

prosperity. And he would be perfectly right. But why does he not look for those other causes of our subsequent decrease? Must the Episcopal Veto be excluded from any share in our great increase, and yet be made to bear the whole blame of our diminution?

Now the very address from which he quoted sets forth the real source of our growth, from 1832 to 1840, namely, the work which I undertook to perform in the support and training of young men for the ministry. My humble Theological Seminary contained at one time ten candidates for the sacred office, sustained by the classical school connected with it. I sacrificed all my property, worth about \$20,000, and several thousands more, in the effort to establish the institution, the whole of which was swept away in the disastrous times of 1838-9. And the growth of the diocese, in consequence, was checked, and the number of our clergy reeded. The object of my address to the Convention was to show them the importance of having our own Theological Seminary again, on a surer foundation, by proving, from our diocesan statistics, the great difference between the growth of the clergy previous to 1840, when I carried on the work of ministerial training, and the lessening of the clergy, since the period of my pecuniary ruin. The episcopal veto had nothing to do with the matter, on the one side or the other. It was a pure question of adaptation of means to the end. Our clergy increased rapidly, while I was able to employ the proper means to sustain and encourage candidates. And they diminished, though not so quickly, when those means could no longer be employed.

The same journal from which our censor drew his statement would have shown him that the Convention responded, without a dissenting voice, to the justice of the appeal, and passed their resolutions accordingly. Since that time, all the preparatory measures have been consummated. A charter has been obtained for the new "Vermont Episcopal Institute." The deed of the property has been executed. A portion of the subscriptions has been secured. And the prospect is fair and encouraging for the revival of our old means of increase, with far better hope of permanence, when we shall have appealed to the liberality of our friends at large, to aid in this most useful and valuable enterprise.

With what sort of eyes our anonymous assailant could have perused these documents, I am unable to conjecture. But we have all heard the story of the astronomer who was satisfied that he had discovered an elephant in the moon, when it turned out, upon an examination of the telescope, that he had only shut up a fly under the object glass! Something of this kind seems to have occurred in the case before us. The "Episcopal veto" had become a fixed idea in the mind of our worthy censor, and whatever page he read, the monster was there, and lo! the diminution of our clergy was at once explained, with perfect demonstration!

The inference which he insinuates, though he does not directly assert it, is that Vermont, being the only diocese which is "so well endowed," and the only one which is placed in the awful clutch of "the Episcopal veto," is therefore the only one in which there are so many vacant parishes. This inference is about as well sustained as the rest of his ingenious hypothesis. I have taken the trouble to examine the journals of many other dioceses, and beg leave to state the results for the reader's satisfaction:

N. Y., in 1833, reported	27	vacancies out of	237	Ch.
Ohio	26	"	83	"
Illinois	23	"	52	"
Virginia, in 1832,	27	"	173	"
Missouri, in 1834,	7	"	21	"
S. Carolina,	9	"	53	"
N. Carolina,	26	"	53	"
Indiana, in 1834, reported	8	vacancies out of	28	Ch.
Delaware,	3	"	21	"
Wisconsin,	10	"	35	"
Alabama,	4	"	29	"
Michigan,	8	"	37	"
Texas,	8	"	21	"
Mississippi,	14	"	32	"
Tennessee,	6	"	17	"
N. Hampshire,	6	"	11	"
Maryland,	10	"	107	"
Pennsylvania,	66	"	173	"

It is not impossible that I may have erred in making out some of the foregoing estimates, and that of Pennsylvania among them, because I regret to find, in most of the journals, an absence of any clear and distinct statement of the vacant parishes although I should think that this is one of the most important facts to be laid before the Convention. But I have done the best in my power, by taking the list of the churches, and comparing it with the list of the clergy who are set down as rectors. If I have been misled in the true result, I shall be most happy to have the mistake corrected. No statistical service could be performed of greater importance at

this time, than the furnishing a complete list of the actual amount of clerical destitution. For by doing also are our people likely to be roused to the necessity of a vigorous and persevering effort, to supply the increasing and alarming deficiency. True it is, that the number of our clergy is largely increased. Yet it is no less true that the growth of our population and the wants of the church have increased in a much greater proportion.

