

"NEW LIGHT"—WHAT IS IT?

Again is resumed the fundamental vexed question—the very foundation of Archbishop Benson's independent attitude as against previous Privy Council presentments—the value of the introduction of new light in warranting any re-consideration of a question already decided. Lord Esher lays down the proposition that not only new facts or new evidence, but even a new line of *argument*, may be considered as new light for that purpose: and so the committee appears to reach a more solid and reasonable basis for future reversal, if necessary, of their previous decisions. Tyndale (in controversy with Sir Thomas More) is the medium for introducing an idea that the mixture of water may have been due to a desire to "slake the heat of the wine" rather than to a wish to load the service with more ceremony. This gives occasion to Bishop MacLagan to refer to the practice of Bishop Wilson and John Wesley; while Sir Horace Davey adverts to an idea that Cardinal Newman was made responsible for when vicar of St. Mary's, Oxford, viz., the advisability of not using undiluted wine at *early* services. Sir Horace seems to have a gift for introducing unawares ideas that make against his own argument.

PARS SEPTENTRIONALIS,

as the Latin equivalent for north side, comes in for some consideration, as showing an intention of not using the English term in its mathematical or technical sense. Even the question of *round tables* as altars comes up, and the terms of the rubric considered in relation to a table of that shape. Sir Horace quotes Levit. i. 10, describing a sacrifice made "on the side of the altar northward before the Lord," but finally gives up the reference as being, as the Lord Chancellor slyly put it, "irrelevant and against you." The learned counsel again makes an obvious slip when he speaks of "a conspiracy to bring back the ritual of the English Church to the state it was in at the date of the first prayer book of Edward the Sixth"—the very thing which the "Ornaments Rubric" itself *professes expressly* to do!

MARRIAGE BANNS

is a subject which seems to have little enough connection with the work of the committee, but the mention of the rubric gives occasion to the Lord Chancellor to affirm that the only *legal* place for the publication of banns is (*not* after the second lesson but) after the Nicene creed, the rubric having been altered by the printers of their own unauthorized mere motion, supposing themselves qualified to bring the prayer book into conformity with their idea of the meaning of a subsequent Act of Parliament. So easily do errors creep in as gloss to a text, unless the custodians themselves are carefully watched.

A DIM RELIGIOUS LIGHT

through stained glass windows is adduced as a parallel to the use of eucharistic and vesper lights as a ceremonial adjunct to a service. If it is an additional ceremony to have lighted tapers at a celebration, why is it not the same kind of thing to have the light of the sun toned down by the use of opaque glass in the windows? This idea, introduced by the Lord Chancellor, was rather a clincher to the absurdity of Sir Horace Davey's contention against the use of more or less light during the celebration of the Holy Communion. The whole investigation seems to have a tendency, in fact, to reduce the finical objections of the Church Association to Catholic ritual down to glaring nonsense.

SOME REASONS WHY, AS PATRIOTS, WE SHOULD SEEK TO MAKE CANADA A CHURCH OF ENGLAND LAND.

BY REV. E. J. FESSENDEN, M.A.

Political institutions, to be workable, must be correlated with the character of the people, and the religious element in a people's life is, far and away, the most potent formative force in determining their national character. The absence of all faith and religious culture is the death in a people's life of all that can make government upon the broad basis of a people's "will" possible. All history shows that national character, under such conditions, suffers depreciation into coarse anarchic elements, bringing in "red ruin and the breaking up of laws."

That which has enabled England in the past to keep her constitutional rights and liberties, at home and in the colonies, steadily broadening and deepening, making her history glorious, and ever-enobling her people, has been, above everything else, the sturdy independence, the love for law and order, and the practical common sense of Englishmen. This English spirit has made it possible for the English constitution, while keeping its fundamental principles intact, to adapt itself to the varying needs of successive ages. But this English spirit is not a "survival of the fittest." It is here, and makes the empire prosperous and happy, because the Church of England has made it what it is.

The old Saxon life acquired it in that unique home of English history, where, for a thousand years and more, it has been nurtured. This English spirit was begotten in the making of England. The Saxon immigrants had their primeval institutions scarcely, if at all, effected by the Roman civilization, and still holding, as it were, in solution, the monarchical, the aristocratic and democratic elements which, in the alchemy of the coming years, were to crystallize into the English institutions of the present. Paralleled to this the Church, which equalized the Saxons, while possessing her apostolic ministry, her sacraments and scriptures as her primeval institutions, like her Saxon converts, held her own national and territorial life in a divine chaos. Thus the civil and the spiritual met and commingled in the making of England, as they did nowhere else in Christian history, and gave us our English constitution and life.

The people were organized as a spiritual whole—the Church of England—nearly 200 years before the civil powers were formed into the kingdom. The ecclesiastical synods, in many respects, formed the pattern and regulated the procedure of the political assemblies. The canon law and moral teaching of the Church of England became the common law of the kingdom. On the other hand, the whole organic life of the Church grew into form in the matrix of Saxon England. The Church was intensely national and patriotic, and the kingdom knew itself to be seized of Christian responsibilities and duties.

There were no Manichean dualities—"the free Church in the free State," the lamb inside the lion—in the making of England.

