

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

- Coloured covers/
Couverture de couleur
- Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée
- Covers restored and/or laminated/
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque
- Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur
- Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- Coloured plates and/or illustrations/
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents
- Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion
along interior margin/
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la
distorsion le long de la marge intérieure
- Blank leaves added during restoration may appear
within the text. Whenever possible, these have
been omitted from filming/
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées
lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte,
mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont
pas été filmées.
- Additional comments: /
Commentaires supplémentaires:

- Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur
- Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées
- Pages restored and/or laminated/
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
- Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
- Pages detached/
Pages détachées
- Showthrough/
Transparence
- Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression
- Continuous pagination/
Pagination continue
- Includes index(es)/
Comprend un (des) index
- Title on header taken from: /
Le titre de l'en-tête provient:
- Title page of issue/
Page de titre de la livraison
- Caption of issue/
Titre de départ de la livraison
- Masthead/
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below/
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	12X	14X	16X	18X	20X	22X	24X	26X	28X	30X	32X
						✓					

A. C. 12.03
N 55

NOVA SCOTIA Church Chronicle.

VOL. IV.

HALIFAX, MARCH, 1868.

No. 3.

"Ad profectum sacrosanctae matris ecclesiae."

THE NATAL DIFFICULTY.

In order to give our readers a clear idea of the present state of this scandal which will be the means of working a great benefit to the whole Anglican Church, but, more especially and speedily, to its colonial branches, we must first state the *present* creed of the misguided and obstinate man who insists on drawing the salary and standing in the place of a Bishop of Christ's Church.

Dr. Colenso's belief as continually expressed by himself is this, with other points, viz.—that the Bible does not contain an unerring record of Divine truth—that it does not contain, even upon faith and morals, that which we are all required to adhere to. That our blessed Lord knew no more than any intelligent Jew of His own period,—that He was, in fact, ignorant,—that it has been reserved for Dr. Colenso to point out the errors of his ignorant Lord, and that He whom the angels worshipped is not a fit object for our adoration.

Six years ago, Dr. Colenso having published his disbelief in Christianity, according to the above epitome, the Convocations of Canterbury and York condemned his heresy, and vehemently urged his Metropolitan, the Bishop of Capetown, to summon and try him.—these representatives of the English Church thus, be it remembered—declaring it to be the work of each branch of the Colonial Church to try, judge and subject to discipline its own delinquents. This course was accordingly taken by the Bishop of Capetown. He summoned Dr. Colenso to appear before him and two of his suffragan bishops, and answer to the charges laid against him. Dr. Colenso acknowledged his Metropolitan's right to try him, by appearing by his proctor, but failed to purge himself of the charge of heresy, and was accordingly deposed, but invited by the Bishop of Capetown to appeal from the decision of his Court to the Archbishop of Canterbury, which the deposed Bishop failed to do, relying on his Letters Patent, thus setting the power of the State against that of the Church, putting his trust in man, and in his heart going from the Lord.

Seeing that by the late famous decisions of Lords Westbury and Romilly, the Church in the Colonies was declared to be in exactly the same position as all other religious Societies, left to its own management, and free from State interference, the first step taken, after Dr. Colenso was deposed, was the refusal of the Trustees of the Colonial Bishopric Fund to pay his salary. But here it was seen that the children of the Church were not yet to be let go to freedom and purity of worship in the Colonies. Like other religious bodies, the Anglican Church abroad was left free to *support* itself. But here its similarity to others, in point of freedom was to cease. It was not to be left free to *purify* itself. Dr. Colenso, utterly denying the doctrine of Christianity, insisted on a maintenance from funds raised for the

propagation of the christian faith, and the secular courts compelled the Trustees to pay his salary from the Bishopric Fund, whilst they also forced the orthodox clergy to give him and his four heretical clergymen full possession of the Church property in Natal. Great was the triumph of the enemy.

Dr. Colenso's admirers, *i. e.*, the infidel portion of them, boasted that the Church of England was saddled with a Bishop "whose views are opposed to the whole spirit of the teaching and doctrine of the Christian Church at large, from the earliest time down to the present day."

But what said the Church to all this? A few noisy men of the Rationalistic sort, put themselves forward as the exponents of Church Opinion, in opposition to the voice of Convocation and Synod. Dean Stanley, knowing Dr. Colenso's views, and the additional fact that he has introduced into the Natal churches a hymn-book from which all praise or worship addressed to Jesus as God is carefully excluded, now publicly declares that (in his opinion) the doctrines of the Bishop of Natal are such as the Universal Church has never condemned,—such as within the Church of England are by law allowed. Prejudice must surely go far to blind the eyes and stop the ears of any man who can read ecclesiastical history, and hear—even once—the services of our Church, and yet make such an assertion. The Bishop of London also has acted a very extraordinary part in this trouble. He was one of the first to wink at the publication of Colenso's heretical books in the city of London, and when it was plainly his own duty to call any clergyman—much more a Bishop—to account for denying the faith of the Church within his jurisdiction, he excused himself on the plea that it was the duty of the Bishop of Capetown, as the Metropolitan of the Bishop of Natal, to try that offender. When a motion was made to condemn Bishop Colenso's heresies, in the Convocation of Canterbury, the Bishop of London and St. David's, Dean Stanley and some others made every effort to prevent such condemnation. Afterwards, in the Lambeth Council, when the great body of the Bishops were most anxious to discuss and condemn Colenso's heresies, the Bishops of London and St. David's most earnestly besought, and unfortunately prevailed upon the presiding Archbishop to take no formal expression of opinion from the Council, as a Body, on the matter. Fifty-six of the Bishops, however, foreseeing the use which would afterwards be made of this apparent want of decision at so conspicuous an opportunity, placed on record their acceptance of the spiritual validity of the deposition of Colenso.

The line of defence adopted by Colenso and his Rationalistic friends has been to keep clear of the spiritual; and trust to the delays and quibbles of the secular powers, well knowing that in all doctrinal disputes their decisions have almost invariably looked towards what is wrongly called liberality of sentiment, at the expense of the Catholic faith. The Bishop of London, with the zeal of a partisan, is now demanding that no successor to Bishop Colenso be consecrated until a legal decision can be obtained as to the validity of the sentence which has been pronounced by the spiritual court,—or in other words, demanding that the Church shall be guided by the State in matters of doctrine. The Archbishop of York has also urged this delay and appeal to State; but in the most vigorous and manly style the noble Bishop of Capetown has replied to both these prelates. He shows that the highest Court of Appeal has decided that the Church in South Africa is not established by law, but is a voluntary association, in no better nor worse position than the other religious Bodies of the Colony. The Bishop of Capetown, therefore, says to the Bishop of London that the Church in South Africa "is entitled to exercise all the rights and liberties of such voluntary associations, without interference on the part of your Lordship or others with those rights."

The Bishop of London asserted that a schism would be created if a new Bishop were sent out. The Bishop of Capetown shows that it is Colenso who has made, and is every day widening the schism, and ravaging Christ's flock—and charges upon the Bishop of London the responsibility of encouraging him by addressing him in a letter as "Dear Lord," "Your faithful brother in Christ."

In answering the Archbishop of York, the Bishop of Capetown maintains that no civil court in England has or ought to have any jurisdiction over the decisions of any voluntary association in South Africa in Spiritual matters. And after pointing out to his Grace (who absented himself from the Lambeth Council,) that in that august assembly, and not in the columns of a newspaper, the matter in dispute would best have been discussed, the Bishop of Capetown also asks his Episcopal censors, who advise him to submit the question to the decision of some civil court, what they intend to do should such a court affirm that Dr. Colenso's teaching is not contrary to the faith held and taught by the Church of England, or upon some technical ground should uphold him in his position? Are they prepared, in such a case, to recognise him as a Bishop of the Church, and to hold communion with him? If so, what will their own position in Christendom be? And what will be their position towards the Church in South Africa, which has deposed the false Teacher? He solemnly and prophetically warns these prelates and all others in the Church of England who countenance Colenso, of throw impediments in the way of his successor, that though the Church in South Africa is being ravaged during these delays, it is the Church of England which, in this matter, is really on her trial, as a true branch of the Church Catholic. The Church in South Africa has rejected and exposed the wolf in sheep's clothing. Will the Church of England side with him, or remain neutral, or consume the time in Erastian doubts and quibbles until he shall have completed his ruinous work, and branded the Church of England with a mark of shame from which she may never recover? In this case the days of that Church are numbered.

