

set in the new church of St. John, at Lewes, where the whole centre of the floor is covered with open benches for the poor, and the pews on each side are so low as to be almost unobtrusive to the eye.

The same point is also urged by Mr. WALLINGER, of Lewes, in his consecration sermon. He says, that— "To call the parish church the church of the poor man when the accommodation afforded in it has no reference to the capacity of the hearers, is an insult to the understanding and the feelings.

"In our own diocese, a considerable part of the pews has recently been converted into open seats in the church of Kingston-by-sea. In that of Grafton the pews have been removed from the centre of the church and ranged round the walls—a valuable recognition that the best places for hearing should be given to those who have greatest need of such an advantage.

The importance of this matter will be easily appreciated. Having been once broached, it is sure to command attention. We desire neither precipitation nor blind reaction from one error to its opposite.

THE CHURCH.

TORONTO, SATURDAY, MARCH 27, 1841.

We must endeavour to bring to a conclusion the remarks commenced some weeks ago, upon the Rubrics of the Church, as far, at least, as they refer to the ordinary Morning and Evening Service; intending hereafter to offer some similar observations upon those that pertain to the Offices of the Church which may be deemed occasional and special.

The expositions last offered were concluded with the Creed. In the parts of the Service already thus reviewed, "order and variety," to use the words of Dr. Bisse, "have fully appeared, the beauty of holiness hath shone forth, in the principal parts of our service, as they are laid down in the Exhortation. We have seen the Church acknowledging her sins in the Confession; then 'setting forth God's most worthy praise' in the Psalms; then 'hearing his most holy word' in the Lessons; and after that, with one heart and one mouth, declaring her assent to the Catholic faith in the Creed.

We have mentioned before the propriety, as a matter of decency and order, of the people's rising or kneeling, antecedently to the employment of the words which, in those postures respectively, they are required to use; for example, that they should rise from their seats before the words of the Te Deum or Jubilate are actually commenced by the Minister, and that, in the supplications which follow the Creed, they should kneel previously to the use of the prayers by the Minister commenced with the appropriate petition, "Lord, have mercy upon us."

In the use of the Lord's Prayer which immediately follows, we find a direction that the Minister, clerks, and people shall repeat it with a loud or audible voice. "By the clerks in this rubric," observes Mr. Wheatley, "I suppose were meant such persons as were appointed at the beginning of the Reformation, to attend the incumbent in the performance of the offices: and such as are still in some cathedral and collegiate churches, which have lay-clerks (as they are called, being not always ordained) to look out the lessons, name the anthem, set the Psalm and the like: of which sort I take our parish clerks to be, though we have now seldom more than one to a church." Here, however, it becomes us to remark that anciently these officers were real clerks, or clergymen, as the term itself strictly and legally means; and that it was customary for such functionaries, being in holy orders, to be associated with every parochial minister in the performance of the divine offices. They constituted, as it were, the Levites of the tabernacle; and, like their prototypes, had to receive a formal and religious consecration to the office before they were permitted to exercise its duties. We have spoken often of the great advantage which would result from the restoration of this office to its proper dignity, as thus affording to the parochial minister a stated means of assistance in his spiritual charge, without which many of its subordinate, though important, duties are necessarily imperfectly performed. But without dwelling further, at present, upon this point, we may briefly allude to the rebuke which the rubric, just cited, tacitly conveys to those who fancy that the responsive portions of the service should be left to the clerk, or clerks, alone. The "Minister, clerks, and people," are so associated together, that it is impossible not to perceive that all are meant equally to bear their part in the devout offering of these petitions. That a different impression prevails, the practice of some congregations would seem to imply: the literal terms of the rubric ought, however, to undeceive them; and if the "paternal authority of the Church has not force enough, those only should be silent who feel that they have no sins to be pardoned, and no wants

to be supplied! Only when this conviction gains possession of the mind, will they be justified in maintaining silence, and thus manifesting indifference, when the confession of sin is breathed and the supplication for mercy is uttered.

