

Moved by the Rev. R. C. Boyer, seconded by Rev. J. Jameson, and

Resolved 2.—That we pledge ourselves to renewed zeal and action, and energetic support of an institution which embraces so many pious and benevolent objects.

Moved by the Rev. R. C. Boyer, seconded by Mr. Wm. Hunt, and

Resolved 3.—That this Institution presents a channel for the liberality and zealous co-operation of both Clergy and Laity for the maintenance of our holy religion, and both acting in unison a greater stimulus is afforded to the promotion of the one sacred cause—the propagation of our holy faith.

Resolved 4.—That the following gentlemen be the office-bearers of this Society for the ensuing year:—

- Vice-President—COL. PRINCE. Treasurer—W. P. VIDAL, Esq. Secretaries—REV. W. RITCHIE and ALBERT PRINCE, Esq.

COMMITTEE OF MANAGEMENT.

- The Churchwardens, ex-officio, W. P. VIDAL, Esq., PHILIBETH SALTER, Esq., JOHN F. ELLIOTT, Esq., GEORGE JESSOP.

ENGLAND.

THE BISHOP OF EXETER'S PASTORAL.

The time for holding his usual triennial Visitation having come round again, the Lord Bishop of Exeter has determined upon issuing a pastoral letter in lieu of the charge usually read at the Visitation, and at the same time has given directions for the celebration of the Holy Communion in the several churches in which the Visitation is appointed to be held, thus rendering the Visitation itself at once less wearisome and more edifying.

The pastoral letter was published on Tuesday, and consists of 126 pages of matter. The judgment in the Gorham case is, first, ably and comprehensively discussed; and, although it may be regarded as a worn-out topic by some, yet those who know what light and learning (ecclesiastical and legal) the Bishop of Exeter brings to bear upon every subject which he discusses, will anxiously and attentively read all that he says. The plea of the Archbishop of Canterbury, that he acted ministerially in instituting Mr. Gorham, is utterly annihilated; while his Grace's Charge to the Clergy of Exeter, to which the Primate recently referred the Archdeacons and Clergy of Canterbury, is shown to be most inconsistent, unsound, and dangerous, by a searching and extensive examination of its theology. The Bishop exposes a mode of attack upon Church principles which is fearfully prevalent among the party with which his Grace is identified. The Primate, when Bishop of Chester, in the Charge referred to, criticised and condemned certain statements in the "Tracts for the Times," the doctrine of which turns out to be that of Waterland, Bull, Pearson, &c. The Bishop says—

"I have cited this passage (from Bishop Bull) from one of the very places to which his Grace refers us. It appears, therefore, that he knew whom he here charged with departing from the sense of the Articles which he had repeatedly subscribed. But had he not a right to attack Bishop Bull, if he thought he was in error, and was doing, however unconsciously, the work of the Devil? Most certainly; but then I think it was his duty to tell his clergy that it was Bishop Bull, rather than the Tractarians, whose false teaching he thus denounced."

This reminds us of Mr. Lowe's preaching Bishop Beveridge's sermon at Maderia, and being loudly denounced, and formally complained of to the Bishop of London, as guilty of preaching Popery. Dr. Hook brings forward a similar fact in the preface to the enlarged edition of his "Church Dictionary" (a sixth edition of which is announced by Mr. Murray.) Dr. Hook says that he could not mention the various sources from which it had been compiled, but that—

"Extracts have been often made almost word for word, from some of our greatest divines, and the compiler has been sometimes censured for giving explanations, for which not he, but some of the most distinguished theologians of our country are responsible."

Just so; and the plain statement of the Prayer Book, even, are often treated in the same manner by those Churchmen who have not much acquaintance with it. It is this ignorance of its doctrine and ritual practices which has led to so much ultra-Protestantism and Puritanism; hence the necessity of abolishing the use of the Prayer Book when the Puritans sought to spread and establish their system; they knew, and honestly acknowledged, that their system, and the system of the Prayer Book, were so utterly irreconcilable, that the one could breathe and live safely only while the other was proscribed and abolished. And this is just the struggle which is now going on amongst us; the only difference being, that in our day there are other parties, the Romanists, the Latitudinarians, and the Infidels, who would gladly see both systems, and all other systems but their own, utterly destroyed. Our strength and security consist in our faithfully maintaining, and earnestly carrying out, the one system of the doctrine, the practice, and the constitution of the English Church, as it is plainly and obviously laid down in her formularies. Two, inconsistent, antagonistic systems, will only make us an easy prey to all or any of our watchful or vigorous foes. From the examination of the Chester Charge, the Bishop goes on to cite the cases of three or four candidates for ordination, and others in various dioceses, whose personal examinations, by the Primate and others, show that the most orthodox statements are treated with distrust and favour.

