

the Synod—
r low, clerics
n the course
things of a
ke everything
strongly was
members of the
the designa-
demanded on
mittees should
Ve confess we
o shocking a
y professedly
nciple should
at it should
nciple in the
the Synod is,
less than the
the inconsis-
e remarkable,
the "party"
ain a defeat;
inary meeting
men to ignore
ity and unani-
orted to move
have existed
exist, but we
ance of a dis-
sity of carry-
ecidedly "par-

ne whole, an
and also upon
The mode of
which it pro-
alize the "cau-
voting canno

E REV. S. F.

s the following

of St. Alban's
ester Cathedral,
Lancaster, with
ed. During his
uch time as he
in the company
d rector of Miles
tle we are en-
ls of this inter-
opinions on this
questions, Mr.
f feeling and a
o of him and his
e, that English-
his sincere friend,
ment, a drop of
whereas that was
believed in the
it will prevail,
rymen would see
e, and which he
was the liberty
also thought, it
y was of opinion,
ntane or Roman
ely on his per-
iving oneself to
hop. The prin-
submitted again
the priests, the
ishops from the
all round, and it
ere the servants
ite provable and
eat reformers of
ok. In England

we have drifted into a sort of vague, hazy notion that if a bishop ordered a thing the minister had to obey, no matter what it was. Now, when a minister is ordained he vows canonical obedience to his bishop; or that when a prelate speaks in accordance with the canons of the Church, obedience is compulsory. He knew no other obedience, for both were the servants of the Church. Mr. Green has maintained his vows, because the Bishop of Manchester demanded from him uncanonical obedience; he made a request that was not ratified by the canons. In support of this he added that the Reformation settled it that Henry VIII., the priests, the bishops, everybody, in fact, were bound by the laws of the Church and the Realm. The great fundamental statute of the Reformation, binding in itself, was of that nature, so that if any law for the government of the Church, the bishops and the laity in religion, ritual, or doctrine were passed, it must be approved by the Church and confirmed by the realm. Our fundamental statute, then, was violated by the Public Worship Regulation Act, a measure passed by an extraordinary Tory Parliament, composed of men of all shades of opinion, and persons without any creed at all. That statute was for the guidance of the ritual of the Church, professedly so, because Mr. Disraeli, Prime Minister at the time, said it was intended to put down Ritualism, and therefore that was a statute, as he had said, professedly for the guidance of the ritual of the Church. It was made law without consulting the Convocation of the Church; in fact, in the teeth of the protest of the Church and the Convocations of York and Canterbury. Then they choose to form what was called the Court of Arches, and Lord Penzance was created judge. This was done also by the same Parliamentary statute, and were we to obey a court constituted by the Public Worship Regulation Act and Lord Penzance, we should be virtually saying that the Church of England, instead of being the Church of Christ passed on by succession through the Apostles from our Lord, was ordered, governed, and regulated by Acts of Parliament—that is, was no Church at all. He (Mr. Little) would, therefore, sooner die than obey Lord Penzance. If his bishop spoke to him with the power of Pentecost, and in the name of the Holy Ghost, he should recognize at once that he was a bishop of the Catholic Church, or if he said, "According to such a canon I believe you ought to do so and so, and omit so and so, for the good of the Church," or, "I advise you to do this," then he should have great hesitation in disobeying, even if he differed in opinion—although perhaps he would be bound to disobey if it was a very serious matter. But when the bishop comes and says, "You must obey the law," meaning thereby not the law of the Church, but the Public Worship Regulation Act, he could not obey, because it was a measure emanating from the realm alone, attacking the mysteries of the Church, which Christ had given to the faithful, and not coming jointly from the Church and realm. Mr. Little remarked, "We can't obey a bishop when he becomes a funk of the Public Worship Regulation Act; we believe that the English Church is free, and we are contending, not about any vestments, but the freedom of the Church. Therefore I said to Mr. Green—Be brave, continue in your fortitude, stand firm. If you die in prison, die in prison so that when you come to the day of Judgment our Blessed Lord will not be able to say to you, 'I committed My mysteries to you, I committed My people's souls to you, and you surrendered the principle of the liberty of the Church which belongs, not to the bishop of the diocese, but to the everlasting God of heaven, and not to a court constituted by a Parliament without the authority of My Church, which parliament consisted of believers, unbelievers, heretics, and Jews.' I am very sorrow you are in prison, but stay in prison, die in prison sooner than acknowledge such a principle as that."

