

was the wrong man for the place,—that he was dictatorial and bigoted. Being a high churchman, he sharply criticised what he termed Mr. Duncan's loose views in regard to the practice of certain Church forms and ceremonies. He introduced so much of pomp and color and ceremony in his ministrations, that the people turned in astonishment to their leader for an explanation. He claimed to be head of the mission by virtue of his office. He demanded the accounts of the colony, and when produced, he charged the man who had made Metlakahtla what it was, with misappropriating funds, and claimed that all the moneys sent by individuals to Mr. Duncan personally, and for a specific purpose, were the property of the society. These moneys had all been invested in public improvements, and Mr. Duncan believed that they belonged to the colony.

It is needless to give further details of the rupture, nor is it difficult to conjecture the result. Two factions arose. About sixty gave adherence to the Bishop, a thousand remained loyal to their leader, and some went back to their old ways, declaring that since Christians quarreled thus, they were no better than savages.

At length the Mission Society felt called upon to sustain the bishop, and consequently, to dismiss Mr. Duncan. The Society also claimed the land on which the little community had erected their public buildings, and the government confirmed that claim by declaring that "all public lands belonged to the Queen;" although Lord Dufferin, governor-general of the dominion, had assured the Indians that "they had a prescriptive right to their lands," and that they should not be deprived of them without compensation. Consternation seized the poor Indians, and they began to concert plans for a rebellion. The minister of the interior wrote, in a bundle of negatives, thus: "If there has not been an Indian war, it is not because there has been no injustice."