

# The Breeze.

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

VOLUME III.—No. 35.]

QUEBEC, THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 26, 1846.

[WHOLE NUMBER 139.]

**JESUS, JUSTICE, AND A SINNER.**  
Bring forth the prisoner, Justice.  
Are done, just Judge, see here the prisoner stands.  
What has the prisoner done? Say what's the cause Of this commitment?  
Of his too gracious God: he broke the laws Of that great Majesty that gave him breath, And heaps transgression, Lord, upon transgression.  
How knowest thou this?  
His sins are crying; and they cry aloud!  
What say'st thou, Sinner? Hast thou ought to plead That sentence should not pass?  
Ah me! I dare not: I'm too vile and base To tread upon the earth, much more to lift My eyes to heaven: I need no other shroud Than my own conscience; Lord, I must confess, I am no more than dust, and no whit less Than my indignant styles me.  
Lord, shall I strike the blow?  
Sinner, speak on: what hast thou more to say?  
Vile as I am, and of myself abhorred, I am thy handiwork, thy creature, Lord: Stamped with thy glorious image, and at first, Most like to thee, though now a poor accursed Convicted criminal, and degenerate creature, Here trembling at thy bar.  
Lord, shall I strike the blow?  
Speak, Sinner: hast thou nothing more to say?  
Nothing but Mercy, Mercy: Lord, my state Is miserably poor and desperate: I quite renounce myself, the world, and flee From Lord to Jesus; from thyself to thee.  
Cease thy vain hopes; my angry God has vowed, Abused mercy must have blood for blood. Shall I yet strike the blow?  
My bowels yearn, my fainting blood grows cold, To view the trembling wretch! Methinks, I spy My Father's image in the prisoner's eye.  
I cannot hold.  
Into my side: let there the wound be made: Cheer up, dear soul; redeem thy life with mine; My soul shall smart, my heart shall bleed for thine.  
O groundless deeps! I owe beyond degree! The offended dies, to set the offender free.

## THE PREACHING OF MORAL DUTIES INSUFFICIENT.

None here, I apprehend, would be at a loss to find among his own parishioners more than one person living in good credit and esteem among his neighbours, irreproachable in his general dealings with the world, a prudent manager of his affairs, and of consequence not addicted to any public scandalous excess; but, with all this, grossly negligent of religious obligations. Go and expostulate with such a man: Tell him that you are sorry to observe that he is seldom seen at church,—that he never comes to the Lord's table,—that he never sends his children to be instructed in the catechism,—that, from these symptoms, notwithstanding the general probity of his life, you are apprehensive he thinks less than it may be his interest to do about the concerns of futurity. The man, who is by no means lost to all sense of duty, will take your admonition in good part; but he will defend himself, and his defence will be that he is at least a moral man. Press him farther, ask him what particular merit he means to attribute to himself under that character: Would he be understood to plead "not guilty" to your accusation? would he pretend that he is a scrupulous observer of the Sabbath—never absent without necessity from public worship, and frequent in his attendance on the Lord's table?—He will confess to you that he means no such thing; the contrary is notorious, and he would be sorry to be thought capable of setting his face to so gross a falsehood. Does he mean, that notwithstanding his neglect of the external forms of religion, he hath still been exact in the better part—in the social duties of the Christian life?—that he is liberal in alms, tender-hearted to the poor, slow to anger, patient of injuries, ready to forgive,—that his affections are so set on heavenly things that he is cautious of excess in the use even of lawful pleasure?—Nothing of all this; the man is no hypocrite; he will not pretend that his life will bear so strict a scrutiny. But still he is a moral man,—that is to say (for everything more is excluded by his own confession), he is no murderer, no adulterer, no thief, no liar, no spendthrift; and, with nothing more of the Christian character about him than is supposed to be contained in the negation of these crimes, he hopes to find admission into the kingdom of heaven; for if at any time he hath chanced to drop in while you have been preaching, he has heard you tell your congregation that morality is all in all.

to us by revelation; and no action is religious, otherwise than as it respects God, and proceeds from a sense of our duty to him, or at least is regulated by a sense of that duty. Hence it follows, as I have before observed, that although religion can never be immoral, because moral works are a part of the works of religion, yet morality may be irreligious; for any moral work may proceed from mere moral motives, apart from all religious considerations: and if a moral work be done by a person not sufficiently instructed in religion to act upon religious considerations, it cannot proceed from any other than mere moral motives; and of consequence, it must in that instance be irreligious,—not contrary to religion, but without it.

