

flesh and he has become man; that to all who believe in him he has given eternal life; and that these treasures, namely, salvation from sin and death, the Holy Ghost, and the kingdom of heaven, shall be given for nothing,—the world despises the grace and tender mercy of God. But when men taught that we could by our own works merit the grace of God, the people eagerly embraced it, and offered to give all that they could to obtain it.

The apostle Peter admonishes us to resist the devil who, like a roaring lion, goeth about seeking whom he may devour. We ought to carry ourselves thus in tribulations: we ought to be afraid because of our sins, yet not to remain in this fear, but to turn to God's grace; for commonly out of excessive joy proceedeth secularity, and again excessive fear produceth despair, both which God has expressly forbidden. We are not to despair of his mercy, nor be secure in ourselves.

The Berean.

QUEBEC, THURSDAY, SEPT. 26, 1814.

Our friend Philo-Berean has favoured us with the following note, referring to the Editorial in our last number:

My dear Sir,—Are you justified in citing, as an *extravagant* proceeding, a refusal to administer the Sacrament to a Presbyterian as such?

Might not a Clergyman, of truly Catholic spirit, feel himself bound by the letter of his instructions (see Rubric at the end of the Confirmation Service), to admit those only to the Lord's Table who have been confirmed or "are ready and desirous to be confirmed?"

In reply to this note, we will do ourselves first of all the pleasure of expressing thanks to our friend, for frankly communicating with us upon a point where he thinks us wrong. We should be exceedingly sorry, if we were found to censure harshly, when error proceeds from a conscientious regard to obligations solemnly entered upon. It would also be very contrary to our meaning if we were thought to place on a level the three cases upon which we expressed the disapprobation which, as regards one of them, our friend thinks misapplied. The two latter cases would seem to us Romanism in bloom, if they could be proved; in the former we should only dread that tendency towards it which we endeavoured to expose in our number of the week before last. Entertaining such dread, we are not quite sure that the word *extravagant* is too strong, when applied to the one case, while we are very certain that a much stronger term of condemnation might justly be applied to both the others.

Philo-Berean is aware that in the Church of England "discipline is well nigh lost." The invitation to the Lord's table is given in the beautiful terms of our Communion formula; the rubric which requires that those who intend to be partakers should signify their names to the Curate, is almost universally neglected, and persons come to the table upon the mere negative qualification, that no open scandal can be alleged against them. The conscientious Clergyman, while he longs for that restoration of discipline "in its full efficiency and its salutary influence upon the Church" which is anticipated by the preacher quoted below, shelters himself under the solemn warning which the Church teaches him to pronounce: "Judge yourselves that ye be not judged of the Lord;" and supposing that he is faithful, close, and searching in his public and private ministrations, we believe he is thus doing all that, under present circumstances, it is in his power to do. He allows the first direction in the rubric in the Communion service to be generally neglected; but in the case supposed by our Correspondent, he fastens upon the closing direction in the service for Confirmation, in order to repel an applicant of whose religious character there is positive evidence, only she has not been confirmed, being a Presbyterian. We will gladly abstain from saying that this is *extravagant*, but we must say that it is very wrong. In fact, the rubric to which our Correspondent refers, seems to us one of those which the Bishop of Virginia has in view when he says (see Bercan No. 21) "some passages in our Prayer Book, which seem, by their sound, to be relics of Rome, and are so understood by many, when rightly interpreted, will appear to be solemn protests against Romish abuses." Our reformers had to correct the abuse of administering the Eucharist to infants; against that, we apprehend, the rubric was intended by deciding that, before a person became a communicant, he should give an intelligent account of his faith, and confirm, in his own person, the vows and promises made on his behalf by sponsors in baptism. It would be deviating very much from the mind of the reformers, if we made this rubric the occasion for a repulsive measure against consistent

members of an orthodox, non-episcopal community.

