

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

We have pleasure in recommending a very readable story by ELLA STONE, published by Messrs. Nisbet, *Grace Murray*. The character and life of the heroine are admirably portrayed. The doctor did not "propose" to Grace, but to Nellie. It is a touching scene—years afterwards, Grace promising the dying father, a widower, that his children should receive from her a mother's love and care. The religious tone of the tale is excellent.

Short Biographies for the People. Vol II. is like Vol. I., very good. The new biographical series of the Religious Tract Society has more than once been commended in these pages.

The Annual volumes of the *Boy's Own Paper* and the *Girl's Own Paper* are as attractive and interesting as usual. Wonderfully cheap. The monthly numbers have been several times noticed in these pages.

° ° Several notices of new books are unavoidably deferred.



THE MONTH.

THE TWENTY-FIFTH CHURCH CONGRESS was held at Portsmouth; and some of those who took part in the proceedings—representative men, well qualified to express an opinion on the point—observe that the Congress of 1885 will favourably compare with not a few of its predecessors. An esteemed correspondent writes to us: "There was a very good tone at this Congress—no friction, the most perfect temper; and I am sure it will do good. As to numbers, it was rather a disappointment; the elections were an adverse influence." The absence of influential laymen is probably to be accounted for upon political grounds. "Church and State" was naturally the key-note of the sermons and the most striking speeches.

On Monday evening at an enthusiastic assemblage of the C.E.T.S., in the Congress Hall, Bishop Wilberforce presiding, Canon Ellison, the founder of the Society, stated that the members now number 650,000, while there are branches for women, agricultural labourers, soldiers, merchant seamen, etc.; and that, by the co-operation of the Missions for Seamen Society, 24,000 pledges had been taken among the sailors. Alluding to the immense help that the Society had experienced in the grand organization of the Church of England, he wound up, amidst enthusiastic cheers, by saying that he believed the work of the C.E.T.S. would teach a large majority of our countrymen to write after the word "Dis-establishment" "NEVER."

The Congress sermons on Tuesday morning were preached by the Bishops of Carlisle, Derry, and Ripon. The Bishop of

Carlisle, in the parish church, taking for his text, " Watchman, what of the night ? . . ." thus concluded :

Who is sufficient for these things ? For these things ! Nay, I have but touched the tithe of that which has to be done in this dear old England, which with all its faults we still love with the dearest affection of true children's hearts. Who is sufficient ? Well, Christian brethren, no person, or party, or organization, or Church is sufficient to do these things ; but of this I am certain, that the Church of England can do more than any other existing instrumentality to carry forward the whole work of God and His Christ. I believe she is doing more ; and while doing it she does not interfere with others, who are trying to do the work in their own way ; she raises no voice in favour of crippling other religious bodies ; her churches are open to all without exception ; her ministers minister to all who are willing to accept their ministry ; the very principle of her life and operation is that of pure, simple, unbounded charity. I cannot believe that Englishmen will allow their Church to be thrown down. The day must be coming as well as the night. The light which has shone hitherto cannot be doomed to diminution : extinction is impossible, for it is the light of Christ. O ye statesmen, O ye members of Parliament, O ye old voters and ye newly enfranchised millions, put aside all party feelings as concerns this great question ! make up your minds that the Church of your fathers shall be the Church of your children ! purge her that she may bring forth more fruit ! strengthen her where she needs strengthening ! supply what is wanted ! renew that which is decaying ! but do not give her over to her enemies, do not cripple her usefulness, do not combine to lay her in the dust.

A very pleasing incident formed a prelude to the opening of the Congress. As soon as the President (the venerable Bishop of Winchester) had reached the platform the Mayor and Corporation, in their full-dress robes, were introduced, and the Mayor, who is himself a Nonconformist, in a few well-chosen sentences, offered to the Congress, in the name of the Corporation, a hearty welcome to Portsmouth. He cordially acknowledged the great and successful work of the Church of England, and assured the Bishop of the sincere prayers of himself and co-religionists for the success of the Congress. The Bishop thanked the Mayor in the name of the Congress for the hearty welcome accorded them. Upon the retirement of the Corporation, Mr. Griffin, J.P., appeared on the platform leading a goodly body of Nonconformists, and read an address, conceived in a truly catholic spirit, and expressed in language of Christian generosity.

In his opening address the President spoke of the various subjects to be debated, and of the Congress itself :

This is an era in its history [said the Bishop]. It has lived and worked for just a quarter of a century. Five-and-twenty years ago it was a new and doubtful experiment. It has steadily won its way. It has held its annual sittings in every part of England, once in Ireland, and once in Wales. It shows no signs of decadence, as it grows in age. This is a proof that it has met a want, and in part has satisfied it.

My right rev. brother, who presided last year at the Carlisle Congress, referred to the revival of Convocation some years earlier, in

1852, and to the feeling which then grew up in favour of consultation with laymen as supplementary to the reanimated councils of the clergy. I am the only living Bishop, I am one of but three or four of the clergy now living, who sat and took part in that Convocation of 1852, after its voice had been silent for some century and a quarter. I can well say that we who then met together in but small numbers at the Jerusalem Chamber, rejoiced with trembling. Parliament was hostile to us; public opinion was unfavourable to us; Church and even clerical opinion was divided concerning us. By the year 1860, however, Convocation had, newly established its constitutional right to meet and to debate. Still there was an anxious questioning whether there ought not to be a lay element either in Convocation itself or outside of Convocation, but able to take common counsel with it. Difficulties of many kinds were in the way, and perhaps happily in the way. It is due to the zeal and energy of two clergymen, both at that time Fellows of Colleges at Cambridge—one of whom has (alas for us!) passed to his rest, the other with us still, thank God—that this expedient of a Church Congress was devised and tried.¹ It met first at Cambridge in the Hall of King's College. The numbers were small. The College Hall could have held twice as many. The Bishop of the Diocese was too old and feeble to preside. The Archdeacon of Ely represented him. There was no member of the Home Episcopate with us. My old and revered tutor at Eton, Bishop Chapman, formerly Bishop of Colombo, was the only representative of the then living Bishops. But the meeting was a success; so much of a success that it was resolved to repeat it the next year at Oxford. Bishop Wilberforce gave it his presence and countenance, and it has ever since gone on growing and advancing.

