

SECOND LETTER

TO THE

BISHOPS AND CLERGY

OF THE

United Church of England and Ireland

IN CANADA,

FROM

FRANCIS FULFORD, D.D.,

LORD BISHOP OF MONTREAL AND METROPOLITAN.

Montreal:

PRINTED BY JOHN LOVELL, ST. NICHOLAS STREET.

1862.

L E T T E R .

SEE HOUSE,

Montreal, June 5th, 1862.

RIGHT REV. AND REV. BRETHREN,

I have just received a reply from Archdeacon Hellmuth, to a letter lately addressed by me to you, respecting certain statements made by him while in England. There are some parts of it on which I wish to make a few remarks. The Archdeacon having first given his version of what occurred on the occasion of the proposal made to me for the erection of a new Church in this City, goes on to enumerate certain subsequent acts of mine, which he says justified him in believing that I could have entertained no reason to condemn his conduct in that matter; and that he and his friends supposed that it was now brought forward again because I had taken umbrage at the opposition made by him to the powers which were intended to be vested in me by my original patent as Metropolitan. In answer to this I can truly say that in the first place I have always wished for free and open discussion, whether on that or any other public measures; and that I have never for an instant harboured any ill-will against any one for the honest and fair expression of his opinions; and having had every reason to be more than satisfied at the manner in which the discussions on that particular subject were conducted, and with the results arrived at, it has not occurred to me to think unkindly of anything that took place in connection therewith.

Then as to any subsequent acts implying approval. The communication respecting the erection of the Church was of a private nature; and would never have been made public at all, unless it had become known at first through the Archdeacon and his friends. I certainly most entirely believed that it was an unfair attempt to hurry me into an approval of a proposition of the terms of which I had not at the time been properly informed: and from that time I was anxious not to admit the Archdea-

con into this Diocese, or to let him interfere in its concerns. But I never had any ill-will to Dr. Hellmuth, or wished to injure his position elsewhere. Nor should I have brought forward the subject in the way I have now done had not the occasion appeared to me to justify my stating, why previously I had objected to his being connected with the Diocese, and why I thought his present sweeping attack on the clergy and ecclesiastical Institutions of Canada, did not come most appropriately from him. For the same reason when objection was made to his being appointed General Superintendent of the Colonial Church and School Society in British North America, though all the members of the Montreal Committee were perfectly cognizant of my feelings on the subject in regard to Dr. Hellmuth, I was satisfied, without officially and specifically pressing them, on finding, for other reasons stated by the Committee during my absence from home, that the Diocese of Montreal was to be excepted from his charge. It was distinctly known to the members of the Committee that I should not have continued to act with them, had it been otherwise arranged. The Archdeacon, however, alleges in his favor that two years afterwards he was appointed by the Montreal Committee, with my consent, President of the Church of England Mission to the French-speaking population of British North America: the principal Institution of which is at Sabrevois in this Diocese. This, however, so far from involving any inconsistency on my part, was a proof to the contrary; while, at the same time, it was my wish not to act vexatiously, or in a way injurious to the Mission. The work of the Montreal Committee embraced two objects: 1st. The schools, whether Normal, Model, or Common, within the Diocese; these were simply Diocesan matters, and, excepting a grant from the Parent Society in London, deriving no aid from external sources. 2nd. The Mission to the French Canadians, in aid of which subscriptions were received, and collections made in all the Dioceses of B. N. A. It was found that after the Archdeacon's appointment, as General Superintendent, there was some difficulty in carrying on the work of the Mission at Sabrevois, in consequence of the clashing of arrangements made by our Committee, and the deputations we sent out, over which Archdeacon Hellmuth had no control, with those made by him for the general purposes of the Society, and collections taken up by him to be remitted to the Parent Society in London. Upon this subject I wrote a long explanatory letter to the Society in London in July, 1858. And some little time after, in consequence of the anxiety of our Committee, that some arrangement could be made, at the particular request of one of their number, I had an interview with Dr. Hellmuth, who, as well as the members of the Committee, was fully aware of my objection to let him interfere in this Diocese. This interview led to no result at the time; but seeing that I had nothing to do with

his authority to act for the rest of B. N. A., and since it was evident that the work of the French Mission would suffer; and, as in reality the two objects of the Committee were quite distinct in their nature, one Diocesan, the other British American, I proposed to the Montreal Committee that they should be placed under the charge of two distinct Boards or Committees; and then I would not object to the General Superintendent acting in connection with the latter, the support of which was very mainly derived from parts of the Province already under his charge, and in the prosperity of which so many from the other Dioceses were interested. This was accordingly so carried out, and has since been continued on the same plan.

Before leaving this subject, I would also notice an allusion which the Archdeacon makes towards the close of his letter to a *Pastoral* issued by me, soon after I came to Canada, against "*the Colonial Church and School Society*;" "Their rules, (he says) as you no doubt then thought, clashing with what you considered your Episcopal authority. Their rules and constitution, I am thankful to say, have not been, and I trust will never be changed."

Here the Archdeacon has been in error. The objections I made in my pastoral were, 1st, to the conduct of one of the agents,—and on this point it turned out that the Parent Society were exactly of the same opinion as myself. 2nd. I objected to a Rule of the Society under which they claimed to send their Agents into whatever places they thought fit. I contended that if I was to act with them, I could be no party to placing any Agent in any Parish or Mission, where there was a clergyman holding my license, without his consent. And after some correspondence had passed on the subject, I received a document, dated June, 1852, signed by the Rev. Mesac Thomas, Secretary to the Parent Society, on behalf of the Committee in London, setting forth "the arrangement between the Lord Bishop of Montreal and the General Committee of the C. C. & S. Society." The 7th article is as follows: "No Catechist or Schoolmaster shall be employed within the local limits of any Clergyman's charge without his consent."