Upon the conclusion of the Lord's Prayer, the Priest is directed to stand in fulfilling his part in the touching versicles which succeed. Why he is instructed to assume this posture, is thus explained by Bishop Sparrow: "The priest in the holy offices is sometimes appointed to kneel, sometimes to stand. The reason of this is as follows. The priest, or minister, being a man of like infirmities with the rest of the congregation, a sinner, and so standing in need of grace and pardon, as well as the rest, in all confessions of sins and penitential prayers, such as the Litany is, is directed to beg his pardon and grace upon his knees. He being, moreover, a priest, or minister of the most high God, that hath received from him an office and authority, sometimes stands to signify 'that his office' and authority.—So that the ministers of the Gospel are appointed by God to offer up the sacrifices of prayers and praises of the Church for the people, thus to stand between God and them; and to shew this his office, in these services he is directed to 'stand.' And it is worthy of remark here, that the word priest is used in contradistinction to minister,—as seeming to intimate that only those who have been admitted into the grade of the ministry designated by the former name, are expected to manifest this dignity and authority of the sacred office.

From these versicles we are directed to proceed to the Collects; two of which,—those for Peace and Grace,—are to be statedly used, while a special one is appointed to precede them for each Sunday and Holyday in the year. Upon the antiquity and excellence of these Collects, as well as their adaptation from their very brevity to enkindle and maintain a devotional spirit, this is not the proper occasion to remark: suffice it to say that the composition of most of them can be traced to the primitive and pure ages of the Church; and that in matter and expression they can scarcely fail to gain the approbation, as they declare the wants and feelings, of every devout petitioner. On the occasion of Week-Day Services, for which no special Collect has been provided, that which has been appointed for the preceding Sunday is always to be used,—the Sunday Collect being, in short, the Collect for the whole week, unless where instructions to the contrary are given by the intervention of a Holyday.

The rubric which follows the two standing Collects, concerning the singing the Anthem, is not usually observed, although the adoption of what it recommends would form so appropriate a distinction between the preceding parts of the Service and the Litany which succeeds. Yet as the latter was originally a distinct service and not used at the same hour in which the preceding part was employed, the direction concerning the singing of the Anthem in this place might not have contemplated the immediate use of the Litany, and therefore, where the latter forms a portion of the service, the postponement of that act of praise can scarcely be deemed an irregularity.

No particular remarks are required to be made upon any rubrical directions regarding the prayers which are appointed to be used as a substitute for the Litany, on other days than Sundays, Wednesdays, and Fridays; nor do any requiring special notice occur in the directions for the use of the Litany itself. It may, however, be proper to account for the direction, twice repeated towards the close of the latter Service, to the Minister to call upon the people to "pray," at a time when it might be thought, from their continuance in the posture of prayer, it were needless to renew the invitation to do so. This also is explained by Bishop Sparrow as follows: "These words, [Let us pray], are often used in ancient Liturgies, as well as in ours, and are an excitation to prayer, to call back our wandering, and re-collect our scattered thoughts, and to awaken our devotion, bidding us mind what we are about; namely, now when we are about to pray, to pray indeed, that is, heartily and earnestly. The deacon, in ancient services, was wont to call upon the people often, 'Let us pray vehemently;' nay 'still more vehemently;' and the same vehemency and earnest devotion, which the manner of these old Liturgies breathed, does our Church in her Liturgy call for, in these words, 'Let us pray;' that is, with all the earnestness and vehemency that we may, that our prayers may be such as St. James speaks of, active, lively-spirited prayers; for these are they that avail much with God."

We would only further remark that when persons are to be prayed for, the announcement is properly made before commencing the Litany, and the special allusion to the case thus announced is then annexed to the appropriate suffrage "for all sick persons," or as the case may be. When special thanksgivings are required to be made, they should immediately precede the form of General Thanksgiving; so that, where the case requires it, the necessary allusion to such special mercy, may be included in the general acknowledgment of praise and thankfulness.

