

been to keep them in ignorance. Formerly it was not so. No industry has been taught in the so called industrial school.

27. "The Conference.....recommended that Metlakatla should be kept as it always had been, a lay mission."

The very words of the resolution are these: "Having full knowledge of the Parent Committee's wish with regard to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and having ascertained that Mr. Duncan cannot conscientiously remain at Metlakatla if the Committee compel the administration of the Sacrament according to the rite of the Church of England, and being unable to suggest a better plan which would meet the emergency, recommend that, *if practicable*, the Metlakatla Mission be carried on by the Church Missionary Society as a lay mission independent of clerical supervision." It is obvious therefore that it had not been previously a lay mission, whatever that may mean, and the real cause of the Society's action is found in this foolish and cowardly resolution.

28. "The Bishop was strongly opposed (to the resolution).....and wished it rescinded, and the Conference adhered to its opinions and forwarded the resolution to the Society. Probably the Bishop sent a report and a different recommendation.....and about this time the Society entertains the idea of dispensing with Mr. D.'s services, &c., &c."

The Bishop did not attend the Conference but remained at the Forks of the Skeena. He knew nothing of the proceedings of the Conference, therefore could not wish them rescinded. He made no report thereof to the Society, but when he read the report he was filled with shame and sorrow that such should proceed from professed members of the Church of England. Happily the Society has shaken off the majority of those who made the resolution possible. The two next paragraphs, about Mr. D.'s dismissal, removal and ordination, I cannot dwell on for very disgust, but proceed to the following, which states that

29. "On his (the Bishop) return (from England) we find him writing a letter to Mr. D., asking him to come back. That same letter contains one of the most insulting proposals which could be made to a man like Mr. Duncan."

Here is a copy of my letter, written solely with a view of peaceful living under the altered circumstances, and how it could be thought to ask Mr. D. to come back puzzles me. The Society never entertained the idea of receiving him back, nor did I. He could not be received back under any circumstances. I merely sought to mitigate the evils of separation.

"THE MISSION HOUSE, METLAKATLA,
May 27, 1882.

"My Dear Mr. Duncan:

"Though my letter may share the contempt bestowed by you on myself, yet I cannot suffer our *personal* rela-

"tion"
"it."
"ture"
"me"
"that"
"which"
"your"
"wish"
"other"
"Christi"
"in G"
"thing"
"Wed"
"but a"
"ed th"
"those"
"oly,"
"secul"
"letter"
"hope"
"gladl"
"will a"
"diffic"
"I"
"as the"
"by Le"
"threa"
"shose"
"ial to"
"adher"
"infla"
"I"
"under"
"for ev"
"from"
"T"
30.
"dence"
"The"
"is one o"
"holding"
"persuad"
"influen"