# The Berean.

THEY RECEIVED THE WORD WITH ALL READINESS OF MIND, AND SEARCHED THE SCRIPTURES DAILY, WHETHER THOSE THINGS WERE SO.—Acts xvii. 11.

VOLUME IV.—No. 23.] QUEBEC, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 2, 1847. [WHOLE NUMBER 179


### A NAME IN THE SAND.

Alone I walked the ocean strand,
A pearly shell was in my hand,
I stooped and wrote upon the sand
My name, the year, the day.
As onward from the spot I passed,
One lingering look I fondly cast;
A wave came rolling high and fast
And washed my lines away.

"And so, methought, 'twill shortly be
With every mark on earth from me!"
A wave of dark oblivion's sea
Will sweep across the place
Where I have trod the sandy shore
Of time; and been to be no more;
Of me—my day—the name I bore,
To leave no track or trace.

And yet with him who counts the sands,
And holds the waters in his hands,
I know a lasting record stands
Inscribed against my name;
Of all this mortal part has wrought—
Of all this thinking soul has thought,
And from these fleeting moments caught
For glory or for shame.

HANNAH F. GOULD.

### SCRIPTURAL EDUCATION FOR IRELAND.

*Letter from the Right Rev. Robert Daly, D.D., Lord Bishop of Cashel, to the Right Hon. Lord John Russell.*

MY LORD—The importance of the subject on which I take the liberty of addressing your Lordship, will plead my excuse for intruding on your time and attention; it is the education of a portion of her Majesty's subjects.

Education is a subject of primary and universal importance, at all times and in all places, worthy of the most serious attention.

It is a source of much gratification that it has now at length received serious consideration, in some degree commensurate with its importance. It is most gratifying to those who desire the real welfare of mankind to see, that your lordship, and the statesmen connected with you, have opened your eyes to the necessity of taking a part in the advancement and diffusion of education, and have boldly put forward the almost self-evident maxim, that it is better for a country to provide for the prevention of crime by the education of the inhabitants, than for the punishment of it, when committed by an ignorant and degraded population.

In this enlightened sentiment I most fully concur, and for its bold and public declaration I feel grateful. It was with real pleasure that the true friends of the country read the declaration, that it is her Majesty's wish that the youth of this kingdom should be religiously brought up, and that the rights of conscience should be respected.

We in Ireland felt an interest in your educational movement, and as well as many in England, were prepared to expect a proposition for a combined system of education, in some respects similar to that of the National Board in our country.

There are not wanting those who, indulging in theory on the subject, rather than being acquainted with it practically, would have wished for such a system, and they could dilate with much plausibility on the beauty of bringing together persons of all denominations in harmony and good will. But you and your colleagues have had wisdom enough to see through the deceit, and to be convinced of the impracticability and evil of such a system.

In bringing forth your scheme for England, you have abandoned, nay you have denounced, the principle of combined education, and have adopted and defended the system of separate education.

The friends of Scriptural education in Ireland have watched your proceedings with much interest, and in proportion as they had formed an high opinion of your Lordship's character for honesty and fair dealing, were full of expectation and hope. We heard from your mouth, and that of your colleagues, the very language with which we ourselves had condemned the system of the National Board and its attempts at combined education, and which we had used in favour of a separate grant for Scriptural education.

We had made the objection against attempting to force combined education—we had denounced it as impracticable—we had condemned it as requiring a sacrifice of all religion. You borrowed the argument from us—you took almost the very words out of our mouths; and we surely had reason to hope that when in principle you were brought over to our opinions on the subject, you would not refuse us the benefit in practice.

I would remind your lordship of the language which you and your colleagues are reported to have used.

Lord Lansdowne said—"It would be extremely desirable, indeed, to have all sects educated under the one roof, as was suggested (from Lord Beaumont.) But he would ask the noble Lord whether, from his own experience, he judged that such a scheme would be a practicable one?"