The good and faithful Bishop should rather have said that in such case the days of Church-and-State connection are numbered. The Church in her Convocations of Canterbury and York, the Episcopal Synod of the Church of Scotland, the Provincial Synod in Canada, our own Diocesan Synod, and the General Convention of the Episcopal Church in the United States, and lastly the great body of the Bishops in the Lambeth Council, has approved the action of the South African Church against Colenso. The desire for Synod and Council which has so wonderfully spread in the Anglican Churches within the last twenty years, will now receive an immense impetus. The days of isolation are numbered. The days of Erastianism or the bondage of Church to the State are numbered. But the days of the Anglican Branch of Christ's Holy Catholic and Apostolic are not numbered, for the gates of hell shall not prevail against her. A faithful man, Rev. W. K. Maccorie is to proceed to South Africa to be there consecrated bishop in the place of Dr. Colenso, and the heresiarch, now cast out and disowned by every branch of our Church, will eventually be dropped even by his Erastian friends. The Church in the Colonies, in the course of this difficulty is rapidly learning her true position and powers, and the end will prove that emancipation abroad will lead to emancipation at home. The days of Erastianism are numbered. The great struggle between Faith and Infidelity, in these latter days, has entered upon its first stage.

THE SERMON OF THE CROSS;

OR, THOUGHTS FOR LENT AND PASSION-TIDE.

THE season of Lent, has come round again; and again the Church has solemnly and lovingly called upon each one of us to turn unto the Lord our God, not so much with praise and thanksgiving, as more especially with repentance, lowly adoration, abasement alike of soul and body. At such a time, with prayer for and trust in the Spirit's guidance, our eyes turn naturally to Christ crucified; our thoughts to those precious words spoken to us from the cross itself—wrung, as it were, out of our Saviour's dying agony by His undying love.

First of the cross itself.

"*They crucified Him.*" (S. Matt. xxvii. 35; S. Mark xv. 24; S. Luke xxiii. 33; S. John xix. 18.)

In these words there is a notable instance of the simplicity of truth—the simplicity, therefore, of Scripture and Prophecy—which from our practical unfamiliarity with crucifixion, we are perhaps somewhat in danger of overlooking. Christ, when signifying by what death He should die, had said, "*I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me.*" Now, if we look at the exact mode of crucifixion, we shall see that by no other death could this prophecy—these words, "*lifted up*"—have been literally fulfilled. To crucify, the victim was stripped nearly naked, and then extended on the cross as it lay on the ground. While in this position the nails were driven through the hands and feet (usually by four soldiers, who, in the case of our Saviour, afterwards divided His garments into four parts); and so nailed together, cross and body were "*lifted up from the earth,*" and the bottom of the cross suffered to fall into the hole previously dug for it. Thus, then, was our Saviour lifted up; thus "*they crucified Him;*" thus He took upon Himself not only death, but the lowest, meanest form of death; not only the form of a servant, but of the basest criminal; thus was He not only "*obedient unto death,*" but "*made Himself of no reputation.*"

"*And with Him they crucify two thieves; the one on His right hand, and the other on His left.*" This gives us another view of Christ crucified. Now we may behold the cross as the judgment throne will be: on the one hand the sheep, on the other the goats; on the one hand the penitent saved malefactor, on the other the miserable impenitent railer. And, again, in the two thieves alone, we may see the different effects the preaching of the Gospel would have on the children of men.

Lastly, let us see in Christ's cross a special and strangely beautiful type of that new covenant, that new commandment, that Love, of which He came into the world to be an example and a firstfruit. Let us behold in the cross stretching four ways, the length and breadth, the depth and height, of that Love; and in His arms, extended upon it, the infinite mercy that would embrace all His poor creatures, draw them to His heart, and hold them there.

"*Father forgive them; for they know not what they do*" (S. Luke xxii. 34.) These words seem the very outpouring of the love which we have just been contemplating in Christ crucified. The prayer appears to have been made at the time when the soldiers were employed in driving the nails through his hands and feet; and probably they were primarily intended as the objects of it; since, as Romans, "*they knew not what they did.*" But in its more extended sense it

applies equally to all souls for all time; for the great thing that Christ died to procure was forgiveness of sins, and the first words He utters upon His death-cross are a prayer for it. His last declaration is love to His enemies; His last legacy, an earnest request to God for the forgiveness of His persecutors and malefactors. And not only does he wish their pardon—not only does He “pray the Father for them;” He even pleads, He turns advocate—“for they know not what they do.”

“Verrily I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with Me in paradise” (S. Luke xxiii. 43.) There is perhaps no passage of Scripture that calls for more earnest attention, more reverent truth-seeking, than this solitarily recorded instance of death-bed forgiveness. Let us consider it, first, as regards our Saviour; secondly, as regards the poor thief; lastly, as regards ourselves.

As regards our Saviour, it is evidently intended as a grand display of His power and grace. Thus He triumphed over Satan, upon the cross; thus He communicated life when He was in the very jaws of death; thus He dispensed pardon; and thus He disposed of a kingdom, as from a glorious throne, when crucified as a malefactor.

As regards the thief, let us see what he did to merit so signal a mercy. One of the fundamental truths of our religion is, that we have power of ourselves to do neither good nor evil; but that we have power to choose whether we will be instruments in the hands of the Holy Spirit, or of the devil—for the temple of one or of the other our bodies must be. Now, Christ's extraordinary meekness and patience under his sufferings, and His prayers for His murderers, were a special revelation of the Holy Spirit; and to this revelation the thief yielded himself up. So yielding, he was led to “believe in his heart unto righteousness”—to “make confession with his mouth unto salvation.” And this under such disadvantages, such discouragements, as, except the same Jesus were to be again crucified, never can be equalled. He believed Christ to be the Saviour of the world when one of His disciples had betrayed Him, another denied Him, and all of them had forsaken Him; to be the Son of God, the Lord of life, when He was hanging on the cross, suffering the pangs of death, and seemingly deserted by His Father; he proclaims Him the Lord of paradise when all the Jews condemned him, and the Gentiles crucified Him as an imposter and malefactor. He feared God, acknowledged the justice of his punishment, and with patience submitted to it; he condemned himself, and justified the holy Jesus, declaring that He had done nothing amiss. He was solicitous, not for the preservation of his body, but for the salvation of his soul; and not only for his own, but for that of his brother thief, whom he so charitably reprehends, so earnestly requests not to proceed in his blasphemous language, so lovingly invites to the fear of God. The glory, therefore, which this poor thief did to Christ, by his faith and piety, upon the cross, seems such as the whole series of a pious life in other men can hardly parallel.

Lastly, as regards ourselves. Herein is our comfort, that God's mercy is endless, and can never truly be sought too late. This pardoned thief is a standing monument of this blessed truth. At the same time, let us remember that the mercies of God are never recorded for man's presumption, nor the failings of man for man's imitation. And further—for fear we should trust to this signal mercy to our soul's death; lest it should be abused, and that God may be “clear when he is judged”—it is contrasted with the awful case of the thief who died hardened in unbelief, with a crucified Saviour before his eyes,

as a warning to presuming sinners that *in general men die as they live*, and that though it is certain *true repentance never comes too late*, it is also certain that *late repentance is seldom true*.

"*Woman, behold thy son!*" "*Behold thy mother!*" (S. John xix. 26, 27). In our Saviour's pardon to the dying thief, He speaks to us supremely as God. In His next words it is His manhood that is more strikingly set before us. Thus touchingly He hallows earthly love; thus tenderly He teaches all men to honour their parents in life and death. Son and mother was the earthly relation He had specially sanctified; and now that His mother was about to lose her Son—now that the sword, foretold by Simon, was about to pierce her soul—He chooses, to replace the loss, the disciple who had been the friend of His own man's heart; who had been beloved by Him with a peculiar degree of affection; who, doubtless returning this love to the utmost degree possible to humanity, was at once of all men in the world fittest to comfort, and in his own case most worthy to receive, such a mother.

As Lent draws on to Passiou-tide, appropriately do our thoughts pass on to the final agony of our Redeemer; to those two fearful utterances wrung out of His torture; and finally to the glad outburst of victory that foreruns our Easter-tide.

"*My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?*" (S. Matt. xxvii. 46; Ps. xxii. 1.) Following upon the words of our Saviour to His disciple S. John, came the three hours of miraculous darkness, when all created light veiled its shining before Jesus in agony, and enveloped in darkness a world that crucified Him. Then was "*the Son of Righteousness,*" "*the Light of the World,*" under an eclipse. Then was Jesus in agony, wrestling with the powers of darkness; suffering His Father's displeasure against the sin of man, for which He was making himself an offering. Then (in that *He was made sin for us*) was His soul full of sin, and the light of His Father's and the Comforter's love withdrawn from Him. Then was He truly "*very man.*" And from his manhood rang out that exceeding bitter cry, "*My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken Me?*"

Let us not forget that our sins formed part of this agony. Let us not forget that for us also Christ was crucified. Let us not dwell too entirely on the sin of his actual murderers; lest, without due prayer and watchfulness on our own part, we also "*crucify the Son of God afresh;*" lest, equally with the revilers who stood about His cross, we also "*put Him to open shame.*"

It is notable that in this utterance of our Saviour's agony—that during this special and exclusive assumption of His manhood—He no longer uses his own words, as in the former instances we have been considering; but those of His great human prototype, David.

