

race justifies a reasonable man in believing that any condition of things, at any given time, is the one which must necessarily be the best adapted to men at all subsequent periods? It may turn out, by-and-bye, that the only principle of government practicable, even in the mother country, in relation to Public Worship and Public Instruction, is that enunciated by Cromwell himself years ago: "Love all, tender all," cried he to his Parliament in 1653; "cherish and countenance all in all things that are good; and if the poorest Christian, the most mistaken Christian shall desire to live peaceably and quietly under you—if any shall desire but to lead a life of godliness and honesty, let him be protected."—*Wilson's Cromwell and the Protectorate*, p. 204. Statesmen are being compelled, by the stubbornness of events, to allow that "they be two things," as Bacon speaks, "unity and uniformity." They have discovered that the enforcement of the latter does not secure the former; while the former may be presumed to exist when the latter is given up. Some even go so far as to hold that "the sort of variation resulting from independence and freedom, so far from breaking the bond, is the best preservation of it." A number of neighbouring families, to use Archbishop Whately's illustration of this proposition, living in perfect unity, will be thrown into discord as soon as you compel them to form one family, and to observe in things intrinsically indifferent, the same rules. One, for instance, likes early hours, and another late; one likes the windows open, and another shut; and thus, by being brought too close together, they are drawn into ill-will, by one being perpetually forced to give way to another.

From the days of Elizabeth down to the opening of the Royal Commission recently appointed by the present Queen, there have been occasions presented when the theory of the identity of the people of England and of the Anglican Church could have had a wide realization. At the Hampton Court Conference, the hectoring spirit of James "I. and VI.," was of course fatal to any such theory, although in his blind misreading of the British people, he supposed such a spirit not incompatible with it. "Well, doctor, have you anything more to say?" asked James of one of the dissentients on that occasion,