

are mainly indebted to it, under God, for the fact that mine is almost the only Diocese which has been blessed with such a rare amount of order, harmony, and peace, while many others have witnessed no small amount of discord and agitation.

In the next place, let me call attention to the fact that in the assembly convened by the Bishop of Montreal, held on the 19th January, 1853—the minutes of which have been published—the principle of the *vetus* was adopted, after full discussion, almost unanimously. There were, it is believed, only four dissentients out of the whole body, 32 Clergymen and 37 Laymen being present. A third opinion to the same effect is contained in the proceedings of the Conference of the Diocese of Adelaide.

The Diocesan Assembly, it is stated, is constituted when the Government and Chapter of Clergy meet together, and are presided over by the Bishop.

The Chapter of Clergy consists of every duly licensed Officiating Minister—Presbyters alone having the right of voting. The Government consists of Lay Rectors, (being communicants) for all the Congregations.

No rule shall be binding on the members of the Church in this Diocese which shall not have received the concurrent assent of the Bishop, the Chapter of Clergy, and the Convention in the Diocesan Assembly.

Other confessions of the view which has been here given might doubtless be produced without difficulty by any one who had time to enquire after them. These happen to be the only ones to which the writer has had the opportunity of referring.

On one other point a word may not be superfluous. A difference of opinion exists as to whether we should endeavour to procure the authority of the Imperial or the Colonial Parliament for the proposed Synodical action.

It can hardly be asserted here that the Episcopalians of Canada have not the power which other religious bodies have and exercise, of making such rules for their own government as they shall see fit. We may meet and agree to any rules we please. But to enable the Government to administer those rules, we must lay down to be recognized by the law of the land, as being laws in point of fact, so far as the body they relate to is concerned.

If then the sanction of law is to be given to the proposed Synodical action, it is to be considered, from which authority it is to be sought, from the Provincial or the Imperial. I believe it should be from the Imperial.

If it be desirable to obtain for this or any other Diocese the power of acting legally in Synod, it is manifestly desirable further, that no one Diocese should be singularly favored, that the peculiar circumstances of each particular Diocese; but it is desirable, for all that, that the same system in all its essential features, should be found in the several Dioceses, which have even now common laws, and which may be made further united under one common head, or Metropolitan Bishop.

It is not, in any way, intended either to deny the full authority of the Provincial Legislature, or to suppose any unwillingness on their part to give the sanction sought. On the contrary, I believe they would comply with our wishes very promptly.

But as Churchmen, we naturally look back to the source from which we derived the blessings we enjoy. Our feelings and sympathies are drawn closely to that country from which we came forth, and from which we have received and continue to receive the support, which which it may almost be said that we are still dependent for our existence as a Church.

And besides feeling, we have already shown that we are drawn to the same conclusion by interest. We are drawn to it also by two other considerations. While on the one side it has been declared by high authority that as far as existing Imperial laws are concerned the Church in the Colonies is free to adopt rules of discipline for itself, as we have assumed, and as common sense would seem to require; it is well to remember that on the other, that appeal to means to be despised have been given to the contrary effect. This seems to form a sufficient reason for our waiting patiently while, for relief from the Imperial Legislature, if there be any prospect of it. And such prospect there is. The attempt has been made, in the Imperial Parliament, to meet our wishes. For the present, the matter is in abeyance. But those who are pledged, whom we may trust, to bring the matter forward again, and there is good prospect of its being done with success. Shall we then wait little while patiently, or shall we go in a hurry to the Provincial Legislature to get done what the Imperial may probably will soon do for us? Shall we not for the present be content to join with other Colonial Dioceses in petitioning the Imperial Government? There is nothing to hinder our going on in the meantime, to make such arrangements as are necessary.

Let us go on then, and let us still be patient, and wait the natural course of things. The result we desire may be not far off. If we are disappointed in our expectation of Imperial Legislation, we can still resort to Provincial. There is no reason to suppose that the Provincial Government would refuse our petition. The sanction we shall ask for from them will be then, as it is now, for the public good as well as for our own, and the request is undeniably a very reasonable one.

If these imperfect remarks shall tend in any way to make the case as clear as possible, as it ought to be, I shall feel that my labour has not been thrown away. I can only add the hope that at the approaching meeting the subject will be taken up with a mild and gentle spirit, such as should be theirs, who feel that they are indeed members of Christ their Head, the spirit of charity, which seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, beareth all things.

To the Editor of the Church. April 10th, 1854.