"*I thirst!*" (S. John xix. 28; Ps. lxix. 21.) Still the agony! still the man Christ Jesus, wrestling, suffering, wailing! He whose blood had been poured out like water; whose blood still writhed in torture; from whose soul—now an altar, whereon were laid the sacrifices of sin—the light of His Father's love was still withdrawn—this man thirsted; thirsted the thirst which is ever the consequence of intense and prolonged human suffering; thirsted as had been foretold; thirsted for the redemption which His sufferings were to win; thirsted—what sinner can imagine how intensely?—to behold again the light of His Father's face. And even in this last suffering, may we see a last signal and saving act of mercy. "*Now there was set a vessel full of vinegar; and*" (in answer to His cry of thirst) "*they filled a sponge with vinegar, and put it to His*

mouth." Vinegar, be it remembered, had been for many ages the common drink of the lower people in the East, and it was at that time the beverage of the Roman soldiers. We may reasonably believe, therefore, that there were some souls to whom this moment of our Saviour's thirst was "*the accepted time*," the "*day of salvation*;" inasmuch as "*He was thirsty, and they gave Him drink*." And thus our Lord's first and last act upon the cross was the immediate saving of souls.

"*It is finished*" (S: John xix. 30.) If we to whom sin is original nature are powerless to imagine, much less to put into words, the extremity of our Saviour's sufferings, the exquisite agony of sin to a sinless God, equally does human reason collapse, powerless, before the rapture, the happiness of His first words, after His sufferings were ended. "*It is finished*." Finished the suffering—finished Redemption; fulfilled the prophecies; merged into the reality of truth and substance the types and shadows; gained the victory over Satan, sin, the world, and death; vindicated God's honour; made sure His ancient promise and purpose! Alleluia!

Father, into Thy hands I commend My spirit," (S. Luke xxiii. 46; Psalms xxxi. 5.) So many thoughts crowd upon this last sacrificial utterance of Jesus, God and man, that it is difficult to arrange them clearly. First, it is God who speaks to us. Men, when they are at the point of death, can hardly utter a feeble cry; but Jesus "*cried with a loud voice*." And His blessed head fell not; He "*bowed*" it; He "*yielded up the ghost*;" He died only because He willed to die. In so much He was God; but as man also, in these last words, as in everything, He was our great ensample. Again, at the last, He spake to us, not in His own words, but in the words of His human prototype, showing man's triumph in death. And we, who are told that "*except we become as little children we shall in no wise enter the kingdom of heaven*"—in what other words than these, "*Father, into Thy hands I commend My spirit*," could we find so perfect, so simple an example of child-like faith, trust, confidence, love?

There is also an important doctrine of our Church embodied in these words which we must not overlook. Herein is distinct proof that the human soul is distinct from the body; that it lives after it; in a state separate from it; and such a state as is susceptible of happiness or misery. For why is the spirit here the object of our Lord's care, and commended to God, but because there is a place of safety from danger, where saved souls shall not only survive, but live also in a manner very different from that in which they lived here; free alike from temptation, sin, and affliction?

For the Young.

LIFE, VOYAGES AND DISCOVERIES OF CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS.

[CONTINUED.]

OUR young readers will recollect that we left the subject of our remarks in the previous number of the Chronicle struggling manfully against the ignorance of nobles and others, who ought to have been his principal supporters; and it now becomes our pleasing duty to exhibit the result of his perseverance, viz:

the attainment of his long desired plan of sailing in search of unknown western lands.

It appears that one of the great obstacles of his success in gaining the consent of the Court of Spain, was the nature of his demands; his principal stipulation being, that he should be appointed admiral or viceroy in all the lands which he should discover, and receive one-tenth of all gains arising therefrom. When it was objected that in case of failure he would lose nothing, he offered to advance one-eighth of the sum required for the execution of his enterprise, on condition that he should be entitled to one-eighth of his profits. He made no stipulation for any reward or emolument whatever, in the event of failure. But his terms were rejected by those who treated with him. The actual expense, it was said, would be certainly great; the honours and emoluments claimed by Columbus would be exorbitant, even should he perform the uttermost of what he promised; and if all his sanguine hopes should prove illusive, such vast concessions to an adventurer would be deemed not only inconsiderate, but ridiculous, and hereafter be cited in proof of the gross credulity of the Spanish monarchs.

Under these circumstances, Columbus determined to abandon Spain and endeavour to seek from other nations the support which the country of Ferdinand and Isabella had refused him. In the beginning of February, 1492, he quitted Santa Fé, and took the way to Cordova, whence he intended to repair to France. His departure was a source of deep regret to those friends who had embraced his views; and to none more so than to his old patron Alopzo de Quintanilla, comptroller of the finances of Castile, and to Louis de St. Angel, receiver of the ecclesiastical revenues of Arragon. Anxious, if possible, to avert the irreparable loss which Spain would in their minds sustain, if Columbus were allowed to depart and carry his project into another country, they hastened to the Queen and addressed her with the eloquence of honest zeal. Moved by their forcible arguments; Isabella at last consented to the terms proposed by Columbus, and after a slight hesitation occasioned by the coldness of Ferdinand, and the empty state of the royal treasury, she declared her resolution to undertake the enterprise for her own crown of Castile, and to pledge her jewels to raise the necessary funds. St. Angel relieved her from this mortifying expedient by engaging to advance the required sum as a loan from the treasury of Arragon. Columbus was overtaken at a distance of two leagues from Grenada by a messenger of the Queen, who bore a request for his immediate return to Santa Fé; he obeyed after giving way to a momentary feeling of distrust, excited by a recollection of the frequent bitter disappointments which he had already undergone. On his arrival he was cordially received by Isabella; and the assent of Ferdinand having at length been obtained, the negotiations were quickly brought to a favourable close. On the 17th April, 1492, articles of agreement were signed at Santa Fé by Ferdinand and Isabella, to the following effect:—

1. That Columbus should have, for himself during his life, and his heirs and successors for ever, the office of admiral in all the lands and continents which he might discover or acquire in the ocean, with similar honours and prerogatives to those enjoyed by the high admiral of Castile, in his district.
2. That he should be viceroy, and governor-general over all the said lands and continents; with the privileges of nominating three candidates for the

government of each island or province; one of whom should be selected by the Sovereign.

3. That he should be entitled to reserve for himself one-tenth of all pearls, precious stones, gold, silver, and spices, and all other articles and merchandize in whatever manner found, bought, bargained or gained within his admiralty, the cost being first deducted.

4. That he, or his lieutenant, should be the sole judge in all causes or disputes arising out of traffic between those countries and Spain, provided the high admiral of Castile had similar jurisdiction in his district.

5. That he might contribute an eighth part of the expense in fitting out vessels to sail on this enterprize, and receive an eighth part of the profits.

Obstacles again presented themselves in the fitting out of the vessels intended for the expedition, and even after all the difficulty which had been experienced in fitting them out, the slender armament which only consisted of three small ships was considered neither befitting the dignity of the nation by which it was equipped, nor adequate to the important service for which it was destined. Columbus, however, had too much enterprise and courage in his disposition to be led away by the ideas of alarmists; for the small size of his three ships, two of which were barely larger than coasting schooners, and only partially decked over, seemed to exhibit a degree of recklessness which many supposed would terminate fatally. Everything, however, was at last arranged, and Columbus embarked in the largest of the three, which was completely decked, and named the "Santa Maria;" Martin Alonso Pinzon was the captain of the second, called the "Pinta;" and his youngest brother, Francisco Martin, the pilot; while the other vessel, called the "Nina," was commanded by the second brother, Vincente Yanez Pinzon. Three other pilots were engaged in the expedition, with some official functionaries, a few private adventurers, a physician and a surgeon, and ninety seamen, who made altogether one hundred and twenty persons.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

ADJOURNED CONFERENCE OF BISHOPS OF THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION.

HOLDEN AT LAMBETH PALACE. DECEMBER 10, 1867.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES APPOINTED BY THE CONFERENCE.

(Concluded.)

III.—On the Courts of Metropolitan, and the Trial of a Bishop or Metropolitan.*

I. Your Committee consider that the constitution of the provincial tribunal for appeals from the decisions of diocesan tribunals, should be determined, whenever, it is not fixed by law, by the synod of the province; but it is expedient, in their judgment, that its rules should be assimilated, as far as circumstances will admit, to those of the proposed tribunal of appeal in England.

