

not competency to read the Church-services; hence the host of priestly shadows you meet with at every corner of the streets, devouring the morsel of bread and handful of onions they have just laid in at some neighbouring costermonger's. To this root of many evils, you may add, the entire dependence of the patriarch, the head of the Greek Church, upon the Porte. Mark the mode of his appointment. When the office is vacant, the principal merchants and others, who profess the Greek faith, unite into parties, and bid against one another for the price of the vacant chair; and the minister of the home department, albeit under cover of a mock election, awards it to the candidate of the party who are in a situation to pay him most for it. The dependence in which the head is kept, involves necessarily the dependence of the members. And the church in which the patriarch officiates boasts, to this day, possession of the chair in which St. Chrysostom sat!—*Church of England Magazine.*

ALWAYS, EVERYWHERE, AND BY EVERYBODY. Wise men who have thoughtfully considered of Vincentius his way though in general they cannot but approve of it so far as to think it highly improbable that there should be antiquity, universality, and consent against the true and genuine sense of Scripture, yet when they consider this way of Vincentius with all those cautions, restrictions and limitations set down by him (b. 1. c. 39), they are apt to think that he hath put men to a wild-goose-chase to find out anything according to his rules, and that St. Augustine spake a great deal more to the purpose when he spake concerning all the writers of the Church, "That although they had never so much learning and sanctity, he did not think it true because they thought so, but because they persuaded him to believe it true either from the authority of Scripture or some probable reason."—*Bishop Stillingfleet.*

The Berean.

QUEBEC, THURSDAY, JULY 23, 1846.

In the extract on our first page, from Dr. Tyng's speech, there is this passage, referring to the Bible: "It does not need a ministry to interpret it." We advert to it on purpose to state that we are aware these words might be taken out of their connection and made the subject of criticism, which would be utterly unjust towards the speaker. In premeditated composition, he would probably have expressed himself more guardedly. The results of Dr. Tyng's own labours as a Pastor are striking proofs of the honour which God is pleased to put upon a ministry which interprets Scripture so as to induce one after another to recognise his individual responsibility to interpret the Scripture for himself personally, and to apply its truths to his own individual conscience. The extract from Archbishop Usher's elaborate Body of Divinity will be read with advantage in conjunction with that from Dr. Tyng's extemporaneous address.

We are not a little pleased to find, from an extract in the *Episcopal Recorder* just received, that Bishop Lee of Delaware, in his Primary Charge to the Clergy of his Diocese, treating of the rule of Vincentius, quotes the very passage from Bishop Stillingfleet which we have just used against Dr. Jarvis's admiration of the rule. The Bishop of Delaware helps us to another quotation from no less an authority than Priest Newman, whom we suppose now admitted to the Romish sacrifices, because the mail just received enumerates him as the Rev. J. H. Newman, among those who assisted at a recent consecration of a R. C. Bishop. In his "Essay on Development" he says thus: "It does not seem possible, then, to avoid the conclusion that, whatever be the proper key for harmonizing the records and documents of the early and later Church, and true as the dictum of Vincentius must be considered in the abstract, and possible as its application might be in his own age, when he might almost ask the primitive centuries for their testimonies, it is hardly available now, or effective to any satisfactory result. The solution it offers is as difficult as the original problem."

BOARD OF MISSIONS OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES.—We signified, in our last, our intention to add some information upon the proceedings of this body, bearing upon *Foreign Missions*. The following is from the *Episcopal Recorder*.

"The missions to China and Africa, have the confidence of their friends, and no need has been felt for retrenchment of the expense which they involve, because of confidence in the principles and plans of those who administer their affairs, and satisfaction with the results, which they have been able to exhibit. Such has not, however, been the case with the mission to Constantinople; and the necessity of appropriating considerable sums of money to its support, from funds, either expressly or impliedly appropriated to other missions, has created extensive dissatisfaction in the Church.

