

not he know?" Ps. xciv. 7. It is God who gives sight to the eye, and hearing to the ear, and senso to the touch, and taste to the palate, and it is the inspiration of the Almighty that giveth understanding to mankind. God is the infinite fountain of all finite intelligence. He is that infinite being to whom all hearts are open, all desires known, and from whom no secrets are hid.

The divine Omniscience and the divine Omnipotence suggest two different ideas to our minds; but still they are ideas which are coexistent and inseparable. The Omniscience of God cannot be separated from His Omnipotence, nor His Omnipotence from His Omniscience. God is that infinite spirit and that universal mind which pervades all finite existence, and therefore all things must be known to Him. The Omnipotence of the Deity pervades all finite existence, both material and immaterial, and is in every joint and bone of our body, in every muscle and tendon, and every nerve, and every fibre of our flesh, and gives action to our hands and agility to our feet. The Deity lives and moves in every faculty of our minds, and more especially in all our native intuitions and feelings, and in every action of human thought. And therefore the infinite mind of God must be universally transfused and universally existent, and of consequence nothing can be hid from Him. And therefore has David said and sung in his inimitable Psalm, "Whither shall I go from thy spirit? and whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there; if I make my bed in hell, (the grave,) behold thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea; even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me." Ps. cxxxix. My own existence is only local, but the divine existence is universal. The Deity has no need to leave His throne in the heavens, to come and investigate all my thoughts and all my ways. From His divine habitation in the heavens does He behold all the children of men; and all finite existence is under the light of His all-seeing eye, and is under the guidance of His almighty hand.—*N. Y. Churchman.*

### Correspondence.

The Editors of the Church Times do not consider themselves responsible for the opinions of their correspondents.

#### FOR THE CHURCH TIMES.

Why are there so many obstacles to the increase of the number of English Bishops?

*Mr. Editor,*

This is a question which has often puzzled me. Why is the number of English Bishops smaller than the number of Roman Bishops? Why for instance, that in Nova Scotia, or in the diocese of Nova Scotia, there is only one Protestant Bishop, while there are three Romish? This fact struck me most forcibly a few days ago as I was glancing over one of our Almanacs. There you have the real palpable fact published to the world, that there is a Roman Archbishop at Halifax, and that this foreign authority has its suffragans at Arichat and at Charlotte Town, while the Church of England has only one Bishop over the whole of this vast area? It is impossible to see this and not to enquire the cause. There must be a cause; and one cannot but suspect something wrong at the bottom. There is as much work to be done by the English as there is for the three Roman prelates. There is as much ground to go over. The members of the Church are scattered over the whole extent of country as well as those of the Church of Rome. and our Clergy are, it would appear, quite as numerous, if not more so. Yet our one Bishop must do the work of three! Is it, then, that English prelates have less work, less business, less travelling, less correspondence, less important concerns to attend to, than those sent here from Rome? Can it be that the Bishops who acknowledge Christ alone to be truly Head of the Universal Church, have less to do or must be more crippled in their work, than those who acknowledge the Pope? Or is this what may be considered the fruit of our connection with England? Is it because we do indeed give to our Queen the same authority over us that she has over all other bodies and causes, both ecclesiastical and civil, that we must be thus limited and restrained? Every body knows that to enlarge the number of Bishops is to enlarge and increase the efficiency of the Church. We have seen it within the last twenty years most abundantly proved. Wherever a new Bishop has been appointed the clergy have been doubled and trebled in a short time. This policy is well known at Rome. Why, then, I would ask, does not the Queen of England permit the Church of England to have as many Bishops as she

wants? Why does not the Archbishop of Canterbury see to this? Why not petition, remonstrate, agitate? Why should we not have three or four Bishops in this Province, too, as well as the Romans? Where is the fault? Who is to blame? What are the difficulties in the way? or what means should be adopted to arrive at that end?

I shall endeavour to answer these questions in my next. J. S.

Jan. 28. 1857.

### News Department.

#### Extracts from Papers by the Steamer Araba.

##### ENGLAND.

*Lord Palmure*, in presiding at the annual meeting of the Edinburgh Bible Society on Friday last, made the following remarks on the subject of a new version of the English Bible:—

"We have the Church of Rome attacking Protestantism fairly and openly in front; but I am sorry to say that we have in the ranks of Protestantism itself many whose hearts are Popish, but who cover these hearts with a mantle of spurious Protestantism. Amid all these dangers and all these attacks, I know of nothing so likely to be successful in resisting them as the dissemination of the Word of God in our good old Saxon tongue, as we have had it for the last 300 years; and this brings me to make an observation, which perhaps is not out of place on the present occasion. We have heard a talk in the country, and we have seen absolutely put into practice in the United States of America, a scheme for what is called a new version of the Bible. Now, feeling very strongly on that subject, I take this opportunity of publicly stating my opinion that any such scheme is fraught with the utmost danger to the Protestant liberties of this country—nay, it is fraught with the utmost danger to the Protestant religion itself. If I look to America, I am happy to find that the scheme there has been, I might almost say, utterly abortive. It is quite true, and every man must admit, that there are perhaps some slight things—some mistranslations, slight in themselves, and not affecting any great principle, which might be corrected in a new translation of the Holy Scriptures, but they are so slight in comparison with the danger of letting in those who would make alterations, partly from the criticism of erudition, partly for the purpose of getting in dogmas of their own, that I think it would be the most dangerous and most disastrous thing that could occur to this country, if we were to permit those words to be tampered with, which have been household words in many a pious family for upwards of three hundred years, and I hope will be the household words of all the families in the world before three hundred years more elapse. If we were to allow these holy words to be tampered with, we should be in the greatest danger of shaking our Protestant institutions to the foundation. We have some old landmarks, and the Bible is the greatest of these, and, rather than risk the removal of these great landmarks of our Protestant institutions, I would submit to these little imperfections which may exist in our present version, leaving it as part of the calling of our ministers to study the Holy Scriptures in the original tongues, to fit them to explain to those who sit under them wherein those little differences exist. I am quite certain of this, that if we had not an authorized and confirmed version of the Holy Scriptures, we should never have arrived at this day with Protestantism so thoroughly and staunchly established as it is in this country at present. Therefore I do hope that if any agitation is made in this country for the purpose of disturbing the present authorized version of the Bible, the Christian community will rise up as one man in its defence, and will maintain it intact, seeing it is so dangerous to touch it."