But to pass on to the matter of the church in Sherbrooke Street; and here I must notice an inaccuracy in the account given by the Bishop of Huron of my conversation with him at Kingston. I most certainly did not use any such expression, as that Genl. Evans had "*conspired*" with Dr. Hellmuth to take me in; nor did I state that I considered that the erection of the proposed building would "*in the end prove highly injurious to the Church.*" I took no objection to the church itself, nor to Dr. Hellmuth, as the incumbent. I am ready to express regret at Gen. Evans' name having been mixed up with the statement; and I should not have mentioned it, except for the purpose of explaining the transaction. I had but one short interview with him; when he certainly declined

to give me any statement of his proposal in writing, but I cannot pretend to say that he knew exactly what had been the communication made to me by Dr. Hellmuth. Having premised this, I most unhesitatingly deny the correctness of the Archdeacon's version throughout: certainly, according to his statement, I might if I thought right, have refused to accede to the proposal, but I could have had no further ground of complaint. I must leave those best acquainted with us both to form their judgment as to what the facts were. At least I can say it is no fault of mine, that I am unable to produce a document in writing, to certify to the exact terms in which the application was made, and I think I may venture to assert that there never was a proposition of the like nature made to any Bishop, of which after repeated applications on three successive days, not the slightest memorandum could be obtained in writing. Why was there this reluctance? And again why such secrecy enjoined? It was surely a great public work; and in contradiction to the Archdeacon on this, as on almost every point of detail, I must distinctly assert that I named the Dean and one layman, whom I should wish to consult before giving an answer, and I was told that I must not mention it to any one. Why again and again was I pressed for an immediate decision? I asked for only a few days delay, which I thought could not be material; as it would take about eighteen months before the church could have been fit for occupation. And here again as to this point the statement of the Archdeacon gives a version entirely new to me. The proposition in fact was simply that Genl. Evans was willing to spend £3000 for the erection of a church on his property in Sherbrooke Street; not one hint was given about its being only advanced, either with or without interest, or that the land was other than a free gift. There was no difficulty raised as to private patronage: all that I could elicit was that I might settle every thing as I pleased, and make every arrangement, with this proviso, that Dr. Hellmuth was to be the first incumbent. There was a proposition about a service in German, but that was quite a collateral incident, and had nothing to do with the essential merits of the case. The Germans, who happened to be going to present an address to me, on the day of my last interview with the Archdeacon, stated that there were then only about seventy families of them in the city; and therefore, in answer to a question from me, very wisely decided, at that time, against any encouragement being given to a separate German service: thinking it much better that they should all continue, as they were doing, to attend the several English churches, and be identified with them. A large immigration some five or six years after, has since led to the necessity for a separate German service. But so far from their answer affecting the question, I immediately, on their leaving the room, said to the Archdeacon; "Well, you see that part of the plan falls to the ground; but now let us return to the

general proposition ;" and then it was—and not at the first interview as Dr. Hellmuth asserts, that on third day in consequence of sundry questions put by me in order to try and find out what the proposal really meant, that I was at last informed of the actual terms on which the Church was to be built. And certainly I at once expressed how entirely I had been under a misapprehension during all our negotiations ; and upon that ground, put an end to the conference, so that all the Archdeacon has stated on this subject is purely imaginary. Most certainly I knew the terms (as he asserts), upon which the money was to be advanced before I came to a decision, and it was he who communicated that fact to me ; but it was thus elicited at the eleventh hour, and was the sole and simple reason of my declining to proceed with the business, which I did directly I was informed upon this point.

The Archdeacon justifies himself in the matter of the Clergyman, whom he eulogized in England, after he had been under censure in Canada, by stating that a considerable time, two years, had elapsed ; and that he had much improved during that period, and that therefore it was correct to speak of him as he did. This may be perfectly true ; and I most truly rejoice to think it may be so. But as the Archdeacon left for England towards the end, I believe, of September, and the speech in question was made about the middle of November, of course he was in possession of these facts before his departure. I would ask then why as General Superintendent of the Society, he did not take measures to have the Rev. Mr. ———— restored to his proper status, before he left Canada ; and whether the other members of the Society's Committee were not left by him still seeking to enforce the removal ; and were not a little embarrassed and surprised, when they read what had occurred at the meeting in England. Perhaps the Archdeacon knows whether his conduct in this matter has been satisfactory to them.

The Archdeacon complains in connection with a letter from the Bishop of Quebec, published by me, that I had been seeking information against him, while waiting for his reply to my letter to him in England, enquiring as to the truth of the report of his speech at Islington. The fact was that while I was travelling down from Kingston with the Bishop of Quebec, he spoke of what the Archdeacon was reported to have said respecting the Canadian Colleges ; and expressed himself, very nearly as given in his letter. All I did was simply to ask whether he had any objection to send me in writing what he had then said, which he said he would do very willingly.

It was with the full conviction that I had undertaken a most painful task, that I moved at all in this matter ; and have done it solely as a matter of public duty. My only desire has been for the cause of truth ; and if I have used any language that the occasion has not warranted, no one will regret it more than myself.

I remain, Your faithful brother in Christ,

F. MONTREAL.