

ated at once to the rudest and most polished state of society. I cannot sufficiently admire its happy adaptation to the circumstances of these shores; where, by its means, the public worship of God is sustained, and all things are done decently and in order" independent of an officiating minister. It is alleged that the assumption of lay-readers tends to degrade the priestly office; but the practical working is quite otherwise; wherever they have been established, I find the inhabitants not only better instructed, but inspired with deeper reverence for the ordinances and masters of religion. There were a number of baptisms and thirteen communicants.

8th and 9th.—We travelled to Oyster Pond and Belmore, upon lakes, now become solid and smooth, without any difficulty. The liberality of the Society is likewise extended to these settlements; and the people, who have liberally responded to it, are joyfully and thankfully preparing to build a house for the glory of God, and the benefit of themselves and their descendants. These three consecutive churches will comprehend a large body of members, and afford ample employment for a faithful Pastor. The practicality of being attended to in winter, being no longer problematical, offers a further inducement for their erection, and the appointment of an overseer to the flock. My congregations here are large, and, in general, strongly attached to the Established Church. I called upon Mr. Turple, who has outlived an hundred years, and is now blind, deaf, and almost unconscious of existence: his wife is still alive, and in the same situation. I found him lying in a wretched hotel, where his daughter and family, who nurse him, were obliged to take shelter, in the depth of winter; having been dispossessed and thrust from their house and lands by an act of cruel oppression. I transmit a circumstantial statement of this unjust and affecting case to your Lordship, in the hope that you may obtain redress for the injured and distressed family, from the proper authorities. On the evening of the 9th I officiated at Musquedobit school-house.

10th.—A very wet day, yet the house was filled. I preached twice, and immediately thereafter set out, in the midst of a heavy rain, for Chezetcook, where I had an appointment for the evening. I am glad to relate, that a flourishing singing school, with thirty-five pupils, is kept at Musquedobit Harbour. A day school is kept by Mr. Pelly, who likewise reads, and teaches a Sunday school. He is a very competent man, yet he receives only twenty pounds current, without board, from the people for his services. The storm and rain increased, and the road was one sheet of slippery ice, so that we were thoroughlyrenched, bruised with falls, and overcome with fatigue, in passing over the seven miles betwixt us and Chezetcook; and after all, nobody ventured to come out and attend me. I had the satisfaction, however, of keeping my engagement, which I have never once, under the most untoward circumstance, failed to do, during the period I have been in orders.

Having now entered the limits of Dartmouth parish, my itinerant duties for the present terminate.

THE BISHOPS IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

Publicity has been studiously given in this country of late, to whatever might place the Church in an unfavourable light;—and, amongst other things, to the radical attempts in England to change the Constitution, by banishing the Bishops from the House of Lords; and the speech of one of the great Reformers on one side of the question has been lately sent forth to enlighten the good people of this province, who are left to suppose that the matter carried all before him, as the decision of the house was not given. We now take leave to give something on the other side, in the subjoined speeches of Lord John Russell (himself a Reformer) and Sir Robert Peel, in answer to Mr. Lushington, together with the division which took place on the motion.—*Ed. C. G.*

Lord J. Russell said,—the hon. gentleman who brings forward this motion, in so doing brings forward a proposal for a change in a very essential principle of the British Constitution, which, as he must be aware, recognises "the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and the Commons in Parliament assembled." It is a motion to alter one of the most ancient points of the Constitution of these realms, and to resort up-

on new grounds to a new constitution of Parliament. I say, therefore, that to such a change I am averse, unless I have the strongest reasons in its support. Now the reasons by which the hon. gentleman sought to advocate his proposal are altogether vague, desultory, and unsatisfactory. The hon. gentleman began by talking of removing the bishops from the House of Lords, but appeared to be altogether uncertain with what object towards the Church, and where his object would end. The hon. gentleman quoted Bishop Leighton, and then pointed to the Scottish Church, where there are no bishops, in contrast with the pomp with which the bishop is installed in this country, and the state of his enthronement on attending a cathedral, which ceremonies and state I have seen attendant upon the person of as good a man as ever lived in this or any other country. [Hear, hear.] Now, to what do these allusions tend? Do they tend to the question of the removal of the bishops from the House of Lords? Not at all; but to the establishment of the Presbyterian system of the Church of Scotland. [Hear, hear, hear.] The hon. gentleman then referred to the United States, where there was no Church Establishment at all. [Hear, hear, hear.] When the hon. gentleman, therefore, proposes to me to have no longer a Parliament of Lords Spiritual and Temporal and of Commons, but one only of Lords Temporal and Commons, the arguments he uses lead at once to two altogether distinct considerations—namely, in the first place, to a Church in which there are no bishops; and, in the second, to a State where there is no Church Establishment. [Hear, hear.] Now, I must own it appears to me that if these are the grounds upon which the hon. member proposes the change he particularizes in his motion, these grounds are not sufficient to support that motion, nor will the change he wishes in it be sufficient to answer the hon. gentleman's purpose. This change, if agreed to, must lead to farther change, and I must own that such a change once commenced, I cannot see any point at which we may consistently stop short of the constitution of the United States in which there is no Established Church. [Cheers.] The hon. gentleman who makes this motion, and the hon. member of Middlesex, argue that there must be a distinction between civil and spiritual functions. The hon. gentleman should recollect, however, that in this country the head of the Government and the head of the Church are one. The King is the head of the Church, and the government of the Church becomes that of the government of the country; it is impossible, therefore, with such a constitution, to have the complete distinction of civil and spiritual functions which the hon. gentleman desires. Such a distinction cannot exist consistently with a Church Establishment. [Hear, hear.] The Established Church is a distinct part of the Constitution of this country. The bishops, by holding seats in Parliament, are the acknowledged representatives of that part of our Constitution. If they are to be excluded from their seats, I then do not see by what rule we could exclude the other orders of the clergy from seats in the House of Commons. [Hear, hear.] It appears to me, however, that the bishops are that portion of the clergy which can best execute the political duties of the Church, and that with the least disturbance or interruption of their spiritual functions, many of these duties being of such a nature that they can be attended to when absent from their dioceses, whilst the inconvenience attendant upon clergymen leaving the flocks of their respective parishes would be very great. [Hear, hear.] However this may be, I must say I know not upon what grounds we should pretend to exclude this great body of men altogether from the privilege of being represented in Parliament, considering the property that belongs to them, and the station they hold in the country. Would it not be exceedingly unfair in Parliament to discuss and pass measures affecting all these interests—as tithes, and advowsons, and ecclesiastical property in general—and to say that on these great questions they would not allow those who are most deeply interested in them to take any part? [Hear, hear.] With respect to the total distinction and distribution of civil and political functions. I own that all experience is against it, for it has been found that persons who have religious functions to perform have not confined themselves to the exercise of those functions, but have frequently taken part in political contests. But if