* Resolution X.—"That the resolutions submitted to this Conference relative to the discipline to be exercised by the Metropolitan, the Court of Metropolitans, the scheme for conducting the election of Bishops, when not otherwise provided for, the declaration of submission to the regulation of Synods, and the question of what legislation should be proposed for the Colonial Churches, be referred to the committee specified in the preceding resolution."

II. In the case of charges against a bishop, they suggest the following as general principles:—

That each province should determine by rules made in its own synod the offences for which a bishop may be presented for trial, and who should be promoters of the charge.

That the charge should be presented to the metropolitan.

That it appears doubtful whether a preliminary inquiry is expedient, provided that sufficient precautions are taken that no frivolous charges should be entertained.

That the metropolitan should summon to the hearing of the cause all the bishops of the province (except the accused), who should sit as judges, not merely as assessors.

That no trial should take place, except before two-thirds of the bishops of the province, provided that there be never fewer than three bishops present, including the metropolitan.

That if three bishops of the province should be unable to attend, it should be lawful for the metropolitan to call in one or more bishops not of the province.

That it is desirable that, whenever it may be practicable, there should be assessors, as recommended by this Committee for the higher tribunal of appeal.

That in case of the non-appearance of the accused after sufficient citations, the trial may go forward as if he were present, or he may be punished for contumacy, according as the province may prescribe.

That there should be no sentence except by the judgment of two-thirds of the tribunal, or by three judges, whichever should be the greater number; the assent of the metropolitan not being necessary to the sentence.

That the general rules of procedure should be framed by the synod of the province; but should be, as far as possible, similar to those recommended by this Committee for the proposed tribunal of appeal.

That an appeal to the higher tribunal recommended by this Committee should be allowed when the case is one of doctrine, or discipline involving doctrine, if notice of such appeal be given within _____ days from the delivery of sentence; and that in all cases, proper provision should be made for a new trial on sufficient reason being shown.

That there should be no contract not to appeal to civil courts; but that sufficient provision should be made by the declaration of submission (to be considered in another report), that the sentence of the spiritual tribunals may be effective.

That a metropolitan should be tried in the same manner as any other bishop—the senior bishop, in that case, acting in the place of the metropolitan.

F. MONTREAL, *Chairman.*

H. GRAHAMSTOWN, *Secretary.*

IV. *Scheme for conducting the election of bishops, when not otherwise provided for.*

Your Committee have to consider the proper mode for conducting the election of a bishop, wherever it is not provided for by any existing law, and without reference to any question that might arise as to the temporalities connected with the see.

It is evident that there are two parties whose concurrent action is necessary in such an appointment; viz., the clergy and laity of the diocese, and the bishops of the province by whom the person elected as bishop is consecrated.

Your Committee are of opinion that, in accordance with the ancient usages of the Church, the election as a general rule should be made by the diocese, and that the bishops of the province should confirm the election. They consider, however, that it is consistent with this principle that the diocese should nominate two or more persons, of whom the bishops of the province should elect one; or that the diocese should delegate to any person or body the power of choosing a bishop for the vacant see, it being understood that the diocese must accept such choice as final.

The principle of the concurrent action of the two parties concerned would also be preserved if the bishops of the province should nominate two or more persons, from whom the diocese should elect one.

In the election by the diocese, it appears to your Committee that the right of select-

ing the person who shall be their bishop belongs to the clergy, the laity having the right of accepting or rejecting the person so chosen. But it is expedient, in their judgment, that the election should always be made by the diocesan synod, wherever one is established, and in accordance with the rules of that synod. In those dioceses in which there is no diocesan synod, they recommend that, for the election of a bishop a convention should be summoned by the dean, senior archdeacon, or senior presbyter of the diocese; that this convention should consist of all presbyters, and of lay-representatives, who should be male communicants of at least twenty-one years of age; that these representatives should be elected by each parish or congregation, in such manner as should be determined by the convener; that the person who should obtain the majority of votes of the clergy, and also of those of the lay-representatives, present at the convention, should be accounted to be elected to the bishopric; that this election should not be vitiated by the absence of any of the parties summoned, or by the failure of any congregation or parish to elect a lay-representative; that any question as to the validity of the election to the vacant see should be submitted, prior to the consecration, to the consecrating bishops, whose decision should be final; and that after the consecration of a bishop no objection should be entertained.

They further recommend that, where the diocese is included in a province, the confirmation of an election should be by the metropolitan and a majority of the bishops of the province; but where the diocese is extra-provincial, that the confirmation should rest with the Archbishop of Canterbury and York, and the Bishop of London; that the power of confirmation should be absolute—the bishops having the right to refuse to confirm the election, without assigning any reason for their refusal.

All further rules necessary for conducting the election should, in the opinion of your Committee, be made by the synod of the province.

F. MONTREAL, *Chairman.*

H. GRAHAMSTOWN, *Secretary.*

V. On Declaration of Submission to Regulations of Synod.

Your Committee recommend that, in all branches of the Church, the government of which is not determined by law, a declaration should be made by those who hold office therein. They consider that a declaration is necessary, in order to define the conditions of the consensual compact, and that it should be framed so as to secure submission to all synodical action in its legitimate sphere, and to the decisions of the constituted tribunals.

They recommend the following declaration to be made, before the metropolitan, or some person duly appointed by him, by all bishops elect, either before their consecration, or, if already consecrated, before exercising any episcopal functions in their dioceses:—

"I, A. B., chosen Bishop of the Church and See of _____, do promise that I will teach and maintain the doctrine and discipline of the United Church of England and Ireland, as acknowledged and received by the province of _____, and I also do declare that I consent to be bound by all the rules and regulations which have heretofore been made or which may from time to time be made, by the Synod of the Diocese of _____, and the Provincial Synod of _____, or either of them; and, in consideration of being appointed Bishop of the said Church or See of _____, I hereby undertake immediately to resign the said appointment, together with all the rights and emoluments appertaining thereto, if sentence requiring such resignation should at any time be passed upon me, after due examination had, by the tribunal acknowledged by the synod of the said province for the trial of a bishop; saving all rights of appeal allowed by the said synod."

They recommend that the following declaration be made (in addition to the declaration required by the rules of that province or diocese as to doctrine and worship) by persons to be admitted to holy orders, and by clergyman to be admitted to the cure of souls, or to any other office of trust in the Church:—

"I, A. B., do declare that I consent to be bound by all the rules and regulations which have heretofore been made, or which may from time to time be made, by

the Synod of the Diocese of _____, and the Provincial Synod of _____ or either of them; [and in consideration of being appointed _____, I hereby, undertake immediately to resign the said appointment, together with all the rights and emoluments appertaining thereto, if sentence requiring such resignation should at any time be passed upon me, after due examination had, by the tribunal appointed by the Synods of the aforesaid province and diocese for the trial of a clergyman; saving all rights of appeal allowed by the said synod].”

(The part in brackets to be omitted when there is no appointment to a cure of souls, or office of trust.)

Your Committee consider that it must be left to the province or diocese to decide whether laymen who are admitted to any office or position of trust should be required to sign a declaration of the same nature.

G. A. NEW ZEALAND, *Chairman*.
H. GRAHAMSTOWN, *Secretary*.

VI. On Provinces and Subordination to Metropolitans.

On this subject your Committee beg to report as follows :

They are of opinion that the association or federation of dioceses within certain territorial limits, commonly called an Ecclesiastical Province, is not only in accordance with the ancient laws and usages of the Christian Church, but is essential to its complete organization.

Such an association is of the highest advantage for united action, for the exercise of discipline, for the confirmation of the election of bishops, and generally to enable the Church to adapt its laws to the circumstances of the countries in which it is planted.

It is expedient, in the judgment of your Committee, that these ecclesiastical divisions should, as far as possible, follow the civil divisions of these countries.

Of the bishops of these dioceses thus associated, one, in conformity with ancient usage, ought to be Metropolitan or Primus, the functions and powers of the metropolitan being determined by synodical action in the province, except so far as metropolitan powers are defined by undisputed General Councils of the Church.

It seems to your Committee most in accordance with primitive usage that the metropolitan see should be fixed, but they do not deem this to be essential. It appears expedient that the Provincial Synod should have the power of changing, when necessary, the site of the metropolitan see.

Your Committee do not consider it necessary that the election to the new metropolitan see should be conducted differently from the election to other vacant sees; since the bishops of the province possess the right of confirming or refusing to confirm any election.

Your Committee strongly recommend that all these dioceses which are not as yet gathered into provinces should, as soon as possible, form part of some provincial organization. The particular mode of affecting in each case must be determined by those who are concerned.

It is sufficient for your Committee to point out that the steps to be taken for affecting this change are two-fold, since the relations of the dioceses in provincial organization, when complete, are formed on the one hand by the subordination of the bishops of the province to a metropolitan, and on the other by the association of the dioceses in provincial action. Any alteration of existing arrangements would require, therefore, in the opinion of your Committee, the concurrent action of the diocese which is to be gathered into a province with other neighbouring dioceses, and of his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, to whom the bishops of the dioceses that are at present extra-provincial have taken the oath of canonical obedience. In the case of the limits of an existing province being altered, the consent of the synod of that province would be required for the alteration.

