

marked manner, that in their opinion such concessions would be prejudicial to gospel truth,—were therefore very distasteful to them as Churchmen, and would not be at all likely to win Nonconformists—even if made. One speaker showed that a better way of winning the sympathies of Dissenters would be by more largely employing lay agency in the work of the Church.

On the subject of Education, the Bishop of Illinois, in a most eloquent speech, argued that her connection with the State gave the Church of England a most important power of mingling religious with secular knowledge—a power, he was sorry to say, not attainable to anything like the same extent in his own country, where Church and State had no connection. He argued that education without religion was an evil,—increasing the will and ability to do evil. In this view all agreed.

An animated discussion took place on the subject of “Free and open Churches,” in which the advantages and difficulties of the system were well brought out,—the latter being the almost necessary separation of the sexes in free churches in large towns, and the desirableness of having a due appropriation of seats, to preserve the rights of parishioners, where strangers attend such churches in large numbers. The free admission and accommodation of the stranger and the poor into their Father’s house—unabashed by the frown of the rich man, or by the closed doors of the chief seats in the synagogue—together with other well-known arguments, were found to outweigh many personal inconveniences.

Perhaps the most important of all the debates at this Congress, was that on “Church Ceremonial.” On this question “there was some hard-hitting, which was as well received and vigorously returned as it was straightforwardly given. Mr. How’s energetic and well-worded remonstrance against the tone of scornful superiority which Ritualists have sometimes adopted towards “the mere Anglican,” was heartily approved of and endorsed. The Guardian says:

“The debate was conducted with great ability, and with much fairness and forbearance by the speakers on both sides. After a ventilation of the subject so thorough and so earnest, it may be hoped that the two sides on this question will understand and appreciate one another better than before; and will have arrived at a conclusion in which a good many who attach themselves to neither are much disposed to confide—viz., that there is no such hopeless divergence between them—as to forbid their hope of their still doing good work together for the prosperity of the common Church.”

Diocesan Synods and an increase of the Episcopate were warmly advocated. The Bishop of Lichfield expressed his readiness to introduce the former into his diocese as soon as practicable.

The bold policy of bringing together men of different views on theological points, has met with the most marked success, both in the Pan Anglican Synod and the Wolverhampton Church Congress. The result in both cases has proved that devout and earnest members of God’s Church can discuss the most exciting theological questions of the day, not only without acrimony, but with much benefit to themselves, and to the cause of truth, charity and unity. These meetings suggest and foreshadow the Synods and Councils which will—we know not how soon—restore by God’s blessing the lost pearl of unity to the Christian world.

DEATH OF THE BISHOP OF LICHFIELD.—It is but a fortnight since we had occasion to speak of the amiable and venerable character of the Bishop of Lichfield, and the firm and gentle manner in which he discharged his duties as President of the Church Congress, then in apparently vigorous health, notwithstanding his advanced age. We have now to record his death. He died suddenly, after a day of hard work, on the evening of Saturday last. In the morning he had been speaking at a meeting for the promotion of schools in connection with St. Nicholas’