The first subject handled in the Congress Hall was the Revised Version of the Old Testament. Papers were read by the Bishop of Bath and Wells and Dr. Driver; Professor Kirkpatrick, Dr. Wright, and others spoke.

The opening paper on "Church Work among Men" was read by Rev. George Everard. The Hon. J. G. Adderley spoke of Working Men's Clubs in the East-end.

At the meeting on the Prayer Book, a very practical paper was read by Canon Venables, Vicar of Great Yarmouth, whose contribution to *THE CHURCHMAN* on this subject some of our readers may remember ("Liturgical Improvements," *CHURCHMAN*, vol. vii., p. 194). As to rearrangement of existing Services, said Canon Venables, no great change was needed; the chief one was a shortening of the Baptismal Office, so that it might always take place in the service. But there should be a liberal interpretation of the rubrics. He thought that a few additions and varieties to some existing Offices were needed. He submitted, thirdly, that the enrichment of the Book of Common Prayer is required. Among the needs he specified a third Sunday service, a hearty office for the institution of an

¹ The Rev. W. Beaumont was one of the founders. A presentation was made, by Bishop Harold Browne, to the other founder, Archdeacon Emery, to whose energy, tact, ability, and generous sympathies, the success of the Congress is so greatly due.

Incumbent, and a catechism of leading events from the Day of Pentecost. He said: "I believe great benefits would be secured if under episcopal authority such services were permitted as would be little more than such as many pious Dissenters are accustomed to hold within their own houses of meeting, much though I dislike them." Another paper was read by the Rev. A. J. Robinson, Rector of Whitechapel.

The Working Men's Meeting was a great success. There was a most attentive audience; and the necessary overflow meeting was large. After the singing of the Old Hundredth and the repetition of the Lord's Prayer, a telegram was read by Archdeacon Emery from the Leicester Congress of Railway Servants, calling upon the Church Congress Meeting of Working Men to join them in resisting any further encroachments on the day of rest. The Bishop of Winchester, who presided, began by putting this request to the vote, and it was agreed by acclamation to accede to it. The Bishop of Carlisle, as usual, made a very effective speech. His Lordship's points in regard to the Church as the Church of the people were heartily applauded. The Dean of Gloucester, also, referred to the Disestablishment agitation, and, although there was evidently a good sprinkling of Liberationists present, the great bulk of the meeting cheered to the echo all references to the good work the Church has done for the people and the loss the poor would suffer if Disestablishment became an accomplished fact.

The subject of Emigration was worthily debated. The Bishop of Newcastle, who presided, read the first paper. The Bishop repeated the United States oath of naturalization, in which stress is particularly laid upon abjuring Queen Victoria, "of whom I was formerly subject," and expressed a wish that the tide of emigration should be as much as possible directed to our own colonies. The Hon. Mrs. Joyce, in an admirable paper, said, according to Mr. Samuel Smith, if our population went on increasing at its present rate it would be 150,000,000 by the close of the century. A practical paper by the Rev. J. F. Kitto, who was away in Canada studying this question on the spot, was read. Mr. Kitto was not aware of any case in which the Church of England had taken the oversight of a new colony, but on this point Captain Field, in the discussion, referred to the establishment of the Canterbury colony in New Zealand, in which an original shareholder having kept his share, found the £25 share now worth £24,000. The Rev. J. Bridger, the indefatigable Emigration Chaplain, mentioned the thriving condition of the nineteen families sent from the Rev. H. Huleatt's Bethnal Green Parish at the expense of the Baroness Burdett Coutts. Having secured the Sherbrooke Home, he was going to take out the last of his first

batch of girls. He was trying to get a home for boys. He proposed that each English diocese should raise £5,000 to be employed in loans in kind to emigrants, and to found each a settlement to be named after the diocese. The Rev. H. C. Marriott Watson, from New Zealand, as one born abroad, was struck with the depression of London, and explained that their periods of depression were due to functional derangement, whilst in England they seemed due to organic causes. The New Zealand labourer's Magna Charta was :

Eight hours' work, and eight hours' play,
Eight hours' sleep, and eight bob a day.

"The Teaching Work of the Church" attracted a large assemblage. Canon Westcott was enthusiastically welcomed, and his paper, of course, was rich and emphatic.

Among the many subjects discussed by the Congress, writes the *Record* correspondent, none has excited so much real enthusiasm and drawn together so large an assembly of members as the question of Church Defence.¹ The Bishop of Winchester, at the opening, remarked that the subject was not a political one; and he hoped it would not be treated in a

¹ An important Conference of members was held on the platform at the close of the Thursday afternoon sitting. Some 200 leading and influential gentlemen, both clerical and lay, remained behind to discuss what plan of action should be adopted in defence of the Church from the danger with which she is threatened. Mr. Beresford Hope remarked that Church Defence was a very pressing duty just now. Archdeacon Emery, who had convened the Conference, spoke of Mr. Chamberlain's proposals for free education as a conspiracy against the National Church. All present were thoroughly with him in this, and, indeed, the meeting throughout was of a most enthusiastic character. He declared that it was the absolute duty of Churchmen at this crisis to take steps at once to let it be known how tremendous was the danger threatening the Church, and to stir up the nation at large on the subject. In his own Archdeaconry, he said, a Vigilance Committee had been formed, and if every Archdeacon and Rural Dean, yea, every clergyman, were to take up the work vigorously, he said it would not be too late, even now, to ward off the attack. He pointed out that it was essential that they have some Society as a basis for their operations, and he recommended that it should be the Church Defence Institution. He moved: "That this meeting, recognizing the great work which is done by the Church Defence Institution through its lectures and publications, commends it to the liberal and immediate support of all Churchmen at this time." Bishop Macdougall, Archdeacon of the Isle of Wight, seconded the proposal. The Church had to her hand in her parochial system, he said, an organization which nothing could equal. Several members then made practical suggestions, and all agreed that if anything were to be done it must be done *at once*. It was encouraging to hear from the Rev. H. G. Dickson (writes the *Record* correspondent), the Secretary of the C.D.I., who was better capable of judging than most other men, that the country is already arising to the importance of this question, and he prophesied that if we only organized the matter at once we shall win all along the line.

