

The Church Chronicle

FOR THE DIOCESES OF
 SYDNEY, NEWCASTLE AND GOULBURN.

"SPEAKING THE TRUTH IN LOVE."

Published on or about the 7th
 and 21st of every month. } VOL. I. No. 12.

SYDNEY, JUNE 23, 1866.

TERMS: { Annual Subscription } 12s.
 { payable in advance. }

Contents.

Diocese of Sydney—

THE LATE GENERAL CONFERENCE...	199
NEEDLESS WORK AT THE POST OFFICE ...	200
CHURCH INTELLIGENCE—	
The Bishop of Sydney—The Conference of the Three Dioceses—Ordination—The Church Society	200
Adelaide	200
English Church News	201
Italy	202
Missionary Intelligence	203
Election of Churchwardens	204
A Sermon	204
Dr. Pusey's Eirenicon	206
Infidelity Vanquished	206
Miscellaneous	206
Correspondence	207

Diocese of Newcastle—

GENERAL CONFERENCE BILL	207
Church of England Legislation	207
CHURCH INTELLIGENCE—	
Morpeth—Hinton	209
Diocese of Christ Church—New Zealand ...	209

Diocese of Goulburn—

THE GENERAL CONFERENCE	210
Correspondence	211

To Correspondents.

The Editors are not responsible for the opinions expressed by Correspondents.

We can pay no attention to anonymous communications.

Letters for *The Sydney Editors* may be addressed to the care of JOSEPH COOK and Co., 370, George-street, Sydney.

Correspondence and communications having reference to the Dioceses of Newcastle or Goulburn, should be addressed to the Newcastle or Goulburn Editors, as intimated in the first and second numbers of this publication:—

In the former case to THE DIOCESAN EDITOR of *The Church Chronicle*, MORPETH. In the latter case, to the GOULBURN EDITOR of *The Church Chronicle*, Office of the DIOCESAN DEPÔT, GOULBURN.

ERRATA.—In the previous number of *The Church Chronicle*, 11th June, (Ordination Sermon) the following errors occur:—

Page 184, col. 1, line	4, for "that" read "what"
" " " 3, "	70, for "had" read "have,"
" 195, " 1, "	59, for "Lord" read "soul"
" " " 1, "	61, after "branch" insert "and doctrine"
" 195, " 2, "	53, for "resolutions" read "revolutions"
" 195, " 3, "	4-5, for "man" read "men"
" " " 3, "	62, for "teams" read "teems,"
" 196, " 1, "	3, for "you may" read "may you."

Diocese of Sydney.

THE LATE GENERAL CONFERENCE.

We regret to find that, after the lapse of six weeks since the report of the General Conference appeared in our columns, our Newcastle brethren should have thought fit to take exception to it, and to the leading article in the same number.

We will not enter into a controversy with our friends, being persuaded that they are in error, and being desirous to promote, as far as possible, harmony and peace. A few words however are necessary by way of explanation. And we give them readily and frankly.

It was at first proposed to submit each speech to its author for correction, taking the report in the *Sydney Morning Herald* as the basis. But this idea was given up, after consulting with those whose views it was desired to ascertain and satisfy. And it was understood that the BISHOP OF NEWCASTLE in particular was content with the general adoption of the report as given in one of the daily papers.

The publisher then was supplied with a copy of the *Herald*, and the types were set up from that copy. It is no doubt true that the BISHOP OF GOULBURN and his Chaplain, the Rev. Mr. LILLINGSTON, made such alterations and additions to their speeches as more accurately to represent what they said. And there are no doubt two or three other alterations which it seemed important to introduce, with a view to a more correct representation of the

proceedings. But in the main we were indebted to the *Herald* for our report; and with the exceptions we have named, it was that which appeared in that journal.

If our friends deem it 'one-sided' we would remind them that the able and convincing speeches of CHANCELLOR GORDON and Mr. ALEXANDER STUART were so curtailed, and the main points lost sight of, that they have since determined upon publishing them at length. And if there were any seeming unfairness, it might rather be alleged by these gentlemen, than by those on the opposite side, who were certainly more fully reported, and more in accordance with what they said.

With regard to the leading article which is also complained of we cannot in justice to ourselves admit that there was any misrepresentation of facts in it. On the contrary we re-affirm all that we therein stated.

We do not pretend to know, and we should think it highly improper to reveal, what took place in the Select Committee appointed to prepare the Constitutions. But this we know for fact, that the Representatives of the Sydney Diocese were not opposed to the establishment of a Provincial Synod for the Colony as a *Court of Appeal* from the Diocesan Synods; they were decided advocates of it. They, or the large majority of them, would not have considered their work complete without provision for it being made. What they were opposed to was the establishment of a Provincial Synod, such as was proposed in the Newcastle Constitutions, which should override and

control the Diocesan Synods, and form the governing body of the Church in New South Wales. This, which we understood to have been a favourite idea in that quarter, was certainly given up in the General Conference; and thus unanimity was happily attained.

Having offered these explanatory observations in self-justification before the Church, we shall add no more, believing that the questions themselves have been settled where they ought to be, viz., in the Conference, and that what has been there settled should not now be disturbed.

NEEDLESS WORK AT THE GENERAL POST OFFICE ON SUNDAY.

WE are informed that on Sunday last, (17th instant) when the Mail Steamer was expected to arrive, the employes at the Post Office were in attendance at 9 a.m., waiting, as we presume, to perform the ordinary duties of their calling in unpacking and assorting the letters. The Steamer did not arrive till about 3 p.m. Whether these servants of the public were kept in attendance all day we do not know. But about 4 p.m. drays were seen conveying the mail boxes to the Post Office; and we are informed that the remainder of the day and evening was employed in the ordinary work of the office upon such an arrival. Now we ask—what necessity was there for this? It could not be said that there was any urgency in the matter, arising out of the late arrival of the mail, and the near approach of the departure of the next. Surely the public could have waited a few hours for their letters and newspapers, without an invasion of the sanctity of the Lord's Day, and depriving the officials of their rightful privileges—secured to them by Divine appointment. We do trust that on any similar occasion, a different course will be pursued, and if the mails *must* be landed and delivered at the Post Office, that they will be allowed to remain there unopened until the day of Holy rest is ended.

Church Intelligence.

THE BISHOP OF SYDNEY.—Our readers will be sorry to hear that the Bishop has been suffering from illness, and has twice been obliged to forego holding confirmations. Those at St. Philip's, St. John's Darlinghurst, and St. Thomas's, North Shore, were unavoidably postponed.

THE CONFERENCE OF THE THREE DIOCESES. The Metropolitan has summoned the adjourned Conference to assemble on the 11th July, to receive the Bill which has been prepared by the Committee appointed for that purpose. As the Bill is a very short and simple one, we should suppose the business will be of a formal nature. It appears to be drawn in such a way as to obviate the objections which have been previously raised. And its object is to obtain power for the members of the Church to manage its property.

ORDINATION.—On Trinity Sunday an ordination was held by the Lord Bishop of Sydney in St. Andrew's Temporary Cathedral, when the Rev. William Frederick Boulton Uzzell and the Rev. Henry Archdale Langley, were admitted to the order of the Priesthood. Morning prayer was read by the Rev. Thomas O'Reilly; the lessons by the Dean. The ordination sermon was preached by the Rev. Canon Allwood. The Candidates were presented by the Dean as Archdeacon, who with Canon Allwood and the Rev. T. O'Reilly, assisted the Bishop in the imposition of hands. Mr. Uzzell continues Curate of Dapto, and Mr. Langley of All Saints, Bathurst. These gentlemen owe their training to Moore College, which we are glad to see continues to supply a fair proportion of young men for the Ministry in both this and neighbouring Dioceses.

THE CHURCH SOCIETY.

The Monthly Meeting was held on Monday the 4th instant, the Bishop in the chair. Sir John Young, and 19 other members being present.

In the absence of the Secretary from illness, prayers were read by the Dean and the Minutes of the last meeting, confirmed and signed by the chairman. The Finance Report stated the receipts to be £473 7s. 1d. and the warrant prepared for payment for £282 19s. 2d. the receipts for the Gold Fields were £12. The Rev. H. A. Langley at the request of the Bishop, stated the duties of the Catechist recently appointed for the District of Bathurst. On the application of Rev. T. H. Wilkinson for rebuilding the School Church at East Bargo, £25 was granted, upon condition that not less than an equal amount be raised in the District and that the plan with specifications be approved by the Committee. The following new applications were referred to the Finance Committee to be reported on at the next meeting.

1. The Churchwardens of St. Jude's Rankwick, for assistance towards erection of a Parsonage.

2. Rev. H. H. Britten for loan from the

Endowment Fund towards the Parsonage at Castle Hill.

3. The Rev. J. C. Corlette, Jamberoo, for grant of £100 in lieu of the Interest granted two years since on £500 towards the building of the new Church.

4. An application from Rev. W. B. Cave on account of a new school at Ashfield was considered not to come within the sphere of the Society's operations.

On a special application from the Rev. W. B. Brownrigg, officiating minister in the Lachlan District in 1862, it was agreed, "That the sum of £12 10s. which had been received from the Lachlan District through the Rev. Thomas Kemmis and specially raised for Mr. Brownrigg's stipend but forwarded to the Committee without explanation, and applied to the liquidation of a balance against the District then existing, be repaid to Mr. Brownrigg."

Mr. Charles CAMPBELL moved that a Committee consisting of the Rev. Canon Allwood, Rev. R. L. King, Hon. James Mitchell, and M. E. Murrin, Esq., and the mover, be appointed to report upon the expediency of revising the Rules and Regulations of the Church Society.

ADELAIDE.

(From the Adelaide Church Chronicle.)

THE LORD BISHOP.—The Very Rev. the Dean has received a letter by this month's mail from the Lord Bishop, which has been kindly handed to us. The following extracts from the greater portion of it, and will no doubt be perused with pleasure by our readers:—

"Ship *Yatala*, Good Friday.—My Dear Dean—We are just turning the corner of Africa, and shall soon haul up for Table Bay: a fine day, smooth water, 10-knot breeze, and away we go like a greyhound, 38 days out, and 10 miles from Cape Town. I have had this morning a full service in the cuddy, well attended. To-night we shall anchor, and D.V. I land to-morrow. I have a chance you see of being reminded of old Trinity by preaching on Easter Tuesday, and will keep this open for a few notes on Cape Town. Meanwhile we had fine weather, easterly winds, 10 days of calm slow work, but notwithstanding have made a good passage under 40 days. We have overhauled and left behind several China and India ships, the *Yatala* spinning along in wonderful energetic and South Australian fashion, beating all opponents. Legoe, his ship, officers, provender, are all one could wish. Two full Services on Sunday give me occupation, besides daily morning and evening prayers and expositions. We have gone through nearly St. Matthew, Romans, Hebrews, Philipians; in fact I have a nice little parish on board. Monday, April 2.—We cast anchor on Saturday, at 4 a.m., after a glorious run along a magnificently bold and rocky coast from Cape L'Agulhas under a strong S.E. wind. Landed at 11 o'clock. The Bishop of Cape Town sent his carriage, and we drove out to his Bishop's Court, seven miles from town. The drive out round the shoulder of the Table Mountain is very beautiful. Oaks and pine with rich close foliage overshadow the roads, so that the hot sun cannot penetrate to the heads of the travellers. It gives a richness and coolness to the scene which we lack in South Australia, and shows what the banks of the Torrens may become when they are properly planted. This house was the old country house of the Dutch Governors. It is very spacious, forming three sides of a quadrangle, the wings being the offices. A row of umbrageous oaks surround

the court-yard. Passing through a large hall to a terrace, the crags of Table Mountain tower up over the tall oaks and pines, presenting a most beautiful scene. The estate comprising 350 acres, surrounds the mansion, which to occupy properly would take £4,000 per annum. Bishop Gray is wealthy, and mainly supports his colleges and his Caffres' Mission Institution. I yesterday preached, morning and evening, at the Cathedral—a very large oblong church, bigger much than White's Room: seats 900 people on the floor, 180 communicants, full choral service, intoned choir, surpliced, and fine organ. In the evening the church was well filled. There are some superior men among his clergy. Colenso stands excommunicated; nevertheless he has applied to the Supreme Court to oust the Dean out of the Titular Cathedral. The land is vested in the Bishop of Cape Town, who appointed the Dean Incumbent. What title the Titular Bishop can have to take the church of a licensed minister from him because he is a Titular Dean, I can't see, especially as the legal estate is in the Bishop of Cape Town's hands. It is a very pretty quarrel as it stands, and poor Mother Church suffers all the evils which such disputes are sure to generate. Meanwhile the last novelty of Colenso is his preaching against the personality of the devil. Fancy this state of things. The Dean has his sermon at 9 and 3, Colenso at 11 and in the evening. One clergyman only in Natal sides with Colenso.

We gather the following interesting information regarding the Adelaide Diocese from the *Tasmanian Church News*.

I regret that I have not of late been able to send any correspondence from this Diocese. Perhaps on this occasion it may be interesting to your readers to be told how Church matters are managed here.

Besides our Synod, we have a standing Committee which meets once a month, to transact all business committed to it by Synod. It is composed of twenty-one members elected by ballot at the annual meeting of Synod; and of these seven must be Clergymen, fourteen Laymen. The Bishop presides in Standing Committee as in Synod. The business is chiefly financial, and consists for the most part in voting grants of money from Central Church funds; to those cures which are entitled to receive aid. Certain parishes are altogether excluded from assistance, namely, the five Adelaide parishes, and three others which it is considered ought to be self-supporting. To compensate to these parishes for their exclusion, they have been offered the means of endowment to the extent of £50 a year, by a method to be presently explained. The principle adopted in aiding the other cures is that of assisting those who most deserve it by their activity in gathering their fellow-churchmen together under their ministry. The chief criterion of this is the number of sittings let, the pew-rent system prevailing, with few exceptions, throughout the Diocese. So much per sitting is granted on the number of sittings let, according to a fixed scale. But to prevent any restriction on those who may prefer to depend on weekly offerings for their Church income, or who, having pew-rents, yet apply any portion of the weekly Offertory to stipend, every pound so collected and applied is reckoned as if it were a seat let. No individual Cure can receive more than £50 in one year. Missionary Cures where, from the nature of the case, sittings let can afford no proper criterion of the efforts used in the locality, are dealt with in a class by themselves.