REV. AND DEAR SIR— In requesting the favor of a place in your columns to notice some points in the letters of W. S., I promise you to be as brief as possible. In your correspondent's first letter in reply to mine there are several points which I have written under a feeling of annoyance. Its whole tone was, I conceive, contrary to that law of love which should guide Christian men even in discussing subjects on which they happen to differ. His second letter, I am happy to see, manifests a more liberal spirit, and towards its close he expresses in the true spirit of a Christian his regret for the severity of his former letter. I shall make no further allusion to the uncourteous remarks to which doubtless he refers. I must, however, first remind him that the excuse which he makes is altogether unwarranted, because it rests upon the unproved assumption that I am unacquainted with the subject.

In both the letters of W. S., written in reply to mine, he appears to assume that I am endeavouring to prove that the Reformers held opinions on Baptism not in accordance with the teaching of our Church; and I would remind him that there is a difference of opinion between us as to what is the teaching of the Church, and that I fully believe, as no doubt he does, that the opinions of the Reformers regarding Baptism are in perfect accordance with the teaching of our Church.

I shall now in a few words point out how far W. S. and I appear to agree in our opinions upon the subject of Baptism, and where it is that we differ. As to the Baptism of adults, we both agree that faith and repentance must precede, if the person is to receive any spiritual benefit from Baptism. I do not, however, see how this agrees with his definition of regeneration, in which he speaks of "the reception of initial

common with the Bishop of Exeter, and which I think much the same as those of W. S., are altogether opposed to what was taught by the Reformers. Had I not already occupied too much of your space I could give many such passages from his letter, for although what he says would not prove the point in debate, yet I conceive it to be strong and impartial testimony to the fact that I have rightly interpreted the opinions of the Reformers. I have no wish, Mr. Editor, to prolong this controversy, and I shall not again trouble you unless W. S. advances very different proof from what he has already brought forward.

It is evident that we cannot agree upon this subject, but on one thing we can agree, and that is, in hoping that the works of the Fathers of our Reformed Church may be more generally studied.

Yours truly, M.

OBSERVATIONS ON F. T.'S LETTER. To the Editor of "The Church."

REV. AND DEAR SIR—I have read with some attention, and not a little astonishment, a letter in your last number signed "F. T."—levelled in your bold and pointed language against an article in a previous issue of your journal, signed "D. E. B." I am desirous, as a subscriber to the Church and a clergyman in this Diocese, to be permitted to say a few words with regard to the article alluded to. I have you will most certainly have seen a small space for the brief observations which I have to make, and I assure you that I am most averse to, and would most carefully guard against newspaper discussion, as a most unwise, injurious, and imperfect step, for the promotion of the object in view, namely, "the Endowment of additional Bishoprics in this Province."

Three features seem to characterize the epistle from F. T., viz., a charge against D. E. B. of opposing the Bishop of Toronto's plan, proposed in his Lordship's "Pastoral"—an exposition of the same plan, and an expression of warm approbation of the Lord Bishop's scheme.

Now, sir, the first of these features is the only one upon which, for the reasons already stated, I am desirous to make a few remarks simply because I believe that F. T. has been guilty of a very false impression of the minds of many respecting D. E. B.'s communication—especially as nearly three weeks have elapsed between the appearance of the two letters, and therefore the plan proposed by D. E. B. may not be quite fresh in the minds of the readers of your journal.

I remain, Rev. and Dear Sir, Yours obediently, A. COUNTRY RECTOR IN THE PROPOSED SEE. April 3, 1854.

LETTERS RECEIVED TO APRIL 19.

J. K., Orangeville; Ven. Archdeacon S. Kingston; T. G., Chippawa; Rev. T. B., Wolfe Island, ad. sub. 10 copies No. 55 sent; E. E., M. Toronto; Rev. W. K., Brockville; Rev. W. K., St. Catharines, rem. for H. R. and J. C.; Rev. E. G., Fort Erie.

TO CORRESPONDENTS: We beg to explain to the Rev. E. J. Boswell, that we received the Report of the Eastern District Branch of the Church Society through the Secretary of the Parent Society, who gave us a summary of the financial statement, &c. greater part of the details having been already published in the paper, and as pressed as we were, it would have been very inconvenient to repeat.

"F. T." will see that we have acted in accordance with his last instructions. His second letter did not reach us until Thursday last, and our paper had gone to press Wednesday evening previous.