The remarks which we have thus far made will apply as strictly to the Evening as to the Morning Service, so that no particular allusion to rubrical directions occurring in that, is necessary. At some future period we shall undertake a similar consideration of the Rubrics pertaining to the Communion and other Offices.

In a preceding column will be found an article from that distinguished journal, the London Times, of great practical value, and well worthy the careful attention of our readers. It is a great argument for the endowment of a National Church, that through its means an obedience is rendered, more full and complete than could be afforded under any other system, to the plainly implied wish of our blessed Lord, that "to the poor the Gospel should be preached." Yet it is, at first sight, as strange as it is hard that with a munificent, if not in all respects an adequate, provision for the ministrations of religion, so many of our Churches,—so large a portion at least of many of them,—should virtually be closed against the poor. We need hardly pause to explain that they are not designedly closed against them; but, by the modern system of pew-selling and pew-letting, they are virtually so. While the rich, and such as are in comfortable circumstances can afford, according to this system, to provide themselves with Church accommodation, that large and important branch of society who depend for their subsistence upon their daily labour, and who after meeting all their necessary and moderate expenses can, in very few cases, afford to pay for their seats in the house of God, are, in many situations, almost wholly excluded from its privileges and comforts. The pews are all sold or leased, with the exception perhaps of a few, in which, from remoteness of situation, the minister is indistinctly heard, if the Church be large, or not heard at all to any purpose of edification; or they are left, as a last resort, to a few benches in the aisles which, though they may be, are incapable often of containing the tithe of those who would avail themselves of free accommodation in the Church.

But this is not all the evil. From the prevalent custom of letting pews, few churches, conducted according to that system, can, as a general rule, be thoroughly filled. There may be a considerable number who oc-

cupy all the Church room for which they pay; but how often is the reverse the case, and in how many instances are pews only partially filled? not unfrequently do we observe pews, hither and thither, aristocratically cushioned, lined and carpeted, very aristocratically tenanted on a Sunday by two or three persons, when they will each contain from six to eight! And it is not unfrequently the case that parallel with the aisle, where crowds are found availing themselves gladly of the humble benches, and while greater crowds cannot get a sitting at all, a full score of pews stand there with their costly decorations, some without an occupant at all,—others possessing one solitary individual,—and many not half or even a third filled. The contrast thus presented is not only discouraging but painful,—compelling us to feel that, by the force of a vicious custom, a large number of persons anxious to worship God in his appointed temple, and desirous to be instructed in Christian truth, are excluded from that temple, while actually there is abundance of room for them! It is an undeniable fact that, as a general rule, even in churches where not a pew is to be had "for love or money," but all are leased, or sold, or in some way appropriated, those very churches are not more than three-fourths filled! and this entirely for the reason we have mentioned,—that, in a vast number of cases, there are not, in a particular household, a sufficient number of occupants for the pew they pay for, and consequently a large portion of such pews are steadily unoccupied, while just an equal portion of those who would be worshippers are excluded from the sacred edifice.

It would not be hard to shew that this custom of selling and leasing pews is of very modern introduction, and an innovation not upon the practice of the early Christians merely, but even of our fathers of the Reformed Church of England. Still where it has taken its stand amongst the established customs of modern society, its abolition, hastily at least, could not be hoped for without more immediate loss than perhaps eventual gain; but the subject is one of sufficient importance to be well and widely discussed; and that person, we are free to say, would be entitled to a handsome premium who should be able to propose a plan by which the acknowledged conveniences of the pew system might be so blended with the plan of free accommodation that, while the wealthy were provided for, no poor man should be deprived of church-room.

From the notice taken of this subject by distinguished individuals in the Church, as is evinced in the article from the Times which we have copied, we are led to hope that it will soon be taken up formally by the ecclesiastical authorities in the mother country; and their decision will necessarily be a guidance for our own practice. One thing, in the mean time, strikes us as not just only but feasible,—that the churches so arranged should, during at least one service in the day, be rendered free; so that the poor man and his family might have a chance at least for that instruction which he naturally, but we regret to feel, often vainly looks for in what has been on many grounds truly and emphatically styled "THE POOR MAN'S CHURCH."

