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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

A Monthly Magazine

CONDUCTED BY CLERGYMEN AND LAYMEN

OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

VOL. XIV.

LONDON
ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW
1886

THE

CHURCHMAN

APRIL, 1886.

ART. I.—THE IRISH NATIONALIST PARTY AND THE IRISH CHURCH.

A NEW House of Commons has been returned under the new and extended franchise for Great Britain and Ireland. For Great Britain the return has been very much on the lines of the last Parliament, the Conservatives having, indeed, gained somewhat, but the two great parties of Liberals and Conservatives remaining much as they were before. For Ireland, however, a compact body of eighty-five followers of Mr. Parnell has been returned by the new voters; and the number of Conservatives (or Loyalists) who have succeeded in obtaining seats amounts to only eighteen—sixteen of them hailing from the province of Ulster, and two from the University of Dublin.

It does not fall in with our purpose to inquire closely into the circumstances of the return of the eighty-five Parnellites, nor even to dwell upon the fact that if we add together the numbers of those who voted for Conservatives and those who for various reasons abstained from voting, we reach nearly *one half of the whole electorate.* The fact—the hard tangible fact—still remains, that Mr. Parnell has secured a following which, owing to the present state of political parties in England, makes him practically master of the situation, and enables him to bring to the front a question which is about nothing less than the integrity or dismemberment of the Empire.

We have drifted into this state of things; we have been drifting for a long time; but drifting becomes accelerated towards the end. It seems but yesterday—it is not a year ago—since the Prince of Wales and his amiable consort visited Ireland, and received a welcome which, for Dublin, was hearty, for all Ulster enthusiastic, for Belfast magnificent. The country was then under the rule of a nobleman who had

the respect and goodwill of the loyal part of the community. Nothing was farther from the thought of his Government than a separate legislation for Ireland, and the confident expectations of that Government were fixed upon a majority in Great Britain which should bear down all opposition, and make it—and not Mr. Parnell—master of the situation. By the results of the Election the position has been changed, and Mr. Gladstone's Government, driven for a while from office, has found it necessary to make a change of front, and to sue for pardon from those it lately denounced, in order that it may regain the emoluments and power of office.

Few, even of those who have thus eaten their own words, can say that the political complication they have brought about affords a cheerful outlook; if it did so in any sense, the fact would reflect strongly on their old policy as well as on their late denunciations. All that they have hitherto done comes to this downright assertion: "We are the men, and wisdom dwells with us; and if the State is to be defended by any right hands, ours are the right hands to do it!" Let us hope—for there are degrees in hope—that we be not brought ere long to say, "Save us from such a defence, and such defenders!

The subject of our paper leads us in the first instance to discuss the "Nationalist" programme—so far as it can be called by so ambitious a name—and then, having seen what it is likely to do for Ireland as a country, we may go on in the next place to examine more particularly the relation of this Nationalist programme to the interests of the Church of Ireland.

Anyone with the heart of an Irishman must regard the present state of things in Ireland as a Nemesis on England for wrong-doings in the past. Ireland has always been discontented under English rule. Before the Reformation, as well as before and since the legislative union, Ireland has been the paradise of agitators. Any agitator who knew the rudiments of his trade has never had any difficulty in fanning the embers of discontent into a flame, and as there is no smoke or flame without some fire to set it going, we must suppose there has been some cause for a state of feeling in Ireland towards England which Mr. Walter Besant thus expresses by the mouth of Mr. Fagg, of Australia, when down on his luck, and in a pessimistic temper, "We must import more Irishmen —there shall be separation!"

