

clude from christian communion the notorious offender? In the church of England, as by law established, he has no such power. If he refuse to administer the sacrament in the church to the most infamous person, the man may appeal to the Ecclesiastical court, and there, if he can secure the favour of the lay-chancellor, he may securely set both the minister and the bishop at defiance: nay, the minister, should he persist in refusing, is liable to be suspended, and even excommunicated for his contumacy. And in the court of Arches, bishops themselves are subject to the sentence of the chancellor.

“In the case, however of an individual who comes to demand participation of the Lord’s supper, as a qualification for an office in the army or the fleet, it is at the peril of incurring a suit at law, that the clergyman resists the application.—The church to which he has attached himself has obtained from the state the boon that all persons previously to admission into such posts, shall submit thus to qualify themselves; and the state, in its turn, exacts from the church, as the price or condition of this grant, that all persons seeking to become thus qualified shall be admitted. And is this any thing more than what is just? In the event of refusal on the part of the church; though the matter be spiritual, a temporal damage is sustained by the individual; for this, accordingly, an action would be maintainable in the civil courts, and the defendant, if unable to bring legal proof of the fact on which he grounded the refusal would be liable to damages.* Revolting as this gross profanation of the Lord’s supper must be to

* See the opinions of Mr. Sergeant Hill and others, in Towgood’s letters to White.—Appendix, page 309.