

the means of introducing into our hitherto peaceful communion. It has all along been conscientiously and consistently opposed by a large number of intelligent and influential Churchmen in every part of the diocese, as a powerless and costly incubance. Their opposition throughout, as it is well known, has been rather of a defensive than an aggressive character—a course which was doubtlessly indicated by their reluctance to cause divisions in the household of faith. On no occasion that I am aware of have their expressions or their actions exceeded this limit; not even excepting that memorable exhibition before our Provincial Legislature, in which the bishop ingloriously failed to obtain the sanction of law to a project of Church government, which was clearly papistical in its tendencies, and which if successful would have totally subverted the whole superstructure of our apostolical Church. Yet, depend upon it that this opposition, although at present silent and unobtrusive, is not therefore the less real, earnest and determined. It still retains all its pristine strength and vigor. And if by advocating and representing as of prime importance a measure of an evil tendency, to which the opposition party owes its very organization, you succeed in more clearly defining its outlines, and exhibiting its energy, strength, and expansive proportions, results may possibly follow which cannot fail to exercise a vast influence on the future destinies of our humble Zion. For it is, in the nature of consecutive events, impossible that we, in this western section of the Province, who are conscientiously opposed to a synodical Church, can derive any spiritual benefit or ecclesiastical advantage from a system of government which deliberately ignores our rights and privileges, and tramples our feelings in the very dust.

Not the smallest recognition of our constitutional position, not the least concession to our scruples and unanswerable objections, has yet resulted from the deliberations or actions of the Synodical Meetings. Adopting, for their fundamental rule, the principle of a wide and liberal voluntarism, the so-called Synod has not hesitated to enact rules and regulations for the future guidance of the *whole* body of Churchmen, whether assenting or not. They have enacted lengthy and minute regulations in reference to the election of future bishops, thus arrogating to themselves the sole management of this delicate transaction, and virtually excluding us, the opposition, from any participation in this exercise of our undoubted rights and privileges. Our representations are treated with marked indifference, and we are regarded, on the voluntary principle, I suppose, as persons who exclude ourselves from the benefit of all constitutional and ecclesiastical privileges, for no other reason, that I can perceive, than that we are determined to maintain in its integrity that system of Church government and discipline which has been handed down to us from our fathers.

From this venerable system, I conceive, there are only two general modes of divergence: one tends to latitudinarianism, the other, directly or indirectly, tends to popery. Of the latter description are, in my humble opinion, the Synodical movement and its action, which you select for your future advocacy, but which, be assured, grate most harshly and deeply on the feelings and earnest convictions of many estimable church people in every section of the Province.

I will not ask you to reconsider your views and determination, for both are apparently assumed with deliberation, in the full knowledge of their nature and character. But I will ask you whether you think the treatment which we the anti-synodists have hitherto experienced is either just or generous, or such as we have a right to expect from our brethren, all being members of the Church of England? I am sure that no one who speaks from a full knowledge of all the circumstances of the case will say that we have been treated with a common measure of justice, to say nothing of either kindly consideration or generosity.

It cannot surely be supposed that this anomalous and uneasy state of things will long continue—that the anti-synodists will always be content under a system of Church government which compromises their spiritual rights and privileges, or that a profitable and beneficial accord can again be restored between themselves and their diocesan, who must be held responsible for the origin and successive developments of this unhappy movement. Such a supposition would be altogether inconsistent with the strength and earnestness which at this moment characterize our sentiments and determinations. A breach of confidence has already, in the mode just indicated, been most unfortunately effected, and I fear it cannot very easily be healed. Sooner or later, it