The funds from which these grants are made are, the Allen Fund, yielding something over £400 a-year (being the interest on a bequest of £5000 by the late W. Allen, Esq.; the annual grant of the S. P. G. Society (which is likely to cease); and the General Church Fund, which is very small. But, small as are the funds at the disposal of the Standing Committee, the system has practically led to a considerable increase of the incomes of the clergy by stimulating local effort. You are aware there is no State-Aid in this Diocese, and we have learnt to be thankful that there is not. The want of it has led to efforts to create endowment funds, which will in the end confer a far greater and more lasting benefit on the Church.

The above funds are those which are absolutely under the control of the Standing Committee; but there are others which are available for the benefit of the Church. The chief of these is the Leigh Fund. In very early days, Mr. Leigh, of Leigh Park, Cheshire, before he became a convert to the Church of Rome, gave to the Church certain property in Adelaide, which is placed under the management of the Attorneys of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, who are at present the Bishop, the Dean, the Archdeacon of Adelaide, and the Hon. G. Morphet. This property now yields an income of over £3000 a-year. Part of this is yearly re-invested, part is devoted to endowments, part to grants for parsonages, and part to the payment of two missionary chaplains, who minister to vacant cures, and in the bush. In promoting Endowments, the Attorneys co-operate with the Standing Committee, who apply to this object a small available portion of their annual funds, as well as £100 a-year contributed for the purpose by the Bishop of St. Asaph. To the city parishes the offer was made, that if they would pay to the Attorneys a capital sum of £187 10s., it would be supplemented from some of the above sources, so as to secure a permanent endowment of £50 per annum. A similar offer has been made to suburban and country parishes, the only difference being that the capital to be paid in their case is £150, and the endowment secured £40 per annum; with the further proviso, that only two Churches can be endowed in this way in one year, the offer being made to the several cures in the order of seniority, with the understanding that those who do not avail themselves of the offer lose their chance until all the other Churches in rotation have had their turn. Three of the Adelaide Churches are now endowed with £50 a year, and a good proportion of the others with £40. As soon as all have been endowed to this extent, the effort will be begun once again to increase the endowment. Besides the above funds, there is the fund raised by the Church of England Endowment Society, which at the end of this year will have reached a capital sum of £10,000. This is a Lay Society, entirely managed by lay Directors. This has not, however, as yet been utilized (to use the modern barbarous phrase.) It was understood that no distribution of the funds for endowment should take place until the Society shall have been in existence seven years; and as yet I believe it is only six years old. The success of this Society is the more remarkable inasmuch as the scheme with which it started has not been realised. It was proposed to borrow money in England at English rates of interest, and lend it in the Colony at Colonial rates, applying the profit on the transaction to endowment. This has (perhaps fortunately) not proved feasible; and the entire capital has been raised by voluntary contributions.

Thus, besides the funds under the direct control of Synod, there are the Leigh Fund, with its large and increasing income, and this further capital of £10,000, which will certainly be administered in co-operation with Synod.

The See is also endowed by the munificence of Miss Burdett Courts. But this endowment is not in the hands of the Church. No one but the Bishop knows much about it. It is believed that the Capital funded was £30,000, half in English and half in South Australian investments. In 1847 the income was understood to be £800 a-year, but it must now be much larger; although it should be taken into account that Bishopscourt was built at great cost, almost entirely from the funds of the See.

English Church News.

(From a Correspondent.)

The new House of Commons appears to be far from favourable to our national Church. If we had but few warm friends in the former Parliament, we have now not a few open enemies; Roman Catholics, who scarcely care to conceal their enmity and feel no shame in disavowing the solemn pledges of moderation by favour of which alone they obtained emancipation 36 years ago; Dissenters, who in blind determination to advance their own opinions strive to overthrow our noble edifice, and forget that they are tearing down the main ramparts which shield them from our common enemy the Popedom; and worst of most lamentable of all, many of our own brotherhood who are carried away by the spirit of "Liberalism" to throw down all barriers of sound doctrines, in civil as in religious matters. All these present a formidable opposition to the maintenance of those sound principles whereby our fathers have grown strong. In illustration of these remarks, we cannot but point at once to the "Oxford Tests Abolition Bill." By this Bill now read a second time, Mr. Coleridge, who at his recent election gave reason to expect ultra-liberal tendencies, has given admission for Dissenters of all shades and characters, not only into the advantages of education, which they have long enjoyed, not only to the honour of a B.A. degree, which they have also been able of late to gain, but to the degree of M.A., and with it, nearly all the *privileges of the government body of the University*. A Bill of Mr. Bouverie had done much of the same work before; and now we grieve to say this new Bill has been read a second time with more than two to one in its favour. Mr. Goschen, who has lately found a place in the cabinet, manifests tendencies of the same kind. A large number of men, highly educated and influential seem to have come to the conclusion that definite principles of religion are of small importance, either in ruling an Empire or conducting the education of youth; and the sober words of a man here and there, like our good old friend Mr. Henley in this last debate, manfully declaring the necessity of religion to education, are sorely needed among our Statesmen, but scornfully neglected. So again in altering the oath of admission to Parliament, for which a Bill is now passing through the Legislature, the wisdom of our forefathers which presented a barrier to those who avowed their allegiance to another "prince or potentate is counted almost superfluous and amile; the notion of danger to be apprehended to our constitution from the encroachments of Popery is laughed to scorn; and much additional liberty is now allowed to those of them who are disposed to

be hostile. Apropos of Popish encroachments, a book was published lately in London with the authorship of Dr. Manning entitled "Archbishop of Westminster;" a most plain violation of the famous "Ecclesiastical Titles Bill;" yet the Attorney General (Sir Roundell Palmer) when called upon declines to prosecute. Thus that Bill, which was always felt to be a most paltry expression of the national feeling in regard to the outrage of the Papal aggression 14 years ago, seems now to have quietly lapsed into a nullity. Men may say "what's in a name," but in such a case a name involves a large and important principle.

Meanwhile our great Religious Societies are mourning the want of public support. It is sad and humiliating to us as a wealthy Christian nation, to hear of Mission work abroad curtailed and checked, charities at home shutting their doors against many applicants, because of small funds, when the disproportion is immense between the richest of our charities and the incomes of our wealthy noblemen or merchants. Is there no such thing as the pleasure of giving liberal support to good work? Amid many dark pictures there is much to cheer us in the quiet work of the Church through individual Parishes. By zealous clergymen in towns and villages, whose eyes are open to discern wants, and hands ready to supply them; by Sunday School Teachers and District visitors, yea we would hope in some cases by the suspected agency of Deaconesses, a large stream of good is flowing through a thousand channels under the varied action of the spirit of truth. A strong stand is made against that extreme Ritualism, which the really sensible Englishman repudiates as needless and hurtful! and this position has been strengthened by the wise words of rebuke uttered by our venerable Primate. At the same time there is an earnest effort everywhere to make our services popular and animated, without wasting their vital energy. May God direct all efforts, suggest all good influences, control all evil tendencies.

ITALY.

From Speech of Archdeacon Wardsworth, at a Meeting of the Anglo-Continental Society.—March 7th.

The first event which strikes the eye on looking at the Italian Peninsula, is the transfer of the capital of the Italian kingdom, in pursuance of the treaty of September, from Turin to Florence. The mention of Florence suggests the names of some of the greatest men who have illustrated Italian history: it suggests the name of Dante, and of Petrarch—the latter not a native of Florence, but intimately connected with it: it suggests the names of the Medicean princes and popes; of Michael Angelo, Galileo, and Guicciardini; it suggests the memory of that great Florentine Synod, which attempted in vain to unite the Churches of the East and of the West; it suggests the recollection of that more recent Council held there in the last century, in the days of the Grand Duke Leopold of Tuscany, when the measures were considered, which were proposed by Scipio Ricci, Bishop of Pistoia, and by other Bishops of Tuscany, for a national Reformation of the Italian Church; a Council which may serve to show to Italian ecclesiastics and statesmen what they might attempt, and what they ought to avoid. The consideration of what took place at Florence at the great national festival of last year, is full of interest, as exhibiting a striking proof of what we might almost call—with reverence be it said—the immortality and omnipresence of the human mind. Last

year, Florence witnessed the celebration of the six-hundredth anniversary of the birthday of Dante. If there is any mind more than another which now exercises influence on the Italian nation, it is that of the great Tuscan poet, who almost seems to have foreseen and foretold the events of the present day. May I be permitted to quote from Dante's Purgatorio two lines, which, with other words of the same poet, perhaps more than any utterances of the present age, have tended to produce the events which are now taking place? That great national poet of Italy thus speaks, concerning the Church of Rome,

"La chiesa di Roma,
Per confondere in se due reggimenti,
Cade nel fango, e se brutta e la soma."

"That is to say, the Church of Rome, in trying to combine in herself two supremacies, the spiritual and the temporal, plunges in the mire, and involves herself and her system in ignominy and ruin." That was Dante's prophecy more than five centuries ago; and we see its fulfilment in our own day. The Church of Rome has aspired to boundless domination, spiritual and temporal; her own ambition is the cause of her own shame and destruction; and she is now being stripped of her power, not by Protestant princes or people, but by the Parliament and People of Italy.

"The next event which meets the view is, the law which has been enacted by the Italian parliament, and which came into effect on the first day of the present year, and which abrogated the compulsory celibacy of the Italian clergy. The Parliament have authorized the clergy to marry, and some of the Italian clergy have already contracted marriage. Thus, they have been emancipated, by the Roman Catholic laity, from an unscriptural and antisciptural bondage, in which they have been enthrallled for about eight hundred years. St. Peter himself was a married man; St. Paul declares that marriage is honourable in all, and he condemns those who forbid to marry. But Rome has taken up arms against Nature and against Scripture, and has forbidden her clergy to marry, in order that they might be more subservient to herself. But the Roman Catholic Parliament of Italy has now vindicated the rights of Nature and of Scripture; and no one can say what may not be the effects of this restoration of Scriptural and primitive usage, and whether it may not lead, under the providence of God to other rejections of Romish usurpations and corruptions, and to other recoveries of primitive and Catholic truth.

"Let us now pass on to another important event. On the 29th of January last the draft of a bill was circulated among the members of the Italian Parliament, the provisions of which contemplate nothing less than an entire reconstruction of the whole Diocesan system of the Italian Church. It aims at the entire suppression of the Monastic Institutions of Italy; and at a complete reconstruction of the framework of Italian Bishoprics. I am far from eulogizing the provisions of this great organic change. It is heartily to be wished that many of them may be reconsidered; but I would point to this event as showing that the Italian Church and Parliament are now in great need of our prayers for right guidance; and, with all reverence and humility be it added, of our counsels also. The embarrassments in which the diocesan system of Italy is now involved, are due to the vicious principle of Concordats, adopted by pontiffs and princes, more than three centuries ago; by which the people and the clergy were deprived of their

ancient legitimate rights in the election of Bishops; and by which the Roman pontiffs sacrificed to sovereign princes those rights of the clergy and people, on the condition that the Roman pontiffs themselves should have a veto on the appointments to Bishoprics by Sovereigns. Pope Pius the Ninth is now arrayed in hostility against Victor Emmanuel, King of Italy; and therefore the Concordat has collapsed; and no appointment to any Episcopal See in the Italian kingdom can now take place. More than sixty Bishoprics are now vacant in Italy; the whole diocesan system of the kingdom is about to be submitted to the revision of the Italian Parliament; and all the revenues of the Italian Church are now about to be placed upon a new footing. The great question of election to Bishoprics is about to be agitated. What were the primitive rights of the laity in this important matter? what were the rights of the clergy? what were the ancient privileges of Metropolitans? what were the usurpations of Popes infringing those rights, and violating those privileges and degrading the Bishops of the Christian Church from their proper position as successors of the Apostles, deriving their authority and commission from Christ? what were the other encroachments of the Roman Papacy, reducing the Bishops of the Italian Church into bondsmen, vassals, and serfs of the Roman See, and enforcing upon them an uncanonical and unscriptural oath, that they will 'uphold the royalties of the Papacy against all men, and persecute all who will not submit to the Bishop of Rome?' These, my Lord, are questions which will now engage the attention of the Senators and Churchmen of Italy; and it is not possible to conceive any ecclesiastical or secular questions of greater importance than these.

"One word more. I have listened, my Lord, to what you have read from the rescript of the Cardinal Vicar of Rome, Cardinal Patrizi. I am not surprised by the terms of that rescript; they are nothing more than what the world heard, three centuries ago, from Cardinal Bellarmine, namely, that the essence of Christianity, and of Church membership, consists in unqualified submission and obedience to the Roman Pontiff. Surely, as your Lordship has said, such declaration as these ought to dispel all illusory dreams of union with Rome as she is; and that she will recant her present principles, and become other than she is, must, I fear, be regarded as a vain imagination. What signs are there of any such recantation. Is there any symptom of relenting on her side? No. On the contrary, if we look back to the last twelve years, we see a deliberate determination on her part to intensify her claims to universal dominion. On the 8th December, 1854, she claimed the right to enforce a new dogma on the conscience of Christendom. At Witsuntide, 1862, she almost elevated her own temporal supremacy into an Article of the Christian Faith. In 1865 she put forth a syllabus of propositions, reviving the pretensions of Hildebrand. And now we are led to believe that the personal infallibility of the Roman Pontiff is ere long to take its place among the dogmas of the Roman creed. Let us all pray for the union of Christendom, but let it be for union in the truth. Union in error is conspiracy against the truth; it is treason against Christ, who said, 'I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life,' and who also said that He came into the world to bear witness unto the truth; and Who prayed for all men, to His Heavenly Father, and said, 'Sanctify them, Holy Father in Thy truth.'"

Missionary Intelligence.

A few extracts from a narrative of a tour in the Fukhien province of China, made by Rev. J. R. Wolfe, of the Church Missionary Society, and J. G. Fry, Esq.

