

I regret your Lordship has not condescended to accede to the suggestion, especially at this particular season of the year, the approach of Easter, when so many are supposed to be preparing themselves to carry out the command of our Saviour: "Do this in remembrance of me," and it would have been well to satisfy their minds on so important a matter, and possibly bring some of the stray sheep back into the fold. That is your duty, my Lord.

But it would almost appear, from your Lordship's letter to the Rev. Dr. Cordner, a Unitarian clergyman, published in the *Montreal Gazette*, that you are more desirous of his good opinion and those around him, than the people of your Lordship's Diocese.

You are pleased to say, my Lord, that "no clergyman of this city has, to my knowledge, 'repelled' anyone from Holy Communion," while you at the same time state that you instructed your curate to see a certain *person*, one of your congregation, which he did and "expressed the hope that as he had left the Church he would not come to holy communion next Lord's day." If this is not "repelling," my Lord, I should really like to know what it is. This *person*, it would appear, was a communicant, and had he presented himself at the altar railing to receive communion, 'tis beyond a doubt he would have been "repelled," and why? Simply, because he had stated that in receiving the holy communion, he did not believe he was "*verily and indeed receiving the body and blood of Christ*," and this in a Protestant Episcopal Church. Except as regards "notorious evil livers," the impression has been that the communion of the Church of England was open to all who "truly and earnestly repent of their sins, are in love and charity with their neighbors, and intend to lead a new life, following the commandments of God, &c.," but it would appear it is not the intending communicant who is to judge between himself and his Maker as to his being in a fit state of mind to approach the holy table—the Priest or Bishop is to be the judge. If so, why not adopt the confessional at once?

But, my Lord, rumour hath it, that a letter is in existence or was said to have emanated from your Lordship, to your Curate, officially notifying the *person* that he was excommunicated. I do not vouch for the correctness of this myself, but the authority I have it from is good.

But, my Lord, if there has been no act of excommunication in the city, how is it in Hazeldean, in your Lordship's Diocese, where the Rev. Mr. Mulvaney, under his own hand published a letter to the effect that he had excommunicated Messrs. Jno. Clarke and Jno. Hodgins with your Lordship's orders, given Mr. Mulvaney in the presence of a churchwarden.

Has a "Priest" the power to excommunicate while it does not form a part of a Bishop's duty. There is certainly something wrong in this matter one way or the other.

Referring, my Lord, to the Rev. Dr. Cordner's reply to your Lordship, it would appear, it is not "churchmen" alone, who have noticed the innovations in the Church during the past thirty years,

for D
chang
surpr

the l
poop
poral
tainl

Lord
Ott
unde
He s
sens
you
bish
teriz
we r
mati
cong
publ
was
Lew
with
the
the
corn
of o
sett

has
ser
cur
rep
the
rec
int
the
con

To

for
we
th