

mandments of men" The one declares that "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation, so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation."\* The other pretends that Holy Scripture does not contain all things necessary to salvation, and that even what it does contain is only necessary in so far as it is certified as such by its own fallible councils, and that there are also other things—oral traditions, human decrees, and Papal appointments—which have not only the force of God's Holy Word, but actually supersede it. Nay, it virtually makes fallible men not only to overthrow the authority of God Himself, but to usurp His Divinity, and pervert it and debase it, with awful blasphemy.

Thus not only can we have no peace with Rome, but we are bound, by our own sacred and solemn obligations to God Himself, to resist it even to the death, if need be, as the Holy Martyrs resisted it, whose blood has proved to be, as it was predicted it would, the seed of the True Church. They who are Romanizers among us, therefore—who yearn after Rome themselves, and use arts and devices to send others there—or who even palter with its principles, and run the risk of promoting their adoption, whether by word or deed: such men, if such there be, are undoubtedly adversaries of the Truth, and enemies of the Cross of Christ.† They are traitors to the holy cause to which, in the sight of God, they had solemnly committed themselves. They are disloyal to their Church—they are unfaithful to God. Not in the character of her teaching only, but, as in another of the Articles of Religion, their Church expressly declares,—and they have assented thereto,—“the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in her living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith,”‡—that certain of her doctrines are “found things vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God,”§—that some of her injunctions are “plainly repugnant to the Word of God, and the custom of the Primitive Church,”¶—and that other of her ordinances are even “blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits.”‡ As well as this, there is also an enslaving of the individual conscience—a closing up of the only discriminating faculty of the mind in the things of the soul. The individual responsibility is thus ignored; the Priest is put in the place of conscience,—it is him with whom the soul has then to do, and not with its God. The individual judgment, as well as the individual conscience, is thus placed under human, instead of divine direction.

There is thus between us and them “a great gulf fixed”—yet a gulf which they, by coming, through God's grace, to a knowledge of the truth, may pass over and come to us, and be rescued from the fearful perils of their false position; while we, unless we are led astray, and become perfidious, and degenerate, and turn the grace of God into licentiousness, can never pass it, seeing that it must involve us in the most fatal mists of error and delusion. Romanism, therefore, we repeat, is the great enemy of our Catholic and Apostolic Church; and he who, either directly or indirectly, sends any there, will certainly be obnoxious to that fearful, yet divine denunciation—“It must needs be that offences come, but woe unto that man by whom the offence cometh.”—*N. Y. Churchman.*

\* The Sixth Article of Religion. † Art. XIX.  
‡ Art. XXII. § Art. XXIV. ¶ Art. XXXI.

## The Church Times.

HALIFAX, SATURDAY, FEB'Y. 16, 1856

### THE CHURCH WITNESS' CORRESPONDENT.

ACCORDING to promise we resume the subject of last week's Editorial, so as to complete our reply to “Cura.” At the beginning of his letter we are told, that it was “almost an insatiation,” to decide the question of Synods by a majority, and that as a unanimous vote could not be secured the project ought to have been abandoned. In other words, because a small number did not approve, the wishes of the great body of Clergy and Laity ought to have been disregarded. If the resolutions had been carried by a bare majority; we could understand this view, but with a majority of 37 to 9 and 28 to 10, the result was too decisive to allow of longer hesitation. He then asks, how are the minority to be dealt with? We reply, to be left of course to act according to their own judgment and good sense. The same question may be asked in the case of any voluntary Society, and with reference to the Meetings of any of the denomina-

tions. They are perfectly at liberty either to adhere to their own views, or to join with their Brethren, and yield their own prejudices, in deference to the decision of the majority. As for his reference to the Act of Toleration, a Bill of Rights, and Blackstone, to prove that any man may, if he pleases, become a Dissenter, and choose for himself the denomination which he will join, we are only surprised, that any grown up men can be so childish as to cite authorities to prove what every child in Nova Scotia knows, and too many of them, when scarcely beyond their childhood, act upon. We fully admit for instance, that if “Cura” himself chose to become a Mormon preacher, no one could hinder him; and much as we desire to see our fellow men walking in the better way, we should be very sorry to add to, or detain in our Church, a single Member by compulsion, even if it were possible to do so. But what has this to do with Synods? Does “Cura” mean to say that the minority will apostatize, because they do not approve of the measure? What! desert their Church because they are now permitted to have a share in its government? because what has been in form a despotism is henceforth to be a limited Monarchy? We have a much better opinion of the minority than to suppose them capable of any such folly and wickedness.—There is a great deal of clap-trap about “maintenance of rights and privileges,” but what does it all mean? We should be amongst the first to resist any attempt to deprive us of any fraction of either, but, turn it which way we will, we cannot understand that this system takes away anything, whilst it certainly gives us much.

We are sorry that we cannot sympathize with “Cura” in the “deep humiliation and concern,” which he professes to feel in concerning that this movement “originated solely and wholly with our Bishop,” for we know not whether this is the fact, and we are equally grateful to his Lordship, for the offer made to the Diocese, whether it originated with himself or not. On referring to his Circular of August, 1854, we find the following reasons given for the course adopted. The expediency of holding Colonial Synods had been asserted by the Bench of Bishops of England and Ireland, by Her Majesty's Government, and by both Houses of Parliament, and some Dioceses were already taking active steps to establish them, and therefore, as he stated, he felt bound to enable the Members of this portion of the Church to decide, whether they would adopt what was recommended by such high authorities.

