upon their honour, that if he would make a free and open declaration of his proceedings, it ſhould neither be employed againſt himſelf, nor againſt any other perſon; but that if he ſhould continue to be reſolute in refilling to give this ſatisfaction to their queen, who was anxious to ſearch the matter to the bottom, they were inſtructed to let him know, that ſhe would abſolutely conſider him as a private perſon, and order him to be tried and executed as a traitor. In this extremity he accepted the conditions held out to him, and diſcloſed minutely all the tranſactions of the principal parties in the conſpiracy. But while he deſcribed the offences of his miſtreſs, the duke of Norfolk, and himſelf, he could not avoid to detract from their blame by apologies. It was natural, he ſaid, for the queen of Scots to exert the moſt ſtrenuous endeavours in her power to recover her freedom and crown; and the methods ſhe adopted to obtain her purpoſes ought to be conſidered in connec­tion with the arts of Elizabeth, who pertinaciouſly de­nied her acceſs to her preſence, who kept her a cloſe priſoner in contempt of all the principles of humanity and juſtice, and who afforded an open and power­ful aſſiſtance to her enemies. The duke of Norfolk he was earneſt to excuſe on the foundation of the advances which had been made in his marriage with the queen oſ Scots. Their plighted love, and their engagements, did not allow him to forſake her. As for himſelf, he was her ambaſſador and her ſervant; and being highly indebted to her eneroſity and kindneſs, he could not abandon her in captivity and diſtreſs without incurring the guilt of the moſt ſinful treachery and ingratitude. The daring propoſal he had made to ſeize the perſon of Elizabeth was the point, he obſerved, which ſeemed to preſs upon him the moſt ſeverely; and he intreated them to believe, that he had moved it only with the view of trying the courage of the duke of Norfolk.— The privy-counſellors of Elizabeth were now in poſſeſſion of all the evidence they could expect in this im­portant buſineſs. Norfolk was admoniſhed to prepare for his trial; and biſhop Leſly perceived, that though he might eſcape with his life, he would never more be permitted to reſide in England, and to act there as the ambaffador, the miniſter, and the friend of the queen of Scots.

The defeat of the duke of Norfolk’s conſpiracy was a blow to Mary which ſhe could never recover. Her moſt faithful friends were languiſhing in priſons upon her account; ſhe had no longer the counſels oſ the bi­ſhop of Roſs; and the Spaniſh ambaſſador, who had entered into her concerns with an unſcrupulous cordia­lity, had been ordered to withdraw from England. The trial and condemnation of Norfolk ſoon followed, and plunged her into the moſt calamitous diſtreſs.

The maſſacre of the Proteſtants at Paris in 1572 proved alſo extremely detrimental to her. It was in­terpreted to be a conſequence of the confederacy which had been formed at Bayonne for the extermination of the reformed. The Proteſtants were everywhere tranſported with rage againſt the Papiſts. Elizabeth pre­pared herſelf againſt an attack from the Roman Catho­lic powers; and was haunted with the notion that they meant to invade her kingdom, and to give it to the queen of Scots. Her ambaſſador at Paris, Sir Francis Walſingham, augmented her apprehenſions and terror. He compared her weakneſs with the ſtrength of her ene­mies, and aſſured her that if they ſhould poſſeſs themſelves of Scotland, ſhe would ſoon ceaſe to be a queen. He rcpreſented Mary as the great cauſe of the perils that threatened her perſonal ſafety and the tranquillity of her kingdom; and as violent diſeaſes required violent remedies, he ſcrupled not to counſel her to unite Scotland to her dominions, and to put to death a rival whoſe life was inconſiſtent with her ſecurity. The more bigotted Proteſtants of Scotland differed not very widely in their ſentiments from Sir Francis Walſingham; while thoſe of them who were more moderate were ſtill more attached to their religion than to Mary; and amidſt the indignation and horror into which the ſubjects of Scotland were thrown by the ſanguinary outrages of Charles IX. and Catharine de Medicis, they ſurveyed the ſufferings of their ſovereign with a diminiſhed ſympathy.

This year the regent, finding himſelf beſet with dif­ficulties which he could not overcome, and the affairs of the nation involved in confuſion from which he could not extricate them, died of melancholy, and was ſucceeded by the earl of Morton

During the regency of the earl of Marre, a remarkable innovation took place in the church, which de­ferves to be particularly explained, being no leſs than the introduction of Epiſcopacy inſtead of the Preſbyterian form of worſhip. While the earl of Lenox was regent, the archbiſhop of St Andrew’s was put to death, becauſe he was ſtrongly ſuſpected to have had a concern in the death of the earl of Murray; after which the earl of Morton procured a grant of the temporalities of that ſee. Out of theſe he allotted a ſtipend to Mr John Douglas, a Proteſtant clergyman, who took upon him the title of archbiſhop. This violence excited cenſure and murmurs. In the language of the times, it was pronounced to be a profanation of the kirk, and a high contempt of God; and it underwent the ſcrutiny of the miniſtry in applications and complaints to the regent. The matter was doubtleſs of too much importance to be overlooked; and a commiſſion of privy-counſellors and clergymen was appointed in the name of the king to inquire into it, and to reform and improve the policy of the church. This commiſſion, upon the part of the privy-council, conſiſted of the earl of Morton, the lord Ruthven, Robert abbot of Dun­fermline, Mr James Macgill, Sir John Ballenden, and Colin Campbell of Glenorchie; and upon the part of the church there were named John Erſkine of Dun, and Mr John Winram, Mr Hay, Mr Lindſay, Mr Pont, and Mr John Craig. The conſultations and debates were long; and the influence and management of the earl of Morton directed their determinations. It was reſolved, that till the majority of the king, or till the wiſdom of the three eſtates ſhould be conſulted, the titles of archbiſhop and biſhop ſhould continue as in the times which preceded the reformation; and that a chap­ter of learned miniſters ſhould be annexed to every me­tropolitan or cathedral feat. It was determined that the fees, as they became vacant, ſhould be given to thoſe of the Proteſtant miniſtry who were moſt eminent for their qualifications; that the archbiſhops and biſhops ſhould exerciſe no higher juriſdiction than what was permitted to ſuperintendants; and that they ſhould be ſubject to the controul oſ the general aſſemblies of the church. It was agreed, that all abbots, priors, and