Let us remark, however, that, as we understand the matter, the person in question sought admission only as a guest. She lived, as a domestic, at a distance from the ministrations of the Church to which she belonged, but desired to partake of the communion in conformity with the ritual of the Church of England, when the opportunity occurred. If the case were that of a Presbyterian who wishes to enter into full membership with our Church, it would be a reasonable demand upon such an individual to "be confirmed, or to be ready and desirous to be confirmed," such being the door of admission to the Lord's table in the Church of which she asks to become a member. But the admission of Non-episcopalians as guests at the Sacrament in our Church is a very common and, we must say, a very commendable practice. In the United States, we repeatedly heard Episcopal Clergymen make this announcement, previously to the administration of the Lord's Supper: "Persons in regular standing with any other Church who may be desirous of partaking with us, are welcome to do so." We have known of this addition: "The table is the Lord's, not ours: ours is the privilege of receiving them, theirs is the risk, if they come unworthily."

But there is higher authority for members of the Church of England, than this. Our friend knows that the canonical qualification for sponsorship is, that the party have "received the holy Communion." (Canon xxix.) How did the King of Prussia, whose own baptism and confirmation were administered by a Clergy who have only presbyterian orders, become qualified, in the judgment of the Archbishop of Canterbury, to be sponsor to the Prince of Wales? We know that his admission has been objected to, and parties would make it out that the Archbishop does at Court, what the Priest must not do in his Parish; but this is a libel proceeding from the party engaged in the progress Rome-ward. We feel persuaded that His Grace welcomed the King of Prussia as, in the judgment of charity, a true-hearted, protestant Christian, whom he gladly linked together with the illustrious parents of our future Sovereign in a bond of sacred obligation that the Prince should be so brought up to understand the solemnity of his baptismal vow, promise, and profession, as to prepare him for a right understanding and consistent discharge of his future duties in guiding the affairs of his powerful protestant empire.

We will just add the remark, that the Prussian Church, though her orders are presbyterian, recognises the solemnity of Confirmation, administered by presbyters. It is quite a different question whether members of the Church of Scotland, who reject the rite of Confirmation altogether, can consistently present themselves as sponsors at infant baptisms. This question we have not to treat on this occasion, but we wish to guard against misconception. Baptism and the Lord's Supper are recognised by the Church of Scotland equally with that of England; and they only are in question in the case supposed. The same scruples that would repel a Presbyterian for not having been confirmed, would reject the Confirmation of the Prussian Church for not being episcopal.

We must hope that we shall not be thought to look upon it as a light matter that any, either of the rubrics or of other Church regulations should be disregarded by the Clergy who are more peculiarly under obligations to observe them, or by the Laity, in whom one could wish to see more of a close attachment to the institutions of the Church than is common amongst them. We think it a great evil, that changes which have come over minds and things should have placed Clergymen in a position where in some cases it is very difficult and quite inexpedient, in others next to impossible, and in others again altogether impracticable to comply with the letter of their instructions by rubric, canon, or otherwise. In closing our last Editorial, the length to which we had already been led compelled us to defer a remark which we are glad to append to the observations now offered upon Philo-Berean's queries. By the repeated decisions made in the Archbishop's Court and partly confirmed by the superior tribunal, with regard to baptism, and by the close adherence to our Church-formularies which may be required, the Clergyman is placed in the painful position of having to withhold from some children a privilege which the Church intended for them: Lay-baptism, we are told, is *sufficient* and must not be repeated. But it can at best be considered only as *private* baptism; and the Church in her maternal love towards her children has provided a special service for receiving the subjects of such baptism into her body by public recognition. The form of doing this, adverted to in our last, is found in the office for private baptism. The Clergyman, after inquiring particulars of the act which has taken place, has one form prescribed to him from which he is not to deviate: "I certify you that in this case all is well done, and according unto due order, concerning the baptism of this child." Now many a Clergyman, adopting the law as declared by the Dean of the Arches, would be perfectly ready to pronounce a child to which water

has been applied with the invocation of the Trinity by a lay-person, *sufficiently* baptized; but few indeed would be prepared to say that in such cases "all has been well done and according unto due order." The consequence is, that the affectionate solemnity of receiving the child into the Church can, in many cases where it may be desired by parents, not be performed.