political spirit. Some of those present were Liberals and some were Conservatives, while some of them were both Liberal and Conservative. They were Liberal in that they were desirous to remove all abuses, and Conservative in that they desired to retain and preserve all that was good. They might therefore be Liberals or Conservatives or both; but whatever political party they belonged to, he felt he might confidently say that before all things they were Churchmen—all Churchmen to the backbone. Mr. Moore (author of "The Englishman's Brief") and Mr. Beresford Hope read the Papers. Dr. Jessop and Prebendary Harry Jones were the selected speakers. Mr. Dale Hart, the Rev. Henry Roe, Canon McCormick, Mr. Bemrose (the well-known publisher), Archdeacon Emery, Canon Eliot, and Canon Hoare were called upon to speak.

On rising to deliver what must justly be termed a noble speech, writes the *Record* correspondent, Dr. McCormick was enthusiastically received by the Congress. He spoke of the work of the Church concerning philanthropy, and in connection with this mentioned the work of the lamented Earl of Shaftesbury as that of a Churchman and a peer of the realm. Need I add that the mention of that revered name was the signal for loud applause in all parts of the hall. "Lord Shaftesbury," Canon McCormick added, "is the answer to the calumnies that are cast against the upper classes." He warned the meeting not to unduly magnify the fact that the Church is the Church of the poor, for it is the Church of all classes alike, and he charged the Liberationist Society with widening the breach that existed between Churchmen and their Dissenting brethren.

At the Soldiers' and Sailors' Meeting, the Rev. J. E. C. Welldon, Headmaster of Harrow, said that, after the last Congress, one of the *Sécularist* papers dubbed him "a conceited young beetle":

He pathetically recounted the losses Harrow had suffered in old Harrovians; amongst whom, tablets to General Earle, Lord St. Vincent, and Colonel Burnaby were in the Harrow Chapel. He further told them the masters and lads had raised enough in the school to nominate one boy to the Gordon Camp, and he that day had attended the funeral service of Lord Shaftesbury, who was an old Harrovian, and in whose funeral procession was a detachment from the Shaftesbury training ship. If there was one name of which a public school might be proud, it was that name.

At a special meeting for Working Women, Bishop Wilberforce, Canon Venables, the Rev. A. J. Robinson, and others, made appropriate speeches.

Among all the weary and anxious news which comes from Ireland, the following paragraph will give widespread pleasure and satisfaction:

The Lord-Lieutenant has addressed a letter to Lord Plunket, Archbishop of Dublin, in which he states that he has thought it right to

obtain for his information and guidance the opinions of the Law Officers of the Crown on the subject of the legality of the title "Church of Ireland." They are of opinion that this matter has "been practically settled by the Legislature, and that the title of the distabished Church in Ireland is 'the Church of Ireland.'"

The Archbishop of Canterbury has put forth three Forms of Prayer in reference to the approaching General Election. One of them, which may be used in Divine Service, is the prayer for the High Court of Parliament, with slight alterations.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer, at Salisbury, counselled electors to require from candidates a distinct pledge upon two questions—the Disestablishment and Disendowment of the Church, and the maintenance of the hereditary principle in the House of Lords.

In an article headed "The Radical Programme," the *Spectator* says :

We cannot approve or support the methods by which the Radical chiefs seem determined to seek their beneficial ends. They seem to us to be wandering out of the path of Liberal tradition by keeping to which we have advanced so far, and to be plunging into that Socialist wilderness within which wild beasts crouch.

The scent of bribery is in it [*i.e.*, the Programme]. We hold it to be a frightful misfortune—a misfortune which may demoralize a generation—that, just when the Democracy has been enthroned, Liberal leaders should go before it and offer direct pecuniary inducements in return for power. Instead of asking the new voters for sacrifices, instead of bringing home to them responsibilities, instead of even offering them cautions, Radical speakers say : "Give us but power, and you shall all be happy. Your children's school-fees shall be paid for you. You shall have stores to cheapen groceries in every village. You shall have the land you want at less than the market price. You shall, through the Councils, be your own landlord, and you shall be as well housed as your betters, yet pay the rent you pay already." Mr. Chamberlain actually declared on Wednesday that he thought it possible to make poverty cease out of the land ; and he never makes a speech which has not for its real drift that whatever happens, and whoever suffers, the poor, that vast corporation to which every one who works with his hands claims to belong, shall be made comfortable at last. What is that but bribery ?

At the Peterborough Diocesan Conference a masterly paper on the question of the day was read by the Bishop. It will, no doubt, be largely circulated.

At Monmouth, the Premier gave an answer to the Midlothian Manifesto. Lord Salisbury spoke with effect upon the Land Question, Local Government, Religious Education, and the National Church. He suggested the sale of glebe lands, we gladly note (a permission we have long pleaded for), a method of increasing the number of labourers' allotments which, as the *Guardian* remarks, "is, at any rate, more practicable than Mr. Chamberlain's plan." On the National Church he said :

You have read, no doubt, what I call that long and dreary epistle from

the retirement of the late Prime Minister. You have seen how, amid other things, he has consigned to the category of doubtful matters which depend upon the majority of voices, his convictions and his course in reference to the Established Church of these islands. It is his last surrender, it is the last of the opinions of his youth that he has given up, that he has sacrificed upon the altar of party. ("Shame!") I could have wished that this crowning abandonment of the convictions of his youth had been spared to us. I confess I never believed that I should see Mr. Gladstone among those who would attempt to disestablish and disendow the Church of these islands. It means that the time of ultimate and supreme conflict is at hand—that the danger which we have foreseen for many days is now close at our doors.