Continuing the conversation, the reverend gentleman said that Englishmen would sooner or later realize the necessity of the liberty of the Church of Christ, and that it must be governed by the real law of the Church and the realm, not that of the realm contradicting and repudiating the Church. His countrymen would plainly see that they were fighting for a principle and not for a fad or a fancy. That great statesman, the Prime Minister, one of the greatest of mortals, whom he admired more than any living man, spoke for six hours against that Public Worship Regulation Act. He made one of the most brilliant orations of his many glorious speeches in that great Parliament of rampant Tories against the passing of that Act. Now, Mr. Gladstone, although he has not actually stated it, practically says that he disapproves of that Act, that it is unconstitutional and contrary to liberty, but as the bishops succumbed to that Parliament let them administer the Act. He (Mr. Gladstone) could not let Mr. Green out of prison. The bishops were not loyal to their Church, and they ought to bear the responsibility of putting a priest in prison. The Rev. gentleman thought the Public Worship Regulation Act was parallel to the case of the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill, which invaded the rights of Englishmen in the way of preventing the assumption by the Papal See

of certain ecclesiastical titles in the United Kingdom. The people of the country has long said that if a man in England liked to call himself Bishop of Jamaica let him do so. They said it was an absurd bill, and they will say the same of the Public Worship Regulation Act, or, said the Rev. gentleman, "my name is not Knox-Little." That Act was a specimen of Tory tyranny and nothing else, and no man who was a Liberal, as he was, or a Churchman, would have anything to do with it, but rather scorned and ignored it. He would die for the rights of Englishmen, and the constitution of the Christian Church, and he thought Mr. Green was prepared also to die for the right. Just consider, he continued, Mr. Green's particular case. He had one short interview with his Bishop, lasting about half-an-hour. He never heard of these accusations except in that one half-hour, and he never had another chance offered him. He was hauled before Lord Penzance without any chance being given him at all. Mr. Green's ritual was of the most modest kind—in fact he had hardly any ritual.

His people were thoroughly united together. They are nearly all working people, and he had seen the church at Miles Platting filled with women with shawls over their heads, and working men in their working clothes. He was not a man who came before the public much, but quietly worked on with the love of many friends. He was in a way unseen and unknown in a parish where he was living in the midst of an atmosphere so redolent with chemical acids that his children's health had been undermined. He persevered in his labours steadily, patiently, quietly, humbly, always good, earnest, and faithful, doing no harm to any man. But suddenly there were imported into his parish by the Church Association three men who had nothing to do with the parish, the church, or the workpeople, but were sent there for the purpose of hauling him before Lord Penzance. In other words, that they might be the accusers; And then when they bring him up they accuse him of three charges, which to his (Mr. Knox-Little's) certain knowledge were entirely without foundation. If the Bishop had asked for evidence on them not a tittle could have been given. There were only five charges, and three of these were absolutely false. Then another of the charges that were brought against him was that he mixed water with the wine in the Blessed Sacrament. Conscientiously believing in that Mr. Green could not obey. Every theologian now agrees in the opinion that our Blessed Lord did it Himself. Then, according to St. Paul, in the cup of blessing the wine was always mixed with the water, and he (the apostle) must have mixed it with water. Pusey, Liddon, and all the theologians of the English Church, believed that in mixing water with wine they were only doing what our Lord did. That was one of the charges upon which Mr. Green was put into prison—a man who did his work well, lived among his people, and was one whom they loved. Then Mr. Green married a girl in a lower rank than his own—one of the class for whom he worked. He married her because he loved her, and because he wanted to be considered as one of them by his parishioners. She is a good, pure, high-minded woman, and a most faithful wife. Mr. Green frets about her, as he believes her health is shattered. Their children are shattered. Mr. Green is a most intellectual man, of very clear thought.