F. MONTREAL, *Chairman*.
H. GRAHAMSTOWN, *Secretary*

VII.—*Report of the Committee appointed under Resolution XI. of the Lambeth Conference.**

Your committee report that, after full consideration of the questions referred to them by the Conference, they have adopted the following resolutions:—

- I. That every branch of the Church is entitled to found a Missionary Bishopric.
- II. That it is desirable that each branch of the Church should act upon rules agreed upon beforehand by the Synod or other Church Council of the said branch.
- III. That each Missionary Bishopric should be deemed to be attached to one branch of the Church, and that all rules for the election of a Missionary Bishop, and for the formation of a diocese or dioceses out of the missionary district, should be made by the Synod or other Church Council of such branch of the Church.
- IV. That notice of the erection of any Missionary Bishopric, and the choice and consecration of the Bishop, should be notified to all Archbishops and Metropolitans, and all presiding Bishops of the Anglican Communion.
- V. That in appointing a Missionary Bishop, the district within which he is to exercise his mission should be defined as far as possible; and that no other Bishop should be sent within the same district, without previous communication with that branch of the Church which gave mission for the work.
- VI. That, while peculiar cases may occur in missionary work, owing to difference of race and language, in which it may be desirable that more than one Bishop should exercise Episcopal functions within the same district; the committee consider that such cases should be regarded as exceptions, justified only by special circumstances.
- VII. That, with respect to the special case of Continental chaplaincies, the committee suggest to the Conference the consideration of some ecclesiastical arrangement by which the various congregations of the Anglican communion may be under one authority, whether of the English or American Church.
- VIII. That the conditions on which a Missionary Bishopric should be brought within a provincial organization should be—
 - (1.) The request of the Missionary Bishop, addressed both to the Church from which he received mission and to the province which he wishes to join.
 - (2.) The consent of the Church from which he received mission, that consent being given by the Metropolitan or presiding Bishop.
 - (3.) The consent of the province he wishes to join, that consent being given by the Provincial Synod.
- IX. That the *status*, jurisdiction, and designation of the Bishop thus received into a system of provincial organization should be determined by the Synod of the province to which his bishopric should be selected.
- X. That, as a general rule, it is expedient that such Missionary Bishopric should be attached to the nearest province; but that in certain cases it may be necessary that some more remote province should be selected.
 Bishop Tozer's mission is a case to which the committee desire to draw the attention of the Conference, as being one in which, for the present, provincial organization would seem to be impracticable, from the isolation of the district in which Bishop Tozer exercises his Episcopal functions, and its remoteness from the province of South Africa.
- XI. That Missionary Bishops and their clergy should be bound generally to the canons of doctrine and discipline of the Church from which their mission is derived, or to which they may have been united, and that all alterations in matters of discipline be communicated to the authorities of that Church.
- XII. That when a Missionary Church shall be received into the organization of a Provincial Synod, the said Church should be bound by the acts of that body; but that, in order to effect this, the Missionary Church should be granted a power of representation, or of vote by proxy, in such Synod.
- XIII. That, as a general rule, in conformity with Church order, all missionaries and chaplains residing or engaged in the exercise of ministerial duty within the diocese or

Resolution XI.—"That a special committee be appointed to consider the resolutions relative to the notification of proposed Missionary Bishoprics, and the subordination of missionaries."

district of a Colonial or Missionary Bishop should be licensed by, and be subject to the authority of, the said Bishop.

XIV. That every clergyman removing from one colonial or missionary diocese or district into another diocese ought to carry with him letters testimonial from the Colonial or Missionary Bishop whose diocese or district he is leaving.

XV. That no person admitted to holy orders by the Bishop of any diocese in England or Ireland, who shall afterwards have been serving under the jurisdiction of any Scottish, Colonial, or foreign Bishop, should be received into any of the home dioceses, without producing letters dismissory or commendatory from the Scottish, Colonial, or foreign Bishop in whose diocese he has been serving.

XVI. The attention of this committee has been called to the clause in the paper of arrangements for the Conference, headed "Subordination of Missionaries." The committee has failed to understand what is meant by the words "instructions from those in authority at home," but it can recommend no scheme which interferes with the canonical relation which subsists between a Bishop and the clergy.

W. J. GIBRALTAR, Chairman.

WILLIAM GEORGE TOZER, Missionary Bishop, Secretary.

VIII.—*Report of the Committee appointed under Resolution VI. of the Lambeth Conference.**

By the resolution of the Lambeth Conference two questions were referred to the committee :

1. How the Church may be delivered from a continuance of the scandal now existing in Natal ?

2. How the true faith may be maintained ?

I. On the first question, the committee recommend that an address be made to the Colonial Bishops Council, calling their attention to the fact that they are paying an annual stipend to a Bishop lying under the imputation of heretical teaching, and praying them to take the best legal opinion as to there being any, and if so what, mode of laying these allegations before some competent court, and if any mode be pointed out, then to proceed accordingly for the removal of this scandal.

The committee also recommend that the address to the Colonial Bishops Council be prefaced with the following statement :

"That, whilst we accept the spiritual validity of the sentence of deposition pronounced by the Metropolitan and Bishops of the South African Church upon Dr. Colenso, we consider it of the utmost moment for removing the existing scandal from the English communion that there should be pronounced by some competent English court such a legal sentence on the errors of the said Dr. Colenso as would warrant the Colonial Bishops Council in ceasing to pay his stipend, and would justify an appeal to the Crown to cancel his letters patent."

II. On the second question—

"How the true faith may be maintained in Natal?"

The committee submit the following report:—

That they did not consider themselves instructed by the Conference, and therefore did not consider themselves competent, to inquire into the whole case; but that their conclusions are based upon the following facts:—

1. That in the year 1863, *forty-one* Bishops concurred in an address to Bishop Colenso, urging him to resign his bishopric.

2. That in the year 1863, some of the publications of Dr. Colenso—viz., *The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua critically examined*, Parts I. and II., were condemned by the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury.

* *Resolution VI.*—"That, in the judgment of the Bishops now assembled, the whole Anglican communion is deeply injured by the present condition of the Church in Natal; and that a committee be now appointed at this general meeting to report on the best mode by which the Church may be delivered from a continuance of this scandal, and the true faith maintained. That such report shall be forwarded to his Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, with the request that he will be pleased to transmit the same to all the Bishops of the Anglican communion, and to ask for their judgment thereupon."

3. That the Bishop of Capetown, by virtue of his letters patent as Metropolitan, might have visited Dr. Colenso with summary jurisdiction, and might have taken out of his hands the management of the diocese of Natal.

4. That the Bishop of Capetown, instead of proceeding summarily, instituted judicial proceedings, having reason to believe himself to be competent to do so.

That he summoned Dr. Colenso before himself and Suffragans.

That Dr. Colenso appeared by his proctor.

That his defence was heard and judged to be insufficient to purge him from the heresy.

That, after sentence was pronounced, Dr. Colenso was offered an appeal to the Archbishop of Canterbury, as provided in the Metropolitan's letters patent.

5. That this act of the African Church was approved—

By the Convocation of Canterbury;

By the Convocation of York;

By the General Convention of the Episcopal Church in the United States in 1865;

By the Episcopal Synod of the Church in Scotland;

By the Provincial Synod of the Church in Canada, in the year 1865;

And, finally, the [spiritual] validity of the sentence of deposition was accepted by fifty-six Bishops on the occasion of the Lambeth Conference.

Judging, therefore, that the see is spiritually vacant; and learning by the evidence brought before them, that there are many members of the Church who are unable to accept the ministrations of Dr. Colenso, the committee deem it to be the duty of the Metropolitan and other Bishops of South Africa to proceed, upon the election of the clergy and laity in Natal, to consecrate one to discharge those spiritual functions of which these members of the Church are in want.

In forwarding their report to his Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, as instructed by the resolution of the Conference, the committee request his Grace to communicate the same to the adjourned meeting of the Conference, to be holden at Lambeth on the 10th day of the present month.

G. A. NEW ZEALAND, Convener.

December 9th, 1867.

IX.—*Form of Letters Dismissory for the Clergy.*

To the Right Reverend the Bishop, and Reverend the Clergy, and to the faithful in Christ of the Diocese of A.

We, B, by Divine permission Bishop of C, send greeting in the Lord.

We commend to your brotherly kindness by these our letters, D E, Priest [or Deacon] of our own diocese, beseeching you to receive him in the Lord, as a brother, sound in the faith, of a well-ordered and religious life, and worthy of all Christian fellowship, and to render him any assistance of which he may stand in need; and so we bid you farewell in Christ our Lord.

