

"disbeliefs" expressed in very plain terms in my last communication; I take it to be so on two grounds, firstly, as the "Head of the Church" here, to bring the erring brethren, as you believe us to be, back into the fold; and secondly, to prevent others from going astray, for you may rest assured, my Lord, there are thousands now attendants and even communicants in this diocese and throughout the Dominion who think exactly as we do, and who sooner or later will join us just as circumstances admit.

We know my Lord, that a certain class are very apt to attach opprobrium to anyone leaving the church they have been born and brought up in, and the dread of this may for a time deter many from joining us at the moment. When I say thousands of Churchmen think as we do. I include many of the Clergy also, and your Lordship is candid enough to admit "that there are Bishops, Priests and Deacons who hold these disbeliefs and their livings also." This is a melancholy admission coming from a Bishop of the Church, and one cannot otherwise than believe that it is only their "livings" that keep them in the Church—hence it must be admitted that Bishop Cummins and his conferees certainly deserve the highest credit and the sympathy of real Churchmen, or I should say real Christians, for having preferred the faith to the "Flesh Pots." We do not admit having left the Church, but the Church has left us.

The difference of opinion, however, among the Clergy has long been well understood. For anyone who has attended any of the Diocesan Synods must have heard various clergymen, in addressing the Synod, refer to the PARTY with whom they generally acted. This speaks badly for the unity of the Church and clearly demonstrated that some change is required. It may be said, why do not the laity try to reform matters through the Synod? I am not aware, my Lord, how the laity are treated at the Synod of this diocese, but my own experience as a delegate to the diocese of Toronto, fully convinces me that the lay delegates as a rule are the nominees of the clergymen or their friends, and I recollect distinctly on the occasion of a lay delegate standing up in the Synod to speak on some objectionable doctrine said to be taught at Trinity College, Toronto, that he was fairly hissed down by the "educated Clergy." Again, a rule existed there that anyone addressing the Synod should do so from the platform where the Bishop presided. Now, as a rule, laymen are diffident, and not public speakers, and it really did appear as if this rule was made to deter them from expressing their opinions.

You refer my Lord, to Bishop Cummins having at one time been a Methodist Minister, and you are generous enough to say, "I suppose that he would have said that it was 'the Lord who put it into his heart.'" I will not accuse your Lordship for a moment of entertaining the idea that the ministrations of a "Methodist Minister" are not as acceptable to Almighty God as those of a Clergyman of the Church of England. I could not possibly imagine your Lordship so wanting in Christian charity, although the remarks might

bear t
this C
Minis
serv
the "

eight
Not n
their
letter
broug
Roma
ionab
conve
Chur
harve

the s
him.
reaso
Lord
meet
deno
'tis o
tion
city
Rom
Engl

exco
pate

and
Ref
reg
Hou
his

you
desi
disc
ano

thru
at s
awa
rest