

It was right that the Bishop should have set forth his views before the congregations. But, that being done, he should, in my humble judgment, have retired; and left the congregations and ministry free to deliberate on his proposals.

On this ground I protested three several times against the evident unfairness of expecting myself and congregation to be bound by a movement of the nature and ends of which the majority, I am persuaded, are still profoundly ignorant. And I must also observe that this movement, so far as authority is concerned, is only the act of individuals, however highly esteemed, and not of the congregation.

Now I believe that the true business and end of a synod is that of a voluntary union of congregations, who have agreed on their common faith, to combine their strength in spreading abroad the gospel and, in common christian works. And had these been purely the ends of the present movement, I for one would not have opposed it. So far from this being the case it has at the outset been grounded on principles utterly repudiated by a large body in the Church of England.

I must put this matter plainly before you, because I declare to you my conviction that the purity of the reformed faith is in danger from those principles.

Had it not been for the occurrences which took place at the consecration of the church, when, before you all, I protested against ritualism; and had it not been for what has ensued from that protest; I, too, might have been led into the unconscious acceptance of principles, the nature of which I might have discovered when too late.

What has subsequently happened I feel I must now briefly put before you. It is a duty which I owe to my ministry and the cause of truth; to my family; and to you, my beloved brethren. To you, the congregation, because ever since that protest there has been a something, you scarcely have known what, disturbing your quiet if not obstructing your edification; to my ministry, that I may not be supposed to have exercised it unlawfully to my children, that my name may not be a reproach to them when my lips are silent.

I must therefore put a certain letter before you; a letter which, whatever others may have done, I have never communicated, nor spoken of, except to some very few members of the congregation, who have sought of me an explanation; and you will bear me witness, my friends, that, whatever wrong may

have been done to me, I have not gone whispering among you to foment dissensions. What I say, therefore, I say openly.

The letter to which I allude is a judgment passed upon me by the Bishop, for the protest which I uttered on the occasion referred to; and I produce it now in order, first, that this element of disquiet,—so far at least as it is a hidden one,—may be removed from amongst you; and also, because it forcibly illustrates what I wish to say as to the dangerous nature of the principle on which the projected synod is virtually based; the doctrine, I mean, of the apostolical succession; the controversy of ages and of all the churches.

And here I wish you to bear in mind, that I bring this before you as an official act on the Bishop's part, and not as a personal matter; the said letter having been sent by him to the Church Wardens (who did not send it back) and therefore virtually published. What I therefore now say to you is in some sense my defence, as well as pertinent to my general argument.

This is the letter:—

BISHOP'S GLOSS, VICTORIA,
December 14, 1872.

REV. SIR:—Having offered you, with no good result, several opportunities of expressing regret at your conduct on the 5th of December, a regret which should be expressed to your Bishop, who was unhappily present an eye and ear witness of the sad scene; to your brother minister whom you openly insulted in the House of God, and to the congregation whom you disturbed and distressed, it now remains for me to discharge a most painful duty, the more painful considering your position as Dean of the Cathedral and as senior clergyman of the diocese; from whom might be expected at least an example of self-control, propriety and order.

On the 5th of December, at the evening service of the Day of Consecration of Christ Church, immediately after the sermon by the Archdeacon of Vancouver, instead of proceeding with the service, you stood up, and in irritating and chiding language you denounced your brother clergyman by name, and amongst other words declared that he had violated the law of the church, the law of the land, and the law of God in the Scriptures.

Being evidently under excitement, your manner and language caused unseemly disturbance in the congregation. There were vehement expressions such as are only heard in secular buildings and in drinking saloons, stamping of feet, clapping of hands, and

other uncreated and regulated amidst the church to the Bishop and the congregation.

To the less and possibly to blasphemy of God, placed in

You have which is divine law, and in the term of divine work or impiety.

Moreover the Church opposition the clergy because contradict and disquiet.

No provision of sermon had to be adopted account.

from the v you have a your copy right. You of God was occupied t and he is a

Consider aiding the the outrage divine work expressly f exhibition taking a dering, ho service in bably un such action offence of a have been most lenient upon you

As your conduct on ber, 1872, careful in