

earnest development of the church life, would be more likely than any one from among ourselves to lead us on to a similar state of things, and secondly, that being free from all trammels of old associations, or personal predilection, he would be more likely to act with impartiality, wisdom and vigour, than one who was hampered by mere local claims and feelings. To this we may add, that neither the country nor the people are marked by such peculiarities as to prevent a man of ordinary experience and discernment from speedily adapting himself to both. Experience shows the truth of this position. Bishops Wilson, of Calcutta, Selwyn, of New Zealand, and Grey, of Capetown, did not find their want of acquaintance with their respective dioceses lead them into any very serious error; and can we reasonably suppose that if one of the Indian Chaplains, or one of the old New Zealand or Cape Missionaries had been elevated to the episcopate because they happened to be better acquainted with their respective localities than these great men, we should have seen what we behold to-day—those dioceses in a few years grown into vast organized ecclesiastical provinces—would they have occupied as large a place in the heart of the church at home, or would they have received—what every new diocese requires—as large a measure of assistance from her? In the present state of things we look upon some want of intimate acquaintance, with both country and clergy, as hardly a disadvantage, but if it is so, we hold that the considerations adduced above are a full and sufficient answer.

Again, it will, of course, be said that such a course as the one which we advocate would be unfair and invidious towards the colonial clergy, and that the effect will be most disheartening and injurious, if those who bear the burden and heat of the day find strangers brought in to occupy all places of honor and emolument.

In the first place we are happy to be able to say, from our own knowledge, that many influential clergymen who have labored long in this diocese, are strongly in favor of the course indicated, and can see nothing invidious in it; and they, we take it, are tolerably competent judges on this question. We are happy to think that the great bulk of our brethren are more anxious for the welfare of the diocese as a whole, than for the advancement of their own personal views or individual interests, and that when it shall please God to call them to exercise the right of election, they will show that their sole anxiety is to secure the best possible incumbent for the vacant See.

It must also be borne in mind, that the chief end of the church is not to make men comfortable in their worldly circumstances. Because a clergyman has labored so long in her service, that perhaps his powers both of mind and body are beginning to fail, he is not for that reason to be placed in her highest office, the exercise of which demands the exercise of his very best faculties.

Length and faithfulness of service should unquestionably be considered, honored and rewarded, but not with such honors and rewards as shall prove a drag upon the vigorous action of the diocese. The interest of the individual must always yield to the general well-being of the body as a whole.

Finally, we wish to be very distinctly understood, that in advocating the step which we now do, we have no desire that in case of its adoption, it should therefore pass into a precedent, which on other occasions we shall be bound to follow—on the contrary, we are very decidedly opposed to any such idea, it is merely a plan which—regard it in what aspect we may—appears to our judgment immeasurably the best, in order to meet the prospective necessity which in the course of nature awaits us.

In connexion with this objection, of which we think that we have now disposed, it is frequently asked with somewhat of an air of unanswerableness: "What would be thought of the lawyers if they were to 'import' their judges, as you would

have us 'import' our bishops? would it not be a very humiliating confession of their own legal incapacity?"

In the first place, we reply on the authority of more than one legal gentleman, that the profession would be nothing the worse for adopting the very plan which is objected to. We have heard it said that one reason why the present very distinguished Chief Justice of the province is still burdened with work, when from his years, his honors, and his labors, he might well look for rest, is chiefly because the country affords few or none who are competent to succeed him. We next remark that if this be the case among the lawyers of the province who are so numerous, then *a fortiori*, it must be so among the clergy who are so few.

But beyond all this we hold that the cases are by no means analogous. Lawyers, bringing to the practice of their profession a fair amount of ability, attain eminence by the hard study of statutes, cases, rules and precedents which in their principle are everywhere the same, for the science of law is one which is eminently and characteristically logical and argumentative in its nature. It affords no place for the affections, and can attain its ends only by excluding the influence of mere feeling which generally tends to obscure the clearness of its cold and penetrating glance.

Theology on the contrary, can fulfil its holy objects only by touching the heart. It teaches men that their happiness depends upon the state of their affections, and unless it leads to feelings of humility and true devoutness it fails in the end which it is intended to subserve. The result of this distinguishing feature of theology is this, that there will inevitably be times and places when and where (in consequence of theologizing correctly) there will be greater earnestness and devotedness than can be found elsewhere—localities where the affections will be more fervently fixed upon their true objects, and the christian feelings be more vigorously carried out into their appropriate action; and this at once places theology in a very different category from that of law, which experiences no such alterations and affords scope for no such outgoings of the heart. Now if we desire this true revival to extend, it is evident that we should endeavour to get from the place where this revival of true christian earnestness is most vigorous, him who from his position as bishop should lead such movements in every diocese, and since there is urgent need that the renovated life which distinguishes the Church at home should be transplanted here, we hold that the argument which is brought against our plan from the appointment of colonial judges is, when rightly reflected upon, rather in our favour than otherwise.

Space compels us to defer till a future number the consideration of the remaining objections which may perhaps be brought against the project of which we are in favour.

CHURCH FOR THE DEAF AND DUMB.—A public Meeting, called by the Association in aid of the Deaf and Dumb, was held on the 12th ult., at Willis's Rooms, Lord Ebury in the chair. The Bishop of Oxford proposed the following Resolution:—"That in the opinion of this meeting the erection of a building for the Association in Aid of the Deaf and Dumb, containing a room for Divine services in the finger and sign languages, accommodation for a few aged mutes, a reading and lecture room, the offices of the Association, &c., is a very desirable object; and such an undertaking is cordially approved, and earnestly recommended to be carried out." The Rev. W. Cadman moved the second Resolution as follows:—"That this Meeting pledges itself to endeavour to raise the means for carrying out the aforesaid object, (about £3,000,) and that as the clergy cannot preach to the deaf and dumb themselves, they be requested to aid the Association in this important work by granting their churches for sermons in its behalf."

The London Diocesan Penitentiary celebrated its anniversary on Wednesday, at the Home of the Society at Highgate. Morning Service and the Holy Communion were celebrated in the Chapel at eleven o'clock, and a Sermon preached by the Incumbent of the parish, the Rev. O. B. Dalton, from the words—"This Man receiveth sinners and eateth with them." Among those present were the Marquis of Bristol, Lord Dufferin, Mr. Crawley, Dr. Irons, the Rev. Upton Richards, F. Garden (Sub-Dean of the Chapel Royal), John Lawrell, &c. The Bishop of London also took part in the proceedings in the latter part of the day.