Just look also at the results of his condemnation. There is that parish deprived of a most faithful pastor, while there are hundreds of parishes in which there are clergymen violating the law ten times more. He did not mean altogether the Ritualists, but men who were neglecting all sorts of rubrics, not doing their duty, not saying daily prayers, which the Prayer-book commands, not saying the Athanasian Creed on days appointed, which was a plain violation of the law and a neglect of duty, while some were even spending their lives badly. Then no person under the Public Worship Regulation Act ought to wear a stole, and the gross injustice of the law which Mr. Green violated was broken by every bishop on the bench, and by nine-tenths of the clergy, because the vestment which Mr. Green wore was a modest linen thing which they could hardly distinguish from the surplice. Stoles are forbidden by the Privy Council, yet almost every clergyman in England on a Sunday wears a stole—black though it may be—but all stoles are forbidden by the Privy Council in what it calls the law. They were every one of them violating that law, yet Mr. Green alone was put in prison.

As to the bishops, the Privy Council has commanded that they shall still wear a cope in the cathedral. The Bishop of Manchester never wears a cope, and neither do the Archbishops of York or Canterbury, but the Bishops of Lincoln, London, and Peterborough are consistent and wear their copes. The Bishops of Gloucester, Manchester, Hereford, Worcester, if fact nearly all the bishops, have not conformed to the law. All should be treated alike, and what is "saucy for the goose is saucy for the gander." Some of them would answer that the Privy Council only ordered the cope in an *obiter dictum*, or

in the course of a judgment, the matter itself not being before the Court, and, therefore, they would say "we are not bound to wear it." Well, consider in the first place that there are three or four bishops who think they are bound to wear it to be consistent; and, in the second place, to these men like the Bishop of Manchester, who are so very anxious that we should obey the law, he said, "If you are very anxious to abide by the law you will seize every opportunity of knowing the mind of the law, even when the law makes use of an *obiter dictum*. Because it was said indirectly you ought not to be the less willing to know it, and the more your desire is to obey this Privy Council the more honourably and energetically will you carry out their hints, and a bishop ought to embrace the opportunity."

He also reiterated that he was a liberal, although it was not the business of a clergyman to be a politician. The celebrated John Hampden, who was also a Liberal, was said in his day to have been a violator of the law, but at the present time people acknowledge that he was a deep and large-hearted man, fighting for the freedom of his country—precisely what we Churchmen are doing. It is all very well to pass a law like the Public Worship Regulation Act, which violates the principles of the Church, and establishes an Ultramontane and Papal principle. He for one and Mr. Green for another, would stand out against it, and he believed that they would triumph, for Englishmen would see that we don't care a straw about vestments, stoles, or candles, but we admire the glory of the dear old English Church ritual. All the powers of art, thought, and beauty ought to be employed in the worship and adoration of God, but these things may be non-essential, and therefore if it were necessary, much as we love them, we can give them up. There must be some ritual, for even the Methodist has his ritual, or a certain way of conducting his service. If Mr. Green gave up this point he would surrender all the liberties of an Englishman, and he (Mr. Knox-Little) would die first before he would do it. It was not true that he had boasted they dared not lock him in prison, but he did his duty to the best of his mind and heart, and he was very thankful that he had been permitted to live in peace.

Liberal Offer.

ALL New Subscribers sending us One Dollar each, from now till December 31st, 1881, will receive the DOMINION CHURCHMAN to the end of 1882.

We ask the clergy, laity, and friends to earnestly make an effort in their different parishes throughout the Dominion to get every family to subscribe at once.

Diocesan Intelligence.

MONTREAL.

From Our Own Correspondent.

GLEN SUTTON.—This mission so ably worked by its first incumbent keeps to its former strength under his successor Rev. C. Lummis. The services are well attended, the church being well filled on Sundays. This shows that the attachment of the people was not, as some feared, to the man; but to something deeper and more lasting.

RICHMOND, Vt.—In this little but rising town, lying close to our southern border, one of our clergymen, the Rev. J. Smith of Sutton, took part a few weeks ago in a service begun there by the Rev. Mr. Atwell of the American church. At the request of the Bishop of Vermont, Mr. Atwell went there to see what opening there was for our Church. On this occasion the gathering was large, and a great desire is expressed by many that services should be regularly established. It was in this same place that the Rev. John Kerr, when in Glen Sutton, we may say, broke ground by having services. What he begun is likely to continue.

STANBRIDGE EAST.—On the twentieth inst., while harvest thanksgiving services were being held in most of the churches through the diocese, the church of this parish was the scene of one of the most solemn burial services probably ever witnessed in the diocese, not excepting the city. The occasion was a sorrowful