

[TO THE EDITOR OF THE "SPECTATOR."]

SIR,—When your correspondent, Mr. Fletcher, asks,—“Can any one lay his hand on a statute which has established the Church of England?” he surely asks what is a very unpractical question. For even if it were not possible to refer to the several statutes known as the Reformation Statutes, as well as to various statutes in which the phrases “the Church of England as by law established” and “the Established Church” are to be found, can any one deny that the State upholds, and regulates the affairs of, the Church of England, by means of Acts of Parliament and of administrative arrangements, in a sense altogether different to that in which it interferes with the government of other Churches? That is what is meant by “Establishment,” and it matters very little in what particular phraseology the Church so established is referred to in public documents. It is a matter of *things*, rather than of *words*.

I may add, however, that in the Coronation Oath the Sovereign promises not only to maintain “the laws of God, the true profession of the Gospel, and the Protestant Reformed Religion established by law,” but also “the settlement of the United Churches of England and Ireland, and the doctrine, worship, discipline, and government thereof, as by law established,” together with the rights and privileges appertaining to the Bishops and Clergy.

It is also a curious fact that in the original draft of the petition of the Seven Bishops to James II., relative to the Royal declaration on liberty of conscience, presented on behalf of themselves and the Clergy—a fac-simile of which is given in Cardwell’s “Documentary Annals of the Reformed Church of England,” and which is in the handwriting of Archbishop Sancroft, the form of subscription is, “Your Majesty’s most faithful, loyal, and obedient subjects and servants, the Clergy of the Church of England by law established.” This was altered to “the Clergy of the Established Church of England,” and although in the petition as actually presented neither of these forms appears, they show that the phraseology, which some persons appear to think is of modern origin, was in current use at that period, and that the recent Royal Commission has simply followed both usage and legislation in recommending that the Judges of the Provincial Courts and the Final Court of Appeal should be required to declare themselves to be members of “the Church of England as by law established.” As the Commissioners apparently undertook to describe the exact constitutional position of the Church, the fact that they adopt such language may be regarded as some proof of its strict accuracy.—I am, Sir, &c.,

Serjeants’ Inn, October 24th.

J. CARVELL WILLIAMS.

#### MR. BRIGHT AND THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

[TO THE EDITOR OF THE "SPECTATOR."]

SIR,—In your notice last week of Mr. H. H. Fowler’s address to his constituents at Wolverhampton, I find the following words:—“When Mr. Fowler asked why the House of Lords should not be reformed, Wolverhampton cheered him most lustily,—and we wish the Conservative leaders in the Peers would carefully watch the growing signs of public impatience with which their obstructive attitude towards Liberal measures is received.” At the immense meeting in the Town Hall which Mr. Bright addressed during the Leeds Conference, there was no part of his speech which was more lustily and emphatically cheered than that in which he referred to the reform of the House of Lords.

Almost before the first sentence which introduced this question was concluded, the whole audience broke forth into a ringing and deafening cheer. A more unmistakable evidence of the growing impatience of the people at the obstructive attitude of the House of Lords could not be found, especially when we remember that the 4,000 men and women who crowded the Victoria Hall on that occasion did not represent merely the somewhat pronounced Liberalism of the largest Yorkshire borough, but also represented the public opinion of 500 Liberal associations in all parts of the country. This fact gives additional force to your suggestion that the leaders of the Conservative Peers would do well to take notice of this significant sign of the times, for if they foolishly determine to ignore it, they will do much to bring on that conflict between the two Houses of Parliament which, as Mr. Bright said, “is full of peril to one of them, and full of humiliation to both of them.”—I am, Sir, &c.,

197 Belle Vue Road, Leeds.

BENJAMIN G. WILKINSON.

#### JUSTICE TO IRELAND.

[TO THE EDITOR OF THE "SPECTATOR."]

SIR,—In your article of October 20th on “Disintegration,” you say:—“Nor is there much more use in considering whether Irish hatred is incurable or otherwise. If it is not, we are taking all the means we can to cure it; and if it is, we must still take the same means, and endure the resulting failure as we best may.” This is terribly cold comfort to all those who have been induced to follow the lead of the authors of the great measures passed to conciliate Ireland. Hear Mr. Bright on the Church Disestablishment Bill of 1869 (*Annual Register*, 1869, p. 37):—“I say when I look at this measure, I look at it as tending to a more true and solid union between Ireland and Great Britain. I see it giving tranquillity to our people.” Hear Mr. Gladstone on the Land Bill of 1870 (*Annual Register* 1870, p. 39):—“Hesitate, then, I beseech you, for a moment before you run the risk of lighting a flame which you will in vain labour to extinguish, lest it should be the unhappy fate of your country that after she has surmounted every difficulty, borne every calamity, and conquered every enemy, she should at length miss the prize of national peace, happiness, and contentment, through the agency of those whom she believed to be her friends.” Again, he says, on the Land Bill of 1881 (*Annual Register*, 1881, p. 99), “Then the year 1881 will not have passed without adding to the Statute Book another great emancipating and redeeming measure, necessary alike for the prosperity of Ireland, the fame of Parliament, and the strength and solidity of the United Kingdom.” These were pointed to again and again as the “fruits of justice,” and for these great ends were those measures passed. And it is a terrible commentary that in 1883 we find the *Spectator*, instead of being able to point to these fruits of justice, the peace and contentment of Ireland, and the “solidity of the United Kingdom,” forced by the discontent and sedition which exist to be thankful that, with a formidable army and a splendid force of constabulary present amongst them, there is “no fear of rebellion in Ireland.”

I am myself a Liberal, and have agreed to the principles of all the great measures passed by the Liberal Party. But I think, as honest men, we are bound to suspect something wrong, when we find our measures bearing such disappointing fruits.—I am, Sir, &c.,

J. W.

#### PHYSIOLOGICAL EXPERIMENT AND PHYSIOLOGICAL SPECULATION.

[TO THE EDITOR OF THE "SPECTATOR."]

SIR,—The question has been raised in your columns as to whether physical injuries are ever transmitted from parent to offspring. Permit me to say that certain experiments recorded by an eminent physiologist throw an important light on this question. As these were experiments on live animals, the *Spectator* could not be expected to republish or to make use of them.

It appears to me a matter for regret that the ingenious speculations of the *Spectator* should be cut short by its inability to make use of knowledge gained by a method of which it disapproves.

I can hardly be wrong in assuming that you would not wish to encourage or give value to the work of Vivisectionists. The experimental results to which I have above referred would furnish you with decisive information; but is it not considered objectionable for one and the same person to run with the hare and to hunt with the hounds?—I am, Sir, &c.,

E. RAY LANKESTER.

11 Wellington Mansions, North Bank, N.W.

[Did any sane man ever scruple to avail himself of sound knowledge, whether that knowledge ought, or ought not to have been available? Professor Lankester might just as well say that because some of Napoleon’s campaigns were gigantic crimes, strategists who disapproved them ought to be regarded as both “running with the hare and hunting with the hounds,” if they made use of them in writing on military strategy. Any such scruple would be idiotic. But none the less, Napoleon would not have been justified for making those campaigns on the ground that he was going to add greatly to the resources of military science, by the huge vivisectional experiments he was about to make.—Ed. *Spectator*.]

#### ANTHONY TROLLOPE’S “AUTOBIOGRAPHY.”

[TO THE EDITOR OF THE "SPECTATOR."]

SIR,—In your review of Anthony Trollope’s “Autobiography” you say:—“His own explanation” of his unpopularity “is that