

it with care; indeed, I had no doubt that the Holy Spirit had taught her the true and living way, and helped her to walk in it. Every subsequent conversation gave me increased satisfaction. She was baptized, and added to the church, and has, as all who know her can testify, since that time adorned the doctrine of God the Saviour. I am happy to add, about two years ago the Lord also changed the heart of her son; he now walks in the fear of God and the comforts of the Holy Ghost. They have removed from Clarenc, and are now settled in the Township of Mountain, and according to the latest accounts, walk in a manner worthy of their high vocation.

As this last account is written from memory, and is of so long a date as six years, there may be some slight mistakes; but as to the substance, I have the fullest recollection. Had I had an opportunity of consulting her, I might have refreshed my memory, and then I am sure I should have stated things with greater plainness; for the impression of her conversation is more vivid on my mind than I have ventured to convey in this narrative.

I intended to have made some remarks, which naturally result from these accounts, as well as to mention some things which I elicited by questions, but must defer them to some future occasion, perhaps next month. How delightful to witness the rough outlines of our Saviour's image drawn on the sinner's heart here—but how delightful to see them when complete in the exquisite finish of heaven.—“We shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is.” Yours in the Gospel of Christ, JOHN GILMOUR.

THE SUFFICIENCY OF THE BIBLE AS A RULE OF FAITH AND GUIDE TO SALVATION.

This is the great matter in controversy between Protestants and Roman

Catholics. *We* say the Bible is sufficient—they say that it is not. Now, suppose that Paul, the Apostle, be permitted to decide between us. We are agreed to refer the matter to him. Can our opponents object to this reference? Let Paul, then, be consulted in the way which he can be, viz. through his acknowledged writings. It is agreed on all hands that he wrote the *second* epistle to Timothy. Well, in the *third* chapter of that epistle, and at the 15th verse, he writes to Timothy thus:—“And that from a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation.”—That the Greek is here correctly translated into English, any scholar may see.

Here, then, we have what Paul *wrote*, and can not believe that he would *write*, in a letter to Timothy, that the Holy Scriptures are capable of being known by a child, and able to make wise unto salvation, and then *say*, to be handed down by tradition, that they are so obscure and abstruse that one can make nothing out of them.

But what did Paul write to Timothy about the Holy Scriptures? He reminds him that he had known them from a child; that is, he had been acquainted with them so far as to understand them from that early age. Now, either Timothy was a most extraordinary child, of which there is no proof, or else the Holy Scriptures of the Old Testament and of the New, so far as the latter was written and recognized at the time, are intelligible to a child. I see not how this conclusion can in any way be evaded. If the child of Eunice could and did know them, why may not my child, and your child, and any child of ordinary understanding? And what do we want more for a rule of faith, than a Bible which a child can understand? The Bible, then, can not be insufficient as a rule