

he always expressed an utter Dislike of it. I myself have heard
 one of this Minister's Parishioners, a Person of undoubted
 Credit, as well as the Minister, declare, that to his Knowledge,
 this Minister had always expressed his strong Dislike of the
 Act. And I myself also declare, that I believe it would be a
 very difficult Matter, for Col. *Bland* to prove, that this Mini-
 ster, deservedly esteem'd and respected by his Parish, was ever
 severely censured by any Memorialists for not entering into
 their Measures. The Ministers, concerned in the other par-
 ticular Act, might, for what I know, be well satisfied with it.
 But why? Because they, or their Predecessors, had been be-
 fore contented to take the poor pittance of Fifty Pounds Cur-
 rent Money a Year from their respective Parishes, rather than
 go to Law, of which they were not able to bear the Expence.
 And pray where now was the Wonder, that they should pre-
 fer a lesser to a greater Evil? Col. *Bland* has given us some Ac-
 count of a famous Petition of the Clergy, in which I own I see
 no mighty Harm, provided it might stand Alone, without the
 Colonel's Comment. Had it been offer'd in the Behalf, instead
 of being offer'd in the Name, of the Clergy, they would have
 had less Cause to be offended at it. I could have wish'd too,
 that it had been so nicely Worded, as not to have been liable
 to be interpreted into any implied Censure by the most strained
 Construction: Particularly that there had not been in it the
 doubtful Expression *so many*, which is capable of being taken
 by two Handles; the worst of which this Commentator has
 not fail'd to lay hold on. This Petition, he says, was disclaimed
 by *some* of the Clergy. It was indeed disclaimed by many of
 them; but not for the Reason he mentions. It was not
 Owned by any more than One Clergyman, who designed Well;
 but, whether he was strictly justifiable in doing what he did
 on