

uniting three distinct services into one is contrary to the Canons, and the very spirit and intention of our Prayer Book.

By the system which he has introduced, the mode of performing service changes every Sunday, which want of uniformity greatly mars the good that would otherwise result from it.

I shall now proceed to show how the services can be shortened without introducing a change in the mode of celebration every time that they are performed.

Morning.—Morning Prayer, Sermon, and Lord's Supper.

Evening.—Evening Prayer and Sermon.

By adopting the above plan, the following advantages are gained:—1st. The Morning Service would be shortened by omitting the Litany and ten Commandments, with the Epistle and Gospel and Nicene Creed, and thus prevent the repetition of the Collect for the day and the Creed, twice in one Service, together with repetition of the Lord's Prayer seven times, as well as reading other portions of Scripture besides the proper Lessons for the Morning.

2nd. The Afternoon Service would consist of a distinct Service from either the Morning or Evening, and yet contain the essentials of public worship,—namely, Prayer and reading the Word of God. I have before shewn that the Litany can be canonically separated from the Morning Prayers, and when used with the Communion Service it furnishes us with a complete office without omitting the reading of the Scriptures, and the recital of a Creed, &c. The administration of Holy Baptism ought to be the substitute for a Sermon in the afternoon, which is the most convenient time for its being conferred.

3rd. The Evening Service would constitute a separate one from the present Afternoon Service, and thus prevent the repetition of the same prayers within a few hours,—a repetition which is most irksome both of Clergymen and congregation.

As regards the administration of the Lord's Supper in the Evening, I am apprehensive that it is quite contrary both to the Rubrics as well as to the usage of the Church. Doubtless Mr. Miller is under the impression that many will then communicate who never attend the Morning Service. Time alone can prove the correctness of his judgment on this point; but I cannot but think that it would have been more wise on his part to have restored a Weekly Communion than to have had a monthly administration of it in the evening.

The Church has made a provision for the Lord's Supper to be given on every Sunday, and many of our best and greatest Divines have declared the Sunday Services to be most imperfect, unless accompanied by the administration of the blessed Eucharist. A Weekly Communion would remove the objections which many urge against never participating in this Holy Sacrament, for they would then have an opportunity of communicating so frequently as would entirely obviate the excuses now made to a mere monthly administration.

The omission of public baptism is one of the greatest draw-backs in Mr. Miller's arrangements, and the plea he advances for it does not justify the violation of the express law of the Church. I know, by experience, that there is no parish in which lower views on baptism are held than in that of which he is the Rector. It cannot be otherwise as long as its administration takes place in an empty Church, which alone has a tendency to lower this holy rite among the people. Mr. Miller will, I trust, see the absolute necessity of obeying the positive law on this important point, and thus furnish himself the most powerful inducement for his people to follow his steps, on the principle that "example is stronger than precept."

I am, Sir, your faithful servant, H. G. Friday, July 16th, 1852.

CONVOCAATION.

To the Worshipful the Chapter of the Cathedral and Metropolical Church of York.

Reverend and Dear Sirs—The Convocation being dissolved in which I had the honour to be one of your procurators, I venture to solicit a renewal of that ancient trust in the Synod which will be immediately convened.

From the time of my election I have applied myself to study the constitution and history of Convocation, especially in the Northern province; and I have been able to elucidate some particulars, which, having been omitted or but slightly touched on in the controversies of the last century, will be found of importance in the very different question agitated in our own day.

The dispute between Atterbury and Wake was wholly political. The parliamentary character of Convocation—not its ecclesiastical—was the question they so hotly contested. Our attention on the contrary is directed to its revival simply as the superior Synod of the Church.

The question is one which cannot now be postponed. It has already been twice debated in the House of Lords; some of the most experienced and sagacious of our Bishops have unreservedly declared in its favour; others fully allow the synodical principle; while the Convocation of the Southern province—by a majority in the Upper House, and without a dissentient voice in the Lower—has recently been on the point of addressing the Crown for a royal license to resume its functions.

My own sentiments upon the subject are expressed in the speech of which a copy has been sent to every member of the Chapter.

No policy, it appears to me, could be more fatal than the attempt to stifle a question which is thus rapidly forcing itself to an adjustment. There are theories afloat which on the one hand would utterly merge the spiritual character of the Church, and on the other would destroy its union with the State. Such theories are not now confined to Dissenters and aliens from our communion; they gather strength the longer we continue the present unworthy suspension of the legitimate representation of the spirituality.

I am for Reform, not Revolution. I desire to see the Convocations of both provinces resume their constitutional organisation, in order that the Bishops and Clergy may there freely communicate upon the evils demanding their consideration. It will then be for both orders (if they think fit) to concur in soliciting the royal license to treat of a remedy. In so doing they must "make plain" to the Crown the object in view; and the license will restrict their deliberations to such as may be approved by her Majesty. After all, no constitution will be of any validity until finally allowed and confirmed by the Crown. I cannot foresee the possibility of any danger from a proceeding so cautiously guarded at every stage.