Your lordship is reported to have argued the question between combined and separate education more at large, and to have expressed yourself thus:—

"Sir, with regard to this question, we were called upon in 1839, and also at the present time, to consider whether we should attempt to spread over the country some general system which might agree with the system on which those schools are governed, or with the schools established by the British or Foreign Society, or the schools established by any of the dissenting sects in the country, which we might think preferable. We thought it would be unwise, in 1839, and we think so also at the present time. We do not think that practically the attempt would have succeeded; it must have ended in failure, and so far from advancing we are of opinion that we would have retarded education by such a system. In 1839, we said that with regard to the National Schools in connexion with the Church, they should act according to their own views—that we should not interfere with the religious instruction given in those schools in any other way than insisting that the inspectors, who were appointed by the Privy Council, under the sanction and approval of the Archbishop of Canterbury, should belong to the Church, and should report upon the religious education given in the schools. With respect to other schools, we then stated, that we should not make any inquiry into the state of religious education—that we should not interfere with the course of religious instruction given in them, but we required that the inspector should report generally upon the efficiency of the school. These were rules we adopted, in 1839, with respect to the building of schools, and which we adopt now with respect to the education of masters and pupil teachers."

But Sir George Grey stated more simply and clearly the principles of the two systems, and has condemned the one and approved the other. He has drawn a picture which is in fact a favourable picture of the system of the National Board, and then he has pronounced a decisive judgment against it.

"The noble lord (Lord Morpeth) had said that there were three courses open to government, but he thought there were only two. He did not believe it would be possible for any goverment to propose that education of the people should be placed entirely in the hands of the established church; the two courses then open to the government were, the course proposed by the honourable and learned member for Bath, and the course that had been adopted. The one was to establish entirely a new system of education, disregarding the divisions of the country upon matters of religion, disregarding the schools established in connexion with different denominations, and endeavouring to bring all the children together into one system of education, by which they could grow up in harmony, peace, and good will. Such a plan would be impracticable; it would meet with no cordial acceptance by any one denomination of Christians, or by that house. He agreed with the hon. member for Nottingham that the earnest religious feeling of the people of this country would oppose an absolute bar to combined education, because it could be only effected by the exclusion of all religion.—He knew that all did not intend to exclude religion from their schools, but thought it might be introduced through different religious teachers; such a proposition would not, however, diminish one iota of the opposition. Then, what was the other plan, proposed and acted on by the government? The principal on which the measure, if he might so term it, was framed, was not to establish any new system, but to improve the present schools—the government proposed to raise the character of the education that is given in existing schools, and improve the position of, and raise the standard of acquirement in, the schoolmasters. What had been done during the last few years, since parliament had agreed to grant money for the purposes of education? Those grants had been applied for the purpose of building schools in connexion with the various denominations, and that being the case, the government thought it time to consider how the character and quality of education might be raised in those schools without endeavouring to supersede the existing agent at work in any of them."

I ask your lordship, in the face of the public, and the face of justice-loving England, can you in the British houses of parliament maintain such principles—prove them to be sound, and act upon them in England, and then act upon the very opposite in Ireland?

1700 of the clergy of the Established Church in Ireland were only a little in advance of you; they were before-hand in approving the system you have adopted in England, and condemning that which you are now become wise enough to condemn. 1700 of the clergy can adopt the very words of Sir G. Grey, 'To establish an entirely new system of education, disregarding the divisions in the country upon matters of religion—disregarding the schools established in connexion with different denominations, and endeavouring to bring all the children together in one system of education, by which they would grow up in harmony, peace, and good-will—Such a plan would be impracticable: it would meet with no cordial acceptance by any one denomination of Christians, or by that house. The earnest religious feeling of the people of this country would oppose an absolute bar to combined education, because it could only be effected by the exclusion of all religion.' These words of Sir G. Grey express better than any words which I could select, the principles which have influenced, and do influence, 1700 of the Irish clergy; and I ask you to say, is it common justice to consider it a crime in them to say in Ireland what you have felt yourself constrained by right reason to say in England? Are you to put these 1700 men under a ban, because they spoke, before you did, the very language which you now speak? because they had wisdom to see what you and other statesmen had not seen; and because they had principle to maintain what you now know to be the wisest and best, when it was against their interest to do it? And will you make those men the objects of your favour, who were either mistaken or weak enough to approve what you now have declared to be impracticable, or being wise enough to see, as well as their brethren, the evil of the system, were unprincipled enough to join it at the nod of those in power? I thought this was impossible. When I read the strong plain language of you and your colleagues, I felt it was impossible that you could say one thing with regard to Ireland and another with regard to England: and I did expect that you would have sanctioned separate education in Ireland; and when you do not contemplate it as practicable or desirable to force members of the Established Church and Dissenters, to be educated at the same school, you would not try to force Protestants and Roman Catholics to be educated together, though it can only be effected by the exclusion of all religion.

