

will acquire sufficient magnitude to cause a permanent division of the diocese—a result which in fact constitutes the only mode of relief we can discover from the oppression and injustice with which the synod and its proceedings surround us.

This solution of our present unfortunate difficulties would, in the opinion of many intelligent Churchmen, commend itself to all as a most wise and judicious measure, well calculated to promote the best interests of episcopal protestantism, and to establish spiritual edification. The present financial condition of the Church would seem to be an obstacle in the way of any immediate action in this direction. Finance, however, is subject to changes and fluctuations. And a time may come, perhaps sooner than some among us imagine, when funds will not be wanting to endow a bishopric in western Nova Scotia.

I fear that you will think this letter too long; but I cannot conclude it without some reference to the letter of your correspondent "A Protestant," which appeared in your second number. Speaking of the change in the mode of appointing Colonial Bishops, consequent on the late decision of Lord Westbury, he says: "Fortunately our Bishop, by the establishment of our Synod, has not acted on the letters patent granted to him, and therefore there is not anything to undo." There is some mistake here, arising probably from your correspondent's limited acquaintance with certain proceedings, which have been confessedly conducted under the authority of "the letters patent." The Bishop of Nova Scotia acted on his letters patent when he constituted himself perpetual chairman of the Synod, so called; when he withdrew licenses to preach from clergymen in this diocese; and whenever he exacts the oath of canonical obedience from any of his clergy. It were well and in accordance with law if all these acts were left "undone."

The legitimate consequences of Lord Chancellor Westbury's late decision in reference to the power of Colonial Bishops as conferred by their letters patent, may be briefly stated to imply the following practical changes in the present order of things:

1st—The title of "my lord," in addressing the Bishop, ought at once and forever to be abolished. Applied to bishops in England, it implies temporal rights and legal privileges, which this Province has not yet conferred on any bishop. The R. Catholics use the title on spiritual grounds. If we henceforth use it, we must derive it from the same source, for we have no other. Is this consistent? Would we not thus be showing our approval of a system against which we "protest", and accuse of "lording it over God's heritage"?

2nd—Our Bishop ought at once to relinquish the presidentship of the so-called Synod. Any power or authority of a *temporal* nature which he may henceforth exercise should be concocted in the presence of a convention of the whole Church.

3rd—The oath of canonical obedience ought at once to be abolished, because it is a direct violation of every rule of justice and propriety that you should be called upon to swear to obey a man who has neither power nor authority to protect you in your obedience

ANTI-SYNOD.

SUMMARY OF CHURCH NEWS.

WE cannot make a better commencement than the following extract from the Report of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, on the occasion of the retirement of Rev. Ernest Hawkins from the office of Secretary of the Society. Mr. Hawkins was appointed Assistant Secretary in 1838, and Secretary in 1843.

"The Society could offer no more suitable recognition of its estimate of the invaluable services of Mr. Hawkins, than it did in ordering to be printed the following brief statement of progress during the last quarter of a century:—In 1839 the income from all ordinary sources (excluding dividends, interest, &c.) was £16,557, and in 1864 it was £91,703. The number of *Missionaries* then was 180, and last year 493. The *Incorporated Members* have increased from 344 to 1,447.