

all denominations, without any knowledge what ever of the description of ceremony that was to be performed. Hon. members opposite had received with a roar of disapprobation the declaration of Mr. Hubbard that a bill to allow Cardinal Wiseman to officiate in Westminster Abbey would not be more inimical to the Church; but if the measure under discussion became law, Cardinal Wiseman might go into Westminster Abbey and celebrate mass there; and what would be the result? Riot, disorder, and bloodshed. Admit the dissenters to the churchyard, and the next step would be to make the church itself common to sects of every religious denomination.

Mr. BRIDGEMAN termed the argument of the noble lord a hobgoblin, with which he desired to frighten the house. He did not believe in the success of any attempts on the part of nonconformists to overthrow the Established Church. Should that Church be overthrown, it would be through the growth of zeal within its own borders, and the coming to a crisis of those differences of opinion which notoriously prevailed in the Church. With regard to the bill before the house, he recommended that it should be permitted to go into committee, and should then be altered to agree with the Act, which was already in force in Ireland.

Mr. NEWGATE admitted that there had been a grievous want of charity exhibited by certain clergymen of the Church of England, who acting upon some nice technicality, had refused to read the truly christian service of the Church over the graves of their departed brethren—often brethren in Christ, though differing, perhaps, as to the externals of religion. He regretted that there was no competent tribunal to appeal to in such cases, so that the rights of dissenters might be declared and enforced in open court. It was said that the Roman Catholics would not avail themselves of the bill if it were passed, he should think very lightly of the Romish hierarchy, however, if they did not. They considered that the Protestant Church was a usurper of their rights, and his objection to the bill was, that unless the law was maintained which established the rights of the Church of England to her churchyards, the very first who would enter them would be the Roman Catholic prelates.

Mr. BUXTON supported the bill.

Mr. WALPOLE characterised the bill as a measure designed to remedy a minimum of grievance by the creation of a maximum of inconvenience. Instead of going into committee upon it, therefore, he would suggest that it should be withdrawn, and that another should be introduced which would meet the professed objects of its supporters, and at the same time be exempt from the objections to which the one before the house was amenable.

Mr. BAINES, believing that there was a feeling on part of the opposition to do what was reasonable towards removing what was a real practical grievance, also recommended the withdrawal of the bill, and the preparation of another free from the objections urged against this. He thought there was an amount of fair objection to the details of the measure that would justify his hon. friend in taking that course.

Sir M. PERCY stated his readiness to comply with the suggestion of Mr. Walpole, provided Sir W. Heathcote would consent to withdraw his amendment.

Sir W. HEATHCOTE having declined to accede to this proposal,

Sir G. GUMBY expressed his regret that the hon. baronet should have determined upon taking that course, and added that although he had come down with the intention of voting against the bill, he should now retire from the house and not vote at all.

Mr. DISRAELI had anticipated that the right hon. gentleman had risen to announce the intention of the Government to introduce a bill upon the subject on their own responsibility; but the proposal he had made was most unreasonable, and he hoped his hon. friend would not comply with it.

The house then divided, and the amendment was carried by 236 to 155. The bill was therefore lost.

Wednesday, May 1.

RELIGIOUS WORSHIP BILL.

Mr. L. KING, in moving the second reading of the Religious Worship Bill, explained the state of the law which it proposed to amend, whereby no clergyman can legally enter the parish of another clergyman and perform Divine Service there without the permission of the incumbent, and the inconveniences attending this prohibition, which, he remarked, was, in many instances, practically disregarded.

Mr. S. ESTCOURT observed that, although the preamble of the bill purported that its object was to give increased facilities for the performance of Divine worship, its real meaning was to enable the Archbishops and Bishops to grant licences to clergymen of the Church of England to perform Divine Service in any parish without the consent of the incumbent; in other words, to place a rival and competitor in every parish, in defiance of the incumbent. He urged that no better plan could be adopted to introduce strife and discord in parishes, that it would break up the parochial system, which it would be better at once to do away with. He hoped the house would not pass a bill so meagre and unguarded, the professed object of which could be attained by other means, and he moved to defer the second reading for six months.

