

contrary to, or at variance with, the formularies and doctrines of the Church of England," were as stringent as any that could be devised by his noble friend. As to the constitution of the assembly, it was to consist of laymen and clergymen, and there must be a majority of both to give validity to the regulations. The establishment of these assemblies would give an opportunity for the discussion and settlement of questions which might otherwise be a matter of continual dispute; and, far from producing the evils anticipated, it appeared to him that this was the best measure which could be devised for preventing their recurrence.

The Earl of Harrowby said that the bill omitted altogether the provision of some tribunal for the purpose of getting rid of improper clergymen.

The Archbishop of Canterbury considered that the very object of the bill was to enable the colonists to do that which they could do better for themselves by having it in their power to establish such a tribunal, and to introduce such rules and discipline as the circumstances of the case might seem to require.

The Bishop of Salisbury said the intention of the bill was to be permissive and not compulsory—to give the members of the Church of England in the Colonies the power to do such things only as the members of all other religious communions could now do.

The Earl of Derby apprehended that, if the powers of self-government possessed by Dissenting bodies were extended to the members of the Church in the Colonies you would enable an ecclesiastical body such as this assembly to punish by deprivation of benefice a clergyman who was exercising functions which he would be entitled by law to perform.

The Duke of Newcastle assured the noble earl that the danger pointed out by him was guarded against by the fourth and the first clause, by which it was enacted that these synods, or by whatever denomination they were to be known, should have no power whatsoever over or against the laws of this country, or of the colony in which they should be brought into operation. The bill was simply enabling and permissive.

The Earl of Harrowby complained that his question as to the giving of greater facilities for the getting rid of improper clergymen had not been answered.

The Bishop of Salisbury conceived that every Church had in itself a natural and inherent right and power to regulate its discipline. Every Church, therefore, would have a right of making arrangements as to the manner in which its own discipline would be exercised, unless impediments were placed in its way by the existence of some extraneous authority.

The Bishop of Oxford apprehended that the difficulty into which the noble earl had fallen was not from sufficiently bearing in mind the difference between the Church in the colonies, which was a purely spiritual body, and the Church at home, which possessed mixed spiritual and civil rights. The civil position of the clergy in the colonies was not like that of the clergy at home. They were not possessed of benefices in the same sense as the clergy at home. There were very few so circumstanced, and such as were would not be affected by this bill. The position of the great body of them was this—that they received certain stipends or salaries so long as they continued to hold the license of the bishop of the diocese.

The Earl of Chichester expressed himself not satisfied by the explanation of the right rev. prelate.

The Earl of Derby said the object of the bill appeared to him to be to check the authority of the bishops with regard to those of the colonial clergy who were in the position of licensed curates, and to interpose another body for the guidance and regulation of the bishop; but he thought it very desirable that it should be more distinctly expressed in the bill, that the assembly could have no power or authority with regard to such of the clergy as were not in so precarious a position, who held what might be termed benefices, and who had legal rights capable of being enforced. He doubted whether the fourth clause expressed this sufficiently clearly, and he was afraid that the words already introduced, disclaiming all civil authority over the clergy in the position of licensed curates, might by implication be held to assert the existence of such rights over the beneficed clergy. It would be better to get rid of all ambiguity by inserting a saving clause.

The Duke of Newcastle said the mode of proceeding in the bill was this:—The first clause removed from the Church of England in the colonies all the disabilities under which, by the statute law, it now laboured, and the next five clauses merely pointed out what the assembly should not be able to do. He himself believed the fourth clause to be unnecessary, but as some of the colonial legislatures, Australia and the Canadas, had the power of removing from benefices, he had thought

it more advisable to insert the clause, to prevent all possibility of the Acts of the Legislatures being overridden by the assemblies.

The Bishop of London said the object of the bill was entirely confined to spiritual duties, and could not, therefore, give any power to interfere with the civil rights of parties. He was of opinion that to adopt the suggestion of the noble earl would place the clergy of Canada in a worse position than they were in at the present moment.

The Lord Chancellor proposed, when clause 3 came under consideration, to add the words, "or to deprive him of any civil rights to which he may by law be entitled."

Clause 1 was then proposed.

The Earl of Harrowby objected to those parts of it which conferred certain powers on the colonial bishops, among which was the power to compel the clergy of Canada to meet in synod at the seat of the metropolitan diocese.

The Bishop of Oxford said their lordships ought to weigh the matter well before they consent to strike out that part of the bill, which the whole colonial ministry after consulting the people throughout their dioceses, had agreed to. The Bishop proposed to make the clause enabling assemblies to be held more explicit by the introduction of words to the effect, that the archbishop or the metropolitan of the district should, on the first occasion of holding the same, convene the bishops. The right rev. prelate objected, however, to any definition or limitation by the Act of the powers of the synod.

The Earl of Harrowby consented to withdraw his amendment, and clause 1 was agreed to, as were clauses 2 and 3. On clause 4.

Lord Montagu inquired whether under this Act the laws passed by the ecclesiastical assemblies would have the effect of overriding the Imperial Acts of the British Legislature?

The Lord Chancellor was understood to reply, that no regulations or laws passed by these assemblies would have such a power. Clause 4 was then agreed to.—On clause five,

Lord Montagu objected to the clause. It did not provide any way of preventing discussion on matters of faith, at these synods, and, if such discussions were permitted, they would have a very injurious tendency.

The Bishop of London opposed the amendment.

