

the treaty of Turin, in 1801. In obedience to this treaty, and in spite of the remonstrance of the Pope, an edict was issued by the Duke concerning the treaty, and giving a formal guarantee of immunity to his anti-papal subjects. The King of Sardinia now holds the territory in question under the stipulations of the treaty alluded to, and the reciprocal obligation of that treaty has never been denied. This obligation on the part of the King of Sardinia he has inherited with his dominions, and on the part of the British and Dutch government the duty is binding and clear.

The treaty referred to have been laid before the House of Commons; and a memorial has been presented by the Archbishop of Canterbury and others to Lord Aberdeen, calling his attention to these important and interesting facts. We shall look with some anxiety for further steps to be taken in this matter.—*N. Y. Observer.*

INTENTION OF MINISTERS TO ENDOW THE CATHOLIC CLERGY.—We hear, through a quarter of high authority, that it is actually the intention of Sir Robert Peel to propose, during the ensuing Session, a measure for endowing the Roman Catholic clergy of Ireland, and especially granting them glebes, or portions of land. We cannot vouch for the accuracy of the information, but that it is fully believed by some of Sir Robert Peel's own supporters, high in rank, but who have told the Premier that they should oppose him on this question. The country will act accordingly. We regret, though we are not greatly surprised, to see that the just published number of the *Edinburgh Review*, in an elaborate article on Ireland, strongly recommends the endowment of the Catholic clergy, to which body the reviewer proposes to give three hundred and twenty thousand a year, not by annual grant, but by creating a new and perpetual stock, yielding that annual amount, to be invested in Commissioners! If such a measure should be proposed, it will do more than any thing else to shake the principle of Religious Establishments in the minds of the English people.—*Leeds Mercury.*

FIRST LIST OF DONATIONS TO THE WESLEYAN EDUCATION FUND.—The first list of subscriptions to this fund, to promote the education of the children of the labouring classes, amounts to £6,000; which sum, observes the *Watchmen*, is surely a very satisfactory first instalment of £20,000, which it is desired to raise at once, for the specific purpose to which we have adverted. It only remains that the numerous friends to Wesleyan Education, who have not yet come forward, should imitate the example thus set them, and the result cannot fail to be gratifying and satisfactory. For the promotion of this great end, the sectional meetings already held have been found very advantageous; and we hope soon to hear of arrangements for others, as in no way can the case be brought forward more lucidly or efficaciously.—*Leeds Mercury.*

BAPTIST MISSIONARY SOCIETY.—In our paper of the 17th ult. we stated that an iron vessel called "The Dove" had been launched for the Baptist Missionary Society, and that she was intended for the use of the Missionaries on the coast of Africa, to convey them from one place to another. The vessel being now completely equipped, and about to depart for her destination, the members and friends of the Baptist denomination in this town and neighbourhood had a festival yesterday, to celebrate the event.—*Liverpool Mercury, Dec. 15.*

DEATH OF MR. JOHN MORRISON.—The accomplished Chinese scholar, and excellent man, Mr. John Morrison (son of the late eminent Missionary, Dr. Morrison, the translator of the Scriptures into Chinese) has been prematurely cut off by fever, at Macao. His death is a loss to his country, for which he acted as principal Secretary to the English Commissioner in China. It is a loss to literature, as he was perhaps the first living Chinese scholar. And it is a great loss to the London Missionary Society, with which he retained the friendly connexion begun during the life of his venerated father. Mr. Morrison was a man of high character. He caught the fever of which he died at Hong Kong, which island appears to have been very sickly.—*Leeds Mercury.*

LAY OPPOSITION TO PUSEYISM.—The Lay Address to the Authorities of the University of Oxford, praying for measures to arrest the spread of Tractarian errors in that University, was transmitted to the Vice-Chancellor on Thursday last. Among the parties who had affixed their names were five Dukes, three Marquises, thirteen Earls, ten Viscounts, five Barons, two Right Hon. Commoners, twenty seven Hon. Commoners, twenty nine Baronets, forty nine members of Parliament, and, as far as could be computed, between four and five hundred Country Magistrates. The aggregate of signatures is believed to have exceeded ten thousand.—*London Record.*

The Rev. Dr. Burns has lately arrived at New York. He is joint delegate with the Rev. Dr. Cunningham, to plead the cause of the Free Church in America. Great success is attending them.—*Christian Guardian.*

THE CHRISTIAN MIRROR.

