

at home, and not instil into the minds of their daughters that happiness is to be found in gold only; but teach their daughters to become more modest in their behaviour, as it is now considered by many as very stupid for a maiden to blush at anything she hears or may choose to do. I doubt very much indeed if the number of fast young women does not equal that of the young men, and am ashamed to say in many instances they far exceed many young men in what is called *check*.

I think there is ample scope for your pen to write on this phase of the training and education of the young women of the rising generation; and just let the women understand that they have much to do with the so-called selfish life of club-room bachelors. Hoping that I may have given you a hint as to what some think of both sides of the question, I remain, yours truly,

JUSTITIA.

Montreal, Oct. 21st, 1878.

REFORMED EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

To the Editor of the CANADIAN SPECTATOR:

SIR,—By your permission I will submit the following:—

CHARGES MADE BY F. C. LAWRENCE, M.D.	DENIALS BY REV. B. B. USSHER.	PROOFS BY F. C. LAWRENCE, M.D.
SPECTATOR, October 5th. Making historical errors.	SPECTATOR, September 27th. Not a single historical statement made in article published in SPECTATOR of August 7th, 1878.	Not one produced in F. C. Lawrence, M.D.'s (Ritualist) October 12 communication.
The Reformed Episcopal Church holds doctrines unknown to the New Testament and the Church Catholic for nearly seventeen centuries.	The R. E. Prayer Book is the revision offered by Bishop White, of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, who took the Revision ordered by William III. We hold the same doctrinal views as the Ryles, Alfords, Grassetts, Baldwins, Bonds, Tyngs, and the host of Evangelical men the world over.	SPECTATOR, October 12th. No reply. <i>Query.</i> —Will F. C. Lawrence not admit that the Ministers of twenty years ago were an Evangelical majority? Did this majority teach what they could not prove by the New Testament?
The Reformed Episcopal Church teaches instantaneous conversion, and that the person so converted sins not ever after.	Denied. Proof given. Articles 13 and 19 of the Reformed Episcopal Church also Collect for grace.—Page 15, Prayer Book.	SPECTATOR, October 12th. No retraction made.

It will be observed that the Rev. B. B. Ussher gives a plain statement as to where he may be found, being Minister of St. Bartholomew's Reformed Episcopal Church; but "F. C. Lawrence, M.D., Ritualist," may only be another *nom de plume* for some other man. Where does he live? It will be a matter of interest to Anglicans, High and Low, to be made aware of the whereabouts of a friend on the one hand and a foe on the other.

In the Second Book of Edward VI. I admitted its language taught baptismal regeneration. Had the Reformers lived, this would have been swept away: they would have eliminated all Romish error, but the persecution by their Anglo-Roman opponents caused their death by martyrdom ere this was done.

It is amusing the evidence some men will bring forward to support their cause. I charge the Anglican Book of Common Prayer with Romish teaching, and "F. C. Lawrence, M.D.," willing to do a good turn to his Jesuit friends, and show that once in a while (just by accident) they can tell the truth, quotes from the Memoirs of Lord Cecil that, "in 1567, Cummin, a Jesuit engaged by Pope Pius V., said of the Prayer Book, 'it was the Roman Mass Book in disguise.'" Pius V. had, as a papist, a supreme contempt for an apist, hence his sending over this man to open the eyes of a semi-Protestant people, largely Catholic at heart, to the fact that they were getting an imitation, and had better keep to the genuine thing.

I am charged with "utter incorrectness" in the assertion, that the First Book of Edward VI. was Romish in its teaching. It was mostly a translation from other liturgies. It taught prayers for the dead, gave forms for exorcism and anointing, consecrating water; gave the idea of the Lord's Supper being a sacrifice, and the communion table an altar; also the mixed chalice and the Romish sacerdotal vestments, which the Ritualistic Anglican priest wears to-day under the authority of the Rubric of the Book of Common Prayer found just before the order of morning prayer, and reading as follows:—"And here is to be noted that such ornament of the Church and of the Ministers thereof, shall be retained and be in use, as were in at all times of their ministrations, shall be retained and be in use, as were in the Church of England by the authority of Parliament in the second year of Edward the Sixth." Edward ascended the throne in 1547; the First Book was published in 1549; the Act of Parliament permitting the sacerdotal Romish vestments was passed in the same year;—I must, therefore, leave it to your readers to judge whether I am "utterly incorrect" in my statement that the First Book of Edward VI. was Romish in its teaching. I presume that "F. C. Lawrence, M.D.," will admit there is a difference between the First and Second Book of Edward VI. Will he answer: Did the Second Book have more or less Romanism than the First? Is not the Reformed Episcopal Prayer Book more like the Second than the First? and is it not proof that there was something objectionable in the First that caused the Second to be issued, leaving out what was objectionable in the first?

