

member of the families to whom he ministers. He becomes a chosen companion to the parents, and a necessary guide to the children. The adults seek his society, the youthful grow up with a reverence for his character. And so great is the moral influence of his relation, that while he may in an unsuspected manner do much injury, he must have become himself an extreme instance of moral obliquity, to be finally and thoroughly rejected from this conceded position. To assume the ground that he is not responsible for the known influence of his example, is to undermine one of the most important principles of scriptural and moral obligation. Nor is there a relatively superior station in human society, whose proper responsibility such an assumption would not overturn. If our acts of undeniable and positive duty, are abused by others into chosen examples for evil conduct, we certainly cannot relinquish our obligation to do right, for such a reason. The responsibility must then be wholly borne by the others who transgress. All the perverse and destructive imitations of the quack, cannot make the science and practice of the honest and educated physician less a duty to mankind. But if positive evil flows to others, from the example of our unnecessary indulgence of appetite or propensity; and still more if that indulgence is conceded by us to be useless for any benefit; and yet more, if we are made to see the evils which flow from it abounding actually around us; and beyond this, if we actually hear the extremes of the evil, palliated and excused from a knowledge and observation of our example; our responsibility for this example must be undoubted, upon every principle of correct morals; and both the precepts of the Holy Scriptures, and the common acknowledgments of truth among men, would unite to hold us to this responsibility, and to urge us by every consideration of duty to mankind, and accountability to God, to relinquish a questionable indulgence of appetite, in view of the undeniable wretchedness and sin, of which it ultimately was the parent and cause. The common sense of moral obligation, would concur with the utterance of the secret voice within ourselves, to testify how much nobler and more worthy of imitation was the spirit of that Christian hero, who said, "If meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to offend. For it is good neither to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, or anything whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak." To no class of men is this principle more important than to physicians, and the same noble spirit who uttered this glowing passage, I am sure would have united in the enforcement of its application, to every one, who should ask permission to enjoy from him, the title which he gives his friend in the text—"the beloved physician."

—Dr. Tynge, preaching to a Temperance Society of Medical Students, on Col. iv. 14.

The Berean.

QUEBEC, THURSDAY, FEB. 13, 1845.

A serious evil, formerly unknown, has arisen out of the movement which has for some time been going on in the Church at home—and it has more severely affected our sister in the United States—that is, the necessity under which the reflecting Churchman finds himself, to make choice between opinions on the churchman's duty, strongly pronounced by individual Bishops, which are found in diametrical opposition to each other. In the United States, the differences among Bishops have assumed the shape of correspondence carried on between them and printed in the periodicals of the day; to that extent matters have not proceeded, nor are likely to be carried, in our mother Church: but the course recently adopted by the Bishop of Exeter presents not less really a conflict between him and other Prelates, as will be found by the Charge which we print on our first page, delivered by the Bishop of Worcester to the candidates by him admitted to orders on the 21st of last December. We have found one Bishop deciding that the sermon on the Lord's day morning is part of the Communion service, and therefore ought to be preached in the robes which the Clergyman wears in reading prayers and administering the Sacraments: another gives it distinctly as his persuasion that the sermon is not a portion of the Communion service, and he expressly recommends his Clergy to wear their academical gowns in preaching; and this just about the time that in the other Diocese an authoritative direction has been issued for the surplice to be uniformly adopted in performing that part of clerical duty.

So much we may say upon the evil arising from an attempt at "taking order" in one Diocese by itself, for the appeasing of existing strife, while in other Dioceses the same attempt might possibly lead to the enforcement of precisely the opposite course. The Church thus may break into as many fragments as there are differences of opinion among Bishops; and those whom we have to thank for it are the persons who set out with bitter condemnation of Churchmen for not being united!

The Church is too dear to her affectionate and intelligent members to allow of their submitting the views which they are to hold as Churchmen to the peculiar circumstances by which it comes to pass that they are placed in one Diocese or the other. They want to

find themselves in their mother's house; whatever the name of the Diocese may be that supervises the portion of her domain in which their lot is cast. When, therefore, they find that in the one portion they are authoritatively bid to adopt a practice which in another they are told is founded upon a "mistaken notion," they feel as if their rights as children and heirs were infringed upon by either one or the other of the authorities which issue their conflicting directions, and they must anxiously look for some authority superior to both, that shall have weight to restore them to unison. They may also reasonably lament that the word of authority should have been used when the power of enforcing compliance does not exist.

