

Anglicana) have all her liberties whole and unhurt, and the same fully enjoy and use." Many other statutes might be referred to, passed in pre-Reformation days, to show that the people of England called the Church in England "The Church of England," or "English Church."

The Church of England was, no doubt, in one sense, a segment of Latin Christendom very much in the same way that Ontario and Quebec are segments of Canada; but Ontario is not Quebec nor a part of it, nor is Quebec Ontario.

Is it not also a popular error to speak of "the Church" as if it consisted solely of the clergy? Were there no laity in the Church of England in Becket's time? Were they anti-national? Did they set the government at defiance? If not, how can it be truly said that the Church of England in Becket's time was anti-national?

The fact is, in Becket's time the Church of England was merely another name for the people of England, for the one composed the other, and there were no dissentient sects from the national church.

No doubt the priesthood contributed very largely to the Papal encroachments in England; but whoever will calmly examine the statute law of England will find ample evidence that these encroachments were regarded long prior to the Reformation as usurpations of authority, and that the people of England in Parliament were constantly endeavouring to restrain these encroachments on the liberties of the national church.

For instance the 25 Edw. III., st. 5, c. 22, provided that persons purchasing "a provision" in Rome for an abbey should be out of the King's protection. The 25 Edw. III., st. 6, recites at length the grievances of the King and people by reason of the Pope assuming to appoint aliens to fill English benefices, and imposes penalties on those who seek such appointments from the Pope. The statute 27 Edw. III., st. 1, c. 1, imposes the penalties of *Pramunire* (i.e., put the offender out of the King's protection) on all suing in a foreign Court, i.e., the Papal Court; 38 Edw. III., st. 2, c. 1, imposes like penalties on persons receiving citations from Rome in causes pertaining to the King; 3 Rich. II., c. 3, provides that none should take any benefice of an alien or convey money to him; obviously aimed at the Pope, who was the only alien who assumed to give away English benefices. See also 12 Rich. II., c. 15; 13 Rich. II., st. 2, c. 2 and c. 3; 16 Rich. II., c. 5; 2 Hen. IV., c. 3 and c. 4; 9 Hen. IV., c. 9 (Ruffhead's ed.); 3 Hen. V., st. 2, c. 4; all of which statutes are plain and incontrovertible evidence of the struggle maintained by the Parliament (in which of course both the laity and spirituality of the Church of England were represented) against the encroachments of the Papacy on the rights of the Church of England. So far from it being true that the Church of England was even anti-national in the pre-Reformation period, it must be apparent that it was always intensely national, and it could not well be otherwise, unless the people in their Christian

aspect were opposed to themselves in their political aspect.

It appears to me the writer of the article in question also fails to grasp the distinctive character of the Reformation of the Church of England. Neither clergy nor laity at the Reformation pretended to set up a new church. Their object was simply to purge the old Church of England of errors. Out of 9400 beneficed clergy in Elizabeth's reign, only 189 refused to conform, and yet the writer of the article says if the clergy could have had their way they would have left things as they were. For eleven years after the Reformation was effected in England, as we learn from Sir Edward Coke, those who favoured Romish doctrines continued to worship with their brethren who rejected those doctrines, and communicated at the same altars. Would they have done so if they had thought a new church had been set up? When the Pope, in the eleventh year of Elizabeth's reign, excommunicated the Queen, and ordered his followers to withdraw from the national church, the schism was effected, but that was the act of the Pope, not of the Church of England. She never excommunicated the Romanists; all that she essayed to do was to prevent Romish doctrines being imposed on people as a condition of communion in the Church of England.

The position taken by the Church of England was simply this: her reformers said in effect, Here is a mass of doctrine and practice which has grown up in the church, which is not sanctioned by the Scriptures, by the usage of the primitive church, nor by the church as a whole. Its sole sanction is derived from the decrees and usages of that part of the church which adheres to the Roman see. This part of the church is not competent to formulate articles of faith for the whole church; that is a matter within the province of an Ecumenical Council alone. We will, therefore, no longer suffer these doctrines to be taught in the Church of England as necessary to salvation, nor require them to be accepted as a condition of communion in the Church of England.

I do not understand how any Protestant can adopt the argument that this had the effect of destroying the identity or historical continuity of the Church of England, unless he adopts the further argument that the rejected doctrines are essential parts of Christian Faith. The identity of the Roman Church is maintained by her succession of bishops. So is that of the orthodox Eastern Church; so is that of the Anglican Church. The standard of faith in the Church of England is the Nicene Creed, which is the standard to which, barring the *Filioque* clause, the whole church has assented. No other profession of faith is required from communicants at her altars.

No doubt in pre-Reformation days it was believed by members of the Church of England that the world was flat and stationary, and that the sun moved round it. No one would now say that this error was an essential part of the Christian faith, even though a Pope

once thought it was, or that a church rejecting this error loses its identity. Neither can Protestants say that the belief in purgatory, transubstantiation, the worship of saints, angels, and relics, belief in the immaculate conception, the supremacy and infallibility of the Pope, the use of images, the denial of the Eucharistic cup to the laity, etc., are essential parts of the Christian faith, or that a church which rejects these doctrines and practices loses its identity. To reject that which is an essential part of the Christian faith might well be said to destroy the continuity and identity of any part of the church, but how the simple rejection of erroneous or non-essential opinions or practices can have that effect is not apparent. The Church of England at the Reformation imposed no new creed; she simply restored the ancient creed of the undivided church (namely, the Nicene creed) to the place of honour.

In this country we can afford to look at the question of disestablishment from the simple point of honesty, without regard to the exigencies of politicians. No one herewill profit by the spoilation of the Church of England. If the Church of England is identical with the Church of pre-Reformation days, as I think it must be admitted it is, then her title to the ancient endowments is older than any other title to property; but even if, as her enemies allege, it dates only from the Reformation, is three hundred years of undisputed enjoyment not a sufficient title? Any honest man, if his own property was concerned, would say that it was.

No doubt the nation has power to deal with the property of the church just as fully as with that of individuals. It has power to take the property of A and give it to B, but such legislation can only be justified by extraordinary circumstances. If it could be fairly shown that the property of the church is in excess of its needs, or that it is being diverted to improper uses, a case for legislation might be made. But the attack is not based on any such suggestion, and the enormous sums which the members of the church have voluntarily given of late years towards extending the offices of the Church, is a sufficient proof that the ancient endowments are not adequate for the present spiritual needs of the nation, nor for that part of it which accepts the ministrations of the National church. GEO. S. HOLMESTED.

#### BIDS FOR THE TEMPERANCE, LIQUOR AND FRENCH VOTES.

WE referred in an editorial last week to the bidding going on for the liquor vote and the temperance vote. Take as a specimen the following extract from an editorial in an out and out temperance newspaper. The editor of the *Globe* says, "To hear some professing Christians talk, one might think that thieving and lying and licentiousness are venial sins, and that their practitioners might arrive at salvation by simply abstaining from strong drink!" That sneer at Christian temperance workers is a clever bid for the sympathy of the liquor interest. Then in another paragraph there is a sneer at the Ottawa Government for withholding the machinery necessary to com-