It gives us the sincerest pleasure to learn that two new Churches, in connexion with our venerable Establishment, are about to be erected in the Township of Louth, Niagara District. A site for one of these sacred edifices has been generously given by G. P. M. Bak, Esq., near a small village called Jordan, about midway between the villages of St. Catharine's and Grimsby, and in a fertile and thickly settled part of the country. Mr. Bak has also contributed a site for a Parsonage, and is ready to aid in the erection of both structures by a liberal pecuniary contribution.

The site of the other Church proposed to be built in the same township, is the gift of Nathan Pawling, Esq., and is contiguous to Port Dalhousie, at the mouth of the Welland Canal. Around this spot are settled several families, warmly attached to the Church, who had engaged, for many years, the tender and assiduous care of the late lamented Rector of St. Catharine's, the Rev. James Clark. It was, indeed, while he was proceeding to attend a statel service at a school-house near the harbour, that the accident occurred which caused his melancholy death.

One most important reason for erecting a Church at this spot is,—that it will be quite accessible to the sailors of the numerous vessels which, during the season of the navigation, pass through the canal; for it frequently happens that thirty or forty schooners are lying in the basin on the Sunday, many of the crews of which might be induced to attend the public worship of God, if a Church were at hand open to receive them and regularly supplied with an officiating minister.

We understand that building committees have been appointed for the completion of both these Churches, and we trust that, with the Divine blessing, the good work they have in hand will prosper.

On Saturday night last, at 11 o'clock, the Election for this city terminated in favour of Messrs. Dunn and Buchanan. At the close of the Poll the numbers were: Mr. Dunn, 495 | Mr. Sherwood, 441 Mr. Buchanan, 466 | Mr. Monro, 435

On Monday last the custom of chairing the successful candidates was interrupted in a most melancholy manner. The procession, when in King Street, was arrested by a violent tumult attended with fatal results. One unhappy man lost his life, and three were wounded, one of them in a very serious degree.

The particulars of this lamentable event will be found in an article from the Patriot, which we have inserted in a succeeding column. This account is—as far as we can learn—substantially correct, though a few circumstances have not been alluded to. One of these is the gratifying fact which has come to our knowledge, that our worthy Mayor, whom the Radical Journalists have attacked in most unchristian language for alleged misconduct, was the person who solicited and obtained the interference of the military.

That the laws have been violated by this unfortunate disturbance of the peace is alone sufficient cause for our deep regret, but our grief is increased by the deplorable consequences in which the affray has ended. An ill-fated man has been suddenly cut off, and hurried without a moment's warning of his impending fate, before the tribunal of his Maker. We pray that this fearful event may convey an impressive and salutary lesson to the minds of all, exposing, as it does, the fatal influence of our evil passions when uncontrolled by wholesome restraint, and teaching the necessity of imposing a check on their impetuous and dangerous transports.

With regard to the men through whom instrumentally the occurrences of this fatal day have been stained with blood, we hope and believe that facts, with which we are as yet but imperfectly acquainted, will prove their guilt to be less heinous than is generally supposed. A Coroner's Inquest has been instituted, and, it is more than probable, that evidence will be given sufficiently strong to exculpate the criminals from the charge of premeditated murder, and to shew that the deed was committed under the influence of previous provocation.

Since the date of our last publication we have received the following intelligence relative to the Elections in this Upper division of the Province:

Table of election results for various counties including Prescott, Glenagarry, Stormont, Leeds, Lenox and Addington, Middlesex, Norfolk, Wentworth, and Halton.

We have been authorized to make known to our readers a gratifying circumstance connected with the erection of the new Protestant Episcopal Church at L'Acadie, an account of which was furnished in our last. £300 currency was given by the Lord Bishop of Montreal from a grant of £500 sterling made by the Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts, towards the erection of churches in the Diocese of Quebec.