Regarding Rev. Mr. Oxenham, now a priest in good standing in the Anglican Church, waiting upon Cardinal Manning to secure if possible a basis of union between the Anglican and Roman communion, your correspondent in trying to accuse me of misrepresenting things, sneering in italics that I had hidden half the truth, has "put his foot in it," as the saying is. Turning

to my letter of September 28th, I find I wrote: "That after the sentence of Rev. Mr. Mackonochie was reversed, the Ritualists held a meeting, and the Rev. Mr. Oxenham, a priest in the Church of England proposed that they appoint a committee to wait on Cardinal Manning and see how they could bridge things over and fix it so that the married clergy could be received as priests by the Roman Pontiff"; but it now appears, by "F. D. Lawrence, M.D.'s" showing, that *he* (Oxenham) *went still further* than the proposition I charged him with, and *actually did wait on Cardinal Manning*,—a pretty specimen of a Protestant clergyman he is. I own I was behind the times. I thank the gentleman for the further information; it may prove useful, being stated on the authority of a "Ritualist."

As to the Anglican Church in Britain prior to Augustine's time, I asked "Ritualist," in my first letter, to point out to us poor ignorant people when the Church of Rome ever recognized such a thing as the Anglo-Catholic Church, but he gives no answer. I knew he would strive to bolster up his claims by the early Anglican Church theory concocted to cover up the inconvenient matter of Apostolic succession through excommunicated Bishops, not that I think the excommunication harmed them, but then I knew Anglicans (who set great value on the unbroken chain) don't like to think of this, and have struggled hard to fix up a loop-hole; but it is not half so well done as the fancy historical nonsense that the British nation is the lost tribes of Israel. I think this subject has been handled by abler judges than I am, and the verdict of the greatest authorities is against the theory. It has, however, nothing to do with the present condition of the Anglican Church, which has brought about this correspondence. If it had existed the Church of Rome would have recognized it; but "F. C. Lawrence, M.D.," has not given the proof that she has done so.

A thrust is given at the Reformed Episcopal Church for its permitting extempore prayer, and we are told "a Jesuit the name of Cummin introduced it into the Church of England, and as we use it, may not the Reformed Church organized by Bishop Cummins owe its origin to Jesuitical intrigue and machination?" Yes; the Reformed Episcopal Church was organized because of *Jesuitical intrigue and machination* which were carried on in the Anglican Church, and so Romanized it, so saturated it with Popery, that we as Protestants packed up the treasures of the Reformation and left. As to the extempore prayer, the Jesuits owe you something for saying one good thing in their favor, evidently Cummin, of whom Lord Cecil writes, was a man of ability, and Pius V. had better sense than the many modern Anglo-Roman Catholics who forbid extempore prayer. It is said of an Anglo-Catholic priest who called to see a dying woman, and was asked to pray for her, that he replied: "I regret that I cannot, Madam, as I have forgotten my prayer-book." If Cummin had been there he would have done better than that.

I remain, yours truly,

B. B. USSHER,
9 Drummond Street, Montreal,
Minister to St. Bartholomew's Reformed Episcopal Church.

CURRENT LITERATURE.

SHAKESPEARE'S TRAGEDY OF HAMLET.—Edited by William J. Rolfe, A.M. Published by Harper & Brothers, New York. Dawson Bros., Montreal.

The writer of this excellent little work prefaces it by stating that "it is part of his plan to give selections from the best æsthetic criticisms of Shakespeare, not only in the long extracts from eminent commentators, . . . but in the briefer remarks on special passages, which are quoted in the notes," and in the introduction to the play the writer has very fully and creditably carried out his purpose. The whole gives as complete an insight into the character and merits and of the Tragedy as we recollect to have seen. The notes which appear as an appendix to the book are striking and truthful, and to those students of Shakespeare who take a delight in making themselves masters of his writings this little work will be found of great assistance.

HARPER'S HALF-HOUR SERIES.

The Harpers intend that the "half-hour" of the reader shall be well and profitably employed, for in these small pocket editions is found the choicest literature in a cheap and convenient form. The traveller on his journey, the man of leisure, the workman with the few spare moments at dinner-time can find entertainment and instruction. Fifteen or twenty cents will procure a compact edition of a work which would cost 10s. 6d. sterling in England. In producing this series Harpers' have done much in placing within the reach of all the choicest of English literature, the best and most instructive works of fiction.

ENGLISH LITERATURE, PRIMERS, CLASSICAL PERIOD, by Eugene Lawrence, 143 pp.; price, 20 cents.

This comprises a sketch of the life and works of Milton, Dryden, Pope, Swift, Gibbon, Goldsmith, Gray, Hume, Samuel Johnson, Garrick, Mrs. Robertson, Sheridan, Addison, Adam Smith, and a host of others.

BEHIND BLUE GLASSES, by F. W. Hack Winder, pp. 138, 20 cents. Translated by Mary A. Robinson.

Ingenious and clever in plot, elegant in style, and interesting in every line. A young Diplomat visits a celebrated Eye Infirmary with pretended disease of the eyes that he may win the affections of his lady-love and interview and influence a Russian Diplomatist, both of which objects he accomplishes "behind the blue glasses."

HARPER'S LIBRARY OF AMERICAN FICTION—"LIKE UNTO LIKE," by Sherwood Bonner; pp. 169, 75 cents.

Quaint and attractive in binding; printed in clear type on the best of paper, this series cannot fail to find readers among those who like American fiction. The book in question is a tale of Southern life, illustrating the society of the South, and the sentiments and prejudices of the people since the late unpleasantness toward the North.

In this tale the love that laughs at locksmiths seems equally powerful to overcome Northern prejudices and Southern hatred. The author is not a George Eliot nor a Dickens; but in the sketches of society at the South—