The Bishop of Toronto begs to inform his brethren, the clergy of the district of Niagara that he intends (D.V.) to confirm at their several missions and stations during the month of May next, in accordance with the following list. Should there be any error or omission, the Bishop requests the clergyman interested to notify him of the same in time to be corrected.

Toronto, 12th April, 1854.

May, Sunday, 14 Grimby..... 11 A.M. Monday 15 Jordan..... 10 A.M. Tuesday 16 Port Dalhousie..... 8 P.M. Wednesday 17 Niagara..... 11 A.M. Thursday 18 Thorold..... 11 A.M. Friday 19 Drummondville..... 11 A.M. Saturday 20 Stamford..... 11 A.M. Sunday 21 Chippawa..... 11 A.M. Monday 22 Port Erie..... 11 A.M. Tuesday 23 Bertha..... 11 A.M. Wednesday 24 Port Colborne..... 2 P.M. Thursday 25 Port Maitland..... 11 A.M. Friday 26 Danville..... 3 P.M. Saturday 27 Cayuga..... 11 A.M. Sunday 28 Port Colborne..... 3 P.M. Monday 29 Cataraugus..... 11 A.M. Tuesday 30 Jarvis..... 11 A.M. Sunday 28 Walpole..... 11 A.M.

PIA ESTENSIONE. The bodies of St. Simon and St. Jude are enshrined in great splendour in the magnificent Church of St. Peter at Rome, while, *mirabile dictu*, the same identical bodies are likewise deposited at St. John's, Verona. Fra Filippo Ferraris, an illustrious Jesuit, tells us expressly that these same bodies may exist contemporaneously in separate places, and Cardinal Valerio explains the difficulty in a manner which he appears to consider quite satisfactory. It is only a *pia estensione*.

Now there is a trite proverb in common parlance as "old as the hills," namely, "Extremes meet," or as it is occasionally rendered, "too far east is west," and as time rolls on we are furnished with innumerable proofs of the correctness of these ancient sayings in many ways, but more especially in the fact that the "too far east" of ultra Protestantism, very frequently verges closely upon the "west," of the Italian Church. A remarkable instance of this approximation is apparent in the line of argument adopted by the Reverend and Lay individuals who are desirous of "secularizing" Church property. It savours remarkably of the *pia estensione*. Indeed they evince more dexterity by far than Cardinal Valerio, and could rival any Fra Filippo of the whole brotherhood, in altering, amending and suppressing plain simple truths which militate against their unreasoning prejudices, and fore-zone conclusions. We shall now proceed to illustrate our assertions by a few examples from the hosts that present themselves before our mental vision.

Take up, for instance, almost any number of the *Globe* or the *Examiner*, or of any other sheet that advocates the spoliation of religion, and you will find its columns garnished with the usual stereotyped tirades against a "dominant Church," the "blighting, withering effects of the union of Church and State," the "tyranny of the clergy," &c.; all which evils are to be done away for ever by the secularization of the Reserves. These are all specimens of the *pia estensione*, intended merely to dupe the ignorant and unthinking, for the editors know perfectly well that the only dominancy the Church lays claim to is her superior purity of doctrine, in that she is "built upon the foundation of the prophets and apostles, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone," and that all the other high-sounding phrases are mere cant, having no real meaning in this country at all.

Then again, it is quite overwhelming to witness the tender solicitude evinced by these journals for our spiritual welfare, and the nervous horror they feel that our Pre-tentist principles should be damaged by receiving the votes of the French party in defence of our property, which is the last fence that protects their own. But these affected apprehensions are only another instance of the *pia estensione*. It may be, however, that they speak from experience, that they compromised their own Protestantism when they received the assistance of the Roman Catholics in placing the question in its present position through the address to the English government; but we beg to assure them so far as the Church is concerned that our principles are of such a character that we cannot make political barter of them.

