

good—it has proved that clergymen in their own parishes are entirely free from the operation of the law; and as for the meetings of religious societies, I cannot believe that any one could in earnest believe that they were affected by it. The best authorities have now declared that, to avail yourself of the provisions of the act, and certify your house for a religious service, is nowise stamps any one as a Dissenter; and, indeed, it is hard to understand how such a conclusion could be founded on an act to regulate the religious worship of Protestants. I really think, therefore, that it would save much heart-burning and promote the cause which we all unite in wishing to promote, if the measures were not persisted in, and matters were allowed to remain in the state in which they were before the introduction of this bill.

The Bishop of London denied that he was hostile to the London City Mission; such a charge was entirely without foundation. He had certainly declined to belong to the London City Mission, because he disapproved of its constitution, and because he thought it improper for any association to send religious teachers into a parish, not only without the consent of the incumbent of the parish, but in some cases against his will. In several instances he believed that the working of the association had been favourable to dissent and against the Established Church, and therefore he thought himself fully justified in not belonging to it. At the same time he was not at all opposed to lay agency, and he did not care what missionaries were employed, provided only that they co-operated with the clergymen of the parish and were Churchmen. It was quite true that two or three years ago several cases occurred, in which he had thought it his duty to sign fault with the London City Missionaries, because that he considered that their proceedings were favourable to Dissent and opposed to the interests of the Church of England. To prove, however, that he was not opposed to lay agency, he might state that he had been one of the first to assist in the formation of the Scripture-reading Society, which employed lay agents to explain the Word of God in the cottages of the poor, but which only sent Scripture readers into those parishes in which the incumbents assented to their introduction. The discipline of the Church of England was clear on this subject. If any member of the Church thought himself called upon to exert himself and employ his talents and his time in making known the great truths of Christianity to those now ignorant of them, it was his duty to do so according to the rules of the Church to which he belonged, and with a due regard to its safety. If there was in this diocese a want of adequate ministration, this was no reason why they should introduce laymen to undertake that ministration in a manner hostile to the parochial system. It formed a very good reason why they should build more churches and extend the parochial system, but no reason at all why they should allow a body of persons to exercise functions which the Church of England had committed to others, and which, if otherwise exercised, would lead to great confusion. The whole question before their lordships was, whether they would sanction public ministrations by lay members of the Church of England so long as they professed to belong to the Establishment, and whether they would allow these persons to take upon themselves the office of Church minister? No one proposed to interfere in the slightest degree with Nonconformists, or with their freedom of public worship; and if the bill, to adopt the phrase of the noble earl, "ignored" them, it was because those persons did not wish to be interfered with. But what the opponents of the bill objected to was, he repeated, that lay members of the Church of England should take upon themselves the office and functions of the clergy, and should do that which the Church confided to others. They made this objection because they deprecated the evil of setting up in each parish a rival Church under the sanction of the Church's name, but without her authority. It had been stated in a newspaper that the right rev. friend had declared that a meeting had been held, at which the Bishops were unanimous in their determination to resist this measure. Now, the Bishop of Oxford stated no such thing: he only said that all the Bishops present at a certain meeting, called for quite another purpose, were of the same opinion with respect to the bill; and the statement in the newspaper in question, that the meeting must have been one of a few selected prelates was altogether without foundation.

Lord Brougham differed from both parties. He thought that if the acts were obsolete that was argument sufficient for their being repealed. He was one of those who thought that this general privilege should

be given to Churchmen—they should be allowed to open a chapel—to worship in private houses or in a public building without any restraint being imposed upon them. He considered that it was absolutely essential to the well-governed of the Church and to its continued usefulness, that there should be larger powers and more efficient means of enforcing discipline among its members; but, at the same time, he saw no reason for refusing the claim of Churchmen to be put on the same footing with Dissenting bodies.

The Earl of Derby, after complaining of the misrepresentations of the noble lord who had followed him in the debate, said that after the discussion that had taken place, and the statement of the right rev. prelate, who thought it would be more advantageous to the cause of religion that neither of these measures should become law, and looking also to the very advanced period of the session, he [Lord Derby] believed that he should be acting more wisely and more in accordance with the interests both of the Church and the Dissenters, and with the convenience of their lordships, if he abstained at present from pressing this measure any further.

The Earl of Shaftesbury regretted if he had said anything unjust or given offence, but thought he had as much right as any one to complain of misrepresentation.

