

—liberties which she enjoyed even under heathen emperors. The spiritual sentence then of the Church remains just where it did. All that has been decided is a point of law. With the spiritual powers, rights, office of the different orders in the Church, the law has no concern, and does not claim to interfere.

Though I have ever respected, as I was bound to do, the Queen's Letter Patent, framed and prepared by the highest law officers of the Crown and bearing the signature of my Sovereign, and in all my proceedings have endeavoured to act in strict accordance with their provisions, I have never believed, nor acted as if I believed, that my authority was derived from them. I have ever held that my commission was given to me from Christ through His Church.* The Church, in her Lord's name, entrusted me with spiritual power. The Crown sought, but it seems, sought in vain, to clothe that power with the authority of law. In its attempts to do so, it has hampered and weakened it. Under these circumstances, the only question really is this: "Is the right to deprive a Suffragan of his power to minister in Christ's name, and with His authority, lodged, by the laws and canons of the Church, in the Metropolitan and Bishops of a region called a Province, because of the peculiar relations in which its Bishops stand to each other; and has that right been exercised with a due regard to justice in the present case?"

There can be no doubt, that by the canons of the Church from the earliest ages—canons accepted by the Church of England, acknowledged and acted upon in our courts at home—the power to deprive a Bishop of his spiritual func-

* Judgment, pp. 4, 5. Natal Charge, p. 5.