The Lord Bishop of Toronto will hold his next General Ordination at the Cathedral, Toronto, on Sunday the 25th of April. Candidates for Holy Orders, whether of Deacon or Priest, are required to obtain previously the Bishop's permission to offer themselves, and they will be expected to be furnished with the usual Letters Testimonial, and the Si Quis attested in the ordinary manner. The Examination will commence on Wednesday the 21st April, at 9 o'clock A.M.

COMMUNICATION.

To the Editor of the Church.

Sir,—Having, in your paper of the 13th instant, read a communication "on some of the supposed disabilities of Colonial Clergymen," signed H. S., in which the writer speaks of that body as "the less elaborately equipped servants of the outskirt of the Church," and proclaims their "naked simplicity;" I beg leave, through your columns, to enquire of the writer, upon what grounds he is prepared to shew, that the duties of Colonial Clergymen and Missionaries, even in the wilderness, involve less of difficulty and require less of preparation, than those of thousands of rural Incumbents and Curates in England? Considering the various kinds and degrees of error which they are called upon to combat,—the strength and bitterness of opposition which is often manifested against the cause which they are pledged and privileged to maintain,—the power of ready and fluent expression, which, upon sudden occasional calls, and in the face of the least elaborately equipped, at least, it is desirable that they should possess,—the reason of the hope and faith that is in them, which they may be summoned to give to various classes of gainsayers,—why, I say, is a "less elaborate equipment," or a more "naked simplicity" requisite for them than for their brethren in the valleys of Wales, among the Wolds of Yorkshire, or the Fells of Cumberland? Again, how shall we reconcile with the general tenor of H. S.'s observations, the fact, that, some thirteen or fourteen years ago, a Clergyman,—a graduate of an English university, who had been ordained Deacon by an English Bishop, and who, previously to his embarking to exercise his ministry in a Colony, had taken the greatest precaution, by consulting the highest authority to ascertain that his position in the Church would be entirely unimpaired by his admission to Priest's orders in the Colony,—found on his return, that the Act 59, Geo. III, which was passed about the time of his removal, had so operated to his disadvantage, that, in order to get himself reinstated in statu quo, he was necessitated to resign his mission under the P. G. S., and take for a time a Curacy in England? Again, let me request H. S., who seems to be master of the subject, to explain and clear up the following anomalous and extraordinary circumstances, viz:— That after the enactment of 59 Geo. III, in 1819, and before the enactment of the Act of Victoria, in 1840, how came it to pass, 1st. That the Rev. Mr. West, who had been ordained both Deacon and Priest by the American Bishop Chase, of Ohio, promptly received, on his return to England, license and authority from English Prelates to exercise the functions of the ministry in England? And he did officiate as a Minister for some length of time in or near Liverpool.— 2d. That the Rev. Joseph Wolff, ordained Deacon by Bishop Doane, of New Jersey, also a foreign and not a Colonial Bishop, appears to have found no difficulty in proceeding to Priest's orders in England, and in obtaining preferment in the Province of York and Diocese of Ripon? Not being competent to reconcile these anomalies either with the spirit or letter of 59 Geo. III, or with the experience of the English Clergyman alluded to above, I long to be further enlightened upon the subject.

I remain, Reverend Sir, Your obedient servant, ZELOTES. P.S.—If I remember rightly I saw it stated in the Church some time ago, that the Rev. Mr. Caswall, though by birth an Englishman, was debarred from exercising his ministry, or at least from holding a charge among us, in consequence of his having received ordination from a Bishop of the United States, though that Bishop derives his powers, with a very few intermediate steps of succession, from an Archbishop of Canterbury. However, I cannot imagine that any insuperable impediment can exist, after the above instances of Mr. Wolff and Mr. West, to which may be added Mr. Blanco White, Mr. Todrig of Bermuda, (see P. G. S. Report, 1838), as well as many other Clergymen, who, having been ordained by Romish and foreign Bishops, have held or are now holding clerical stations in our church.

ECCLESIASTICAL INTELLIGENCE.