"I now proceed to give you a brief account of my journey and visit to Po Siang, or Rivulet City. It is so called from the little rivulet which flows beside it, and which swells in its course into the noble river Min. Po Siang is about 350 British miles from Fuh-chau. I was accompanied by J. G. Fry, Esq., of Silverlock and Co., whose Christian spirit, unobtrusive piety, and general intelligence, made him a very agreeable and pleasant companion. We were a month absent, and through the good providence of God, we did not suffer a moment's illness, nor experience the least danger or annoyance from the people. We walked the entire distance, with the exception of seventeen miles, which we travelled by night in a small Chinese boat. In our journey north from Fuh-chau to Po Siang we passed through two "Fu" cities, about fourteen large towns, and an innumerable number of villages. These latter appeared to us to contain a population varying from 800 to 3,000 each. I am afraid to conjecture the population of the towns and cities; but if one may judge from crowded streets and general appearances, it must be very great indeed. During our journey we had opportunities of seeing much of the people. We lived, in fact we were compelled to live, like the Chinese; eat what they eat, sleep where they slept, and quietly to submit to the unpleasant results of their excited curiosity. For a month we had to endure the torture of being the most popular creatures in these regions. At every village we came to, the entire population turned out to see us, and generally followed us till we passed the boundaries of their hamlets. Labourers in the distant fields would leave their implements behind, and run to look at us. Woodcutters on the steep cliffs would rush down and meet us in some bye-path, and utter exclamations of surprise. At every place we stopped we were surrounded by men, women, and children, with surprise marked in their countenances. The children frequently screamed, and fled at our approach, as if we were indeed "barbarian ghosts." I believe the poor innocent creatures believed we were ghosts. The people frequently called us Huang kui, *i.e.* "foreign ghosts." Mo kui is "devil," and I never heard them use that expression towards us. The most general name by which we were called was Huang kiang. This expression, in the lips of the great majority of the people, is one of contempt for the objects of it, but many of the ignorant know us by no other name, and innocently use it. Nothing could surpass the curiosity of the natives, and their observations and remarks on our persons, &c., were equally strange and ludicrous. Our eyes and noses seem to be the parts which struck them most extraordinary. They ventured frequently to touch our noses, and examined very closely our eyes. Our hands and fingers nails also underwent a close examination. Our clothes were not overlooked; they were handled by thousands of fingers. There was a repetition of this every day and night wherever we came, till we became so accustomed to it that we could quietly sleep while the operation was going on. I have frequently seen my friend fall fast asleep, surrounded by hundreds of Chinese examining closely each article of his dress.

We started from Fuh-chau about eight A.M., on Monday, March the 2nd, taking with us four coolies and the Bible Society colporteur, and a number of books and tracts for distribution. Leaving the city through the west gate, we passed over the beautiful range of hills which surround it on the west side, and soon found ourselves on the charming banks of the river Min. The morning was delightfully calm. The sun shone forth in all his early loveliness, and gave to every object an aspect of cheerfulness, and threw an additional charm over the entire surrounding scenery. As we walked along the river-side, and viewed the water as it flowed noiselessly but rapidly along through a lovely valley, most tastefully cultivated, and covered with plats of various vegetation, and abundantly studded with the plum, the pear, the guava, the orange, the olive, and the wide-spreading banyan, and listened to the music of the thrush and other singing birds, whilst they filled the air with their sweet notes, we could not help feeling that this was still a beautiful world, worthy of its great Creator, and well calculated to call forth the creature's admiration of his goodness, his wisdom, his power, and his love. But, alas! amidst all this loveliness we were made to feel that it was also a fallen world. While all nature seemed to smile and join in its morning song of praise to the great Creator, man alone appeared to mar the beautiful scene. Every step of our progress brought us before the monuments and evidence of his deep ignorance and alienation from God. Idols, and idolatrous shrines and altars, met us at every turn, and strongly reminded us in the early morning of what the Roman satirist said of Athens, "That it was easier to find in her a god than a man." But the Christian turns away with very different feelings from such scenes and sights, and longs and prays for the time, when the "idols shall be utterly abolished," and when man shall be entirely freed from the slavery of sin in which Satan has so successfully bound him.

"While stopping at the town of Kang-chia we witnessed a very gorgeous procession. It was in honour of a great idol in the town, but, though apparently very important in the view of the natives, who seemed very much interested in it, several of them left their ranks, and remained to look at us. This procession consisted of men and boys. Some were beating gongs and drums, which made a wild and confused noise; others played a sort of fife, the incoherent notes of which the Chinese dignify with the name of music, and asked me if I considered it pleasant or harmonious. I said I could discover neither tune or harmony in it, and that it was to my ears by no means Ho teang, *i.e.* "pleasant to hear." At this they gave a hearty laugh, and said, "What kind of music have you at the other side?" In the centre of the procession, borne on men's shoulders, was a large boiled hog, tastefully decorated with flowers. Immediately behind the hog was borne, in like manner, a boiled goat, and, after the goat, a cooked fowl. These were all borne, the people informed us, as an offering to the idol, in order to appease his supposed wrath, which the inhabitants appeared to dread very much. I asked if the idol could eat these offerings. Some laughed, some said Yes, and said No, and all seemed highly amused at what they considered the absurdity of the question. The rear was brought up by a number of men and boys bearing banners and flags of various shapes, sizes, and colours. When it had passed by I endeavoured to speak to the multitude around us of the great power of God, the great and infinite Creator.

One said, "Do you mean to say God has no beginning, and shall never have an end. He was neither born nor created, and He will never die. He never had a birth-day." Another said, "What is his sang?" *i.e.* "surname." I said, "Our God has no sang, for He is not a man like all your gods, which are not really gods, but the ghosts of departed men, or the stumps of some old tree, or some mud which the workman made into the form of a man." One then asked what was the name of my God. I said, "His great and glorious name is Jehovah, which means the eternal self-existent one."

"To seek for a better lodging than a Chinese hotel, which is proverbial for its filthiness, we made our way back to a Buddhist temple," which we had passed on our way into the village. The priest at first objected to let us in. After some considerable time was spent in talking, and expressing his surprise at seeing two "foreign ghosts" at that late hour before the door of his monastery, he consented to let us remain for the night. He was now as loud in his expressions of happiness at seeing "foreign sing-sangs" as he was a moment ago at seeing "foreign ghosts," and made himself as active as possible in making preparations for our accommodation for the night. We were highly amused with all this, but it is just characteristic of the Chinese. No matter how repugnant a thing may be to their feelings, if once that thing is fairly established: though against their efforts and their feelings, they will tolerate it with the appearance of the greatest goodwill. And this trait in their character is a great encouragement to the Missionary work among them. Once Christianity is established to any extent, though to gain that certain point it may have to struggle as for life, the Chinese will not only tolerate it, but, by God's blessing, will embrace it too, and be the zealous propagators of its doctrines among other people. But we must return to the temple. The priest remained up the whole night watching lest thieves, he said, should break in and plunder us, the presence of a foreigner was such an unusual thing in the village. No doubt the expectation of getting a few hundred cash in the morning made him more active and polite, yet, independent of this, there was good nature smiling in his countenance, which at once won one's confidence and regards. We were now both tired and hungry, and we made preparations for tea. The priest acted as valet, occasionally assisted by our own coolies. Tea being over, we spread our beds on the ground, in the midst of hundreds of idols, which were spread promiscuously around, undergoing repairs. Some of these idols were over nine feet high, and invested with beard and moustaches, which made them appear very military and ferocious. Before retiring to rest, and after reading a portion of God's word, we sang that beautiful hymn, "Rock of Ages," and then knelt down, and on the very spot where for ages the poor deluded Chinese have knelt and adored the idol of Buddha, we worshipped Jehovah, the living and the true God, the God of our fathers. We turned our backs on the huge idol which was placed upon the altar, lest the priest and others who were present should imagine that we revered their idol. It was indeed sweet to realize, as we trust we then did, the presence of our God, and to transform for the time the temple of Satan into a place of prayer and praise to Jehovah. We prayed for the priest; we pleaded for the speedy fulfilment of the promises which gave the heathen to Christ for His possession, and when the idols He would utterly abolish; and committed our

selves, and all whom we love, to the care and protection of our heavenly Father. The poor priest appeared lost in astonishment, and looked as if he had been fixed to the spot on which he stood during the time we were singing and praying. When these were over, I explained to him the nature of the worship in which we had been engaged, and who the Great Being was whom we adored. We then lay down to sleep, with the emblems of idolatry all around us. I woke occasionally during the night, and was saddened when I remembered how many millions of poor Chinese were given up to the worship of these senseless pieces of wood and clay around me, but gladdened at hearing from the lips of the colourer and my coolie, the words of the Gospel, which they were reading aloud to the simple-minded priest. I could not help thinking as I listened to those words of life and salvation, that they are the destined means to be employed in fulfilling the very promises which we had been pleading in our prayers before retiring to rest. The priest was evidently interested.

ELECTION OF CHURCHWARDENS.

The following letter was addressed to the Churchwardens in the Diocese of Sydney several weeks ago. It is now transferred to our columns with the permission of the writer, and in consequence of requests from several of the Clergy and others that it might have a wider circulation:—

To the Churchwardens of Churches in the Diocese of Sydney.

GENTLEMEN,

My apology for addressing you, is the knowledge that irregularities often occur in connexion with the holding of the Annual Vestry Meetings of our Church, on Easter Tuesday, for the election of Churchwardens, I allude to those Meetings, in reference to which the provisions of the Church Act ought, and are intended to be observed. I have, therefore, drawn up the following practical directions on the subject, and I trust they may be found useful, by those for whose information and guidance they are principally designed.

I. The Meeting must take place on Easter Tuesday, and may be held in the Vestry, or in any other convenient place.

II. Notice must be given of the hour and place of Meeting. The Trustees, strictly speaking, are the persons who should give this notice; but if the notice is given by the Churchwardens, all that is needful will, in ordinary cases, have been done. The notice should be given either by means of the Clergymen in Church, or by posting a notice on the Church Doors, or by advertisement in the public papers. If the first or second of these methods is adopted, the notice may be given as late as Easter Sunday. If the third method is adopted, the same discretion should be exercised as in giving notice of any other Meeting.

III. At the Meeting thus called, there should be present,—first, the Trustees, or a majority of them (if the Bishop is sole Trustee, his presence is not requisite); secondly, duly qualified Pew-holders and Renters of Sittings; and thirdly, the Clergyman licensed to officiate in the Church. If the majority of the Trustees are not present, an election of Trustees' Warden cannot take place, and the appointment will rest with the Bishop. If duly qualified Pew-holders and Renters of Sittings are not present, the election of their Warden cannot take place, and the appointment will rest with the Bishop.

If the Clergyman licensed to officiate in the particular Church is not present, the nomination of his Warden cannot take place, and the appointment will rest with the Bishop; and unless, and until all three Wardens are regularly elected and nominated or appointed, the office of Churchwarden cannot be exercised, inasmuch as the Act expressly declares, that the three persons so elected and nominated (as provided by the Act), shall jointly execute the office of Churchwarden.

IV. The Meeting being assembled, the Clergyman should take the Chair, or in his absence, one of the Trustees (not being a Churchwarden), or any other qualified Pew-holder or Renter of Sittings. Business may then be proceeded with in the following order:—

1. The outgoing Churchwardens should produce their accounts, duly entered in a book and signed by them, shewing the balance (if any) remaining in their hands. Any objections to the accounts should then be discussed, and the discussion should terminate by the Vestry passing the accounts, either as presented by the Churchwardens, or altered.

2. The Trustees should elect one of their number as Trustees' Warden.

3. The Pew-holders and Renters of Sittings, should elect one of their number as their Warden.

4. The Clergyman should nominate another of the Pew-holders or Renters of Sittings as his Warden.

5. The outgoing Churchwardens, or one of them, should deliver over to the new Churchwardens, or one of them, the book of accounts, and balance (if any) remaining from the last year. If, however, no Churchwardens are elected or nominated, the outgoing Churchwardens must keep the book and balance, until new Churchwardens are appointed; and it would be prudent to act in the same way, if from any cause, the whole body of new Churchwardens has not been elected or nominated.

V. As to who are qualified to vote at Vestry Meetings of Pew-holders, and at the election of Churchwardens, they are—First, every person, male or female, not being under age, or a married woman, and whether a member of the Church of England or not, who has engaged a pew or sitting, and has paid the rent due up to the last quarter day; and Secondly, every person, male or female, not being under age, or a married woman, who, being a member of the Church of England, has for one year and upwards been a contributor of not less than £1 a year to the maintenance of the Church. Each voter has one vote for every single sitting he has engaged, or for every pound he has contributed, up to the number of six votes. I may add here, that in my opinion, any Renter of Sittings, whose pew rent has been duly paid up, in other words, who is not in default, is entitled to vote in respect of the sittings so rented by him.

VI. Where the Bishop is sole Trustee of a Church, the Pew-holders and Renters of Sittings, must elect two Wardens, one being in lieu of the Trustees' Warden; and the Bishop has the power to appoint one or more in default of election.

VII. Whenever there has been a failure to elect or nominate a Churchwarden by the persons who ought to have elected or nominated, the outgoing Churchwardens should immediately give notice to the Bishop, who will then make the necessary appointment as required by the Act. As the failure generally arises from accident, it will be well in such a case to inform the Bishop at the time of

sending the notice, of the name of the person who would probably have been elected or nominated if the election or nomination had taken place. No charge ought to be made in the Bishop's Office for the appointment.

VIII. The Easter Tuesday Vestry Meeting is the most fitting occasion for the Pew-holders and Renters of Sittings to determine the rate, and times of payment of the salaries to be allotted to any Lay persons holding office about the Church, and also, to indicate to the Churchwardens the manner in which it is wished that the Offertory money shall be disposed of by them. With regard to this latter subject, it is to be borne in mind, that the disposal of the money given at the Offertory is regulated by the Rubric to such pious and charitable uses as the Minister and Churchwardens shall think fit, wherein if they disagree, it shall be disposed of as the Ordinary (the Bishop) shall appoint. A resolution of the Vestry will, however, form a very useful guide to all parties concerned in the disposal of the Offertory, as the words, "pious and charitable uses," have a very wide signification.

IX. An Easter Tuesday Vestry Meeting cannot be adjourned, so far as the election and nomination of Churchwardens are concerned. If such election and nomination are not made on Easter Tuesday, the appointment rests with the Bishop, as before mentioned.

X. If any dispute arises in reference to the election of a Churchwarden, the Bishop is to settle it under the 10th Section of the Act.

I remain, Gentlemen,

Your obedient Servant,

ALEXANDER GORDON,

Chancellor of the Diocese.

Sydney, Lent, 1866.

The following sermon, is printed at the request of some who heard it.

A Sermon,

Preached in St. Philip's Church, Sydney, on the First Sunday after Trinity.

"Blessed are they that do His commandments, that they may have right to the Tree of Life, and may enter in through the gates into the city."—REV. xxii. 14.

It may at first sight seem as if this assertion were at variance with many others in the New Testament, which declare that our entrance into heaven depends entirely upon the merit, and propitiatory sacrifice, of our Great Redeemer, and the free grace of God in Him. But there is in reality no contrariety or contradiction between those glorious doctrines of grace, and this assertion of the blessedness of those who do the commandments of God.

Obedience to the will of God is the fruit of faith in Him. It is its natural result, and faith is the parent of obedience.