You justify your decision by saying, that "the revenue of the established church in Ireland appears to me sufficient not only for the support of the beneficed clergy, but also for the encouragement and maintainance of a scriptural system of education."

I feel assured, my lord, that a thinking public will never give your lordship credit for the honesty that has generally been ascribed to your lordship, in thus putting your refusal upon this ground.

His Grace the Lord Primate of Ireland has stated the simple fact, that the income of the parochial clergy, even if duly received, would not afford to each of them an average sum of £200 per annum. Your lordship would not say that this income is sufficient—not only to maintain a gentleman and his family, as clergyman of a parish, but to maintain within it a scriptural system of education. I was for nearly thirty years rector of a parish, the income of which was originally £400 per annum; when the bill for the relief of the clergy passed, and substituted a rent-charge in the place of the tithe, I was relieved of twenty-five per cent., and had £300 per annum. There were five schools in that parish; three maintained by the landed proprietors, and two entirely at my own expense. I would ask was the income of this parish sufficient to support the clergyman, and maintain the schools? Had I had no other income the schools must have fallen to the ground. But I dismiss this part of the case, because there are facts enough to prove that a supposed sufficiency of the funds of the established church is not the real ground for refusing a grant.

I shall trouble you with my reason for this conviction. If you really considered the revenue of the Established Church sufficient, you would have so organised the National Board that the members of the Established Church should be left to their own sufficient resources, and not allowed through that channel to obtain public funds; whereas the members of the Established Church may have abundant funds from the National Board if they will only abandon their Protestant principles. When I was rector of the parish of Powerscourt, I could have had abundant funds if I would have excluded the Holy Scriptures from the schools in school hours. Had I asked for funds, saying I would add my name as approving the un-Protestant principle of the National Board, I should never have received from your lordship, or those connected with you, the answer you gave to the Lord Primate, that you *considered the revenue of the Established Church* sufficient for the maintenance of a Scriptural education. You would have granted the money if I would have granted the principle.

Again—if it was really a view of the revenues of the church which induced you to withold a grant, you would not consider it a merit in those clergymen who, in spite of their sufficient funds, get support for their schools from the National Board; and you would not consider it a crime in those clergymen, who, keeping aloof from the National Board, support their school out of private funds. Your practice contradicts your assertion. It is the avowed principle of your government to extend your patronage to those clergymen, and those only, who join the National Board, and, by so doing, get a share of the public funds. Those that will pursue a system of combined education, which you say is impracticable—those who will engage in a system which you say necessarily excludes religion—those who will draw upon the public funds, though, you say, they have sufficient funds themselves—these are the objects of your patronage, whatever other failings they may have, either of commission or omission; whilst those who will not do so are excluded from your patronage, whatever else may be their merits. I will not dwell upon the disqualification or want of qualification of those that have been recommended to you by their taking a share of the money of the National Board, as I should not wish to speak disparagingly of any, as I should not will give a sample of the way in which your rule prevents you from employing the patronage of the church in advancing those that would be profitable to her, and creditable to you.

