

than among ourselves, has been brought forward by Anglican teachers; and, beyond this, that doctrines, which were supposed to be condemned by the English formularies, have been taught as "Catholic" doctrines in English churches. The question now arises, whether these things are to be permitted—whether certain clergymen may go on "developing" these mediaeval themes to any extent, or whether a stop is to be put to such extremes. What is the public opinion of the Anglican Communion on these subjects? This is the question which has now to be answered. Of course, there is another question—What is the meaning of the Anglican formularies? What do they allow? What do they require? What do they forbid? But, inasmuch as a certain latitude of interpretation has always been allowed in these matters, the extent of that latitude will have to be determined, and that by public opinion. If the members of the Anglican Communion desire a different kind of ritual from that to which they have been accustomed, that will settle the question. Or, if they wish to extend a larger amount of liberty to individual congregations. So, on the other hand, if they are resolved to repress certain excesses, these excesses will have to be abandoned. To a certain extent we are getting at English public opinion, as it is expressed in the two Houses of Parliament. It is sometimes said that the House of Commons does not necessarily express the deliberate judgment of the English people. When, however, we get both houses—Lords as well as Commons—of one mind, and that mind expressed, not as the result of a sudden impulse, but as representing a long-continued series of judgments and sentiments, then we may certainly conclude that we have got the public opinion of the English people. So much on that general subject. In another article we will consider the resolutions of the English House of Commons.

IN THE COMMONS.

What is the relation of the Parliament of England to the Church of England? This is a question answered very differently from different points of view. By some it is boldly asserted that Parliament has everything to do with the Church; by others, with equal boldness, that it has nothing to do with it. It is tolerably obvious that these two classes of people must be using language in totally different meanings. It will be well, therefore, to leave off such modes of speech, and explain ourselves as we go along. Parliament, then, has always had something to do with the Church. It has dealt with its property, with its laws, with its relations to the See of Rome, and other subjects, at all times. Parliament did not reform the Church, but it accepted the Reformation. To go no further back than the period of the Restoration, the Parliament of Charles II. accepted the Prayer-Book sanctioned by Convocation, and thus gave final legal force to the Reformation settlement. When that was done, it was the business of the courts to decide particular cases of the violation of

the law. But the work of Parliament was not then ended. The formation of new parishes and new dioceses was accomplished by parliamentary action; and even what is called the Royal Supremacy, under a constitutional monarchy, must be exercised under parliamentary control. Shall we say, then, that Parliament has the right or the power to interfere with the internal management of the Church? Undoubtedly the nation has the right to say what Church shall be the national Church. So we have conceded in England, in Scotland, and in Ireland. And there is no escape from this, unless we accept the Supremacy of a Vicar of Christ, who is to have the last word in Church and in State, alike. Moreover, the disestablishment of the Church would not free the members of the Church from the rule of the law courts. Wherever the possession of property is involved, the State will claim and exercise the right to see that the conditions are fulfilled on which the property is held. Without going further into these general questions at present, we would draw attention to the recent action of the House of Commons in regard to the controversies in the Church. Some zealous Churchmen will say that these are not matters for the House of Commons to deal with, seeing that its members are not of necessity Churchmen. But we may bear in mind, that most of its members are actually Churchmen, and further, that it represents the nation and the Church of England as a national Church. The largeness of the majority voting on these questions may also be considered. It was not at once that the members came to an agreement. One resolution, which brought in the English Church Union, was properly withdrawn; and the following substituted for it: "This House deplors the spirit of lawlessness displayed by certain members of the Church, and expresses the hope that Her Majesty's ministers will not recommend any clergyman for ecclesiastical preferment unless satisfied that he would loyally obey the bishops and the Prayer-Book." The debate seems to have been quiet and moderate, and special attention was given to the speech of Mr. Arthur Balfour. He declared that, if there was hope for the future of the Established Church, it could lie only in the resolute determination of all moderate men who are loyal to the Church to unite and express their intention not to allow the great fabric, which was the work of generations of able and pious men, to be destroyed by the frantic, short-sighted policy of honest, but mistaken ecclesiastical theorists, whether belonging to one party or the other. He felt deeply that while men were disputing these matters of relatively small importance, there was, perhaps, irreparable injury being done not only to the Church, but to the whole cause of religion. We are sure that these words will find their echo in the hearts of the great majority of the clergy and laity of the Church. The motion just quoted was moved by Mr. Samuel Hoare, M.P. for Norwich; but an addition proposed by Mr. G. C. Bartley, M.P. for North Islington, is still more remarkable. This was the ad-

