

to have everything its own way, and to get rid of all who placed any value on liberty of thought, freedom of conscience, and the right of private judgment. The Puritans or Presbyterians as they were interchangeably and indiscriminately called, were not disposed to be sticklish about minor matters. Had they been met in a spirit of generous and magnanimous consideration, an adjustment alike honourable to all concerned, might doubtless have been effected. But throughout the entire procedure, the bishops and their party displayed an exclusiveness and arrogance, such as quite precluded an harmonious issue. So obviously was this the case, that Episcopalian writers in speaking of the history of that period, employ language quite as strong as any Non-conformist could do. Archdeacon Hare says, "All hope of union was blasted by that second most disastrous, most tyrannical, and *schismatical* Aet of Uniformity, *the authors of which it is plain, were not seeking unity but division.*" According to Bishop Burnet, "care was taken that nothing should be altered as it had been moved by the Presbyterians for *it was resolved to gratify them in nothing.*" The Puritans wished to make the Church of England comprehend all who held essentially the common faith of Christians. The aim of the bishops was to make this comprehension impossible,—at least it was resolved to exclude every puritan. "It is to be called a '*comprehensive*' church," said the Bishop of Ely with coarse and contemptuous ridicule, when preaching before the King,— "though I think it might better be called a *drag-net*,—or a *Trojan horse with a comprehensive belly!*" Isaac Taylor states, that the whole proceeding seems to have been conducted "with the express object of *preventing any extensive conformity taking place.*" The whole design of the conferences, so far as the Episcopalian leaders were concerned, appears to have been to ascertain how far the Puritans