

the church had decided in a council undoubtedly general, such as are, by the consent of all parties, the first of Nice, the three of Constantinople, that of Chalcedon and that of Ephesus, the contrary to that which the protestants decide, there is no doubt that this decision should carry the day." You have here then, according to the learned Abbe and according to M. Leibnitz, for they both laboured together, the authority of the church brought into honour and repute: and according to them and the acts of Charenton, it is not lawful for any one to adopt his private interpretations, because otherwise there would be as many religions as parishes: the oecumenical council should supersede all others, infallibility is attached to the greatest part of the church, because the assistance of the Holy Spirit has been promised it. Do we require more? Or did we ask more in the time of Luther and Calvin? Who would not feel himself vehemently moved with compassion at the sight of the fatal schism, that has been effected by means of crying down an authority, to which the reformers were one day to have recourse again? O the blindness and folly of man! Oh! the misery of your guilty reformers and their numerous descendants!

But I am detaining you too long in a strange country: I hasten to conduct you again to your fellow-countrymen. From the time that England, which perhaps may claim the glory of superior knowledge in its temporal interests, and of excelling in the art of governing, had taken the fatal resolution to legalize schism and to form itself into a religious constitution, it felt the necessity of investing its new church with all the strength and power of the nation. One of the first concerns of the parliament was to carry a law for the establishing of uniformity of worship. The supreme governess acted upon the same plan. No sooner had she subordinated her bishops for those of the ancient church, but she gave them to understand that they must assemble and draw up a formula of faith, that might serve as the basis of the common creed of her subjects. They actually assembled in 1562, and drew up the thirty-nine articles, which afterwards received the approbation of the governess and the legal approbation of parliament. But what influence could the governess or the parliament have over the mind, after they had taught the people to despise the holy authority that Jesus Christ had given to his church? And, above all, what did the new spiritual lords mean by their twentieth article? With what face did they there claim for themselves the right of judging controversies, deciding upon matters of faith, of enforcing obedience to their decisions by all their spiritual censures, they who but lately had prided themselves on their abjuring the authority of the universal church, and had just made such a shameful display of insubordination against their legitimate superiors? How come they, now a days, to entertain so high an idea of the episcopal dignity and authority, much misplaced undoubtedly in their persons, and yet essentially most christian? There are then certain powerful truths with which men find themselves penetrated and as it were impregnated in spite of themselves; to which they are constrained to pay homage, when

their interests hold their peace. For then they lay down their principles in theory, as if they no longer remembered having combated them the day before in their actions. To conclude, all that they gain is to give a more scandalous display to the contradiction with which they were reproached between their actual doctrine and their public conduct. "Who are you? Said they to them: whence come you? Yesterday we knew nothing of you? Whose place do you occupy? It is the place of your masters in the faith, of your superiors, to whom the right of holding their sees still belongs, unless sheer violence makes them lose it. You have despised authority in them, and would you have it recognised in you? They at least held it from the universal church, with which they were in communion: they formed a part of the apostolic chain of succession; but have not you by breaking this communion, broken also the chain? Have you not gone out of the regular line? Intruders into these ancient sees your authority comes from yourselves* You have no existence, nor power except from your royal governess; you are her creatures as she is the creature of parliament; your authority comes from her; her's from it. Join together, as long as you please, in framing rules of policy, among you and yours. So far, so good. But do not pretend to subjugate our opinions: they are free, you know they are, you have taught us so, and without this, you would not be where you are." The dispute has continued since and still exists between the partisans of the established church and the numerous sects who wish for none. The first, agreeably with the institution of the divine Legislator, judge with reason that without authority there can be no unity in the church: the others, agreeably with the principles of the reformation and much more consistently, are of opinion, that if they must submit to a spiritual authority, there was no necessity for beginning by emancipating themselves from it, and that, all things considered, it would have been better to have kept to that which derived its origin from God himself. It is certain that the doctrine of the twentieth article is unwarrantable on

"* Ut fieri solet in edificio collapsio, ut qui illud restaurare cupit, in veteri fundamento non ædificet, quia convulsus est et minus firmus, et plenum rudera, sed novum aliquod fundamentum ponit. ita in restauratione ecclesie factum est. Voluit enim Deus non in veteri fundamento, hoc est, in *successione episcoporum*, sed novo quodam et extraordinario modo illam instaurationem fieri."

"Nostris episcopi et ministri non sunt a papisticis episcopis ordinati." (a)

It is principle that he who withdraws himself from the authority of the Church loses by that act all the jurisdiction he had received from it; and there no longer remains any jurisdiction for him to communicate. Thus the bishops who were not papistical, of whom Whitaker speaks, supposing even they had enjoyed the right of conferring it before their defecton, would not have been able to transmit any after Cardinal Pole was then the last archbishop of Canterbury in the apostolic succession, and Parker the first in the parliamentary and royal establishment.

And should the consecration of Parker have been valid (and this even, according to Le Courayer, is at least doubtful, to speak of it in the most favourable manner possible) it is certain that the jurisdiction of the Church could never have been communicated to him.

the principle of the reformation, in England as well as upon the Continent." There was no other means of establishing it than by returning to the Catholic principle. It would have been necessary that the first reformers, instructed by experience, should frankly have acknowledged their mistake have loudly declared that they had gone astray, and that neither order, nor unity, nor salvation could be expected, unless under the protection of an infallible authority. A candid and spirited acknowledgment like this would have been too heroic to have been expected from the very persons who had raised the standard of revolt. But you who come so long behind them; you, who without partaking in their aggression, equally share in their errors and the fatal consequences of which they were the first witnesses, and which they so much deplored towards the end of their career, what prevents you from surrendering yourself to the clearness of the proofs, the force of truth and the lesson read by experience? Never lose sight of the day when the reformation took its rise in your country and elsewhere and say; 'The Church and its authority were then as before, as to day, and as for ever, solidly establishment upon the promises of Jesus Christ; this foundation is not less firm and immovable than that of the universe, for the finger of God supports them both alike, and promises to them the same duration.'

To be continued.

*See among others, Lord Sommers. Tracts, vol. 11. p. 460, where you will find an anonymous work, the author of which expresses himself in a strong and virulent manner, against the twentieth article, and against bishop Sparrow, the publisher of the thirty nine articles and the canons.

ON THE EDUCATION OF CANADA.

Kingston, May 1831.

To the Editor of the Catholic,

Sir—On the 11th of the present month there appeared in the Canadian Courant, a paper published at Montreal, an article upon the state of Education in Canada. The tenor of his remarks surprised me, not indeed in considering their source, but in reflecting on their nature. Daring statements unsupported by the least shadow of argument, erroneous notions, principles tending to the demoralization of society, apparent desire of working up religious prejudices in order to excite religious animosities, misrepresentation of the conduct of respected and respectable men and institutions.—Such is the idea which I formed of the production on the first perusal of it. I cannot affirm that further reflection has caused me to alter it.

It is with the view of preventing the public mind from being misled, of doing away with the mist which such remarks have a tendency to excite, of affording reflecting and impartial men, men not governed by passion and prejudice, but by reason and principle, grounds for forming a prudent judgment on the system of education which is followed in the Catholic establishments of the province, that I undertake to offer a few reflections on the production of the Courant. I desire to make my communications to the public through the medium of your