The Bishop next turns to the other topics—"books of devotion in which all but divine honour is paid to the Virgin Mary" put into the hands of the people by some ministers of our church;—"prayers for the dead urged as a positive duty;"—"a superstitious use of the sign of the cross recommended as profitable;"—"the use of crucifixes." On all these the Bishop pronounces unqualified condemnation, and his agreement with "the high authority" (the Bishop of London's) from which he is quoting,—one "with whom he generally and gladly concurs, and from whom he never differs but with reluctance and diffidence." From this general agreement, however, the Bishop excepts the condemnation of the statement that "the meditation of saints is a probable doctrine," and the enumeration among the errors of Rome of the doctrine which attributes a propitiatory virtue to the Eucharist; on both which points the Bishop defines the sense in which they may be held, as distinguished from the error which is to be condemned. Another particular on which the Bishop feels it necessary to qualify his concurrence in the condemnation pronounced by his Right Reverend Brother, is the use of "auricular confession" and "absolution." The use of the phrase "auricular confession" is retained by the Bishop, because it is the phrase used in the first Prayer Book of Edward VI., speaking of secret confession, and because the 13th canon forbids, under the pain of irregularity, the revelation of anything commu-

nicated to the minister in secret confession. The use of the so-called sacrament of penance, i.e., of penitential practices in satisfaction for sin, the Bishop entirely condemns, but he upholds, by arguments from Holy Scripture, and by the authoritative language of our Church, as well as by the writings and example of some of her soundest divines, the use of secret confession and absolution, in the cases in which they are appointed to be used in the Book of Common Prayer.

The Bishop next proceeds to comment on the phrase,—"used by the Archbishop in his reply to his Clergy,"—"the Protestant Faith," observing that "Protestant" cannot be an attribute of "Faith," because the object of "Faith" is divine truth, that of "Protestant" human error. Hence the Bishop passes on to the recent ignorant declamation against "the sacramental system," arguing, again from Holy Scripture and the Prayer Book, that as the two Sacraments are the means of our being brought into union, and of our continuance in union, with Christ, the "sacramental system" is the very gospel itself, and our own Church is so bound up with it that they must stand or fall together. In treating of this point the Bishop glances at a journal which "has been used as the first channel of communication of Her Majesty's gracious pleasure to the Bishops" in the letter from the Secretary of State to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and thus rebukes its recent language on one of the sacraments:—

"In this journal, the doctrine of spiritual regeneration in baptism—the very key-stone of the whole system—was thus characterised:—'The new birth given unto us by God in baptism: this is a doctrine of Rome, and of DEVILS.' Now, I say with all seriousness—and, if I know myself, I say it in Christian charity—that it would be well for those who thus write, to bear in mind, while God, in mercy, gives them time, how nearly—if the doctrine thus denounced by them be true (and at least the *prima facie* teaching of their Church declares it to be true)—such denouncement of it must approach to the 'sin unto death'—the irremissible sin—to 'blasphemy against the Holy Ghost.'"

The vindication of the "sacramental system" is followed by a most solemn exhortation to the clergy, to be diligent in warning their people of the spiritual death entailed by the denial or profanation of that state of grace to which they have been introduced by baptism, and in which it is the object of the other Sacrament to sustain them, and, on the other hand, in leading them to a full apprehension of "the rich grace and purport of Christ's Holy Sacraments;" the Pastoral setting forth with great beauty and unction the connexion of the "sacramental system" with the spiritual realities of the Christian life, and especially with the education of the young in Christian principles and habits. This leads the Bishop to speak of the Catechism, and of the practice of public catechising, and to record his protest against the language held on this subject by one of his Right Reverend brethren:—

"It is painful to read in a report of 'the British and Foreign School Society' for 1849, that a Bishop of our Church, in moving a vote of thanks to her Majesty and Prince Albert for their continued support of that Society, denounced the principle of 'the National Society for educating the children of the poor' by instructing them in the Prayer Book and in the Church Catechism, as an 'invidious' and 'a pernicious' principle. He even apologised for 'not having yet taken any steps to have that principle abrogated.' His own requisition was, that the instruction of these children should be 'based on the simple and plain truths of Scripture,'—as if those truths rightly understood, were at variance with our Church's teaching. Now this Bishop, doubtless, holds confirmations, and he must know that no one ought to be admitted to that holy rite, who has not been instructed in our Church Catechism. He also knows, that no one ought to be admitted to holy communion, unless he has been confirmed, or is ready and desirous to be confirmed. It is difficult, therefore, to understand how he would have them duly prepared for receiving this Sacrament which is 'necessary to salvation,' unless they be taught as our Church requires, and as he would forbid, them to be taught. When such things occur in such places, it is a plain duty publicly to protest against them. For, while they are permitted to pass unnoticed, we have no right to wonder that some, even good men, fly from our Church, as nothing better than an 'unreal mockery.'"