We look with great anxiety, then, for some act, or delivery of opinion at least, to emanate from the whole bench of English Bishops, that may go some way, really to appease the strife with which our Church is afflicted. We think it may be assumed, from the Bishop of Exeter's withdrawing the command of preaching in the surplice, while he persists in his demand of compliance with every rubrical observance, that he has discovered the former to be such as he had no right to impose. We thought so from the first, upon His Lordship's own showing. If the law was to be enforced, it was Albe and Cope that had to be restored to use. But it is what nobody wishes, not the Bishop of Exeter himself. Then if we must deviate, where is the authority which can say how much?

The Bishop of Exeter seems to say, and we do not dispute it, no where. The following is taken from His Lordship's letter to the Dean of Exeter, dated 11th December, and expressive of grave displeasure at the course taken by the Chapter of that See, in memorializing the Archbishop of Canterbury, as has been mentioned by us before, that a meeting of all the Bishops of the Province might be convened for the purpose stated by the Chapter:

"Without the special permission of the Crown, such a Meeting for such a purpose would be not only incompetent to do what the memorialists prayed, but would be absolutely illegal. This you may think to be very hard; perhaps it is hard. But such is the law of the land, as stated by Archbishop Wake, after very grave inquiry; and the law of the land I, for one, shall always obey when it is not contrary to the law of God. Will it be said that the difficulty may be overcome by obtaining the license of the Crown? Let the memorialists seek to obtain it, and they will probably hear, from higher authority than mine, that such a license cannot be granted for such a purpose by any power known to the Constitution. If it were granted, which it never will be, and if the Archbishop and all the Bishops of the province acting under it should do what the memorialists desire,—nay, should obtain the assent of the Crown to what they had done,—they and the memorialists might perhaps find themselves at last to have been travelling on a fool's errand, and to have wasted so many sheets of paper or skins of parchment as shall have recorded the result of their deliberations.

There is no legal mode in which 'the prelates of the Church,' as a body, can come to a concurrence in some uniform interpretation of Rubrics, and in some uniform rule for the direction of the clergy, or can 'sanction such a measure by their united authority.' We, the Bishops cannot hold a provincial synod, with power to make ordinances."

Our readers will find on our first page an extract from Mr. Palmer's Treatise of the Church, in which that author gives it as his opinion that provincial synods may legally be convened by the Archbishops, not to make ordinances, but to act upon the ordinances in force already. We do not think the author a safe guide in matters of doctrine or ecclesiastical theory; but on a question of positive law, his erudition gives some weight to his opinion, and we may well hope that the bench of Bishops is not in quite so powerless a condition as the Bishop of Exeter seems to suppose. But it does not signify to us, in the matter in question, whether the law entitle them or not to meet as a synod and make ordinances. If, as a body of men to whom the great mass of Clergy and Laity in the Church look up with reverence, they could come to an agreement—by an unofficial meeting, by correspondence, or whatever the mode may be—upon a uniform course for the discouragement of differences in the mode of conducting public worship, and if that agreement became known, it would, we entertain no doubt, be received with joy; the mode by them recommended would be cheerfully adopted and adhered to by the great body of the Clergy, and meet with no objection worth regard on the part of the Laity. That agreement, in fact, did exist until comparatively modern times; the uni-

* By the kindness of a friend, we have before us the "Form of administering the Communion" prescribed in the second year of King Edward VI.; and we discover an addition to the vestments which strict rubrical order would require the Wardens of a well regulated parish to provide: the "Tuniclet" to be worn with the Albe by those who are to help the Priest in the administration of the Sacrament.

form "tacit acquiescence of the Bishops," as we read in the Charge on our first page, was to the Clergy and Laity in place of law: the breaking away from what had become venerated usage, by individual Clergymen upon their own responsibility first, and at last by a Bishop imposing that course as a duty upon all the Clergy in his Diocese, is what has caused all the disturbance.

