

thanks for the care with which they have considered the various important questions referred to them."

Since the Bishops have declared that these reports contain the results of the deliberations of the committee, it was most incorrect to argue as was done at our Synod in support of these reports, that they came to us supported by the authority of *all* the Bishops assembled at Lambeth, and therefore that those who opposed the adoption of these reports, were opposing the sentiments of all the Lambeth Bishops.

I object to a Court of Appeal sanctioned by these reports, and to promise only to submit to such, because in these courts there is no recognition of the Royal Supremacy so plainly declared in the Articles of our Church—no recognition of the decisions of the Privy Council, the highest court of our Church—no Presbyters or Laymen, learned in the law, are to sit as judges with the Bishops.

It is the doctrine of the Church of Rome, as stated by some of her Bishops in Ireland in their letter to her Majesty's government, that Bishops alone have the right to decide on doctrine; but where is the authority from English Law, or the Bible, or the Book of Common Prayer, for claiming such a right as to be sole judges of doctrine for the Bishops of the Reformed and Protestant Church of England? No one can say that a Court of Appeal, constituted as these reports propose, might not condemn for heresy a clergyman holding the doctrines of our Church, because he differed from the interpretation put on these doctrines by the Bishops who judged him.

In conclusion, I feel it my duty to deny that our deliberations on these and other subjects of importance were characterised by a spirit of harmony. There was, indeed, fair and free discussion; and we, I trust, can agree to differ. I hope that changes sanctioned by these reports, but opposed to the principles of liberty, to our rights as citizens in a free country, and to the principles of the Church of England, will, as their real nature and tendency is exposed, encounter an opposition which, by God's blessing, will ensure their ultimate rejection by the Synod.

I am, yours faithfully,

F. H. ALMON.

The Month.

GREAT BRITAIN.—The successor to Bishop Sawyer, Bishop of Grafton and Armidale, whose melancholy death by drowning we lately recorded, will be the Rev. J. F. Turner, Vicar of North Tidworth, Wilts. The Bishop designate, who is a son of the late Lord Judge Turner, graduated at University College, Durham, in 1851. The diocese was formed out of the see of Newcastle about two years ago, the endowment being principally provided by an Australian Cabinet.

We understand that the Very Rev. Henry Douglas, Dean of Capetown, has accepted the Bishopric of Bombay, *vice* Dr. Harding, resigned, and that the Rev. S. Galloway Cordan, incumbent of St. John's, Hammersmith, will most probably become Dean Douglas' successor.

We have to record the death of the Bishop of Peterborough, after an Episcopate of hardly four years. He was educated at Pembroke College, Oxford, where he took his B.A. degree in 1820, being first-class in classics. In 1834 he was appointed to the head mastership of King Edward, the Sixth Grammar School at Birmingham, and this post he resigned in 1848, on being appointed to the Deanery of Jersey. In 1843 he was elected master of Pembroke College, Oxford, in which capacity he took high Evangelical ground, and was the determined opponent of Dr. Pusey and the conductors of the "Tracts for the Times." He was subsequently Vice-Chancellor of the University of Oxford, and was nominated by Lord Palmerston to the Deanery of Lincoln in 1864, and in the same year, by the same Minister, to the Bishopric of Peterborough. The late Bishop was of Liberal principles.