

Wellington-street, W. C. ; Mr. John Hart, Reigate ; Mr. Meyrick W. Heath (Treasurer), Clifton, Bristol ; Mr. R. B. Prosser ; Mr. Hy. Richards, 50 Nev-ern-square, S. W. ; Mr. W. Glennie-Smith, Clifton, Bristol ; the Rt. Hon. the Earl of Onslow and Mr. C. Brown Smith of Wolverhampton.

It is a very serious thing for the Diocese to lose such staunch and true men from among its supporters, and every one of the above named is a centre of influence, so that these names mean that the Diocese has lost probably scores of supporters. We hope indeed that we have not lost what is of more value to us even than their money—their prayers. We sincerely hope that in them the needs of the Diocese are still remembered.

The reasons for their resignations are given in the letter to Bishop Dart, in which they tender their resignation :—

“1. Before leaving England you gave us most distinctly to understand that the work of the Diocese would be conducted on the same lines as in the past. In this we have been disappointed.

“2. The transfer to your lordship’s own stipend of the grant made by the S. P. G. for many years to the Indian Mission is a step of which, even as a temporary expedient, we cannot conscientiously approve.

“Thus on two important matters of principle we find ourselves in direct disagreement with your lordship. We need hardly say that we take this step with the greatest regret, and wish to express our deep sorrow at feeling thus compelled to sever our connection with a work with which we have been so long associated.”

As to reason No. 1, it is quite a mistake to suppose, as apparently has been thought by some and stated in the public press, that it means that the late Bishop Sillitoe “carried out a one-sided policy to the detriment of the best interests of the Church.” Any one who can remember how Bishop Sillitoe took the side of the “aggrieved parishioners” in the case, certainly of two churches in the Diocese, knows well that he held our good old Church of England to keep within herself men of High, Low and Broad Church views. We have but to remember again the way in which he favoured the ecclesiastical division of the city of Vancouver to know that his policy was not one-sided. Some of us know too, how that when he might have appointed a moderate High Churchman from Eastern Canada and was entreated to do so by some leading men in the congregation when Christ Church was vacant, he refused, on the ground that he must appoint a priest of evan-