

We must reason thereon, for distance of time, as we do for distance of place.

A Pope is elected at Rome. The inhabitants of Rome are assured of it by their senses; they have heard him proclaimed, and have rendered him homage. The news is uniformly spread throughout Europe. No one contradicts it. All testimony agrees thereon. I am as firmly convinced of it as if I had seen it.

It is the same with regard to distance of time. Cæsar was assassinated at Rome in full senate; the Romans alone saw it; but all history, without a single contradiction, deposes thereto. This fact has reached us from history to history. There is no reason to disbelieve any of them. I am, therefore as certain of this fact also as if I had seen it.

This is the case with religion. It has reached us by testimony. We must examine the strength of that testimony.

**FIRST EXAMINATION.—The Old Testament which prepares for the Gospel.**—We must see if, since Moses, the facts and the testimony may have been altered.

**SECOND EXAMINATION: Jesus Christ comes to establish the law of Grace.** He proves his doctrine by miracles: he consummates it by his resurrection: the resurrection is proved by the testimony of the Apostles who conversed with him and in whose presence he ascended into heaven. They shed their blood to sustain, not a speculation, in which the mind is prone to error, but a fact on which their senses could not deceive them. They prove their own testimony by miracles, and they even communicate this power to others. There is no interval between the resurrection of Jesus Christ and the first establishment of the church. St. Paul writes letters to several churches already formed. The date of his epistle is incontestible, nothing discredits it. Miracles are perpetuated, the very conversion of nations becomes a new testimony. In fine the light has reached us without intermission, without interruption.

What difficulty yet remains? many sects are divided in belief and all cry out *I am the Church*. But can one be deceived on this point? Jesus Christ said to the apostles: Go preach: he who hears you hears me. . . . I am with you even to the consummation of the world. Should we look for this divine authority in sects separated from the main trunk, or in the immediate and direct succession of the apostolic ministry.

Can there be any hesitation? If I seek this authority among sects who acknowledge their separation, I am left without any rule of faith. My individual judgment is to determine my belief: so many minds, so many dogmas. But by holding to this visible body of pastors, successors of the apostles, I need only an humble docility in order to believe.

We must then believe and practice what the visible church teaches. We must work out our salvation in trembling and in hope.

In trembling; because He who gives me passing griefs for my earthly trials, can render my condition permanently miserable if I violate His laws.

In hope; because He who grants me

passing pleasures to sustain me in this life, can render my condition permanently happy if I am faithful to His grace.

I have set out from certain principles, and all these consequences, if properly deducible from them, are equally certain; but it would be sufficient, that of all religions, the christian religion were only the best proven, to make man obliged in conscience adopt it, because it is an evident contempt of truth to prefer that which has not its marks to that which has.

In a word; the study of religion is an historical discussion; and, if the testimony on which it rests have every condition necessary to establish the certainty of a fact, then we are no longer at liberty to combat it by philosophical objections. We would not have opposed these objections to the miracles had we seen them; neither therefore are we at liberty to oppose them to the testimony of these miracles if it is irrefragible.

From the Edinburgh Review.

### ORIGIN, NATURE, AND TENDENCIES OF ORANGE ASSOCIATIONS.

ART. IX.—1. *Report: Orange Lodges, Associations, or Societies in Ireland.* Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 20th July, 1835.

2. *Second Report from the Select Committee appointed to Inquire into the Nature, Character, Extent, and Tendency of Orange Lodges, Associations or Societies in Ireland, with the Minutes of Evidence, and Appendix.* Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 6th August, 1835.

3. *Third Report: Orange Lodges, Associations or Societies in Ireland.* Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 6th August, 1835.

4. *Report: Orange Institutions in Great Britain and the Colonies.* Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed 7th September, 1835.

5. *Report of the Select Committee appointed to inquire into the Origin, Nature, Extent, and Tendency of Orange Institutions in Great Britain and the Colonies, and to Report the Evidence taken before them, and their Opinions to the House.* Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 7th September, 1835.

[CONTINUED]

But we return to our subject. Colonel William Blacker, formerly grand master of the county of Armagh, distinctly stated to the Committee (Irish Report, 8975 to 77) 'that from the first Orange procession in 1796, until the night of the last 12th July, the country was never so quiet as upon those procession nights, and that men who are loose in their conduct for all the rest of the year are steady then.' This startling assertion, was as stoutly met by Mr. Christie, the Quaker, who declares (Irish Report, 5600) 'that there has scarcely been a 12th July to the best of his recollection in any year from the commencement of Orangism till now, when a breach of the peace has not occurred, and frequently lives have been lost in consequence of processions.' Again, he adds, 'a life was lost at the very first procession which he witnessed. A surgeon of the name of Murdie was stabbed at his own door.' (Irish Report, 5634.)