this is a characteristic of bishops, does not the same description apply to Dissenters? With regard to the Dissenters, I know many ministers of the different sects for whom I have the greatest respect and regard; I know how much they attend to the spiritual interest of the Church to which they belong; but if I were to select those who are most respected, and if I am asked whether, they separated political functions from spiritual, I am glad to say they do not do so. [cheers and laughter.] I am glad to say that so long as I have taken a share in politics I have found the Dissenting ministers the warmest friends of political liberty, and whenever the rights of their fellow-subjects have been in danger, they have always been eager to promote the cause of political freedom, and I give them credit for it. [Cheers.] To the proposition of the hon. member I must therefore object, because in a country like this, where political and ecclesiastical duties are so intermingled, I cannot see how, by dint of resolutions, we are to reach the millennium, and have a certain number of persons of the Established Church ministers of religion—solely and exclusively devoted to religious interests, with their eyes constantly directed to what is above—and another set of persons who shall, in like manner, confine themselves to political interests. [Hear, hear.] The hon. member who moved the resolutions said the bishops had for many years voted against measures in favour of political freedom, and for measures calculated to oppress their fellow-citizens. Now though I seldom concur in the votes given by the bishops, yet I must say, while their appointment is vested in the Crown, it is natural to suppose that the Minister of the day will raise pious and learned clergymen to the bench who are favourable and not adverse to his political opinions. That, however, has not always been the case, and I can give instances of bishops, even under Tory Governments, who have advocated the principle of separating political from religious functions—I allude to Bishop Wight, Bishop Kennett, and Bishop Hoadley, who were the warmest advocates of political freedom. The latter Prelate, in his place in the House of Lords, argued in favour of the separation of the functions, because the kingdom of God was not of this world, and asserted in the strongest manner the Whig principles which he openly professed. And as it happened in these days, when the Government was in the hands of the Tories, so it happened when the Whigs were in office in the reign of Queen Anne and George I. The parties in power appointed men of learning and piety, but at the same time men who had held the same political opinions. This was the case also in the time of Lord Liverpool; and what wonder, then, was there that these prelates, when raised to the bench of bishops, retained the same opinions which they held before their appointment? Had they acted in a different manner—had they shifted from day to day—those prelates, for instance, voted with Lord Grey on all occasions, and then shifted round and voted in a different way when the right hon. Baronet was in difficulty, though the first mode of acting might have been more agreeable to my opinions, it would not have made the bench of bishops more respected. [Hear.] The practice existed one hundred years ago, and continued in the Government of Lord Liverpool, and it could not be considered any argument for the proposed change that a Government which had been in office for twenty or thirty years had appointed bishops who professed the political opinions of the party. Rather general reasons had been given by the hon. gentleman. I dissent from these reasons, because they would not effect the object he has in view, and I am not disposed, therefore, on such grounds, to agree to the alteration. [Cheers.]

Sir R. Peel said, that if any unpopularity were attached to the most decided opposition to the motion of the hon. member for Ashburton, to his full share of that unpopularity he begged leave to put in a distinct claim. [Hear hear.] Feeling as he did upon the subject, he certainly would not be guilty of so base an action as to leave the whole of the unpopularity with the noble Lord. [Hear.] It might not serve the noble Lord for him [Sir Robert Peel] to say so, but he must declare that he never heard a speech delivered in a more manly manner than the speech of the noble Lord, or one which reflected greater credit on the noble Lord's abilities and judgment. [Hear hear.] There was one objection to the