

"But the bill does not stop short with diocesan assemblies. It likewise recognises that more complex, but very necessary, element in ecclesiastical polity—the province. The eighteenth section provides that 'provincial assemblies may be held'—we quote the title of the clause in all its monumental brevity. The text itself declares that, for securing uniformity, 'it shall be lawful for the archbishop or metropolitan for the time being, lawfully constituted, in any of the possessions in which this Act shall be in force, to convene the bishops of such province—these bishops having respectively to convene their several diocesan assemblies, or the representatives of them, at the place indicated by the archbishop or metropolitan. The whole are to form a provincial assembly, in which the bishops are to sit and vote as one house, and the clergy and laity as another; and the divisions are to be taken by orders and by dioceses, so that nothing can pass which has not in its favour a majority both of the clergy and of the laity of every diocese taken separately. The regulations of this provincial assembly are to be subject to the same allowance or disallowance as those of diocesan assemblies.'"—*Ch. & St. Gaz.*

**THE CHURCH IN THE COLONIES.**—A bill prepared by the bishops for giving liberty of Synodical action to the Colonial Churches has been introduced into the House of Lords and carried through all its stages without a division, Lord Montague opposing capiously, and Lords Derby and Harrowby suggesting objections in detail. It was launched by the Primate, that consistent enemy to synodical action at home; the Bishops of London and Oxford promoted its progress, to which the Duke of Newcastle lent vigorous and useful aid. It appears to have been framed with care, and minutely revised before it received the approval of the government. Necessarily vague in its terms, yet anxiously limited in its practical scope, it is of course assailable from every opposite quarter, and we must be prepared to see it exposed to some unfair criticism and some wilful misconception. Take, for instance, the subject selected by the two objecting Peers, of clerical discipline. The Bishop's power is at present absolute.—Lord Derby insists that it should remain so, unless it is transferred to some Court capable of proceeding in legal form and taking evidence on oath.

**COLONIAL CHURCH BILL.**—The Colonial Church Bill is one that in its provisions can hardly be found fault with, or warrantably be objected to. The Government and the bishops, with a respectable admixture of laymen of eminence and wisdom, seem certainly to have done their best, in giving liberty to the Colonial Church, to guard against all evil consequences to the Church generally, whether as regards its discipline or its doctrine. Much has been done in this way; and yet, perhaps, much more might have been effected. But the Colonial Church is in an exceptional position, and requires (as we readily admit) many concessions which are not needed by the Church at home. It is instructive, however, to see that what is allowed to the Colonial Church on the ground of her distance from the mother country, and on that of both her position and composition, is being made use of by the extreme Tractarian party in the Church in England, as opportunity for demanding, nay, exacting, the same concessions here—concessions which would be used as to ultimately separate the Church from the State, and create an *imperium in imperio*. How far is it wise for the State to yield, and how much the Church is authorized to ask and is warranted in endeavouring to obtain, will be seen in the lucid archidiaconal charge which graces our opening pages. The question has seldom been so clearly expounded as our readers will find it in the columns to which we now venture to direct their notice.

Although we contemplate this Bill with moderate and qualified approval, we feel bound to state that Sir James Stephen has, in a long letter addressed to the Earl of Harrowby, expressed his strong dissent from the principle of the bill. He deprecates its enactment on the ground that it violates the sacred colonial franchise of self-government; that it involves a breach of faith with our Colonial Legislatures generally, but most especially with our Canadian and Australian settlements. Sir James avers that the bill will involve us in hopeless and bitter contests with the colonists, and will excite a feeling of hostility against the Church in the minds of those beyond her pale, as well as schism among the members within. The learned professor advocates delay in order to give the colonies time to make their protest, and the home legislature extended opportunity for weighing objections. Referring to the question of synods, Sir James says:—

"The conditions, subject to which the contemplated synods are authorized to make 'regulations,' are borrowed, not only in their structure and design, but in their whole technical phraseology, from those royal charters, commissions, and instructions, by which the Crown has in all former times defined and restrained the legislative authority of the various colonial assemblies. It follows, therefore, that if those instruments were sufficient to call into existence now law-making powers, this bill must also be sufficient for the same purpose. It is in these respects a mere echo of them. And lawyers in the colonies are so conversant with these instruments that this fact will be as perceptible to them as it is to me, and they will of course infer from this remarkable identity of language a corresponding identity of design."