Witness our hand,

A, BISHOP.

B, SECRETARY.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE ADJOURNED CONFERENCE.

Resolution I.—"That this adjourned meeting of the Conference receives the report (No. 1) of the committee now presented, and directs the publication thereof, commending it to the careful consideration of the Bishops of the Anglican communion, as containing the result of the deliberations of that committee; and returns the members of the same its thanks for the care with which they have considered the various important questions referred to them."

(The same resolution was passed with reference to Reports II., III., IV., V., VI., VII.)

Resolution II.—"That the report (No. VIII.) of the committee appointed under Resolution VI., laid before this meeting by his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, be received and printed; that the thanks of this meeting be given to the committee for

their labours; and that his Grace be requested to communicate the report to the Council of the Colonial Bishops Fund."

Resolution III.—"That his Grace be requested, if applied to by the House of Bishops in the Episcopal Church in the United States of America, to allow a copy of the records of the Conference to be made for them, and to be lodged in the hands of such officer as shall be designated by the House of Bishops to receive it, for reference by Bishops only, but not for publication."

Resolution IV.—"That his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury be requested to convey to the Church in Russia an expression of the sympathy of the Anglican communion with that Church, in the loss which it has sustained by the death of his Eminence Philarete, the venerable Metropolitan of Moscow."

Resolution V.—"That the thanks of this Conference be given to the Bishop of Grahamstown for the valuable services which he has rendered as secretary to many of the committees appointed by the Conference."

Resolution VI.—"That the thanks of this Conference be given to Philip Wright, Esq., and to Isambard Brunel, Esq., barristers-at-law, for their aid as assistant secretaries to the committees; and especially to the latter for his valuable assistance in all matters that required legal advice."

Resolution VII.—"That we cannot close this Conference without conveying our hearty thanks to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, both for convening this meeting, and for the mode in which he has presided over its deliberations."

Besides the preceding resolutions, the President reported that he had been authorized to annex the following signatures to the Encyclical Letter:—

A. T. Cicestr.	Edward Newfoundland.
Auckland Bath and Wells.	J. Fredericton.
Robert Down and Connor.	T. E. St. Helena.
William Derry.	

2. The following Bishops were appointed as a sub-committee, for the purpose of drawing up a bill, in accordance with a report submitted by the committee appointed under Resolution IX. of the previous meeting:—

Bishop of London.	Bishop of Lichfield (elect).
" Oxford.	" Montreal.
" Lincoln.	" Grahamstown.
" Ely.	Bishop Trower.

3. His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury laid on the table a form of Letters Dismissory [Report IX.] which he had prepared, in accordance with Resolution II. of the last session of the Lambeth Conference.

4. The Bishop of Illinois, at the request of the Lambeth Conference, that the meeting of the Triennial General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States would be held on the first Wednesday of October next, in the city of New York; and, in behalf of the Church in the United States, offered an affectionate invitation to the Bishops of the Conference to be present on that occasion; and also expressed the hope that the different branches of the Anglican communion would depute one or more Bishops as representatives of the Mother and Colonial Churches, to be present on that occasion, assuring all that might accept this invitation of cordial welcome and affectionate brotherhood.

(5.) At the request of the Conference, the Bishop of Lichfield (elect) undertook the office of corresponding secretary for the Bishops of the Anglican communion.

His Grace the President then pronounced the Benediction, and the Conference was closed.

Church News.

ENGLAND.—The following petition was laid before the Convocation of York, which met on the 6th ult.:

The humble petition of the undersigned (clergy or laity),

Sheweth—1. That this realm is grievously injured by its religious divisions, whereby Christians are separated from one another in the common acts of worship.

2. That, according to Holy Scripture and primitive antiquity, nothing more was required for union among the faithful than Baptism, the reception of the Holy Communion, and the holding the Creeds of the Universal Church.

Your petitioners therefore pray that your honourable house would be pleased to take some steps for the healing of these divisions, either—

1. By an appeal to unity, based on the grounds above mentioned; or,

2. By appointing a committee of your honourable house to confer with Nonconformists on the terms of union, and to devise the way whereby the ministers of the various Nonconforming bodies may be brought into co-operation and unity with the clergy of the Church.

After an interesting debate, in which the strong desire of the Convocation for unity was very manifest, the resolution, amended as follows, was unanimously adopted, viz:—

That whereas the union of all faithful Christians is earnestly to be desired, and as many of the causes which led to the separation of the Wesleyans from the Church of England are sensibly diminished, this house would cordially welcome any practical attempt to effect a brotherly reconciliation between the Wesleyan Body and the Church of England.

About eleven years ago a movement was made in the Convocation of Canterbury towards the same end, but came to nothing, because the mode of admission offered by the Church to Dissenters was simply absorption,—“lay down your arms and come in.” But now, some propose that the Wesleyan body be invited to come in, not individually, but as a Body, ordination thenceforth to be Episcopal, and the preachers (not ordained) to be allowed under Episcopal supervision, still to labour as preachers, but that the Sacraments be administered by Episcopally ordained clergymen. Men of mark, it is proposed, shall be made bishops. It is not too too say that such concessions in Wesley's days would have retained the Wesleyans.

The desire for the increase of the Episcopate is rapidly working its way. The following resolution passed in the Convocation of York, with but two or three dissenting voices;—

That in the opinion of this house, an extension of the home Episcopate is urgently needed, and that such extension will be best secured by the creation of three new sees, and by the appointment of a Suffragan Bishop in each diocese containing not less than 500,000 souls.

The question of popular education, forced on by the recent enlargement of the franchise, is now exercising the English mind a good deal. The “godless” system, or that which excludes doctrinal (religious) teaching from the public schools, is very distasteful to the more religious part of the nation. The Prussian system of compulsory attendance at the schools does not find general favour. The free-school system, without these drawbacks, is gaining ground, viz., free schools in which religion is permitted to be taught at stated times during the week to all children who are permitted by their parents to receive such instruction.

Certain "Aggrieved Parishioners" having complained to the Bishop of St. David's of the introduction of "novelties" into the public worship in the parish of Tenby, the Bishop shows all the "novelties" to be quite consistent with the law of the Church. He says that as to the practice of placing the elements on the Lord's Table immediately before the Prayer for the Church Militant, according to the Rubric, "the question cannot be whether it is allowable to comply with the direction, but whether any clergyman may be excused for neglecting it." Referring to the judgment of the Privy Council in the case of the Knightsbridge Churches, his Lordship shows that so long as the elements are placed on the table at the proper time, it is immaterial whether they are previously put on a Credence Table or kept in the vestry,—only that in some churches there is no vestry. The clergyman's position at the altar, the Bishop says, is a matter with which no one has a right to intermeddle. The remaining answers are rather interesting:—

I am unable to find the rubric which enjoins the use of a collect after the sermon; and the propriety of the common usage appears to me open to question.

After having done all in my power to encourage the formation of choral unions throughout my diocese, it is impossible for me to censure the occasional use of choral services; and I must presume that they are agreeable to the congregation of the Cemetery Chapel. I cannot pretend to form a clear idea of the proceedings of the harvest thanksgiving from the description in the memorial. But I may observe that at every meeting of a choral union a procession is an invariable, and, with a view to order and decency, a necessary accompaniment of the service.

I have so often and so strongly recommended the use of the Offertory, that I could not consistently find fault with an attempt to introduce it, though the prudence of the step must always depend on local circumstances.

I cannot bring myself to make any remark on the introduction of a lectern, or

On the still more minute particulars which follow. They elude every attempt to weigh them, as the small dust of the balance.

At a very full meeting, lately convened in Manchester for the purpose of condemning the Church in Ireland, a majority of the meeting in the proportion of 5 to 3 voted down the cut-and-dry resolutions, and passed the following:—

That this meeting declines to pronounce an opinion in favour of destroying the Established Church in Ireland, because it has no evidence before it to justify such a proceeding; and also because this meeting has no desire to excite the angry passions of controversy throughout the country.

Mr. Bright, in a late speech on the Irish question, in Birmingham, affirmed that the days of the Irish Church Establishment were numbered, and hinted that success in the breaking up of the "grievance," would be the encouragement and guarantee of the disconnection of Church and State in England. But strange to say, Dean Close and the Recordites generally, who mortally dread this disconnection, are blindly labouring for it with all their energies, by assisting the State to throw every possible obstacle in the way of Colenso's removal, and prevent the Church from cleansing herself of deadly heresy. Mr. Bright's proposed solution of the Irish Church difficulty is placing that Church on the same footing with all the other religious bodies, or in other words making it a voluntary association. Out of the present endowments, he would give small endowments to the Church, the Roman Catholics, and the Presbyterians. By the time this is done, the State will have ceased to interfere with the doctrinal teaching of the disestablished branches of the Church, and purity will be some recompense for poverty.

