongs which cannot be forgiven; he has touched the Pope's crown and the Monks' bellies."

GERMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH.—LOWER SAXONY, DEC. 22.—We have just learned from Breslau that the Romish priest T. Staniczewski, officiating clergyman at the Church of the Cross, in that city, has given in his resignation of his charge, and an intimation of his secession from the Romish communion, to the Prince-Bishop von Diepenbrock; this highly-respectable man, whose labours during the last sixteen years in various parishes are attested by the highest testimonials to his clerical zeal and personal character from his ecclesiastical superiors, has now joined the Christian Catholic Church, and promises to prove a very valuable accession. He has hitherto preached every Sunday and holiday in the Church of the Cross, in Polish, to the great edification of his hearers, and his perfect knowledge of that language will render him a most efficient minister for the inhabitants of Upper Silesia.—*Morning Herald.*

A PRISONER'S CONFESSION—WHOSE PROPERTY? (see Berean of December 26th.)—This question has been dropped for the present, probably not to be re-agitated; a majority of the magistrates having voted that nothing can be gained for the ends of justice by the publication of any communication which the murderer John Tawell may have made to the Chaplain for the relief of his conscience.

A PEEP INTO STUDENTS' ROOMS AT OXFORD.—A Correspondent of the London Times writes that in the rooms of more than one student of the ancient University of Oxford there is to be seen at this time a small wainscot hook-closet, externally as plain and unpretending as possible, exciting no suspicion, and affording no clue whatever to the mysteries within, but which, being opened, is found to be a portable altar, of which the following description is given: "In its form it copies the triple of the Roman Catholic altar. The inner side of either door presents richly embellished scrolls, upon which are portrayed with suitable inscriptions the passion of our Saviour and such like scenes. At the back of this cupboard altar, and in the vesica, is fixed the cross, now bare, and now, where the proprietor is rich enough to command the treasure, adorned with the figure of the Saviour and other accompaniments of a similar nature. The ground is painted deep blue, and is studded with stars. At this altar, the far

simile of many used in Romish families, the early matins of the student are devoutly offered up."

By way of apology for the University, another Correspondent contends that the "two or three, or it may be half-a-dozen young men" who may be found at Oxford, "weak and misguided enough to turn their scout's closet into an oratory, and deck it with popish emblems," "are for the most part notorious to the University." It is a somewhat odd kind of an apology which justifies the toleration of an evil by the notoriety of it; and the Editor of the Times may well remark, "the parents and guardians of the students will derive small consolation from the admissions made." It must be hoped that, if no authoritative denial can be given to the report, the public will speedily hear of vigorous measures taken by the College and University authorities to punish the offenders and prove the efficiency of her discipline for the protection of the youth entrusted to her care against the insidious snares of those who lie in wait to deceive.

TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN.—A case of considerable interest with regard to this ancient Protestant Seminary of learning has just been decided by its visitors, the Archbishops of Armagh and Dublin. Some time ago, Mr. Denis Caulfield Heron stood the examination for scholarship in this University, and was declared to be the successful candidate among sixteen; but upon being required to take the prescribed oath, he refused on the ground of his being a Roman Catholic. The oath acknowledges the supremacy of the Sovereign, denies the authority of foreign Princes or Prelates within this realm, binds him who takes it to obey willingly the College-statutes, which require various religious duties according to the Protestant worship, and makes him promise diligently to perform all the business of the College which shall be entrusted to his charge. Upon his refusal to take the oath, he was denied admission to the benefits connected with the scholarship. He applied to the Board of Visitors who declined interfering until, on an appeal to the Queen's Bench, that Court decided that the Board of Visitors had jurisdiction in the matter, and were bound to entertain the case. Mr. Heron's counsel was accordingly heard, on the 11th of December, by the two Archbishops, who were attended by the Judge of the Prerogative Court as their Assessor. An elaborate opinion was subsequently submitted to the Visitors by this legal functionary, and in accordance with the advice given by him, the Board dismissed Mr. Heron's appeal. The concluding sentence of the learned Assessor's opinion is to the effect that, looking to the whole body of Trinity College charters and statutes, he thought it was intended indeed "to give to Roman Catholics the benefit of a liberal education, and the right to obtain degrees, but without allowing them to become members of the Corporation of Trinity College, or in any manner changing its Protestant character."

