

quate support of a considerable number of our clergy, and they serve to throw a groundless suspicion upon many hard-working, conscientious, and estimable clergymen, which may seriously impair the success of their work, and even mar their future prospects. Such infringement of the order and constituted arrangements of the Church, such enforced partition of its ordinary and established operations, based upon an alleged unsoundness in the great administrative body is, I believe, without a precedent in all the past history of our Colonial Church. And I am persuaded that not a single religious body of the many around us would regard such a course as otherwise than revolutionary and schismatic.

If such issues had been fairly contemplated, more caution, I am persuaded, would have been exercised. The thought would naturally have presented itself that, if rival institutions are to be started by individuals within the Diocese, appeal should first be made to its governing body, the Synod, and the grounds fully and clearly set forth on which the sanction of such institutions is desired.

Every respect for conscientious opinions differing from those entertained by a large majority of at least the clergy of this Diocese ought to be, and I believe is, entertained; nor, I am persuaded, is any desire felt to exclude those who hold such opinions from their fair share in the ministrations and general work of the Church. But I trust a way may be found for effecting this without disturbing its settled organizations, or creating rivalry and dissension in parishes where there ought to be oneness and concord. Rivalry and strife of this character, if made to operate systematically, must issue in separation; and better this, perhaps, than a perpetuation of internal conflicts.

But I have a confidence that the good sense, and sound principles, and loyal attachment of the vast majority of Churchmen in this Diocese would shrink from the very possibility of such an issue. They would not, I am persuaded, tolerate the idea of such a calamity. For surely it is quite possible to uphold our combinations for God's work, without doing violence to individual convictions. Means, we must believe, can be devised for the application of generous offerings for the support of the ministers of the Church in such manner as will meet those convictions, without the presentation of organized rivalry or division. The Synod, through its constituted agencies, can be made to diffuse and apply those contributions in accord with the conscientious wishes of those who supply them, without the exhibition of such injurious schism as any other, and independent, agency would present. At all events, their calm judgment upon the whole matter would be most desirable.

Much of the prejudices that exist as to peculiar religious tenets arise from misconception of the teaching of the Church, and views much too restricted in the interpretation of its Articles of Faith. This is particularly the case in reference to a leading subject of controversy—the presence of our Lord in the Eucharist. Those who repudiate such a presence consider that its assertion indicates a propensity to adopt the Romish doctrine of Transubstantiation, and the evils which are believed practically to flow from that tenet. While repudiating that gross and untenable opinion, a presence of Christ in that holy sacrament is undeniably affirmed by the Church. And with this belief some, not unnaturally, go further than others in the endeavour to define the nature of that presence. The great mistake and danger is in the making such attempt; for when good and earnest men enter upon such an undertaking they usually get beyond their depth, and mystify rather than edify. In the noble words of Hooker, “men should give themselves to meditate with silence what we have by the sacrament, and less to dispute of the manner how.” Such should be their discretion; to meditate profoundly upon the wonders of this mystery, but to forbear from trying to explain them; to hold fast to their opinions, if these are conscientiously adopted, but not to bewilder others by attempted elucidations. It is enough for the comfort and strengthening of believers to feel assurance that Christ in His Holy Supper is present “after a heavenly and spiritual manner.”

The assertion of opinions believed to be in excess of this view has, in the Mother Country, been made the ground of impeachment: but Sir Robert Phillimore, in his memorable judgment in the case of *Shepherd v. Bennett*, has clearly shewn, through citations from the Articles and formularies of the Church, and from the writings of many of her greatest divines, the extent of liberty which the Church of