The Archbishop of York seems a good deal staggered by the Bishop of Cape-town's answer to his letter, published in the *Times*. When the Dean of York

brought forward a cut-and-dry resolution in the York Convocation, advising that a legal decision on the validity of the deposition of Bishop Colenso be obtained before his successor be consecrated (which was just what the Archbishop of York had advised in his published letter), His Grace made a long speech, ending with a request that the resolution be not passed. It was accordingly withdrawn.

UNITED STATES.—Rev Henry Ward Beecher, in a recent sermon at Brooklyn showed us in its true colours that religionism which spends its enthusiasm in secular and not in sacred matters, which prompts a man to criticise severely the decorations of God's house but to grudge no expense upon his own dwelling. Alluding to Church offerings he said that "according to the liberality of a congregation in their own churches, in like manner was their liberality towards other objects. Too much could not be done for a church. He would have a flower committee, if he could, for there should be flowers in every church, to bring up to the eyes of little children and others the words of the Saviour, "consider the lilies how they grow." A congregation should bestow all the sentiment they could upon a church, work with all enthusiasm, beautify it as much as possible, and give it all the attractions which were possible and anything so spent was not squandered on the Master. He next spoke briefly on the meanness of being a cheap Christian, and said if persons were to be Christians, they should be so in effect. In conclusion he besought his hearers to act through life in a truly Christian-like manner, for a Christian's life was worth any man's having."

Publications of a grossly demoralizing tendency having at length flooded the city of New York, are now about to be checked. Pictorial illustrations of horrid crimes are daily, in certain shop windows, making the passers-by familiar with vice, while on the shelves of many of the bookstores are to be found abundant incentives to lust. The District Attorney now contemplates bringing these, as a Nuisance, to the notice of the Grand Jury.

It would be well if the same vigilance were soon to be exercised in Halifax. We are informed by a respectable and conscientious bookseller that 'a certain periodical illustrative of crime (which every week shows its demoralizing front in some quarters) is almost every Saturday night enquired for by many apparently respectable young people of both sexes in our Metropolis.

A religious paper the *N. Y. Episcopalian* says:—"We would call the attention of the proper authorities to the objectionable and immoral exhibitions which are spread before the eyes of youth in many of our shop-windows, and at places of public resort. If it is thought advisable and necessary to organize a society for prevention of cruelty to animals, would it not be just as desirable to write for the prevention of injury and ruin to souls, reputation, minds and morals of the rising generation. The inquiry is prompted by the very general appearance of immoral and demoralizing pictures in the windows and on the news stands. It is to be feared the people are not sufficiently impressed with the magnitude of this evil. Many do not stop to scrutinize the prints to which these pictures belong, or if they do, turn away in utter disgust, wondering who buy them, and how the business can be supported. Yet these vile publications are training many youths, and are doing their pernicious work in our families. They have increased in boldness, and in the graphic representation of iniquity suggest more than they express."

Certain Churchmen on this side of the Atlantic seem determined to drive from their side all moderate men. One of their leading periodicals in the United States now declares that "The Apostolic Office was confined to the Apostles of Christ, and was never committed to successors,—and Bishops are not Apostles." [Are not Presbyters Bishops in the primitive sense?]

With such views it is no wonder that by the same party it is now published to the world that—"Some new and advanced position must be made.... The figment of re-ordination is now to be disposed of. The claims of an arrogant episcopate are now to be put upon trial." This means that it is a piece of arrogance in our Church to ordain a man who joins our ranks, if he happened to have had non-episcopal ordination before.

These people in reciting their Creed publicly professed to believe ⁱⁿ the Holy

Catholic Church," and yet in their "new and advanced position" they declared that the title of "Reformed Catholic" as applied to our Church is simply abominable,— "Protestant Episcopal" must be its name. No wonder these folks wish to have the Prayer-Book revised.

The Tyng trial excites much interest, and is beginning to be better understood. Rev. Steph. Tyng, jr., is called to account—not for preaching in a Methodist place of worship, for this is a thing of frequent occurrence in the States when the Church first appears in a new district—but because he officiated in the parish of another clergyman not only without his leave, but in the face of his prohibition. This is a direct violation of one of the Canons of the Protestant Episcopal Church, a Canon which was once brought to bear by the father of the present defendant, against a brother clergyman who officiated in his parish without his permission.

NOVA SCOTIA.—Trinity Church, Halifax, will neither be sold or mortgaged by the Trustees until after the passing of the Bill for that purpose.

Correspondence.

RIVER JOHN, Feby. 20th, 1868.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHURCH CHRONICLE.

Sir.—Will you please give publicity to the accompanying letter, which I recently received from the Rev Charles Elliott of England, by inserting it in the next issue of your valuable paper? The substantial proof which the Rev Gentleman gives of the deep interest he feels in this part of the field of his former labours will be gratifying to the members of the Church.

It may be necessary to explain that the parsonage for which the Rev. Gentleman has sent so handsome a donation is not being built, neither is it probable that the building of it will be undertaken for several years. But the money which he has so kindly sent will be added to a small sum already set aside for that purpose.

J. A. KAULBACK.

BEAUFORD BUILDING,

Gloucester, Jany. 31st, 1868.

My Dear Sir.—I send you by the present steamer £15 which together with £10 forwarded some time ago will make one hundred dollars towards the erection of a parsonage house in the mission of River John. Of this sum \$20 have been given by my friends, the balance is from myself. This I have done at some little personal sacrifice, but I have felt that your mission has peculiar claims arising from two causes. It was the sphere of my most arduous labours, while I consider that the maintenance of our Church in that quarter will for some time demand extraneous help, and more than any other section of the Province is entitled to my consideration.

I am

yours faithfully,

(Signed)

CHARLES ELLIOTT.

Notices.

DIOCESAN SYNOD.

At the Session of 1866 the following Resolution was passed.

"That the increasing responsibilities devolved upon this Synod demand that every section of this Diocese should be as fully represented as possible, and that the Executive Committee be instructed to prepare an estimate of the amount required to meet the wants of its next session, including unavoidable expenses of members non-resident in this city, and that the same be requested from the several Parishes or Congrega-

tions in such proportions as in their judgment will be fair and equitable—the amount to be paid in not later than one day after that named for opening the Session.”

In accordance with the above the Executive Committee have adopted the following scale of assessment and request the several Parishes or Congregations to comply therewith.

A scale of Disbursement has also been adopted, in accordance with which the expenses of Representatives from the Country will be paid in proportion to the amount paid in.

SUM REQUIRED \$400,—PARISHES OR MISSIONS 58.

Cathedral.....	\$44	Melford.....	6
Falkland.....	4	St. Margaret's Bay.....	8
Albion Mines.....	4	St. Mary's River.....	4
Amherst.....	8	Newport.....	6
Annapolis.....	8	Parrsboro'.....	4
Rosette.....	4	Pictou.....	9
Antigonish.....	6	River John.....	7
Aylesford.....	6	Pugwash.....	6
Barrington.....	5	Rawdon.....	5
Beaver Harbour.....	6	New Ross.....	4
Bridgetown.....	6	Sackville.....	4
Bridgewater.....	7	Shelburne.....	12
Chester.....	6	Ship Harbour.....	9
Blandford.....	5	Stewiacke.....	4
Clements.....	6	Truro.....	5
Cornwallis.....	6	Tusket.....	4
Kentville.....	7	Weymouth.....	6
Dartmouth.....	12	Windsor.....	8
Digby.....	9	Forks.....	4
New Dublin.....	9	Yarmouth.....	13
Falmouth.....	2	Arichat.....	6
Lower Granville.....	9	Sydney.....	8
Guysborough.....	7	Sydney Mines.....	8
Hubbard's Cove.....	6	Glace Bay.....	4
Liverpool.....	12	Louisburgh.....	5
Lunenburg.....	11	Walton.....	3
Mahone Bay.....	11	Portmedway.....	3
Maitland.....	6	Porter Lake.....	2
Manchester.....	2	Waverly.....	2

The Executive Committee of the DIOCESAN SYNOD OF NOVA SCOTIA, give notice that the next meeting of the Synod will be held (D. V.) in July next; (the day will be communicated after the Bishop's return) and that representatives of the laity are to be elected, by the parishes and districts entitled to be represented, at the meetings on the Monday next after Easter.*

By order of the Executive Committee,

March 10th, 1868.