Some Clergymen, thinking necessity to be above law, would perhaps be disposed to introduce into the service the modification to which we have here adverted. With regard to certain modifications in the service, and deviations from the rubric, it has here and there been understood that some individual Bishop or other in private made his Clergy feel easy in using that measure of liberty for which they knew their Diocesan would not call them to account. The present Bishop of Calcutta once, in a Charge, told his Clergy that no deviations from the prescribed service could be allowed without his being consulted on the subject—or something to that effect. But nothing of this kind satisfies us by any means. Bishops have no more power to sanction deviations, than Presbyters to adopt them; and it was well observed, with reference to the Charge just referred to, that the course there contemplated would only just of one offender make two. But a recent occurrence in England has placed in a strong light the doubtfulness of all such expedients, and shown that the only safe course for Clergy and Laity is the recovery of legislative power to the Church, in order that she may rectify by law that which in her present fettered condition causes distress to the conscientious Clergyman, while it prevents some attached churchmen of the highest qualifications from laying themselves under vows, in the discharge of which they anticipate difficulties like those now referred to, and lead others to seek for a ministerial commission with other religious communities, when in their hearts they would give the preference to episcopal orders.

The occurrence to which we refer is the suspension of a Clergyman by the Bishop of Exeter, for having omitted a clause in the collect after burial. We must defer the further treatment of this matter till our next number. In the mean time, we express the satisfaction which it gives us, to have a letter from our valued Correspondent L. C. to whom we shall look for further communications upon the deeply interesting subject of the acquisition of legislative power by the Colonial Churches. We also recommend to the attention of our readers the extract from the Archbishop of Dublin's Charge, to be found on our first page, as well as His Grace's remarks on recovery of that power by the mother Church, incidentally thrown out in the "Outline of Correspondence" printed in the Bercan of the 12th instant.

The book from which we have extracted the article on our first page, headed "Pursue your steady course" was published in the year 1832, and the author, who had been for years Chaplain to the East India Company on the Madras Establishment, says in his preface that the substance of the work was written fourteen years before. The novelties to which he refers, were not those which have since that time sprung up to cause apprehensions to the Church at home, and to threaten the simplicity of the missionary work abroad; but his remarks are the more striking on that account.

To the Editor of the Bercan.

Sir,—Some time ago, in answer to an inquiry on the subject, you were kind enough to explain that the inference was erroneous, which existing circumstances had appeared to warrant, that the possession and exercise of Legislative authority was at variance with the genius of Episcopacy.

In the church of Rome, where thought is in chains, intelligence no element of devotion, and unreasoning obedience a universal duty, one need not look for evidence of congruity between church-legislation and Episcopacy. Three hundred years have passed since that church ventured upon a general Council; and mind has been making too great progress for her ever to venture upon another.

But if Protestant Episcopacy encourages the exercise of private judgment, and desires no compliances but such as spring from intelligent conviction; then she has nothing to fear from liberty of thought, or freedom of debate, and every thing to gain from that description of christian conference which, eliciting and diffusing wholesome views of her principles, would invest her acts with the force of previous deliberation and approval, and her members with the feeling that they were interested in upholding a system which they understood.

Why, then, have some 130 years been suffered to elapse since the Protestant Episcopal church of England was last allowed to hold her general Convocation? It would be instructive if any of your readers could favour us with a summary of the causes which operated to deprive her of her Legislature, and with a comparative sketch of the relations previously and since subsisting between her and the state.

Meanwhile the tide of opinion appears to be keeping pace with the course of political events; so that, to whatever extent secular jealousy of clerical authority may have contributed to the absorption of ecclesiastical legislation in the civil legislature of the Empire, the altered character of that legislature is now awakening the apprehensions of the Church, and forcing upon her the alternative of either convoking her members to legislate for themselves, or of being legislated for by her enemies.

Nor can it be questioned that the altered circumstances of the times would suggest the wisdom and necessity of a corresponding alteration in the composi-

tion of the Convocation, should it ever be revived,—the Mother deigning to learn a lesson from the Daughter, by giving to the Bishops and Clergy in their deliberations and decisions, as is the case in the United States, the benefit of Lay experience and co-operation.

The Laity, indeed, having so long discharged the duty of legislating for the Church, will with reason conceive that they have acquired some competency in the premises, and will choose, not to relinquish, but merely to transfer the exercise of their functions from their representatives in the Commons house of Parliament, to their representatives in the lower house of Convocation.

