

between Scotland and Ireland, at the time they were respectively united to England—a difference, which demonstrates that the precedent attempted to be drawn from the former is not at all applicable to the latter.

Great benefits, both of a political and commercial nature, were promised by the Minister to Ireland at the time of the Union. We shall admit that he stated what he himself believed would follow that measure. Have these promised advantages been realized? He held the beam in his hand—did he balance the scales evenly? Every man who is competent to judge, and who will give an impartial opinion, must answer, no! He may have intended well; but it should not be forgotten by his admirers, nor by the supporters of the Union, that it was a mighty and vast undertaking—a stupendous edifice to construct. Neither must they forget that oceans of innocent Irish blood were crying aloud to Heaven against the twin architects of construction; Pitt and Castlereagh—the modern Nero and Caligula of Ireland. May the Minister, not have committed some error—neglected some prop in mapping out the foundation; may not the chief architect have been so dazzled by the splendor of the dome, as to have neglected the solidity of the base? The part of the foundation that rests on Ireland is evidently giving way—a slight shock—and the whole fabric may tumble into atoms. Should not the state of the building be examined? A little delay—and the dilapidation may be irreparable. Could not some of the pillars be placed on the only solid basis on which they can securely rest—the confidence, the attachment, and the interest of the Irish people?

Hume, a great authority, says: "To balance a large state or society, whether monarchical or republican, on general laws, is a work of so great difficulty, that no human genius, however comprehensive, is able, by the mere dint of reason and reflection, to effect it. The judgement of many must unite in the work—experience must guide the labor—time must bring it to perfection—and the feeling of inconvenience must correct the mistakes which they inevitably fall into their first trials and experiments."

We have now brought this series of papers to a close.—EDITOR OF TRUE WITNESS.

LOYOLA, THE JESUIT.

The Statue to His Memory in Quebec City.

The remarks of the Witness of this city on the above subject called forth a rejoinder in THE TRUE WITNESS of September of which the following is a continuation, and, for the present at least, the conclusion. So the Witness is requested to look on this question and then on that:

With respect to the Reformation (so called) in England, we all know that Henry VIII., who took the first steps towards it, was, at the beginning of his reign, so zealous against it, that he wrote a book, which he dedicated to Pope Leo X., in opposition to it, and in return received from this Pontiff, for himself and successors, the title of Defender of the Faith. Becoming afterwards enamoured of Ann Boleyn, one of the maids of honor to the Queen, and the reigning Pope having refused to sanction an adulterous marriage with her, he caused a statute to be passed, abrogating the Pope's supremacy, and declaring himself Supreme Head of the Church of England. Archbishop Parker records that the bishops, assembled in Synod in 1581, offered to sign this new title, with the following salvo: "In quantum per Christi leges licet," but that the King would admit of no such modification. (Antiq. Brit., p. 325.) In the end, they surrendered the whole of their spiritual jurisdiction to him; (all except the religious Bishop of Rochester, Fisher, who was put to death for his refusal,) and were content to publish Articles of Religion devised by the King's Highness.—(Heylin's Hist. of Reform. Collier, &c.)

Thus he plunged the nation into schism, and opened the way for every kind of heresy and impiety. In short, nothing is more evident than that the king's inordinate passion, and not the word of God, was the rule followed in this first important change of the National Religion. The unprincipled Duke of Somerset, who next succeeded to

supreme power in the church and state, under the shadow of his youthful nephew Edward VI., pushed on the Reformation, so-called, much further than it had yet been carried, with a view to the gratification of his own ambitions and avaricious purposes. He suppressed the remaining colleges and hospitals which the profligacy of Henry had spared, converting their revenues to his own use and to that of his associates. He forced Cranmer and the other bishops to take out fresh commissions for governing their dioceses during his nephew's, that is to say, his own *good pleasure*. 'Licentiam concedimus ad nostrum beneplacitum dumtaxat duraturam.' Burnet, Hist. Ref., p. II. B. I. N. 2. He made a great number of important changes in the public worship, by his own authority or that of his visitors. See the Injunction of the Council of Preachers, published before the Parliament met, concerning the Mass in the Latin language, prayers for the dead, &c. See, also, the order sent to the Primate against psalms, ashes, &c., in Heylin, Burnet and Collier. The boy Edward VI., just thirteen years old, was taught by his uncle to proclaim as follows: 'We would not have our subjects so much to mistake our judgment, &c., as though we could not discern what is to be done, &c. God be praised, we know what, by His word, is fit to be redressed, &c.' Collier, vol. ii., p. 246. When he employed certain bishops and divines in forming fresh articles and a new liturgy, he punished them with imprisonment if they were not on all points obsequious to his orders. The Bishops Heath and Gardiner were both imprisoned for non-compliance. He even took upon himself to alter their work, when sanctioned by Parliament, in compliment to the Church's greatest enemy, Calvin. Heylin complains bitterly of Calvin's pragmatical spirit, in quarrelling with the English Liturgy, and soliciting the Protector to alter it. Preface to Hist. of Reform. His Letters to Somerset on the subject may be seen in Fox's ACTS AND MONUM. Afterwards, when Elizabeth came to the throne, a new Reformation, different in its Articles and Liturgy from that of Edward VI., was set on foot, and moulded, not according to Scripture, but to her orders. She deposed all the bishops, except one, "the calamity of his See, as he was called, namely, Anthony Kitchen, so called by Godwin, de Præsul, and Camden; and required the new ones, whom she appointed, to renounce certain exercises, which they declared to be "agreeable to the Word of God, but which she found not to agree with her system of politics. This took place with respect to what was termed prophesying, that practised by many Protestants, and defended by Archbishop Grindal and other bishops, as "agreeable to God's Word; nevertheless, the Queen obliged them to suppress it. Collier Eccl. Hist. P. II. p. 554, &c. She, even in full Parliament, threatened in blasphemous language, to depose them all, if they did not act conformably to her views. See her curious speech in Parliament, March 25, 1585, in Stow's Annals. This speech alone would stamp the Virgin (?) Bess, as a fitting head for a political Church, founded by her adulterous father.

