

delicate sense of honor and Christian feeling would absolutely require, as it appears to me, such a resignation, it would be quite possible to accompany it with a firm and yet respectful disclaimer of any accordance with his Bishop's views, or to his personal unfitness for the said Dignity or office.

(3). To proceed, however, to the *third* of these propositions, being the one, I imagine, that, in the opinion of the anonymous writer, most clearly betrays the cloven foot of "Episcopal Absolutism," and which is given by him as follows:—“(3) Clergymen, to be dismissed with six months' pay, or at six months' notice.”

Now, I beg my readers to note what was the true character of this “third proposition,” or Canon, as it was really presented by us. Why, that so far from being an indication of “Episcopal Absolutism,” it is almost ultra-democratic in its provisions. As printed in the last Synod Report, it was as follows: “And the STANDING COMMITTEE shall have power, with the consent of the Bishop, to dispense with the services of any Clergyman, upon giving six months' notice in writing or six months' salary.” The Crown Rectories, however, being excluded, as I think, improperly, from its operation.

Such misrepresentation as the writer of the pamphlet in question has here been guilty of, in the strong *insinuation*, though I know he does not boldly say so, that this power of clerical dismissal was to be vested in the Bishop, would be unworthy of the merest man of the world; how much more, then, of one who makes such large pretensions of being himself actuated only by high Christian principle?