April 24th. 1844.

My dear Sir,

I have written to Mr. Fox in reply to a letter asking whether I would be present at a meeting on the Subject of Convocation, to say that on the 4th. 6th. 12th. 17th of May I hope to be in London, and would gladly attend any private meeting on one of these days.

It is with the greatest satisfaction that I find such a feeling among our clergy, and I shall be ready to give
way to lend what aid I can to extend it.

What Gladstone feels is, I believe, that the Church are too much divided, or too little mature in opinion to make any definitions, or positive enactment of Convocation safe for the Church. I feel this alike wise.

But he would also admit that to say that the Church are unfit to legislate in the Spiritual matter of the Church is to say that they are unfit for one of their chiefest functions; and that, if this is to continue the Church of England is really dis fraught, and the government extinct.

I conceive it is necessary to make all efforts to preserve the Church in the discharge of such duties.

And in the meanwhile to check the legislation of Parliament which has in it two evils, first the no less infirmity of the legis lators, and next which is much more the establish ment of the fait accompli of the state principle namely that the Church has no legislature, and that the State
is compelled alone to enter
into and determine all Ecclesiastical questions.

It seems to me clear that
the affirming of the legislative
power of the Church
is most important in view
of the Eastern practice and
all but established for ever.

The Ecumenical Councils
were, as holds so dangerous in
assertions in that direction: a
The sense of the Church has
imposed a check upon it

While the Church may
also impose a check on the
disposition to attempt such
practices hereafter, an
Ecclesiastical Council that disapproves,
justifies itself.
Every day I have proofs of the increasing grievances of the Clergy on such points. The Archbishop strongly supported by the laity might require either that Bills originating with the Clergy in private, should be rejected, or that leases should be granted to Convocation to declare its sense upon the subject.

I know no better way of protesting the Archbishop's refusal with these feelings, or worse, than by strong private representations. Address public, signed often lose in weight what they gain in numbers: and many laymen will say in private things tenfold more than they will publicly put their hands to.

There are many bare words standing over to the same conclusion, of which I will add only one more.

The Convention, moreover it be consulted, must be consulted by the Archbishops, by whose appointment the licence to deliberate must also be obtained from the Crown. Therefore nothing to direct addressers, a recommendation to any but the one only person, with whom the Bishop may be regarded as identified. I have before me at this moment the draft of a memorial intended to be presented to the Bishop of the Diocese by the Clergy of one of our House
The 9th of March, 1843

A. S. Manning

My dear Miss [Handwritten]

I have been very much interested in your letter of the 2nd instant. It is infinitely kind to me, and I am grateful for your kind wishes. I shall do my best to make the best of this situation. Please let me know if there is anything further I can do. I am very much obliged to you for your kindness.

A. S. Manning