

CORRESPONDENCE.

[The name of Correspondent must in all cases be enclosed with letter, but will not be published unless desired. The Editor will not hold himself responsible, however, for any opinions expressed by Correspondents.]

To the Editor of THE CHURCH GUARDIAN:

SIR,—Agreeing with those who think that a serious wrong has been done to the Provincial Synod by the exclusion of the Secretary of the Lower House from the roll of its members. I would suggest the question, is there any obligation to elect a member of the house as Secretary? The Secretary of the House of Bishops is not a member of that House, and I am not aware of any regulation implying a limitation of the freedom of choice in the other House. Allowing Canon Norman no longer represents the Diocese of Montreal, may not the Lower House vindicate its own independence by re-electing him as Secretary? His position may be disagreeable, but it seems to be necessary that he should continue to act as Secretary up to the time of the organization of the House by the election of a Prolocutor; and we may hope that notwithstanding his rejection by a party vote in the Synod of his own diocese, he may be induced to continue to serve if a large majority of the Provincial Synod manifest a desire to retain his services as Secretary. It is much to be deplored that the Provincial Synod, of which the proceedings are of so much importance to the whole Church can be deprived of some of its most able and valuable members by the action of a in party one of the Dioceses.

A MEMBER OF SYNOD.

THE NAME OF OUR CHURCH.

SIR,—I have received not a few communications concerning the letter I ventured to address to the other Bishops of the Church in Canada, and through them to the members of the Church in general, with reference to a change of name of our Church. I am glad to find there is a fairly wide-spread desire for some change. I was not surprised that there should be many objectors. Will you allow me to say a few words through your widely circulating paper on some of the objections that I find most prevalent?

1. There are those who urge the *non possumus* plea. However advisable some change may be, the difficulties in the way are too great. I would answer. If the thing is in itself to be desired, let us try. Far greater difficulties than any I have yet heard of have yielded to earnest persistent effort. It will be time enough to say, "It is impossible," when some real effort has been made.

2. There is next the religious objection. It is urged that the assumption of the title "Church of Canada," or "Catholic Church of Canada" would be presumptuous, and also unfair to those other Christian bodies that now divide the land with us, some of whom are even more numerous than we are. I can only say that while fully and gladly admitting the good done by those who have separated themselves from the unity of the Church, and acknowledging the evident signs that they exhibit that God blesses their work in spite of their schism, I have always believed that there can only be one true branch of the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church in any country, and that Branch is known by its maintenance of the Apostolic doctrine and its threefold ministry, which "it is evident unto all men diligently reading the Holy Scripture and ancient authors," as our Prayer-book says, "there has ever been in Christ's Church from the Apostles' time." And the claim of such Church to be the Catholic Church of the country in which it exists is altogether independent of such mere accidental circumstances as its numerical superiority, or its recognition by the State. However, it has been suggested that the name "Anglican Catholic Church of Canada" would do away with

this objection. It seems to me that even this is introducing an un-Catholic division like the Roman Church, but still as it speaks of a race rather than a country, it is far less objectionable and unmeaning than "Church of England." It can, moreover, claim a kind of precedent in the Pan-Anglican Synod. If therefore a change is made this might be accepted as a solution of the difficulty.

It certainly could not offend any other body of Christians. All that I contend for is that somehow it should be expressed in our title that we are the legitimate representative of the Catholic Church of CANADA, and not the Church of another country, merely in Canada. The exact form in which this is to be done may well be left for the Church itself to decide.

3. The third and last objection is the legal one. The Church in Canada, we are told, was intended to be, and still is 'an integral part of the Church of England,' and, therefore, has no right to any other name, and if it does assume another name it severs its connection with that Church. There can be no doubt that in the early days of the Colonial Church it was thought by statesmen and lawyers that the Church, 'as established by law' could be transplanted into the Colonies with all its privileges and restrictions. Most unfortunately Erastianism then reigned supreme, and those in authority had little knowledge of the rights and powers of the Church as apart from its civil connections. And till very lately this phantom was clung to as though it was a great reality. Letters patent were issued by the Crown conferring rights on Bishops with the most solemn formality till those documents were found by astute lawyers to be nothing but waste paper. I do not pretend to unravel the intricacies of ecclesiastical law which in the case of the 'establishment' has, I fear, been allowed to get into a very chaotic state in England. But I appeal from the subtleties of legal fictions to what facts have accomplished, it may be in spite of the intentions of lawyers and law; I fearlessly ask: can one Church in this country be said to be any longer, as matter of fact, "an integral part of the Church of England"? The Church in Canada is no part of the spiritual estate of the realm of England like the Church of Canterbury. It is no part of the Constitution of England. It is not subject to *Jus Regium Ecclesiasticum* whereby temporal punishments can be annexed to spiritual censures. It has no voice in Convocation which is "the Church of England by Representation." Its clergy cannot hold cures in England except under special License from the Archbishop of Canterbury. Dioceses are created by its own Provincial Synods, not by the Crown. Its Bishops are elected by the free voice of the Presbyters and Laity of each Diocese. No *conge d'elire* issued by the Crown restricts the choice.