Amongst the persons connected with your government in Ireland there is no person who stands higher in public estimation than the present Chancellor, Right Hon. M. Brady. He has earned the good opinion and respect of persons of every class and every party, and it would be admitted at once that any member of his family would, through him, have a claim upon your lordship's patronage, if he was himself not unworthy of it. Now the Chancellor has a brother, whom I have had the pleasure of knowing since he was in College—his character in the church is not less excellent than that of his brother at the bar. He served a curacy in the diocese of Cork, made himself acquainted with the language of the people, and was entirely devoted to his work. It was not extraordinary that an application should have been made to your lordship's government for preferment for such a man so connected. An application was made, his character acknowledged, and his claims admitted, and he was offered preferment—and he was not told that in the parish intended for him he was to consider the revenue not only sufficient to support him and his wife and family but also to maintain a system of scriptural education there; but he was told that it was an indispensable condition of his preferment that he should join the National Board, and have his school supported by its funds on its principles. This in conscience he could not do, and he was told that the excellent brother of the distinguished Chancellor might remain a curate, and support his wife and children upon a curate's salary.

Will you, after this, expect the public to believe your lordship to be honest in putting forward the sufficient revenue of the church as a reason for not giving a grant for the education of the Protestants in Ireland? No, my lord, it is no matter of money—it is a matter of principle. In England you wisely wished to improve and increase the education of the people, and you rightly proposed to supply public money in order to attain a public good. In Ireland you do not desire the improved and increased education of the Protestants, and therefore you refuse the money. You would give an unlimited sum of money to un-Protestantise the Protestants of Ireland—to make them join the Roman Catholics in their very worst error, and that which is the support of all their other errors, that of taking the Scriptures out of the hands of the people. If the Protestants submit to this un-Protestant principle you will never tell them that the revenue of the Established Church is sufficient, not only for the support of the clergy, but for the maintenance of a scriptural system of education. How can you then expect that you shall be considered honest in this reason for your refusal?

But you mention another reason:—'The great majority of the people of Ireland being Roman Catholics, I should not think it advisable to make a provision for education, from which their children were excluded, either by law or by regulation.

I cannot conceive that the thinking public will consider your lordship more honest in this assigned reason than in the former; and the evidence against you, in this case also, is taken from your own acts.

I would premise that the Church of England schools in Ireland, to which you refuse to give aid, have no rules to exclude Roman Catholics, have no regulations as in the Church of England schools in England, requiring all the children to be instructed in the formularies of our Church. They give peculiar Church of England instruction to the children of the Church only; and if the Roman Catholics are excluded from the schools, it is simply by the regulation which requires the Scriptures to be read by all the children. They exclude themselves on account of the regulations requiring the Bible to be read in every school, just as the Protestants exclude themselves from the schools of the National Board, because the Scriptures are not read by the children in the school hours. There are conscientious objections on both sides, which prevent a combined education of Protestants and Roman Catholics. In England the Roman Catholics, a small minority, ask for a grant for separate education; you have professed yourself willing to grant it; you have not said to them, 'The great majority of the people of England being Protestants, I should not think it advisable to make a provision for education, from which their children were excluded, either by law or regulation.' But in Ireland the minority ask for a grant for education, and you refuse them upon a principle which you have repudiated in England. The cases are literally parallel: you act one way in England, and another way in Ireland. I ask your lordship is this fair dealing? Is this honest? The only difference is, as far as this principle is concerned, the minority in England is Roman Catholic—the minority in Ireland is Protestant. *The minority in England seek* education in a system which you have sworn to be superstitious and idolatrous; and you have professed yourself ready to grant their petition. The minority in Ireland seek education in what you profess to believe to be true and profitable; and to justify your refusal, you put forward a principle which you yourself violate in favour of those in error.

Pause and consider what you are doing. If a Roman Catholic minister should agree to grant separate education to the Roman Catholic minority in England, and then when asked to do the same for the Protestant in Ireland, should refuse to do it, and gave as his reason, as you have done, because they are a minority, what would be said of his equal-handed justice? And is it less unfair dealing, because the minister professes to be a Protestant?

I can, my lord, feel for the difficulty of your situation; you cannot tell your real reasons, and yet you must give some reason; you have really nothing that you can say, and yet you must say something.

Pardon, my lord, my plainness of speech: is there not cause? You insult that Word of God, which I value. You inflict an injury upon the class of persons to which I belong. You ill use that church, of which I am an overseer, and I cannot be silent.