In an able article on Lord Salisbury's Newport speech, the *Guardian* says it will reassure Conservatives and attract Moderate Liberals. The *Guardian* proceeds: "Lord Salisbury is in possession. If a Moderate Liberal helps to turn him out of office, in whose favour and for whose benefit will he be working? Nominally, and for the moment, in favour and for the benefit of Mr. Gladstone. Really, and after a short, possibly a very short interval, in favour and for the benefit of Mr. Chamberlain. The vote of a Moderate Liberal, then, should be determined by this consideration. In the last resort, and assuming the choice to lie between the two, does Mr. Chamberlain's programme embody my conviction and wishes better than Lord Salisbury's programme?"

THE INTEREST OF THE PEOPLE OF ENGLAND IN THE MAINTENANCE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AS A NATIONAL CHURCH.

THE following paper was read at the Peterborough Diocesan Conference, October 15th, by the Very Rev. J. J. S. Perowne, D.D., Dean of Peterborough:

MY LORD,

It is under a very deep sense of responsibility that I rise to open at your Lordship's desire the discussion on the subject which stands upon the paper, "The Interest of the People of England in the Maintenance of the Church of England as a National Church," and to move the Resolution of which I have given notice. Your Lordship reminded us yesterday that it would be well if those who use terms would be precise in the definition of their meaning. I am not responsible for the way in which this proposition has been framed which we are invited to discuss. But if it will help us to a clear conception of the subject, I will venture to say that I understand by the National Church, not the Church of the Reformation only, nor the Church of Augustine only, but that Church which, owing its existence to the earliest Christian missionaries who set foot on our shores, has ever since been part of our national history, entwined with all our institutions, more ancient than some that are most venerable, older by some hundreds of years than the House of Commons itself, which is now asked to get rid of it as a useless and even pestilent excrescence on the national life. By the maintenance of that Church I

mean the maintenance of it in its integrity as an essential portion of the constitution. I do not mean the maintenance of the abuses. There are abuses which I think every honest and loyal Churchman must deplore, and the reform of which ought not to be delayed. Depend upon it, if we do not show that we are alive to these abuses, and determined to put an end to them, they will very speedily put an end to us. We must not live in a dreamland, and flatter ourselves on the perfection of our own system, and think that all are enemies who presume to probe our wounds and sores. "The best friends of religion," says an eminent Nonconformist minister in London, Mr. Statham, "are those who see that the Church needs reform, and not disestablishment, and who realize that in her service there might be a glorious sphere for the permanent preservation of the Christian faith in an orderly and beautiful service, which would preserve alike the verities of the Christian faith and the sanctities of spiritual and social life."

By the people of England I understand not one section of the community, nor the new electorate of which we hear so much, nor those who are commonly described as "the masses"—meaning thereby our working population—but all classes of the nation, and, I will add, all members of other Churches and denominations, for I believe that all classes and all Churches have an interest in the maintenance of the National Church, as the one great conspicuous witness against ungodliness and vice, against the immorality and the scepticism, the wide-spread existence of which we all confess and all alike deplore.

So much, my Lord, by way of definition. And now I venture to say that this subject is one the importance of which at the present moment can hardly be exaggerated. It is one which we must face, whether we like it or not. We cannot be blind to the signs of the times. "Watchman, what of the night?" The Watchman said, "The night cometh, and also the morning; if ye will inquire, inquire ye." And we are driven to inquire. We cannot disguise from ourselves the fact that the tendency is all in one direction. There is a levelling tendency—a tendency to get rid of everything which wears even the semblance of privilege. Not only in our own country, but in other countries, we see a gradual but very marked progress of opinion in this respect. The wave may recede here and there for a time, but each returning tide leaves its mark higher up on the shore. All institutions are on their trial, and the Church cannot expect to escape. A little while ago we should have flattered ourselves that the question had been laid to rest. In spite of the persistent efforts of the Liberation Society, as by a grim irony it styles itself, the force of the agitation seemed spent; the subject, we were told on high authority, was not one which came within the sphere of practical politics; but this is so no longer. There is a spirit abroad which must be dealt with. In the minds of religious men it takes the form of a conviction that any and every connection between the Church and the State is wrong; and in the minds of irreligious men it takes the form of a determination to destroy that which gives to religion its chief support.

What is the language we hear from the other side of the Channel? Perhaps we may extract a little comfort from it. An eloquent and learned French Protestant divine, who is also an ardent Liberationist (M. de Pressensé, writes: "The question of the separation of Church and State has come to the front throughout the whole of this electoral campaign. It is one of the burning questions of the day, and its solution cannot be long delayed. Yet, judging from the general tenor of the electoral programme of the moderate Republican party, I conclude that immediate legislation on the subject is not to be looked for. The deputies have evidently felt that the country was not yet ready for so great a change, and that it would be dangerous to press it. The imprudence with which

the Radicals in their electoral assemblies have urged the immediate suppression of the budget of worship without any measures of transition or compensation, and with the further prospect of the confiscation of the entire property of the Church, by whatever tenure it is held, has done not a little to incline moderate Republicans to the side of patience." And he quotes the words of M. Goblet, the minister of worship in France, who, avowing his wish to see the Church separated from the State, nevertheless proposes to secure to it its churches and manses, and the offerings made for the purpose of religious worship. There we see something of a reaction, something of that large and liberal measure dealt out to the Disestablished Church, with which we on this side of the Channel have been bidden to comfort ourselves.

