

might be forbidding a defender. If the sermon in question had been an attack on sentiments held by the Bishop, as it was an attack on those held by the minister and his congregation,—the Bishop himself would hardly have failed to thank his defender, and to load him with his best rewards. How much more, when I stood up, as I believed, for my master, and for my church, in defence of the ministry which had been entrusted to me with the most solemn adjurations. Still, had I acted in the manner described, I should have been unworthy of the ministry.

I have the consolation of believing, from numerous testimonies, that the step was approved by the congregation generally,—some of whom even on their dying beds, have referred to it with tears.

But in fact there was no other way open to me of dealing with this offensive discourse. There was no tribunal in the country which could have dealt with the erroneous doctrine which I believed it to contain. I had no hope that the Bishop would rebuke the preacher. He has indeed since intimated that there was nothing in the sermon which went beyond the liberty of opinions in the Church of England, and of which any formal notice could be taken. I may observe, my brethren, in passing, that the preacher on that occasion, was guilty of a great breach of trust in using my pulpit to teach doctrines which he knew were notoriously adverse to my own. The pulpit is under the exclusive control of the minister who, as he must have known, is accountable for the doctrine taught, so far as in him lies.

I say, then, that in this case,—in the case of the letter I have read to you, condemning me for my protest,—the Bishop, relying doubtless, on the irresponsible authority which I am sure he sincerely believes he possesses, combined in his own person the functions of prosecutor, witness and judge; functions which, I venture to say, except in the ecclesiastical law, (if this be law) or in Government over infants or slaves, are never allowed to meet in one person.

I must also observe, that on applying to the Bishop to know what others witnessed against me; at what council, if any, this sentence was decided on; and what record, if any, was made in the archives of the diocese; this information was refused, and I was referred, for redress, to the Archbishop of Canterbury, which means, I believe, a costly lawsuit. I am quite sure if Archdeacon Gillson knew these things, he would write some-

what differently from that which I read from his pen in the STANDARD of to day's date.

Now brethren, I put this case in connection with the synod from a Christ Church point of view.

It has, I believe, been impressed upon you that the synod is to heal this and every other wound of the church.

Now it is not a synod in itself that I object to, but the principles on which the proposed synod is grounded. And seeing in this case the working of these principles and feeling certain from the very nature of the assumption on which they are based, that they will still work, though in another form, the question arises, is it safe to go into such a synod?

Who will suggest a tribunal by which such a case as this could be tried? For I find in the proposed synod no provision made for trying the Bishop himself, whoever may be the incumbent of the office. I wish to speak with all respect. This is a public question. We are constituting, or professing to constitute, the church for our children. And surely we cannot omit from our consideration the chief part of that constitution,—the head. Now, as in the proposed constitution, the Bishop can say "no" to every proposal of the rest of the body, it is plain that no tribunal can try the bishop, except a revolutionary one,—i.e., one which will destroy the prerogative.

It may be supposed that the convention will alter this. The Bishop does not suppose so. He has adopted the resolutions which include,—though they do not express—the veto, as the "understanding" on which the convention meets. See the circular to the "Clergy and Laity." And in looking over the programme set forth, I must express my own feelings that there is apparently little that savors of religion in the movement, but much that resembles an approaching political contest. At least I must say that when elections are directed to be held in any church,—for the registrar of the diocese, it would seem, has kindly arranged that this proceeding shall take place in the sacred edifice itself;—(subject, I believe, to the approval of a committee)—and when the communicants and congregation are called to what may be a party strife, where no sound of discord should be heard, it does a little grate on my ideas of the sanctity and devotion which one would like to see preserved amongst us.

But to revert to the question from the Christ Church point of view. How is the

Synod at the ever annual pro-

Will false de which The syn consent put a re an eccle diate g contrar tion. would I is called There i of a s Whatev erects, are, or land. synod v with su the pow

In th but for probab done as what I by ado apostol veto res trine, w at least present some o to decl Church rather provide that su in the fact sh mention doctrine

I mu that th dens t own cl most e and as plain a groun me, ac Bishop them.