In the Lords, the Bis op of Exeter took the opportunity of moving for some papers to express his opinions on the subject, objecting that the bill ought to have been introduced by the Secretary of the Colonies, rather than in the other house. and that the colonists were taken by surprise, relying upon the name of the noble Duke as a tower of strength to their cause, believing that he would not consent to sacrifice the interests of the Protestant Church in Canada, by allowing the clergy reserves to be seized upon and confiscated :-

"He was quite ready, at the same time, to admit that when a statesman found himself involved in the duties of office, it was necessary for him to review the conclusions at which he had before arrived on any important matter of public policy .-He admitted that it was the duty of such a person to correct his first impressions; and undoubtedly, if the previous private impressions of the noble duke had been against this measure, and he had subsequently changed that view, and considered that, as a Minister of the Crown, he was bound to support the present bill, he honored the noble duke for having yielded to reason and conviction. He for one confessed that the fact of the noble duke having succeeded to office, and being an important Member of the new Government, was to him strong ground for believing that that Govern-ment would prove itself a friend to the Churce of England and the Protestant religion as by averestablished. But not only was the noble du e placed at the head of the colonies, but there was another remarkable circumstance, viz., that the noble carl who formerly held that office, and who was understood to be the most hostile to the views | sacrilege. That was a charge of so grave a naof the colonists on this subject, was no longer a ture, that, however anxious he was not to enter member of the Government at all, and this to the colonists must have appeared as another ground once to say he could not recognise its truth or of confidence. Looking to the other members of justice. If this measure were sacrilege, what the Administration, they would see more than one : was the act of 1840? The Government did not right honorable gentleman whom they knew to propose to deal with the Clergy Reserves as they be faithfully attached to true religion especially as were dealt with in 1840, transferring from one embodied in the Church of England. There was body to another the arbitrary disposition of the in particular one individual eminently distin- property; but, assuming that it went the whole guished by every public virtue, a man of whom it length the right reverend Prelate contended for was impossible, even when one differed from him, and that the Reserves were applied to secular to speak without respect—he alluded to Mr. purposes, he would ask the right Rev. Prelate Gladstone the Chancellor of the Exchequer—and what was the character of the act of 1840, which what did the colonists know of him? He (the he had supported? Sacrilege could not be a Bishop of Exeter) was not aware that that right question of degree. If a man broke into a honorable gentleman had ever publicly expressed | Church and stole plate, he would be equally an opinion on this subject, but the colonists must have been aware that he first became greatly as well as favourably known to the world by the publication of a work on the relations of the Church to the State, in which he held and main- | They supported an act which took away from the tained the great principle that it was the first duty of the Government, as such, to support and advance the true religion. Had they not a right purposes of other creeds or forms of Christianity, on that ground then, to be satisfied that the right but to secular purposes. But he went further, hon, gentleman would be found among the supporters of their claims? There was another very special ground on which they must have formed some hope of the right hon, gentleman, and that was the constituency which had more than once selected him as their representative—he meant the University of Oxford-a constituency whose fidelity to the cause of religious truth could not be for a moment doubted.

Having given an outline of the history of the reserve fund and the papers he wished for, some of them reating to the recognition of Roman Catholic titles in Canada, the right rev. prelate in conclusion, contended that this was a matter with which it was not computent for the colonial legislature to deal, that it was an inperial question involving the highest and most sacred part of our constitutional law, and that it was one upon which the Imperial Parliament alone should de-