"By grace are ye saved through faith." "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy He saved us" This is one side of a great truth. But faith without works is dead, and therefore "not every one that saith unto Jesus, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of His Father which is in heaven! And they who shall finally be admitted are those who are sanctified as well as justified, made holy as well as counted righteous, like unto God as well as adopted into His family.

There is a *meekness* required in those who shall become inmates of that glorious place, no less than a *title* to the inheritance. There

is a *character* which must be possessed by all who enter; and without that character heaven itself, with all its holy worship, and sublime grandeur, and unspeakable glories would be no heaven to them. It would be a life of death, darkness without light, weariness without relief, everlasting pain of heart, and sadness and woe.

Great errors have often been committed for want of drawing the distinction which I have now made between the meanness for heaven which is necessary, and the title to possess it which is also necessary. But to any reflecting person it must be obvious how important is the difference between these two things; and between the qualifications by which a title is proved to be good, and the ground upon which it was originally given.

Holy scripture is never inconsistent with itself. The more it is studied the more consistent it will be found to be.

In the 7th chap. of this wonderful Revelation of things to come St. John beholds a vision: a great multitude appears before him, so great that it cannot be numbered, and they stand before the throne of glory. As he gazes upon the vision with wonder and admiration, one of the heavenly instructors informs him who they are, and whence they came. "These are they," he replies to the question of the apostle "who came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb. Therefore are they before the throne of God."

Here you observe the foundation of all their happiness is the *blood of the Lamb*. In this they have washed their robes and made them white, by this they have been cleansed from all their natural and actual sins. They came indeed out of great tribulation, but their sufferings did not make their garments white, did not purchase for them the title to the glory they inherit. This they owe to the blood of the Lamb. The distinction is clear and well defined. They came out of great tribulation; that was their state and earthly condition. But it was not by this their sins were atoned for, or their purity effected. Their robes were washed and made white, pure and holy in the *blood of the Lamb*! Hence their attainment to the summit of eternal blessedness.

Now compare this for a moment with the teaching of the great apostle of the Gentiles in his epistle to the Roman Church. He sets out with the fundamental truth, that all mankind are guilty and condemned before God, and the question he discusses is, how can any be justified before him? Not he says by any works of righteousness which they can perform, not by deeds of might, or endurance, or self denial; not by self inflicted penances or tortures; not by heroic suffering, or zeal for the Divine glory, or costly sacrifices of any kind whatsoever. It is not thus that heaven is to be won, or pardon obtained. But only through the propitiation made by the death of Christ.

It was thus with Abraham the father of believers. It was thus with David the pattern of devotion. It was thus with Paul himself, the man of untarnished reputation as a Pharisee and of unsurpassed self sacrifice, when called to follow Christ. The way they sought and found their title to the realms of glory was that which had been revealed from the beginning, the atonement of the one and only Mediator, the Messiah, the Christ, the saviour of the world.

"Him hath God set forth, says the apostle, to be a propitiation through faith in his blood," and "his righteousness is unto and all them that believe, for there is no difference." For all have sinned and come short of the glory

of God, being justified freely by His grace through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus." (Rom. iii: 23, 24, 25)

Is obedience then no longer necessary? May we live in sin that grace may abound? That God may shew more fully how large His mercy is, by pardoning our sins continually, though we take no heed how we live?

Some would, no doubt, argue thus, and so abuse the Gospel. But not so the Apostle. He asks: Do we make void the law through faith? do we declare obedience to it to be needless? Far, far from it. Nay, we establish the law. We confirm and place it upon a surer ground, a more solid foundation. We enforce it by stronger motives, not only by a sense of duty, but of gratitude and love. We secure obedience to it of a higher, more spiritual, and more extensive kind.

All its requirements are incorporated into the covenant of grace, and are binding upon every Christian, and grace is given him to obey them.

"This is the covenant which I will make with them after those days, saith the Lord. I will put my laws in their hearts, and in their minds will I write them, and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people."—(Heb. viii. 10.)

Such then was to be, and such is the distinguishing character of the people of God, and therefore St. John writes: "Blessed are they that do His commandments that they may have right to the Tree of Life, and may enter in through the gates into the city."

Just before, he had announced the speedy approach of that time when the character formed in man shall be unalterable: when it shall be said: "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; he that is filthy, let him be filthy still; and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still; and he that is holy, let him be holy still." So will it be determined when He comes who will be the judge of quick and dead, and whose reward is with him, to give to every man according as his work shall be.

Mark then, my brethren, what is the relation of our doing the commandments of God to our attaining to blessedness in that day. This will be *test of our character*: the *proof that we are Christ's followers, living branches in the true vine*; that we have been led and sanctified by the Spirit of our God; have drunk into Christ's mind, and are one with Him in principle, in sentiment, and in aim. And such only can enter through the gate into the city of our God, the New Jerusalem. None but they that are holy will be permitted, for none but they are fitted to pass thither, and to enjoy the blessedness of that holy world for ever.

And now let me ask you to notice how our Church, as a faithful expounder of the Word of God, brings this before us and enforces it to-day. Her teaching has carried us through all the leading events in the history of our Redeemer. She has taught us of His advent, His manifestation to the Gentiles, His circumcision, His obedience to the law, His baptism, His sufferings and death. She has shown us how He triumphed in His resurrection, ascension, and exaltation at the right hand of God. She has set before us His gift of the Spirit, the founding of His Church, the ingathering of the Gentiles. And in all this we have seen the ever blessed and glorious Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, working together for man's salvation. The reality, the several offices, and separate work of the three Persons is thus clearly revealed. But now she enjoins, as the fruit of our faith in these things, the holy practice to which they lead, and during the remainder of our Church year, until Advent

returns, the services provided enforce those great duties and principles which form the Christian character.

This in the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel for this day, the prayer in the Collect is for grace to keep the commandments of God, that we may please him both in will and deed.

The Epistle describes the character of the Christian as one of love: points out its operation and beneficial effects; the happiness to which it leads; and the utter vanity of all pretension to be Christians without it. Those who love God do His commandments and ever strive to keep themselves from transgression.

The parable in the Gospel shows by way of contrast how the unbelieving and worldly man neglects the duties which love performs; and spends in self indulgence and self-gratification the talents which God entrusted to him to be used for His glory, and it warns us what the end of such ways will be.

Observe the general features of the parable as thus applied.

"It does not appear," says Archbishop Trench, "to be the main object of the parable to teach the fearful consequences which follow on the abuse of wealth, and on the hardhearted contempt of the poor: this (it does) only subordinally. But the fearful consequences of unbelief, of having the heart set upon this world, and refusing to give credence to the invisible world, which is known here only by faith; until by a miserable and too late experience the existence of such a world has been discovered. 'The sin of the rich man in its root is unbelief; the forms it takes are squandering on self, and neglect and contempt of the poor. These are the running sores of the plague within!'"

Look at the man! He is one who is well to do in this world, but he lives without God. A man without religion. Clothed in purple and fine linen, he fares sumptuously every day. But there is no sign of practical godliness in his way of life—in his household arrangements, and in the spirit which prevails there.

In the Providence of God a special opportunity is given him to show what spirit rules within; whether he has any of that fear of his Creator and Judge which will move him to care for a fellow creature in suffering and want. A beggar—a pauper—one in absolute want is brought to his gate and laid there, full of sores. Every time he goes out or comes in the case appeals to his sense of duty, but in vain. Day after day passes on, but Dives' heart remains unmoved!

At length Lazarus dies, and is carried by angels into Abraham's bosom. The rich man also dies, and is buried; and now in hell he lift up his eyes being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off and Lazarus in his bosom.

What a difference! The pauper on earth was yet a son of Abraham, a man of faith, submissive and patient. He was one who did the commandments of God by suffering what his will ordained. And now his *dismissal* from the body is his *admission* into the paradise of God, into the realms of holy peace and calm tranquil joy.

The rich man lives on, it may be, for many years. But at length death overtakes him. He is buried with pomp and splendour, but his soul, where is it? In that world of lost spirits he is in torment!

Vanished are all his dreams of sensual joy. He has awoke to the stern and terrible realities of his eternity. Now he reaps what he had sown! Now he has to suffer the consequences of his own doings! The bitterness of remorse, the agony of despair; and no possible mitigation

of his agony; no relief nor any prospect of it for ever! Oh, how terrible!

"Between us and you there is a great gulf fixed, so that they who would pass from hence to you cannot, neither can they pass to us, who would come from thence." Oh, who can imagine the horrors which invested his soul, and made it unto itself a very hell, every moment of its existence?

And yet we do not read of any gross transgressions of which he was guilty. He only did what very many are now doing. He lived a life of carnal ease and self-indulgence. He cared not and he studied not, how to glorify God, or to do good to man. He neglected the duties which lay at his very door, and claimed his instant attention by being presented to him daily. Thus he lived and thus he died! And you observe his dreadful end!

Oh, my brethren, we live in a world, which Satan has blinded, and in which he has still a mighty sway over its inhabitants, leading captive at his will all who are not doing the will of God. Ignorance and sin, superstition and error and falsehood are on every hand. Snares, temptations and allurements to evil are spread for the young and the old, for the rich and the poor, for the healthy and the sickly, for the learned and the ignorant, for the sensualist and the intellectual, for the sensitive and the refined, for the debased and the vulgar, for the amiable and the virtuous, for the high-minded and the grovelling. Yes, Satan knows well how and where to lay his traps for all, and he does lay them with consummate ability, and too commonly with fatal success!

Are we resisting him? Watching and guarding against him? Are we awake to danger, alive to duty, zealous in doing it, and ever seizing opportunities as they occur to shew our regard for God and our care for our fellow men?

Is our life a life of faith? Do we spend our days in the recollection of the vanity of the world and the nearness of eternity? In striving to do the Lord's will, or to suffer it?

Christ calls us to *serve Him*, and to do it decidedly, vigorously, and energetically.

Look, brethren, at the claims around you. Consider the responsibilities under which you live in the Church of Christ. There are duties to be fulfilled in your families and towards each member thereof. There are duties towards your neighbours, and the society in which you are by God's providence placed. There are duties to the Church and to the congregation of which you are a part. If saved yourselves you are called to save others. If blessed with this world's goods, they are given to you to spend with a due regard to God's glory and the welfare of your fellow-men. If poor, you are still to love your neighbour as yourself, and to do unto others as you would they should do unto you. In short, whatever be your station, or condition in this life, you are therein placed that you may serve God and do His will in your day and generation.

Brethren, I shall not have preached in vain this morning, if by God's grace I shall have succeeded in arousing each to thought and prayer, and shall have led each henceforth to be found at the throne of grace with the petition—Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?

This is the true attitude for a Christian day by day. May it be yours, my beloved brethren, and mine; and may we finally inherit the blessing which is attached to those who do that will from the heart, and are thus acquiring a meetness for the inheritance of the saints in light!

DR. PUSEY'S EIRENIKON.

(From the Sunday Magazine.)

Whatever may be the ultimate fruits of Dr. Pusey's Eirenikon, it seems at present as if war, not peace, were to be the result of its publication. A somewhat fierce strife has been raging between the representatives of English and Continental Popery, regarding the great question so amply discussed in it—the worship of the Virgin. Dr. Newman, it will be remembered, tried as much as possible to do away with Dr. Pusey's array of quotations that showed so clearly the blasphemous nature of the claims set up by Popish writers innumerable on behalf of the Virgin. They were mostly popular writers, he said, not recognised authorities; what was objectionable was but a little part of what they had written; much of it that had an ugly look might be explained if the connection and purpose were taken into account, and so forth. Still Dr. Newman had to confess that Dr. Pusey's quotations had horrified him. He was obliged to disown with disgust some five-and-twenty or thirty sentences and phrases, and to say "that as spoken by man to man in England in the nineteenth century, and according to that literal sense which they bear in the mouths of Englishmen and Englishwomen, I consider them calculated to prejudice inquirers, to frighten the unlearned, to unsettle consciences, to provoke blasphemy, and to work the loss of souls." In a letter to the *Tablet*, Dr. Newman has even published Bishop Challoner's anathema:—"Cursed be every goddess worshipper that believes the Blessed Virgin Mary to be more than a creature, but worships her or puts his trust in her more than God, that believes her above her Son, and that she can in anything command Him." Such plain and honest speaking is not suffered by Dr. Newman's co-religionists to pass without challenge. He has been charged with having "put up our Mother in a public place, and taken her prerogatives to pieces, not reverently, not lovingly, not devotionally, but coldly, dogmatically and dully." He is especially reprehended for having made a comparison between Anglican and Continental devotion disparaging to the latter, although the Pope, the bishops, and nearly all the "Catholic world" have been nurtured amid its influences. Meanwhile, the pamphlets and manifestoes of other Popish writers indicate no disposition towards compromise on this or any other point. Archbishop Manning, in his Pastoral on the "Reunion of Christendom," gives no hint of a disposition to negotiate with the Anglican Church as a branch of the Church Catholic, or to do more than smooth the way for the return of her erring sheep one by one to the true fold. Canon Oakley, in his review of Dr. Pusey, repeats the old topics, rebukes Anglican blindness and perverseness, and affirms as "a simple fact," what Dr. Newman rejects as a "horrible notion" that the blood of the Virgin is partaken of in the holy Eucharist. Father Faber is most loudly uncompromising of all. "Beware," he says, "beware of representing the Church of God as abating one jot or tittle of the greatest of those prerogatives which seemed most arrogant and most preposterous even in the Middle Ages; beware of representing her as having changed one atom in this her temper and her spirit; we must adhere strictly and zealously to high principle. Truth—and remember this is one great distinction between Catholics and heretics—Truth is not ours, but God's; Truth is not ours to bate and pare down."

INFIDELITY VANQUISHED.

