

man, who had valued his keeping when he had been given to him; he had read it, and when he turned it over, he had seen it printed in the first, just as the church were coming to had outlived those of Cromwell and outlived the days of all the Georges, survived, under the reign Victoria, (long sacred truths still as it was in the enquiring sinner to truth and the life, the hope of all the Bible then, by the meeting tonight might result from one The resolution of history, have we thankfulness, than societies have been of opposition to the looking to the op Neologian writers in Roman Catholic ps, in England, and opinions in the most feel convinced of sacred truths systematized; and not but feel the value which stood like the sea, rolling back to perdition. And needed now that they more united for their efforts—the rapid community, even the very extreme of the age, afforded after he had received and of golden promise City of San Francisco were processional erected, speeches discovered, but too appreciated; it was fitted into the State of a little band of fellowship; it was the Chinese inhabitants these Bibles were er, God, we might receivers. These had gone thither for the true riches, they went for the and what “the old, yea, than much and the honey

comb.” Thus the very excitement and speculative spirit of the age, presented facilities for the extension of these Societies, and formed an additional reason for thankfulness that they had been raised up, to meet the emergency of the times.

The Rev. ROBERT IRVINE, in seconding the third Resolution, spoke to the following effect:—

MR. PRESIDENT.—The Resolution so ably supported by the Reverend the Rector of this Parish, implies a principle which was most appropriately and forcibly brought out in the conclusion of your opening address. The principle to which I have reference may be briefly enunciated thus—“Duty is ours—consequences are God’s.”—The Bible recognizes no time-serving, no cautious, running, accommodating policy. It proclaims open war against every man, and every body of men, who would dare to shrink from a commanded duty, because of the consequences. To attempt to trim or mince this great principle, would be to impeach the rectitude of Divine authority, and to brand with stubbornness or enthusiasm some of the most eminent of the sons of men, whose names are embalmed in the annals of martyrdom, and out of whose blood this very Society and kindred Institutions have sprung. Permit me to glance for a moment at the bearings of this principle, before I proceed to apply it to our cause. When Abraham was commanded to offer up his son for a burnt-offering on Mount Moriah, he might, in human estimation, have complained, and justly complained, of the harshness, the cruelty, the enormity, and the inconsistency of the Divine mandate—a mandate as much opposed to the Divine character as it was revolting to the feelings of humanity; but the Patriarch had already learned this principle. He knew that the God who gave the command had assumed the responsibility of the consequences, and when the issue of the matter was known, the Patriarch raised an altar on Mount Moriah, and inscribed it with HONORI JIREH, as a standing proof of the Divinity of this principle—“Duty is ours—consequences are God’s.” Daniel the Prophet contended for this great principle, at the mercy of the lion in his den. The three holy Hebrew youths gave a still more signal testimony to its Divinity, and most appropriately did they define it, when they stood fearlessly before the Babylonish tyrant, and exclaimed, “Be it known unto thee, O King, that we cannot serve thy Gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up.” Around these men were assembled thousands of frantic spectators—on one side the musician with every variety of instrumental enchantment—the other the ruthless executor of a sanguinary and barbarous law—before them a burning fiery furnace, heated with seven times its usual intensity, within them was written by the finger of the living God, the commandment—“Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image,” &c., and this mandate of heaven involved the principle before us, in obedience to which the three Hebrew captives were enabled to “quench the violence of fire.”—When Anna, Caiaphas, and John, and Alexander, and as many as were of the kindred of the high priest were gathered together at Jerusalem, for the purpose of silencing the two Apostles of our Lord,

Peter and John, and when the decision of the highest Ecclesiastical Court of the Jews was announced in their hearing, they replied in the following dauntless language, “Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto God more than unto you, judge ye; for we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard.” In one of the instances now cited, we find the commandment of God resisted by civil, and in the other by ecclesiastical interference. The mandate of a ruthless despot, in the one case, and the fiat of the highest ecclesiastical authority in the other, forbids the maintenance of this great principle; but, in both cases, its advocates recognize no authority, stamped though it be with the impress of royalty, and sealed though it be with the signet of the Sunhedrim, as paramount to the authority of God. The same principle is attested by the history of martyrdom in all ages. It was written in letters of blood upon the scaffold whereon perished many of the noblest sons of Protestantism, in the days of Tudor tyranny. It spoke from amid the James of Smithfield, and its echoes are still vibrating in the ears of the faithful Protestants of England. It was asserted amid the butcheries of the Grass-Market, and its tones are pealing fresh in the ears of Scotland till this moment. It was engraven on the door of the dungeon, and emblazoned on the gibbet at the revocation of the edict of Nantes, and it continued to utter its voice in accents of Protestant principle amid the political turmoil of an Infidel Cabinet with Robespierre at its head—amid the tumult of a Revolutionary war under Napoleon Bonaparte, and amid the late hurricane which swept Louis Philippe from the throne of the Bourbons. The same principle is in spirit embodied in our national Siate Book, and is part of our Protestant Constitution, for it is the opposite of the principle that “the end justifies the means,” and for its maintenance and full development, one Dynasty has been ensnared from these realms to make room for another, which, in the continued defence of our national Protestantism, shall ever maintain the principle that “Duty is ours—consequences are God’s.”

Let us apply this great master principle to our own case, and it becomes the herald of our Bible cause—the pioneer of this Society. It sheds a flood of light on the future prospects of the Institution on whose behalf we are now assembled; it inspires us with a prophetic hope; it nerves our arms with dauntless courage, while it assures us of the most signal triumph. Let us act out this principle, and spread the Bible, irrespective of all consequences. Is it a duty we owe to God and to our fellow-men to give them the Bible? Settle this question, and our course is clear. To some it may seem preposterous—to some absurd; but “if a principle be good, carry it through.” So be it with our cause; spread the Bible and leave the consequences with God. But it is injudicious, say some; inexpedient, say others; useless, say others still; and most prodigal, maintain not a few; to give the Bible to those who can not, and will not, and dare not read it; a waste of means—an unnecessary expenditure of money, to translate and transmit the Bible to such persons. This was the logic of Judas Iscariot, the traitor; when Mary