"The Legislature of Canada had shown its gard to religion already by completely secularising a college, which had been founded and endowed for the purpose of the Church in that country, and he did trust that the interests of the Church would not be left to the tender mercies of such a Legislature. Another Act had passed that Legislature, the 11th and 12th Victoria, chap 143, the object of which was to incorporate a religious order of persons in Canada, who were bound by their oaths to do any service which was required by the Pope. That measure actually had received the sanction of Her Majesty's Government at the very time when there was such an outcry against the Pope in this country, There was only one other document for which he should at present move, and that was a copy of an official letter from the Lord Bishop of Quebec to his Grace the Duke of Newcastle, one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries on the matter of the clergy reserves in Canada. That letter had been hastily writtenbut it was perhaps, the more satisfactory on that account, as containing the deep and earnest im-pressions of the writer. His right reverend friend had kindly favoured him with a sight of the draft of that letter, and he perceived that he declared that no measure could have sacrilege more plainly stamped upon it than one which provided for the absolute confiscation to godless uses of property solemnly dedicated to God. He asked their lordships, were they prepared to sanction that sacrilege ? There had been times when the House of Lords would have spurned the very notion, and he begged to remind the Government that the act would be in direct contravention of the coronation oath-He knew statesmen did not like a reference to that oath. It permitted a great deal; but one thing it did say, that the Protestant Church should be held up in England and Scotland, and all the dominions belonging thereto. He contended that it had been properly construed that the oath bound the Sovereign to the utmost of her power to preserve the Protestant Church and the Protestant religion in this country and all its dependencies-But, independently of this, there was another reason why the proposition of the Government should not be sanctioned. The whole a-

£20,000 a year in the Upper Province; and there But the Roman Catholic Church stood on a much was a restriction that not more than £100 a-year should be allowed to any one clergyman. If there were at present but 200 clergymen receiving £100 a-year each in that country to support the true Church, he asked their lordships, were they prepared to sanction the disturbance of that property in the face of an enormously wealthy Church ? The estates of St Sulpice alone, in Montreal, were estimated at £60,000 per annum; and he might sately say that it was the richest spirtiual corporation in the world He would be no party to a breach of the treaty which bound us to hold inviolate the property of the Roman Catholic Church; but it must be remembered that that provision was the very reason which had induced George III. and his Ministers, to recommed the measure of 1791 to Parliament, and which led to its being triumphantly carried by the Legislature from the payment by the mere fact of such of that day.

The Duke of Newcastle declined entering into a discussion till the bill was before the House. That measure, indeed, the right rev. Prelate, though evidently unacquainted with its provisions, had thought proper to stigmatise as one of confiscation, as designed to pervert the Clergy Reserves in Canada from their legitimate purpose; but their Lordships would find, when the hill came before them, that the right rev. Prelate's apprehensions on this head were without founda-

· The right Reverend Prelate had spoken of the proposed measure of the Government as into the details of the measure, he felt bound at guilty of sacrilege whether he took only a small quantity or more. But what did the right rev. Bench do in 1840? He did not attack them for it, but there must be consistency in this matter. Church of England a large portion of the Clergy Reserves; and it was applied, not to the and asked what were all the preceding acts that had been passed upon this question since 1791? What had been the course taken by the Legislature of Canada, and the recommendations sent out by the Governments of this country? Had they been guilty of sacrilege? What did Sir J. Pakington say? He said he was prepared to deal with this question—that circumstances had occurred, such as emigration and others, which made it necessary to have a redistribution of these funds, necessarily taking a part from the Church of England; and he was, therefore, just as guilty of sacrilege as the present Government would be if they had proposed to hand over the whole of these funds to secular purposes. Upon this subject, so far as the Church was concerned, and any religious dues were involved in this measure, it was as between the present and the late Government a mere question of degree. But as regarded the measure itself upon the most important view—namely, the colonial view, was a matter not of degree, but of principle. The whole question was this-was it to be a colonial or imperial question? Were they to follow out to its true legitimate conclusion the principle of not merely a representative but a responsible government, or to deprive the Colony of the full benefit of that responsible government, and thereby to leave it in an nnomalous position? The right reverend Pre-late had said that the question had been considered as settled in 1840. The late Government had not so considered it. The Bishop of Quebec, and other Bishops of Canada, in 1846 applied for a different arrangement of these reserves; they wished to reopen the question in 1846. How, then, could they say in 1846 it was not settled as to part, and yet that it was closed as to the whole in 1853? He thought that when their lordships came to consider this question, they would arrive at the conclusion with him, that upon purely and strictly colonial views it ought to be settled at once, and in the way proposed by the Government. The right reverend prelate had spoken

