

POPERY—GREAT PROTESTANT MEETINGS.

TORONTO, Jan. 15, 1851.

MR. EDITOR,—

The great public meetings lately held in Britain cannot but have attracted the attention of yourself and others in this province; for, whatever may be the character and extent of the efforts we may be able to put forth, certain it is, that *there are obligations laid on us as a part of the Protestant community to sympathize with the strugglers for civil and religious freedom.* I am aware that there are not a few in Canada who hold a very different view of the matter from what has here been indicated, and that some even deprecate the idea of any interference in the controversy at all. Of the painful symptoms of the case, this is by far the worst, for it tends to divide the friends of the great cause, and to give an easy victory to the adherents of error. The "Popish aggression," as it has been called, is no figment of the fancy. Any man who knows what Popery is, knows well that the Papacy never yet made a movement *for nothing*—never moved at all without deep and due calculation—never calculated calmly and solemnly without some end in view, at variance with the interests of liberty—and never wounded the cause of liberty, save through the side of Protestantism. I can easily understand how it is, that in the United States, the appointment of a cardinal and other paraphernalia may excite no particular interest on the part of the civil government of that country; but it would surprise me not a little, were it true that the movements of the papacy, in the way of aggrandizement, in the States, occasioned no very deep emotions in the minds of individuals and churches. Assuredly there are causes in operation on the other side of the line, as affecting the march of popery, very different from those which affect Britain; and it is not very necessary to discuss the question, though it is a serious one, whether the causes in Britain, or those in the States, are most likely to prove most influential. All sound protestants will rejoice that, in the States, the state of society, the cast of opinion, and the progress of mind, are all in favor of a modification and reduction of the papal power, and facts do shew that emigration to the west has tended to check the aggressions of popery. But who does not know that the condition of matters is altogether different in the old country, and that we are to be guided in our movements not by theories of our own, but by the actual sentiments of the Papacy? Lax protestants may, in these lands, combine with astute Jesuits, in wishing that the protestant clause in the line of the Hanoverian succession were forever blotted out; and who would thank them most heartily for this? Certainly it would be the Antonellis, the Wisemans, and the Piononos of a venerable High Churchmanship, associated perhaps with the Neophytes of the Newman and the Pusey school. The Bishop of Exeter would not, for with all his aberrations from sound doctrine and sound sense, I cannot forget that in other days he did good service to the cause of protestantism, and an appeal is still competent from "Philip drunk to Philip sober." But is it not a "great fact," that such a clause *there is* in the recorded constitution of Britain, and a clause which cost more blood and treasure than all other clauses put together; and, moreover, a clause which, if it had been kept out, would have paralysed Britain's right arm, and left the man who made his escape by the fishing boat at Folkstone in a dark night, in peaceable possession of the crown of his ancestors? And is it not another "great fact," that our beloved Queen—may God long preserve her—has sworn on her great oath, at her accession to the British throne, that popery is at once "*impious and idolatrous*;" and were she to tolerate a mass within Buckingham palace or at Balmoral, her crown must be surrendered forever? Such "facts" our lax protestants in Toronto may not like, misled as they unhap-

pily are by the love of a favorite paradox—their master at Rome does not like them neither—and cheerfully would he recommend twenty years purchase of the rental of the "Island of Montreal" to be given for their repeal. The man knows what he is about—they do not.

Mr. Editor, what of the "Meetings"? They were noble and effective. The London one was by no means the most satisfactory, for assuredly there were nobles and commoners *not there* who ought to have been, and a more logical and conclusive style of address might have been adopted. Still, the "Protestant Alliance" is a fair representation of the mind of Britain, and the Statesbury, and the Bickersteths, and the Bunneys of England are "fit and proper" persons to plead the common faith of the bodies whom they represent. Reasons of state, or of etiquette, may have kept away the great men of the Church and of the State, but we believe they are substantially sound at heart; and I feel always glad when the pious and enlightened Protestantism of the two archiepiscopal mitres of England catches my eye. Do I therefore approve of such mitres? Assuredly not; but taking things as they stand, common sense and regard to common safety bid me rejoice that we have neither a Laud at the head of the Church, nor a Stratford at the helm of the State. Yes, Mr. Editor, the blood of the Russells beats yet warm and healthy, and the Sumners and the Mosgraves of the hierarchy will yet come out in noble array.

Finer specimens of argument and of eloquence we could not have than what were presented at the great meetings in the two metropolitan cities of the north. The Cunninghams, the Candlishes, the Browns, the Alexanders, the Thomsons, of the one; and the Kings, the Symingtons, the Buchanans and the Hills of the other, have thrown a flood of light on the various topics discussed, and with a spirit, a talent, and a tact, which the Senate-house of Great Britain would thankfully claim and cheerfully enshrine. O that we had in Canada West a periodical that could venture to bring their loud and manly appeals within reach of the provincial reader!