"The Committee therefore entered into this subject in their Report, confessed their own want of confidence in the wisdom and utility of the plans of this Mission, declared their utter incompetency to meet the demands made upon the Treasury for its support, and asked special instruction from the Board, as to their further action in the matter. They proposed to have future appropriations confined to such funds, as were expressly contributed for its support. The Special Committee modified this proposition, and suggested that the reduction of the amount appropriated should be made 'as soon as practicable.' A motion was made to substitute for this indefinite term, 'the first of January next.' In b-half of this, Dr. Tyng spoke at length, to show the necessity and propriety of continuing the appropriations for this Mission, on the ground that it had been at first undertaken, on the ground of specific pledges, by certain persons or congregations, professing an interest in the object—and again, that it was continued by the Board, three years ago, in spite of a prevailing disposition to abandon it, at the earnest solicitation of the Bishops of New Jersey, Maryland and North Carolina, on the ground of their assurance that the funds requisite

for its support would be supplied by its own friends. He showed this by reference to the printed proceedings, and then contrasted with this, the almost entire want of contributions which the Report exhibited, and urged the absolute necessity of ceasing to interfere with funds contributed for other purposes, from the certainty, that if this were not done, these would be withheld altogether, and all the Foreign Missions of the Church be sunk, by this millstone around their neck.

"We believe that this proposition was in accordance with the general feeling of the Board, and would have been passed by a large majority, but for considerations suggested by the Rev. Dr. Whitehouse. He avowed himself to be dissatisfied both with the design and prosecution of this Mission, and desirous to abandon it; but he thought that the proper way to do it, was by action in the General Convention, and not the Board. He proposed for the present, to make known to the avowed friends of the Mission its wants, and appeal to them for aid, and then to bring before the next General Convention the question of its permanent prosecution. This plan was adopted, and we suppose it will amount to the same thing.

"It should have been mentioned, that the documents relative to the recent persecution at Constantinople, were laid before the Special Committee; but they had not time to investigate the matter, and scarcely thought it necessary for them to do so. We have no particular information on this painful subject, but in the absence of it, we cannot understand how a Protestant Bishop could be candid and consistent, and yet retain the favour of those who administer the authority of a Church, only less idolatrous and intolerant than the Romish Church itself."

The close of this paragraph probably furnishes a clue to the cause of that want of confidence in the Turkish mission which has given concern to the Board; and we must confess that, on account of intelligence which has been received from that mission, we derive a melancholy satisfaction from this want of confidence; it indicates a watchful state of the public mind, further evinced by the failure of those expectations which had been held out, of support to the mission from certain quarters on whose behalf the three Bishops referred to, thought they could venture an assurance. Bishops Doane, Whittingham, and Ives have been foremost in avowing their sympathy with the unprotestantizing movements of the day; the Turkish mission excites an interest among those so disposed, on account of the opportunity it affords of taking to their bosom the Episcopal Churches in the East, though deeply corrupt in doctrine and superstitious in practice, while orthodox Christian bodies are thrust out of the pale of the Church, because they reject Episcopacy. It is too good a thing to be able to exhibit, in the part taken by Bishop Southgate with the Patriarch of the Armenian Church in Turkey against the Presbyterian or Congregational Missionaries of the "American Board of Foreign Missions," how the Tractarian heresy counts it of greater value that Bishops should govern the Church, though they do it so as to keep her in superstition and ignorance, than that the Church should be taught by Non-Episcopalians to "read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest" holy Scripture. In the midst of all this, Tractarianism has no objection that the funds for the work should be furnished by people who are free from the taint of such sympathies; so that Tractarian funds may remain disposable for the restoration of romanizing architecture and such like matters, from which the Reformers thought they had set the Church of England free."

Missionaries of the "American Board of Foreign Missions" have been labouring for years in Turkey with a view to the diffusion of scriptural light among Mohammedans and among the decayed Christian Churches languishing there in a state of alienation from the life of God through ignorance of His holy Word. Some success has been met with, and it has stirred up the wrath of an ignorant and selfish hierarchy who foresee that their occupation will be gone, as soon as their people shall (as the Church of England prays they may) "through patience and comfort of the holy Scriptures embrace and ever hold fast the hope of eternal life." Excommunication has been pronounced against those who are found to profit by the instructions of these Missionaries; and among those corrupt Churches, under the despotic government of Turkey, excommunication is persecution. Bishop Southgate, who presides over the mission of the Prot. Ep. Church in Turkey, has volunteered his aid to justify the Armenian Patriarch's proceedings. If he has been so strangely misled as to imagine that he is doing service to the cause for which he has been sent forth, by endorsing the proceedings of the benighted Armenians Ecclesiastics against Missionaries who, however we may regret that they walk not with us, have still maintained a character for piety, integrity, and honest zeal for the diffusion of scriptural truth, it may be hoped that the proceedings at the late meeting of the Board of Missions will bring him to examine afresh the ground upon which he has ventured, and to return to that engagedness in efforts for the salvation of souls for which he had credit during his earlier missionary course, and by which alone he may revive the good-will of intelligent Churchmen towards his mission, and secure the means of carrying on a work towards the emancipation of the ancient Christian Churches in the East, from "ignorance, hardness of heart, and contempt of God's holy Word."

