

blems, and was publicly chaired through the town by a large body of Orangemen, who were assembled on that occasion.'

'This open and avowed adhesion to a particular party, and this disregard of what I consider the spirit which guides his Majesty's counsels, has been very painful to me, and places me in the embarrassing position which I attempt to describe.

'When I consider how my hopes of tranquilizing the country have been counteracted, and knowing, as I do, the conduct of Lord Claude Hamilton had caused increased excitement, I cannot offer his recommendation to the Lord Chancellor, without exposing myself to animadversion.

'On the other hand, when I reflect that he has been elected member for the county, and that his rank and station fully qualify him for the appointment, I know not how to withhold my recommendation, more especially as I do not believe that the act of which I complain was in itself illegal—and, above all, when I am willing to hope, that, if appointed to the magistracy, his decisions will not be biased by party prejudice.

'Under these conflicting considerations, I lay the case before his Majesty's government, and if I find no objection is taken on their part, I shall submit his Lordship's name to the Lord Chancellor.

I have, &c.

[Signed] 'CALEDON.'

We subjoin Sir Henry Hardinge's reply:

Castle, 9th Feb. 1835.

'MY LORD,—I have laid before the Lord lieutenant your Lordship's letter, of this day's date, and I am desired by his excellency to say, that the sentiments you express, and the judicious conduct you have always observed in the county of Tyrone, in suppressing all party feelings, meet with his excellency's entire concurrence.

'The line you have pursued is in strict accordance with the principles by which his Majesty's councils are guided; and it is only by a firm and impartial adherence to this system that the peace of the country can be preserved.

'The Lord-lieutenant regrets that any circumstance should have occurred by which your lordship should have been thwarted in carrying into effect this most desirable system of discouraging popular excitement; but his excellency, after an attentive consideration of the statement made by your lordship, concurs in opinion with you, that, in the exercise of your discretion, it is expedient not to withhold the commission of the peace.—I have the honor, &c.

(Signed) 'H. HARDINGE.'

This is an instructive specimen of the 'sayings and doings' of the late Government. Here is the usual conforming flourish about 'the firm and impartial adherence to the system by which alone the peace of the country can be preserved;' followed by the promotions to the bench of an out-and-out Orange neophyte, who is reported by the lord lieutenant of his county for disregarding 'this spirit ["the firm and impartial system"] of his Majesty's ministers;'—the whole gracefully crowned by the old Tory doctrine of expediency. 'It is expedient not to withhold the commission of the peace.' Undoubtedly? For Lord Claude was a county member, and his brother, Lord Abercorn had influence and votes; and the Orange chiefs were staunch and recently reconciled allies. True, the discountenanc-

ing of Orangeism and all other factions, might be the salvation of Ireland; but votes would be the salvation of power and place. So expediency made 'firm and impartial' justice kick the beam.

One other little fact is worthy of remark. The two letters are both dated from the same place on the same day. Why then did not Lord Caledon and Sir Henry Hardinge personally communicate on this subject? Why, if they 'so concurred in opinion,' did this correspondence take place? Is it not obvious that they did communicate? Is it not probable that Lord Caledon required this written authority for recommending an appointment by which, 'he exposed himself to animadversion?'

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

THE QUEEN'S PREROGATIVE.

A writer in the *British Magazine*, contemplating the results of the action of the Convocation of the English Establishment in reference to the Oxford Tracts, thus explains the power of the *Head of the Church* over the two Houses; namely, Bishops and of the inferior clergy. The example he adduces is that of Whiston, accused of Arianism, in the reign of Queen Ann, since whose time the convocation has not, we believe, been allowed to sit.—*Cath. Her.*

'If the question has reference to heresy, Burnet tells us, 'that the Scripture and the first four General Councils are the measure set by law to judge that.' But if the opinions thought to be censured are of more 'doubtful disputation'—if they have never been expressly condemned by the church of England—such, for instance, as whether a clergyman may or may not obey literally the 14th verse of the 5th chapter of St James; and especially if the Church is much divided upon the points under consideration, then, probably, the produce would be thus: The archbishop would consult all her suffragans, and ask their opinion, as to whether the present case was of sufficient magnitude to make it desirable to ask the Queen to grant her license for convocation to consider the subject. If her Majesty thought good to grant their prayer, the upper House would examine the tracts that have been objected to, and censure them or not as they should deem right. They would send down their opinion to the lower House, and that would, after due examination, consent to or dissent from the proposition of the bishops.

'If the two Houses could not agree, things would remain as they were before; if they agreed, their decision would be laid before the Queen; if her Majesty did not assent to it the affair would sleep, as Whiston's did; if she did, the decision would have the force of a canon of the Church; and, probably, clergymen would be bound by it. I say probably, because it is a notorious fact, that but very few persons consider even clergymen bound by all the Constitution and Canons of 1603, though they were agreed upon in convocation, and assented to by King James the First. And I can see no reason why constitutions made in 1842 should have more authority than those made in 1603, the powers that enacted them being the same. But even if the constitutions agreed upon by convocation, & sanctioned by the crown, should be binding upon the clergy, and I think they ought to be in *foro conscientia*, it is certain they would not be considered by the law of the land as obligatory upon the laity; and perhaps the common law would not consider disobedience to them as a sufficient

reason for a bishop's refusing to induct a clergyman into a living; but the glorious uncertainty of the law makes it impossible to say, what would be the decision upon this point.'