But whatever may be the case in France, we cannot say that there is the same disposition here. Candidates at the coming election in November have not made up their minds that "the country is not yet ready for so great a change, and that it would be dangerous to press it." Four hundred candidates have taken up the political watchword of the Liberationists, and some, at least, of them are quite prepared to deal with the subject in the next Session of Parliament. We are within measurable distance of the struggle. And what may well excite, I will not say our alarm, but our watchfulness, is this: that statesmen to whom we might once have looked for support, are now wavering and ready to desert us.

We are all familiar with the mournful spectacle which was presented to us a few years ago as the outcome of Disestablishment. It was the tragic and harrowing picture of "a bleeding and lacerated mass." But now the oil of consolation is poured into those terrible and gaping wounds, and we are invited to console ourselves with the assurance that, whatever may happen, there is such "vitality" in the National Church that it "will be found equal to all the needs of the occasion." Disestablishment will no longer leave behind it "a bleeding and lacerated mass;" it will only be "a great modification of our inherited institutions."

I think it very important to draw attention to the changed attitude of many of our leading statesmen.

What was the language of Mr. Gladstone in May, 1870, in reply to the Resolution brought forward by Mr. Watkin Williams, the then Member for Denbigh, in favour of Disestablishment in Wales? After observing that "the real question which the mover of the resolution endeavoured to raise was the Disestablishment of the Church of England," he said:

I am bound to say my belief is that the Established Church of England is the religion of a considerable majority of the people of this country. I can only say that, independent of that which appears to establish a good *primâ facie* ground for remaining where we are, I do not envy my hon. and learned friend, or my hon. friend the Member for Merthyr Tydvil (Mr. Richard), or any other man who ventures to take in hand the business of disestablishing the Church of England. Even if it were as fit to be done as I think it unfit, there is a difficulty in the case before which the boldest man would recoil. It is all very well so long as we deal with abstract declarations put upon the notice-paper of this House of what should be done or ought to be done; but only go up to the walls and gates and look at the way in which stone is built upon stone, on the way in which the foundations have been dug, and the way they go down into the earth, and consider by what tools, what artillery, you can bring that fabric to the ground. I know the difficulties, and I am not prepared in any shape or form to encourage—by dealing with my hon. and learned friend's motion in any way except the simple mode of negative—the creation of expectation which *it would be most guilty, most unworthy, and most dishonourable on our part to entertain*, lest we should convey a virtual pledge. *We cannot go in that direction; we do not intend to do so; we deprecate it, and would regard it as a national mischief.*

That was the language of Mr. Gladstone in 1870. What is it in 1885?

We are merely encouraged to hope that Disestablishment is in the courses of the distant future, not in the immediate future ; that whenever it takes place it will be done because the people wish it, and that it will be effected with a large observance of the principles of equity and liberality. Not one word is there to imply that it would be an act of shameful wrong. Events we know move quickly. Changes are made by leaps and bounds. Opinions which are only opinions, and not principles, go down like corn before the sickle, though they may have been expressed with a vigour which gave them some show of consistency. Saddest of all, political expediency seems in the case of some of our most eminent statesmen to have taken the place of principle. Each politician sets his sail to catch the *popularis aura*, and never considers on what rocks or quicksands the vessel of the State will be driven. And so one politician—a man of whom we might have hoped better things—tells the people of Scotland that it is for them to settle the question for themselves ; and another and a more eminent statesman, whose strong attachment to the Church of England was once the very foundation of his political creed, has told the people of England that this is a question which they must settle for themselves. I have heard, my Lord, of following a multitude to do evil ; I never heard of following a multitude to do good, though I can quite conceive it possible that you may *lead* a multitude to do good. Of course this is a question which will be settled by a Parliamentary majority ! What are we to think of statesmen who deal in this easy fashion with one of the gravest of all problems—with a problem which affects the deepest interests of the nation, because it touches the very core of the religious life of the nation. What are we to think of statesmen who on such a question as this have no convictions—who treat it simply as a question of the hour ; with whom the first and last article of their political creed is *Vox populi, vox Dei* ; who, instead of leading, are willing to be led ; who have not the courage to say, "This is a wrong ; and therefore, if it is to be done, it shall be done by other hands, and not by ours ;" but are willing to do anything at the dictation of a majority—it may be a very blind and a very ignorant majority ? Happily we have listened within the last few days to very different language. We may differ much in our political creed, but I think we shall agree in this.

You will stop me, my Lord, if you think I am becoming too political, but I am speaking from a Church point of view, and not from the point of view of a political party. I cannot help it if one political party chooses to write upon its banner, *Delenda est Ecclesia* ; if it so happens that the leaders of one political party are pledged to uphold the National Church, whilst the leaders of another are either avowedly hostile or avowedly indifferent. I think we are bound, as you told us yesterday, my Lord, to be Churchmen first and politicians afterwards ; and one statesman has told us in language worthy of himself and of the great position which he occupies that he and those who follow him "can hold no ambiguous language" on this question ; that to them "it is a matter of life and death ; that they can admit on these matters no compromise, no hope that they will support any proposal for the overthrow or for the injury of that which they hold dear ;" that the support of that "sacred institution," the Church ("its support by ancient endowments and by the recognition of the authority of the State") which now for generation after generation in Scotland and in England has held up the power of truth, and has maintained the truths of Christianity before the world—to that," not only "as a party," but as honest men and as Christians, they are irrevocably bound." There is the true ring in words like these. And I hope and believe that, whatever may be our political creed, we shall feel that the National Church, which in the hand of God has been the greatest instrument of blessing to this nation—to all classes of the

nation—and I will add to all the various religious bodies which lie outside of her pale, ought not to be sacrificed on the altar of expediency at the bidding of popular clamour. My Lord, I could not plead for the Church if I did not feel that in pleading for the Church I am pleading for the nation. But it is my deepest conviction that to do away with the National Church would be to inflict a terrible blow on the religious life, and therefore also on the prosperity and welfare of the nation. I am glad, therefore, that the subject which has been brought before us for our discussion has been proposed in this *positive* form, and that we are invited to consider “the interest which the people of England have in the maintenance of the National Church.”