"We have, from former official connection with missionary bodies, somewhat minute knowledge of the spirit manifested, and the conduct pursued by Armenian Church-rulers towards Missionaries whose sole design was to revive the spirit of vital godliness among their people generally, and whose main effort, prudently and unobjectionably, was to promote scriptural knowledge and personal godliness among the Clergy—without the slightest attempt at interference with their ecclesiastical polity." And

"See 'The Mind of the Church' &c. on page 9 of this volume, an extract from the Homily against the evil of idolatry; and that Homily throughout."

We will go one step further than our valued contemporary in Philadelphia, and say that it requires something positive to assure the friends of missions that Bishop Southgate has not sacrificed the cause of evangelical truth to a determination to uphold the power of an unenlightened and intolerant hierarchy. It is with pain and grief, but with admiration of the sagacity displayed by the Bishop of Vermont, that we quote the warning words written by him, two years ago, on the consecration of the Missionary Bishop for Turkey: "I do not believe the apostles would have connived, or appeared to connive, at the corruptions of the Greek and other Oriental Churches, in the face of the people, under the vague and delusive hope of converting the priesthood, en masse, by friendly private conversations at some future day." Still less, certainly, would the apostles have taken the part of the corrupt Churches against the diffusion of evangelical light and freedom.

In conclusion, we have to say that we must not be understood as requiring that the Protestant Episcopal Mission should relinquish its advantage as sent forth by an episcopally constituted body in favour of the non-episcopal mission from the "American Board." We fear that unreasonable demands of this kind may have been made, and that collision between the two Protestant missions would not have been altogether prevented, though the Protestant Bishop had acted in a different manner from what he has done. It must be our wish that the Oriental Churches should maintain their episcopal constitution, but that they should bring it back to scriptural simplicity. The super-addition of patriarchates, bought and sold under the patronage of a Mohammedan government, is as far from the apostolical model as the relinquishment of the episcopal order altogether.

The troubles in the parish of Miramichi, New Brunswick, having been referred to in our last number, and the full statement of them in the *St. John's Courier* being now before us, we apply ourselves to the task of giving a succinct account of the circumstances, because they may lead to some reflections upon the question how the removal of such painful differences, if they do spring up—which in the first place ought to be avoided, if possible—might be attempted with the best prospect of success.

On the 20th of January, a Vestry meeting was held in St. Paul's Church, Chatham (Miramichi) at which the following resolution was duly moved and seconded: "That while we are firmly attached to the doctrine and discipline of the Church of which we are members, we gladly embrace the present opportunity of expressing our most unqualified disapprobation and rejection of the 'Tracts for the Times,' the object of which tracts has been to create discord and division, to revive exploded errors, and to introduce dangerous and unscriptural doctrine into the Church, and which have been justly censured and condemned by the majority of the venerable Bishops, both in the Mother Country and on the continent of America, and by the pious Laymen of the land."

An amendment, to the effect that the Vestry had nothing to do with that matter, because it does not refer to the temporal affairs of the Church, was negatived, and the original motion carried, the four gentlemen who had voted for the amendment protesting and then, together with the Rector, Rev. Samuel Bacon, who had so far filled the chair, withdrawing from the meeting.

By several subsequent resolutions, condemnation was pronounced against the Tracts for the Times and books of similar tendency, and the name of the Rev. James Hudson, a Missionary, was introduced as the party who had circulated such publications, and also had preached a very objectionable sermon on the 11th of January, which they requested the Lord Bishop of the Diocese to call for, and to take such steps in the matter as His Lordship may deem essential for the well-being of the Church, and the cause of truth."

These resolutions were transmitted to the Bishop by Henry Cunard, Esq., the Rector having declined to do so.

A reply was received from His Lordship, dated 12th February, stating that the matters which the Vestry had taken into consideration were wholly out of their province, exhorting them to good will and charity, and referring them to the time of the Bishop's intended visit in August, when he could speak with them on the subject.

