

meeting of the
requisition from
at that meeting
immediately re-
solved, whilst others,
result of a refer-
ence to the Lordship's re-

late Archbishop
private opinions
controverted ques-
tioning them the op-
portunity of the appearance
or approached,
tion of resigna-
to favour what
Good Friday
Arch whenever
practices. The
on and ready
confusion, re-
Mr. Bridge
On the 19th
ers, to whom
anted) yielding
tion of one,
morning ser-
reads in most

to throw a
ng, was the
November,
wfoundland,
in reference
as a neces-
"He per-
doctrine of
views of the

th's, a num-
10th Feb.
ship, depre-
sented that
charges.—

In his Reply, his Lordship uttered not one word to lead the gentlemen presenting the Address to believe the charges in any part or measure true—on the contrary, his Lordship describes the contents of the letter as "railing accusations" against him, and professes to be "filled with grief and astonishment" that any Clergyman could be guilty of such conduct. Of course, every person who heard this declaration, or subsequently read it, felt his Lordship had been most foully misrepresented, and the "Record," deserving condemnation for allowing such gross unfounded accusations to appear in its columns.

Completely to allay all suspicions as to his Lordship's real views on the subject of Baptismal Regeneration, his Lordship in his charge to the Clergy on the 21st September, in the same year, (1847) says, page 40 :—

"The first subject of discussion and disputation, and with which, I am informed, my name has been strangely mixed up, is, what is technically called, Baptismal Regeneration. Why, or on what grounds, it should be asserted that I am an advocate of that doctrine, except on the presumption that I contend for the plain and full meaning of the Catechism, Articles and Offices of our Church, I really cannot conceive; for to the best of my remembrance, I was never called on to express, and never did express, any public opinion about it."

Now, who, on hearing or reading this passage, would believe his Lordship guilty of holding the doctrine? Who, on the contrary, would not give him credit for being wholly innocent of it? But hear him on the next occasion of his writing on the doctrine.

A Sermon, by the Rev. Edward Parker, on the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, had found its way to some of the Clergy; on hearing this, his Lordship addressed a letter to them, condemning the sermon. "It will be quite sufficient, I presume," (said he) "to show that the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration is held by our Church." "I might content myself with informing or reminding you, that the Judge of the Court of Arches has recently decided judicially that Baptismal Regeneration is certainly held by the Church of England." "He has decided, I say, that Baptismal Regeneration is held by the Church of England, and further that a Bishop is justified in refusing institution to any Clergyman who denies it;" indeed, the whole letter was a labored attempt to prove such to be the doctrine of the Church of England and of Scripture, and his Lordship has said he would discountenance and discourage any Clergyman who held views contrary to his; and