CALCUTTA CATHEDRAL.—We learn that a site for the above object has been granted by government, and that towards the edifice and endowment, in addition to Bishop Wilson's munificent contribution of £20,000, the East India

Company has granted £15,000, and two additional chaplains; the British residents at Calcutta upwards of £2000; the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, £5000, and private subscriptions £3259, thus making a total already subscribed of £49,259. As the whole cost of the edifice and endowment was estimated at £60,000, it would thus appear that five-sixths of the whole has been at present raised, which will be completed by an additional £10,000.

HAMBURG, JAN. 29.—The Rhine and Moselle Gazette has the following article from Coblenz:—"By the favour of his Majesty the King (of Prussia), the English residing in this city, who are more numerous than in any other city in the province, have obtained the beautiful chapel at the palace, which has not been used for many years, for the public performance of Divine Worship according to the rites of the English Episcopal Church. Our guests duly appreciate this Royal favour—this proof of hospitality. This is the first church on the Rhine that has yet been granted to the English for their sole use."

CHURCH EXTENSION IN THE METROPOLIS.—White's-row Chapel, Spitalfields, for the last 30 years a dissenting meeting-house, and late in the occupation of the Rev. Robert Aiken, M.A., who has so recently conformed to the government and discipline of the Church, was opened last Sunday, by virtue of a license from the Bishop of London, as a district chapel, in connection with the parochial church, and three sermons were preached, by the Rev. Mr. Stone, the Rector of Spitalfields; the Rev. Mr. Park of All Saints, Mile-end, New-town; and the Rev. J. Jackson, of St. Peter's, Globe-fields. No stated minister is yet appointed; but the duty at this chapel will at present be performed by the ministers of the various district churches in the neighbourhood, who have agreed to divide the labour between them. The building has undergone a complete repair and alterations necessary to the observance of the forms and ceremonies of the Church. The sittings which are calculated to afford accommodation for upwards of 700 persons, are mostly free, the opening of the chapel being principally for the benefit of the poorer classes in this crowded neighbourhood. The want of church accommodation in this densely populated district has been long severely felt, as is fully evinced by the crowded state of the new churches which have been lately opened, and which are filled every Sunday with regular and attentive congregations. Another of the Bethnal-green new churches in the Hackney-road is in a very forward state, and will, it is said, be consecrated in a few weeks.

The Earl of Digby has given the handsome donation of £100 to the funds of the National Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor in the principles of the Established Church.

EPISCOPACY IN SCOTLAND.—The chapel of St. Paul's, Aberdeen, is about to be joined to the Scottish Episcopal Communion. St. Paul's was one of those few chapels—reduced, if we mistake not, to two or three—in which the Liturgy of the United Church of England and Ireland was used; and the ministers who officiated were regularly ordained ministers of that Church, but were not under the authority of the Scottish bishops. Such chapels were in a most anomalous position; they were episcopal, inasmuch as their ministers were episcopally ordained, but they were, as far as ecclesiastical discipline was concerned, independent. We cannot but believe that the union of these chapels, and the extra-ordinary and unscriptural position, will form a sample of that of St. Paul's. If episcopal not merely in name, they will do so. The position of ecclesiastical affairs in Scotland at the present moment, places the episcopal church in a peculiarly interesting position. The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge has voted £100 for the erection of a chapel at Dunfermline, which, it is hoped, will be commenced in a few months. The duty has hitherto been gratuitously done, and the attendance numerous. There is every reason to expect that this will form a very important congregation. It was recently stated by Bishop Russell, that a new chapel was about to be erected in Glasgow; that in Annan, in Dumfriesshire, Divine Service had been commenced in a chapel of the previous Sunday, and that, at a locality on the west coast, a chapel was about to be erected. The Rev. R. Montgomery, Minister of St. Jude's, Glasgow, lately preached in aid of a charitable institution connected with the town of Paisley. The episcopal church being deemed too small for the expected congregation, a very large one belonging to a body of Presbyterian Dissenters, was offered and accepted. Prayers were read by the Rev. W. M. Wade, Minister of Trinity Episcopal Chapel. These facts shew how fast the prejudices against episcopacy in Scotland are dying away.—Durham Advertiser.