One very serious consideration forces itself upon us in reflecting upon the state of things which has arisen in the Diocese of Exeter. Great reluctance is entertained in our mother Church against anything like admitting the Laity to council on Church matters. We feel convinced that the admission of the Laity is primitive, and that it has worked beneficially in our sister Church in the United States. And we should think, it must strike any one, that the concession, to the Laity, of a constitutional share in Church-councils is infinitely preferable to the exercise of an unconstitutional influence which compels a Bishop to retrace steps which he still maintains that he took in the legitimate exercise of his authority. We would much rather have Lay Delegates speak and vote in council and so prevent measures upon which otherwise the Clergy might venture to the peril of the Church's peace and prosperity, than see them convene themselves in meetings unknown to the constitution of the Church, and apply a pressure from without which makes their Diocesan retreat. If the Church may be brought into imminent peril from within, that is one of the ways to bring it about.

We inserted a Grand Jury Presentment upon the Insane Asylum two weeks ago, and this day we present to our readers another on the same subject. It is exceedingly gratifying to find that the condition of the unfortunate inmates in that establishment presented itself so much more favourably to this Grand Jury than it did to the former, while we must continue to hope that different arrangements will be made for the accommodation of these objects of pity.

The Grand Jury enter very largely into the consideration of the urgent want of a new Jail and House of Correction; they recommend that the building now used as such be converted into a General Hospital, and the building lately used as a Custom House into the principal Station or Head Quarters of the Police Force, and a place of detention for the disorderly, in cases for summary decision before the Police Magistrate.

To the Editor of the Berean.
 Sir,—It has been a very prominent, perhaps the chief design of those with whom the Tractarian movement originated, to revive the principle of obedience. Upon the assumption that the genius of Protestantism is opposed to this principle, every effort has been made by them to disparage the Reformation, and to recommend the figment of an infallible something which they are pleased to term the Church. But is not the assumption gratuitous? Can it be asserted with truth, that Protestantism does violence to those deeper feelings of deference and awe, which are a constituent part of Christian humility? It has placed within the reach of millions, a rule of faith to which they can do bow with implicit submission. Under its influence, the spectacle is now exhibited of serious and profound thinkers receiving all the directions contained in the Bible as truth without any admixture of error; and what though the bare supposition of an uncorrupted text would seem to imply the existence of a standing miracle, yet are such thinkers found to read on with unshaken confidence, persuaded that no corruption in things fundamental could have been suffered to creep in. Surely this is the strongest practical acknowledgment of the Lord's continual presence with His Church, and the system which encourages such a state of feeling cannot be justly obnoxious to the imputations which have been brought against it. No, Mr. Editor, the reproach of Protestantism is this: it substitutes a childlike for a childish obedience. Let us learn to glory in our shame!

I remain,
 your's faithfully,
 PRESBYTER.

[Yes, certainly, in shame like this we may glory. Our Correspondent correctly exposes the futility of the objection advanced by those with whom has arisen the design (professed design, we should call it) to revive the principle of obedience. What has the church of Rome, to equal the united endeavour of all orthodox Protestant Churches to circulate the Word of God without note or comment, union most strikingly exhibited in the unspeakably blessed operations of the Bible Society? None of them shrinks from laying that open before friend or foe, and from appealing to it as the judge of controversy. Let its voice be heard, and controversy is at an end among us. And it does speak so plainly that in the Protestant Churches there is essential unity, not by any means destroyed by that diversity in peculiar matters which gives us an opportunity of exercising the lovely grace of mutual forbearance, free from childish submission.

But in truth, the principle of obedience is advocated, by many, so long only as they

themselves hope to bear rule. Look at what Mr. McVickar says (see under the heading GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY) to the instructors from whom he is just breaking away: he is admonished by them, his proper "governors, teachers, spiritual pastors and masters," upon the manner in which he speaks of the Papacy, and instantly he throws up his connexion with the Seminary, because they deprive him of his "reasonable liberty of opinion and freedom of discussion"—why, you imagine it is some untruly Protestant dissenter that has crept into this Episcopalian Seminary, but no: it is a disciple of the Tractarian school that thus kicks against the demand of obedience, and must break through the bounds which the Dean and faculty would set him, because they are not consistent with the regard he has to his "own proficiency in knowledge and wisdom!"

