

thing, at least, appears plain, that neither the Calvinist's nor the Arminian's theory furnishes a key wherewith to unriddle all the mysteries of the universe. Either can propose to the other unanswerable questions, insoluble mysteries. No doubt one is in a better position than the other for seeing all that can be seen of the Divine system of truth; but as both can see so little at the best, it becomes each to be humble and tolerant. It may be that both are fellow-seekers, equally sincere; and that from their present partial views, and by their far divided paths, they will reach the point of full revelation together. Meanwhile, may they not strive and work together now?

For be it distinctly observed, in the great practical matters of evangelical preaching and of Christian duty, both are one. The time has gone by when Calvinist legions pin down Arminians to Universalism, or when Arminians triumphantly demonstrate that Calvinists ought to be Antinomians. Whatever logic may say, there are the facts. General Baptists are not Universalists, Particular Baptists are not Antinomians. We speak of the immense majority. Nor ought we to forget to make grateful and honourable mention of the two great men whom God raised up at the same time, in the crisis of peril to each of these Christian communities, to save them from their respective dangers, and to keep them in the path of evangelic faith. The name of Andrew Fuller is honoured throughout Protestant Christendom; that of Dan Taylor is less renowned, but in his own sphere his usefulness was as great. If the former was the means of saving the mass of Calvinistic churches from Antinomianism, the latter rescued a large proportion of the Arminian Baptists from a form of Socinianism that was threatening to engulf them all. Thus, although they may not have suspected it, did these illustrious men become pioneers in the work of union. Each led his brethren from devious paths, where they were beginning to wander, back to the simple gospel; and having brought them to the Cross, it has become the far easier task of another generation to bring them together.

That it is the same gospel that is preached in both denominations, the most ordinary observation will prove. Go to Derby, Leicester, Nottingham, London; visit the Particular and the General Baptist chapels; listen to the sermons, attend the prayer-meetings, view the administration of the ordinances, —and we venture to say it will become utterly inexplicable to nineteen out of twenty observers on what principle Christians who seem to have literally every essential thing in common should be divided by so absolute an ecclesiastical separation. We speak of "observers" only, be it marked; —the historical student will fully understand how the division was occasioned; but the causes which once necessitated it, we are happy to believe, exist no longer.

From the Puritan Recorder.

#### PROGRESS OF ROMISH INFLUENCE IN CANADA.

Every American Protestant must take more or less interest in the development of Popery upon this side of the Atlantic. In British North America, Catholicity is as powerful as perhaps in any portion of the known world; and in the province of Canada, it is to be seen under peculiar and highly interesting circumstances.

At the time of the conquest of Canada, England consented by express articles of treaty, first with the French commander, who yielded up Quebec by capitulation, and afterwards with the King of France, that

the religion of the French Canadians should be preserved in tact; which the priests ultimately succeeded in introducing the British Government to construe into the recognition of all the civil, legal powers, which their church had exercised under French sway. It was under the first governor, General Murray, second in command to Wolfe, that the church made an attempt to have its jurisdiction in criminal cases established. The attempt to execute a nun was resisted by the governor, who put seven pieces of cannon in position, and threatened to demolish the convent, unless the fair prisoner was released. He carried his point by the terror of military power; but the claim of holding ecclesiastical courts was not abandoned until the passing of the Quebec Act under which the power of inflicting punishment for crimes and offences was specially reserved to courts of justice holden according to the forms and principles of the common law of England in criminal cases. Still the right of the clergy to sue for tithes was conceded; and at the present moment the Romish priest has as little difficulty in a suit of that kind in Canada as he would have in any state of Italy. The clergy on their part lent their support to the British Government. On the outbreak of the American Revolution, Du Plessis Moray, the Catholic archbishop, pointed out to the French Canadians that Franklin had complained of the favourable terms granted to the Catholics of Canada by George III., as a grievance in the opinion of the Protestant colonists; and both the archbishop and his clergy called upon the people to stand by the throne, and even to take arms against Montgomery and Arnold. Many of them did so, though, despite of all the efforts of the clergy, the "rebels" were not entirely without declared friends amongst the French Canadians.

So in the rebellion of the French Canadians in 1837, the priests were found entirely on the side of the crown. Attempts were repeatedly made, by Papineau and the popular party, to cause the property of the priesthood to be placed under the control of the Pope and the purview of their representatives. It was in vain. No sooner would the nominally Roman Catholic majority in the Legislative Assembly procure a bill (such as the "*Marguilliers'* Act), striking directly at the temporal endowments of the church, than the nominally Protestant majority of the Legislative Council (the Canadian Senate) would reject the bill, as a *quid pro quo* for the support of the priests against the popular party. It was therefore the policy of the priests to conciliate Protestants. Tolerance was essentially necessary to a clergy whose wealth and power were preserved by Protestants from the encroachments of professing Papists, desirous of borrowing the voluntary system from the United States and applying it to their church. It was this circumstance which has rendered Romanism in Canada so different from Romanism elsewhere. While Britain retained any substantial amount of power and control in the affairs of the colony, nothing could exceed the mildness of the priests, not only in their personal intercourse with Protestants, to whom they made it a point to be on all occasions civil, hospitable, and obliging, but even in their doctrines, carefully avoiding in their discourses all matter of offence, and often holding up the Protestants as models, in some particular respects, for the imitation of their flocks, and speaking of the duty of living in charity with them, and setting an example of good neighbourhood in their intercourse with them. Of late years this course has been altered much for the worse. The reasons of the change are: The complete recognition by the British Government of the representative principle in the government of Canada.