But whatever we may or may not live to see take place with regard to the Parent church, may there not be inquiries deserving of attention connected with the subject, as it bears upon the interests of her Colonial daughters?

If the revival of the Metropolitan Convocation under a modified Constitution would increase the efficiency of the Church in England, might not the creation of a Colonial one produce a like result in British North America? And if we in a young country are unimpeded in our improvements by the hindrances presented in an old one by vested rights, venerated usages, and the crusted and complicated claims of obsolete laws and long established Institutions, is it not more to be desired, to subject all their proceedings to Constitutional control; and to bring the congregated wisdom and piety of their members into deliberative and legislative action, under some such Title as "The Convocation of the Protestant Episcopal Churches of British North America?"

These ideas are thrown out for the consideration of your readers, and may give rise at a future day to some further inquiries from your very humble Correspondent.

L. C.

ECCLIASICAL.

BISHOP'S COLLEGE, LENNOXVILLE, Eastern Townships.—The foundation stone of this institution was laid on Tuesday of last week by the Lord Bishop of Montreal, who left Quebec for that purpose and other public business on Monday of the week preceding, and returned last Saturday morning.

CHRISTIEVILLE.—At a meeting held in the Vestry of Trinity Church, in the Parish of Christieville, on Friday, the 13th of September, consisting of the Clergyman, Churchwardens, and Pew-holders,—The Rev. Joseph Antislip Allen in the chair, and Charles Forest, Esq., acting as Secretary—the following resolution was adopted unanimously:—

Resolved,—That in the opinion of this meeting, William Badgley, Esq., Advocate of Montreal, deserves the united thanks of the congregation of this Church for his kind and liberal gift of the Organ lately presented to them by him; and that, influenced by a grateful sense of their obligations for this substantial proof of his generosity and kindness, they make known to him, through their Secretary, this public acknowledgment of their gratitude.—*Herald.*

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR GENERAL has been pleased to contribute £10, to aid in the completion of the inside-work of the ELOHA Church in the mission of the Rev. J. Mockridge;—also £10, towards the completion of Christ Church, VICTORIA, Talbot District;—£10, in aid of the Church which is being erected at PRINCETON, Blenheim;—£10, towards enlarging the Church at DELAWARE;—and £10, towards building a Church in Port Metcalf, Walsingham County: all in the Diocese of Toronto.

NANTICOKE, Township of Walpole, Niagara District.—The corner-stone of a small church at this place was laid on the 23rd of August last.

GRAFTON, Newcastle District.—The Church recently erected in this village, was opened for divine service on Sunday the 15th instant.

MARKHAM, 6th Concession.—St. Philip's Church is to be opened for divine service on Wednesday 9th October next.

EDUCATION STATISTICS COLLECTED FROM THE MINUTES OF COMMITTEE IN COUNCIL.

Description of School.	Number of Applications.	Grants awarded.	Grants accepted, &c.	Average amt. of Grants accepted.
National	277	£30,563 15s.	£30,481 15s.	£109 17s. 2½.
British Church and Parochial	13	2,202 0	9,202 0	169 7 8
Wesleyan	7	593 0	498 0	71 2 10
Roman Catholic	1	85 0	—	—

The Parliamentary Grant was open to all denominations of Christians who were prepared to meet the portion which they applied for, by a corresponding expenditure out of the funds at their disposal.

THE OLD SAFE-GUARDS.

It is certain, that there is no kingdom, commonwealth, or any constituted body or assembly, whatsoever, in which there are not laws made for the safety thereof; and that

provide against all attempts whatsoever that disturb their peace, and that prescribe the conditions and qualities that they judge necessary for all that shall bear employment in that kingdom, state, or corporation, and no man can pretend that there is any injury done him, that he is not admitted to employments when he doth not satisfy the conditions and qualities required.

Nor can it be denied, that there is a great difference to be observed in the conduct of those of the reformed religion, and of the Roman Catholics towards one another; the Roman Catholics not being satisfied to exclude the reformed from all places of profit or of trust, they do absolutely suppress the whole exercise of that religion; and severely persecute all that profess it; and this they do in all those places where it is safe and without danger, to carry on that rigour. And I am sorry that we have at this present so many deplorable instances of this severity before our eyes, that is at the same time put in practice in so many different places.