The Bishop of Oxford wished to correct an error, which might be injurious in its consequences if not contradicted, as to the cause of the flame which had broken out in the Australian diocese. The cause of that flame was that the colonists were unwilling that the bishops should, unstrengthened by the report of the laity, undertake to alter in any way the standard of faith which they had received. He was of opinion that in such matters due representation should be given to the laity. He considered that the clause would be more effective as it at present stood than if the amendment were agreed to.

The Archbishop of Canterbury was willing to insert words prohibiting the passing of any resolution by the colonial synods affecting the standard of faith and doctrine, or at variance with the Book of Common Prayer.

The Duke of Newcastle said the present wording of the clause was due to the suggestion of the Government. It was impossible to prevent discussion; but what the clause aimed at was, to prevent the colonial assemblies dealing with matters of doctrine, or altering the standard of faith.

The Duke of Argyll said, if assemblies of the kind were constituted, it was the height of absurdity to call them together and leave them nothing to do but to exchange the compliments of the season. In a country where no question could arise with regard to the regulation of Church endowments, he could not conceive that any subjects were likely to be brought before those synods, which must not, more or less, relate to faith and doctrine; and he should feel it his duty to vote against the amendment.

The Duke of Newcastle and the Bishop of Oxford considered that, if the amendment was sanctioned by their lordships, no regulations could be adopted by the assembly for preventing clergymen from preaching Socinian or any other heretical doctrines.

At length the words proposed by the Archbishop of Canterbury having been agreed to,

Lord Montagu moved the addition of the words—"or which shall affect the royal supremacy of the Crown of England."

The Lord Chancellor said that he would state what he believed to be the law with regard to the Queen's supremacy. Among other statutes passed at the time

of the Reformation was one which declared that the Sovereign of this kingdom should be the supreme head of the Church of Christ in England, or which contained words to that effect. In the reign of Queen Mary all the statutes passed with reference to the Reformation were abolished. The Act 1st of Elizabeth, although it revived these statutes generally, did not revive the particular statute to which he had referred; but the first of Elizabeth, contained an enactment providing that the Sovereign should be supreme in all causes, ecclesiastical or civil, and therefore in common parlance they spoke of the supremacy of the Crown. He must say that he viewed the proposal of the noble lord (Montagu) with some jealousy; but, if the amendment was postponed until a further stage of the Bill, he would take the opportunity of looking into the matter.

Lord Montagu having expressed his readiness to postpone the amendment, the clause was agreed to.

The other clauses were also agreed to, and the bill was reported with amendments.

Their Lordships then adjourned.

THE QUESTION OF PEACE OR WAR has been acting pendulum-wise during the week. The Russian churches have been re-echoing with masses celebrated in honour—of God?—certainly not; but in honour of the Czar, who is keeping up a war fever at home while he professes abroad to be anxious for peace. In Turkey the old national party are eager for war. The wild tribes of Asia are whetting their fanaticism and yataghans. A conspiracy has been detected in Constantinople to dethrone Abdul Meshid, and put in his place his younger brother, Abdul Assiz. Fifteen religious students have been low-strung for participation in this plot. The war fury in Turkey has been further excited by the entrance of the Russians into the Danubian principalities. In the meanwhile, France has proposed a measure for the arrangement of the question which Russia is said to be willing to accept.—The basis of the measure cannot be pleasing to Russia; and if the Czar, while accepting it for the purpose of gaining time, should also insist on retaining the occupation of the principalities, why, war is more likely than ever to be the end of the general protocolling and of the Muscovite treachery.—*Church and State Gazette.*

FRANCE.

THE EASTERN QUESTION.—Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys has lost no time in replying to the second note of Count de Nesselrode. The *Moniteur* contains the Minister's answer, dated the 15th. The promptitude of the publication is accounted for by the breach of etiquette committed by the Russian Government in giving a diplomatic circular to the *Petersburgh Journal* before it had been dispatched to the parties for whose instruction it was intended. Having accomplished this act of retaliation, the French Minister with moderation with perfect firmness, proceeds to convict the Russian Minister of having misled the other powers by an admission that the Sultan had satisfied the demands made by Prince Menschikoff, and of then raising a fresh question. He next convicts him of misrepresentation of matters of fact regarding the pretended provocation to pass the Pruth by the anchorage of the fleet in Besika Bay. In fine, he makes the Russian government cut a sorry figure.

ITALY.

A telegraphic despatch from Turin announces that the Grand Duke of Tuscany had commuted the sentence of perpetual imprisonment on Guerazzi and three of his fellow prisoners to perpetual banishment.

"STOPPING OF THE SUPPLIES."—The *Semaphore* of Marseilles, of the 6th says:—"The general subject of conversation here is a private dispatch from Genoa, announcing that the King of Naples had just prohibited the exportation of corn from his States. This news is said to have been brought to Genoa, by a packet which had arrived direct from Naples. We wait with impatience for the arrival of a packet in our port to give us details of a measure the gravity of which cannot be misunderstood. This news has produced considerable sensation in the corn trade, and led to numerous operations in the article."

RUSSIA AND TURKEY.

A letter from Constantinople states that the Earl of Carlisle, a few days after his arrival at Constantinople, left that city for Broussa.

The Russian forces entered Oltonitza on the 7th inst., an important position on the Danube, which was crossed there in 1828 by an army of 40,000 men under the command of General Roth.

The Crown Prince of Hanover was attacked with measles immediately on his return from England.