

that he particularly mentions that Mr. Spencer found his way to Rome by the very route which Dr. Hook says never leads to it. The Rev. Thomas Sikes, alluded to in his statement, was the author of various tracts for popular circulation, besides that mentioned by Dr. Nolan. They were much of the same character in doctrine as the modern "Tracts for the Times." In our Review of three of them in 1803, p. 301, it was remarked, that the author's representations of "those who are stigmatized as Gospel preachers and evangelical ministers" were so grossly unfair, that they were "with difficulty to be justified even upon the most flexible principles of morality." Strange however to say, these three obnoxious tracts, one of them having the absurd and offensive title of "A dialogue between the Minister of the Church and his Parishioner concerning Gospel Preachers or Evangelical ministers," were for many years upon the catalogue of the publications of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge; till happily they were consigned, much to the honour of the Society, to the more appropriate "list of books and tracts at present out of print;" and they are not likely to be reprinted, unless the Editors of the Oxford Tracts should see fit to revive them. The more judicious members of the Christian Knowledge Society could not but see the impropriety of the very title:—to say nothing of the work. Mr. Sikes, who thus zealously avouched that he was not a Gospel preacher or Evangelical minister, was also the author of the first attack which was made upon the Bible Society, under the title of "A Country Clergyman;" to which the Rev. John Owen, by the instructions of Bishop Porteus, replied, under the signature of "A Suburban Clergyman." Mr. Sikes strongly opposed the free circulation of the word of God. "The Socinian," said he, "will make his Bible—[yes, his; but he cannot make the Anglican version]—speak and spread Socinianism; while the Calvinist, the Baptist, and the Quaker, will teach the opinions peculiar to their sect. Supply these men with Bibles—I speak as a true Churchman—and you supply them with arms against yourself." Mr. Owen observed, many years after, of this pamphlet, that it exhibited "extraneous weakness and unmeasured scurrility;" though it affected "a high tone of orthodoxy and churchmanship." Yet this was the very man—not any person stigmatized as a Gospel preacher or Evangelical minister—who, Dr. Nolan says, drove Mr. Spencer to Popery.

"An early acquaintance with those theological stores from which they (the writers of the Tracts for the Times) have enriched their vein, had convinced the Author of the following pages, of their pernicious tendency. When their readers allowed themselves to be persuaded into good humour with our 'elder Sister,' the Church of Rome, little pains would be required to improve the first impression into liking; until yielding to her blandishments, they threw themselves into her arms. Some years have elapsed, since a work of a disciple of the school which has been recently revived under different auspices at Oxford, was placed in the author's hands, from which he hazarded this ill-omened prognostication. On perusing 'Mr. Sikes on Parochial Communion,' he ventured to pronounce, as he now pronounces on 'the Tracts for the Times,' that it was impossible to go the length of such writers, and while consistency was preserved, not to go much further than they foresaw or intended. Of the success with which this random shot was directed, he received, but a few years since, a proof, on which at the time he little computed. He then saw a letter addressed by the Hon. and Rev. George Spencer, to a friend, in which he detailed the circumstances of his conversion to the Roman Catholic Church; and intimated to the light which Mr. Sikes's work had let in upon his mind, the merit of his conversion. Few reflecting persons who consider the high connections of this proselyte: his former prospects in the Established Church, and the position which he now holds in that Church which he has joined; will long doubt, that the effect of the measures which have so admirably succeeded with him, is not likely to be left untried upon others. . . . He occupies a considerable post among those whose efforts are unwearied in the work of conversion, and who boast of a success in their labours which it would be absurd to dispute, while Popish chapels continue to be raised, and congregations are collected in every part of England. As it would be folly to doubt, that as far as his influence extends, it is employed in recommending the course which has succeeded so intimately with himself; it is impossible even to form a conception of a machinery which would be better suited to the purpose, than that supplied in the 'Tracts,' which have been compiled and edited with the authority of divines of some reputation in the University of Oxford. . . . The author conceives he cannot be supposed an idle alarmist in tracing to this source and imputing to the labours of these divines, the rapid and extensive defection from the Church to the superstitions and abominations of Popery, which brings so foul a reproach on the Clergy; and which would be inexplicable in the present enlightened age, had not the good luck or ingenuity of these Oxford divines accommodated the convert to those errors with this half-way house to expedite him in his passage."

