

can meet that want (of money), is *by recurring to the use of the weekly offertory*—a mode most agreeable to the practice of the early Church—a mode adopted by almost every Church in the world, except our own—a mode fitted for the various conditions of our parishes—well adapted to congregations of manufacturing parishes, where large gains are made in short periods, and where each one who feels disposed to return to God in proportion to the way in which he has been blessed, has the opportunity weekly of doing so—well adapted, also, to agricultural parishes, where the farmers' gains are made by the aggregate of small savings, and where they may have the opportunity of giving their weekly mite—well adapted to the poor, who have the right to be presented with such an opportunity of giving. It is the only means, in short, that I know of by which a large result can be produced without those constantly recurring excitements which cannot be kept up without a great effort." The Bishop of Salisbury (Hamilton) followed with practical instances of the success of the Offertory in his diocese, and we cannot forbear quoting one striking passage in his speech:—"I have been told that parishes were so small that it was scarcely possible to make a collection worth sending to a society. My answer has always been—it is not the amount of the gift, but the giving to the poor of our flocks an opportunity of contributing their mites that is the great object; and that, if a parish could only send half-a-crown, I would rather receive that half-crown, through the love of Christ animating the clergyman and his people, than that the name of the parish should not appear in the list of the contributors." Even the Archbishop could not refrain from adding his testimony in favour of this true mode of Christian almsgiving, although he added a caution, which is, we believe, entirely needless: "With regard to the Offertory, I think it should be strongly insisted on, though the clergy should be left to judge, whether in their own parishes it is likely to succeed; for we know that in many instances great unpopularity has attended that measure."

In the Lower House the most important topic brought forward was the admission of the laity into the Convocation. The Rev. Mr. Seymour proposed: "That an address be respectfully presented to his Grace the President and to their

lordships of the Upper House of Convocation, requesting their lordships to take into consideration the following propositions:—First, that the law of God, as revealed in Holy Scriptures for the government of His Church, and witnessed to by primitive antiquity, while it vests the authority and power to govern, primarily, in the spirituality, does not forbid, rather does it encourage them, to call and admit faithful laymen also to their councils in Synod, at such times and in such manner as they shall judge best for the welfare of the Church. Secondly, that the circumstances of the present times present certain urgent reasons why the Church of England, in taking steps for the renewal of her synodal functions, should take advantage of the liberty, and should provide some more formal and regular opportunities than at present exist, whereat the counsel and co-operation of the faithful laity may be secured to the proceedings of Convocation."

The discussion was long and animated, but the motion was finally negatived. But the active interest now taken by laymen in all questions affecting the interests of the Church, and the steady growth of the synodal-movement are a guarantee that the question will not be allowed to rest here. It must not however be supposed that the opponents of Mr. Seymour's motion were actuated by any jealousy or fear of lay interference. The opposition was based upon the ground that the laity, through their representatives in Parliament, have already a preponderating influence in the decision of all matters connected with legislation for the Church, in the appointment of bishops and other dignitaries, and even, through the Committee of the Privy Council, in doctrinal decisions. Whenever the Church becomes independent of State control, the question will assume a totally different aspect; and the whole body of the clergy will gladly avail themselves of the co-operation of the faithful laity.

The papers announce the death of Robert Isaac Wilberforce, formerly Archdeacon of the East Riding of Yorkshire, who about two years ago unhappily seceded to the Church of Rome. He was known in the Church of England as one of her most earnest and devoted ministers, and one of the ablest of her controversial writers. Since his secession he (like Newman) has produced nothing worthy of his former reputation. "He lived," says the Morning Post, "to fall into