of the effect it would have on the coronation oath, but he thought their lordships would see, when this bill came to be printed, that the Queen would have the same power of veto she now had, and that in no way, as he conceived, was the coronation oath effected by it. (It will be observed that no mention of the veto was made by Mr. F. Peel in the Commons.) The right rev. prelate had also entered into a comparison of the Church of Rome and the Church of England in Canada. Upon some future occasion he would enter into the question; but he could assure the right reverend prelate that, whatever might be-and he believed it to be greatly exaggerated—the wealth of the Roman Catholic Church in Canada, that Church would stand on precisely the same footing as to being dealt with by the Canadian Legislature, as the clergy reserves under this measure. The right rev. prelate had spoken of is decidedly with the former. The address the Roman Catholic endowments in Canada as in its concluding paragraph, explicitly re- which is imparted to the recipient of Holy though they had been settled by acrs of Parlia- ferred to the "resumption of Synodical ac- orders for the sake of his flock. Thus he says ment, which were about to be left on the santale tion at "no distant date," and the Crown "lamentable experience shows that all min-

weaker foundation. If the right rev. prelate would refer to the treaty of Quebec, he would find that the treaty tended to confirm little more than perfect freedom of worship to the Roman Catholics of Canada; and as to the very instance put to the right rev. prelate-that of the corporation of St. Sulpice—what was its title? It was not confirmed by treaty, but was so weak that'a Canadian ordinance was passed, and it was under that its posessions were now held. Again, what had the Legislature already done as to the Roman Catholic endowments? They consisted in one form of tithes, but they were not payable by all classes of the community—they were payable only by persons of that communion. - (Hear, hear.)—and so strictly was that the case, that if a man changed his religion he became exonerated change. Moreover, in Upper Canada, the tithes had been abelished; and in consequence of that, as he believed, the Governor of Canada had conferred on the Roman Church a grant out of the clergy reserves; and under that grant the Roman Catholic Church was receiving £1,600 a-year. That church, therefore, stood upon precisely the same footing as the Church of England. There had been an amount of mystification and misrepresentation upon this subject which he hoped by discussion in that and the other house of parliament would be removed; and he confidently anticipated that the right rev. bench, viewing this measure not abstractedly as affecting the Church of England alone, but as a great national concern, would regard it as one of the greatest advantages of the Church of Canada.

The Earl of Desart tendered his thanks to the right rev. prelate for having brought the subject before their lordships, as it was most important the public should be made sensible of what he must consider as a great blow to Protestantism in Canada, and he said that the more advisedly, inasmuch as the Canadian Legislature had made no secret of their intention to divert these lands

from ecclesiastical purposes.

The papers were then ordered, and the house adjourned.

TORONTO VOCAL MUSIC SOCIETY.

Rooms-St. LAWRENCE BUILDINGS.

Regular practice every Wednesday, at Eight P.M .l'erms of admission, Performing Members 20s. perannum; Nonperforming 25s.

MR. PAIGE. Conductor. G. B. WYLLIE, Secretary & Treasurer

WEEKLY CALENDAR.

Dar.	Date.		.:	lst Lesson	2d Lesson
B	Mar.	! 3,	5 SUND IN LENT. $\left\{ egin{array}{l} M, \\ E, \end{array} \right.$	Exod. 3.	
M	••	14.	{ M, E;	Josh. 8.	John 1. l'Thes. 5.
T	"	15,	{ M,	" 10. " 23,	John 2. 2Thes. 1
w	44	16,	{ M.	" 24, Judges 1,	John 3. 2Thes. 2.
т	44	17,		" 2, " 3,	John 4. 2Thes. 3.
P	••	18.		* 4. * 5.	John 5.
s	**	19,	{ M. E.	" 6. " 7.	John 6' l'I'm 2,3,
В	"	20.	SUN. BEF. EAST. & M.		Matt. 26. Heb. 5a.

a To verse 11.

Canadian Churchman.

THURSDAY, MARCH 10, 1853.

MEETING OF CONVOCATION.

Convocation met on the 15th ult., and we deeply regret that we are unable to give the very full and interesting report of the proceedings which appears in the Morning Chronicle. From the editorial columns of that Journal however, we extract the following comments upon the more important matters which came under the notice of the body.

"The report on the Clergy Discipline Bill is the work which has been completed: and it amounts to a distinct and unequivocal claim on the part of the Church to such a share in her own most vital concerns as cannot be denied to her without denying her existence. Those who are prejudiced against anyattempt at ecclesiastical self-government will be sorely puzzled to find any thing tot object to in the temperate and cautious spirit of that document, and in the all but reluctant language in which it is conched.