I have the honour to be, my lord, your lordship's obedient humble servant.

ROBERT CASHEL, &c.

Waterford June 1847.

### GLEANINGS FROM CHARLES SIMEON.

*The Closing Scene, Continued.*

* * * * * *

Early the next morning (Monday Oct. 24) when I arrived, I found him just raised up, after passing a quiet night; I told him I had, as usual, on the previous evening addressed a large number of Undergraduates, and had ventured to repeat to them some of his remarks, that they might know the power of those great leading principles he had preached to sustain and gladden the soul in the last hours of weakness. "Yes," said he, "it is to the *principles* I look. It is upon the *broad grand principles* of the Gospel that I repose—it is not upon any particular promise here or there—any little portions of the world, which some people seem to take comfort from; but I wish to look at the *grand whole*—at the vast scheme of redemption as from eternity to eternity.....Indeed to say the truth, what may be called my spiritual exercises have lately been at rather a low ebb; and I may make another confession to *you* (smiling), my *bodily* exercises also of late have been at a low ebb." I observed, "Very probably the one may have been partly the cause of the other." "Yes!" he continued; "but however that may be, I wish to point out *this* distinction in my case—that I am not solicitous so much about *this* feeling or *that*, or *this* state or *that*, as upon keeping before me the great purposes of Jehovah from eternity to eternity. Now I might wish to be able to go out to take a good walk—so also in my soul. I might wish to be able to go forth and survey all the glories of heaven and the blessedness of that place;—there might however be something in all that to be suspected. But in taking the great revelation of Himself which God has given us, *there* I rest upon *Him*, and not upon myself. I do not depend upon feelings and thoughts, which are changing and uncertain, but I am kept by Him who changes not, and so I remain.".....(I quoted the passage, "I am the Lord, I change not, *therefore* ye sons of Jacob are not consumed.") "Yes! that is the true view of the matter, as it appears to me. For after all what are a man's thoughts before *Him?* It cannot depend upon a few poor, broken, paling words; nor do I depend upon these. But again I say, I take the glorious and majestic discoveries which God has made to me of Himself, and *there I rest.*" He then added, smiling as he used to do, when making some strong statement upon any point, about which he himself had not the slightest doubt; "I *may* be wrong in my view—*though I think I am not*;" then very solemnly and slowly, "But, however, *this* I know, that I am a poor lost and vile sinner; yea! the chief of sinners, and the greatest monument of God's mercy; and I know, *I cannot be wrong here.*" The following day he revived considerably, and actually occupied himself in making arrangements respecting the sermons to be preached in November at St. Mary's. On Wednesday, however, he was so decidedly thrown back, that all thoughts about further exertions for the public were at once laid aside. When he had determined no longer to use any of the means, which had been resorted to in the hope of prolonging his life (feeling they were now profitless) he said to his nurse, "You cannot but say that up to this time I have submitted patiently, willingly, cheerfully, to every wish of Dr. Haviland; I have not made one objection, have I?" he then added, "I did it all for the Lord's sake; because, if it had been his will to prolong my life, I was willing to use *any* means; but now I feel (and this he said with great emphasis) *that the decree is gone forth; from this hour I am a dying man;* death is far sweeter than life under such circumstances. I will now wait patiently for my dismission. All that could possibly be done for me, *has* been done; of that I am fully persuaded and satisfied—tell Dr. Haviland so."

During the greater part of Thursday (Oct. 27), his whole mind seemed absorbed in perfecting a scheme for four sermons upon his favourite passage in Eph. iii, 18 19. "That you may be able to comprehend with all saints, what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height; and to know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge, that ye may be filled with all the fulness of God." His thoughts had early been employed upon the subject, and before I arrived he had dictated the outlines of the four sermons under the following heads:

"*First.* What it is to know Christ in all the immeasurable dimensions of his love:

"*Secondly.* The effect of this in filling us with all the fulness of God:

"(Here under two distinct and separate heads must be contained:

"(1.) What is that fulness in God of which there must be a corresponding fulness in us; and

"(2.) How the comprehending of the love of Christ will of necessity operate to the production of it in us.