TRINITY CHURCH, NEW YORK.—The Corporation which at present consists, by Act of the New York Legislature, of "the Rector, Churchwardens, and Vestrymen of Trinity Church, in the city of New York," consisted formerly of "the Rector and Inhabitants of the city of New York, in communion of the Protestant Episcopal Church, in the State of New York." Its property was granted by Queen Anne in the year 1709, the city then constituting only one parish, and that parish including the whole city. After the separation of the Colonies from the mother-country, an Act of the Legislature (in 1784) confirmed to the Corporation the possession of its property, Trinity Church still being the only Protestant Episcopal church in the city of New York; accordingly by that Act all the members of that communion who resided in the city were members of the Corporation, and had an interest in the property.

When, however, by the year 1814, other churches had been built and congregations formed, in the city of New York, in communion with the Prot. Episcopal Church, but separate from, and independent of Trinity Church, the Act was passed which, as indicated at the commencement of this article, confines the Corporation within much narrower limits, and constitutes an electing body, by giving the right to vote at the annual election for Churchwardens and Vestrymen of the said Corporation, to the members of the congregation of Trinity Church only and of the two Chapels connected with the same—thus passing by the members of some five and twenty other congregations by this time formed in the city of New York, as much in communion with the Protestant Episcopal Church in the State of New York as the members of the congregation of Trinity Church and its two Chapels, St. Paul's and St. John's.

The landed property originally granted by Queen Anne has become of enormous value—we have seen 50 millions of dollars mentioned—through the extension of building in New-York, and it has been found that the money-power wielded by the Corporation has had no small influence upon the affairs of the Church at large—an influence, it is thought, not favourable to the advancement of her best interests. The Protestant Episcopalians, resident in the city of New-York but not comprised within the body charged with the election of members of the Corporation, are now preparing to assert their claim to be recognised as successors of that body to which the grant was originally made, that is, of the members of the English Church residing within the limits of the city. It is maintained that the Act of 1814 is unconstitutional and might in truth be set aside as void by the Judiciary; but the proceeding now in contemplation is not to take that course, but by petition to apply to the Legislature and get it to reconcile its own Acts, passed at different times, by constituting those the owners of the property who have succeeded to the parties in whom the grant was originally vested. No surprise can be felt at the resistance offered to this measure by those who have now for more than thirty years had the disposal of a princely estate—fully allowing that they have spent the funds under their control according to strong convictions of fitness and utility, but admitting the possibility, at the same time, that their administration of affairs may have strengthened a party which shows itself more and more

hostile to the distinguishing character of that Church which the Legislature of New-York can recognise only as she remains PROTESTANT as well as EPISCOPAL.

ECCLESIASTICAL.

Diocese of Quebec.

INCORPORATED CHURCH SOCIETY.

Payments to the Treasurer at Quebec on account of the Incorporated Church Society, in the month of February, 1846.

Feb. 4—H. Gowen, 2 years' Subscription to 1st July, 1845.	£2 10 0
" 7—J. R. Eckart, 2 do. do.	2 10 0
" 23—Collection Quinquagesimala Sunday, Cathedral Quebec.	35 1 8
" "—Ditto All Saints' do.	3 7 2
" "—Ditto Trinity Chapel do.	5 1 8
" 24—Ditto Mariners' Chapel do.	3 5 7 1/2
" 25—Ditto Melbourn—per Rev. C. B. Fleming	1 0 0
" "—Ditto Nicolet—per Rev. H. Barges.	1 5 0
" "—St. Thomas—Rev. C. Rollit	0 16 3
" "—Donation, Mr. Harrower per Ditto	0 10 0
" "—Ditto Mr. Julyan, per Ditto	0 5 0
" 27—Addition to Sunday's Collection at the Cathedral, Quebec, by one of the Congregation who was absent.	5 0 0
" "—Miss Finlay, 1 year's Subscription to 1st July, 1846.	1 5 0
	£61 17 5

T. TRIGGE, Treasr. C. Socy.

Quebec, 28th February, 1846.