“Cura” speaks with pain of “the apple of discord thrown amongst us,” but we are happy to say that this unwholesome fruit does not appear to flourish except in one narrow District, and that other parts of the Diocese will not suffer themselves to be disturbed by the efforts of a small party bent on mischief, as the letters in our last and in our present number testify. We are told that, during the past year, the Post Office has been much benefited by a continuous issue of eccentric Epistles from that same quarter, whilst our nerves were shaken by the famous Protest, which proved on examination to be a gross deception, having been signed principally by dissenters, very few of the subscribers having subscribed anything towards the extension or support of our Church. Seriously the Parish, to which we refer, is becoming very notorious through the assumption of authority, and strange proceedings, of one of the weaker sex; but we have no doubt that the men of Wilmot will at length free themselves from the imputations to which they have been subject, for we are sure there are many good men and true amongst them.

We believe that the moderation and good feeling, with which the proceedings of the constituent Assembly have been conducted, and the security guaranteed by its declaration of principles and rules, have removed the fears of many who dreaded the effect of the Synods; and that, whilst a very few Clergymen and Parishes may still keep aloof, the great majority both of Clergy and Laity are disposed to regard the experiment much more favorably than at first.

The second half of “Cura's” long letter is entirely occupied with the statements to which we alluded in our last. He parades a long list of authorities, to prove that, for 300 years, there has been no trace of the presence of the laity in any convocation of our Church, and that they have always had a place in Presbyterian assemblies. He might have saved himself much trouble, for the fact is, we believe, generally admitted with reference to England; but it is almost incredible that a writer, on this side of the Atlantic, can be found either so ignorant, or so audacious, as to declare that the constitution of a Diocesan Assembly, including the

laity, is so antagonistic to the principles of episcopacy that they cannot be reconciled. Will he presume to say that the flourishing sister Church of the United States has forfeited her claim to the title of “Episcopal?” Is his opinion to be taken in preference to the unanimous, or almost unanimous, opinion of the Bishops of the Mother Church, that the laity *must* have a place in the Colonial Synods. Is he so far behind the age as to be ignorant, that in England it is generally understood that the laity will be represented in Convocation, if ever it is permitted freely to exercise its powers? We really feel ashamed of wasting time with one who is either so grossly ignorant, or so entirely devoid of modesty, as in the face of such facts to maintain that lay representatives cannot be admitted without a renunciation of our principles.

In his concluding paragraph he has reached the *plus ultra* of absurdity; and we are compelled to doubt the sanity of the man who tells us, that those who have decided for the Assembly “are no longer within the pale of the Church of England and Ireland in Nova Scotia,” and talks of the “Synodal Episcopal Church of Nova Scotia.” Would he call the Mother Church Convocational Episcopal? It would have been an act of charity, on the part of the Editor, to censure this paragraph before sending the letter to press:

Fortunately we are not likely to be left alone, whatever may befall us, as our readers will know from the account of the Adelaide Assembly, now published, to which we may add the information that last month, in Montreal, it was decided to hold Synods by about the same number of votes as this Diocese, the consideration of a Constitution being adjourned as it was here, whilst in Melbourne and Toronto Diocesan Synods are fully established. We now take leave of “Cura,” and shall not take the trouble to notice any further communications, unless he convince us that we have overlooked any important argument in the letters upon which we have commented.

### PROVINCIAL EDUCATION.

THE subject of Education has been noticed in His Excellency's Speech at the opening of the Legislative Session, and an Educational measure has been promised by the Administration, with a view to establish a system of instruction that shall be applicable to the progressive improvement of the country.

Although there is nothing in the present imperfect state of Provincial education that is worthy of commendation, yet Nova Scotia will compare favorably with other communities in the advantage taken of the means of instruction within its reach. The young almost without exception can read and write: a fair proportion of them are acquainted with the general branches of a good common English education: and a favored few (not fewer by comparison of population and wealth, than in other countries), exhibit a very respectable classical proficiency. If we cannot boast of system in our educational efforts, in spite of the want of it we find results that prove the aptitude of the people to learn, and which are an earnest of what may be expected to follow when a good system is perfected and in operation.

There is nothing in these results, however, that should make us rest satisfied with our present condition; on the contrary it is just that state of awakening that ought to engage all the energies of the mind in the pursuit of improvement. We trust that our Legislators will not rest satisfied with any thing short of the attainment of a superior system. The achievement is difficult, less from the want of materials than from the seeming impossibility of making them work harmoniously—of being able to engage all the different interests and influences, in a united effort to complete every part of such a system. General cooperation to carry out one idea would certainly be desirable. But if this cannot be had, it may be asked—what is there to prevent an approximation thereto, that should call forth the energies of every section of the population in the cause? And why might not these energies be so wisely directed, that emulation and not strife should be the result, and in such a way that every separate section should proceed from a well defined basis, although each should have to build its own superstructure.

It sounds strangely to say, that the religious element is the chief obstacle to united action on the subject of education. Yet that it is so requires no laboured argument to prove. In this community, all are more or less impressed with its obligations, but with every variety of opinion, as to the way in which they should be fulfilled. We fully acknowledge the religious principle as most important in secular education. Taken from the teaching of youth the public recognition of Christianity, of God in the world, and substituted a dry morality in its place, and we venture to assert that the home teaching of Gospel truths will not have its due weight, inasmuch as