

perate and dogmatic, it is not surprising that the "Review" should be more remarkable for energy of expression than for coherency of argument. Grovelling before his ecclesiastical superiors, the writer strives to gain their favor, not only by humbling himself before them, but also by abusing their opponents. His constant cry is "nothing can be done without a Bishop !" He believes that this watchword will ultimately be the rallying point of the laity ; he also believes that he has been fortunate enough to find out a point at which papists, pagans and puritans meet. What or where this point may be we are not informed as accurately as we could wish. There can hardly be said to be any analogy between the Lay Association (the puritans of the author of the "Review") and the Pope "that pagan full of pride." But thus much may be assumed with confidence, that, among the people of Quebec, the opinion will prevail that there is a nearer and closer connection between popery and puseyism, than between popery and the tenets of the Lay Association. The Lay Association might be said to hold strong protestant opinions ; it cannot with truth be said to have any popish tendencies. Such an accusation, from men who openly practise and eagerly ape popish customs, is not less ridiculously absurd than wilfully malicious.

The clerical party seem anxious to throw the odium of the disturbances of the 24th of June upon the well drilled efforts of certain laymen. But it is known perfectly well that there was no system of drill organized, and that the interruption to the harmony of the meeting did not proceed from laymen but from a clergyman. An amendment as to the position which deacons were to hold in synodical meetings, was the first interference with the intended proceedings. A clergyman from Kingsey was the author of this motion, concerning which the "Report" does not condescend to take any notice.