"It is a year ago since a colporteur, who is stationed in one of the most important manufacturing towns in the east of France, met in a workshop with a young man who attracted his attention by his serious manner, and the whole of his behaviour. He offered the Bible to him, at the same time endeavouring to convince him of the great moral benefit which its perusal would be calculated to confer on him. To his great regret, he was at once repulsed, though, it is true, with a certain kind of courtesy; but this was soon followed by a succession of impious expressions, which were truly of a character to take away anything like perseverance from a champion less determined than our friend. He did not therefore leave the young man; and, after a lengthened conversation, he succeeded in persuading his antagonist to provide himself with a Bible, in order that he might search out for himself the truths about which he had never previously read, and also to meet with the colporteur that they might discuss the doctrines of the Bible together. These meetings took place at certain intervals, but without any of them being of such a character as to warrant the least hope that the young man had attained to better thoughts in regard to religion. All at once the colporteur learned that the young man had been compelled to return to his native place, owing to some family matters, and that there was no prospect of his coming back to the factory. Our colporteur took pains to inquire whether he had carried his Bible away with him, and the affirmative answer which he received encouraged him, and led him to pray daily on behalf of the young man. More than a year after all this had occurred, the same colporteur while prosecuting his work in the department where he is now stationed, reached a town filled with factories. He entered one of them, situated in an isolated part of the town, and the gates of which were open. The men were all at their meals. Looking into a corner of the work-room, his eyes rested on a man who seemed to take no part in the noisy conversation of his companions; for his back was turned on them. He was, in fact, occupied with reading. The colporteur went towards him, and before he was able to see the face of the reader, he discovered, to his great joy, that the Bible was the book which he was reading. He uttered an exclamation of pleasure, on which the man turned round. No! he could not be mistaken! it was the young infidel, for whose conversion he had so unceasingly prayed for more than a year! and from whom he then learned, that, being powerfully impressed by the warm appeals to which he had been almost compelled to listen, he began seriously to read the Bible, as well as to pray, and that, after a time, the Lord had graciously opened his eyes and his heart; that now the Word of God was the food of his soul, and that his most ardent desire was to make known its contents to all the world."

Miscellaneous.

NEW TRANSLATION OF THE BIBLE INTO FRENCH.—An interesting movement has been inaugurated in Paris towards a new translation of the Bible into French.

PRETENSIONS OF THE POPE.—In replying to an address from strangers, the Pope lately used the following language: "I alone, despite my unworthiness, am the successor of the Apostles, the Vicar of Jesus Christ. I alone

have the mission to guide and direct the bark of Peter. I am the Way, and the Truth, and the Life. They who are with me are with the Church; they who are not with me are out of the Church; they are out of the Way, the Truth, and the Life. Let men well understand this, that they be not deceived nor led astray by *sédisant* Catholics, who desire and teach something far different from what the Head of the Church desires and teaches." Is not this the language of Antichrist?

Correspondence.

To the Editors of The Church Chronicle.

SIRS,—I have carefully read through the Newcastle Editorial, in your last issue, finding fault with your Sydney leader and report of the late General Conference.

It seems as if the writer had been piqued because some of the Goulburn speeches had been amplified and altered from the *Herald's* report, and a few more lines of space given to the Episcopal utterings from that diocese than were accorded to it by the *Herald*. Perhaps the writer of the article in question had not taken the trouble of comparing how fully the speeches of the Bishop of Newcastle and Rev. Mr. Stack were reported in the *Herald* showing, unless perchance they were carefully revised by the speakers, that the reporter had caught the true *genius* of their addresses, and presented them to us clothed in the very garb of utterance chosen by themselves, whereas those of the Bishop of Goulburn and some others were so mishapen, as scarcely to be recognisable either by their authors or those who heard them; and hence the necessity for that revision for which you have earned the thanks of your readers, although your second half, or second third rather, undervalues your good work.

The object of your Newcastle leader seems to be the glorification of that diocese for its forethought and consistency at the expense of the vacillating conduct of Sydney and Goulburn.

The argument of the writer is very inconclusive in its attempt to establish this position.

The first allegation is that the representatives of the Sydney Diocese came to the General Conference with a determination to admit of nothing tending to Provincial action, and that they were bound by the Conference of that diocese to insist on its fundamental constitutions and on them only, and that when their recognition was attained their duties were at an end.

This statement, by an important *suppressio veri*, is made to convey a most erroneous impression.

The Resolutions of the Sydney Conference were:—

1. "That this Conference, desiring to maintain as a fundamental principle of Church policy the inherent right of each diocese to manage its own affairs, and also recognising the importance of united action on the part of the members of the Church of England in this colony, in the establishment of a sound system of synodical government, respectively joins in the request which has been already made on the part of the diocese of Newcastle to the Lord Bishop of Sydney, as Metropolitan, to convene at as early a period as shall to him appear convenient, a Conference of the bishops, clerical and lay representatives of the respective dioceses of this colony."

2. "That this Conference proceed to elect four clergymen and four laymen who jointly with the bishop shall at the general Conference represent the diocese in reference to all matters not already determined by the fundamental constitutions passed by the Conference in February last."

The first of these agreeing to meet in general Conference, of itself shewed a willingness to consider and determine the question of General Church Government; the second empowering the representatives to act for it in all matters not already determined by the fundamental constitutions indicated pretty clearly that there existed subjects beyond these Constitutions which, while it would have been out of place for a Diocesan Conference to determine, formed fitting matter for discussion and determination by a General Conference.

These subjects were embodied in Mr. Gordon's resolutions viz:—

1. The form of Church Government.
2. The degree of legislation therein.

The Sydney Constitutions from the first contemplated a Provincial Synod, being formed, as proved by their providing for an appeal *thereto*.

The real question at issue between the two Dioceses on this point was—

Sydney held that Diocesan Synods should be independent in the government of the Church, in the Diocese, and that the Provincial Synod should be a Court of appeal only.

Newcastle held that the Provincial Synod should be the real Governing body of the Church and that Diocesan Synods should merely be administrative machines to carry out the Provincial ordinances.

This is very distinctly laid down in the address by the Bishop of Newcastle to his Diocesan Synod in August last.

What then was the decision of the General Conference?

The first 20 constitutions recognised the right of independent Diocesan action, and conserve all the powers and functions already laid down in each Diocese for the management of its own affairs.

The 24th constitution *limits &c.*, the power of the Provincial Synod to make ordinances on matters referred to it from Diocesan Synods.

Your first Editorial was assuredly not far from the truth when it said that the Diocese of Newcastle had abandoned a favourite idea.

2. What was the degree of legislation which the General Conference decided should be applied for?

The vote negating the amendment of the Bishop of Newcastle was surely decisive on that point, viz:—

"That it is desirable to apply to the Legislature for such sanction or recognition of the constitution so to be determined upon, as will secure its practical working, and in particular will make subject to it all property devoted to the support of the Church in this colony, and which is not affected by any express trust."

It was argued at great length that the acts of the Presbyterians and Wesleyans secured for these bodies the fullest sanction to the standard which they had respectively chosen to be bound by even to the most binding *coercive legal force* which the Supreme Court could find if they had been part and parcel of the law of the land, and that any thing short of this would be of very doubtful utility.

The bill which has emanated from the Committee is called a bill for the management of the property of the Church—and how does it fulfil its intention? simply by binding with coercive *legal force* the Constitutions agreed to by the General Conference as the rules which

the Church itself was desirous should be the basis of its government.

In other words, as was stated by Mr. Robert Johnson in the Conference, the Constitutions are the voluntary compact to which the Church asks the legislature to set its seal of validity and to make binding on its members at all times which it could not do for itself.

Is this decision more in strict accordance with the views of the Sydney or Newcastle Diocese?

Perhaps however it is well that each retire from the battle in full belief that he has been victorious in having his pet theory conceded by the others. If so it shews that the difference after all is more of mere words than of reality.

But let it be assumed that Newcastle has never changed its views,—although by many the views of that Diocese would be considered rather chameleon-like—is there much cause for boasting? Might it not be said on the other side that if there be boasting at all it should be by those who, holding strongly their own opinions, nevertheless and notwithstanding their majority, gave way in those matters, which were not of primary importance, rather than be witness to a division in the Church caused by the obstinate adherence to its own views of a minority.

I do not say that such boasting is claimed by the other two Dioceses, but that they might as truthfully put forward this argument as that claimed for Newcastle by its zealous but not over prudent champion.

But surely we have not been fighting for the mere petty display of vanity or ambition which one diocese may have over another. Our Conferences have worked but little good if this be the whole result. We have fondly hoped that the General Conference was to be a cementing of the parts into one compact body. A holy union and brotherhood of love as members of one Church in the welfare of which our personal or Diocesan differences were to be sunk, and we were to join together in obtaining that which was deemed necessary for her efficient government.

That differences of opinion will arise is natural, but surely there can be free discussion and accommodation to each others views without each one crowing its own victory even when the other may have in mercy spared it.

Yours, ©

Diocese of Newcastle.

GENERAL CONFERENCE BILL.

As printed copies are now being circulated of the Draft Bill drawn up by the Committee of the General Conference, for the purpose of applying to the Legislature for legal sanction or recognition, if any, for the Church Constitutions lately adopted by that Conference, we consider it a suitable time for inserting in *The Church Chronicle* a letter of the BISHOP of NEWCASTLE on the Sydney Conference Bill of 1865.

This letter which was addressed to the members of the Newcastle Confer-

ence in 1865, appeared in the local paper, the *Maitland Mercury*, and is now reprinted below.

It gives us great pleasure to be able to state, that one great objection against the Sydney Conference Bill of 1865, referred to in our Diocesan's letter, is now quite obviated, as the Draft Bill, now in course of circulation, does not emanate from a single diocese only, but from the whole Church of England assembled in General Conference.

We sincerely hope that the BISHOP OF NEWCASTLE'S second great objection to the Sydney Conference Bill of last year has also been obviated, and that the enactments of the present Bill will be found to agree with its title which refers solely to the management of the *property* of the Church.

CHURCH OF ENGLAND LEGISLATION.

(To the Members of the Church of England in the Diocese of Newcastle, April 6th, 1865.)

MY CHRISTIAN BRETHREN—Having received a letter from the Sydney Conference Committee, informing me that the committee feels bound to proceed with the Sydney Diocesan Synod Bill, and to endeavour to procure the passing of it through the Parliament during the present season, I consider that a crisis has arisen very seriously affecting the well-being of our Church in this colony, and therefore respectfully commend to your consideration the following remarks, as I deem it important every member of our Church should understand the nature of this crisis, and be able to form a right judgment respecting it.

My observations may be arranged under three heads—1. The Church of England, or any portion of the Christian Church, is a spiritual body. Its highest functions are spiritual, ministering spiritual blessings to its members. Its highest discipline is a purely spiritual discipline, the dispenser of spiritual privileges; and its highest punishment is the loss of spiritual privileges, by expulsion or excommunication.

It is thus in its highest character, a voluntary body, every member remaining in it by his own free choice, for the sake of the spiritual blessings which he then enjoys; and if he submits to any discipline imposed upon him, he does so of his own free choice, that he may not lose the spiritual privileges of his membership by expulsion. And whenever any branch of the Christian Church has accepted the aid of the State to enforce communion with her—either by conferring special civil privileges on those in communion with her, or by imposing special civil disabilities on those not in her communion—the result to her has been not strength but weakness—she has then invariably become fettered in the free exercise of her highest spiritual functions.

Should, then, a Christian Church never apply to the State for enactments of any kind? I do not say this. There are two cases in which legislative enactments may be considered

highly desirable, in fact necessary, for a Christian Church.

1st. When past unenlightened legislation has unduly fettered her, and she desires to be freed from these fetters. With respect to the Church of England in this colony, grave doubts have existed in past years, whether she was not thus fettered by the old ecclesiastical laws of England. But these doubts are now removed. The highest court of appeal in England has declared, and the declaration has been judiciously published in all the British colonies by the kind care of her Majesty's late *Principal Secretary of State* for the colonies, that "the Church of England is not unduly fettered in the colonies; that she is in exactly the same position as other religious bodies—no better, no worse. There is, therefore, no necessity to apply to our Parliament on this ground." (May 4th, 1862), printed in the *Church Chronicle*.

But 2ndly—Every religious body finds its powers of ministering to the spiritual wants of its members increased by possessing, in trust, churches, and parsonages, and schools, and burial grounds, and glebes, and other endowments; and these church properties, these temporalities of the Church, as they are called, render it necessary to apply to the Legislature for a Church Temporalities Act. Such an Act the various religious bodies in this colony have applied for and obtained. The Church of England, the Church of Rome, the Presbyterian bodies, the Wesleyans, have all their Church Temporalities Act. And, when any occasion may arise to make it desirable for any religious body to amend or revise its Church Temporalities Act, it is wise to apply to the Legislature for such a revision, and it is only reasonable the Legislature should grant the request. The Presbyterian bodies, on the occasion of their union, are now applying for such an Act, to regulate the *temporal affairs* of the Presbyterian Church; and the Church of England, when commencing Synodical action, may wisely and reasonably apply for a revision of her Church Temporalities Act, and doubtless the Legislature would willingly entertain and grant such a request.

It has been stated more than once in the late Sydney Conference—that the Conference was asking, in its proposed Diocesan Synod Bill, for nothing more than had been granted to the Presbyterians and the Wesleyans. So far so good. But *how* has all that the Sydney Conference is asking been granted to the other religious bodies? Solely in their Church Temporalities Acts? Why, then, cannot the Church of England obtain all she requires by a careful revision of her present Church Temporalities Act? This question has not been, and cannot be, satisfactorily answered. I would hope therefore that every member of our Church in this Diocese may clearly understand—that the only legislation which the Church of England requires, is an amendment of her present Church Act—that it would be unreasonable and invidious for her to ask the Legislature for any other different kind of Church Act; and if she does ask for any other different kind of Church Act, I hope and believe that the Legislature will refuse her unwise and unreasonable request.

2nd. I would call your attention to another subject in connexion with Church of England legislation.

The Church of England in this colony has now three dioceses in active operation—the diocese of Sydney, Newcastle and Goulburn—and, according to the law of the Christian Church, whenever three dioceses, with their bishops presiding over them, exist in any portion or province of the Christian Church, the legislative body of the Church in any such

province is the General Conference or Provincial Synod, of which each diocese forms an integral independent part—whether each diocese be represented by its Bishop alone or by its Bishop and Presbyters, or by its Bishop and chosen Representatives of the Clergy and Laity. And before the Legislature of any country or colony has been asked to give legal sanction to any Church Act in such a province—the Act has received the approval either of the three Diocesan Synods assembled separately, or of the three Dioceses assembled together in one General Conference, or Provincial Synod. I cannot, therefore, but think that the late Sydney Conference has committed a grave mistake in drawing up what it calls a purely Diocesan Bill, and directing it to be introduced at once into the Legislative Assembly—and that the Legislature will commit as grave a mistake if it passes this purely Diocesan Bill, should it be persisted in.

There are two points worthy of notice in the proceedings of the late Sydney Conference with reference to this subject.

1st. In the report of the Conference as printed in the *Church of England Chronicle*, we read that Mr. Johnson moved the following resolution—"That a committee be appointed to frame a code or body of fundamental constitutions of the Synod proposed to be erected for the good management and general regulation of the affairs of *The United Church of England and Ireland within the Colony.*" &c. &c.