The more strictly the subject is examined, the more clearly will it appear, that it was not in consequence of any investigation of the Scriptures, either public or private, that the ancient Catholic Religion was abolished, and one or other of the new Protestant Religions set up in the different northern Kingdoms and States of Europe, but in consequence of the politics of princes and statesmen, the avarice of the nobility and gentry, and the irreligion and licentiousness of the people. I will even advance a step further, and affirm that there is no appearance of any individual Protestant, to whatever sect he belongs, having formed his creed by the rule Scripture alone.

Do you really believe that those persons of the Protestant communion, whom you see the most diligent and devout in turning over their Bibles, have really found out in them the thirty-nine articles, or any other creed which they happen to profess? To judge more certainly of this matter, I wish those gentlemen who are the most zealous and active in distributing Bibles among the Indians and Africans in their different countries, would procure from some half dozen of the most intelligent and serious of the proselytes, who have heard nothing of the Christian faith by any other means than their Bibles, a summary of what they respectively understand to be the doctrine and the morality taught in that

sacred volume. What inconsistent and nonsensical symbols should we not witness? The truth is, Protestants are tutored from their infancy, by the help of catechisms and creeds, in the systems of their respective sects; they are guided by their parents and masters, and are influenced by the opinions and example of those with whom they live and converse. Some particular texts of Scripture are strongly impressed upon their minds, and others of an apparently different meaning are kept out of their view, or glossed over; and above all, it is continually inculcated to them, that their religion is built upon Scripture alone. Hence, when they actually read the Scriptures, they fancy they see there what they have been otherwise taught to believe; the Lutheran, for example, that Christ is really present in the Sacrament; the Calvinist, that he is as far distant from it, as heaven is from earth; the Churchman, that baptism is necessary for infants; the Baptist, that it is an impiety to confer it on them; and so of all the other forty sects of Protestants enumerated by Evans in his sketch of the different denominations of Christians, and of ten times forty other sects whom he omits to mention.

When I remarked that our blessed Master, Jesus Christ wrote no part of the New Testament himself, and gave no orders to His Apostles to write it, I ought to have added, that if he had intended it to be, together with the Old Testament, the sole rule of religion, he would have provided means for their being able to follow it; knowing, as he certainly did, that 99 in every 100, or rather 999 in every 1000, in different ages and countries, would not be able to read at all, and much less to comprehend a page of the sacred writings. Yet no such means were provided by him; nor has he so much as enjoined it to his followers in general to study letters.

Another observation on this subject, and a very obvious one, is, that among those Christians, who profess that the Bible alone is the rule of their religion, there ought to be no articles, no catechisms, no sermons, nor other instructions. True, it is, that the abolition of these, however incompatible they are with the rule itself, would quickly undermine the Established Church, as its clergy now begin to understand; and if universally carried into effect, would, in the end, efface the whole doctrine and morality of the Gospel; but this consequence (which is inevitable) only shows more clearly the falsehood of this exclusive rule. (The Protestant writers, Kett and Robison, have shown in the passage before quoted that the principle of private judgment tends to undermine Christianity at large, and Archbishop Hook, in his charge, shows by an exact statement of capital convictions in different years, that the increase of immorality has kept pace with that of the Bible Societies.)

