

y 30th, 1862.

at the meeting
to consider the
right with refer-
s Lordship the
ng his recent
k place at the
on the 4th and
pression was at
at the meeting,
e Patent were
e existence of

TIZAMBERT."

led by giving

subject of the

ominent part,
e Resolutions

at you have
truth of what

passed at the

"That it be
vour to pro-
ropolitan, by
d privileges

The Quebec Delegates, several weeks before the meeting of the Provincial Synod, met and resolved to select, *not me*, but the late lamented Dr. Falloon to be the mover, and H. S. Scott, Esq., to be the seconder, in order to carry out the instructions embodied in the above; and by consulting the "Journal of the proceedings of the first Provincial Synod," your Lordship will find accordingly, on page 25, the following:

"NOTICE OF MOTION.

"The Rev. Dr. Falloon gave notice that he would, at the earliest fitting opportunity, move a Resolution respecting the Letters Patent."

The rest of the *hearsay* reports, and the assertions without proof of ill-disposed persons, from whatever quarter, are of the same value.

I was ignorant until now, that I have been so closely watched by your Lordship for eleven years, in my various, and I may say active, responsible, and laborious duties, and that in conspicuous fields; and yet, although you have put the worst possible construction upon all my labours and motives, you *have not* been able to substantiate a single thing against me. To God alone be all the praise, whose grace is ever all-sufficient; and who enabled me to stand this fiery ordeal!

For a third time I have completed the painful task of meeting *every* charge and insinuation of your Lordship, and it will be my duty, so long as you shall continue to assail me, to defend myself, and I am confident with similar success.

I do not hide it, that I am jealous of anything and everything which would interfere with my privileges as a British subject or my legitimate liberty as a clergyman of the Reformed Church of England.

Will your Lordship permit me, in conclusion, for your own sake, and the Church's sake—though your inferior in office—to hope that I shall not unduly trench upon the deference due to Metropolitan authority, if suggesting for grave and humble enquiry, whether it is not possible for the highest ecclesiastical functionary—being fallible—to err at times, in Pastorals or otherwise, by assuming a position, and attributes of irresponsibility, incompatible with the recognized principles of our Protestant liberty?

Did we not live under British protection, might we not well tremble at the recent assumption of such a power by your Lordship?

For whose standing or reputation would be safe that incurred your Lordship's displeasure?