The motion was seconded by Mr. James Macarthur, who said—"It was very desirable that the *whole body of the Church of England in this Colony* should thoroughly understand what they wanted before they applied to the Legislature."

The motion thus proposed and seconded was carried, and the committee after a week's labour reported that they had unanimously agreed to certain fundamental constitutions for the management and regulation of the affairs of the United Church of England and Ireland—"within the Diocese of Sydney."

It is not a surprising fact, that a number of highly educated and experienced clergymen, with nearly double the number of intellectual and professional laymen, should appoint a committee to do one thing, and the committee should do quite another thing, and report accordingly; and then, without a single word of explanation from any member of the committee, or a single word of enquiry from any member of the Conference respecting this *most important change*, the report, without any discussion, should be unanimously adopted.

Observe (2ndly) the wise words of the seconder of this motion for appointing the committee.

"It was very desirable that the whole body of the Church of England in this colony should thoroughly understand what they wanted before they applied to the Legislature."

Wise words indeed; but no words could more forcibly condemn the proposed Sydney Diocesan Synod Bill. Does that bill ask for all the Diocese of Sydney wants? Does any one member of the Sydney Conference profess to have so fully considered the present position of the Church of England in this colony, with its obsolete Church Temporalities Act, as to have arrived at a knowledge of *all* the church wants? Far from it: the proposed Synod Bill is only the supposed first necessary step towards *considering* what they want. The President mentioned "fresh powers to be obtained by further legislation." The Secretary of the Conference Committee plainly stated—"The object of the present measure is to

clear the ground for future action. A Synod elected under this Bill, it appeared to him, would probably be occupied one or two sessions before completing a system which would answer the ends in view." Thus the present supposed Bill is not a complete final measure, but only desired as a proper dignified sanction for their commencing to consider their wants.

The prayer of the proposed Sydney Synod Bill seems to be of this nature—Be it enacted by the Queen's most excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly of New South Wales, in Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, that the members of the Sydney Diocesan Synod, may now begin to consider and consult together, so that after one, or two, or three sessions, they may understand what they want and then apply for "fresh powers by future legislation."

The reasonable answer to such a prayer would seem to be—We, the Legislature of N. S. Wales, are not to be troubled about such a trifle—the occasion does not need our interference, if you please—begin at once to consider what you want—pass as many sessions as you find necessary in consulting about and determining what you require. Do this, as you clearly may do it, without troubling us for any unnecessary legal sanction; and, when you thoroughly understand what you want, apply to us to sanction a well-considered revision of your Church Temporalities Act, and you will not apply in vain.

Once more, on this head, the members of the Legislature need not be reminded that the Church of England in this colony consists of three Dioceses, with a fourth in process of erection, and a fifth in prospect; that the Church of Rome has many deaneries throughout the colony; that the different Presbyterian bodies have many districts; and the Wesleyans many circuits. If then a separate bill be proposed for the Diocese of Sydney, where will legislation for the different religious bodies end? Every separate Diocese of the Church of England, every separate Deanery of the Church of Rome, every district of the Presbyterians, and every circuit of the Wesleyans might then ask for a separate Act, which could not with justice be refused.

Surely, then, in a Legislature composed of members of different religious opinions, legislation for the various religious bodies is not to be encouraged *without limit*, but should be as much as possible discouraged. And on this principle no Church Bill should be granted to any of the religious bodies, except a Church Temporalities Act, either original or revised; and even such an Act should be granted ONLY when sanctioned and applied for by the whole united religious body to which it refers.

III. What, then, is now to be done, that the United Church of England and Ireland in New South Wales, may enjoy Synodical action with as little delay as possible? Simply this: Let the proposed Sydney Diocesan Synod Bill be for the present withdrawn; then, as stated in the amendment of the Rev. A. H. Stephen, the Metropolitan would doubtless be willing to carry out the intention expressed in his address—"If any delay arise in obtaining a Bill, I shall call the Conference together again." And when the Conference is again assembled, some thoughtful members of it have already pointed out the course to be pursued.

The Rev. Canon Walsh said in the late Conference—"If the Conference were to take in hand the consideration of the existing circumstances of the Church of England, with regard

to the bearing of the Temporalities Act; and if they were to go to the Legislature and ask that that Act might be repealed, and that there might be substituted for it an Act giving all the powers needed for the government of the Church of England in this colony, then they would go to the Legislature with a moral weight which otherwise they would not have.

The Rev. Wm. Stack said—"They would go to Parliament much better as an actually existing working Synod, than if they went with merely a bit of paper in their hands, for such he held these constitutions to be."

The Rev. H. A. Palmer said—"When the Synod was formed, and had ascertained what Legislation was required in regard to the Temporalities of the Church, they could apply for such powers as they needed."

At such a Conference the chief subjects for consultation would be a careful revision of the present Church Temporalities Act, with a Church Constitution, embracing Provincial as well as Diocesan Synods, to be appended to the revised Temporalities Bill, like a deed of settlement. Both the revised Bill and the Constitution Act being drawn up for the United Church of England and Ireland in New South Wales, and not for one diocese alone, and drawn up as draft Bill, and draft Constitution Act, to be considered and sanctioned by the first General Conference which the Metropolitan may call together.

And if a general Conference could be called together by the Metropolitan at an early date, so as to consider and sanction such a revised Church Temporalities Bill, and such a Church Constitution Act, before the Separate Diocesan Conferences drew up their separate draft Bills, and draft Constitutions, all danger of difference of opinion, or difference of action, would be avoided; and then with the Lord's blessing, nothing could hinder or delay the united action and the greatly increased influence of our beloved church in this colony.

I remain,

My Christian brethren,

Your faithful brother and Bishop.

W. NEWCASTLE.

Morpeth, April 6th, 1865.

Church Intelligence.

MORPETH.

It may be useful to mention a little matter, that is worthy of imitation, that recently occurred, connected with the children of St. James's Day and Sunday School, as showing that the scholars themselves, as well as their parents and friends, appreciate music and singing in their proper place and to its proper extent. It was mentioned to them by their clergyman, the Rev. C. Walsh, that it would help them materially in their singing if a harmonium could be procured for their school, and particularly as their kind master, Mr. Warner, was well able to play it. They were told that if they would collect five pounds, their pastor would try and raise another five pounds, which would be sufficient to procure one of moderate power, suited for schools. Greatly to their clergyman's surprise, and their own gratification, their success was greater than was anticipated, and instead of five pounds nearly seven pounds were handed in by the children. Since the introduction of the harmonium it has given quite a fresh interest in their singing and a very perceptible improvement has already taken place.

HINTON.

A very great loss has been experienced in this neighbourhood by the departure of two of its most estimable ladies, the Misses James. The respect which was generally entertained for them by the inhabitants of Hinton cannot adequately be expressed in words. It will be sufficient to mention that it was not undeserved, for they had for a number of years devoted themselves to relieve the necessities of all who came within their reach. By an assiduous discharge of duties in the control and management of the Sunday-school Miss James particularly distinguished herself, and was much appreciated on that account. There was nothing set on foot connected with the Church or School but met with her own and her sisters' ready co-operation, and through their exertions, aided by others, was successfully carried through. We fear that some time will elapse before their place can in every respect be quite supplied. The members of St. John's Church, with the kind assistance of a few other friends, subscribed a sum of money, and one of Hardy's best watches, with a suitable inscription was presented to Miss James, an inkstand and handsome silver card-case to Miss A. M. James.

Besides the above presents the Sunday-school children wished to evince their respect for these amiable ladies, and begged Miss James's acceptance of a copy of Aikins's British Poets, and her sister's acceptance of a silver fruit knife. An address was presented to them on behalf of the residents, expressive of the regret they felt at the removal of these ladies from amongst them and the fervent wish that they may be spared for many years.

DIocese of CHRISTCHURCH, NEW ZEALAND.

From the *Church Quarterly Paper*, January, 1866.

THE NEW POSITION OF THE CHURCH.

To Churchmen in this diocese, the late session of our Synod is one of the most interesting that has been held. For the first time since its sessions commenced, members of the church in Canterbury have been free to carry out thoroughly the system of Church Trusts devised several years ago. The agreement came to with the General Synod has secured a measure of independence in the management of temporalities which enables all dioceses now existing, or hereafter to be created in New Zealand to carry out those plans for the administration of property, best suited to the circumstances of each locality, and most likely to evoke the greatest amount of interest and active co-operation among the lay members of the church. The amendment by the General Assembly of the Religious, Charitable, and Educational Trusts Act of 1856 has brought its provisions within reach of all the great subdivisions of the church, so that there is no longer any reason for delay in doing all that is requisite for the safe custody of church property, and in originating the disciplinary measures more or less intimately connected with it. In another way also we are more free to act in the management of ecclesiastical affairs. The position of the church is gradually becoming more defined and better understood. What was long suspected is now explicitly declared. Henceforth we are to understand that the Colonial Church is in as good a position—in no better, but in no worse—than any other communion of Christians. Doubtless there have been many among us who have entertained

with much apprehension the idea that our church in New Zealand is practically cut off from the control or protection of English ecclesiastical law. But now that the announcement has come forth in clear and decided terms from the highest judicial authority, we may begin to experience a sense of relief in knowing what our position really is. We are unfettered at last. If we do not forthwith set about a diligent and rational management of our own church affairs there is no one to undertake the task for us. What we have now to desire is that there may be displayed on all hands, among the laity and among the clergy a vigorous resolution to rise to the occasion. Our present *status quo*, it may fairly be said, is none of our seeking. It would be incorrect to say that it has been forced upon us. It has rather been elucidated and explained to us by those against whose judgment there is no appeal. The State authorities of the Empire have devised no scheme for the regulation of the Colonial Church. With the exception of the rare and tardy creation of new dioceses and the occasional appointment of bishops, she has been left to the course of her own natural progress and development, and the judicial committee of Privy Council have simply declared the result. The more we suffer our minds to dwell on this view of the history of the Colonial Church, the better satisfied we shall be with it. It might have required more courage than we possessed deliberately to cast ourselves loose from the State organisation of the mother Church. But what we should perhaps have hesitated to seek of our own free will has been brought about by causes over which we have had little or no control. We are now in all essential respects independent, and our independence is the result neither of intentional interference from without, nor of revolutionary action from within. We may accept it, therefore, without scruple as having come to us in the course of God's providence. We may accept it cheerfully with all its freedom of action and relief from old perplexities, and we should accept it also with a grave sense of the new duties and responsibilities it involves. We would not however be understood to hold that nothing remains to be done in reference to our relation to the State. On a former occasion we pointed out the anomaly of the right of patronage in the appointment of our bishops, still claimed by the Crown. Surely we are not over sanguine or unreasonable in hoping that this right will be given up as a fair and graceful concession to those whom the Crown no longer pretends to control or support. To many it would appear less probable, perhaps less desirable, that the Imperial Parliament may be induced to pass some general enabling Act to supply the lack of power for self government in those wide-spread branches of the Colonial Church which have now been formally cut adrift to shift for themselves. If any of our readers think we are inclined to bring forward such considerations as the foregoing too often and too prominently, we would beg them to consider that henceforth the action of our Synods, whether general or diocesan, will be incomprehensible unless they be kept constantly in view. Without the recollection of them churchmen will lose a powerful motive to energetic action as well as a principle to guide them in the management of their church affairs. There can be no intelligent assumption of independence and responsibility without a clear apprehension of the circumstances from which they have arisen.

Diocese of Goulburn.

THE NEWCASTLE DIOCESE AND THE GENERAL CONFERENCE.

THE last leading article in the Newcastle portion of the *Chronicle*, cannot but cause deep regret to every true friend of the Church in the Colony. Whereas brethren ought to dwell together in unity, this strange production, whatever its object, can have no other effect than that of sowing discord and strife, and exhibiting to the world at large a grievous spectacle of disunion.

The acknowledgement of obligation to the *Sydney Morning Herald* for the Conference Report of April 25th, was surely a matter of propriety; at the same time it was an oversight not to have modified it, by the addition of words shewing that the Proprietor had requested such as fell in his way to correct the press. The omissions, to which the article draws attention, were imperatively required by truth: for the Rev. H. Venn does not "disprove the very opinion" for which he was quoted; as is abundantly demonstrated by a correspondent. He refutes, it is true, *an over statement and exaggerated form of that opinion* but the *opinion itself is precisely that for which it was adduced by the Bishop of Goulburn*, viz., that there were disadvantages in the position of the Church of England in the Colony which did not attach to that of the Presbyterians, Wesleyans, or any other religious body.

Mr. Venn's argument is of the following nature. Finding that unprecedented efforts were made to induce the British Parliament to legislate for the Church in the Colonies, on the pretence that its disadvantages were such as to demand *Imperial* interference, he interposed by a pamphlet, the title of which is—"COLONIAL CHURCH LEGISLATION, an Enquiry into the Ecclesiastical Law of the Colonies and Dependencies of Great Britain; and into the best means of REMEDYING ITS DEFECTS." 1. He distinctly recites the disadvantages, and says that they are a *fact*. 2. But he argues that the Church is not in so disadvantageous a position (which is the allegation of some and which alle-

gation he refutes) as to claim GREATER legislative privileges than other bodies: 3. Nor in such a disadvantageous position as to claim SUCH or any other privileges from the IMPERIAL Parliament, so as to override Colonial Parliaments. 4. He suggests that the disadvantages, (*which do exist* for he carefully states them as a *fact*) can only be removed by Colonial Parliaments. 5. And he recommends an appeal accordingly to Colonial Parliaments to *remedy the defects of the Ecclesiastical Law of the Colony, and to obtain legal sanction for Ecclesiastical arrangements*. If there were no disadvantages why all this counsel and advice!

The very object of Mr. Venn's pamphlet was to deter the *Imperial* Parliament from interfering in the matter of Colonial Church Legislation, on the ground (1.) that that question lay within the province of the *Colonial* Legislatures; and (2.) that the case as presented by some of the advocates of the movement in England had been much *overstated* in reference to the alleged disadvantages.

The Bishop of Goulburn had said that the special disadvantages which result from the absence of legislation were peculiar to the Church of England in the Colony; and that every other religious body had obtained all the sanction of law, which they could possibly desire. Not so the Church of England.