With respect to the subjects, which may properly challenge the attention of Convocation, I should hope they would be of a practical rather than a doctrinal character. For this, indeed, we have abundant security in the diversity of opinion known to prevail upon the Episcopal bench; and in the vast prerogatives of the Crown and the Archbishops.

Though not prepared myself with any particular measure, I am convinced that immense good might result, if the deliberations of Convocation were employed upon questions which have engaged the attention of Parliament and of divers commissions, without arriving at a satisfactory solution.

Of this kind are the Increase of the Episcopate; the Improvement of Cathedral Chapters; the augmentation of poor Benefices; the subdivision of large parishes; the extension of Pastoral Ministrations; and the erection of new Churches.

Another class might comprehend the removal of obsolete or unnecessary restrictions on our ministry; the abolition of temporal penalties in connexion with religious offices; the simplification and improvement of the Church Discipline Acts; with a more scriptural, rational way of proceeding in those long-standing abuses of our Church—the Ecclesiastical Courts.

It is claiming no more for the Clergy than is freely conceded to every class of our countrymen, to suppose that upon subjects so intimately connected with our daily labours, the Convocations of the two provinces might be expected—under God's good blessing—to devise measures more acceptable to the Crown, the Church, and the nation, than any which have yet been suggested.

At all events it seems to be incumbent on those among us who think so to qualify Convocation for such a duty whenever it may be imposed. In this conviction I have bestowed much time and thought in acquiring some requisite information; and if you shall be pleased again to confer upon me the distinction of being one of your representatives, it will become my duty and my pleasure to acquaint myself with your opinions and experience also, as soon as a specific proposition shall be submitted for consideration. I have the honour to be, reverend and dear sirs, your most faithful servant.

Sheffield, July 2, 1852. GEORGE TREVOR.

ENGLAND.

THE CHURCH OF ROME AND THE CHURCH AND STATE OF ENGLAND.

(From the John Bull.)

We read in the columns of the Tablet the following announcement, dated, "Birmingham, Wednesday evening,"—that is, Wednesday week, the 7th inst.:

The Provincial Synod was opened on Monday last, at St. Mary's College, Oscott. The Bishops all arrived on Sunday and Monday, except the Bishops of Liverpool and Nottingham, who, being detained by illness, were represented by the Very Rev. James Crook, and the Very Rev. F. Cheadle. The Theologians chosen by the Bishops and the deputies of the Clergy, as well as other Divines invited to the Synod, also arrived in the course of Monday. The preliminary congregation on Tuesday morning, when the matter was settled for the decrees to be passed at the opening session on the mode of conducting the further proceedings. On Wednesday morning the ceremonies commenced at nine o'clock by a procession of all the Bishops and Clergy in their sacred vestments, during the course of which the "Veni Creator" and other hymns were sung, and the psalms "Exultate" and "Quam dilecta" were chanted in the order prescribed for the opening of the Synod. The procession having arrived in the College Chapel a Pontifical Mass was sung by the Cardinal Archbishop, who also preached a sermon on the text, "My peace I give you; my peace I leave you." At the conclusion of the Mass the Litanies and some other prayers were sung, after which all the Clergy and the congregation left the Church, and the Bishops remaining, proceeded to the more immediate business of the Synod.

Thus, with ostentatious publicity, Dr. Wiseman has proceeded to perform an authoritative act by virtue of offices and titles, which are, some of them simply illegal, others distinctly treasonable. The "Provincial Synod" now sitting at St. Mary's Oscott has for its object to consolidate, and to work out in its details, the Papal aggression of 1850. It is to regulate the status of the Roman schism in England under its new aspect, no longer as a mission, but as a Church, formally established in partibus infidelium, that is, in Protestant England, by the "Apostolic" authority of the Vicar of Jesus Christ. It is, by a synodical recognition of that status, to make the canon law of Rome the law of England for all Her Majesty's subjects; and that not merely in matters "spiritual," or matters of religious belief and practice, but in regard to matters ecclesiastical, under which term, according to the sense attached to it by the Church of Rome, are included many questions affecting the persons and the property, the rights and the liberties, of those who are, under pain of eternal damnation, required to render to that alien law an obedience not only equal to, but exceeding the obedience which they are called upon to render to the law of the land.