The religious element of her life was not a flame burning in a grave vacuum and void. The interests and affections, the varied and complex relations and functions, duties and possibilities of the national, no less than the individual life, were the rich unguents of the flame. Their relations to each other in the English constitution enriched the spiritual and material sides of English life beyond parallel to be found anywhere else.

The English race, whose character has been beaten out in this forge of their providence, are the only people, so far in the world's history, who have been able to work successfully their constitutional government; and in our Empire, when in any age, the elements of our national life, which formed our character at the first, have been vitiated or unbalanced, our constitutional government has suffered detriment and loss.

We have a marked instance and warning of this in the American Revolution. Who were they among the colonial population who, having obtained control of the government and army, in the then American colonies, under the profession of defending colonial rights, in union and harmony with England, used their power as a coigne of vantage to bring in *independence*?

From the earliest days there had been a Home Rule party in New England, the author of its church history and of its disputes with the mother country. Endacott, the first governor of Massachusetts Bay, may be said to have been its founder. The colony, in its inception, was professedly Church of England. The first emigrants went out as members of the National Church. But shortly after his arrival, Endacott, in concert with not one-fifth of the colonists, established a State Church after the Congregational pattern, and exiled as criminals, mutinous and seditious, leading members of the Church of England, notably the Browns, who refused to conform, and claimed their rights and liberties as Englishmen. The greater part of the colonists refusing to join Endacott's church were denied all

rights of citizenship—were taxed by the Colonial Legislature, in which they were denied representation—were tried for their lives by courts and under laws, in the enacting and creating of which they had no voice—laws and courts, too, unauthorized and contrary to the English constitution; and this Home Rule party, now by cajoling and now by defying the Home Government, managed to maintain their tyranny in the colony for sixty years, and when it became evident that the home authorities could no longer be kept at bay, but would insist upon all the colonists having the enjoyment of their rights and liberties as English subjects, this Home Rule party declared the local authority supreme, and to appeal from it treason. They began actually to make preparations to resist the Home Government by force of arms, and though compelled to yield, the party lived and kept to its traditions. Was the seed sown thus early in New England's life and character, containing no germ either of the principles or of the spirit of true, civil or religious liberty that a *century plant* bore as its blossom, New England's party of independence in the American Revolution?

A study of the official correspondence between this Home Rule party and the king, and Lord Clarendon and the Hon. Robt. Boyle and the disenfranchised colonists, of whom were the future United Empire Loyalists, reveals the latter as the true sons of liberty, advocates of *Equal Rights* as against government by an intolerant religious body, hostile to the supreme authority of England.

Virginia's independence partly arose out of the relations of Church and State in that colony. The Home Government established the Church of England there and then by a repressive tyranny tempered by neglect, and made it impossible for the Church to have any other than a maimed and suppressed existence in the colony. By a century of unceasing prayer, the Church supplicated the Government for liberty to give her episcopate to her people beyond the seas.

But, more obdurate than the "unjust judge," the Government refused.

Deprived of all power to take root in the land, without leadership, with no legitimate government and discipline, her people deprived of the grace of confirmation, her sons compelled to cross the Atlantic—a perilous voyage in those days—if they would seek ordination to her ministry, the marvel is that the Church was able to be the religious and moral power in the colony that she was.

But, under such a state of things, conflict and scandal and degradation of the religious and moral life of the community, could not but ensue. In too many instances the wealthy Virginian planters had become notorious for their dissolute and idle habits, and the lower orders were following their example. The plague of a brutal debauchery was revealing itself in the life of the colony.

Added to all this, and its natural outcome, in 1758, a fierce controversy arose over the payment of the clergy stipend. This stipend was fixed by an Act of the Colonial Government in 1698, re-enacted with amendments from time to time down to 1748, at 16,000 lbs. of tobacco, together with the cask in which it was packed. The clergy could commute the payment at the market price of 2d. a pound, which would make the clergyman's yearly stipend £183. In 1755, in consequence of the failure of the tobacco crop, the parishes were given the right of commuting the same rate as before, 16s. 8d. per hundred, though the market value went up to 50s. and 60s. This Act was not to continue longer than six months, and was passed without the usual clause requiring the royal assent before it came into operation. The clergy offered no resistance to this Act. But in 1758, upon the recurrence of the failure of the tobacco crop, the Act was renewed, the commutation being fixed at 18s. per hundred. This time the clergy remonstrated; it meant the starvation of their families; it was revolutionary confiscation. The Home Government disallowed the Act, and as a trial case, the Rev. James Murray sued in the county court of Hanover for his stipend under the Act of 1748, and the court gave judgment in favour of the clergy. The only point that now remained was for the jury to determine the amount of damages, and Patrick Henry, the counsel for the defence, not confining himself to the merits of the case before the jury, made a revolutionary appeal in favour of popular sovereignty as paramount in the colony. This practically left the sovereignty of England in the colony on trust, and he carried the jury with him.

That court house in Hanover was the cradle of the Independence party in Virginia.

England's action towards her Church had bred the egg and the serpent of Virginia's cocatrice of disloyalty.

From various causes there had grown up among certain classes of the colonial population, in the mid-land colonies especially, a "wild west" phase of thought and belief; old associations and influences lost or broken up, they held their own convictions and opinions, as it were, in solution, ready to be crystallized, and it might be into new forms, by the