From the discussion of points connected with the doctrinal differences in the Church, the Bishop turns to the recent attempt of the Episcopate to compose ritual differences, in which "it was his misfortune to be unable to concur," for reasons which he proceeds to explain; and then goes on to state what course he suggested to his brethren in the Episcopate:—

"I ventured to urge my brethren to relinquish the proposed letter to the clergy—a measure which seemed to me manifestly nugatory, and which professes to be executed only by the common-place phrase 'under present circumstances'—and, instead of it I advised that, as honest Churchmen and faithful Bishops, we should go to the foot of the throne, there dutifully lay before her Majesty a plain statement of what those 'present circumstances' are—the country agitated from one extremity to another by religious differences—all confidence in the rulers of the Church shaken—individual clergymen and laymen flying from the communion of such a Church, by reason of the paralysis under which it seems to them to be dragging on a worthless and lifeless existence,—a widely extended suspicion that many more—some it may be of our very best, most learned, most attached brethren—will soon follow; above all, I proposed that we should submit to her Majesty, that the only reasonable hope of staying the progress of the contagion is, that she will be graciously pleased, in accordance with the practice of the best and wisest of her predecessors, and with the dictates of constitutional law, to call together the authorities of the Church in Convocation, and empower and require them to deliberate on the existing evils, and devise and submit for her Majesty's sanction such remedies as to their united wisdom shall seem meet."

Having thus accounted for the absence of his name from the Episcopal address, the Bishop recommends his Clergy to beware of rashness in the revival of obsolete ritual observances:—

"While I fully admit the right of the Clergy to practice all that is not forbidden by the law of the Church, while, too, I would applaud the exercise of that right to the utmost, whenever their own people agree with them in its exercise,—I yet am bound to warn them of the rashness of exercising it against the liking and without the concurrence of their people."

In elucidating this point, the Bishop claims for individual congregations a right to establish for themselves a more elaborate service, and expresses his sympathy with the "lamentations of the poor worshippers in one of the districts of the metropolis, when they saw, or thought they saw, at the dictation of a

riotous and lawless mob of strangers, the approaching surrender of the ritual which they loved, and which was their weekly—to many among them the daily—solace of that poverty to which the providence of God had consigned them."

From the proceedings of this "riotous and lawless mob," the Pastoral passes on, by an easy transition, to Lord Ashley's meeting at the Freemasons' Hall, and subjects to caustic criticism the language held on that occasion by the noble Chairman, and by other speakers, especially by the Earl of Chichester, who suggested the propriety of "getting the laws of the Church" altered in order to accommodate them to the "opinions held by the meeting as to the Gospel of Christ." Among other pithy questions, the following are addressed by the Bishop to the Noble Earl:—

"Has he, or those who act with him, yet made up their minds what course they shall take to 'check the opinions' which he complains of, and to 'purify their beloved Church from its errors?' Is that course a determinate expression of their own views? Have they any views in which they agree? If they have, what are those views, and, above all, what are 'their Church's errors?' An answer to this question would probably be very useful to the cause of truth, and of peace: for they might test the real authority of the Theology of Freemasons' Hall."

After adverting to the language of Lord Ashley, who immediately after a scene of "hissing and excitement" at the bare mention of their Bishop, "most fervently thanked Almighty God who had called him to preside over such a meeting, and to be in some measure a leader in such a work," and to the "320,000 signatures" which endorsed the address of that meeting to Her Majesty,—a "manifestation of feeling highly deserving the consideration of every reflecting minister in our Church,"—the Bishop enters upon the question of the Royal Supremacy, which is treated at great length, and with great learning and acuteness of reasoning. For this, not the least valuable part of the Pastoral, we must refer our readers to the original document, as it is impossible, within our limits, or indeed in any epitome, to do justice to the argument by which the Bishop conclusively establishes the lawfulness of the Royal Supremacy, and vindicates it from the reproach cast upon it, by pointing out its constitutional limitations both in the Church of England, and in the primitive Church.