Mr. Venn thus enumerates the details of those disadvantages: the allegation, (which allegation was true as to the fact of the disadvantages, but wrong as to argument deduced from them) that the Church is in this disadvantageous position *may be traced to the fact*, (1.) that *the Church Constitution of other bodies are more adapted* for the circumstances of the colonists than that of the Church of England (2.) especially in respect of the maintenance of discipline. (3.) *The Church of England in the Colonies has no Ecclesiastical Courts for enforcing its discipline*. (4.) Its Ecclesiastical Courts are all at home, its Bishops and clergy are dispersed in all parts of the world. (5.) Whereas *in the Presbyterian Church and among the Wesleyan Methodists, their means of enforcing dis-*

cipline, lie in Synods, Presbyteries, and Conferences, which can be held wherever a few Ministers and laymen of their persuasion meet together." All other religious bodies possess the power of enforcing discipline and maintaining their distinctive principles. *The Church of England alone owing to the absence of Legislation is deficient in its appliances for these purposes.* This is what the Bishop of Goulburn affirmed, and this is precisely what Mr. Venn states, for he recommends an appeal to the Colonial Parliament for legal sanction to such Ecclesiastical arrangements as will remove these disadvantages.

The Newcastle Leader also deals in a very peculiar manner with the facts relating to the Diocesan as well as General Conference; in a word it mistakes the facts entirely. Let us endeavour to recal some of them.

When the Diocese of Goulburn agreed to unite with the other dioceses, for the purpose of obtaining effective power to deal with the property of the Church, through the medium of legal Synods, a Conference was held in Goulburn. The duty of that *Diocesan* Conference was two-fold:—1. To frame Church Constitutions for the regulation of the Synod, which might be established for the Diocese of Goulburn; 2. To appoint representatives from the Diocese to a General Conference, which was to be held in Sydney, of the representatives of the three Dioceses; and the duty of that *General* Conference was, at the time, stated to be likewise two-fold: 1. To consider the propriety of making united application to the Legislature for legal sanction to the Church Constitutions of the several Dioceses, 2. to establish under the power of such legal sanction a Provincial Synod for the Church in the Colony, and Diocesan Synods for the Church in the several Dioceses. These particulars were distinctly stated in the first circular by which the Bishop of Goulburn convened the Goulburn Conference.

The representatives of the Goulburn Diocese have steadily adhered to these duties in both the Conferences, which they have attended. They have done so without any kind of dictation or in-

terference from the Bishop of the Diocese; and have acted entirely upon their own conviction of their duty and of the object of their election. They have never entered into any arrangement, public or private, to do what is most improperly insinuated.

The Newcastle statement refers to the case of the Canadian Synod; but omits to state that they were legally constituted by the *Act of the Canadian Legislature, 19-20 Vict. chap. 121, "to enable members of the United Church of England and Ireland in Canada to meet in Synod."* The first clause enacts that Diocesan Synods may be held in the several dioceses to frame constitutions and make regulations for enforcing discipline. The second clause authorises the formation of a Provincial Synod to frame a Constitution and regulations for the general management and good government of the Church in the Province of Canada. It will be time enough to refer to the regulations of the Canadian Synods formed under the sanction of an Act of Parliament as soon as the *Church in New South Wales has obtained the same measure of legal recognition*, and is enabled, under the same kind of sanction, to frame the regulations which the exigencies of the case may require, in the same open and publicly recognised manner.

The troubles of the Colonial Church are already weighty and numerous enough. But it is pitiable to see her own sons—nay more—*those who ought to be her nursing fathers* adding to their number, and augmenting their burden.

Correspondence.

To the Editor of *The Church Chronicle.*

SIR,—The leading article from the Diocese of Newcastle, in your last number, contains some very extraordinary statements. I will endeavour to confine myself to one of them, which repeats an accusation of the Bishop of Newcastle in the following manner:—"The Bishop of Newcastle in his speech (*Church Chronicle* p. 138, ¶ 3.) pointed out that a quotation made by the Bishop of Goulburn in his address to his Conference of last December from a pamphlet of Mr. Venn, in support of his own opinion—that '*the special disadvantages which result from the absence of Legislation are peculiar to the Church of England in this Colony,*' was, in fact, a *misquotation.*" That your readers may understand the merits of the case, it will be necessary to explain the subject at some length.

Several attempts had been made in England to obtain from the *Imperial* Parliament legislation for the Colonial Church. Mr. Venn considered that the arguments employed in favour of those attempts were based upon misapprehension of facts, and mistatement of truth; that the disabilities of the Colonial Church which were real, were nevertheless much overstated; and that upon this over-statement of them was based a claim upon the *Imperial* Parliament for special privileges in behalf of the Church of England in the colonies. He was also of opinion that these disadvantages, which he fully admitted, were such as could be removed by Colonial legislation alone. He accordingly recommended a course of procedure, which is very analogous to that now pursued by the Dioceses of Sydney and Goulburn, namely, "*to obtain a legal sanction for ecclesiastical arrangements through the Colonial legislatures.*"

The quotation from Mr. Venn, given by the Bishop of Goulburn, in illustration of his own statement, is thus printed with several printer's inaccuracies in *The Church Chronicle* p. 19:—

"The disadvantageous position of the Church in a colony (writes Mr. Venn) may be traced to the fact, that the constitutions of other bodies are easily adapted to the circumstances of colonists, especially in respect of the maintenance of discipline. The Church of England in a colony has no ecclesiastical courts; these are in England. Whereas, in the Presbyterian Church, and among the Wesleyans, their means of enforcing discipline lie in synods, presbyteries, and conferences, which can be held wherever a few ministers and laymen of their persuasion meet together. They and other bodies have secured their discipline by vesting their property in trust deeds, which insert their doctrines and regulations of discipline in declarations of trust. Thus, with local acts, they are able by an appeal to local courts to eject a minister if he violates their established rules. The property of Wesleyans is vested by trusteeship, in all parts of the world, under the provisions of a Poll Deed, executed by Wesley, 28th February, 1784, and enrolled in the High Court of Chancery, reciting the distinctive principles and discipline of Wesleyanism."

Your readers may judge of the accuracy or inaccuracy of this reference to Mr. Venn, on the subject of the comparative disabilities of the English Church in the colonies, by a more lengthened quotation from his pamphlet, which is subjoined:—

"It may be shewn that upon the soundest ecclesiastical principles a Diocesan Synod can claim no power of legislation. The functions of a Diocesan Synod are thus described and limited by Johnson, a writer of authority as a canonist, in his "*Clergyman's Vademecum.*" "Diocesan Synods are the assemblies of the Bishop and his Presbyters to enforce and put in execution canons made by general councils, or national and provincial synods, and to consult and agree upon rules of discipline for themselves."

"Should it be thought right, in any colony, so far to depart from the principle here laid down as to give the convention of clergy and laity [which Mr. Venn had previously recommended] a measure of legislative action, it will be at least necessary that this action shall be restricted to the management of the temporal affairs of the Church, and the exercise of discipline over the clergy."

"It has indeed been sometimes asserted that the Church of England has been placed in so disadvantageous a position in the colonies, relatively to other religious bodies, that it may

fairly claim GREATER legislative privileges. So much misstatement and confusion has existed upon *this part* of the subject, that it is important to enter into a fuller explanation of the case. THE ALLEGATION that the Church is in this disadvantageous position, MAY BE TRACED TO THE FACT that the Constitutions of other bodies are more adapted for the circumstances of colonists than that of the Church of England, especially in respect of the maintenance of discipline. The Church of England in the colonies has no ecclesiastical courts for enforcing its discipline. Its ecclesiastical courts are all at home; its bishops and clergy are dispersed in all parts of the world. Whereas in the Presbyterian Church, and among the Wesleyan Methodists, their means of enforcing discipline lie in synods, presbyteries, and conferences, which can be held wherever a few ministers and laymen of their persuasion meet together.

"Again, other religious communities have secured their discipline by vesting their chapels and other property under trust deeds, which insert their doctrines and regulations of discipline in their declarations of trust; and thus even without express local acts, they are enabled to enforce the ejection of any minister from their churches and houses of residence, by an appeal to the civil courts, if he violates their established rules. In this way the whole of the trusteeship of the property of the Wesleyan Methodists in all parts of the world is vested in trustees under the provisions of a poll deed, executed by Wesley, bearing date 28th February, 1784, enrolled in the High Court of Chancery, reciting the distinctive principles and discipline of Methodism. Thus they have been enabled to keep up their uniformity of doctrine and discipline throughout all the colonies of Great Britain; and have frequently had recourse to the civil courts of the colonies when any resistance has been made to their exercise of such discipline."

After reciting the titles of the Acts of the Colonial Legislature by which the Presbytery of the Presbyterian Church, and the Governing bodies of the Wesleyan Methodists, Independents, and Baptists regulate their temporal affairs, and secure the discipline and the doctrines of their several communities; Mr. Venn proceeds:—"We here find that they all had the same opportunity of making regulations for their temporal affairs, including their Ecclesiastical discipline, provided that such discipline should be presented to the Legislature in some recognised form and substance, as in a Model Deed."

And then a few pages onward he adds:—"Reverting to the course of proceeding which has been suggested, namely, of an Act of Parliament, authorising the bishops, clergy, and laity of any colony to meet together and propose ecclesiastical regulations, to be submitted for approval to Colonial legislatures, and ultimately to the authorities at home; it is conceived that such an Act would confer great and immediate advantages upon the Church in the colonies, by enlisting the co-operation of the laity, and by giving encouragement, direction, and confidence to the efforts of its zealous and energetic friends for perfecting its system."

Your readers have now the facts placed before them. Let us then examine together Mr. Venn's remarks with reference to the Bishop of Goulburn's proposition that: "the special disadvantages which result from the absence of legislation are peculiar to the Church of England in this colony." Mr. Venn's statement manifestly embraces the following con-

clusions:—"That the Church of England in the colonies is in a disadvantageous position in comparison with other religious bodies,—

1. Because the constitution of the Church of England is less adapted to the circumstances of the colonists than that of other bodies.

2. Because the Church of England in the colonies has no ecclesiastical court for enforcing its discipline.

3. Because consequently the Church of England does not possess, what the Presbyterian Church does as well as the Wesleyan Methodists, the proper means of enforcing its discipline.

4. Because an Act of Parliament is needed to provide for the Church of England the power of discipline which is lacking.

Has the Bishop of Goulburn said more than this? And has he employed Mr. Venn's name for any other purpose than to aid him in exhibiting this fact? Certainly not.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

TRUTH.

To the Editor of The Church Chronicle.

June, 16th, 1866.

SIR,—As a Member of the General Conference lately held in Sydney, I have been very much startled by a leading article which appeared in the Newcastle portion of the last *Church Chronicle*, headed "The late General Conference." There are several points in this article which are so erroneous, to say the least of them, and several other points which are so exceedingly one-sided, that it would not be right to allow them to remain altogether unanswered. I pass over the fact of a leading article, of a united *Church Chronicle*, and which to my mind ought rather to breathe the impartial spirit of a judge, than the one-sided spirit of an advocate; dealing with a general Church question in a manner which would have better suited a correspondent's letter. It would have been better for the Newcastle Editor to have inserted such a composition as a letter, under the wise and judicious heading "We are not answerable for the views and opinions expressed by our various correspondents," than to have put it in the prominent position which it now holds. *The Church Chronicle* of the three Dioceses belongs to them all, and it is at least unseemly that the leading article of one portion should be devoted to attacks upon the conduct of the other two Dioceses. But I come now to look at the Article itself. It begins with an attack on those who have the management of the *Chronicle* for having altered some portions of the report of the Conference as given by the daily papers before it was printed in the *Chronicle*. And it blames the publisher of the *Chronicle* for having said "we are indebted to the *Herald*" for the report which we now present &c., when it had made some alterations and omissions. Now Sir, I cannot believe there is one other reader of the *Chronicle* who will join in that blame; but there are many who would have been only glad if the Editor had been able to have given even a fuller report, by getting all the speakers to give their speeches in writing. That the Editor was able by any means to give a fuller report to Church people of what the General Conference had done, than could be given by the daily secular papers, was not a matter of blame but rather one calling for congratulation. The words "indebted to the *Herald*," surely implied no bond to follow verbatim its report, but were a courteous acknowledgment of the assistance its report had given to the *Church Chronicle*. The rest of this wonderful article is taken up with the consideration of the two

subjects on which the Conference met to deliberate, and to the *proof*? that the representatives of the Sydney and Goulburn Dioceses had acted inconsistently with principles which they hold, and to which they are said to have bound themselves. Now as regards the Diocese of Goulburn I desire to give this assertion at once an unequivocal and full denial. Before though I go further, being one of the Goulburn representatives I desire to deny that I for one bound myself, whatever that phrase may mean, to any set of measures; but that while holding certain views on the matters to be discussed I went into the Conference anxious only to do what was best, whenever after a fair debate I should see what was best. I am unconscious of any fetters having bound me, and I think the Goulburn representatives as a body, showed that they were unaccustomed to shape all their ideas on one model, but were in the habit of thinking for themselves and also of speaking out what they thought.

But now the charge of inconsistency which is brought against us, rests on the assertion that we stated at first that we would admit of no clauses in the General Constitutions with reference to a Provincial Synod; and that there were passed clauses 16—21 of the General Constitutions which all have reference to a Provincial Synod."

Now I cannot conceive, on what grounds this charge is made, as one of the very express objects for which we were elected as members of the General Conference, was to determine the nature and character of a future Provincial Synod. And so far are the Goulburn Constitutions from ignoring a Provincial Synod that in one of the clauses of these constitutions there is express mention made of an appeal to the Provincial Synod. How in the face of all this, can any one say that we were determined to admit no clauses with reference to a Provincial Synod with the General Constitutions? I confess, Sir, I never saw a greater mis-statement in my life. What was the point there, in which we differed from the Diocese of Newcastle and which eventually was carried in our favour. It was this, and *Churchmen in general ought to know it*. Was the future Provincial Synod to override the Diocesan Synods and to deal with matters purely Diocesan, or was it to be confined to Provincial matters, leaving Diocesan affairs to be managed by the Synod of each Diocese? To this we answered always that no Provincial Synod had, or ought to have, any right to interfere with affairs purely Diocesan. This was the point of discussion and in this the Goulburn representatives never changed, but with the Sydney Diocese rejected the amendment of the Bishop of Newcastle in which this right was asserted. And thus the Diocese of Newcastle was compelled to abandon its favourite idea.