We have quoted this passage to shew by a striking example, though it is too notorious to require proof, that Dr. Hook's remark, that no person who holds the opinions which he advocates has been perverted to Popery, is not well-founded. But Dr. Nolan's concluding remark in the extract reminds us to add, that, even if the statement were true, the circumstance might be easily accounted for. Popery is the ultraism of Oxford Tract doctrine; and Oxford Tract doctrine is Popery divested of its most "startling" results. Now, it is a proverbial remark, that the approach of two sects to each other, is no proof that they will always coalesce. The Oxford Tract pupil finds in his system, as Dr. Pusey, Mr. Newman, and their colleagues, have themselves truly stated, the very essentials which give Popery its power and its charm, divested of some matters of more difficult digestion. Popery could only give him Transubstantiation, the worship of saints and a few other extreme opinions; for all that is alleged to be most important in its code, he already possesses; his views of Tradition, his notions respecting "the Church and her Sacraments," and his Anti-Protestant opinions respecting justification, are quite near enough to hers to shew their fundamental unity, while in some details he considers that he has the advantage. Why then should he travel to Rome when he can stay at home, and do so nearly as Rome does?

THE INFINITE MERCY AND PITY OF CHRIST.

This is the highest injury that can be offered to Christ, to think that any creature hath more mercy and pity than he hath. It is to rob Christ of the fairest flower in his garden, when we rob him of his mercy and pity. Mark that place in Heb. iv. 15. that we may not think him austere: "we have not a high priest that cannot be touched with our infirmities."—Christ is no hard hearted man; when you were his enemies he loved you, inasmuch that he humbled himself, and suffered death, even the death of the cross, for you. And he hath the selfsame compassion in heaven, that he had on earth; he wept over Jerusalem, and the selfsame weeping heart carried her to heaven with him, the selfsame weeping eyes! Believe not then the Papists, that he is so hardhearted, or so stately; and that his mother is more ready to speak for us, than he is!—He

on it! This is to pervert the Gospel, and make Christ no Christ.—Archbp. Usher.

The Berean.

QUEBEC, THURSDAY, NOV. 5, 1846.

Most of our readers in this city have recently been interested and edified by the ministrations in two languages, of a Clergyman from New York, the Rev. C. H. Williamson, with whom we and some other friends have had the additional privilege of personal private intercourse. It cannot be without renewed interest that they will read the following letter, which our Reverend brother wrote from this city to the Editor of the New York Protestant Churchman, who has inserted it in his columns:

QUEBEC, 9th September, 1846.
 "REVEREND AND DEAR SIR:—When my Vestry gave me leave of absence, for the purpose of trying to excite some interest in different places, in behalf of my dear little flock in New York, I resolved to go principally to the places where there is some French population. Canada, therefore, with the religious state of which I desired, for many years, to become acquainted, (as respects the French Canadians especially,) was to be the object of my first visit. Having been here a whole fortnight, and having had very little else to do but to visit and walk about the city, I think I can say something concerning the poor French Canadians, whom I greatly love, and who are living in total ignorance of the Scriptures.

"There is here, I am sorry to say, no Protestant clergyman of any denomination, officiating and preaching in French, though there is an immense field white to harvest, in which I believe, a faithful minister of the Gospel would find great success. I conceive that it is, in some measure, our duty not to interfere for denomination's sake with those who read and love the Bible, and have the fundamental truths of the Word preached to them; but when we see thousands groping in the dark when they might walk in the light and liberty of the children of God; when we behold them deprived of the precious Book of life, by the means of which alone they can be sanctified; when we think of their talents buried for years in the ground, whilst they might be placed in the treasury of godliness, bringing, every day, a saving interest; is it our duty to remain idle, and not to put our hands to the plough, directly or indirectly, for the purpose of seeing such a field bring abundant fruits, meet for repentance and holiness? I believe not. Oh! what an opportunity for the distribution of the sacred volume, and for the preaching of the truth! How the brethren here, who belong to the Episcopal Church, from the zealous and faithful Bishop of Montreal, and other clergy, to the most humble member, seem grieved that none is to be found yet who could devote himself to such a noble and promising work! How willing and ready they are to make any sacrifice to see the French Canadians hear the Gospel in their own tongue, and receive the Saviour offered to them! I could not, dear Sir, describe to you with what a brotherly and Christian love I have been received and welcomed here by ALL; one would have thought that it was for them, and amongst them, that I was going to labour. Would to God that we could see in New York, among our clergy, the union, the peace and the concord which I have observed, to my soul's delight, among the Episcopal clergy of Quebec! Will we not add our prayers to theirs, and beseech the Lord of the harvest, that he will send forth labourers into his harvest? What I have seen and felt, since I have been in Canada, has greatly encouraged me to go on in the work in which we are engaged in New York, hoping and believing that our establishment may become a nursery out of which many cedars of righteousness may be transplanted by the hand of the Lord into some benighted places of Canada. May all who love Jesus and his Zion, help and encourage us in our enterprise.

