

series of the Society
ating as a nullity the
r instance, the Mis-
r. Rozier, is charged
ly baptised by Wes-
ch of England Cler-
ch previous baptism

ed, any more than
e same *enlightened*
d his Tractarianism

s charges, it seems,
r the notice of the
submitted them to
Messrs. Robinson
gh these gentlemen
arges, they refer to
one of these three

to Kirby's child,
fusal of Baptism—
aptized; but, they
d the public chris-
h it appears, was
Kirby, an ignorant
rby, or his wife,
d in consequence
learned Counsel
oved?

ent, and Lawyer
ny merits for the

n," of course they
ho were paupers,
from Beaufet, to
at to Burin? Do
ty of pleasure on
distance upon the
ed so far if they
their own Harbor?
ounsel, relates to
sacrament to Mrs.
to,) without con-

fession, &c.; and they appear to rest their conclusion that it is unfounded, upon Mr. White's own statement, and, the certificates of Mary Emberly and Frances Burton. Now, the latter is remarkable only for an incredible statement of what she could not possibly know, "that Mr. White *never* asked her (the deceased) to confess her sins, or denied giving her the Sacrament." And though Emberly states, that in her last moments the deceased wished Mr. White to be sent for, and that her husband would not go for him, and that she (Emberly) was so overcome by the scene that she went home; it may be asked why Emberly herself did not call Mr. White in, as she came again shortly after, at ten or eleven o'clock, Mrs. Kirby having just died.

Mr. White states, that he sedulously attended the deceased during her illness, from the 1st of February until her death, in April, and upon his own statement, his delay in administering the Sacrament to this poor and humble woman is hard to reconcile with the principles of Christian charity or clerical duty.

But in confirmation of the charges against him, are the solemn Declarations of Samuel Kirby, Bridget Bendle and Charles Tulk, (vide "Church of England in Newfoundland," pages 8 and 9) taken more than two years ago, when the circumstances were fresh in the memory of the witnesses; and though referring to different times, they all agree in confirmation of the charges, that Mr. White required "a particular confession," and that he "refused to administer the Sacrament to the deceased;" and there is the further declaration of Mary Tulk, (vide Appendix, No. 9.) taken last February, now published, and corroborative of the other three Declarations, as to Mr. White's refusal to administer the Sacrament. These Declarations, if untrue, would subject the parties who made them, to the punishment inflicted for perjury, which, in such case, they would well deserve; but as the matter stands, who can doubt on which side the evidence predominates?—Let the public judge.

The third charge, as stated by the learned Gentlemen, is, "that Mr. Collett stated that the Bishop required Mr. White to light candles, during the day, in the Church in Beaufet, and on the Communion Table, which Mr. White approved of and did."

Now, it was really very unwise of the learned Counsel, so to magnify and pervert the charge, as made by Mr. Collett. Did they really see his charge with their own eyes, or read