It is this not imperium in imperio we know not what is. Here is a body of men, the Roman Catholic body, singled out from the rest of the Queen's subjects, and bound by an allegiance before which their allegiance to their lawful sovereign melts into thin air, by their allegiance to the Pope. Over this body of men the Pope, represented by Cardinal Wiseman, his Privy Councillor and Delegate, exercises a supreme power and rule with which it is insolently proclaimed that the Sovereignty of the British Crown, and the law of the British Parliament, neither can nor shall interfere. In the exercise of this supreme power and rule, the assumption of which over the Queen's subjects in Dr. Wiseman's famous pastoral, was more than a vain boast, the Cardinal Legate convenes a Council within the realm, for the establishment of laws which are to be, and will be, binding, independently of the assent and consent, and irrespectively of the dissent, of the Crown and Parliament. England is, by this proceeding, reduced to the condition of a Papal province, in which the existence of a sovereign and legislative power, other than that of the Pope and the Councils called in his name, is as completely ignored, as is the existence in this country of a Christian Church, a branch of the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church of Christ, by the establishment of a hierarchy and a priesthood which, while deeply involved in the guilt of schism, lay exclusive claim to the name of "Catholic."

Out of these facts two great questions arise. What is the Church, and what is the State of England to do in the face of these aggressions and usurpations? First, will the Church of England sit still, and suffer her existence and her character as a Church to be ignored, without so much as bearing witness of the Apostolic Commission which she holds, and of the Divine Truth committed to her keeping? Will she not raise her voice in protest, both against the usurpations of which the Papal emissaries are guilty, and against the errors and idolatries which it is the object of these usurpations to substitute for pure Faith and Worship? Will she enact the part of "a dumb dog which cannot bark," whilst "ravening wolves" are invading her fold? Will not even this attempt utterly to extinguish her, rouse the Church of England to a sense of the duty incumbent on her, to assert her character as "the spirituality" of this kingdom and nation, and to take order,—not by any alien authority, treating the Sovereign of this kingdom with contempt, but in subjection to that Sovereign as to God's Ordinance,—for the healing of those breaches, and the repairing of those deficiencies, which have afforded the enemy an opportunity of setting up his robber fold in the midst of her pleasant pastures? Will the voice of the Church of England in Synod assembled not make itself heard? Will the authority of the Church of England in Synod assembled, not be exerted to "strengthen the things which remain," and to make bare "the sword of the Lord" against "the armies of the aliens?"

But, secondly, will the State of England sit still, and suffer its own legitimate power to be ignored, and the freedom and the rights of its subjects to be trodden under foot by a foreign usurper? Will the State of England suffer the Pope to make laws for its subjects, and to set rulers over them who shall "govern" them according to those laws? Will the State of England thus virtually abdicate its own sovereignty, its own independence? Will it allow the intruded power of the Pope to take root in the land, and to throw out its branches wider and wider, until under its deadly shade the soil of England shall produce the same noxious weeds, the same poisonous plants, which spring up in rank luxuriance wherever the Papacy has succeeded in establishing its baneful ascendancy?

The question is no longer a question between the State of England and certain of its subjects holding religious opinions designated by the name of "the Roman Catholic faith." The question is now between the Papacy and the State of England, denounced by the Papacy as guilty of rebellion against its pretended authority. The question is no longer whether the State of England shall "tolerate" the profession of the "Roman Catholic faith" by its subjects; the question is whether the Papacy shall "tolerate" the exercise of its sovereign and legislative power by the British Crown and Parliament. The penalty with which the British Crown and Parliament are threatened, if they shall presume to exercise the authority legitimately belonging to them, of legislating for, and ruling over, this kingdom,—for all and over all estates, persons and causes in this kingdom,—is that the State of England shall, by the active endeavours of the Pope's lieges among her Majesty's subjects, be thrown into utter confusion, and involved in the disorders and calamities of revolution. If any one doubts this, let him peruse the following reflexions, indulged in by the organ of the Papal hierarchy on the occasion of the Royal Proclamation announcing the determination of the Queen's Government to enforce the provisions of an Act of the Imperial Parliament:—

"Lord Derby and his Government are likely to prove themselves to be the best friends of the Catholics of the empire, and the most practical teachers of the faith. Nevertheless, we owe them no gratitude, and we are not bound to observe their commandments. There are two ways of propagating the faith: one of these is trodden by Apostolic men, the other by the persecutor, who drives Christians from their homes into exile, or exposes them to personal sufferings and death. Lord Derby is not an Apostle, or a follower of Apostles. He does his work after the pattern of Nero, though he may not go the extreme length to which that great preacher went in his zeal for the success of the Church.

"The cry of the Nero class was, let the lions loose upon the Catholics. The modern cry is, let the Police hunt them to the station-house. 'Dirty Ecclesiastics' must not show their faces in the street, for they are an offensive sight. They remind Protestants of another world, and are a reflection on the Stock Exchange

They must, therefore, hide themselves; or, if they walk out in the face of day, they disguise themselves, and put on the apparel of business, thriving mechanics, or respectable clerics. This is the law, and the Queen's Ministers require us to hide our religion, and not give scandal to Protestants who hate the very notion that this was other than the home and happiness of man.