"I would not, dear Sir and brother, end this communication without adding, that the Episcopal clergy of this city not only are united, but are united in preaching the pure Gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. I know not whether my visit here will have done good or not to some of my dear Canadians; but I can say that this fortnight has been for me one of grace and unspeakable happiness, during which I have been really fed, and have enjoyed the communion of saints."

The concluding paragraph of the letter bears so personal a reference to the Editor of the BEREAN, that it is out of our power to give it insertion. The part now before our readers requires to be accompanied with the remark that, while our visitor's high appreciation of the welcome, which was given him among us, speaks much to the credit of his affectionate and grateful heart, it ought to be a call upon those to whom it applies, to realize that for which, perhaps, he has been too ready to give them credit. The deeply interesting subject of labours among the French-speaking population around us has never been brought before us with so practically commanding a force as on the occasion of our brother's visit. Well may it be supposed that we all are "grieved that none is to be found who could devote himself to so noble and promising a work"—that we are "willing and ready to make any sacrifice to see the French Canadians hear the Gospel in their own tongue, and receive the Saviour offered to them." As members of a reformed EPISCOPAL Church, with a ritual and usages in which the French Canadian R. Catholic would recognise, rather than in the worship of non-episcopal communities, much of that upon which he has been justly accustomed to look with reverence, divested of the unscriptural super-additions which have deformed the practices, and corrupted the faith, of his own Church, we cannot but think that the mere opportunity of attending our solemn and dignified service, in the language familiar to him, with the large proportion of scriptural reading which enters into it, would be rich with the promise of good fruit. With lively interest, therefore, will the friends of home missionary efforts watch the work in which the Rector of the Church du Saint-Sauveur is engaged; and their hearts will send up prayer for such a blessing upon them as may in due time furnish labourers for the extensive fields open to the eye of faith, in this Province, besides that in the city of New York,

which our friend described in his first letter to the Editor of the BEREAN.

From a private letter which has been received by a friend, we learn that the Rev. Mr. Williamson had proceeded from Montreal—where he received £22. for the purpose of his mission—to Lachine, where the sum of £10. 3s. 6d. was contributed for the same.

We feel much regret at being compelled to take some notice of a statement which has lately been revived, and has been adopted by one whose official station enables parties to whose opinion otherwise no importance would be ascribed, to propagate, and possibly to obtain some currency to, an unfounded imputation. It has often been said that the parties whose secession from the Church, of late, has caused so much grief, were persons who previously entertained defective views of the Church—low Churchmen—inconsistent Churchmen—or something to that effect:—and we have most cordially coincided in that mode of representing them, seeing that, unquestionably, the views set forth by the "Tracts for the Times" were very LOW—DEFECTIVE—INCONSISTENT with the standards of our reformed Church. But the Bishop of Western New York, in the note to his Conventional Address mentioned in our last, hazards the statement that "the prominent Clergymen who have been perverted to Romanism," from the Church of England, "were originally of the class of Evangelical Clergy." This is a very different thing. The designation of "Evangelical"—by whomsoever invented, and though we have no more adopted it as a party-name than that of "High-Church" which is in common use to designate another class of Clergy—has grown into such respectability, and is in itself so desirable an appellation that, for a Bishop of the Church to connect it with a statement calculated to beget distrust of those to whom it is commonly applied, seems little in accordance with that abstinence from avowed partisanship which is generally looked for in one holding the position occupied by Dr. DeLancey.

We have thought it advisable to apprise our readers that the attempt at begetting causeless suspicion of one "class" of Churchmen by statements more remarkable for boldness than for truth is not of quite recent invention. Seven years ago, the boast was that no "High-Churchman" ever turned Romanist; and in our preceding columns is found an article to show how it was met by the *Christian Observer*, at that day. Whether it would be worth the trouble to pen new articles to meet the new edition of the old story, is open to the consideration of those in the mother-country familiar with persons and their history. No result probably would be produced upon those parties who cannot afford to lose opportunities for exhibiting their inveterate dislike of an evangelical ministry.