On the 26th of February, a public meeting of members of the Church of England in the town of Chatham was held, at which, after a long preamble setting forth the proceedings which had been taken, it was resolved "that the course taken was adopted out of pure regard to the Clergyman's feelings, in not arraigning his acts before a public meeting, which becomes painful not only to the Clergyman but to the Laity; the necessity of a public meeting was then stated to have arisen out of the Bishop's decision—the meeting professed their firm attachment to the Church, referred to the harmony which had subsisted and the liberality manifested on her behalf—lamented the revival of errors in doctrine and practice, and specifically such as had proceeded from the acts and words of the Rev. James Hudson—proceedings to be communicated to the Bishop.

A severe expostulation from the Rector was read to the meeting, but did not stay proceedings; the Rector's name, indeed, was considerably kept altogether out of the record of what took place. An address to the Bishop was signed by a Committee of 4, with 89 others.

To this communication a reply was received dated 24th March; His Lordship wholly disapproved of the proceeding by public meeting, stated that dissenters had been present, entitled to vote—that 36 persons had withdrawn and sent in counter-resolutions—that the charges were vague—that nothing had been proved. One matter of complaint, indeed, was embodied in a distinct statement of the party concerned: Mr. Hudson had refused to bury the child of a parishioner which had been baptized, in time of threatening sickness, and in the Clergyman's absence, by a Presbyterian Minister. Mr. Hudson had been at the house before the child died, and had offered to baptize it again, which the father declined. On this subject, the Bishop writes: "Viewing it as a case of necessity, I think Mr. Hudson might, without scruple, have buried the child." His Lordship

"See the article 'The Greek Church at Constantinople' on our first page."

speaks highly of the Clergyman's personal character, and so closes his letter.

A public Meeting of those who signed the former address took place on the 14th of April, at which resolutions were passed, indicating the dissatisfaction of the meeting, requesting from His Lordship a copy of the adverse resolutions, the names of the 36 individuals, and all other information upon which his unfavourable reply was based; in order that His Lordship's mind might be disabused on the subject. Mr. Hudson's sermon of January 11th was on this occasion more especially brought to the Bishop's notice with a request "to furnish them with a true copy of the said sermon."

The transmission of the proceedings of this meeting drew from the Bishop a letter dated 30th April, in which, for all further information respecting the 36 and their resolutions, they were referred to a Mr. Wright, being one of that number. On application to this individual, nothing was obtained but a refusal to communicate anything. Another public meeting was then held on the 23rd of May, at which a Committee was appointed to prepare such answer to His Lordship's communication as the facts of the case demanded—and it was resolved that the whole of the proceedings be published in a variety of papers in the Provinces, at New York, and in the mother-country. The documents close with a long letter, addressed to the Bishop under date 23rd May, in which the signers lament the increase of their difficulties consequent upon the course adopted by His Lordship—entirely deny that any dissenters were present or voted on the occasion—assert their competency to judge whether the preaching which they hear be contrary to the Bible or not—signify to His Lordship that, from the distrust which Mr. Hudson has occasioned they could not be edified by his further services—enumerate several out of the number of objectionable books which had been circulated by that Clergyman (Grestley's Forest of Arden, Paget's Tales of the Village, Bellair's Tales of the Town, published by James Burns, Portman Square,)—and they wind up with a sentence in which they beg "to express their regret that such clergymen as Mr. Hudson are among them; and also to express an earnest hope, that should His Lordship's life be preserved to preside over this diocese for a length of time, His Lordship will look back with regret at having thrown in his influence against them in their endeavour to stop innovation and error in the Church." The communication is signed by the 2 Churchwardens, 9 vestrymen, and 80 others.

We have endeavoured to bring the essential features in this case into the space now occupied with it: the whole, in the closely printed pages of the *St. John's Courier*, fills nearly 6 columns. The persuasion forces itself upon us, from the undisputed fact of the Clergyman's refusal to bury the child of his parishioner, and other features in the case, that the people here just cause to suspect the soundness of his views on doctrine and discipline. A perplexing question, then, arises out of the position in which matters are left at the close of these documents: which is the proper course for the Laity to adopt, when they think they have to prefer complaints against a Clergyman? The Churchwardens and Vestry, it is plain, are by law confined to the temporal affairs of the Church only. If they meddle with circulation of books, and preaching of doctrine, they can get no answer. A public meeting leads to no better result. We are not prepared to say what would have been considered, in the Miramichi case, the legitimate course for the people to pursue. To the undesirability of popular movements of the kind, we are fully alive; the uncertainty whether in the deliberations of a multitude there will be found wisdom and calmness, and in their representations freedom from exaggeration, does not escape us; but when we see the two Churchwardens and a majority of the Vestry, after learning that in their official capacity they cannot be heard on such a subject, take the lead in making their representation along with the members of a general meeting of parishioners, it seems to us, we must confess, that they did the best they knew how to do, though they might have done better, if a more excellent way had been suggested.