\*The churchwardens of St. Olave's, Exeter, have made a representation to the Archdeacon, that the Rev. C. Redwell Roper, the rector, has erected on the altar of his church, by way of Christmas decoration, a cross, seven feet high, which he refuses to remove. The Archdeacon has made the following reply:—

"Otterton, Budleigh Salterton, Jan. 6.

"Sirs—I have been ill in bed since my return to Otterton, but I sent your memorial to the Bishop, and have received his lordship's reply, which is to this effect:—That he is always sorry when any of the clergy involve themselves in disputes with their people about these miserable ornaments. That he once proceeded against Mr. Parker Smith, of Torquay, for putting a cross on the communion table; and though he afterwards found reason to doubt whether he was right in his decision, yet he found that it is confirmed by Sir J. Dodson in the St. Barnabas case; but as that decision is itself appealed from, it is difficult to say

what is the real state of the law. Be this as it may his lordship thinks Mr. Roper was guilty of great discretion (unless the decided majority of his parishioners were in favor of the decoration) in exciting the discussion in his parish. If the parishioners think fit they may institute proceedings against him, either immediately, or as would seem more prudent, after the ultimate court of appeal shall have decided in the case to which he had referred. As he perceived that both of the churchwardens have signed the memorial, his lordship concludes that the minister has not, as the minister of St. Barnabas had, the concurrence of one of the churchwardens. This, in his lordship's opinion, makes Mr. Roper's case worse; for his lordship believes that the minister, without the churchwardens, or at least one of them, has not in strictness a right over the ornaments of the church; but that this is a point on which his lordship does not commit himself absolutely. His lordship then adds in his letter to me this sentence—"Upon the whole, I leave you perfectly at liberty to communicate what I have here written, both to the memorialists and to Mr. Roper."

"I will not conclude without stating my opinion that the law is opposed to these peculiarities.—I am, Sirs, your obedient servant,

"JOHN MOORE STEVENS.

"The Churchwardens of St. Olave's, Exeter."

HONOR TO LORD PALMERSTON.—Amid the vacillation of one Power, the alienation of another, and the ill concealed hostility of a great part of Europe which called itself neutral, Lord Palmerston determined to stand up boldly for the rights which Russia was bent on violating. As is usually the case, courage won the day. Any course less resolute than an armed resistance would probably have been unavailing. But with an Austrian army and an English fleet watching the contested territory, it was felt by all parties that the question was a serious one, and the submission of the Czar has been the result. The Premier should, we think, have the credit which is his due in this memorable affair. The obscure localities which were the subject of dispute are now endowed with an interest for Englishmen, and in future years people will talk of them as recalling the crowning victory which the most powerful and popular statesman of his time gained over the insidious foe against whom he had struggled with constancy during his long career.—*Times.*

At last we have some account of the fate of the recent insurrectionists in Sicily. Baron Bentivoglio, the leader, was shot on the 20th of December, near Palermo:—

He died with courage, after having made his will. He leaves his property to his mother and his brothers. Before the execution he sipped a cup of coffee, and requested that his eyes might not be bandaged. This was refused. He declared that he was the only leader of the insurrection, and he hoped the Government would show clemency to his companions.

### Provincial Legislature.

#### LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL CHAMBER,

February 5, 1857.

At 2 o'clock, P. M., His Excellency Major General Sir John Gaspard LeMarchant, Knight, Knight Commander of the Orders of Saint Ferdinand, and of Charles the Third of Spain, Lieutenant Governor and Commander in Chief, in and over Her Majesty's Province of Nova Scotia and its Dependencies, &c. &c. &c. came to the Council Chamber, attended as usual, and, being seated, the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod received His Excellency's command, to let the House of Assembly know "It is His Excellency's will and pleasure they attend him immediately in this House," who, being come with their Speaker, His Excellency was pleased to open the Session with a Speech to both Houses, as follows:—

*Mr. President, and Honorable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:*

*Mr. Speaker, and Gentlemen of the House of Assembly:*

I meet you again in Parliament with feelings of undiminished pleasure, and I trust that your deliberations will result in measures promotive of the best interests of this thriving and loyal Province.

Animated by true British feeling, and warmly interested in the conduct and progress of the late War, though happily exempted from its disasters and burthens, the people of this Country, in common with their fellow subjects in every part of the Empire, have reason to be deeply grateful for its successful termination, and I am sure will unite with us in a fervent prayer that the benign and sustaining influences of peace may long continue to advance and extend the prosperity and happiness of the Nation at large.

*Mr. Speaker, and Gentlemen of the House of Assembly:*

The Accounts for the past, and the Estimates for the current year, will be forthwith submitted to you.