Upon this ground stands the doctrine of the first reformers, concerning works done before justification, which is laid down in the 13th of our Articles.—"Works done before the grace of Christ and the inspiration of his Spirit are not pleasant to God, forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ, neither do they make men meet to receive grace, or (as the school-authors say) deserve grace of God hath commanded and willed them to be done, we doubt not (saith the Church) but that they have the nature of sin." Not that they are in such sort sins, that in the mere overt act, without consideration had of the obliquity of the motive, they add to the guilt of the deed of them; but being done without any thought of God, though not in defiance and despite of him, they have nothing in them that should make them pass for marks or symptoms of the regenerate character: on the contrary, in all these works merely moral, the Atheist may be as perfect as the Christian.

In the controversy about faith and works, either side of the question hath had pious, learned, and enlightened men among its advocates. When the pious, the learned, and the wise, on both sides, explain, the controversy turns out to be a mere contest about words; the matter in dispute being nothing more than this,—in what words a proposition in which all agree may be best enounced. That man is justified by faith, without the works of the law, was the uniform doctrine of the first reformers. It is a far more ancient doctrine,—it was the doctrine of the whole college of apostles. It is more ancient still,—it was the doctrine of the prophets: it is older than the prophets,—it was the religion of the patriarchs. And no one who hath the least acquaintance with the writings of the first reformers will impute to them, more than to the patriarchs, the prophets, or apostles, the absurd opinion, that any man leading an impenitent, wicked life, will finally, upon the mere pretence of faith (and faith connected with an impenitent life must always be a mere pretence), obtain admission into heaven. Whether our Methodists are justly chargeable with this Antinomian doctrine, is what I will not take upon me to decide; I would charitably hope that it is to be found only in the language of the more illiterate of their teachers: whether they be justly charged with it or no, it is your duty to be careful, that in your anxiety to expose this folly, you yourselves run not into the opposite extreme of the Pelagian heresy. Be careful, that you ascribe no such merit to the good works of men as may claim immortality as the wages of a service,—that you ascribe no power to man to perform works truly good without the assistance of the Divine Spirit. But then, be careful, on the other hand, to explain on what ground merit is denied to the best works of the faithful. It is not that the works in themselves are not good—such as being well done would be meritorious—such as the leaving of them undone, or the doing of them with negligence and indifference, while we profess to be believers, is a deceiving of our own souls: that the want of merit lies in the imperfection and deficiency of our best performances. And remember always to inculcate, that in this respect our faith is no less defective than our works,—that it is not by the merit of our faith, more than by the merits of our works, that we are justified,—that there is, indeed, no hope for any merit of our own, but through the efficacy of our Lord's atonement; for that we are justified by faith, is not on account of any merit in our faith, but because faith is the first principle of that communion between the believer's soul and the Divine Spirit on which the whole of our spiritual life depends. These doctrines are delivered with admirable perspicuity and precision in the Homilies of our Church upon these subjects: "The Misery of all mankind;" "The Salvation of Mankind by Christ;" "The True Lively and Christian Faith;" and "Good Works annexed to Faith." These discourses I would earnestly recommend to your frequent study, as an unexceptionable summary of doctrine upon these important points, and an excellent model of composition for popular instruction.

I am much mistaken, if a proper diligence on our own parts to inculcate these doctrines (which are indeed the very basis of the Christian system) which the philosophers of the present times explain away, and the illiterate enthusiast by the meanness of his style and the absurdity of his illustrations too often blurs,—I am mistaken, if a proper diligence on our part to inculcate these doctrines would not soon supersede the necessity of all controversy. Truth deeply planted in the public mind would keep possession by its own native strength: the common people, made proficient in the faith, however in other respects illiterate, and accustomed to the doctrine originally delivered to the saints, would turn with horror from everything of a contrary sound; nourished with the sincere milk of the word by their proper pastors, they would refuse a drink of doubtful quality mingled by a stranger; in a word, our churches would be thronged; while the moralizing Unitarian would be left to read his dull weekly lecture to the walls of his deserted conventicle, and the field-preacher would bow unregarded to the wilderness.—*Bishop Horsley's Primary Charge to the Clergy of Norwich, A. D. 1790.*

**ST. CROIX.**  
As some of your readers are interested in all that concerns this little Island, to which so many persons resort for health; and, as all will be rejoiced to hear of the prosperous condition of the Episcopal Church there. I send you some extracts from a letter (just received), which will show how greatly the Lord has blessed the labours of his faithful minister at St. Paul's, West End, the Rev. Flavel S. Mines, formerly of New York.