*Missionary Land Sharks.*—The Church Missionaries in New Zealand have turned the Gospel to good account, if we judge by the following specimen, taken from the claims to grants advertised in a single number of the *Auckland Gazette*, that of the 4th Sept. last, viz:—

- The Rev. Wm. Williams, 400 acres.
- The Rev. Wm. Williams, 20
- The Rev. Wm. Williams, 160
- The Rev. Wm. Williams, 50

Total, 570

Five hundred and seventy acres!—a snug little glebe for a Gospel missionary; but look at the following:—

- The Rev Henry Williams, 1000 acres.
- The Rev Henry Williams, 3000
- The Rev Henry Williams, 245
- The Rev Henry Williams, 500
- The Rev Henry Williams, 4000
- The Rev Henry Williams, 500
- The Rev Henry Williams, 2000

Total, 11,245

Eleven thousand two hundred and forty-five acres!—all acquired by one preacher of the Gospel, who was probably sent out at the expense of some charitable ladies for the purpose of converting savages to Christianity.

'*A fructibus eorum cognoscetis eos.*'—How beautiful these Apostolic fruits would look in the *Missionary Record* or the *Evangelical Magazine*! We are glad to say that, among the rev. names which figure in these lists of claimants, we do not observe that of the Catholic Bishop or any of his clergy, for a single acre. This is as it should be.—*Australasian Chronicle.*

From the Catholic Herald.

FUNERAL OBSEQUIES OF THE LATE RT. REV. DR. CONWELL, BISHOP OF THIS DIOCESE.—The solemn office of the dead and Pontifical Requiem Mass took place on Tuesday morning, at 9 o'clock, at St. Joseph's Church, over the remains of the Rt. Rev. HENRY CONWELL, late Bishop of this diocese. He died on Friday morning the 22d inst., at the advanced age of above ninety, twenty-two years of which he was Bishop of Philadelphia. He was the second Bishop, being the successor of Dr. EGAN, who in the year 1808 was appointed by the Holy See, first Bishop of Philadelphia. Dr. CONWELL was consecrated in London, in 1820, by the Rt. Rev. Dr. POYNTER, having been at the time of his appointment, Vicar General of the diocese of Armagh in Ireland.

The Rt. Rev. Dr. KENRICK, late Coadjutor and Administrator of the diocese, officiated; assisted by the Rev. Dr. SULTZBACHER, Canon of St. Stephen's, Vienna, as assistant Priest; Rev. C. J. CARTER acted as Deacon, and Rev. DANIEL F. X. DEVITT as Subdeacon. The two Deacons of honour, were Rev. Messrs. BURKE and PANCOST. The clergymen of the various congregations occupied the sanctuary, whilst the Seminarians of St. Charles Borromeo College, took their places beyond the railing of the sanctuary, and forming an outer choir, assisted most effectively during the solemn chant of the office and mass. The Church was crowded to excess by the faithful, whose piety was considered by the venerable presence of the

body, which, placed in the centre of the choir, clothed in the significant habiliments of episcopal authority, spoke feelingly, even in death of the order and power of the priesthood. The solemn prayer and absolution pronounced aloud by four assistant priests in stole and cope, previous to the closing prayer of the Rt. Rev. Dr. KENRICK, was truly impressive.

The body of the venerable prelate was then borne by four Priests from the Church, and placed in the hearse, to be carried to the grave yard, at the south end of the city. The faithful followed in crowds, whilst the body was preceded by the numerous and interesting members of St. Joseph's Orphan Asylum, and the religious sodalities attached to St. Joseph's Church. The body of Seminarists and the clergy followed, and the vast concourse, moved in order and strict regularity.

Thus has the Church of God in the United States, sent two of her Bishops within a few days to receive the rewards of their labors; and two who entered on their prelate duties in the same year—Bishop ENGLAND and Bishop CONWELL; the latter, well nigh double the age of the former outlived him in the prelate by ten days—'Beati mortui qui Domino moriuntur.' 'Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord. From henceforth now, saith the Spirit that they may rest from their labors; for their works follow them.'—Apoc. chap. xiv. v. 13.

TEN DOLLARS BOUNTY.

ABLE BODIED MEN OF GOOD CHARACTER, have now an opportunity of joining the FIRST INCORPORATED BATTALION, Commanded by Lieut-Colonel Gourlay. The period of Service is for two years (to the 30th of April 1844.) Pay and Clothing the same as Her Majesty's Regiments of the Line, with FREE RATIONS. Immediate application to be made at the Barracks, Hamilton. Hamilton. April 30, 1842.

SPRING AND SUMMER FASHIONS FOR 1842

HAVE BEEN RECEIVED BY THE SUBSCRIBER. HE ALSO wishes to acquaint his Patrons, that he has REMOVED to his New Brick Shop on John Street, a few yards from Stinson's corner, where they may rely on punctuality and despatch in the manufacture of work entrusted to him. S. McCURDY. Hamilton, 1st April, 1842.

REMOVAL.

Saddle, Harness and Trunk Factory.

McGIVERN respectfully announces to his friends and the public, that he has removed from his old stand to the new building, opposite to the retail establishment of Isaac Buchanan & Co., on King street. In making this announcement to his old friends, he most respectfully begs leave to express his grateful thanks for past favors, and hopes that unremitting attention to business will insure him a continuance. Hamilton, Feb. 22, 1842.

BRISTOL HOUSE,

King Street, Hamilton, near the Market. By D. F. TEWKSBURY, September 15, 1841.