The principal topics discussed were, the Maynooth grant; the Law of Mortmain; and the duty of visiting and inspecting nunneries. The grant to Maynooth College was first made by Mr. Pitt in 1795. It was not asked by the Roman Catholics; it was proposed and accepted by them, however, and its scale was something like £2000. It varied from year to year, and one year it was wholly omitted! Antecedently to 1845, it had reached £9000, and that year witnessed Sir Robert Peel raising it to £20,000, and transferring it from the National Endowment to the Consolidated Fund. It is now, I believe £30,000 a-year; and given for what? The original pretext was, to prevent native British subjects from being sent to Italy or Spain for education as priests, that so they might not embrace treasonable doctrines, but retain all that staunch loyalty so ingrained in the breast of a disciple of Paul Cullen. The end was far from being achieved; and the "cabbages" of poor O'Brien at the one end, and the barricades of Paris on the other, lauded as both have been by the trumpets of St. Peter and the Vatican, may furnish a gauge for measuring the length and the depth of Roman Catholic loyalty. The College is *wholly Theological*—and what a Theology! That of *Peter Dema*—a cursed, wicked, Jesuitism, pandering to the basest passions of the heart; and *this*, we, Britons, teach the warm-hearted sons of Erin, and pay cheerfully £30,000 a-year for doing so! And from the benefits of such a school of theology, every Protestant is excluded, and the new inspection of the "den" is actually a matter of state stipulation. Dr. King most aptly gave as a twofold instance of the actual results of the theology of Maynooth, the sentiments of the editor of the *Paris Univers*, and those of the author of a Roman Catholic History of England, both warmly in favour of the burning of Huss, and the ex-

tirpation of "wicked Protestants"—and both *hopeful clerics of the Maynooth College*! Is not this something like suicide on the part of honest John Bull?

With respect to the law of mortmain and the inspection of nunneries, the cases of *Mrs Tallott* and of the poor French dancing-master at London, are admirably illustrated and applied by the masterly hand of a clever lawyer of the right stamp—Mr. Robert Thompson of Glasgow—and he proposes in his speech, that the old law of mortmain, so wholesome in itself, and relatively as important now as in the days of Henry III., shall not be interfered with, but that an *addition* to it shall be made, namely, an extension of it to *personal property*. At present, it reaches only to *hereditary*. Now, at the time of the act being passed, land was in fact the only *real property*—it is altogether different now, when so much of the most valuable endowments of a country consist of shares, and commercial stock. I wish he had taken also the case of *incorporations*. These have already done much mischief, in locking up very extensive domains within ecclesiastical land-ocracies; and if the system is to be acted on by Papists and Puseyites—and why may not *Erasmians* of all shades claim also!—Who can say where the evil shall end?

These are matters, Mr. Editor, of deep import to Britain, and to her Colonies not less. Indeed the Colonies of Britain seem to be given up to the Vatican and to Exeter as so many hopeful "preserves." When even Lower Canada is beginning to move, however, in a right direction, shall Canada West lag behind? Circumstances connected with the late elections lead me to think she will not. Only let every man "do his duty"—and let all Protestant Churches do theirs.

MR. EDITOR, yours faithfully,

A PROTESTANT.

LETTER TO THE REV. DR. CANDLISH OF EDINBURGH, SCOTLAND.

By one of the Corresponding Secretaries of the American and Foreign Christian Union.

MY DEAR DR. CANDLISH,—

I think you will agree with me in the opinion, that next to the need of an abundant and universal outpouring of the Spirit from on High, which the conversion of the world demands, the greatest desideratum at present is the *Regeneration of Christendom*. Let me call your attention again to this great topic, for the purpose of setting forth a little more at large the greatness as well as the importance of the subject.

The population of our globe is estimated by M. Balbi, and other well-informed geographers, at a thousand millions, of which Europe contains at least a fourth part, say 250,000,000, Asia, 450,000,000, Africa, 150,000,000, America, 50,000,000, and other portions of the world 100,000,000. Of course this estimate is not to be deemed strictly exact, but it is enough so for our purposes. Now let us see how the question of Religion is concerned in this reckoning.

The ROMAN CATHOLICS are 200,000,000, according to the statement of his Holiness, Pius IX. I find it very difficult, however, to make anything like that number; but his Holiness ought to be well informed on this subject, inasmuch as he must be a poor shepherd who does not know with very considerable accuracy the number of his sheep.

The members of the GREEK CHURCH and other ORIENTAL CHURCHES—all similar in spirit, and nearly equal in ignorance of the true Gospel, to the Papal Church—may be estimated at not much, if at all, short of 60,000,000.

The PROTESTANTS are, I think, quite 75,000,000 in number.

This makes the nominally-Christian population of the world to be 335,000,000, or about ONE-THIRD PART OF THE HUMAN RACE.