And, first of all, they have an interest in its maintenance—because it is the National Church, because it has struck its roots deep into the national life, and is entwined with all its history. I shall be told this is an appeal to sentiment; but there are sentiments which are not weak or visionary, but which are sacred and enduring. The sentiment of national unity, the sentiment of family life, are among the most powerful of human motives. I am sorry for the man who cannot appreciate the force of such sentiments; and for those, at least, who have grown up under the shadow of the Church, who have found her consecrating all their life, and who have sucked the breast of her consolations—to them, the church of their forefathers is something more than a sentiment; it is a sacred and ennobling passion.

There was a time when, in the midst of the throes of the French Revolution, that great orator, philosopher, and statesman, Edmund Burke, could write :

The majority of the English people, far from thinking a religious national Establishment unlawful, hardly think it lawful to be without one. . . This principle runs through the whole system of their polity. They do not consider their church establishment as convenient, but as essential to their State; not as a thing heterogeneous and separable; something added for accommodation; what they may either keep or lay aside according to their temporary ideas of convenience. They consider it as the foundation of their whole constitution, with which, and with every part of which it holds an indissoluble union. Church and State are ideas inseparable in their minds, and scarcely is the one ever mentioned without mentioning the other. (“Reflections on Revolution in France,” Works, vol. iv., pp. 231, 232.)

But besides this we have, in a National Church, a national recognition of God. Is that also a visionary conception? Mr. Henry Richard, in his address to the Congregational Union, in October, 1877, said: “I do not wish to treat this idea with ridicule or scorn. There are many good men who cherish it with great sincerity, and there can be no doubt that in some shadowy indefinable way it appeals strongly to their religious sentiments and feelings. But if they were asked to analyze or define with any precision the vague language in which they were wont to express their convictions on this subject, I believe they would be very much puzzled.” Yes, and I dare say we should most of us be a good deal puzzled if we were asked to define with any precision what we mean by the sentiment of loyalty, or the sentiment of patriotism, or the sentiment of the family; and yet these are some of the strongest of human sentiments, and men have cheerfully given their hearts’ blood rather than deny these sentiments.

But in the next place I plead for the National Church—not only as a great ideal, but as doing a great work in the midst of the nation, and such as no other religious body has done or can do; and that she is doing this by virtue of her union with the State. The people have an interest in the Church because it is the greatest instrument for the evangelization of the multitude, and especially of the poor.

We have lately been reminded very frequently of the condition in which our rural parishes would be left by the Act of Disestablishment. Let us try to look calmly at the facts. What is the state of things at present? The clergyman is often the only resident gentleman in the parish. This is far more commonly the case than it once was. In very many instances there is no resident squire; in others the country gentleman does not reside on his estate, or comes down only for the shooting season. The clergyman then is the centre of benevolence and the centre of civilization; he is the one person to whom the poor can look, to whom they have a right to look, and to whom they do look for assistance. Does a labourer wish to send his child to service or to find him employment? He goes to the clergyman. Does he want to write a letter to a son or daughter who is gone to the Colonies or to America? He is no "scholar," and he asks the clergyman to write it. Does he want assistance in sickness? It is at the Parsonage he finds the medicine and the port wine and the blankets which he needs, and which have often saved the lives of his wife and his children. Does he need advice in his temporal affairs? Who so sure to sympathise with him as his parson? Does he desire the ministrations of religion in spiritual distress or in the hour of death? There is one man whose duty it is to give him the instruction, and the warnings, and the consolations of our most holy faith. And we, many of us, hardly know how entirely a parish is dependent upon the clergyman in this respect. Even in parishes where there are Dissenting chapels the Nonconformist minister is often not resident; he only comes for the Sunday service, and he exercises no pastoral care even over his own congregation. Several instances have recently come under my own observation in which persons who have attended the chapel all their lives have sent for the clergyman in illness, because their own minister had refused or was unable to visit them. Indeed, it is a frequent complaint among Nonconformists that their village congregations are not ministered to, the whole strength of their efforts being concentrated on the towns where they naturally find most support. Nor must we forget, when we speak of the resident clergyman, that he is for the most part a family man; that he has a wife and perhaps daughters who help him in his labour of love. They know the history of every man, woman, and child in the parish, and feel the liveliest interest in all that concerns them. The clothing-clubs and the coal-clubs are their charitable work; they teach in the Sunday school; they visit in the homes; they are the friends of their poorer neighbours, never judging them harshly nor turning a deaf ear to their complaints. Who can calculate the mischief that would follow from the destruction of such a ministry of blessing? For it must be destroyed with the disestablishment of the Church. The Liberationist programme would either secularise the churches, or let rival sects scramble for their possession. The Parsonage, of course, would disappear; and, as the Bishop of Rochester said, "Paganism" would soon recover its ancient and sinister significance. The Church's work would have to be done from missionary centres of celibate clergy, who, if they could supply in some degree the public ministrations of the Church, would in no sense be the pastors of the people. The sick would be left to die without consolation; the poor and afflicted would no longer have the power of claiming or receiving the tender sympathy and personal instruction of their own authorised clergymen; the best and cheapest kind of police for the masses would be suddenly dismissed about their business, and it is no exaggeration to say that the entire country would suffer.

Nor is it only the rural districts which would be deprived of the means of grace. In large towns where unhappily a great separation of classes has taking place, where the gentry for the most part live on the outskirts,

and the poor and labouring population are massed together, in the great centres of labour (to quote again the Bishop of Rochester's words), such as Liverpool, or Leeds, or Leicester, or Bristol, the Church's framework would be utterly submerged; and just at the moment when she was beginning to overtake the neglect of a past generation, and was earning the gratitude of all good Christian souls by her sacrifices and her devotion, she would be struck down with paralysis." The Bishop then gives instances of what must happen in his own diocese if Disestablishment were to take place, and probably every other Bishop might adduce similar testimony. For it must be remembered that Disestablishment in the mouths of the liberationists means disendowment, means shameless robbery, and the confiscation of Church property to secular uses. No vestige of her ancient revenues is to be left. She must be turned out naked into the streets; she must start afresh despoiled of all, and rely exclusively on the voluntary contributions of her members to carry on the work which she finds it difficult enough to do now under her present more favourable circumstances. How will it be possible to meet the spiritual destitution or to mitigate the material wretchedness and poverty of our overgrown town populations? Do those who are banded together for the overthrow of the National Church, do the religious men among them ever reflect seriously on the consequences of the measure they advocate so earnestly? Do they consider that it means not the getting rid of a dominant church or the assertion of religious equality as they flatter themselves, but the very destruction of religion itself?

