

decided against the validity of letters patent to Colonial Bishops, it was the opinion of the Government that no such letters ought to be issued to the Colonies having independent legislatures. As the See of Rupert's Land was vacant, and delay in filling it was not desirable, the course pursued, under the advice of the law officers of the Crown was, that a letter had been addressed by the Archbishop to him (Mr. Cardwell) and in consequence of that letter her Majesty had been pleased to issue a mandate to the Archbishop authorising him to consecrate a Bishop, and no letters patent would be issued purporting to convey jurisdiction conferred by the Crown.

There are two Bills, now on their way through Parliament, which excite a good deal of attention. The one is to relieve Roman Catholic members of Parliament from taking an oath not to endeavour the subversion of the Church, the other is to admit Dissenters of all kinds to a share in the government of the University of Oxford by an abolition of tests. The former has passed the Lower House, the latter has passed its second reading by a vote of 206 to 109.

Although these Bills have something in common, both advancing in the direction of religious equality, they are not so much alike that the opponents of the one need necessarily object to the other. It certainly does not seem very hard that Roman Catholics, when admitted to a seat in Parliament, should be required to promise not to injure the established religion, though we can easily understand their feeling it to be unfair, that it should be considered necessary to bind them alone, among the Nonconformists, by such an oath. Much stronger objections may be raised against the other Bill. Mr. Goschen, who moved its second reading, told the House that it would be better to copy the German Universities; that our Universities and Colleges had no special connexion with the Church; that they were national institutions not connected with any particular form of religion. It is a matter of regret that a majority of the House of Commons should sanction such views, and a matter of congratulation that the Bill will probably get its *quictus* from the Lords. We may also hope that the new House of Commons may have higher views on the subject of religious education, as well as other Church questions.

Dr. Manning, successor to Cardinal Wiseman, titular Archbishop of Westminster, has lately been consecrated with great ceremony at Moorfields Chapel. He has issued a pastoral to the clergy and laity of what he calls his Diocese of Westminster, which cannot but be read with interest. Coming from the pen of Dr. Manning it must be forcible and eloquent, and, though his weapons are used against ourselves, we cannot help admiring the skill with which they are wielded, nor perhaps refrain from thinking with some degree of satisfaction that he learned his art under Anglican training. He pays many compliments to his predecessor, speaks, of course, strongly and decidedly of the claims of his Church, and describes the work to be done. "The mission of the Church to London and the English people," he says, "has nothing analogous since the mission of the Church to Rome and its Imperial race." We cannot help wondering as we read that "the Dogmatic Bull of the Immaculate Conception, and the Encyclical of last year will, we believe, mark an epoch in the reconstitution of the Christian order of the world," and can scarcely believe that such a sentiment could come from the same man who a little before in the same pastoral writes, "We have no new mission to commence, no theology to construct, no principles to find. The living Church of God moves on majestic and changeless from age to age." But Romanism is itself a great contradiction, a strange mixture of the grandest truths with the most puerile errors. An incidental remark in his postscript must, we should think, almost cause a feel-