We are bound by the ancient Common Law of the Church Catholic. I know not by what else. When it is said that we are bound by the Canons of the Church of England, 'so far as they are applicable to our circumstances,' it must be seen that the whole case is virtually conceded. Who is to decide the important point how far they are applicable. Will the Imperial Parliament? Will Convocation? If we ourselves are to be the judges, and to take what we like, and to leave what we do not like, it is evident that we are not bound by them till we bind ourselves.

That we, in our Synods, voluntarily accept the formularies of the Church of England cannot make us an integral part of that Church. It on the contrary conclusively proves that we are not. Fancy a Province formally accepting the Acts of the whole Dominion, or a municipality the Acts of a Province, of which it forms an integral part? If there was any law but our own voluntary compact binding us as an "integral part of the Church of England" such a formal acceptance of those standards as the basis of our constitution would be absurd.

The Judicial Committee in 'Long vs. the Bishop of Capetown,' said that the result of its verdict was to place the Church of England "in places where there is no Church established by law, in the same situation with any other religious body, in no better, but in no worse position."

Let us boldly accept the position to which we have been brought by stern facts without encumbering ourselves with the frail threads of legal fiction.

The Pan Anglican Synod of 1867, in its 8th. Resolution, very wisely laid down, "That in order to the binding of the Church of our Colonial Empire and Missionary Churches beyond them in the closest union with the Mother Church it is necessary that they receive and maintain without alteration the standards of faith and doctrine now in use in the Church. That, nevertheless, each Province should have right to make such adaptations and additions to the services of the Church as its peculiar circumstances may require, provided that no change or addition be made inconsistent with the principles and spirit of the Book of Common Prayer."

We could desire nothing more. This resolution gives a guarantee for the closest union in doctrine and Liturgical practice, while it allows reasonable diversity. Would that the Church in this country would be bold enough to exercise a little of that "right to make such adaptation and additions to the services of the Church" that she has, and the want of which so cripples the energies of the Mother Church.

The day on which I date this letter is the 99th anniversary of the Consecration of the first Colonial Bishop of our Church. Would it not be a most fit method of commemorating the centenary of this great event for the Church of this country, which was the first to receive this blessing, to gather together representatives of our scattered portions who might consider, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, if some means cannot be adopted whereby greater consolidation, and thereby power, might not be obtained for our Church in this Dominion and a name assumed more truly indicative of our position in this country and in the great confederation of Dioceses of the one Church Catholic, so that when the Centenary Anniversary arrived, a great assembly of the whole Church may be held at which the decisions formulated by the Representatives and ratified by the Provincial Synods and the independent dioceses of British Columbia, should be promulgated, and an era of increased power and vitality, may we not trust, under the blessing of God, inaugurated for our beloved Church?

I am yours faithfully.

ADELBERT,

Bishop of Qu'Appelle.

St. John's College, Qu'Appelle, N.W.T. }
August 12th, 1886.

THE REVISED VERSION AND THE RESOLUTION THEREON OF THE SYNOD OF TORONTO.

To the Editor of the CHURCH GUARDIAN:

SIR,—As the members of the Synod of Toronto are originally responsible for the proposal of the resolution commented upon by my friend, the Rev. Dr. Roe, in your issue of 11th August, I have to ask permission to make a reply to his communication. I shall begin by stating briefly some of the reasons which influenced those who introduced, supported, and passed, almost unanimously, the resolution in question.

The work of revision was committed to a body comprising seventy-nine of the most learned divines, scholars, and literary men, on both sides of the Atlantic, of whom fifty-two belonged to Great Britain and twenty-seven to the United States. They occupied in the case of the New Testament ten years and a half,