A late number of one of the most unscrupulous of all the ministerial organs is now before us, and it furnishes us with curious illustrations of the Valerio or Fra Filippo style of argument. It contains an editorial article on the subject of the Russian war. The writer commences by laying down the axiom that "when might would enroach upon right" there is never wanting a pretext, and that Russia has found such pretext in religion. The imaginative editor then shews to his own satisfaction apparently, that to prevent the evils that threaten Europe from reaching Canada—to avert jealousies and "murderous wars," it is necessary forthwith to destroy all religious endowments. The *Examiner* we have observed, has occasionally taken the same ground. We should not notice such nonsense were it not that we wish to expose the clap-net which is used in default of reasonable argument by our opponents, and the "pre-text" upon which these warlike editors intimate they will visit us with all the horrors of civil war. In the organ just quoted from there also occurs the following paragraph:

"The United States of America have set the example to all others, that a people may be Christian without state endowments, and that piety may exist without plunder." Remarks of this kind are frequently made by secularizing journals, and their object is to hold out a threat—to insinuate that annexation would be a desirable thing, if the plunder of the Church cannot be accomplished. The paragraph just given is false in all its bearings. In the first place an immense number of the population do not profess Christianity at all—a contemporary says seven millions—while myriads of others hold deadly heresies like "nihilism to religion and morality." But, again, it is asserted that endowments do not exist there. This also is untrue, for various denominations hold property of great value granted long prior to the revolution, and honorably protected amid a 1/2 century of turmoil and trial of that stormy period. Trinity Church alone holds forty acres, covered with the most splendid buildings in New York, by a patent granted by Queen Anne. The Lutherans likewise hold large property since the time of Dutch supremacy.

The Rev. Henry Patton, in an able speech delivered at the first meeting of the Synod in Toronto, mentioned an extraordinary case which occurred in one of the States, with respect to Church property held by the Propagation Society from a period anterior to the revolution. It appears that the State Legislature threw covetous eyes up on it in Canadian fashion, and secularized it, but the Society brought an action against the State, and by a decree of the Supreme Court "the property was restored to the Church. Facts of this kind are however carefully suppressed and "arguments" such as we have seen are invented, for their occupation would know full well that their occupation would soon be gone if they were circumscribed within the limits of the truth.

In a late number we offered a few remarks on a quotation from a letter written by the Rev. Mr. Roaf to the *Globe*, and which was certainly entitled to be regarded as a *pia estensione*. He stated that "the danger in the States is not of a want of churches and clergymen, but of excessive multiplication and rivalry." We showed the fallacy of this statement by giving an article from the *New York Times*, illustrative of the excitement and alarm that was experienced by all the leading denominations, with respect to the difficulty of getting candidates for the ministry, which scarcity was attributed to the insufficient provision made for the ministers. There were two or three other points in his letter which we could not attend to at that time, but upon which we shall take this opportunity of making a few comments, as we find the same "arguments" are frequently brought forward in different shapes by our opponents. This gentleman says, "the endowment system is congenial with clerical indolence and pride," and again, "it is adverse to private influence and activity," and of course the meaning of these statements is, that, in Mr. Roaf's opinion, the clergy of the endowed bodies are disposed to be indolent, proud and inactive. Now it can be easily shewn, by visitors to this province, that it would be difficult to find any body of clergy more earnest in their vocation than those of the Canadian church, from the Bishop down to the humblest gleaner. But this is a mere general assertion; so we shall turn from it to the stronger refutation of Mr. Roaf's insinuation which is to be found in the conduct of the clergy in this city a few years since, when the typhus fever was carrying off hundreds of

vicims. We shall give a quotation bearing upon this matter from the Canadian correspondence of the *New York Church Journal*, which we copied into the *Church Journal*, a short time since. The writer says, "When the horribly pestilential typhus fever raged amongst the emigrants who lay in hundreds in the sheds near Toronto our clergy nobly did their duty. Generally speaking, they were bound to life by domestic ties of the strongest and sweetest character, but the Romish priests in their isolated state of loneliness did not behave with more earnestness of spirit and devotion to the duties of their sacred calling. And where were the Pariahs brawlers in those dark days—the men who are always on hand when any church-plundering scheme is on the tapis—any plot for secularizing our reserves? I know not where they were; but this I know certainly, that they were not to be seen about the pest houses. Even so was it during the cholera times. From the Bishop downwards, the imminent danger never caused any clergyman to shrink from the path of duty." Now this statement cannot be denied, though according to Mr. Roaf's declaration we should have expected that the endowed Rector of St. James', and his brother clergymen would have deserted their posts, and fled from the danger, while the Reverend secularizers would have devoted themselves to the sick and dying. But the direct contrary is the truth, and therefore Mr. Roaf must confess that the lack of zeal he attributes to the endowed clergy is a *pia estensione*—a sham argument invented to serve a temporary purpose. The true state of the case is this. These voluntary agitators only regard themselves as ministers to those who pay them, while the clergy of the church consider that they are bound to attend to all who have need of their spiritual services. There are many other "arguments" in Mr. Roaf's letter as incorrect as the one we have just exposed, but our space will not permit us to touch upon more than one or two of them. He says, "Everywhere the supply of funds is about equal to the supply of suitable ministers."