"It is, however, maintained that, except by the intervention of Parliament, the colonial Church cannot be relieved from the disabilities under which it labours, nor invested with the powers of which it stands in need. I must avow my dissent from this opinion also. I hold that all our colonial legislatures are already competent to adapt the ecclesiastical law to their respective local exigencies. In proof of that conclusion I refer to the statute books of the West India Colonies, in which will be found a long series of enactments of that nature, commencing with the year 1825, and continued to the present time. But if we adopt the contrary opinion, and hold that the requisite power is not inherent in the legislatures of the different colonies, what is the legitimate inference? Not, surely, that Parliament should assume to itself the exercise of that power, but that Parliament should confer it upon them."

"It is answered—or rather, if we, ventured to avow the truth, it would be answered—that if such a power were so conferred, the Colonial Legislatures would refuse to exercise it. The authors of this bill are well aware that the Legislature of Van Diemen's Land has unequivocally shown that such would be their decision; and they very reasonably anticipate the imitation of that example elsewhere. The bill is, in fact, an attempt to accomplish by an external authority a measure to which it is known or believed that the internal authorities are irreconcilably hostile."

"The Colonists will resent it as a breach of our recent and solemn pledges not to interfere in their local affairs. They will resent it as an interference in those very local affairs to which they attach the highest importance. They will resent it as a disingenuous attempt to undermine, under the shelter of evasive language an all-important colonial franchise of self-government which no man is so rash and foolish as to assail in direct and open terms."

As an illustration of the defects of the bill, the learned civilian states as follows:—

"Suppose—and it is no very improbable supposition—that any of these synods should, by a 'regulation,' interpret the Liturgy or Articles of our Church in some manner contrary to sound Anglican doctrine; and suppose that, in reliance on any such 'regulation,' the bishop of the diocese should dispossess of their spiritual offices any dissentient clergymen, what is to be the remedy? The injured clergymen would have no local spiritual courts to determine whether the synod had acted *ultra vires*, or to say, as in the Gorham case, that the bishops had mistaken the law. They must appeal to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and through him, to the Queen in Council, a remedy utterly worthless to such appellants, not only on account of the expense and the delay, but because this bill (see the fifteenth clause), would render the sentence of deprivation valid, even though the 'regulation' on which it had been founded should be disallowed by her Majesty."

If Sir James be thought to have a little overstated his case, it cannot be denied that he has advanced much that is worthy of very serious consideration.—*Church and State Gazette.*

#### NEW BRUNSWICK.

**THE CIRCUMCISE.**—On Sunday morning the 31st ult., the Lord Bishop of the Diocese administered, in the Parish Church of Petersville, the solemn rite of Confirmation to thirty-five young persons, whom he afterwards addressed at length, in language peculiarly suited to a rural Congregation, on the necessity and profitability of personal and practical holiness, urging forcibly the duty of reverential behaviour in the House of God, as one of its important and outward manifestations. The sacred edifice was filled to its utmost capacity, and many scores of persons failed in obtaining seats. The Bishop preached in the afternoon in the new and beautiful Church, now in course of completion in the Douglas Valley. The sermon, which was founded on the words of St. John's Gospel, xi. ii. "Our friend Lazarus sleepeth," &c., was listened to with the deepest attention, and a wish was expressed at the close of its delivery that his Lordship would consent to publish his admirable discourse. The congregation was very crowded, and included persons from a distance of more than twenty miles. The Churchmen of the Parish were much delighted with their Bishop's visit, and would be glad to see it early repeated.—*Chronicle.*

**BELLS.**—Eight Bells, with necessary fixings, have been imported in the packet ship *Liberia*, from Liverpool. They are intended for the cathedral at Fredericton, and are valued at £580 sterling.

