

## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

[Brevity is asked of correspondents who send matter for this column. Letters unaccompanied with the names and addresses of the writers will not be published, nor will rejected communications be returned.]

## THE VESTMENTS QUESTION.

Sir,—No explanation has been vouchsafed in your columns regarding the strange omission in the article to which I referred in your issue of Saturday week, but I have received a communication through the post, which I think, in view of the wide circulation of the article, is of public interest. My correspondent writes:—"I see from Saturday's paper you have found that the Royal authority was really given to Archbishop Parker's advertisements. Where did you find it? I have always sympathised with the Archbishop in his dealings with that exceedingly shifty Royal lady, and it was really an attempt on his part to get some sort of order. But all the books I have say that the diplomatic Queen kept clear of giving her signature. It is just the crux of the whole situation." I have replied: "The query of your postcard is rather mystifying! My letter quoted two Privy Council decisions. They interpret the law for us. The 1871 decision deals with the point you raise and dismisses it as a proposition that 'can hardly be maintained,' and later on in the judgment their Lordships say, 'Supposing for the sake of argument that the advertisements did not receive the official assent of the Queen, but were acted upon under a number of Royal Commissions, and with the approval of the Metropolitan, their Lordships think that this was a taking other order' within the meaning of the statute. In any case the omission of all reference to the advertisements in the plausible article . . . is unjustifiable from the point of view of truth." To this my correspondent further replied: "Can any Article in church history be written without a point of view? But as it stops dead at 1662, it may be excused for not quoting from judgments 200 years later. Nothing is there quoted except verifiable legal documents to 1662. Archbishop Parker complains that he could not get the Queen's consent to the advertisements. Queen Elizabeth must have been a hand-ful. But even if she did consent, the advertisements would have gone with the 1559 Act in 1645 unless they were specifically re-enacted in 1662 with the Substantive Act. The clause in the Preface about 'never repealed' is more a Royalist protest than anything else. The Act was repealed by the King's Order-in-Council under seal, which should be enough for any Erastian. The Archbishop issued his advertisements on his own for the province of Canterbury. A Lord Chancellor who could make this alter the force of an Act of Parliament, Convocation and Crown nearly 100 years later, could do anything. It is pretty deplorable in a non-established church to have these musty deliverances of Erastian lawyers hurled at us." To this I have replied: "I wish to the opening paragraph respectfully to submit that any article on church history with controversial intent should be studiously fair, and it does not seem to me that the excuse for non-consideration of the Privy Council judgments can be seriously meant for the writer mentions (\*but does not quote) Bishop Barry's prayer book and Mr. Gladstone's opinion. The so-called 'musty deliverances of Erastian lawyers' define our present law, and a perusal of their judgments shows that they found reasons to believe that the 'advertisements' was a 'verifiable legal document.' These same lawyers constituted our highest Court of Appeal—must have realised the tremendous responsibility of their office, and were dealing with matters of law, and on two occasions—once unanimously and again almost unanimously—came to the same conclusion. Any writer seeking to lead men to an opposite conclusion is surely bound in common honesty to state the whole case. If the Bishop of Salisbury thinks he has fresh light, 'the courts are open,' let him get another hearing; but if Canon Nunn's quotations are correct, the bishop should very carefully verify some of his references. The 'Canterbury' contention is not quite so easy as it is made out to be. But this is quite beside my point, which was and is, that the omission of all reference to the 'advertisements' was not candid." I have received a further reply of which I must leave to my correspondent the responsibility of publication or otherwise.—I am, etc.,

STEPHEN TAYLOR.

St. John's Rectory.

The asterisked parenthesis refers to Bishop Barry's prayer book only.)

## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

[Brevity is asked of correspondents who send matter for this column. Letters unaccompanied with the names and addresses of the writers will not be published, nor will rejected communications be returned.]

## THE CIGARETTE EVIL.

Sir,—This seems to be a matter which deserves to be dealt with by the community as a whole. It is very undesirable that it should appear to be a movement by church people for the restriction of liberty. A conference on the subject might help us all. The evil would be a matter for medical testimony. And if restriction is proved necessary in the interests of the community, I do not see how any body smaller than Parliament can deal with it. We might begin by securing expert evidence. I remember the head of a college, a man of great experience, saying to me that he had noticed in the case of many students that smoking was, to all appearances, the beginning of marked decadence in character. But it would be difficult to make this a universal statement. And it is clearly a matter of enormous difficulty for Parliament to supply the place of the influence and discipline of home. What is the real extent of the evil? How does it affect prejudicially? And what is the best remedy? How can we best arrive at the facts? There is room here for united action.—I am, etc.,

J. F. NEWCASTLE.

## THE VESTMENTS QUESTION.

Sir,—A controversy on ecclesiastical matters is generally both interesting and instructive, but should always be kept free from such personal reference as that introduced by the dean in his letter in Friday's "Herald." I have heard of the "Newcastle Churchman," and believe a Cathedral magazine exists, but may I suggest that controversy on a matter which "concerns Anglicans" generally would be noticed by very few if confined to the limited circulation of parochial publications.—I am, etc.,

"PLAY THE GAME."