How absolutely Nonconformity fails to meet and provide for the spiritual destitution of the poorer part of the population in large towns has been strikingly illustrated of late. Mr. Spurgeon, in a sermon preached in 1861, said: "There is growing up even in our Dissenting churches, an evil which I greatly deplore—a despising of the poor. You know that in the city of London itself there is now scarce a Dissenting place of worship. The reason for giving most of them up, and moving into the suburbs, is that all the respectable people live out of town, and of course they are the people to look after. They will not stop in London, they will go out and take villas, and live in the suburbs, and therefore the best thing is to take the endowment which belonged to the old chapel and go and build a new chapel somewhere in the suburbs, where it may be maintained." "This witness," says Mr. Odom, a Sheffield clergyman, who quotes it, "is true, and applies to almost every large town." And he then proceeds to tell us that the fact that the Church of his own parish of 6,000 poor was once a Baptist chapel, led him to make inquiries, with the result that in a short time he had compiled a list of no fewer than 76 Dissenting chapels, not merely given up by their former owners, but purchased by Churchmen, and now used for Church purposes. He then mentions the sums that have been expended in rebuilding or adapting these chapels, and adds that nearly all are in very poor districts and that in nearly every case an active Church work is now carried on. And he quotes Bishop Lightfoot's remarks with regard to localities in the Diocese of Durham: "As the neighbourhood deteriorated, the congregation migrated to the more respectable localities, and the chapel was obliged to migrate also. The Church of England, therefore, stepped in and vindicated her proud title as the evangelist of the poorest." Who that have ever visited these densely populated parishes, inhabited only by the very poor, seen the noble work that the clergy are doing there—a perpetual example of self-sacrifice for the sake of Christ—who, I say, who have ever seen and sympathised with their work but must tremble lest any step should be taken which should have the effect of weakening their hands and making their hearts sore. Who can have the courage to increase their burden, making them weary and sad, and crippling their energies, and even destroy-

ing, it may be, their work, on the glaring false pleas that a Church in connection with the State is in hideous bondage, and cannot rightly fulfil her mission as a spiritual society. She, above all, is a ministering angel to the poor. She, above all, can say of her mission as her Master and Lord said of His own, "The poor have the Gospel preached to them."

There is one point above all on which we cannot insist too strongly. We must take our choice between the parochial system and the congregational. The Church in every parish is not the Church of a congregation, it is the Church of the people; the clergyman in every parish is not the clergyman of the congregation, he is the clergyman of the people. This he is because he is the minister of the Church which has its privileges secured to it by the State, in order that they may be exercised for the benefit of the whole nation. It is for that reason, it is for the moral and spiritual and eternal welfare, and also for the temporal welfare of the nation, that the land has been parcelled out into parishes, in every one of which is resident at least one man whose business it is to see that religion is brought home to every household. All alike can claim his services; to all he is bound to offer the consolations of religion. It is no answer to this argument to say that there are clergymen who neglect their parishes. No system can ensure the fulfilment of their duties by its officers. But that system is surely best which makes the duty clear and pre-emptory, and therefore also makes the neglect of the duty more shameful. According to the very idea of the National Church, the sluggard and the drone is a marked man; he is a reproach to his Order; he is a deserter from the ranks. The State says to the Church, The whole population is yours, you are responsible for its well-being: go and fulfil your duty, and we will uphold you in the discharge of that duty: you are officers of the nation doing national work. And there is not a village, however secluded—there is not a hillside or woodland farm—there is not a solitary cottage—which cannot claim the services of the parish clergyman, or which he is not bound to visit. But now substitute for this the congregational system, and what then? The congregation becomes the unit instead of the nation, or the parish as representing the national idea. The persons forming the congregation will be the object of the pastor's solicitude. If he is a good man—if he is a zealous man—he may be possessed of the necessary spirit, and seek to carry evangelizing influences beyond his own immediate sphere; but, in the nature of things, this will not be common. The very persons who most need to be looked after, the reckless and the indifferent, the sheep that has strayed into the wilderness, will be left while the shepherd is devoting all his care and attention to the ninety-and-nine who have not left the fold. This view of the evil of Disestablishment has been well stated in the Report of the Sheffield Church of England Scripture Reader's Society:

"Take away," they say, "the parochial system, which stands or falls with the Established Church, and you wrest from the working man his right to claim that help of which we have spoken. Under these new conditions, unless he has formally attached himself to a particular denomination (we know too well how many thousands are not so attached), he could not claim special help in his hour of need. Before his confused mind would pass a number of Christian sects, each with their religious formula and each with their exclusiveness, but no national Church whose ministry he might claim by right of his sonship and her motherhood. A poor waif on the wide sea of humanity, he might drift on forgotten into the outer darkness, rescued by no chance hand from the passing ark of sectarianism, that had 'enough to do in minding their own affairs.' Now our readers can declare to the people that the Church is theirs; that they may claim her services and ministry whenever they desire. It will be an evil day for England's working men—and their eyes should be opened to this fact—when along with the Established Church this claim is overthrown."

I cannot but hope that, when the national conscience has been thoroughly aroused to a sense of the enormity of the guilt, the nation will refuse to perpetrate this flagrant wrong.