In fact, the most enlightened Protestants find themselves here in a dilemma, and are obliged to say and unsay, to the amusement of some persons, and the pity of others. One of the many instances of the distress in question is exhibited by the Right Rev. Dr. Marsh. In his publication, "The Inquiry," p. 4, he says very truly, 'the poor (who constitute the bulk of mankind) cannot, without assistance, understand the Scriptures.' Being congratulated on this important, yet unavoidable concession, by the Rev. Mr. Gandolphy, he tacks about in a public letter to that gentleman, and says, that what he wrote in his "Inquiry" concerning the necessity of a further rule than mere Scripture, only regards the establishment of religion, not the truth of it: just as if that rule were sufficient to conduct the people to the truth of Religion, while he expressly says they cannot understand it!

They cannot abandon the rule of the Bible alone, as explained by each one for himself, without proclaiming their guilt in refusing to hear the Church, and they cannot adhere to it, without opening the floodgates to all the impiety and immorality of the present age upon their own communion. Further on I shall have occasion to notice the claims of the Episcopalian Church to authority, in determining the sense of Scripture, as well as in other religious controversies: in the meantime I cannot

NO OTHER Sarsaparilla has the careful personal supervision of the proprietor in all the details of its preparation as has **HOOD'S** Sarsaparilla.

but observe that her most able defenders are frequently obliged to abandon their own, and adopt the Catholic Rule of Faith. It is not necessary to notice the other sects upon this vital point,—what with their inconsistencies and absurdities they must make "high Heaven weep!" The judicious Hooker, in his defence of the Church of England, writes thus:

"Of this we are right sure that nature, Scripture, and experience itself have taught the world to seek for the ending of contentions by submitting to some judicial and definite sentence whereunto neither parties that contendeth, may, under any pretence or color refuse to stand. This must needs be effectual and strong. As for other means, without this they seldom prevail." See Hooker's Eccles. Polity, Pref. art. 6.

Another most clear-headed writer and renowned defender of the Establishment, thus expresses himself in a charge to the clergy of his Archdeaconry: "The opinions of the people are and must be founded more on authority than reason. Their parents, their teachers, their governors, in a great measure, determine for them what they are to believe and what to practise. The same doctrines, uniformly taught, the same rights constantly performed, make such an impression on their minds that they hesitate as little in admitting the articles of their faith as in receiving the most established maxims of common life." Discourses on various Subjects, by T. Balguy, D.D., Archdeacon and Pubendary of Winchester, p. 287. With such testimonies before one's eyes, can any one imagine that the bulk of Protestants have formed, or were designed to form, their religion by the standard of Scripture? He goes on to say, speaking of controverted points: "Would you have them (the people) think for themselves? Would you have them hear and decide the controversies of the learned? Would you have them enter into the depths of criticism, of logic, of scholastic divinity? You might as well expect them to compute an eclipse, or decide between the Cartesian and Newtonian philosophy. Nay, I will go farther: for I take upon myself to say, there are more men capable, in some competent degree, of understanding Newton's philosophy, than of forming any judgment at all concerning the abstruse questions in metaphysic and theology." Yet the persons, of whom the Doctor speaks, were all furnished with Bibles; and the abstruse questions, which he refers to, are: "Whether Christ did, or did not, come down from heaven?" "Whether he sent his Holy Spirit to assist and comfort us, or whether he did not send him?"—Discourses on Various Subjects, by F. Balguy, D.D. p. 257. It may be remarked that some of these Discourses were preached at the Consecration of Bishops, and published by order of the Archbishop, some charges to the clergy. The whole of them is dedicated to the King, whom the writer thanks for naming him to a high dignity; (the Bishopric of Gloucester,) and for permitting him to decline it.

The learned Doctor elsewhere expresses himself still more explicitly on the subject of Scripture without Church authority. He is combatting the Dissenters—such as the Witness, but his weapons are evidently as fatal to his own Church as to theirs. "It has long been held among them that Scripture only is the rule and test of all religious ordinances; and that human authority is to be altogether excluded. Their ancestors, I believe, would have been not a little embarrassed with their own maxim, if they had not possessed a singular talent of seeing everything in Scripture which they had a mind to see. Almost every sect could find their peculiar form of church-government; and while they forced only their own imaginations, they believed themselves to be executing the decrees of heaven."—Vide, Discourse VII. p. 126.

In recommending the perusal of this article to the theological editor of the Witness, we conclude with a passage to the present purpose from our admired theological poet:—

"As long as words a different sense will bear,
And each may be his own interpreter,
Our airy faith will no foundation find:
The world's a weathercock for every wind."
—DRYDEN'S *Hind and Panther*, Part I.

CANCER PERMANENTLY CURED.
No Knife, No Poison, No Plaster. JNO. B. HARRIS, Fort Payne, Ala. U.S.A.

AGENTS who work for us make MONEY fast. Send your address on postal card for particulars. THE ROYAL MANUFACTURING Co., Windsor, Ont. U.S.A.