One more quotation from Mr. McVickar: "These reasons, as well as the uncertainty and annoyance arising from subjection to a power punishing transgression of bounds, themselves uncertain, and narrower than the Church allows; and the natural inference of feebleness and want of value in a course of instruction which uses an arm of power instead of the persuasions of reason, to expel what is deemed erroneous; not to mention the plain departure from equity in holding students amenable for crude expressions while in the course of forming their opinions, as well as a sense of the deep injustice done in the case of others who have met with harsher treatment than myself, have led me to the step I have taken."

How edifying it is to hear this romanizing gentleman talk against "using an arm of power instead of the persuasions of reason to expel what is deemed error." How harsh, truly, to admonish a theological student against straying towards Rome himself, and clandestinely leading in that direction his fellow-students by his recommendation of Romish Divinity! What ultra-protestant denomination can he point out that carries the demand for freedom of individual opinion farther than what he claims for himself!—EDITOR.]

To the Editor of the Berean.
 Sir,—I have had occasion to sojourn in your good City for the last month, and being now leaving take the liberty, while thankfully acknowledging the very many kind attentions I have received, to express my surprise that in a place of the size and standing of Quebec there is not any public Episcopalian Worship during the week, except on Sundays! Being accustomed, where I reside in general, to have the advantage of attending weekly evening Service, I made enquiries, shortly after my arrival here, in relation to the subject I refer to, and learned to my regret that there was none. I understand that, exclusive of His Lordship the head of the Church in Canada, (whose personal zeal is too well known to need any comment) there are in Quebec not less than from six to eight resident Clergymen of the Established Church, and generally two or three more transient—I could not avoid noticing as remarkable that with such a number of Ministers the Episcopalians should be, (as I believe it is) the only denomination, which has not a stated weekly Service, and then learned that for two or three Winters past it had been tried, but was now relinquished for want of attendance and encouragement. Now this I should rather hold to be a strong reason for its continuance, in hopes that by perseverance, under the divine blessing, it might eventually become a means of great good. I should imagine that in the Summer season such Service is likely to be even better attended than during the Winter—the weather is always more inviting—the evenings longer—and fuel and candles not required. I have had much satisfaction in attending other places of worship during the week, but have a strong predilection for my own, when one can be attained.

I trust, Mr. Editor, altho' a stranger, I shall not be considered obtrusive in making these few remarks, which I venture to do in all singleness of heart, hoping they will be received in the same spirit in which they are made, and will be productive of no offence.

I remain, Sir,
 Your humble servant,
 A STRANGER.

P. S. In my place of residence the Service on the Festivals of the Saints has been generally and I think judiciously changed to the evening (not the afternoon) instead of the morning, and many more thereby induced to attend.

[The question of a week-day evening service was partially treated in our columns before. There would be no difficulty at all in having such a service performed, if a readiness among the Laity to make up a congregation called for it. Experience has proved that there is a readiness to so small an extent only as imposed upon the Clergy the most disheartening task of addressing in a spacious place of worship as many as a good sized room would contain. If we had space to treat this matter fully, we should have to turn our thoughts to the Cottage Lectures in England—they are the week-day service that used to attract congregations there.—It is but right to mention that a service is performed every Wednesday Evening half past six, at the Mariners' Chapel in Champlain Street.—EDITOR.]

RELUCTANT PREACHING OF JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH.—We are painfully struck, in reading this discourse, with the characteristic which marks so much of the teachings of many of our preachers at the present time. When they are called upon to simply state the gospel doctrine of justification, they seem—standing in the august presence of simple Scripture and of the Articles of the Church—awed into a reluctant and timid statement of the blessed truth which set the heart of St. Paul on fire with love. But immediately they escape from the mere statement of the doctrine, they dwell upon the danger of its too constant inculcation, and would keep it harmless by removing it from sight, and dwelling upon the works which are included in it as the ground of justification, rather than by presenting it with holy works as their only cause,

and ever showing that it does not make void, but fulfils the law.—Boston Christian Witness, reviewing a Sermon.

FEMALE EDUCATION.