I would therefore gladly see one single good reason to move a Protestant that fears God, and that is concerned for his religion, to consent to the repealing of those laws that have been enacted by the authority of King and Parliament, which have no other tendency but to the security of the reformed religion, and to the restraining of the Roman Catholics from a capacity of overturning it: these laws inflict neither fines nor punishments, and do only exclude the Roman Catholics from a share in the government, who by being in employments must needs study to increase their party, and to gain it more credit and power, which by what we see every day, we must conclude, will be extremely dangerous to the reformed religion, and must turn to its great prejudice; since in all places, those that are in public employments, do naturally favour that religion of which they are, either more or less. And who would go about to persuade me or any man else, to endeavour to move their Highnesses, whom God hath honoured so far as to make them the protectors of his Church, to approve of, or to consent to things so hurtful, both to the reformed religion and to the public safety.—*From a State Document, being a letter written 4th November 1687, by Myne Heer Fagel, to give an account of the Prince and Princess of Orange's Thoughts upon laws for the security of the Protestant religion.*

THE SCRIPTURE AND THE CHURCH.—The Scripture is the Sun, the Church is the clock, whose hand points to, and whose hand tells us, the hour of the day. The sun we know to be sure, and regularly constant in his motion; the clock, as it may fall out, may go too fast or too slow. We are wont to look at and listen to the clock, to know the time of the day; but where we find the variation sensible, to believe the sun against the clock, not the clock against the sun. As, then, we should condemn him of much folly that should profess to trust the clock rather than the sun, so we cannot but justly tax the mis-credulity of those who will rather trust to the Church than to the Scripture.—*Bishop Hall.*

The contradiction of tongues doth every where meet with us out of the tabernacle of God, therefore whithersoever thou shalt turn thyself, thou shalt find no end of controversies, except thou withdraw thyself into that tabernacle. Thou wilt say it is true, and that it is to be understood of the unity of the Church; but hear and note; there was in the tabernacle the ark; and in the ark the testimony, or tables of the Law; what dost thou tell me of the husk of the tabernacle without the kernel of the Testimony? The tabernacle was ordained for the keeping and delivering over from hand to hand of the Testimony. In like manner, the custody and passing over of the Scriptures is committed unto the church, but the life of the tabernacle is the Testimony.—*Lord Bacon.*

Unless it were for the Word of God, our wisdom were nothing, and our knowledge were nothing. Whatsoever we have, we have it by the Word. Without it, our prayer were no prayer; without it, our sacraments were no sacraments; our faith were no faith; our conscience were no conscience; our church were no church.—*Bishop Jewel.*

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—Received J. R. S. L.;—C. Y. with invoice;—E. of C, we will bear the suggestion in mind.

We beg leave to acknowledge the following payments to the Bercan since our last publication:—

From Rev. R. Knight, 12 months; Mr. J. Brownley, 6 months.

ENGLISH MAIL.—To be closed to-morrow: Paid letters till 7, p. m., Unpaid till 9, p. m.

Political and Local Intelligence.

THE MAIL STEAMER UNICORN arrived on Thursday last, shortly after 3 P.M., bringing English dates to the 4th inst. from Liverpool and the 3rd from London. The news is on the whole satisfactory. The usual abstract from Willmer & Smith's and other journals, of items of interest follows. In Commercial matters the aspect was favourable. The weather had been very fine, in consequence of which the harvest has been secured in excellent condition. This caused a decline in the prices of Canadian Flour, and Wheat. Money was plentiful, and the Manufacturing districts were fully employed.

Nothing of material importance had occurred in England. The English Judges had confirmed the Judgment given in the Irish State Trials, which was anticipated. The House of Lords had not yet considered the question.

The repealers continue their meetings. It is said, that they intend to commence a new system of annoyance to the Government, by abstaining from the use of articles which by being taxed, contribute towards the revenue of the country.

The Queen was again able to take exercise in the open air. The death of Lord Keene is announced. He distinguished himself (being then Sir John Keene) in the campaign against Afghanistan, and especially at the taking of Ghuznoo, for which gallant