#### Editorial Miscellany.

##### ITEMS.

☞ The Cathedral at Fredericton is to be consecrated on Wednesday next, 31st inst. In a P.S. to the Bishop's circular to his clergy, it is stated that there is a considerable debt upon the Building, for which he is personally liable, and to liquidate which his Lordship invites contributions from each Parish of the Diocese.

☞ We perceive that the Canadian Ecclesiastical Gazette is to be discontinued after 1st of October, in consequence of the large amount of unpaid subscriptions. The Editor of the Port Hope *Echo*, hopes that his delinquent subscribers will take a hint from this example of mischief caused by such backwardness.

We would re-echo the same.

The corner stone of the first Protestant church in New Mexico, was laid at Santa Fe, on the 21st May, with addresses in English and Spanish.

A RELIC.—A spoon about the size of a rather small table spoon, was lately dug up with some other articles, near the head of a cove at New London, from a depth of fifteen feet; the original beach having been covered to that depth by successive washings from the surrounding hills. A New London paper says it is supposed that they were left there by the crew of a ship of some of the "Northmen" who visited and described the shores of Long Island Sound eight hundred or a thousand years ago. The spoon, has been sent to the Connecticut Antiquarian Society, and they have pronounced it of Danish manufacture, a composition of bell metal and gold. A heart and an arrow head that are on it are very perfect; there are also three other figures that are scarcely distinguishable.—*Churchman.*

A small coffin, containing the body of an infant, was found in the woods near the North West Arm on Sunday, by two boys. With praiseworthy presence of mind, they brought it into the city, and took it to the Poores' Asylum, where a Coroner's Inquest was held upon the case on Monday—verdict "found dead."—The jurors expressed their just abhorrence at so culpable a deed, as that of exposing the body in such a manner.—*B. N. Am.*

The Hon. Mr. Lafontaine has been sworn in Chief Justice of Canada, in the place of the late Sir James Stewart.—*Ibid.*

By advertisement in city papers it appears that a large fortune has been bequeathed to the Church family in Nova Scotia, by a relative in Wales. Said family and relatives are called upon to meet at Ross's Hotel, Newport, on the 6th Sept., for the purpose of investigating the subject. We hope the good news will prove true.—*Ibid.* (Will the whole Church family get a share?—Ed. C. T.)

**IMPORTANT FROM EUROPE.**—By *Telegraph*.—*New York, Tuesday, Aug. 23.*—Steamship *Arabia* arrived. Flour declined six pence per bbl. Wheat declined two pence. Corn market unchanged—moderate business at previous rates. Sugar Market firm, upward tendency. Molasses, prices stiffer, quotations not altered. Lard, prices a shade higher. Cotton, purchasers demand a concession, which is not conceded by holders. Sale of 40,000 bales. Consols advanced  $\frac{1}{2}$  per cent.

London *Morning Post* says the Russian difficulties are settled. In France the weather has been unfavorable for Agricultural purposes, the crops are anticipated to be less than an average.

**DISTRESSING SITUATION.**—Captain Young, and the only known survivors, ten in number, of the ill-fated barque *Argyle*, from Bristol for Quebec, laden with iron, which foundered at sea, arrived at Quebec on the 5th inst. The account given of their sufferings is dreadful. It appears that they were nine days in one of the ship's boats, drifting about on the ocean, and that six of those days were passed without food or water, during which time seven of the men in the boat died of hunger and exhaustion. Of the survivors, two are females, one of whom is an old lady, turned, we should say, of fifty, who, to add to her sufferings, was doomed to see her son, a fine strong young man of twenty-three years old, die of hunger by her side. The other female is a young woman; and strange to say both these females were exposed to the same privations that the men were, and yet lived through them, and saw six strong men die under them. There were twenty-five persons on board the *Argyle*, including three passengers, viz:—the young lady, the old woman, and her son, and 22 of a crew—all of whom betook themselves to two of the ship's boats; one of which has not since been heard of, and it is feared that but nine of the twenty-five have been left to tell the sad tale.—*Ibid.*