

The disuse upon the ordinary occasions of life, of a distinguishing ecclesiastical dress, is a departure from wise and venerable rules¹, from which our Clergy ought never to take licence to depart farther than, according to the now received usage, they are obliged to do. They should *never* betray a disposition to *secularize* the character and office which they hold. And in the actual performance of any ecclesiastical function, no deviation can be justified for which the plea of necessity cannot be advanced. No needless irregularity should be suffered to creep into our performance of official duty which may settle by degrees into a precedent.

To pass, however, to considerations of a higher nature,—I would observe that among very many disadvantages attaching to our situation as a Colonial branch of the Church, we have our advantages too; and it is not the least of these that in many parts of the Diocese, we are less trammelled by circumstances in making an approach to that holy discipline, the restoration of which, according to the language of the Church herself, is “much to be wished².” The existence of any such advantage ought to be turned to the utmost account. Instances have not been wanting in this Diocese in which communicants who have given scandal by some irregularity, have made public reparation to the assembled company of worshippers; and I cannot but commend the endeavour, which has been used with success by some of our

¹ See Note H.

² Communion Office.