In conclusion, the Bishop proceeds to that which forms by far the most important feature of the whole Pastoral,—viz., his proposal to hold a diocesan Synod immediately after his visitation, principally for the purpose of calling on his Clergy to express or refuse their concurrence with him in "a declaration that we adhere, and by the blessing of God will continue to adhere, faithfully and at any hazard, to the article of the creed, 'I acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins,' which article we consider to have been virtually denied, when Her Majesty decided, as she did, on the report and recommendation of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council."

Independently of this, its main object, the Bishop intimates his intention of seeking the benefit of his Clergy's counsel on some other matters, to be communicated to them before the meeting of the synod. In announcing this step—the importance of which can scarcely be over-rated, and is certainly not underrated by the Bishop himself—his Lordship enters into an explanation of the relation between "particular Churches" or "dioceses," and "National Churches." Of the "particular Churches" or "dioceses" he says:—"According to the ancient principles of the Catholic Church, every diocese is, in itself, a whole; and therefore, if there were no National Church, yet would the Catholic Church remain whole and entire. Not, so if there were no particular Churches, for then would there be no parts to constitute the whole."

The existence of the National Church is thus accounted for:—"A National Church owes its origin, under God's blessed provision for the nation itself, to the convenience of having a common system, in and by which the neighbouring Churches, specially connected by being under the same temporal Sovereign, may act more vigorously and more usefully, by being sustained by the common action of all under one united ecclesiastical polity. It is a main part of that polity, that one chief Bishop presides over many others, with appellate jurisdiction, in order to secure the observance of the Canons."

The relation of each "particular Church" or "diocese" to the National Church, and its duty in the event of a collision, is thus defined:—

"This National system, wise and beneficial as it ordinarily found to be, is yet not essential to the being of the Church; so that it may be—God forbid that with us it ever should be—necessary to infringe it, in vindicating the Catholic faith. The chief Bishop may, whether by unfaithfulness or other less culpable cause, abuse the power intrusted to him—may himself pervert instead of enforcing the Canons—may even carry that perversion so far as to violate some essential part of that faith. The form of polity, under which the particular Churches are combined, may be such as shall provide no mode of remedying the evil. Therefore, as in the system of our civil polity it is necessary to recognise the principle that the Sovereign can do no wrong—in other words, that there be no constitutional power of dealing with him as a wrong-doer—and so it is the duty, as well as the wisdom, of the people, to endure every excess of power that is tolerable, and to have recourse to every practicable expedient to lighten the mischief, rather than proceed to the disruption of the commonwealth; in like manner, it is the duty and wisdom of every of the several particular Churches, combined in that union which is called a National Church, to try every course by which it can affirm its own catholicity, rather than renounce the union itself. If no such course can be devised; if remaining in the union would invoke a particular Church in irremediable and hopeless opposition to the Catholic faith, then the duty of a Church so circumstanced is plain and simple. It must, with whatever pain, and at whatever sacrifice, renounce an union which has become heretical, and therefore no longer any part of the Catholic and Apostolic Church."

This case of extreme jeopardy to the unity of the National Church the Bishop does not, however, conceive to have arisen. He does not recognize "the voice of five lay lawyers, with the assent and counsel of our two Archbishops," as "the voice of the National Church," nor, after his own jurisdiction had been suspended *pro hac vice*, the Archbishop's institution of the Crown's presentee without examination, as "committing the Church to complicity in his act." The Bishop is further careful to inform his Clergy, that as there is no wish, and will be no attempt, to "make canons binding even on themselves," there will not, as he has ascertained from the very highest legal authority, be any doubt of the legality of their meeting.

The following are the regulations laid down by the Bishop for the holding of the Synod:—

"I propose, therefore, that the Synod consist of the Bishop, his full Chapter, his Archdeacons, his Chaplains, the Deans Rural, and about sixty other Presbyters, that is, to be chosen by the Presbyters of every of our sixty Deaneries out of their own numbers:

"That all the matters, to be brought under consideration of the Synod, be stated to every ruri-decanal Chapter, at least a month before the meeting of the Synod:

"That the election of the representatives be not made till at least a fortnight after those matters have been stated:

"That the ruri-decanal Chapters may themselves discuss the several matters, and authorize their representatives to report their sentiments in writing to the Synod; nevertheless the representatives shall not be concluded by the judgment of their respective Chapters, but shall speak and vote in the Synod according to their own judgment:

"That it shall be open to every ruri-decanal Chapter to propose to the Bishop, at least six weeks before the meeting of the Synod, any matters which they shall think it desirable to bring under consideration:

"That the Bishop shall decide what matters shall actually be brought under the consideration of the Synod; and, as before stated, shall announce them to the several Rural Deans, through the Archdeacons, at least a month before the meeting of the Synod:

"As the Synod is in the nature of a council of the Bishop, it is plain, that no resolution can be deemed an act of the Synod which has not his concurrence."