The other question had reference to the seeking Legislative sanction for the Church Constitutions. Now here again in the article referred to, the question is mis-stated. The question was never yet before the General Conference what Bill should be adopted to be sent to the Legislature, but whether any Bill at all should be adopted. So clearly was this the case, that when the Bishop of Newcastle had spoken a very long time against some Bill not before the Conference, one of the Goulburn representatives rose and asked the President to call his Lordship to order, as his speech referred to what was not before the meeting. Though the President ruled that the Bishop of Newcastle was in order, the opinion of the majority of the members was, that that ruling was wrong. The whole question between the Dioceses of Sydney and Goulburn on one hand

and of Newcastle on the other, was not whether a certain bill should be adopted or not, but whether any bill at all giving legal sanction should be sought for. And this was carried in the affirmative according to the wishes of the two Dioceses. There are many other points in this article which might be answered, but fearing that I have trespassed already too much on your space,

I remain, Sir,
Yours, &c.,
ONE OF THE GOULBURN REPRESENTATIVES.

To the Editor of The Church Chronicle.
Beverley, Burrows,
15th June, 1866.

SIR,—In the leading article from the Diocese of Newcastle in the last number of *The Church Chronicle*, regarding the late General Conference held in Sydney, in speaking of the disinclination, on the part of those members of the special committee who were Representatives of the Sydney and Goulburn Dioceses, to consider any clauses for the constitution of a provincial Synod, it is stated that “the Goulburn Representatives thus chosen “with these restricted powers, afterwards bound themselves privately, as the Goulburn members of the Constitution Committee acknowledged in that committee not to admit “into the Church Constitution to be adopted “by the General Conference, any additional “clauses beyond those which were contained in “their Diocesan constitutions which had “reference only to a diocesan Synod.”

As one of the two “Goulburn members of the Constitution Committee,” I regret that such a statement should have been made, and at once give it a most distinct denial.

The words “thus chosen” in the quotation, refer to the former part of the same paragraph, in which the Goulburn representatives are stated to be “tied down by the resolution “under which they were chosen to consider “at the General Conference such matters only “as were not determined by the fundamental “constitutions previously passed by their “conference.”

The wording of this resolution, although not correctly quoted by the writer of the article alluded to, appears to me to be far less restricted than that of the Sydney Diocese, as it confers powers which were not given to their representatives, and if I may judge by the acts of the Newcastle representatives is much more general than theirs.

As I understood the duties of the Goulburn representatives they were to secure for that Diocese in the general form of constitution the principles laid down in the Diocesan constitution, and I never thought of complaining that I was not at liberty to undo all that had been done by the Goulburn Conference. But we were empowered to go beyond this especial duty and to consider and act on our own judgment as to any other matters which had not been passed by our Conference. Thus then we were not “tied down” to a very humiliating extent, and there was as little necessity as there existed inclination on our part to enter into any such “private” obligation as is stated, much less was their any reason for our immediately making that “private” agreement public.

What was done in special committee was capable of a more generous as well as a more truthful statement than that I complain of. When the clauses relating to Diocesan action had been agreed to, to the satisfaction of the representatives from each Diocese, the difficulty arose at the instance of the Bishop of Newcastle regarding the framing of a consti-

tution for a Provincial Synod. At a subsequent meeting of Committee, clauses relating to the Provincial Synod were agreed to, but in these the Bishop of Newcastle did abandon what I understood to have been the “favorite idea” of his Diocese, and the Sydney and Goulburn representatives maintained the principle with which they started, that each Diocese “had an inherent right to manage its own affairs,” irrespective of the Provincial Synod, which, according to the constitutions is a non governing body.

I have had no opportunity of corresponding with the other Goulburn representatives either Lay or Clerical but as I am said, as one of the constitution Committee, to have made a statement affecting not only myself but my fellow representatives, which is wholly without foundation, I cannot pass it without notice.

The allusion in the paragraph in which the expression to which I have referred, occurs, to “feters behind the door” is peculiarly inappropriate to the Bishop of Goulburn, the representatives for whose Diocese would, notwithstanding his position and the great respect in which he is held, have indignantly resented such a statement from him as was made in Committee by the Bishop of Newcastle, that if certain points were not conceded he “would leave not only this Committee but “the Conference and take all my men with me.” Where are the fetters?

I am Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
WILLIAM D. CAMPBELL.

To the Editor of The Church Chronicle.

SIR,—In your last number is an article under the head “Diocese of Newcastle,” which demands the serious attention of all who are interested in promoting the peace, unity, and good government of our Church.

The tendency of that article is calculated to mislead some, and to cause dissension among others of the members of our communion.

I trust there are those more able than myself who will undertake to expose some of the many mis-statements and fallacies which pervade that production. For my part I shall confine myself to one point which I consider personally to affect me.

In page 191, col. 2 of your publication, it is stated: “The Diocese of Goulburn was even more decidedly fixed in the same opinion of not admitting any such clauses into the Church Constitution,” and this refers to a foregoing statement in the same column, where the following words occur in reference to the Diocese of Sydney: “thus affirming their intention of admitting no clauses which would establish a Provincial Synod into the Church Conference.” I really can scarcely find words sufficiently strong to express my indignation at this misrepresentation of our proceedings.

I affirm in the most positive manner that it was held unanimously by the Goulburn Conference that there should be a Provincial Synod, but it was also held by the members that it was *supra vires* for them to enter upon the form of its constitution. This was to be the duty of the General Conference.

To prove that we were not bound down, as alleged, I produce a resolution which is quite decisive as to our power of acting in this or any other matter that might be discussed in the General Conference in Sydney. See *Church Chronicle* No. 1, page 291.

It was moved by the Rev. H. S. Seaborn and seconded by Mr. R. Maddrell,—“That this Conference do now elect four clergymen and four laymen, who jointly with the Bishop shall represent the Diocese at such General

Conference, in reference to all matters not already determined by the fundamental constitutions previously passed by the Conference.

We (the representatives) considered that no discretion was permitted to us to materially alter the fundamental constitutions for our own Diocese, but at the same time, as shown by Mr. Seaborn’s resolution, we were led to conclude that other subjects might be contemplated, and among these unquestionably was that of a Provincial Synod.

After this it is further stated that the Goulburn representatives afterwards bound themselves privately to a certain course of action.

Now I affirm, in direct contradiction to this assertion, that the Goulburn representatives did no such thing. I also affirm that they never even met, nor were ever requested to meet together at all privately, except for a few minutes of the morning prior to the meeting of the Conference in Sydney; and then all that occurred was a conversation as to the manner in which the business of the Conference was to be conducted. Surely the writer must have arrived at his very incorrect conclusion from his knowledge of the fact (which is notorious) that the representatives of the Diocese of Newcastle repeatedly met together in private when in Sydney, with the evident intention of carrying out unalterably in Conference their preconceived notions of what they thought should be done.

I feel deeply that insinuations so incorrect should have been made, and I am sure my co-representatives will do the same. I would say for myself that I have been a minister of the Church of England for more than 40 years. During that time I may have held opinions either upon religious or political subjects quite at variance with the views of my ecclesiastical superiors, but it is only due to them to state that in no case did they ever attempt to prescribe to me the course I should pursue upon the question which now agitates the Church. Nothing ever passed between me and my present Diocesan, except that which was done openly in the hall of the Mechanics’ Institute in this city.

My opinions upon these Synod questions were formed long ago, without any reference whatever to any man in authority, or indeed to any one else; and although this may seem strange to certain gentlemen residing in a particular diocese, yet, nevertheless, as it respects myself, it is strictly true.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
W. SOWERBY.
Parsonage, Goulburn, 16th June, 1866.

Advertisements.

THE CHURCH SOCIETY
FOR THE DIOCESE OF SYDNEY.

Treasurers:
The Commercial Banking Company of Sydney.
Secretaries:
The Rev. Canon Allwood.
J. G. Ewer, Esq.

OFFICE:—Phillip-street, Sydney.
Receipts from 7th to 21st June, 1866.
COLLECTIONS AFTER CONFIRMATION.

	£	s.	d.
St. Barnabas’s	6	10	0
St. Paul’s	12	1	5
St. Andrew’s	9	1	6
Burwood	2	8	8

Canterbury	2 16 7
Balmain	2 10 7
AUXILIARY.	
Mulgoa (quarterly Collection) ...	9 8 0
GOLD FIELDS MISSION.	
Pitt Town, Collection	3 13 0
Wilberforce, ditto	1 7 0
St. Philip's, ditto	27 1 3

YOUNG AND JACKSON, PIANOFORTE MAKERS, AND ORGAN BUILDERS, 166, PITT STREET, SYDNEY, would respectfully call the attention of Clergymen and Organists, to the fact that they are now in a position to undertake the building of Organs guaranteed free from the defects invariably occurring in organs sent to this climate—Small Chancel Organs from £50. No. 1 containing Stopped Diapason Bass, open Diapason and Octave suitable for small churches and schools and of sufficient power to lead any choir. No. 2 with Stopped Diapason Bass, open Diapason Octave, Flute and Piccolo from £85. No. 3 Open Diapason, Stopped Diapason Bass and Organ, Dulcians, Octave, Flute and fifteenth an Octave and a half of German pedals with Bourdons from £120. No. 4 with two Rows of keys, pedals and Bourdons, 12 Stops from £220. Organs, Rebuilt, Revoiced, Cleaned and Tuned—Estimates forwarded on application. Pianofortes by the best makers for sale or hire. Repairing and Tuning. Y. and J. have just received some first class Harmoniums by Alexandra.

MR. SAMPSON'S CLASSICAL AND COMMERCIAL SCHOOL, NEWTOWN.

For the EDUCATION of a limited number of Young Gentlemen in all that pertains to the foundation of a sound Classical or Commercial Education. Monthly examinations will be held by the Rev. G. KING, M.A., and other gentlemen.

Mr. SAMPSON has made arrangements to receive into his family two boarders at the following terms:—

Boarders	£10 10 per quarter.
Day Pupils	£3 3 and £2 2s.

Life Assurance Explained.

MR. B. SHORT,

Sydney Agent of the Australian Mutual Provident Society, will be happy to give full explanation personally, or by letter (without charge), to all persons wishing information in reference to the subject of Life Assurance, Present or Deferred Annuities and Endowments, Educational or otherwise, for children, by addressing him at the office of the Society, New Pitt-street, Sydney; or, Box 73, Post-office, Sydney.

SADDLERY.

JOHN BRUSH, SADDLER,

Manufacturer and Importer.

A large stock of colonial and English Manufactured goods always on hand to select from.

407, GEORGE STREET, SYDNEY.

Opposite the Royal Hotel.

EDWARD MILLETT,

(Successor to John C. Hopkins.)

CLERICAL TAILOR AND ROBE MAKER, 361, George Street, Sydney.

Gowns, Hoods and Caps, for all Degrees. A select assortment of Oxford and Cambridge mixtures always on hand.

ORANGE AND GREAT WESTERN

SADDLE AND HARNESS MANUFACTORY, ESTABLISHED 1855.

JAMES DALE, IMPORTER.

Saddle and Harness Manufacturer, Wholesale and Retail, Orange, Wellington and Dubbo.

WHEELER AND WILSON'S Prize Medal New Improved SEWING MACHINES.

The distinguishing feature in this machine is the making of the

TIGHT LOCK STITCH by the ROTATING HOOK,

an improvement on the shuttle, whereby all heavy and noisy action is avoided, which makes it noted above all other machines for simplicity and general effectiveness; in proof of which, the machine gained a First-class Prize Medal at the London Exhibition of 1862; also, the Paris Gold Medal in 1861; and the numerous testimonials received from persons in all parts of the Colonies amply testify to its excellence. Its complete superiority is fully shown in the following—

It fells or hems any width, turning its own hem as it stitches

Gathers any kind of material with any quantity of fulness.

Gathers and sews on a band at the same time without basting

Embroiders in beautiful designs, with cord, braid, or silk

Sews in cord without basting

Hems, enclosing a cord at the same time without basting

Binds any material without basting

Marks any width of tucks, and stitches them without basting

Trims skirts with braid, velvet, or ribbon, without basting

Quilts any material in any design with silk or cotton

DESCRIPTIVE PAMPHLETS, with testimonials, FREE BY POST, on application.

INSTRUCTIONS GRATIS TO EVERY PURCHASER.

The public are respectfully invited to call and see the MACHINE IN OPERATION at the Show Rooms, No. 1, Wynyard-street, next to Bank of New South Wales.

VENNARD and STEVENS, Sole Agents.

ON SALE, a SERMON, preached in St. James' Church, by the Lord Bishop of Sydney, on the Day of Humiliation. Price, 6d. each; per post 8d. JOSEPH COOK and CO., CHURCH CHRONICLE OFFICE, 370, George-street: Diocesan Depot, Phillip-street.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND CHRONICLE.

The Publishers of the late CHURCH OF ENGLAND CHRONICLE will be grateful to those Subscribers who have not yet paid their subscription, if they will do so immediately. Accounts for the same have been already sent to them.

JOSEPH COOK & CO.,
370, George Street, Sydney.

LIVERPOOL AND LONDON

AND
Globe Insurance Company.

Capital, £2,000,000.

Established in 1836.

Having a Colonial Proprietary, and the following Board of Directors in Sydney.

- J. S. Willis, Esq., Chairman.
- G. K. Holden, Esq.
- Edward Knox, Esq.
- Hon. J. B. Watt, Esq., M.L.C.
- B. Buchanan, Esq.
- Hon. E. Deas Thomson, Esq. C.B., M.L.C.
- Medical Referees:
- Hon. John Macfarlane, Esq., M.D.
- Alfred Roberts, Esq.
- Surveyor—F. H. Grundy, Esq., C.E.

Invested Funds—Exceeding Three Millions.

The Directors continue to grant policies of Insurance in Town or Country against fire, and on life, upon terms which will be found as liberal as those of any other office.

Tables of Rates for Fire and Life Insurance, in all its branches, and every information can be obtained from

A. STANGER LEATHES,

RESIDENT SECRETARY,
Offices, Wynyard Square, Sydney.

NOTICE.—To Subscribers and Advertisers. The Church Chronicle is issued every fortnight—on or about the 7th and 21st of each month.

Annual subscription—Twelve shillings.
CASH TERMS OF ADVERTISING.
Three lines, each insertion ... One shilling
For every additional line " ... Three-pence
For quarter column " ... Six shillings
For half column " ... Ten shillings
For one column " ... Sixteen shillings.
Births, Marriages and Deaths One shilling each insertion.

TO CLERGYMEN, CHURCHWARDENS, AND OTHERS.—Notices of Sermons or Meetings, Subscription Lists, or other Church Advertisements inserted on a reduced scale.

JOSEPH COOK & CO., Publishers,
370, George-street, Sydney.

PRINTED and Published by the Proprietors JOSEPH COOK & Co., 370, George-street, Sydney, Archway opposite the Bank of New South Wales, on Saturday, June 23rd, 1866.