MISSIONARY COLLEGE AT CANTERBURY.—The Right Rev. W. H. Coleridge, formerly Bishop of Barbadoes, is understood to have been appointed Warden of this new Institution.

THE MEDITERRANEAN.—The Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Gibraltar arrived at Alexandria from Malta, in the French steamer Osiris, on Tuesday, the 23d December last, accompanied by the Rev. J. R. Errington. The next day the Bishop held a Confirmation at the British Chapel, being assisted by the Rev. J. Errington, and the day following (which was Christmas-day) his Lordship preached at the chapel, and afterwards administered the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, assisted by the Rev. E. Winder, the Chaplain at Alexandria. The Bishop and his friends left again on the morning of the 27th for Cairo and Upper Egypt.

For the Berean.

There is more in my dear Friend's words than perhaps either of us imagine:

"I will not dare to ask you to come and preach for me; you would, I fear, be mortified at our mode of conducting the services."

This is the language of one Presbyter of the Church of England to another. Both, therefore, are supposed to hold the same doctrines by virtue of their subscription to the articles;—to be one in Discipline, having solemnly subscribed their hands to an *ex animo* uniformity. And yet the one feared that the other would do so much to be offended at in our mode of conducting the services; that he dare not (because unwilling to give offence) ask the other to come and preach for him!

Let us suppose A. to be the writer; and B. the one written to.

Let it be premised that A. and B. have been, hitherto, intimate friends; and therefore, it may be supposed, would not allow trifles to separate them.

B. has been in orders nearly twenty years; has never been accused of any want of conformity to the Rules and Regulations of the Church of England, as he found them administered in the Diocese of York at his ordination—Salisbury and Winchester in which he afterwards served—and as he still finds them in that of Toronto. B. has frequently preached for A. in times past, as well as A. for B. with mutual acceptance. All these points must be considered before the present positions of A. and B. are understood, which have become so altered, that A. fears to ask B. to come and preach for him, lest B. should find that in A.'s present mode of conducting the services of the Church, at which B. would be offended.

So nothing, then, different from their former practice (a practice, be it remembered, taught them by the Church of which they are each Ministers, and which that Church has never altered) keeps the two apart who once took pleasure in each other's ministrations;—that fellowship of hearts which never seems so real as when, in God's House, with one heart and one mouth we "worship the Father, in Spirit and in Truth," which—it is feared—can be no longer. Ancient friendship is broken up, ministerially at least, and what may follow depends rather on their love for each other than on the wisdom of adopting any practice which may be cause of separation.

A. then, and not B., has changed his relative position—so far at least as that no longer can exist that outward unity which once did; and which every consideration as Christians, as Christian Ministers, as servants of the Church of England, faithful to her, in her hour of distress and trial, would induce him to cement, not weaken; preserve inviolate, and not destroy. For surely this is no day for division in the Church of England, when Rome on the one side, and Dissent on the other is sounding, with no doubtful notes, the alarm of war; and when the hearts of God's adopted children are yearning, and their heads devising a way of reconciliation: is so that they, whom the Spirit of Christ has joined together, on so many points, may not be put asunder by differing on one.

And yet, our dear Church is divided—DIVIDING—rather, I should say, many of her members, both of the Clergy and Laity, are desirous of stripping their mother of her former comeliness, to deck her out in the gaudy trappings of Rome's harlotry; to change her

modes of worship; awakening suspicion, where should be confidence; removing the ancient landmarks which so clearly marked out the regions of truth and error; casting a bridge over the gulph which hitherto separated primitive truth and practice, from the unfounded assumptions of a system possessing no good ground of claim to either.

To return from this digression: A., the cause of this feared disruption, calls himself a High-Churchman, and looks upon B. as Low—very Low.

If Churchmanship mean an undeviating attachment to the Church's doctrines and discipline, and conformity to her Rubrics, literally, and as they are interpreted by an overwhelming majority of the Rulers of the Church and the practice of his own Diocese—how can A. reconcile his conduct with his professions? What an anomaly is man!

It is time that we considered what that is, sanctioned by no authority, either in this Diocese, or by the Episcopal Bench or the Imperial Parliament, which one brother Presbyter retains, or introduces in his mode of conducting the services, which ought to be—and are by law—uniform.