This island is about twenty-five miles long, by seven miles wide, and contains twenty-five thousand inhabitants, of which only five thousand are whites.

The established religion is the Danish Lutheran; but all others are tolerated. There are two Episcopal Churches, viz: St. Paul's, at West End, under the charge of the Rev. F. S. Mines; and St. John's, at Bass End, under the charge of the Rev. Mr. Hawley, both of them citizens of the United States.

The writer, speaking of St. Paul's, says:—"I found, on my return (from the United States), the improvements in our Church quite complete. It will now seat more than one thousand four hundred persons, and upwards of nine hundred of the sittings are free; and still you may be surprised, but glad to learn, there is not room; but that the poor are in our aisles and about our doors. About eight thousand dollars have been expended in these improvements; and in the purchase of an organ, lamps, tables, carpets, an asylum for our own poor, and a parsonage. The house owned by the late Mrs. Boyle, has been bought by Mr. T.—, for one thousand seven hundred dollars, and presented to our Vestry as a tribute to the memory of his late excellent sister. Our asylum is the property opposite that house. There is left a debt of nearly three thousand dollars, which we are about making an exertion to liquidate. The Church is enclosed by a stone wall surmounted in front by a terraced railing. It is said to be now one of the neatest in the West Indies.

Our Sunday Schools go on exceedingly well; some of the classes having gone through the gospel and catechisms, are far on in the Old Testament. We have now four schools: One at 6 A. M.; one at 9 A. M.; and two at 1 o'clock, P. M.; embracing, in all, about one thousand three hundred pupils. The Bishop (of Antigua) confirmed in this parish in June, this year, two hundred and thirty-nine candidates, making five hundred and forty-four since Mr. Mines had the parish. His Lordship has published a strong expression of his satisfaction with the improvements.

The spiritual progress of our flock seems, as far as we can judge, to keep pace with the marks of external prosperity. Our communion is large; our members generally exemplary; and there is scarcely a respectable family within the parish in which reading the Scriptures and prayer do not commence and close the day. Discipline we strictly enforce, and every now and then there is a call for it, as you may suppose.

Things are looking brighter too in the parish of St. John's at Bass End, where the Rev. Mr. Hawley is laboriously occupied with every prospect of extensive usefulness. Their Sunday School building is progressing.

We have been spending some days with our friends the D—s, at the S; and there, as almost every where now, it was delightful to see the gathered family and servants morning and evening at the Throne of Grace, and to hear the responsive worship of our Church familiarly sent up from united hearts. We certainly have many things to encourage and comfort us, but still if we had not our trials with all this, we should not be His accepted children; for all such He chasteneth and scourgeth, and through much tribulation we must enter into the kingdom of God.

**AMICUS.**  
*Episcopal Recorder.*

all manner of countenance from a system that produces such results, and to aid you in your noble work of eradicating the evil by moral force alone. You demand the withdrawal of all support from the Popish College of Maynooth, and that a purely scriptural system of education shall alone enjoy the national support. In short, you avail yourself of every conceivable method to fix the general attention upon that which is false in principle, or objectionable in detail; and you wield to the effectuation of your great purpose every individual in your spiritual army, whether he be an officer or a private or, in simple terms, a clergyman or a layman.

"Without entering at all into the questions which may have pointed this appeal to the prelate to whom it is addressed, we have no imaginable doubt that the line of conduct here marked is the true and only one for either an Irish or an English prelate of the present day. The period is gone by for 'letting things take their course.' There must be no more trust in the promises of politicians—no more dependence on the integrity of party. The church must labour, watch, and struggle for itself. Its cause cannot be left to chance, without a crime, or to the interest of man, without ruin. It must be betrayed by neutrality, degraded by indolence, and delivered bound hand and foot to its enemies, by those who are content to think that it will find a strength in the national attachment, which may dispense with the strenuousness of bold and unwearyed zeal." The prelate must acquire the conviction, that the great cause of the Establishment is not to be tried in the Legislature alone, but among the people; that sudden vigour must be called into action, and sudden ability displayed in the rescue of the church, or all is undone. The day of evil is at hand."