Sir G. LEWIS said the law required the consent of the incumbent and the licence of the Bishop, and if the object of the bill was merely to dispense with the former, he was prepared to give his vote for the second reading. It did not appear to him that the bill would interfere with the parochial system, and if it passed with proper safeguards, and the Bishop's consent was provided for, he did not think the dangers apprehended would be likely to be realised, or that the measure would have more than a very narrow and limited operation.

Lord J. MANNERS insisted that the rights of the parochial clergy would be invaded by the bill, which would sanction irritating intrusions and destroy the vitality of the existing parochial system. He suggested cases in which the proposed alterations in the law would create the very evils and excesses which it aimed at curing.

Mr. BASS supported the bill.

Mr. SPOONER should vote for the second reading of the bill, believing that it might be altered in committee so as to confer a great benefit upon the Established Church.

Mr. G. HARDY called attention to the terms of the bill, which authorised any clergyman licensed by the Archbishop to go as a roving preacher into any parish in the province, and officiate there without the consent of the incumbent. He objected to such a disturbance of the existing system, which would upset the discipline of the Church of England, and provoke jealousy, rivalry, and dissensions. The bill went far beyond any grievance that could be really felt, and must inevitably lead to further innovations.

Mr. BUXTON defended the bill, the object of which, he said, was to benefit the Church of England, and its effect would be to diminish strife and alloy ill-will.

Mr. NEWGATE opposed the bill, which was, in his opinion, vicious in principle and fraught with dangerous consequences.

Mr. AYLTON, as framer of the bill, said its real object was to emancipate the laity of the Established Church from the despotism of a certain number of clergymen, who were at liberty now to do as they pleased, and not to interfere with the parochial system.

Sir W. HEATHCOTE pressed upon the attention of Sir G. Lewis that every one of the modifications suggested by him in the bill, and upon which he had justified his vote for the second reading, had been disclaimed by the framer of it.

Mr. HORSFALL supported the bill in the interests of the laity. He thought Sir W. Heathcote had rather misrepresented what had fallen from Mr. Aylton.

Mr. L. KING, in his reply, signified his readiness to adopt the suggestions of Sir G. Lewis.

Upon a division the amendment was carried by 191 to 145; so the bill is lost.

Monday, May 6th.

THE TWENTY-NINTH CANON OF THE CHURCH.

Mr. H. SEYMOUR asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, if that portion of Canon 29 which forbids a parent from being admitted to answer as godfather for his own child had been altered or repealed by the Convocation of Canterbury, according to the Royal license granted to them under the advice of Her Majesty's Government, whether such alteration or repeal would have the effect of relieving the members of the Church in the Province of Canterbury from the obligation now lying upon them in reference to sponsors.

Sir G. C. LEWIS said the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury had received a license from Her Majesty to alter or repeal the 29th Canon, but since then they had not submitted to the Crown any legislative act in consequence of the permission thus given to them. Therefore, no practical question had arisen for the determination of the Government, or upon which they could form any opinion. As to the hypothetical legal question involved in the interrogatory of the hon. member, he believed that an opinion had been expressed by high legal authorities that, even if this canon were repealed, there would still be an ancient law of the Church in force which would have the same corresponding effect. That, however, was a point on which it was impossible for him to give an opinion of his own.

THE

Canadian Ecclesiastical Gazette

IS PUBLISHED TWICE A MONTH,
BY HENRY ROWSELL, TORONTO.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION:

7s. 6d. per annum; from which a discount of 2s. 6d. is allowed if remitted (postage free) within one month from commencement of the volume.

TERMS FOR ADVERTISING.

7 cents per line for first insertion.
2 " " " each subsequent insertion.
Business Cards 250c. per annum not exceeding 3 or 4 lines.

ROWSSELL & ELLIS, PRINTERS, KING ST. TORONTO.