We do not know that anything would be gained by prying into the former ecclesiastical intimacies of the more recent seceders and tracing the great majority of them—as we have no doubt could be done, by those on the spot,—to the class which, with laudable candour, repudiates the appellation of evangelical. That Mr. Sibthorpe belonged to the Clergy commonly called Evangelical, is true; and he is the one that has since honestly avowed his error, and is now bitterly lamenting it. We believe him to have been an enlightened and honest Minister of Christ, when the disguise under which the "Tracts for the Times" did their stealthy work threw him off his guard, and he imbibed the errors set forth in them. But his honesty remained with him; that would not let him rest in the half-way house of sacramental theology into which he was beguiled: he went on to Romanism; and when he was there, his eyes opened to see the fall he had made. Others who have succeeded may have professed to be Evangelical, previously to the rise of the Tractarian sect which now affords more congenial shelter to men who wish to hold on to some party, and are not resolute for pure Gospel-truth. It is well known that, from an early period in this century till within some fifteen years back, it almost needed the profession of being Evangelical, to give such credit to a Clergyman as to get him a congregation in the newly rising District Churches, which had not old congregations attached to them by long habit of attendance. Many a one then affected to be what would serve the purpose at the time; and that they should now be found in the half-way house or in the region beyond, can excite no great wonder. But that a Christian Bishop should be willing to raise suspicion of a class of Clergy, designated by a name in itself of most desirable import, may well excite wonder and, for the cause of evangelical truth in the parts where his influence is felt, painful anticipation.

ACHILL MISSION.—Great distress by famine.—The Rev. Edward Nangle, the indefatigable and successful missionary on this Island, who has under his pastoral care a congregation of converts from the Church of Rome to the Established Church of Ireland, gives a distressing description of the privations to which those poor people are exposed in consequence of the failure of the potato-crop. He has addressed an Appeal to Protestant children every where, to help in providing food for the children. "I must tell you," he says, "that this Island of Achill is a very poor place, there is little corn grown here, and therefore when God made the potatoes rot, the poor people were left without any food. I write these lines to you, to ask you to help us to buy Indian meal and bring it from Liverpool in a ship to feed the poor people." He then mentions the Orphan institution at the Missionary Settlement, in which there are 100 children, and the Day-Schools, containing 200, all taught to read the Bible, and to love and trust in our blessed Saviour Jesus Christ. He thinks, Christian children who have plenty will be induced to give up "some kind of self-indulgence, for the good of the hungry children of the poor" in that Mission. In calling upon children, he remembers what was done by them, in England, not long ago. "The Missionaries in the South Sea Islands wanted a large ship to go from island to island, to preach to the heathen, and

some good men in England wrote a letter like this to the children, and they gathered all the money that was wanted to buy this big ship, although it cost a great many thousands of pounds. Those children showed their love to the poor heathen, and I only want you to show the same love to the poor people in Ireland."

We understand that the Teachers and Scholars of the St. Charles Sunday School have raised a contribution to be remitted to Mr. Nangle for the above purpose. Should any of our readers, young or old, be disposed to aid the object, their contributions, however small, will be thankfully received by the Superintendent of that Sunday School, C. H. GATES, Esq., Bank of Montreal.

In connection with the above reference to the Achill Mission, we have much pleasure in mentioning the monthly publication of the *ACHILL HERALD*, a periodical conducted by the Rev. E. Nangle, which powerfully advocates the cause of Protestant truth, and exposes the errors of the Roman faith. The subscription to it is only 6s. 3d. per annum, and the following notice suggests a convenient mode of ordering and paying for it:

ACHILL MISSIONARY HERALD.—Subscribers to this paper are informed that Mr. Edward Ahern, of the Brit. and Can. School, Quebec, has been appointed Agent for Lower Canada, and is authorized to receive money for the Rev. E. Nangle. Communications, if by mail, must be free of post.

KING'S COLLEGE, TORONTO.—The Annual Commencement of this University was celebrated on Thursday, the 22nd of last month, on which occasion the following degrees were conferred:

B. A.	JESSOP (HENRY BATE).
	ROBINSON (CHRISTOPHER).
	BALDWIN (EDMUND).
B. Mus.	CLARKE (J. P.).
B. A. (ad eundem).	VANCOUVERNET (B. J.), King's Coll. Windsor.