MONTREAL, THURSDAY, FEB. 29, 1844.

In the previous issue, we promised to resume our remarks, intended to shew that the doctrine of "*A Trinity in unity*" is contained in the Holy Scriptures. This, we firmly believe, is one of the many precious gems, contained in the inexhaustible mine, which God has provided for us; and which mine, he commands us to explore,—“Search the scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me.”

Referring our readers to the editorial article, of which this is a continuation, we shall now proceed to occupy our prescribed space, beseeching the Lord the Spirit, so to guide our pen, that it may indite good matter. Modern Jews, who, indeed, are no Jews at all, admit that the Deity speaks of himself in the plural number; this *they cannot but admit*; but when the question is urged upon them, “Why does the Deity speak of himself in the plural number, unless that Deity consists of a plurality of persons?” what answer, think ye, do they furnish?—“O, it is only a figurative way of speaking, which the Almighty has been pleased to adopt.” Other sophists, both Jews and Gentiles—people who regard themselves as “the *illuminati*” of Christendom—try to account for the circumstance in this way:—“The Divine Being uses this mode of expression, to set forth his dignity, in the same way that earthly sovereigns do. This subterfuge is really too contemptible, to be favoured with a moment's serious consideration; but the contempt which its puerility engenders, yields to the sorrow which a sense of its pernicious operation produces.

It certainly is very degrading to “THE KING OF KINGS AND LORD OF LORDS,” to suppose, for an instant, that he would take his mode of speaking and thinking from fallen man—that he would make the conventional terms used by PHARAOH the persecutor—NEBUCHADNEZZAR the autocrat—BELSHAZZAR the sensualist, &c. &c. the means by which he would speak of himself, and make himself known to his creatures. It cannot be. Indeed, the solemn words, whose awful import we are endeavouring to impress upon the hearts of all who read our unassuming miscellany—these solemn words were uttered—

and uttered, too, by that awful voice which said, “*Let there be light*,” before any of those titled mortals, called kings and rulers, *had an existence.*

We never could see, exactly, the propriety of mere earthly sovereigns using the plural number when speaking of themselves. The custom is obviously an assumption, which has its origin in the pomp and vanity of heathen monarchs; and has been perpetuated from their time until the present day. Neither the antiquity of the custom, nor the prevalence of it, can altogether put the anomaly it involves out of sight; it originated in pride—official tenaciousness still sustains it—and if it conduces to support the stability of the throne, and to uphold the powers that be, let it be continued; but never, never, should an usage born in corruption, and reared up amidst “the pomps and vanities” of idolatrous courts, be held up as a model for divine imitation. Let our right hand forget its cunning, and our tongue cleave to the roof of our mouth, ere we should impiously contend, that he “who spake as man never spake,” conformed to the inflated and grotesque phraseology of man, who, even in his best estate, is altogether vanity.

We might advert to many passages in the Old Testament, and from them, deduce very ample evidence, in support of the doctrine we wish to commend to every man's conscience, in the fear of God. But what has been said, is sufficient to convince every unprejudiced and candid enquirer after the truth, that the Holy Scriptures commence with an avowal of this sublime doctrine; and that the creation itself was the result of the joint operations of the ever blessed and glorious Trinity.

To close these passing reflections, without some allusion to the Oracles that speak in the New Testament, would be a culpable omission; and to escape from the guilt which such a dereliction would incur, we shall evoke the aid of their testimony. Let a reference to the prescribed form of baptism be the opening of our supplication. The commission our blessed Lord here gave to his disciples, was expressed in these words,—“Go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the FATHER, and of the SON, and of the HOLY GHOST.” Now, the Gospel is, throughout the whole Bible, declared to be a message from God to man—a conditional offer of pardon and eternal salvation, from God to man. To be more explicit—the whole tenor of the Sacred Scriptures affirm, in the most positive and solemn manner, that “the Gospel” is a covenant—terms, which the Almighty has published and submitted to men for their consideration. Now, the acceptance of this offer, and the agreement with these terms, is to be signified by the reception of baptism; and as man is to conclude this covenant, or agreement, “*cum Deo*,” with God himself, the ordinance by which his concurrence is expressed, must be performed in God's own name; but Christ directed it to be performed in “the name of the FATHER, and of the SON, and of the HOLY GHOST;” therefore,