The demand that the Bishop of the Diocese should furnish the parishioners with a copy of Mr. Hudson's sermon, is designated by His Lordship as "of an extraordinary nature" that he was compelled to decline it and to close the correspondence on the subject. We clearly think the demand, in the shape it was put, was inadmissible; and in the earlier proceedings, the application by resolution was, that the Bishop would call for the sermon, and take such steps in the matter as His Lordship might deem essential to the well-being of the Church, and the cause of truth." But it does not appear that the sermon was called for, nor any other measure adopted to try the merits of the question in consequence of the representations which had been made. His Lordship expresses his own conviction that "no man is more anxious to perform his duty, or more firmly attached to the Church of England," than the Clergyman complained of.

Of course we know nothing to the contrary, and what interests us in the matter is simply the rising conviction that it would be well if the Laity had a legitimate organ through which their representations on such subjects could quietly and respectfully reach the Bishop of the Diocese, and carry such weight as would bring on an investigation, and set the matter at rest. If the Laity are led to suspect that objection is found to every mode that they can devise to make grievances known, the consequence may reasonably be expected to be the rise of that "angry irritable temper for the holy offices and institutions," as the Archdeacon of Winchester (now Bishop of Oxford) called it in his charge—see *Berean* 9th January 1845—"than which none can be more fraught with danger to the truth of God amongst us, and to our common church. Let us beware, my reverend brethren, how we stir it up. Evil as it is in itself, and springing, in some instances at least, from unworthy motives, it is in others based upon the righteous resolution of resisting the return to ancient error, the loss of precious spiritual blessing, the darkening of the light of Christ, to set up in its stead the earthly firm of priestcraft and superstition; and, if this be its source, it is plain that it can be met successfully, not by violence and angry blame, not by an obstinate adherence to things in themselves utterly immaterial, but which are now most unhappily identified with real evils; but only by love and gentleness, by the union of undoubted faithfulness to Christ's pure word and doctrine, with a yielding gentleness towards opposers in all lesser matters."

BISHOPRIC OF JERUSALEM.—We find no express intelligence in the papers we have skimmed over since the arrival of the mail, on the subject of the Rev. Samuel Gohat's consecration to the Episcopate; but the Record of July 2nd contains an advertisement under the heading: "Departure of the Bishop of Jerusalem," which announces a Sermon to be preached at the Episcopal Jews' Chapel, on Sunday Evening, July 5th "by the Bishop of

Jerusalem, previously to his departure for Palestine." Our inference from this announcement is, that the consecration was to take place on the morning of that Sunday, and that Bishop Gohat would set out for his sphere of labour with very little delay.

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.—The grant of £150 (referred to in the *Berean* of the 9th inst.) was unanimously voted in a convocation held on the 18th ult., in favour of the library of Bishop's College, Lenoxxville.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—Received Cpt. F. and forwarded the papers as directed—J. O.—IV. D.;—J. R. S. L.;—Mrs. K.;—R. V. R.

PAYMENTS RECEIVED.—From His Exc. Governor Cunningham, No. 57 to 108; Captain Robertson, No. 105 to 156; Captain Fitzgerald, (2 copies) No. 105 to 156; Messrs. Wm. Nixon, No. 53 to 156; J. Burr & Co. No. 57 to 160; Dr. Scott, No. 57 to 160; Rev. Wm. Fox, Demra, No. 110 to 213; Messrs. Matthew Steele, No. 110 to 161; A. Cole, No. 110 to 161; Sergt. Hutchison, No. 91 to 117; Messrs P. McQuilkin, No. 105 to 156; Jas. Downes, No. 105 to 117; Jas. Downes, jr. No. 105 to 156; Chas. W. Wilson, 121 to 146; John Auld, No. 79 to 130; J. C. Overall, 105 to 156; R. Peniston, No. 105 to 156; H. W. Gibsons, No. 105 to 156; Wm. Penny, No. 105 to 156; W. White, No. 101 to 153; L. T. McPherson, No. 53 to 104; David D. Young, No. 105 to 156; Wm. Henry, No. 53 to 104; Jas. Anderson, No. 53 to 104; Mrs. Stott, No. 105 to 156.

