

might well smile at your visionary conceptions of the nature of the religion of Christ. Dissenters, it might be imagined, *a priori*, are just as likely to be in the right as you. Their means of spiritual illumination are as ample; and, having equally valuable interests to secure, their motives to a faithful use of them are as solemn and impulsive. Thousands of them, of various denominations, are inferior to none in the Church of England, in intelligence, and in the Scripture marks of a child of God. Have *you* searched the Scriptures with deep devotion of heart? They have done the same. Have *you* felt yourself to be a sinner, and fled to a pardoning God through the only Mediator? So have they. Have *you* found peace with God, and received the spirit of Christ, without which a man can be none of his? These covenant blessings have been consciously communicated to them. Do *you* adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things? So do they. Are they, then, to be ordered to *stand off*, merely because, after much deliberation, they have adopted different views of Church *polity* from you, and, under a full conviction of the rectitude of those views, will not passively yield to all your imperious exactions, i. e., falter in their allegiance to Christ! Would it not be infinitely more rational as well as christian-like for you to soliloquise and act in reference to such an one and to *all* such, as the Hon. and Rev. Baptist Noel does. "Am I now," says that distinguished ornament of the English Establishment, speaking of a conscientious dissenting brother—"Am I now to separate from his society? How has he sinned? He was obliged to follow what seemed to him the will of Christ. His conclusions were supported by several of the Protestant Churches. The Lutheran, Swiss, French, Dutch, and Scotch Churches, the Church of Vaudois, and a large and pious section of the American Church, were all

on his side. While in favour of episcopacy, beside the Church of Rome, 'the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth, drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus;' and the eastern churches, which are nearly as corrupt, he found only the Church of England, and three or four sections of the Church of Christ elsewhere, who had retained diocesan episcopacy. Under these circumstances, am I to separate from him? Not to have examined the scripture doctrine would have been sin. Not to have followed the conviction of duty to which the examinations led him would have been sin. In fidelity to Christ he was obliged to act as he did; and if I separate from him, I do it only because he did his duty."* Oh! how refreshing, Sir, to turn from the chilling and repulsive mutterings of your morbid and bigoted spirit to these elevated sentiments of true christian charity—sentiments which delight us the more, because they emanate from one of the noblest sons of the Anglican Church. Had you inhaled ever so small a portion of the spirit they breathe, could you, I solemnly ask, by a process so summary, and apparently without a misgiving or a sigh, eject from the pale of scriptural Christianity two-thirds of all the Protestant ministers in Christendom, with the millions of immortal souls under their pastoral care!!

Apart from this revolting view of the principles you propound, in reference to christian *unity*, the charge of schism comes with a very bad grace from the member of a church which is in this respect herself not without sin, and therefore has no right to cast the first stone. I do not now refer to her *coming out* from the Church of Rome. In this I glory; and I devoutly pray God she may never *go in* again. Here, however, I must be permitted to remark, that

* See the Hon. and Rev. B. Noel's Tract on the Unity of the Church.