**THE OFFICIAL ACTS OF THE NEW POPE.**  
*From the Continental Echo.*  
Looking, as thoughtful men, at the official acts of Pius IX., to what do they really become reduced? To an amnesty, which, though a generous procedure, was at the same time a stroke of good policy; to the nomination of a prime minister untaunted with the tyrannical and merciless instincts of Cardinal Lambruschini; to the permission to construct railroads as in Austria and Russia; to the foundation of a military school which will inure the children of the poor to habits of severe discipline from the earliest age; and, lastly, to the promise of some economical and industrial reforms. This is something; but conscientiously speaking, and considering all that the Roman States required, is it not really but a little? We are well aware of what may be said in reply:—"In the first place, the institutions of the country are not to be changed in a day; time, prudence, and caution are requisite, and the reign of Pius IX. counts but a few months as yet. Then the Holy Father has many difficulties to encounter, both at home and abroad; he must meet and overcome them by degrees, lest by attempting to dash them to pieces at one blow, he should expose himself to the danger of being buried in the ruins. And, finally, think of the enthusiasm, the transports of the population of the Roman States! Surely the Pope must have already done much to excite expressions of affection so profound and unanimous."

Here are three arguments which are not without weight; let us not exaggerate, however, but keep close to the truth.

Although Pius IX. has reigned but a few months, and must act with prudence, might he not still have gone beyond the narrow limits to which he has confined himself?

Would it have required a great deal of time, for instance, to draw up an encyclical letter? And if he is really animated with a liberal spirit, should he not have hastened to cheer the Catholic, the civilized world, by disavowing, if not in direct terms, at least by the utterance of more enlightened principles, the brief in which Gregory XVI. so shamefully attacked liberty of conscience, liberty of worship, liberty of philosophical opinion, the liberty of the press, and all the most valued and cherished institutions of modern times? This brief still rests on the Holy See as a brand of infamy; no true Catholic can bear it without hanging his head in shame and sorrow. Why, then, has not the new Pope pronounced a single word (we mean publicly, officially, such as can be well authenticated), in contradiction of this apology for a despotism which shocks men of the most moderate opinions? It is surely trifling to plead want of time in relation to so great and imperative a duty as this.

But the resistance, the opposition, the internal and external obstacles? This is the second argument advanced, and we have been impatient to arrive at it. Yes; there can be no question that such obstacles do exist. On the one hand, the Cabinet of Vienna would regard with a jealous eye the entrance of any portion of the Italian nation on a career of advancement and liberty; on the other, the cardinals and Jesuits strive to maintain the ancient spirit of the Court of Rome. But the opposition of Austria would be easily overcome, or at least, confined within due limits, were Pius IX. seriously and firmly so to determine. A Pope placing himself at the head of his subjects in order to banish a foreign soldiery, and establish liberal institutions, would be invincible. All Italy, all Western Europe would rise as one man to support him; and the Cabinet of Vienna would fear to show too much of its ill will, lest it might drive the pontifical government into the arms of France, and so lose its possessions in the peninsula of Italy. There is, then, but one really formidable source of opposition, that of the conclaves—of the sacerdotal spirit. Will Pius IX. yield to it, or will he make it yield to him? There lies the whole question.

**A RECENT DISCLOSURE.**  
[See second page for information to complete the following statement.]  
Sir,—A letter which appeared in the Times, of Thursday, October 15, under the absurd title of "Proselytism at Cambridge," and the signature of "A Father," seems to call for the justification of the party who is therein charged with a very serious misuse of his influence and position as a Master of Arts of that University.

I question the propriety of this kind of allusive attack upon "a resident Master of Arts," as much as I condemn the manifest unfairness of reserving

that attack for a period of five months, until the principal party, a late convert to the Church of Rome, who alone could and would have fully explicated me, should have left the country, which he did only a week or two before the date specified above. Nevertheless, having no wish to excuse myself beyond the real merits of the case, I shall, with your permission, make a few observations on this somewhat violent and bitter impeachment of my conduct, though my defence must at present rest solely on the strength of my own uncorroborated assertion.

I have no objection whatever to the publication of certain portions of a letter which I addressed shortly after the event alluded to, and in reference to it, to the former tutor (a beneficed clergyman of high reputation) of the "pervert to Romanism." I gave distinct permission to the party to make any use of it he pleased, because it contained a candid statement of facts, so far as I was cognizant of or concerned with them; and that it has at length been so used is no matter of complaint or regret to me.