"On the whole, we believe the Government is doing our work far more effectively than we are doing it ourselves. The aspect of public affairs is in one sense threatening, and there is, in all probability, a heavy storm gathering its strength. But the other hand, a storm, when it comes, is no respect persons, and hail does not spare the conservator the rich when it breaks the poor man's window; the Holmfirth flood did not spare the mill of health when it carried away the cottage of the Irer. So will it be in the political confusion—if Gies are to be victims, they will find companions; their torments that never expected to be included them."

This is not an idle threat. It is a resolve of the Papal hierarchy, which they do not think it worth their while to disguise, that their non-compliance in the Parliament now in process of election shall play their part as to render impossible the action of the Government which is not prepared to allow the full scope for the execution of its designs in British Empire. Will a British Parliament in the freshness of its strength submit to this ignominious domination? We throw not! If we mistake not, one of the first acts of the able and energetic statesman who is to be the destinies of the British Empire in his hands, will be to call upon that Parliament to roll around him for the purpose of crushing the alien faction, and interdicting it for ever for the insolent attempt to interfere with the progress of government and legislation, with the prerogatives of the British Crown and Parliament.

THE DERBY MITRY.

It may be argued that forasmuch as the Earl of Derby and his party have been opposed the free importation of foreign corn, it is not open to them to acquiesce in that policy, even after the verdict of the country pronounced in its favour, and that, therefore, they must for ever after be excluded from power. Some such reasoning, if we mistake not, hallen from the lips of Mr. Gladstone, who contends that those who voted for the late Sir Robert Peel, on occasion of his surrender to the "unadorned eloquence" of Richard Cobden, are to be trusted instead of those who stood out against that surrender. But Gladstone forgets that it both the Earl of Derby's party and the little knot of politicians which he himself presents, ultimately acquiesce in the policy of the free importation of foreign corn, there remains between them an indelible difference, on which this very question of "confidence" or "no confidence" hinge. When the late Sir Robert Peel, and with him Mr. Gladstone and his remaining followers, adopted the policy which they had hitherto opposed, they basely betrayed, in the very act of doing so, the confidence reposed in them by their constituents. The Earl of Derby, on the contrary, and his colleagues, in adopting the policy of the free importation of foreign corn, will do so, after an appeal to the constituencies, preceded by an intimation that it rests with them to decide whether that policy is to be reversed or maintained. The course pursued by the late Sir Robert Peel, and those who Mr. Gladstone included, followed him, was dishonest, treacherous, unconstitutional; the course pursued by the Earl of Derby and his party is eminently honest, loyal, constitutional. It is of the very essence of our free and nicely balanced Constitution that it affords an opportunity of so disposing of great national questions, that after their constitutional settlement all parties shall be, not only free, but bound to acquiesce in that settlement, and that, consequently, their acquiescence in it, though contrary to the feelings formerly maintained by them, shall be an honourable and a patriotic act, and not a ground of reproach, or a disqualification for taking a share in the government of the country. As after the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, after the Roman Catholic Emancipation Act, after the Reform Act, statesmen who had opposed these measures to the last, have not been disqualified for office, even so it is now. That the question of the free importation of foreign corn was not settled before, is not the Earl of Derby's fault.—The blame of this rests with the unconstitutional conduct of the Peelites; to the Earl of Derby belongs the merit of having brought the question to a final and constitutional issue, in the result of which all can, conscientiously and honourably, acquiesce. And he, therefore, above all other men, is entitled to the confidence of the country and the new Parliament.

Independently, however, of all this, there is yet another, a far higher and stronger, ground on which the Noble Earl deserves, and we doubt not will obtain, the confidence of the new Parliament. We allude to his staunch and uncompromising attachment to our Constitution in Church and State. This the Morning Chronicle, the self constituted organ of the Church, but in reality the organ of a faction in the Church, calls "nonsense," the repetition of which from the Treasury Bench would "provoke a burst of contemptuous laughter." We remember no such "bursts of laughter," but, on the contrary, outbursts of vehement cheering, even in the old House of Commons, indifferently as that was constituted, on every occasion when this distinctive characteristic of the Earl of Derby's Government was brought under the notice of the House. The feeling of confidence of which those cheers testified, will not be less decided in the new House of Commons; nor will it be less decided in the new House of Commons; nor will it be diminished by the recollection of Mr. Gladstone's votes on the Popish question and the Jew Bill, of the demonstration made by Mr. Cobden's League on the Noble Earl's accession to office, of the glimpses afforded from time to time by Sir James Graham, as to the tendency of his political opinions, or, last not least, of the proposals with which Lord John Russell wound up his ministerial career, and of the political profession of faith which he made at Guildhall, where he announced the sum of his statesmanship to be that he will carry, at the bidding of popular clamour, as much as from time to time he may see his way to carry.—John Bull.