

duly administered." Whatever you may feel it in your heart to do, *I* cannot represent it as so monstrously uncharitable. The third part of the Homily against Idolatry does, however, in point of fact, unchurch the communion of Rome, through which, with singular consistency, you derive your supposed succession. No "*occasion*" can, therefore, justify your saying to members of the Wesleyan Society that their Ministers are not ministers of Christ, under the fallacious plea of "making known the opinion of the Church."

There is no danger, at present, of your possessing a spirit of "liberality," towards those who differ from you on the subject of Church government. You are too much in dread of "republicanism," and "radicalism," and "enthusiasm," and "fanaticism," "with all their accompanying evils," to be *liberal* in your religious opinions! Be it so. If you prefer the little shell of a narrow, sectarian bigotry, to the fine, open and expansive field of a truly christian liberality, you are at liberty, I suppose, in this land of freedom, to follow your own choice. But if you "boldly promulgate" your illiberal opinions, you cannot reasonably expect to escape the just charge of bigotry. You seem to be afraid of this imputation; and hence your feeble attempt to turn it aside. "It does not necessarily follow," say you, "that he is a bigot, because with candour and firmness he makes known and maintains his opinions." (lb. p. 4) Certainly, "a clergyman" is not a bigot *because* he makes known and maintains his opinions with *candour* and *firmness*. The manner of announcement may not make him a bigot, but you forget that the *thing* believed and announced may. Now respecting the ministerial claims of your "dissenting" brethren, you have adopted unscriptural, and most absurd and intolerant notions, and have promulgated them with an unbecoming boldness, and, at least, "*out of season*." To any person, not a clergyman, I would say, these notions make you a bigot, and would request him to free himself from the accusation if he could.

But you "have repeatedly spoken of the Church of England as a branch of the true Church." (lb.) To whom you have thus spoken I know not; but to me you have *written* as if it were the *true Church* to the exclusion of all others. But now you acknowledge it is only a *branch* of the true Church! Well this is some encouragement. But why not tell all that is in your heart! With all this apparent "liberality" — for at the spirit of *real* liberality you have great horror — do you not sincerely believe that it is the *only* branch of the true Church in the British dominions? If not, will you have the kindness to mention by name the *other* branches? as many persons would like very much to receive from a true son of the Church information on this interesting subject.

As to the dissatisfaction of some of my "own congregation" at hearing me read a paper respecting the ministerial office, and obviating your aspersions, to which you refer, pages 6th

and 7th
this day,
gation, pr

You feel
private le
at the un
it all, Sir,
your requ
I tell you
sing your
all others
to publish
act on my
your part.
letter to y
reason why

But my
you assert
ment nor
may be tr
gether to
published,
answer yo
sions. H
divine rig
arguments
advanced,
peculiar to
sendings
ties. That
dare say, I
At all even
covery. E
perfectly s
to offer, y
strictures,
in it, as, i
a word ac
rescue the

To the a
objection.
and error c
"love to
very groun
the attack.
man. I t
you had no
peared.

The res
statement o
informed, to