"These two must form two distinct sermons)

"*Thirdly.* The immense importance of making this subject one of most earnest and incessant prayer."

Immediately on my arrival he begged the paper containing these outlines to be put into my hands; and then requested me to take down the divisions which he had prepared during the night for the last of these discourses.

In dictating these outlines he manifested his usual clearness and precision of mind; correcting and improving the divisions as more appropriate words suggested themselves. These minor details are noticed here as illustrating the cast of his mind to the very last, and as showing how that, which had been the principal and successful study of his life, had become a habit, which brought unspeakable delight to him and was literally his occupation in death. So intensely were his thoughts fixed on the distribution and illustration of this glorious theme, that he declared he thought no higher honour could be conferred on him, than to be permitted to prepare a set of discourses upon it; and added, "This is the grandest subject I can conceive of for a course of Sermons;—I should think a life well spent, even out of heaven, to write and deliver four Sermons upon it in a manner worthy of it."

His nights about this time were generally very restless, and he would employ himself in meditating on such portions of Scripture as particularly displayed the love and immutability and sovereignty of God, or else tended to deepen his sense of sin, and cry for the Meetings in behalf of the Society for the Conversion of the Jews, and for the Anniversary Sermons at his Church; his thoughts soon became engrossed with this great subject, to which he had so long devoted his warmest regards. He wished to deliver, he said, his dying testimony to "its immense importance," and prepared to compose an address to be read to the Undergraduates at their Meeting on the following Monday. Being afraid he might not remember the texts, which he wished to refer to when he came to dictate the address, he ordered his attendant to get his small Bible, and directing her where to find them, he desired her to read them out, and then mark them down; saying with great emphasis, "*Take care of these texts; they are gold every one of them.*" He then dictated the following:

"I wish to show you what grounds we have for humiliation, in that we have been so unlike to God in our regard towards his fallen people. See Jer. xii. 7: 'I have given the *dearly beloved of my soul* into the hand of her enemies;' and again Rom. xii 28; 'as touching the election, they are *beloved* for the fathers' sakes.'—And to bring you into a conformity to God in relation towards them, so far as it respects your efforts for their welfare, and your joy in their prosperity, see Ezek. xxxvi. 22—24, 'Therefore say unto the house of Israel, Thus saith the Lord God; I do not this for your sakes, O house of Israel, but for my holy name's sake, which ye have profaned among the heathen, whither ye went. And I will sanctify my great name, which was profaned among the heathen, which ye have profaned in the midst of them; and the heathen shall know that I am the Lord, saith the Lord God, when I shall be sanctified in you before their eyes. For I will take you from among the heathen, and gather you out of all countries, and will bring you into your own land.' And again Jer. xxxii. 41, 'Yea, I will rejoice over them to do them good, and I will plant them in this land assuredly *with my whole heart and with my whole soul*,' And lastly, see Zeph. iii. 17, 'The Lord thy God in the midst of thee is mighty; He will save, He will rejoice over thee with joy; he will rest in his love; he will joy over thee with singing. I will gather them that are sorrowful for the solemn assembly, who are of thee, to whom the reproach of it was a burden. Behold at that time I will undo all that afflict thee; and I will save her that halteth, and gather her that was driven out; and I will get her praise and fame in every land where they have been put to shame. At that time will I bring you again, even in the time that I gather you: for I will make you a name and a praise among all people of the earth when I turn back your captivity before your eyes, saith the Lord.'"

*To be Continued.*

### JOURNEY IN NEW ENGLAND.

*From Correspondent of the Southern Churchman.*

Leaving Andover, I went to visit the College of Maine, at Brunswick. This has now about 150 students. Dr. Woods is the President, whom you know as the translator of Knapp's Theology. The Professors are considered able in their departments. The College is now building a Chapel of stone, altogether unique in character in this country, and after a design of Upjohn's. It has two towers, of 130 feet in height, and is more than 100 feet in length. They have already spent $25,000 upon it, and as much more will be needed to finish it. A