dition: "And to obey the law as decided by the courts which have jurisdiction in ecclesiastical matters." This was opposed by a certain number of members, and even Mr. Balfour declared himself against it. Notwithstanding this, Mr. Hoare's resolution, together with Mr. Bartley's rider, was carried by a vote of 200 to 14. We are not defending this vote. We should have preferred a modification of Mr. Bartley's addition. But what we want to point out is the significance of the vote in relation to the public opinion of England. We have often been told of late, not merely that High Churchism was on the increase, which is obvious, but that the country was in favour of the extreme forms of Ritualism, which are indistinguishable from Romanizing. This we did not believe, and we have now got a very clear answer on the subject. Let it be clear to partisans on both sides that they cannot have all their own way; and, if they are determined to have it, they can only rend the Church and bring about disestablishment. The most shocking thing is, that a certain number of persons seem to think this a small matter, compared with their being permitted to carry out their own fancies.

FALSE LIGHTS IN THE PULPIT.

By Rev. Robert Ker, Rector, St. Catharines.

In this article my object is not controversial. Brethren infinitely better informed than myself on all these questions will see weak points where I fail to detect them; but I feel that we shall prove ourselves untrue alike to the Church and the cause of religion generally if we hesitate to sound an alarm. It is necessary to advise ourselves fully of the dangers, if we would intelligently apply a remedy. Are we prepared to sacrifice our eternal hopes at the bidding of those whose conception of Christianity is, that it is a philosophy to enable us to cater to the physical comfort and amusement of the present generation? May I add, that in these discussions it is always helpful for brethren to favour us with their opinions under the responsibility of their own names. Some two weeks ago a friend of mine, resident in the United States, was good enough to send me a few copies of a leading New York paper, containing reports of what are called "sermons," by several prominent pulpites in that city. On reading these pulpit essays, delivered in the sacred name of religion, I was forcibly reminded of the words of the prophet Ezekiel, "Woe unto the foolish preachers that follow their own spirit and have seen nothing;" that is to say, preachers who have no message from God to the soul-laden, but who evolve from their "subjective consciousness," as it is termed, certain theories about Christ and Christianity, which they suppose harmonize with modern culture, and upon which they discourse to admiring audiences at the rate of from \$100 to \$200 per week. It is reasonable to suppose that people who pay for this sort of thing like it and that the contract between the pulpiteer and his employers is faithfully observed. From a purely literary point of view it is ex-

tremely doubtful their money, which they are not even the swine did eat say it, but the corn upon us that make simply actors, with Their misconceptions of the pulp shameless perversities behind the mate descendant philosophy in the not over careful when out of their lars. The preach denominationally one Presbyterian of all, an Episcop shamelessly anti-terian and Episcop antagonism to churches. Of this is the most offensive Presbyterian, a thousand true of Of course, St. Confession of I position to Van the Van Dykes their own swor the Plymouth on Christ as and nothing m Church to tak of the people, mony with Dr. th Church turng-room, and But these vagegical opinions anything. Dr. and he assure believes in it; Holy Scripture rection," well know of any statement need clergy of Ne hear what the The New Yo answer to Dr there are a g that city quit perhaps a ge without exc which Dr Ra cated man h him that the built theatres where the pe any one or a so disposed; drinking and emptied, and her energies community. ford's folly a his attention at the buria commit his earth, ashes