## THE VESTMENTS QUESTION.

Sir,—A recent issue of a local church magazine, which has been widely circulated, contains an unsigned article affecting to deal with the vestments question from a historical point of view. This article has a curious gap in the recitation of the history of the question, and the omission is so pertinent to the question at issue, and so fatal to the position the writer has assumed, that one is constrained, in the name of truth, to protest. After all for the ordinary layman in questions of law the matter is fairly simple. We have one only final court of appeal in all matters concerning the interpretation of law, and that the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, which is composed of men "who are no mean scholars or unlearned historians." Now, in 1871 in the case of Hebbert v. Purchas, this final Court of Appeal decided that "the defendant, Mr. Purchas, has offended against the laws ecclesiastical in wearing the chasuble, alb, and tunicle; and that a monition shall issue against the defendant accordingly." Again in 1877, the Privy Council allowed the question to be reargued before them in the Ridsdale case, and on May 12, 1877, their Lordships gave judgment confirming the decision appealed against. The Lord Chancellor, in delivering judgment, said: "The conclusion drawn by this committee in Hebbert v. Purchas that the Advertisements of Queen Elizabeth on this subject had the force of law under 1 Eliz., cap. 2, section 25, appears to their Lordships to be not only warranted but irresistible." The full text of the judgment shows that the matter was examined very fully from a historical point of view. The Elizabethan Act (1559) in section 25, provided for the ornaments of the church and ministers "until other order shall be therein taken by authority of the Queen's Majesty;" and 1566 "other order" was taken in the Advertisements of that year, and that "order" has been decided by the highest Court of Appeal to be the law of the Church of England. The omission of all reference to these Advertisements is obviously the most important inaccuracy in the article referred to, but unfortunately it is by no means the only one.—I am, etc.,

STEPHEN TAYLOR.

St. John's Rectory.

## Appointment to Gresford Parish.

Yesterday afternoon, after the conclusion of the induction service at St Mary's, the presentation board met in the vestry of St Paul's Church to consider the filling of the vacancy in the parish of Gresford. The parochial representatives were Messrs. James Boydell, Richard Boydell, and Joseph Cooper. His Lordship the Bishop of the diocese was present and submitted the names of six clergymen for the consideration of the Board. After consideration, the choice fell upon the Rev. Stephen Taylor, B.A., a clergyman of the Sydney diocese. Mr. Taylor should prove a strong accession to the ranks of the clergy of the diocese. He is a comparatively young man, and the son of the Rev. Canon Taylor, of Newtown. He is a scholar of Cambridge University, and was Senior Optime in his year. He was ordained in 1893. For a year he was Acting Principal of Moore College, Sydney, and is at present curate to his father at Newtown.

THE REV. STEPHEN TAYLOR.—The career of this young clergyman, the new curate of St. Stephen's, is well calculated to stimulate the best energies of our colonial youth. He is the fourth son of Canon Taylor, and has been preparing for some years for the work to which he is now called. He was educated at the Sydney Grammar School, and passed with credit the various examinations, including the junior and senior of the Sydney University. Six years and a half ago he went to Cambridge and entered as sizar at Corpus Christi College. There he gained a Manner's scholarship and graduated B.A. (senior optime), 1892. After that (for a short time) he held the appointment of senior mathematical tutor at the Church Missionary Children's Home. Thence he proceeded to complete his Cambridge course at Ridley Hall, under the Rev. Dr. H. C. G. Moule. In 1893 he was ordained deacon by the Bishop of Manchester, and was the appointed Gos-peller at the ordination service. From that time until he left England to curate under the Rev. H. J. B. Armstrong, vicar of Eccles, near Manchester, he received priest's orders in 1894. 1895 he married a daughter of the Rev. J. Stott, for many years vicar of Walsley, near Bolton. Mr. Taylor seems to have made many friends during his curacy in Eccles. This was shown by the many valuable and useful presents which were made to him on his departure by his vicar, the congregation, the schools, and private friends.