All the other witnesses, with the exception of course of the Orangemen, concur

in this opinion. Even Lord Caledon, who from his Tory politics might be supposed to have a leaning towards the Orangemen, distinctly declares 'that their institution has led to breaches of the peace, and that their processions are mischievous; the whole system tending to disunion.' (Irish Report, 5418—73.)

But these are matters of opinion. We proceed, therefore, to more substantial matters of fact and law. We confine ourselves to recent times. When the Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel suddenly changed their policy respecting Catholic Emancipation, and from being the last to listen to solicitations, became the first to yield to virtual force, the whole body of Orangemen loudly and vehemently opposed them. Accordingly, measures were taken, and proclamations issued, against the processions and proceedings of Orange and other associations. (Irish Report, Appen. 143.) But the Orangemen not the less persisted; until finding their former friends more in earnest than usual, they resorted to the best legal counsel to aid them in their distress. The following letter, which was, in this emergency, drawn up and approved by the grand committee, will explain the state of their case; as their subsequent deeds will evince their obedience to well-known laws.—This letter is dated from their committee-rooms, 26th October, 1830:—'Sir and Brother; the grand secretary of the county Antium having applied to this committee to have the opinion of counsel taken as to the legality of an interruption of an Orange procession at Ballymona on the 12th July last by the police, and the taking from them their badges, flags, &c.—The committee forthwith caused a case to be laid before two eminent barristers, Mr. Sergeant Pennefather and Mr. Holmes, both of whom have given it as their opinion, that under existing circumstances, and the present state of the law, Orange processions are not only decidedly illegal, but dangerous; more particularly as the proclamation of the 18th July, 1829, not only referred to them, but contemplated such meetings, and that the police were fully justified in acting as they did at Ballymona. The committee, to prevent the loss of life or liberty, feel it imperative on them to request you will make such opinions of counsel speedily and generally known to our Orange brethren only. The committee are as anxious as their brethren for the usual display of Protestant feeling. Still they feel called upon to recommend to the whole body at once voluntary to give up all processions for the present, and publicly to make known their intention of doing so.'

This is undeniable proof that the grand lodge and great body of Orangemen were fully aware of the illegality of Orange processions even in 1830. What has been the consequence of this knowledge of the law, and of these loyal injunctions of the grand lodge? Their resolutions were circulated in October, 1830; and by an official return (Irish Report, Ap. 3, p. 93), it appears that in the single province of Ulster, no less than fifty Orange processions (some of 5000 men) paraded on the 12th July, 1831! These were generally

headed or countenanced by Orangemen high in civil station and authority; and even by members of the grand lodge who had prepared the above anti-procession injunction!

Was it that the Orangemen conceived the change of government in 1830 released them from their resolutions to obey the law? We know not: but, by the returns, and by the concurrent testimony of all the witnesses, whether Orange or not, it appears that the zeal and activity of Orangemen were greatly increased after that event. This zeal and these processions continued unabated through 1831, 1832, 1833, 1834, and 1835. In the present year, the Ulster return contains an account of some seventy places where Orange processions or demonstrations, more or less violent, took place, on the 12th and 13th July (Irish Report, 8105), in defiance of the law and all the efforts of the government.

When we come to speak of the Orange perversions of law, we may be able to show why these processions could not be more effectually put down, and why conviction of the offenders and their due punishment could rarely be obtained. Happily less of outrage and fewer scenes of bloodshed attended them than formerly. This partly arose from the vigilance of Government. But the principal cause sprung from the Catholics, who abstained from taking the law into their own hands;—that is, from interfering with the Orange processions, from the belief that they at length had a government which would sincerely vindicate the existing laws (Irish Report, 3; Ap. 104.) Still many lives were lost. But the character of these processions, and the divided allegiance of Orangemen, are best gathered from examples. For this purpose we refer to the disposition of Mr. Sharman Crawford, the member for Dundalk.—not on account of any marked features of violence attending the processions there mentioned,—for on the contrary it was rather more peaceable than usual; but because it affords an instance of Orange breach of law, in defiance even of Tory authority.

There had been much bad blood in the neighborhood of Crossgar in consequence of former processions—frequent quarrels between Orangemen and Catholics had taken place—one man, a Roman Catholic, had been shot in the arm. Great apprehensions of a riot were entertained as the time approached for the usual procession (12th July, 1830.) The proclamations against processions issued by the Lord-lieutenant in Council, were extensively posted up. The magistrates reported the state of the country to the government, and Mr. Crawford received instructions to attend at Crossgar and keep the peace. His deposition declares, 'that' (Irish Report, 43 13,) agreeably to his instructions, informant attended Crossgar on Monday the 12th July; found there a party of constabulary, consisting of twelve men, commanded by Fielding Given, Esq., chief constable. Informant first caused an arch, which had been erected in the village, to be taken down; informant then detached a party of four