

through the magnifying lenses of their Ecclesiastical Assistant? Let Mr. Collett's own words speak for themselves, in his letter to Mr. White, "when you prove there were not *two new mould candles*, placed over the Communion Table, and none, at the same time, placed in the other usual places, &c." (Vide Church of England in Newfoundland, page 15.)

But where is the charge to be found, "that the Bishop desired Mr. White to light candles in the day time, &c."? Was this said by the learned Counsel, to use their own words, "with a knowledge of its falsehood"? In common charity it is to be hoped not, but even treating it as a *blunder*, it may be fairly taken as a criterion of the value of this legal Opinion. Had it not been asked, or given, perhaps John Hollett's Declaration, (vide Appendix No. 4) might not have made its appearance, and the extract from the Bishop's Bermuda Charge of 1849, (ante page 15) referring to the "two lights set on the Altar," which (among other things) the Bishop wished "might be adopted with due honor in all" (Churches), would have been deprived of half its significance. Here (in Newfoundland) it seems the Bishop's legal Advisers, would consider the imputation of a *penchant* on his part for "lighted candles," as a "gross libel" upon him, to be avenged by the infliction of their legal Talons upon the character and veracity of the unfortunate person who might make it. In Bermuda, in the same diocese, the opposite statement would be a libel!

But the "legal Opinion" is not more remarkable for what it contains, than for what it does not contain. Though it proposes to deal with the whole Pamphlet, and in true *æa Cathedra* style, pronounces not only "that the charges are groundless," but with a coolness (might it be said an insolence?) truly professional, adds "that they must have been published with a knowledge of their falsehood;" yet it is now abundantly evident, that this "Opinion" does not even allude to one quarter of the charges contained in the Pamphlet.

To Nos. 1, 2, 5, and 6, no discernible reference is made, any more than as though such charges did not exist, and the necessary inference is, that after all their inquiry and examination, the learned Counsel could not gainsay those charges.

True it is, the refusals to baptize Masters' and Richard Collett's children were admitted, and justified by his Lordship the Bishop, and were undeniable; and then, again, the refusal to admit Mr. Collett and nearly the whole of his