

found deliberation the affirmative side of the case had been taken* by "the Chief Shepherd!" and that in consequence, about 100 shirts or surplices, had been ordered to be thus worn in C. W. We know not the service which the Bishops appointed for the solemn occasion of thus robing their clergy, but we should suppose that none more appropriate than Matt. xxiii. 27 could have been found in the sacred canon, viz, "*Woe unto you Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye are like unto whited sepulchres.*"

It seems that the congregation at Guelph, as at other places, were disturbed by the innovation of their Diocesan; but, whether it was simply a feeling of reluctance at getting out of the beaten path, or some secret misgivings about whited sepulchres we cannot tell.—Be that as it may they demurred at the proceeding and wanted again to have the surplice order rescinded through an appeal to the Bishop. But unfortunately for the slaves of priestly power, the appeal had to pass through the Priest, just as in the case of Methodist slaves an appeal against Conference must pass through an agent and member of Conference!—so that when the Episcopalian Parson or Methodist Preacher shall refuse to be the channel of communication—the people must just *bear the yoke*:—there is no redress.—The minority however on this occasion appealed to the Press, and published the petition which they failed to carry and were unable lawfully to transmit, and also their reasons for so doing. Their petition is one of the most pitiable and abject kind:—it runs thus—

TO THE RIGHT REVEREND JOHN, LORD BISHOP OF TORONTO, &c. &c.

The Petition, &c. &c.

That in the opinion of your petitioners the wearing of the surplice (or shirt) has given great dissatisfaction to many of the most conscientious members of this congregation—"—"—"that it is with extreme diffidence we approach the subject of the right of the constituted authority of our Church to direct its spiritual concerns (such as compelling men to wear a shirt outside of their coat,—yet we humbly submit to your Lordship the propriety of withdrawing your recommendation to your clergy on these matters—"—"—"that we are emboldened to address this request to your Lordship in consequence of the recent declaration (or recantation) of his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, (concerning the Exeter shirt question) &c. &c.

No body of men who had ever read their Bibles with an ordinary share of common sense could ever submit to play at such a game of childish foolery with their fellow-mortals as that to which we have referred—under the name of Christianity. THE NEW TESTAMENT does not even recognize the office which they allow to be their constituted authority—namely—that one man shall rule over many congregations as Bishop—let the literati of Guelph discover it there, *if they can*. It also condemns the receiving of honorary titles—(see Matt. xxiii. 7 & 8)—and knows nothing of Lord Bishops. (see Mark x. 42 & 43, and 1st Peter v. 3). And as to the wearing of official garments by the ministers of religion it is altogether silent. It teaches everywhere that respect is due to character not to appearance. A man in plain clothes may therefore be an object of our esteem and love, while a surpliced sinner may deserve both our pity and contempt.

Either gross ignorance or rank infidelity—or both—must prevail to a large extent together with State support to uphold this grand ANTI-CHRISTIAN USURPATION in the world.

* The term "THE CHIEF SHEPHERD" was lately applied to the Bishop of Montreal in a letter from one of his clergy upon "the surplice question." !!