The most prominent portion of yesterday's proceedings, was the presentation of the address to the Throne. Her Majesty's advisers may be congratulated on their skill in wording the Royal answer. Neither the friends nor the foes of Synodical action can make much of it; yet such force as it has

thus taken up. Silence on such a point may be interpreted as consent.

The chief topic of interest in yesterday's sitting was the claim urged by the Colonial Bishops to seats in Convocation—a claim we frankly admit, which involves considerations of the most momentous nature. The Bishop of Cape Town's petitions opens the very largest inquiries. For example, it raises the question of the nature of Convocation-how far it is a true Provincial Council-how far it is part of Parliament-what constitutes suffraganship—what is the essence of the Province of Canterbury—what is the meaning in the case of Colonial Bishops, of the supremacy of Canterbury-what is a colony—what a plantation—what are the legal effects of certain letters patentwhat is the mutual force of the cannon and common law when they come into conflictwhat is the bearing of certain treatieswhat of certain acts of parliament? Yet these matters are only part of the difficulty involved in the claim of the colonial bishops. The form in which the claim came before convocation is remarkable. The Bishop of Cape Town petitions, not the Archbishop of Canterbury, but "the prelates and Clergy of the Convocation to be summoned," &c. The Archbishop, with the consent of the Bishops, refers the petition to the Vicar-General, Dr. Travers Twiss, who reports to the Archbishop solely his opinion against the Bishop of Cape Town's claim—where-upon the Archbishop decides accordingly. The proceeding we think as ill considered as it is harsh. The Archbishop was not petitioned, nor was he asked to decide. Neither did the Upper House commission their president to settle the appeal for them. Convocation was petitioned—Convocation remitted the petition—the Vicar-General's Report, therefore ought to have been made to Convocation or at least the Archbishop ought to have communicated that document, even if addressed solely to him, to his brethren, and to have asked their decision on it. The constitutional grievance is akin to the case of the Speaker disposing of a petition made to the House of Commons. The present Archbishop of Canterbury has made many false : steps but his vesterday's proceedings, both in this matter and in his decision on the consensus fratrum, are beyond even his Grace's wonted activity in committing himself.

As regards the claim of the colonial bishops, without expressing any opinion on the matter itself, we rejoice at all events, that it has been urged. Laying aside, for the present, Dr. Twiss's Report-which suntmarily speaking, only seems to show that Cape Town was not a see when the sittings of Convocation were regularly held—it is plain that the demand of the colonial prelates to sit in Convocation is founded only upon their estimate of that body as a Provincial council. If the colonial sees are subordinate to Canterbury only in such a sense that their prelates may not assist with the 'provincials in the spiritual concerns of the province, of course their suffraganship and obedience to the metrapolical see amount to nothing. If they are to have no voice in the synodical action of the province, they must organize and carry out the most independent exercise of spiritual authority for themselves. No step could be devised more certain to accelerate the entire independence of the colonial Churches-or, indeed, to force them into the position of foreign Churches-than to refuse to admit their bishops to the Convo-cation of Canterbury. Unfortunately the Archbishop has undertaken, on his own authority, to reject on the loftiest principles of Ultramontane and personal infallibility, the claim of the colonial prelates—a claim be it remembered, which was never legally referred to him—and also to settle the question of the consensus fratrum by blandly." yet blindly, ignoring the existence of any bishop but himself. His Grace has, we repeat, in his own person, sanctioned the worst and most extreme error of the Papacy—the dogma of a personal and irresponsible supremacy. It is for the Church of England to say whether she will acceptable the revival, in its most odious form, of the most intolerable abuse of the Papal system."

LITURGICAL REFORM, IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

ARTICLE III IN THE NORTH BRITISH REVIEW, August, 1852.

His remarks upon the priestly office and upon the Ordination Service manifest how these. deficiencies in faith, of which we are speaking, destroy the capability of receiving almost any doctrinal truth. He seems entirely ignorant of the distinction between personal sanctification and that grace of office mount of the provision from the clergy was about book, while the clergy reserves were disturbed. has not been advised to deny the position listers do not receive the Holy Spirit at ordi-