"The Prayers are all offered up at the Communion Table—The Sermon preached from a Stand and in the Surplice."—A. adds: "There is, however, no Popery in the Sermon." As an elder brother, I would say to him:—"Obsta principibus! Rome was not built in a day!—No! Nor did Rome Ecclesiastical, at once, stand forth, the Mistress of all abominations. 'The mystery of iniquity doth already work,' said St. Paul; but it was irresistible to all but the spiritually minded (1 Cor. ii. 15.) Departure, in forms, from prescribed order, plainly marks the possibility of its being the preface to far more serious evils. It was so with those whose beginnings were hailed as attempts which would revive all that was lovely and of good report in the Primitive Church; compress the various disagreeing principles in the Anglican Church so firmly, as to crush Dissent for ever; and introduce a millennial state of Ecclesiastical Unity—when Rome should no longer envy England—nor England vex Rome!—Has it secured these promised advantages? Let the sad history, written as it is in the departure of many, the weaned affections of more, tell its own tale. That Church which, at the first publication of Tract No. 1, was the fond and cherished hope of the millennial state; the boast of friends, respected by foes, is, now that Tract No. 90 has leavened the minds of so many, the laughing stock of Dissent, the triumph of Rome, whilst her dearest friends take up a lamentation for her, and say 'How is the fine gold become dross! how is the most fine gold changed!'—'Even the sea-monsters draw out the breast, they give suck to their young ones: the daughter of my people is become cruel.'"

Let me ask my friend—can there be greater cruelty than to introduce or continue that which may, in this Diocese, produce what it has, at home? (Eccles. i. 9.) My friend A. would shudder at the idea, could he realise it! He has no such apprehensions—and smiles at B.'s fears as the conjurings of a Low-Churchman's mind!

Let me quote the language of another respecting the difficulty between the Bishop of Massachusetts and one of his Boston Clergy:

"We know that the beginnings of these attempts (to introduce into our Mother Church of England some of the most pernicious doctrines of the Church of Rome) to change the Church of England, so that she should no longer stand upon Protestant ground, were distinguished by substantially the same alterations in her forms of external worship as those which have been introduced in the Church of the Advent in Boston. Fears were entertained then, and expressed by sentinels on the watch-towers of our Zion, that these changes, though merely in forms of worship, were of an alarming portent; but no; it was answered that their only object was to conform the Church of England more to primitive usage—none manifested more abhorrence of Romish doctrines than the authors of these novelties—even Mr. Newman himself declaimed vociferously against Rome—but now, where is he?—and where are the rest of these leaders? All, all, except Dr. Pusey, in the bosom of the Church of Rome, and he, if recent reports be true, will not long remain an exception. Yet these gentlemen, when objections were made to their early deviations from the established usages of their Church, defended themselves by substantially the same arguments that the Rev. Mr. Croswell does now—they were only a little more strict than their brethren—their only sin was, that they had gone back to the primitive usage of the Catholic Church; and for this, forsooth, they were maligne and persecuted! The result is before the Church and the world. It is not a matter of wonder, that Bishop Eastburn, and every other Protestant Bishop, should now regard even the beginnings of changes in the forms of our worship with anxiety and alarm."—*Protestant Churchman, Jan. 17, 1846.*

B., who makes no pretensions to Bishop Eastburn's clear-sightedness, with that Right Reverend Watchman regards even the beginnings—and such as his dear brother A. admits to exist in his Church—of changes in the forms of our worship, with anxiety and alarm; if not for A. himself, yet for many a youthful minister, who, without my friend's strong mind to discern things which differ—in the adoption of his practice, imbibe the dangerous opinions with which they are too frequently connected; and from which they usually arise.

In my next I will show that these changes are not within our power to make, or not at the private will of the Clergy of the Church of England.

That the God of all grace may abundantly pour out of His Spirit on my friend, and the Ministry at large—is the prayer of His friend B.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—Received C. B. and direct the next paper again to MG. C.—A Wanderer—yes, rather too sharp—we must take some of the edge off.

PAYMENTS RECEIVED.—Messrs. C. Wood, No. 104 to 166; J. Church, No. 79 to 104.