

the ground work of popular declamation or of a political harangue, designed to make a temporary impression on the public mind. But in a grave discussion, regarding the fundamental principles of church government, we should rather look, for examples and instruction to the lessons of history and the dictates of justice, than to vague suppositions and unproved assumptions. Let a protestant churchman think on these things.

I am sorry that I am obliged to offer him a downright contradiction when he charges the Anti-Synodists with countenancing aggressive measures. In every instance our opposition, in so far as I am aware, amounted only to the negative quality of passive resistance. We paid no attention to the Bishop's mandate to elect delegates and to attend the Synodical meetings. Was this aggressive? We made our views to be heard in parliament, when our liberties as churchmen were threatened, and when our system of church government was openly attacked, by the introduction into that body of an invidious measure, which, if passed into a law, would have absolutely proved subversive of our rights and privileges as British subjects. Here, I maintain, we acted only on the defensive. If the measure above alluded to had indeed passed into a Provincial statute, then indeed the Synod would soon, very soon, become the proprietor and dispenser not only of the Endowment Fund, but of every other kind of church property in Nova Scotia.

This redoubtable champion of the Synodical movement, with a perversity of sentiment, which, I confess, engenders in my mind a large amount of astonishment, openly counsels those, "who will not acknowledge the Synod, or submit to its decisions to depart from among us." No man can misapprehend the import of this language. But who utters it? A gentleman, who has himself, by following the voice of the majority, actually departed from the well known system of discipline, which, for the last three hundred years, has distinguished the Church of the Fathers. The truth is that the Synodists are the moving party, and if a schism be the ultimate result of their action, they alone must be held responsible for this unfortunate sequence. The advice to depart from among them is therefore altogether inappropriate, inasmuch as we never did belong to them. And I should be glad to learn by what practical means your correspondent would propose to cause us to depart from the Church of England, or renounce that reformed episcopacy, which we love. To talk or write of such measures as merely possible or even permissible, in the nineteenth century, displays a marked, if not a reprehensible disregard of the feelings and sentiments which characterize the age in which we live. The Synod, by the act of the Legislature, is a voluntary association, and consequently the adoption or rejection of its measures and decisions cannot in the remotest degree affect the place or standing of any one member of the Church of England. If its character were otherwise and in accordance with the views and wishes of its promoters, then we should behold the sorrowful spectacle of our legislators combining and co-operating with "a protestant and churchman" to commit an infringement on the Apostle's Rule: 1. Cor. i. 10, Rom. xvi. 17.

In view of the attitude which is now assumed by the Synodists, I cannot perceive any mode or measure by which a division of the Diocese can possibly be avoided. They are determined, they tell us, to proceed and to conduct church government among us, through the instrumentality of their favourite measure or project. Against all this we have solemnly protested, and recorded our views before parliament, in the full conviction that we have reason, truth and justice on our side. We are of the same opinion still. Does your correspondent imagine that we can relinquish this attitude with honour, or turn our backs on the position in which we are fortified, without compromising our feelings of self respect, and provoking ridicule among all beholders? Would he have us prove faithless to our former associations, and to confess that hitherto we have been transgressing against high heaven; but now that we repent and desire to be admitted to the Synodal fold? This indeed, would have been a degree of humiliation to which we can never submit, and which we have done nothing to deserve. Here, then, is the cause which, if the Synod prevails, will render a division of this Diocese inevitable.

I am altogether unacquainted with the amount of our Diocesan's stipend; but if a protestant and a churchman be correct in his figures, I have only to add that I am amazed.

I remain, yours truly,

ANTI-SYNOD.