We learn from the Toronto Church that the Rev. Dr. McCaul, Vice-President, in an address at the close of the proceedings, made the gratifying announcement that "the Council have resolved upon the establishment of seventy-two scholarships: three in each of the twenty districts into which the Province is divided, which will confer exemption from all tuition fees in the University; six in the University, of which the advantages, in addition to the above, are Room and Commons in the University free of expense; and the remaining six to be attached to Upper Canada College."

ECCLESIASTICAL.

Diocese of Quebec.

INCORPORATED CHURCH SOCIETY.

PAYMENTS MADE TO THE Treasurer at Quebec, on account of the Incorporated Church Society, in the month of October, 1846.

Oct. 3, Wait, Rev. W. W., subscription to 1st July, 1846.	£25 0 0
7, Montreal, Lord Bishop, annual subscription, to 1st July, 1846.	25 0 0
" Mountain, Lieut. J. G., 26th Regt. ditto.	1 16 3
15, Milne, Rev. Geo., Collection at Paspebiac, Hopetown, New Carlisle, and Port Daniel.	2 10 0
30, Scott, H. S., annual subscription to 1st July.	1 5 0
" MacLaren, J., ditto.	1 5 0
" Scott, Miss, do.	1 5 0
" Davies, W. H. A., do.	1 5 0
" Boxer, Capt., R. N., do.	1 5 0
	£60 11 3

FUND FOR WIDOWS AND ORPHANS OF THE CLERGY.

Oct. 25, Collection at Nicolet, per Rev. H. Burges.	£1 13 9½
30, do Mariners' Chapel, Quebec, per Rev. J. E. F. Simpson.	3 3 3
" do All Saints' Chapel, do per B. Cole, Ch. W.	2 5 9
31, do St. Peter's Chapel, per Mr. Brown, do.	1 5 8
" do Cathedral Quebec, per Rev. A. W. Mountain.	42 6 6
	£50 14 1¼

T. TRUDGE, Treasr. C. Socy.

Quebec, 31st Oct. 1846.

MONTREAL, TRINITY CHURCH DISTRICT VISITING SOCIETY.—We learn that the Collections made after two Sermons in aid of the above Charity, on Sunday the 18th ulto. amounted to £53.

To the Editor of the Berean.

Since reading the letter of your Correspondent MIKROS in the BEREAN of the 22nd ult., feeling entirely with him on the inexpediency of giving prominence to the Black Letter days, it has seemed to me that it would be very desirable to have some light upon the inducement which the compilers of the Calendar have had for preserving the names marked against the days referred to. Saints' days I cannot call them at all, for there are, among the characters whose names are found in the Calendar, some in whose history any thing but the character of the saint is to be discovered. Could your Correspondent furnish information, from some source acknowledged as respectable authority by those who are so fond of reviving every thing that may assimilate our reformed Church to the form she bore "before her face was washed," as Dr. Hook would describe it (not that I think the description at all adequate to the case)—from some source generally reputed strict Church, or from some other, whether high or otherwise, only let it be a PROTESTANT Church source, to satisfy those who may require satisfaction on the point, that the preservation of those Black-Letter names was not designed to be an endorsement of the character of those who bore them, or of the truth of those events which it seems to distinguish by commemoration?

Your Correspondent would thereby confer an obligation on me, and probably on many others who desire to have their hands strengthened in preserving to the members of our beloved Church the precious legacy of attachment to the truth, and protest against error, received from the confessors and martyrs of the sixteenth century, in the recovery of the pure word of God, and freedom to hear, read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest it.

INQUIRER.

To the Editor of the Berean.

It is not well, in these days of revived Romanism, that the members of our Church should clearly understand, what is the estimation in which she holds the Apocrypha? In Art. VI.—styled "Of the Sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures of salvation"—she places the Bible on an eminence, without the reach of any other writings. On the contrary, the

position of the Apocrypha is no higher than that of other writings of man, since neither can be applied "to establish any doctrine." Some parts of these may be turned to use "for example of life and instruction of manners;" but if they were used to establish doctrine, some of the worst, the most anti-scriptural teaching of Rome could be established by them.

Certain portions of the Apocrypha are found in the Calendar, as lessons to be read at the time of divine service. Yet it seems to me that the Church has virtually repudiated the use of these writings in her public service. In a volume of the Homilies, now before me, printed at "Oxford, at the University Press, 1816," and published with the stamp of the "Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge," I find "An Admonition to all Ministers Ecclesiastical"—at the close of which is written: "and where it may so chance some one or other chapter of the Old Testament to fall in order to be read upon the Sundays or Holydays, which were better to be changed with some other of the New Testament of more edification, it shall be well done to spend your time to consider well of such chapters beforehand: Whereby your prudence and diligence in your office may appear; so that your people may have cause to glorify God for you, and be the readier to embrace your labours, to your better commendation, to the discharge of your consciences and their own."