But supposing my imperfect list to be reasonably accurate, it appears that out of 10 dioceses, including my own, there is not a single one fully supplied, while many are more deficient than Vermont, notwithstanding this frightful bughear, the "Episcopal veto." We have 10 vacancies out of 32 parishes. But Missouri has 7 out of 21; North Carolina, 26 out of 53; Texas, 8 out of 21; Mississippi, 14 out of 32; New Hampshire, 6 out of 11; and Pennsylvania, 60 out of 173. All of these, therefore, are worse off than we are. Many others are but little better. Ohio has 26 vacancies out of 83; Indiana, 8 out of 28; Wisconsin, 10 out of 35; Michigan, 8 out of 37; Tennessee, 6 out of 17; even Virginia has 27 vacancies out of 173; and New York the same number out of 237 churches, notwithstanding their immense advantage over us in age, in wealth, and in population, besides possessing the two largest Theological Seminaries. Let Vermont have again the instrumentality which she once enjoyed, when in eight years, her clergy multiplied from 11 to 26, and I venture to predict that she will have no reason to shrink from any fair comparison.

I may not close my communication, however, without acknowledging the personal compliment which our benevolent censor is pleased to pay to myself, as "so excellent and amiable a man!" It would be ungracious in me to reply, in the words of the poet, *Tineo Danaos et dona ferentes*. But I must be permitted to say that if his judgments on the subjects of "excellence and amiability" is not more sound than it is upon the question of the Episcopal veto, and the comparative condition of my diocese, it would hardly weigh much in proving that I am justly entitled to these epithets of praise. He certainly knows nothing of the one, and I fear that he knows quite as little of the other. Indeed, I am strongly tempted to suspect, though it is hardly "amiable" to say so, that he has only thrown in these pleasant words on the principle of those ingenious doctors, who hope to induce children to swallow their bitter pills, by coating them with sugar.

And now permit me to add a few words about this admirable specimen of skill in manufacturing opinions. A nameless writer in Philadelphia directs a letter to the editor of the Church "Echo," in Canada. The Echo, of course, repeats the communication, which is quite consistent with the business of an Echo, whose province it is to return the sound, without knowing or caring whether it proceeds from the voice of truth or error. And you the Protestant Churchman, take up the Echo, and echo it again, in order that, like the horn among the Alps, it may be beautifully prolonged by the process of reverberation. The Scriptures themselves declare, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be established." Who can doubt the justice of a judgment which comes before the public with such a powerful weight of asservation? An anonymous charge against the Episcopal veto, as a "desolating" peculiarity, written in Philadelphia by—somebody. This somebody, a declared admirer of the excellence and amiability of its author. The charge repeated in Canada, and again repeated in New York! Most cogent proof! Most conclusive consent of testimony! Does any reasonable man dispute the importance of an echo? Only let it be repeated a few times, and there are not many ears that can tell whether it originated in the braying of an ass, or the roaring of a lion.

My worthy brethren, as an honest friend to you and to the Church, I would take the liberty of advising you never to play the echo of an anonymous accuser, until you have taken the trouble of enquiring whether the accusation is just, and understand the merits of the question. There is no Episcopal veto in Vermont which has not an equal guard in the veto of the clergy, and the veto of the laity. The argument in its favor has not been met, and cannot be answered by any man who believes in the apostolic character of our ecclesiastical system. Ask those who have a right to speak of its practical working, for nineteen years, and they will tell you that it has been, under God, an instrument of unity, and order, and fraternal peace. With us who understand the subject in its true aspect, there has not been heard a hiss, during all that time, against its operations. As the responsibility of introducing it rests on me, it is my duty to defend it against all unfair attacks, at least among the members of our

own American communion; and this I shall certainly feel bound to do, however painful the necessity. And with regard to the administration of my successor, which our anonymous censor seems to dread, as if, in his hands, this salutary principle were likely to work such awful consequences, let me advise him to rely on the good Providence of God, who will guide the Diocese, I trust, to the choice of one, not only more "excellent and amiable" than I pretend to be, but better fitted, in all respects, to promote the welfare of the Church, and the glory of her Divine Redeemer.