There is another reason why we may well shrink from any action which would weaken the National Church. She is the great bulwark of Protestantism in England. But take away her national position, reduce her to the level of the sects, and, however great might still be her influence, the Church of Rome would become something more than a very formidable rival. "He must be a purblind politician," says Sir William Harcourt, "who does not perceive that the residuary legatee of Disestablishment will undoubtedly be the Church of Rome." This is felt and acknowledged by Roman Catholics themselves. "The English Church," says a writer in the *Westminster Review*, "by its prestige and influence, and its perversion of the true idea of a spiritual power, stands in the way of the growth and expansion of the Catholic (he means the Roman) Church. If, moreover, Catholicism is ever to regain possession of the nation, it must be over the ruins of the Anglican Establishment." This is no imaginary danger. It is perfectly certain that none of the Nonconformist bodies alone or united would be a match for the Church of Rome. The bond of a common dislike to Popery is frail and ineffectual. The Church of Rome has great traditions, a vast and powerful organization. No human society has ever equalled her in this respect. She can drill her legions into the most absolute and passive obedience. The least sign of mutiny, the least effort of self-will, is instantly crushed, or directed into a harmless channel. There is a solidity, there is a compactness, there is an intensity of movement which would carry all before it. And there can be very little doubt that, in the event of Disestablishment, the forces of the Church of Rome would be largely recruited from our own ranks. I do not, indeed, believe that the Church of England as a body would be prepared to surrender her independence. It is a highly over-wrought picture, which a leading Nonconformist minister in London has drawn of us in this respect. He is arguing against Disestablishment on this ground, that it would probably throw the Church of England into the arms of the Church of Rome, and he says :

"The great and grave question concerning Disestablishment is the fact that the nation would be setting free what would probably be a large sacerdotal Church, rich and powerful, narrow and exclusive, priestly and proud. [But suppose the Liberationist theory carried out, that the churches should be handed over to the parishes, and the highest bidders secure them for use, what a picture is presented, not only of sectarian conflict, but of secularist conflict in the matter of their disposal and of their use!] A liberated Church, too, would be a Church in bondage—yes, in the worst kind of bondage known to history. It would be shut out from all the life and progress of the age, and become a narrow ecclesiastical confederacy, bound hand and foot by canon law, and governed by ecclesiastical anti-common-sense. Then without assuming the rôle of a prophet, but only of a "possibilist" what is to hinder such Disestablished Church from an Eirenicon with the Church of Rome? Nothing! We have seen in Dr Pusey's Eirenicon how the *rapprochement* takes place, and I for one firmly believe that within fifty years, at the least, after Disestablishment one after another of the difficulties would be quietly removed, and the English Churches be again under the control and supreme sway of the Pontiff himself. Cardinal Newman's dream would then be realised."

I say I think this is an overwrought picture, but it is well to see ourselves as others see us. And I for one cannot look upon the dangers thus forcibly described as altogether imaginary, when the president of a large and compact society within our Church has quite recently expressed his desire for "a visible unity with the great Apostolic see of the West." I

do not, indeed, think, as I have already observed, that the Church as a body will ever be found longing for that union which is only another name for absolute submission. Union with Rome on any other terms is the idlest of all dreams. But that there would be a large defection from our own Church does not appear to me by any means improbable : and that the Church of England, even if she remained one Church, and were not rather broken into two or three ; weakened by her severance from the State ; no longer holding a position of National dignity ; no longer able to make her voice heard with authority, would yield to the aggressive force of a Church possessing a most compact organisation, presenting always an unbroken front, and claiming to exercise an exclusively Divine authority.

These then are some of the grounds—I think, perhaps, the principal grounds—though I am well aware there are others on which I would rest the claims of the National Church, and argue that the people of England have an interest in the maintenance thereof.

My lord, I have kept to one part of my resolution,¹ the first half of it exclusively ; and I have so unduly taxed your patience and that of the Conference, that I shall not attempt to deal with the second part further than to say that as I cannot regard Mr. Monckton's resolution as a rider, but must regard it as an amendment to the latter half of my resolution, I shall reserve what I have to say on this second half for the discussion on his amendment. [It was withdrawn.—ED.]

I have therefore now to move the Resolution of which I have given notice. My Lord, we have a magnificent heritage bequeathed to us by the piety and wisdom of our ancestors through many generations. The history of the Church of England is no common history. She has her splendid roll of scholars and divines, of philosophers and statesmen, of saints and martyrs, who have enriched the field of human thought and extended its boundaries. She has been the home of freedom and the nursing mother of high and holy lives. She has been the champion of the oppressed, she has cherished the sense of justice, she has sanctified the family and given dignity to the national ideal. Without her the national life would have been poor and mean and ignoble. The nation has been great because the Church and the nation have been one. Strip her of these her proud prerogative, and just in proportion as she becomes enfeebled and degraded, in that proportion will the nation become enfeebled and degraded too. A national life which has lost a great ideal and great traditions has lost a great inspiration. Shall we suffer such an inheritance, so holy and so precious, to be torn from our hands ? Shall the vineyard which the Lord hath planted be profaned ? Shall its hedges be broken down, so that all they that go by pluck off her grapes ; so that the boar out of the wood shall ravage it, and the wild beasts of the field devour it ? Shall we not rather pray, Look down, we beseech Thee, O God of hosts ; look down from heaven, and behold and visit this vine ? Quicken Thou us, and we will call upon Thy name. Turn us again, O Lord God of hosts ; cause Thy face to shine upon us, and we shall be saved.

¹ RESOLUTION.—That this Conference, sensible of the great benefit conferred upon the nation by the existence of the National Church, pledges itself to do all in its power to maintain the Church of England as a National Church.

That in view of the persistent misrepresentations which are made on the subject, it is desirable that accurate information respecting the Church, its status, and its endowments, be disseminated by means of publications, lectures, etc., in the various parishes of the diocese, that the Bishop be respectfully requested to take such steps to this end as he, after consultation at his archdeacons, rural deans, and lay members of Conference, shall think best.