In citing this by way of application, allow me to ask whether the giving of such a discretionary power, with a part of what is admitted to be God's word, the Church of England does not imply, a fortiori, the same power at least, in reference to that which is declared to be no part of God's word?

It is but just to quote here the Rev. Hugh Stowell (now Canon of Chester) in a sermon on "The Church of England and the Church of Rome contrasted," in which he remarks upon "A Note appended to a late Edition of the Homilies, published by the Christian Knowledge Society; 'N. B. The latter part of the foregoing admonition relating to the change of lessons in certain cases at the discretion of the Minister is now entirely superseded by the Act of Uniformity 14 Car. II. cap. 4. Sect. 2 & 24."

"But to this unaccrued note it may be fairly answered, that the said Act did not repeal any part of the Homilies, or of the Preface to the Homilies, but rather confirmed them; for an Act of Parliament cannot repeal any previous law without mentioning it; and Royal Proclamations had the force of law before the Act of Uniformity."

The note is probably called "unaccrued," because it is set forth by no authority which the members or ministers of the Church of England are bound to recognize. The permission, then, stands waiting the discretion of every one who is desirous of showing "whereby his prudence and diligence may appear, &c. &c." In this concession of a discretionary power, I recognise that wisdom from above so observable throughout the teaching of our Church. If she saw reason for allowing certain portions of the Apocrypha to be read, she did not compel the Clergyman, if his discretion told him that "it were better" for such a lesson "to be changed."

Mr. Editor, my full impression is that Truth and Error are once again to meet in this our world, to contend for the minds and hearts of men. If not mistaken—judging from the almost unanimous opinion of writers on prophecy—the reign of the Deceiver is drawing to a close. Then—it will be a Death-struggle. (See Rev. XI). The enemy is heaving in sight. Let us clear for action—casting away all that would hinder us in the day of battle. Believing that the subject of my letter might prove a hindrance, greater, perhaps, than any can conceive who are not conversant with the Romish question, I would respectfully invite your readers to its consideration. If the idea already suggested be correct, and the Church of England has no respect for these apocryphal writings as of authority to establish any thing; then, in our controversy with Rome, we meet on the open plain of Holy Scripture, without any ruined tower, in which the enemy can hide themselves from the attack of truth.

MIKROS.

[We think, the Church of England has so plainly distinguished between the word of God in the Holy Scriptures, and the word of man in the Apocrypha, that only those who have not a proper sense of the value of God's blessed word of revelation, or those actually engaged in the awful work of bringing it down to a level with the word of man, can feel otherwise than deeply solicitous to provide against the one being confounded with the other. The reading of the apocryphal lessons has very generally been discontinued in England by the substitution of other chapters; and we believe the ruling powers, even if they thought the practice irregular, had no desire to discountenance it. But, in all probability, the Admonition referred to by our Correspondent convinced most Clergymen that the practice was not irregular. As to the note, which we doubt not was drawn up upon legal advice which was thought conclusive—though it is a strong step to append it to the book set forth by authority—its force may certainly be questioned, as is shown by the extract from the Rev. Canon Stowell. Lawyers are apt to be so strict in the interpretation of law that they do not care what they strangle by it—though it were the life of religion in the Church.]

It may be fair to copy the clause in the Act, as the Note referred to gives it: "All Ministers are bound to say and use the Morning Prayer, Evening Prayer, Celebration, and Administration of both the Sacraments, and all other the Public and Common Prayer, in such order and form as is mentioned in the said Book amended and joined to this present Act, intituled The Book of Common Prayer." Notwithstanding the conclusion at which the author of the note has arrived, it is reasonable to doubt whether this clause binds the Minister to any thing additional to what he is bound at receiving orders. He subscribes to the three clauses in the XXXVth Canon, the second of which binds him to the use of "the form in the Book of Common Prayer prescribed, in Public Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments;" in the third "to acknowledge all and every" the XXXIX Articles—and among these he knows there is one numbered XXXV, which sends him to the Book of Homilies, and in the very middle of these, he finds the "Admonition." Whether the virtue of this Admonition is done away with by the Act of Uniformity—a statute, the remembrance of which, in some of its parts, the English nation has no reason to cherish—is a question of legal interpretation with which the Minister is not so well qualified to grapple as he is to