It is only a few days since a gentleman of unquestionable veracity stated the following facts to the writer. He said he was acquainted with two families, who sent their daughters to a Roman Catholic seminary. The fathers of these families are highly respectable, and officers in Protestant Churches.—Their daughters completed their course of instruction at the seminary and returned to their father's house. The parents anticipated a great increase of pleasure, in the improvement of the minds and manners of their beloved daughters. You may judge of their amazement and horror, when these daughters told them that they had united with the Roman Catholic Church. Up to that hour, the parents thought that all was right. The crisis had passed, while the parents, unconscious of danger, were anticipating brighter days in the increased pleasure of social intercourse, which cultivation and refinement would impart. Now the awful reality of apostasy flashes upon them, withering all their hopes, as lightning withers the green and beautiful trees. The reader may imagine the heart-felt grief of those parents when the hour of family worship arrived. There was presented a scene of anguish caused by the strange, the unnatural conduct of those children, that we shall not attempt to describe. These daughters refused to hear their father's voice in prayer, because they said it was not right to hear heretics pray!

These are not the only cases of the kind. They are adduced as specimens. They show as clearly as sunbeams, that the teachers in these seminaries have exerted a powerful influence to unsettle the religious principles of their pupils, and to persuade them to enter the Roman Catholic Church.—Charleston Observer.

TOLERATION IN FRANCE.—On the 29th Dec. M. Smith, a printer, and M. Delay, bookseller, of Paris, and two persons named Eck and Rolier, were brought before the Court of Assizes of the Marne, held at Rheims, the two first named persons for printing and publishing, and the others for distributing certain religious Protestant tracts. The prosecution was instituted by the Procureur du Roi of Vitry-le-Francois, on the ground that the tracts contained matter offensive to the religion of the majority of the French, and tending to excite hatred and contempt towards the ministers of the Roman Catholic religion. The defence to this accusation was that the tracts in question were entirely free from the offensive matter—that they had been long in circulation without exciting any attempt at legal repression—and that one of them had been reprinted fourteen times. M. Brouard, of the Paris bar, who appeared for the defendants, read extracts from the works of several Roman Catholic writers, some of them members of the clergy; to show that they contained, in support of the Roman Catholic religion, language much more energetic than that complained of in these Protestant tracts, the authors of which had not departed from the limits of fair discussion, whereas in some of the Roman Catholic publications from which he read extracts, the Protestants were not only attacked, but also calumniated. The defence was attended with complete success. The *Industriel* of Rheims, at the close of its report of this trial, says—"The verdict of acquittal, which it was easy to foresee, was received favourably by the numerous auditory present. May the demonstrations of sympathy which were shown to the defendants cause them to forget the strange prosecution—we had almost said persecution—to which they were subjected!"—*Galignani's Messenger*.

SENSIBILITY OF THE VOTARIES OF PLEASURE.—On Saturday the 14th of December, Miss Clara Webster, a dancer, was almost burned to death on the stage of Drury-lane Theatre, by her dress catching fire. She died in consequence of the injury received. The following reflexions are from the *Record* newspaper:

"Events are every now and then occurring that confirm and illustrate in a very striking manner the testimony of Scripture as to the innate depravity of human nature. They hold up the glass to its deformity, and penetrate the meretricious decorations under which it fancies itself most securely hid, demonstrating that man, both in his individual and social capacity, is what the word of God describes him to be. There is perhaps no feature in that sad picture which the tinsel lackering of dissipated worldly society has more disguised than the heartless cruelty of the voluptuary, the selfishness that clieves to sensuality, the 'being past feeling' which the Scripture has linked with 'lasciviousness.' Am I a dog that I should do this? would be the indignant reply of even many a man whom the habit of licentious pleasure has hardened to its true nature, were the issues of selfish sensuality held up to him in all their extent and deformity.

We have on former occasions denounced the ballet of the opera house and of the theatres as the most polluting and debasing form of vice with which this country is cursed. * * * Let us hope that the equal-handed justice which has of late begun to pursue the gambler to his splendid haunts, will not be deterred from this duty also, nor shrink from attempting to deliver our public streets from the propagation of the evil through the vulgar exaggerations of French indecency, with which our leading print-shops now abound.

But our present business is with a recent fact which may well astound our boasted and self-complacent feelings of national virtue, and awaken the inquiry whether the epoch of blood-thirsty cruelty which marked the pleasure spectacles of Pagan Rome before her fall, may not find some parallel in Christian Britain? We find an audience at our largest