CONSECRATION OF BISHOP ELLIOTT.—This important event took place on the 28th of February, in Christ Church, Savannah. We may well rejoice to congratulate our friends upon its accomplishment. For our northern readers who are not personally acquainted with the new Bishop of Georgia, we may be allowed to say something more particularly. Bishop Elliott was a lawyer in Beaufort, S. C., and an attendant on the church, which has been so much blessed under the ministry of its present Rector, the Rev. Joseph R. Walker. His talents and standing both at the bar, and in the walks of literary life, in the latter of which he has been known as the editor of the Southern Review, placed him in the first eminence among the men of his age, as his family connexions did among the inhabitants of his native State. After having been called to the bar, he relinquished the prospect of a successful career in the law, and devoted himself to the work of the ministry. In the ministry he has been occupied for five or six years, as a Professor in the University of Carolina at Columbia. He was the selected candidate of a very large, we think we may say with justice, the larger portion of the clergy for the episcopate of South Carolina. In this election, another succeeded. But Mr. Elliott was shortly after elected Bishop of Georgia, and to this station he has now been set apart. In the prime of life, with manners and appearance to adorn the highest station, with talents of the first order, with principles thoroughly evangelical, a firm lover and defender of the Gospel, and that, at a time, thus proffered which he once called to us "reformation principles"—with a character unblemished, and influence most extensive in the South, where he is known, he enters upon this office. No consecration of a bishop for our church, has ever been more justly a subject of congratulation, for those who love the Gospel, and desire the true prosperity of our Zion.—Episcopal Recorder.

Civil Intelligence.

FURTHER EXTRACTS FROM OUR FILES BY THE PRESIDENT.

LORD STANLEY'S IRISH REGISTRATION BILL. From the St. James's Chronicle.

There was evidence of concert between Mr. O'Connell and the ministers at the very threshold of Tuesday night's debate upon Lord Stanley's bill, although the latter were, by the necessity of their position, compelled to vote against their master's motion. Ministers, however, were, by their own acts, precluded from dividing with their tyrant, either upon his first proposition to refuse leave to bring in the bill, or upon his modified suggestion to postpone the debate: that is, to postpone the leave to bring in the bill until it might suit Lord Morpeth's convenience, and the pleasure of the house, that another bill should be introduced. They (the ministers) had themselves brought in three bills upon the same subject, thus affirming, in the most unequivocal manner, that it was a proper subject for legislation: indeed, their promise of a fourth bill was another affirmation to the same purpose. They, therefore, could not deny that it was proper to bring in a registration bill, and any objection they could offer must be personal to Lord Stanley, or founded upon a claim of the exclusive initiative by the executive. Personal objections, however, cannot be recognised by the law of any impartial deliberative body; and the parliamentary constitution refuses to the Crown any exclusive initiative, except in particular cases—such as grants of public money, or laws directly affecting the Sovereign and the Royal Family. The much may be fit to explain the terms upon which the subject of the debate, and to explain also why Lord John Russell and Morpeth dared to vote against Mr. O'Connell and his immediate party. The ministers were, in fact, compelled to vote, as they did vote, by their own proceedings, and by the law of parliament; but they gave sufficient proof that they did not oppose Mr. O'Connell without pain and reluctance. The debate was on the whole temperate, and even tame, as must generally happen when men have exhausted all their arguments and passions upon a trice winnowed question.

The only tangible objections raised against Lord Stanley's proposition were, the absence of statistical arguments in his lordship's speech, and the fact that the noble lord brought in no English or Scotch registration bill. The first objection was offered by Mr. O'Connell, the other by Lord John Russell. Both objections are, we believe, new, and as feeble as new arguments brought in at the tail of a long controversy are found to be. Even did not either admit of a particular answer, as we shall presently show both do, both are worthless: for, first, what have statistics to do with laws for the prevention of frauds and perjuries? Statistics necessarily deal with men in masses—frauds and perjuries are the practices of individuals, no matter by how many individuals they may be practised. Who would think statistical arguments