

say, by the interests of bishops, which now stands in the way to obstruct justice. That evil demands instant reform. I trust this session will not pass without applying it. To seek a remedy for the abuses of our courts by the substitution of theologians for lawyers, of partisans for impartial judges, would be to expose our unhappy clergy to be treated with the disregard of the rules of evidence and equity which has characterized the proceedings of the Bishop of Capetown on two occasions, and now signalizes the Reports of Bishop Selwyn. This would indeed be passing from one evil to a greater, from discussions at times perplexed and misleading, but always aiming at truth, to the disputes of controversialists always vehement, and scarcely ever just.

II. That this would be, of all evils, the worst, I will illustrate to your Grace by a few cases, which I take from the practice and known opinions of eminent English bishops.

Let me first take the present Bishop of Salisbury. No doubt, in selecting him, I am aware that exception may be taken. For it may be pleaded that the Bishop of Salisbury has gone beyond the diversities of opinion, which are admissible within the Church of England; as much beyond the bounds in one direction, as Bishop Colenso on the other. I have no answer to make to this; for Bishop Hamilton, in transcribing into his charge the dogmas which, when announced by Bishop Forbes in Scotland, were condemned by all the Scotch bishops, has departed widely from the formularies and articles of his church. Still his case offers, if not a fair, at least a striking illustration.

Suppose then that the scheme of these Reports presented to your Grace passed into law, and that each bishop, seated on his tribunal, became the sole judge of the faith and teaching of his clergy. I observe that a clergyman in Wiltshire, writing with that freedom which our laws allow, denounces the views of Bishop Hamilton as disloyal and Romish. At present he does this safely. But under the proposed system of Episcopal Tribunals, he would instantly be summoned before the Bishop's Court at Salisbury, be called on to recant, and on his refusal, he would be suspended and deposed.

The suffering clergyman shakes from his feet the dust of the Wiltshire Downs, and removes to Southwark, or Spitalfields. He resorts to the venerable Bishop of Winchester, or to the Bishop of London. He is told that every dogma propounded on Bishop Hamilton's tribunal as true, is rank heresy; that these doctrines are contrary to the Articles of the Church of England, as well as to its uniform teaching. That our Reformed Church has no altar, no sacrifice, no sacrificing priest, no presence of Deity in the material elements, that from those errors her offices are carefully purged; that to her the confessional is an abomination, and auricular confession sternly prohibited; that no man can absolve from sin, but God only; and that if a bishop asserts such things to be true, he defies his Church, violates her Articles, and is a priest of the Church of Rome, not a pastor of the Church of England. Such would be the finding of the Episcopal tribunals of Winchester and Lon-