The Bishop of Oxford deeply regretted the tone which the noble earl who had just sat down had adopted. That noble earl could not be a stranger to the great Christian obligation of speaking on such a subject in the way least likely to excite any angry feeling against those who, whether they were right or wrong, were endeavouring to do their duty to the Church of which they were ministers. The most rev. prelate had already pointed out that one reason why the Episcopal bench opposed the bill of the noble earl was because they could not assent to it without violating their consciences and sanctioning what involved a violation of one of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church. He deeply lamented the tone which the noble earl had used. Thereiterated insinuations which he made all through his speech of base motives on the part of those who opposed his own views were most unworthy of the noble earl. The attempts, too, which he had made to excite a jealousy of the Episcopal bench in the minds of the Dissenters was as adverse as possibly could be to that spirit of the Gospel in which this bill was so ostentatiously introduced. The grounds upon which the Episcopal bench had opposed the noble lord's bill had nothing whatever to do with the Dissenters. Their opposition rested on this—that, while a particular mode of ministering God's Word was laid down by the Articles of the Church, and while the direct spiritual action of the Church was tied down and fettered by the law, the noble earl's bill called on them to alter the state of the law with regard to the Church, without conferring on her power to enforce her discipline in a different way. He could not understand by what perversion of ingenuity the noble earl had discovered anything in this bill [the Earl of Derby's bill] which was to give greater power to the Bishops over the clergy than they at present possessed. The licensed clergy were not at all affected by the bill, and, as the power of the Bishops over the unlicensed clergy was at present absolute, it could not receive any addition from this bill. What the bill really proposed to do was to enable the Church to take advantage of the zeal of her laymen, to give a legal status and sanction to those of the laity who undertook to labour in conjunction with the clergy. It was the misfortune of the Church of England that she was tied down in her attempts to do good by statutes such as this which it was now sought to amend: but it was not simply by repealing these last sorts of restriction that the good which the noble earl sought could be effected. Power ought to be given at the same time to the Church to do what was necessary in a legitimate way—she ought to be enabled to recognise the labours of her laity. That was what he wanted, and, if the noble earl had introduced any provision into his bill for enabling the Church to meet the altered circumstances of the times, he should gladly have supported it. If this matter should be brought forward again, he trusted it would be discussed without any insinuations or attacks on individuals who were only doing their duty to their God, their country, and their Church, for words uttered in that house were taken up by unscrupulous partisans out of it, and a right rev. prelate had informed him of some misrepresentation having appeared in the *Record*, the editor of which declined to put in a contradiction. When the noble earl became aware that this was the kind of treatment which the Bishops

on these benches were receiving, he ought, when he came forward in the name of a Christian Church and of a work of charity, to keep his tongue free from uncharitable imputations, which others would be too ready to adopt.

The Bishop of London admitted that it was perfectly true that when the London Mission Society was first established he objected to the principle of abstracting men on parishes without the consent of the incumbents, but, having since learned that the members of that society had acquired the favorable opinion of many clergymen, he had abstained from any expression of hostility towards them.

The Earl of Granville—My own opinion is strongly this, that while that bill professes to deal with the proviso intended to impose political and not religious restrictions on Dissenters, it imposes religious restrictions on Dissenters directly, and also indirectly, and by a side wind restrictions on the religious liberty of the members of the Church of England. I think, too, that any person will see, on reflection, that the bill does not in the slightest degree remove the evil of which complaint is made; while, by re-enacting a portion of the enactments of the law described by some of the right rev. prelates as useful, because it is not quite obsolete, it gives very great life and vigour to those remaining enactments.

The bill was then withdrawn.

From the "Cape Breton News."

THE BISHOP'S VISIT TO COX-HEATH, AND THE NORTH WEST ARM.

Among the other portions of the parish of St. George's, Cape Breton, which have recently enjoyed the benefits of a visit from the Chief Pastor of the Church in this Diocese,—are the above two places,—which are under the immediate charge of the Rector. An account has already appeared in this paper, of the Bishop's ministrations in Sydney: and perhaps some who were not present would like to hear a short account of the services performed at these two stations.

No confirmation was held at Coxheath, as its short distance from Sydney enabled the candidates to come in and receive that holy rite at the parish church. Six young persons accordingly attended from this settlement. But Sunday the 22nd, being the regular day for the usual afternoon service there, his Lordship kindly drove out at 3 o'clock, accompanied by the Rector. Hitherto the services here had been performed in the school-house of that settlement, a very neat building, but far too small for the congregation; but the exterior of the new chapel which has lately been building there, was now sufficiently advanced to enable us to occupy it for Divine service. The whole building was boarded in and the roof shingled; and a temporary platform with desks were laid. By a praiseworthy effort on the part of the people,—the work was thus far advanced, and it afforded a pleasant change, during such warm weather, from the usual crowded school-house. The Rector read prayers, and the Bishop before commencing his sermon addressed the congregation upon the subject of their present work; and advised them not to rest satisfied with the present imperfect state of their chapel, but go on until the whole should be properly finished for Divine Worship. The grant which had been made by the society for promoting Christian Knowledge,—to assist them in the work,—he told them was an unusual favor,—considering their short distance from the parish church,—and ought therefore to stimulate them to complete it thoroughly. He preached from Ephesians vi. 11th, an eloquent sermon, earnestly inculcating the putting on of the whole armour of God, and contending against the evil of the world. We hope by his Lordship's next visit to have the little church well finished in Gothic style, originally intended, and more worthy than it is at present of such impressive and solemn services. We returned in good time for service at St. George's, Sydney, at 7 o'clock,—where another beautiful sermon was preached by the bishop from the 19th. and 4 following verses of Romans—chap. VIII.

On Sunday the 29th, having officiated in the morning at Trinity Church, Sydney Mines,—which by the by is undergoing complete repairs, and when finished will be a good specimen of a gothic Church,—his Lordship crossed the North West Arm in a boat, accompanied by the Reverend Robert Arnold, and reached the little chapel of St. John's, in that settlement, about 4 o'clock,—in good time for the appointed service and confirmation. A large number of people had previously assembled, together with the Rector and several of the congregation of St. George's. The chapel, however, although crowded, was only sufficient for a portion