Whit-st we appreciated the ability of F. T.'s Letter last week, we regretted the vein of sarcasm observable in some parts of it, as well as the too positive way in which D. E. B.'s presumed motives were alluded to. We felt, however, that we could not say much to any purpose without in some measure breaking D. E. B.'s incognito, and on that ground, though perhaps we were over scrupulous, we abstained from comment. But as CLERICUS has opened the way for us, we gladly avail ourselves of the opportunity to assure F. T., and our readers generally, that we heartily concur in the confidence which CLERICUS has expressed in the purity of D. E. B.'s motives; and as we feel persuaded that nothing could have been farther from his mind than to embarrass the large and able project so nobly started by our Bishop, so we have not the slightest doubt of his vigorously aiding that project in every possible way. So far as our own humble opinion of that scheme is concerned, we have no expectation of seeing a better one proposed, and we trust that our fellow Churchmen, throughout the length and breadth of the diocese, are to a man prepared and resolved to meet their wise and thoroughly practical diocesan with a zealous and munificent co-operation.

On Monday last the foundation stone of the new Mechanics' Institute, in this city, was laid "with Masonic honours." The occasion was one of special public interest, for the building in course of erection promises to be, in size and architectural elegance, a structure of which this city will have reason to be proud. A large body of spectators assembled, probably not less than 4000 in number, besides those who enjoyed the privilege of seats on the platform. T. G. Ridout, Esq., the Grand Master of the Freemasons, and the Rev. Dr. McCaul took a conspicuous part in the ceremonial, the latter gentleman addressing the numerous assemblage at some length with much fluency and force. A prayer was offered up by Dr. McCaul at the commencement, and a benediction pronounced by him at the close of the proceedings.—We have not room for farther details.

We are requested to state that a copy of the Rev. Adam Townley's Letters on the Common School System, will be sent gratuitously by the publisher to each of the Clergy in the Diocese, and to each of the Lay Delegates who attended the Synod last year. We respectfully suggest that, in view of the approaching General Election, every legitimate effort should be made to give the public mind a sound tone on the vital subject of Education; and the great utility of Mr. Townley's Letters on this subject, to the religious and the right view of the question, will be warmly acknowledged, and we are sure, by our brother-clergymen, whether clergy or laity, in the Diocese, and indeed whosoever they may be read, Church papers in the United States have reviewed them most favorably.

We feel much pleasure in directing the attention of such of our readers as may require music or musical instruments to the advertisement of Messrs. Small and Paige in another column. Mr. Paige, who is a thorough master of his profession, always keeps on hand an excellent supply of Pianos and other instruments by the best manufacturers, which are selected by himself in Boston, New York, and Philadelphia. They are also agents for Warren's Melodeons and Harmoniums, which are admirably adapted for small churches. Along with the latest and most popular English and foreign music, to which their agents regularly forward to them when published, Mr. P. has introduced into Toronto a choice and rare selection of the works of the great masters of harmony, both sacred and secular. Messrs. S. & P. at present occupy the building which was formerly used as "the Church Depository."

At the Easter Meetings of the United Church of England and Ireland resident in the Colonies, from any Disability as to the holding of Meetings in such Colonies for the Regulation of Ecclesiastical Affairs therein.

Whereas by reason of the Laws, Statutes, and Ordinances which affect or bind the Bishops and Clergy of the United Church of England and Ireland, doubts may exist whether the Bishops and Clergy of the said Church resident and performing Spiritual Duties in the Colonial Possessions of Her Majesty can lawfully hold or be present at Meetings of the Bishops, Clergy, and Lay Persons professing to be Members of the said Church in any Colony, for the purpose of agreeing on Rules and Regulations touching Ecclesiastical Affairs; and it is expedient that such Bishops and Clergy should be relieved from such Disability; Be it declared and enacted by the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows:—

That no Statute, Law, Rule, Usage, or other Authority of the United Kingdom shall extend or be construed to prevent the Metropolitan of any Province or the Bishop of any Diocese in the Colonies of Her Majesty, together with his Clergy, and the Lay Persons of such Province or Diocese, being Members of the United Church of England and Ireland, from meeting together from time to time for the purpose of such Regulations, Agreements, or Arrangements as local circumstances shall in their Judgment render necessary for the management or conduct of Ecclesiastical Affairs within such Province or Diocese: Provided always, that such Meetings, or the Regulations, Agreements, or Arrangements that may be made thereat, shall not obtain any force or authority from the enactments hereby made.