Does "A Father" really believe, or can he wish to insinuate, that any master of Arts of this University would, knowingly and intentionally, try every underhand means in his power to induce undergraduates of twenty years of age to embrace the Romish faith, he having no intention whatever of doing so himself, or (having such ultimate, probable, or wavering intention) desiring to send others before him to sound the way, and pioneer for him a dangerous path? Or does he imagine that any Christian gentleman can be utterly thoughtless or reckless of the tremendous responsibility of being in any degree instrumental in inducing a brother to change his profession of faith? No one, I trust, will hastily believe me to have been wilfully guilty of such very improbable enormities.

What, then, are the facts of the case? Briefly these:—A well-informed and sensible young man, of admirable character, and of a highly religious and devotional turn of mind, was (I forget by what means, and at whose instance) introduced to me, and afterwards became my pupil. On my first acquaintance, I at once perceived that his mind was thoroughly conversant, and even engrossed, with the unhappy controversy between Romanists and Protestants. I do not hesitate to assert distinctly (and I am fully prepared to produce proofs of it), that he then held, and plainly avowed that he held, in every particular, the Roman Catholic Creed; and therefore I am assuredly in no way responsible for having taught it to him. Now, knowing this, it will perhaps be said I should have been prepared for the possibility of his taking the sudden and precipitate step which he afterwards did take. I confess that I did not sufficiently anticipate the result; for I confidently believed that his good sense would have suggested a deeper and maturer view. But when he announced to me his intention I at once told him, in all earnestness and sincerity, that I thought such a step would be, in him, unjustifiable, on the grounds of his youth, and the absence of his father from England. I certainly had frequently, as with an intimate friend (which he had become from the totally different relation of a private pupil), conversed with him (though dissuasively at least as much as sympathetically) on the subject of what is popularly called "Popery;" and I believe that in so doing I did but do what was perfectly natural for any person to do under the circumstances. Will it be contended that educated members of a University are bound to maintain a total reserve on subjects which every newspaper and magazine of the day freely and unsparingly discuss? But, moreover (and this is the principal charge alleged against me), I certainly did consent, at his own importunate request, to introduce him to Dr. Wareing, the Roman Catholic Bishop, who happened to be at Cambridge on one occasion; though it is right to add, that I had before positively refused to be instrumental in making him acquainted with the Roman Catholic priest resident in Cambridge. Now, in the above introduction it may be that I was extremely wrong and grossly indiscreet. I can only say that if it was an error in judgment, it was at least done, on my part, most innocently.

I have no objection to state, that I think the responsibility of hindering an earnest and convinced convert to the Roman faith from making his profession of it at least as great as that of inducing him to embrace it. In this difficult dilemma, I did what I believed to be right. I represented to him his youth, his manifest incompetence to decide the question, his absent father, and the plain duty of consulting some spiritual adviser, which, I, as a layman, could not be. When I found these arguments to be vain, I finally recommended him to lay the whole case before the Bishop, who received him at Northampton, and who, I most firmly believe, did but act upon what he considered his plain duty in advising him not to delay in taking the course he accordingly followed.

Ironical mention is made of the "admirable candour" with which I laid the above circumstances of the case before the late tutor of the youth in question. I did so from a sense of duty, and for the express purpose of letting so much of the blame as was due to me fall upon myself. Had I preferred to conceal or deny my part in the transaction, it would have been easy to do so. If it can be inferred from this account that I was the willing instrument of converting a young undergraduate committed to my care to Romanism, first by instilling into him its doctrines, and then pretending to check him from embracing them (which is obviously the construction of "A Father,") or that this is only one of many "victims" of mine, past or intended; then it is high time for the University to interdict me, and to take care that I be prevented, like Socrates of old, from "corrupting the youth." It will then be, indeed, the duty of the College to "dismiss this recreant son," and not allow him to enter within the walls again—a course which it has not yet thought necessary to pursue.

I distinctly deny that I have ever interfered with the religious opinions of my pupils at Cambridge, as one and all of them will willingly attest. I have always been very cautious not to do so. I am called upon to make this statement publicly in behalf of myself, my College, and the University, to which such letters as that of "A Father" are extremely injurious. It has never been my province or my wish to influence the minds of my juniors in any such way, even though, like every one else, I