Requesting, as a matter of simple justice, a speedy insertion of this communication, I remain, as always,

Your affectionate friend and servant in Christ,
JOHN H. HOPKINS,

Bishop of the Diocese of Vermont.

Burlington, Vt., Feb. 10, 1855.

News Department.

From Papers by R. M. S. Africa, March 3.

MR. ROEBUCK'S COMMITTEE.—On Monday the committee nominated by the House of Commons for the first time, to choose a chairman and consider the course of their proceeding. Mr. Roebuck was unanimously chosen chairman, the other members being Mr. Drummond, Sir J. Pakington, Colonel Lindsay, Mr. Layard, Mr. Ellice, Lord Seymour, Sir George Lewis, General Peel, Mr. Bramston, and Mr. J. Bell. The question as to whether the proceedings of the committee are to be open through the instrumentality of the press to the public, as is now customary in all our courts and other tribunals, is to engage the attention of the committee at their next sitting.

PEDMONT.

In its sitting of the 23rd, the Chamber of Deputies at Turin, having resumed the debate on the Covents Suppression Bill, rejected the amendment of M. Robecchi, tending to the total suppression of all convents, an amendment which had been opposed by the President of the Council, the minister of Justice, and the report of the committee, on the ground that the bill went far enough as it stood. The discussion of the articles was to be continued in the following sitting.

After long debates, and the rejection of a great number of amendments, the Chamber of Deputies at Turin has voted the first article of the Bill for the Suppression of Monasteries. This article, which comprises in itself the whole bill is as follows:—

"All communities and establishments of whatever description of monastic orders, and of regular and secular corporations, existing in the state, are suppressed, and cannot be re-established, except by special law.

"Are excepted—

"1. The Sisters of Charity of St. Joseph.
"2. Such of the communities of orders and corporations as are principally destined for education and public instruction, or for preaching and giving assistance to the sick, to be designated by name in a special clause approved of by Royal decree, and to be published contemporaneously with the present law."

FRANCE.

PARIS, Tuesday, Feb. 27.—A correspondent of the *Morning Post* says:—"All doubts and hesitations as to the Emperor's journey to Sebastopol are now at an end. His Majesty will decidedly leave. Even the day is fixed for the departure—it will be Saturday next the 3rd, or, at latest, Monday, the 5th. What is more is, that the Empress will accompany his Majesty. A consultation of physicians has taken place as to whether or not it would be prudent for her Majesty to make the journey. The result, is that it has been decided, to her great delight, that seeing that her health is exceedingly good at present, she may safely undertake to go with the Emperor. The Emperor has nominated the personages who are to attend him. His *chancelerie privée* is thus composed:—M. Delmas, as chief private secretary, in the room of M. Mcquard, detained by the government; M. Chantepie, secretary interpreter; M. Cunisset, *religieux* of the *chancelerie*, and two *employés*. The whole of the famous band of the Guides, so well known, and so much admired at London, has also received orders to set out."

LOSS OF A FRENCH TRANSPORT.—The Paris correspondent of the *Daily News* says:—"A rumour prevailed at Genoa on the 22nd that a French frigate had been lost with all on board, in the Straits of Bonifacio, between Corsica and Sardinia. No particulars of the disaster are given. The vessel in question was said to be the *Somillante* frigate, with a crew of 600 men on board. I regret to state that this news is but too true, and I fear the number of men on board is larger than also reported. The *Constitutionnel* says:—"We have received a confirmation of the sad news which has these two days been rumored about in Paris. The frigate lost in the Strait of Bonifacio is the *Somillante*, which recently left Toulon with 400 soldiers on board. The vessel struck on one of the reefs in that passage, and immediately sank. The crew and passengers, making together, 350 men, all perished. No other details have been yet received of this catastrophe." The lamentable loss of the frigate *Somillante* has created a most painful sensation in Paris. Several hundred men have perished, together with a vast quantity of cannon, mortars, shells, gunpowder, and shot. Nothing was saved—not a shell. All that had been washed ashore—so far as the Government was concerned—two pairs of trousers. The *Somillante* was going to the