And whereas we have just exposed, but our space will not permit us to touch upon more than one or two of them. He says, "Everywhere the supply of funds is about equal to the supply of suitable ministers."

But as to church ordinances in neighborhoods having but a thin population and small farms, it could be expected from government funds, which are merely expended on established rather than missionary stations." Both these statements are untrue. No impartial person acquainted with the province outside the large cities and towns, could endorse Mr. Roaf's assertion in the first sentence quoted; and as for the next, with respect to the "Government funds," by which we presume he means the "Clergy Reserves," we assure him that there are about fifty missions in the remote parts of this province connected with the Church of England, from each of which there are from three to fifteen stations, where services are regularly held, and all of which missions are dependent upon the Clergy Reserve fund for their chief support, without which they would have to be closed. For their chief support we say, for the Church does not, as Mr. Roaf would wish his friends to understand, discountenance voluntarism. All our efforts are in a greater or less degree dependent upon this principle for the necessities of life. The Canadian Church holds precisely the opinions contained in the following extract from a distinguished speaker: "The principle of religious endowments is never so efficient in its working as when strengthened by the pure and enlightened voluntary exertions of its advocates; so, on the other hand, voluntary efforts are never so energetic and successful, as when based on the stability of the endowment system, and endowed with the elements of perpetuity."

We might proceed for hours exposing the miserable subterfuges, exaggerations, misrepresentations and falsehoods to which these reverend and lay agitators have recourse, in order to excite political animosity into the commission of revolutionary acts of plunder. They cannot bring forward truthful, manly arguments, and therefore they are thrown for excuses upon their inventive powers to justify the spoliation of the temple of God, which has been regarded by Christian men in all ages as the last sin, the consummation of all wickedness.

To repel the impending calamity all true lovers of religion should unite in meeting their arguments and intimations with the contempt they deserve—despising the sophistries with which ambitious politicians would seduce them from their duty towards God and their country, and replying to the calumnies which are uttered against them by constant expositions of the truth. All whose hatred of the endowed bodies does not exceed their love of Christianity, should combine in averting the wrath of God from this highly favoured land—wrath, which from the days of Heiloote in the Temple, through all succeeding ages, and never more signally than in our country, has inevitably fallen upon the spoliators and desecrators of God's Church—His holy place and things.

DESECRATION OF SUNDAY. The Paris correspondent of the *New York Times* mentions in his last letter the following odd instance of strange forgetfulness of their sacred calling on the part of certain American ministers, who, we are happy to say, are not members of the Episcopal Church. The Carnival balls are always scenes of the grossest debauchery, and the particular one at which those "clergymen" disgraced themselves by attending is described even by a French paper as having been "a tremendous scene of uproar and frenzied conviviality."

It is most gratifying, on the other hand, to perceive the respect shewn for the Lord's day by the English Ambassador, Lord Cowley.

I spoke lately of American clergymen who attend the masked balls on Sunday morning. I may mention, in this connection, that Lord Cowley, who was at the fancy ball at the Tuilleries on Saturday evening, withdrew at midnight, as the Sabbath was drawing. At the same moment that the British Ambassador retired from this scene of festivity, three American ministers entered another through the doors of the Grand Opera. If Lord Cowley thinks himself a secular officer—called upon to testify, in his own person, to the regard felt by his nation for the observance of Sunday, it seems to me that a clerical, even though he represent nothing but his congregation, can adduce no worthy argument whereby to excuse

At the Easter Meetings of the United Church of England and Ireland resident in the Colonies, from any Disability as to the holding of Meetings in such Colonies for the Regulation of Ecclesiastical Affairs therein.

Whereas by reason of the Laws, Statutes, and Ordinances which affect or bind the Bishops and Clergy of the United Church of England and Ireland, doubts may exist whether the Bishops and Clergy of the said Church resident and performing Spiritual Duties in the Colonial Possessions of Her Majesty can lawfully hold or be present at Meetings of the Bishops, Clergy, and Lay Persons professing to be Members of the said Church in any Colony, for the purpose of agreeing on Rules and Regulations touching Ecclesiastical Affairs; and it is expedient that such Bishops and Clergy should be relieved from such Disability; Be it declared and enacted by the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows:—