The Synod is proposed to be held at Exeter on Tuesday (and the two following days if necessary) in the first week after the completion of the Visitation. An appendix to the Pastoral contains the address from thirty-seven ministers in Prussia transmitted to the Bishop last summer; and the communication made to the Bishop by the Archbishop of Canterbury, enclosing Sir G. Grey's letter and the address to her Majesty from the 320,000 lay members of the Church, together with the Bishop's reply to the Archbishop.

COLONIAL CHURCH INTELLIGENCE.

THE MEETING OF BISHOPS IN AUSTRALIA.—The Sydney Morning Herald gives the following account of the result of the meeting of the Colonial Bishops at Sydney:—

"When the congregation had retired, the Bishop of Sydney read to the Clergymen an outline of the proceedings of the Bishops during their conference. A large portion of the proceedings were of a technical character, referring to matters of discipline, but were all recorded as "opinions," and not as binding for the present. The most important decision which their Lordships arrived at was, that there shall be summoned, with little delay, a provincial Convention, and also diocesan Conventions, consisting in the former case of the Bishops, and delegates from the Clergy and laity in each of the six dioceses; and, in the latter, of the Bishop of each diocese, with the Clergy and lay representatives. It was intimated that no time would be lost in furnishing the Clergy with copies of the proceedings, in order that their opinion might be obtained."

PROTESTANTISM ABROAD.

THE FREE CONGREGATION IN GERMANY.—The Consistory of the Duchy of Anhalt has published a decree, which prohibits the recognition of the "Free Congregations" among the Christian denominations, on the ground of their having departed from the Christian faith. Their baptisms and other religious services are declared invalid and *ipso facto* void.

COMPARATIVE NUMBERS OF PROTESTANTS AND PAPISTS IN PRUSSIA.—A statistical work just published, states the number of Protestants in the Prussian Monarchy at 10,016,798, that of Papists at 6,079,613.

POPERY AT HOME.

THE PAPISTS AND THE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL.—The terms of a management clause for Roman Catholic schools have finally been settled between the Committee of Council on Education and the Roman Catholic Poor-School Committee, with the unanimous approbation of the Roman Catholic Bishops.

POPERY IN THE COLONIES.

POPIST TITLES IN NEWFOUNDLAND.—From a correspondence printed on the motion of Sir R. H. Inglis, it appears that the Bishop of Newfoundland notified to Earl Grey in August last the assumption by Dr. Mullock (the successor of Dr. Fleming, "Bishop of Carparia") of the title "Bishop of Newfoundland." In reply, a letter addressed by the Colonial Secretary to the Governor of the colony was communicated to the Bishop, in which Earl Grey says:—"The accompanying Parliamentary papers, ordered to be printed respectively on the 11th of March, 1837, the 31st July, 1848, the 26th July, 1849, and the 25th March, 1850, will furnish the Lord Bishop with the instructions issued by my predecessors and by myself, in regard to the titles and precedence of Roman Catholic Prelates. At the same time, I must observe, that the prefix 'Roman Catholic Bishop of Newfoundland' would render the assumption of that title by Dr. Mullock of no importance."

POPERY ABROAD.

DECAY OF RELIGION AT ROME.—The Giornale di Roma contains a long address to the Cardinal Bishop of Albano to the faithful, in order to revive their devotion for the Holy Sacrament, in which he complains, that the Churches are no longer frequented as formerly, and that the Holy Viaticum is not accompanied by such pious crowds as formerly.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF GOA.—Archbishop Torres has been removed by the Pope from the Archdiocese of Goa with the consent of the Portuguese Government. It appears that the Archbishop would not allow the Pope's Vicars-Apostolic to usurp the jurisdiction of his Archdiocese in the English possessions connected with his See. The Nuncio, in Lisbon, having obtained the ear of Count Thomar, procured the consent of the Government to the recall of the Archbishop; and no successor being appointed, the Pope can, in the meantime, play his cards in India as he likes.

THE BISHOP OF LONDON AND FOREIGN PROTESTANTS.—The Bishop of London has addressed a letter to the Marquess of Cholmondeley, as President of the Foreign Aid Society, stating that, in his opinion, "we may, in perfect consistency with our obligations as members of the Church of England, assist in providing those of our guests who belong to Protestant Churches and hold the great doctrines of Evangelical truth, with the means of attending the public service of God, according to their own forms of worship, during the short period of their visit to this country, although such services could not be performed in our Churches, nor could any of our clergy properly take part in them," suggesting that the Society should lend its aid in making arrangements for the purpose.