

tory, that Lord Cairns himself in his speech in the House of Lords said, that not a laymen only but even a lawyer would find it so impossible to reconcile them, that though professedly final, they could not in reality be so. After they might have known and ought to have known Bishop Gray's struggles with this most unhappy Court of final Appeal, whose blunders and crimes have at last compelled the issue of a Royal Commission, they nevertheless unanimously agreed to urge the Synod which was, and is (thank God) free from its jurisdiction, to place itself under the domination of this most unhappy and incompetent tribunal.

But even this does not exhaust the proof of the imminent peril of allowing hasty legislation on exciting matters, even by the House of Bishops. If we had not the certified report before us, it would be impossible to credit the blunders which were made. Leaving the guidance of "Her Majesty's Highest Courts," and the questions before the Privy Council, the Bishops venture to propose a resolution of their own motion, and at the very first step plunge headlong into an inconceivable mistake. They actually base their resolution on a plain and undeniable misquotation of the Prayer Book, in which mistake they "unanimously agree." Their exact words are as follows: "Whereas, the Rubric at the end of the Communion Office *enacts* that the bread shall be such as is usual to be eaten, the use of wafer bread is hereby forbidden."

Of course, any one who can read his Prayer Book and understands plain English, can see in a moment that **THEY** failed to do one or else the other. The Rubric at the end of the Communion Office makes no such enactment as their Lordships assert it to do. It says, that in the want of something better, "*it shall suffice* that the bread shall be such as is usual to be eaten." That did not mean adulterated