

be your Head, and *she has thought for you*, and you will be merely her mouth-piece, by which she makes known the doctrines of the Gospel, as she understands them, and as she has made them known in her articles, and those articles explained by her formularies."

This is enforced by reference to the vow, "or oath," taken by each candidate,—"that you will give your faithful diligence always so to minister the *doctrines* and sacraments and the discipline of Christ," not only "as the Lord hath commanded," but, "as *this Church and Realm* hath received the same."

"But, you would say, suppose there may be a doubt." Then, again, you will swear or vow, to obey your ordinary and other chief ministers, unto whom is committed the charge and government over you, following with a glad mind and will their godly admonitions, and *submitting yourselves to their godly judgments*. Thus has the Church provided for the resolution of your doubts. Nothing has been left to your judgment, but everything to that of the Church and her chief officers."

Such is the teaching of this "Reformed" divine. But we defy any Papist to go beyond him in the doctrine of Passive Obedience. And the worst of it is, that this is not merely a personal opinion, but that it is pretty firmly based on the Ordination Service itself. If any more of our brethren are thinking of "going up higher," we hope they will ponder well how *low* they must go first.

But after all, the man, the Englishman, and the Protestant, are too much for the Priest, even in this preacher himself, and in this very sermon! For, in meeting the objection, "that at one end of the Province, you will hear one decision, and at the other end, quite a different decision,"—he goes on to give, as he naively says, "what may be considered a *kind of rebuke* to those whom he, with all priests and deacons, is bound in consequence of *their office*, to honour and obey;"—and then accuses the Bishops, before whom his whole soul ought to lie prostrate, of refusing to obey the Church! They had ordained persons who did not believe in Baptismal Regeneration, and who would "hold out the right hand of fellowship to ministers of other denominations;" hence the present differences and inconsistencies. The remedy to be applied was, that the Bishop should not "ordain any, who, he may think, will in any way depart from the doctrine of the Church, according to the Bishop's judgment." To these last words the note is added,—"*We have a precedent for this, in one of the neighbouring dioceses, where the Bishop will ordain no one who differs in opinion from him.*" The reference is no doubt to the Bishop of Huron, a strong Evangelical, and is meant to cover by his example a refusal by a High-Church Bishop to ordain an Evangelical candidate. A good enough argument on the "you're another" principle; but it proves a great deal too much for the main object of the sermon. The question returns in greater force than ever, "What does the Church teach? When a Right Reverend Father in God in London requires me to deny Baptismal Regeneration and Priestly Absolution, and another in Kingston requires me to believe them, and *I dare not think for myself*, what am I to do? Is God's Truth one thing in Western, and its opposite in Central Canada?"

Besides this chief doctrine of the discourse in question, there are incidental statements on other points which must not be overlooked. Severe things are said of those who "err on the side of defect" in relation to the Rubrics, which is said to be more injurious than "excess." It is said that there is more authority for changing the white gown for a red or a green than for a black one. The following reveals at once the uneasiness of "Evangelical" consciences, and the unworthy means adopted to relieve them;—we say, "unworthy," and might