EDWARD GILPIN, *Secretary.*

The Executive Committee recommend the following subjects for the consideration of the Synod at its next session:

“To petition the Legislature so far to amend the provincial law as to set apart a certain portion of the school-time of every week for the purpose of religious instruction; during which it shall be lawful for the ministers of any religious denomi-

* It is requested that the Certificates, (blank forms for which are sent) or at least the first of them, may be forwarded to the Registrar of the Diocese, Henry Pryor, Esq., immediately after the election. If No. 2 cannot be procured and forwarded with the other, it must be produced by the representative before taking his seat in the Synod.

nation to enter any of our public schools and to take charge of such children as shall be willing to receive their instruction."

"That it is desirable that the Church in this Diocese should form part of an Ecclesiastical Province."

They recommend that in the Rule for the "Election of a Bishop" the words "*in England*," be omitted.

Also, the consideration of the following Reports of Committees appointed by the Pan-Anglican Conference—

V.—On declaration of Submission to Regulations of Synod.

VII.—Relative to the notification of proposed Missionary Bishoprics, and the subordination of missionaries.

IX.—Form of Letters Dismissory for the Clergy.

Also to consider whether it is not desirable that the Synod should meet annually in other Dioceses.

The Executive Committee give the required notice of the above proposed business.

EDWIN GILPIN, Sec'y.

D. C. S.

At the last meeting of Executive Committee notice of motion was given for aid to a missionary at New Germany.

Application was made for aid to the missionary at Nowport.

The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on the 20th inst.

Attention is requested to the following Rule:—

"All Subscription Lists received before the 31st March in each year, will appear in the next forthcoming Report, while those received after that date shall be omitted."

WESLEYANISM.

In a previous paper upon Wesleyanism it was attempted to give a short account of the condition of the Church of England at the beginning and middle of the 18th century; the formation of the first Methodist Society at Oxford was also noticed. The work of the Wesleys now demands our attention. In the year 1735 the two brothers accompanied by one or two other Methodists left England to go as Missionaries to Georgia, then an English Colony. To dwell upon their work there would be beyond our purpose, it must suffice to say that they laboured there for over a year with great earnestness though without any such remarkable effect as soon afterwards began to attend their preaching in England. This period of their lives is deeply remarkable for having brought them under the influence of some Moravian brethren from whom they learned that there were some things in experimental Christianity of which they themselves were ignorant. At a later period the Wesleys themselves described their own condition at that time as being utterly unspiritual, unconverted, unregenerate. One reading their life and seeing their zeal, self-denial and love for souls would scarcely agree to so harsh a sentence, but it is plain that there was in them far too little of simple dependance upon the work of Christ. They have not yet realized what became afterwards the great theme of their preaching the great truth which gave them the power of claiming the attention of ten thousand hearers at one time, and swaying as with the power of a rushing, mighty wind the souls of a great multitude.—That great truth was the power of the faith in a present Saviour, the hope of present Salvation through Him—Faith in Him whose name was called Jesus because He should save His people *from their sins*. Whatever narrowness there may have been in their views of some portions of Divine Truth, however much they were inclined to limit the "diversities

of operation," to one fixed plan, in this matter they freely proclaimed the whole Gospel of Christ. And it came to the souls of the men of that time like refreshing showers to the parched earth—or rather it came like the Mind of God to the dry bones of the prophet's vision, causing "a noise and a shaking" but bringing with it life. They preached at first in such churches as were opened to them (let it be borne in mind that they were ordained ministers of the Church of England) but their preaching soon began to give offence. They preached a doctrine which had not been heard of for a long time "Justification by faith," and as there is always a great number of persons in the English Church who are fully persuaded that anything to which they have not been accustomed must be wrong, there were many voices clamorous against those new-fangled innovators with their strange notions. What! shall it be said that we and our forefathers have not had full and complete knowledge of what our Church teaches? If these new ideas once begin who can tell where they will end? let us leave things alone as they were; make no change; it was well enough in the old times. These new ideas must be popish (so some of them really said) and the British Protestant will endure no Popery. So said the obstructors of that day. But there was another cause of offence. The poor, the publicans and sinners pressed to hear the Wesleys, and when it was known that one of them was to preach, the church would be crammed, and the regular pew-holders who had been able to take their Sunday nap in their pews regularly for years undisturbed, found themselves crowded out by the thronging multitudes. The crowding and the heat were insufferable. Charles Wesley was a Curate at Islington. His church-wardens were determined that they would "stand it" no longer, so they hired men to stand at the pulpit stairs and forcibly prevent his entering. They pressed the Vicar (who seems to have been a moderate man) so hard that he at length dismissed his Curate. The matter was laid before the Bishop of London, who approved of the course adopted by the church-wardens in defence of the purity of the faith. And now the Wesleys were driven to follow the example that Whitfield had already set them, and preach in the open air. At first they were loth to do this; strong lovers of order, they had an abhorrence of anything at all irregular "Till lately," says John Wesley in the year 1739, "I should have thought the saving of souls almost a sin, if it had not been done in a church." It seems hard to understand now how they could have felt any difficulty about field-preaching, or how any body could object to it, but they overcame their scruples at last, and went out by the waysides. Numbers flocked to hear them—on one occasion, C. Wesley preached at Moorfields to an assemblage of ten thousand souls, soon after on Kensington Common to twice that number. Anything like a detailed account of their labours would require more space than our limits allow; one or two short accounts from the journal of Charles Wesley must suffice as an example of the rest: "At Runeville the minister lent me his pulpit. I stood at the window which was taken down and turned to the larger congregation of above two thousand in the churchyard. They appeared greedy to hear. In the afternoon I preached again to a Kensington congregation. The church was full as it could hold. Thousands stood in the churchyard. It was the most beautiful sight I ever beheld. The people filled the gradually rising area, which was shut upon three sides by a vast perpendicular hill. On the top and bottom of this hill was a circular row of trees. In this amphitheatre they stood deeply attentive, while I called upon them in Christ's words, 'Come unto me all that are weary.' The tears of many testified that they were ready to enter into that rest. God enabled me to lift up my voice like a trumpet." Imagine that scene repeated hundreds of times in England, Wales, Ireland, the earnest preacher, the weeping hearer; it was to be seen in

London and Bristol—among the Kingswood colliers, and the Cornish miners, rough wicked men, who had never entered a church in their lives, never used God's name but in blasphemy, weeping for their sins, rejoicing in a Saviour. But the scene was not always so peaceful as that just described, often their lives were in danger from the violence of a multitude too often incited by those whose duty it was to restrain them. Here is an account of the preaching of Charles Wesley at St. Ives: "I went forth towards the market place at St. Ives. When we came to the place of battle the enemy was ready set in array against us. I began the hundredth psalm, and they beating their drums and shouting. I stood still and silent for some time, finding that they would not receive my testimony. I then offered to speak to some of the most violent, but they stopped their ears, and ran upon me, crying that I should not preach there, and catching at me, to pull me down. They had no power to touch me. My soul was calm and fearless. I had just named my text when an army of rebels broke in upon us. They began in a most outrageous manner, threatening to murder the people if they did not go out that moment. They broke the sconces, dashed the windows in pieces, bore away the shutters, benches, poor box, and all but the stone wall. I stood silently looking on, but mine eyes were unto the Lord. They swore bitterly I should not preach there again, which I immediately disproved by telling them that Christ died for them all. Several times they lifted up their hands and clubs to strike me, but a stronger arm restrained them. They beat and dragged the women about, particularly one of a great age, and trampled on them without mercy. The longer they stayed and the more they raged, the more power I found from above." In this extract we have a specimen of some of the opposition which he met. But of course the hardest opposition was that which was met with from many of his brethren in the ministry. Some complained because they were "making changes," some because the crowds of communicants whom they brought to the altar imposed such additional trouble upon them. For let it be distinctly borne in mind what was the position of the Wesleyans at this time. They were not then, as they are now, a sect separated from the Church, but they were members of the Church of England, indeed her most earnest members, regular at her services, communicating at her altars. The Wesleys had not a thought of separating at this time; they were simply clergymen who, seeing that some of the truths of Christianity taught in the Bible and embodied in the Prayer Book, had fallen out of men's minds, in the face of great opposition were teaching these forgotten truths, and these truths were spreading. They were most careful not to let their preaching and special service interfere with the regular parish services. They were to be found at their meetings at five or six in the morning, and at eleven in their parish Church. Of this Church they ever spoke with the greatest affection, and they strove to awaken her. It is because they were thus engaged that we can so heartily sympathize with them, that we feel indignant at the opposition offered to them.

It will be with the deepest regret that we shall notice as we go on, how at last they grew impatient and ended with a schism; and it will suggest to us the need of earnest prayer that the Church of England may never again through a timid unreasoning conservatism, or in some outbreak of popular prejudice estrange the affections of any of her most earnest, devoted, self-denying sons.—*Com.*

WE have received the Tenth Report of the Provincial Hospital for the Insane. The rate of recovery is as usual, very encouraging, and the buildings, appliances, and grounds are shewing continual improvement.

Many thanks to Miss Katzman for late English papers.