POST OFFICE NOTICE.

In consequence of the change made this Summer in the despatch of the Lake Champlain Steamer from St. John's three hours later than heretofore, thereby reducing the Contract time with the American Government for conveying the Mail to Boston,—His Lordship the Post Master General has deemed it expedient to order that the Bags should be despatched from Montreal one day earlier than has been usual during the Summer Service.

Local and Political Intelligence.

EUROPEAN NEWS.—The 4th of July mail from England, by the steamship *Cambria*, reached town on Tuesday morning, furnishing us with accounts 15 days later. The most important news is the final passing of the Corn bill, and the retirement of Sir Robert Peel from office. On Thursday the 25th of June, the Corn bill passed its third reading in the House of Lords without a division; and at 2 o'clock on the following morning, Sir R. Peel and his cabinet were defeated in the House of Commons on the Irish Coercion bill, by a vote of 292 against 219; leaving the Government in a minority of 73. On the following day, Sir R. Peel proceeded to the Isle of Wight for the purpose of tendering the resignations of his colleagues and himself, which were accepted. Lord John Russell was then empowered by Her Majesty to form a cabinet, a list of which follows.

THE CABINET.

Lord Chancellor, Lord Cottenham.
President of the Council, Marquis of Lansdowne.
Lord Privy Seal, Earl of Minto.
Secretary for the Home Department, Sir George Grey.
Secretary for the Foreign Department, Viscount Palmerston.
Secretary for the Colonies, Earl Grey.
First Lord of the Treasury, Lord John Russell.
Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Charles Wood.
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Lord Campbell.
Paymaster-General, Marquis of Clanricarde.
Board of Trade, Earl of Clarendon.
Board of Control, Sir John Lubbock.
Chief Secretary for Ireland, Mr. Labouchere.
Admiralty, Earl of Auckland.

NOT OF THE CABINET.

Master of the Mint, Right Hon. R. S. Shiel.
Secretary-at-War, Hon. Fox Maule.
Attorney-General, Sir Thos. Wilde.
Lord Advocate, Mr. A. Rutherford.
Solicitor-General for Scotland, Mr. T. Maitland.
Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Earl of Beshborough.
Commander-in-Chief, Duke of Wellington.
Master-General of the Ordnance, Marquis of Anglesey.

This event is not altogether unexpected; as it has been for some time confidently predicted that Ministers would be defeated by a combination of the protectionists with the Whigs and Irish members, when the Coercion bill came before the House. The sensation, therefore, was not so great as is usual on the entire change of the rulers of a great country; and the securities, which are a sure test of public feeling, did not fluctuate much. On Monday, Sir R. Peel addressed the House of Commons in a long and very able speech, explaining the reasons for his resignation and retirement from official life. He stated it as his opinion that the new ministry would continue to cherish the principles of free commercial intercourse; in which case he would feel bound to give them his cordial support. He alluded to the important reductions in taxation which had been effected during his administration without decreasing the revenue of the country; to the successful manner in which the honour of the British arms had been upheld in India and elsewhere; to the earnest desire of himself and his colleagues to maintain the nation's rights without a resort to warlike measures, which have just been so successful in effecting a peaceful settlement of the Oregon question; and concluded with the following allusion to his own position and feelings: "Sir, I now close the address which it has been my duty to make to the House, thanking them sincerely for the favour with which they have listened to me in performing this last act of my official career. Within a few hours, probably, that power which I have held for the period of five years will be surrendered into the hands of another—without repining—I can say without complaint—with a more lively recollection of the support and confidence I have received than of the opposition which during a recent period I met with. (Cheers.) I shall leave office, I fear, with a name severely censured by many hon. gentlemen, who, on public principle, deeply regret that severance, not from any interested or personal motives, but because they believe fidelity to party engagements,—the existence and maintenance of a great party,—to constitute a powerful instrument of government; I shall surrender power severely censured; I fear again, by many hon. gentlemen, who, from no interested motive, have adhered to the principle of protection as important to the welfare and interest of the country; I shall leave a name execrated by every monopolist (loud cheering from the Opposition), who, from less honourable motives, maintains protection for his own individual benefit (continued cheering); but it may be that I shall leave a name sometimes remem-