Discontent can only be met by real, honest, generous efforts to produce content. Were these efforts made by England in a continuous way, and upon any system? We must go back a long way to get the answer, and when we do get it, it is not

reassuring. England did not understand Ireland—never tried to do so—and in her dealings with Ireland all through she understood her own interest so well that she took good care that no interest of Ireland should ever come into competition with it. She knew so little of Ireland that she forbore to publish the reformation in a language understanded of the people, and thereby threw those people into the arms of Rome; and she knew so much about her own commercial interests that she destroyed the Irish wool trade, and the hopes of a rising colony, that Yorkshire might prosper and Liverpool sit contented! It may indeed be said that of late years England has laboured to atone for the past, and has made concession after concession to Irish demands, till many in Ireland have been constrained to cry out, "Ohe, jam satis!" But then concessions may not be of the right sort; they may be grudgingly given; the taste may be taken out of them; they may be like a bone thrown to a hungry dog; or food flung by belated travellers to a pack of ravenous wolves; they may be extorted from a sense of fear, and not from the love of righteousness; and the real object of granting them may be the good of those who grant, and not the real good of those to whom they are granted. In any such case concessions constitute a poor remedy for ingrained discontent. If the English Government in Ireland had pursued a firm and even course; if it had spent honest energy in the establishment of truth and justice, religion and piety; if it had laboured honestly to develop industries and resources, and to protect capital; if it had dealt fairly between man and man; it might have failed ("'tis not in mortals to command success"—more especially in Ireland), but it would have failed nobly. However, it did not do so; it was a Government sometimes Whiggish, sometimes imbued with a spirit of Toryism, but always narrow, mean, and self-seeking. It was a Government from hand to mouth, whose aim it was not to remedy evils, but to tide over difficulties, and therefore a Government which, by its own confession, has failed—"Hinc illæ lacrimæ."

And to this difficulty, arising from bad government, may be added a social difficulty, which, to an influential section of the Irish people, has been a fertile cause of discontent. We know what this social difficulty does with Dissenters in England, and, in its own way, it has done as much harm in Ireland. How little does the average Englishman know of Ireland,[1] of her wants, resources, people, or even geography? To the

[1] A friend of the writer took a curacy in England, and in the course of his parochial ministrations was asked by a well-to-do and apparently

average Englishman Ireland is a trouble which he is weary to bear, and it would matter but little to him if the island so near to England were sunk in the depths of the sea, and the waves of the broad Atlantic rolled without let or hindrance to the spacious docks of Liverpool. This contented ignorance of Englishmen of a country so close to theirs, and of a people who are their fellow-subjects, has done quite as much as misgovernment to produce a feeling of alienation and discontent.

But we must take care that we are not led away by sentiment, or by feelings of irritation. If people are now coming forward with a remedy, it is our wisdom to inquire carefully into the character of that remedy. We have to ask: Is it likely to mend matters, or to make them worse? And if we have reason to suppose it would not mend, but make matters worse, we have to ask, Why should we fly from evils which we know, to other evils which we know not of? And we have also to ask—Why should not England, even at the eleventh hour, govern Ireland on principles of justice and mercy, and with a real view to the interests of all?

Mr. Parnell, the most astute, self-contained, and, so far, the most successful of Irish agitators, has not committed himself by formulating his demands in the House of Commons. Still he has spoken his mind pretty freely in other places, and from what he has said we are at liberty to infer that any scheme of local self-government which falls short of full legislative independence is not his "single plank." Why he adopted this metaphor does not appear. It may have been suggested to him by the saw-mill lately set up on his Wicklow property, or he may have intended to illustrate the fact that a plank must come into the business anyhow—for if he wins, the loyal men of Ireland must walk the plank; and if he loses, he must be prepared to walk it himself: but then it *is* a single plank, pure and simple, with no mistake about it—

> All Ireland shall be free, from the centre to the sea—
> Says the Shan Van Vocht;

the "Shan Van Vocht" for this particular occasion being Mr. Charles Stewart Parnell.

Are any proposals of the "old Parliamentary hand" likely to satisfy this demand, and the spirit it has aroused amongst the disaffected part of the Irish population? Mr. John Morley, the new Radical Chief Secretary, speaks at Newcastle of home government and English connection, that English

---

educated parishioner "whether they had gas in Ireland?" My friend asked with a bewildered air, "What *is* gas?" His interrogator proceeded to enlighten him, but evidently pitied his benighted condition.

connection being cemented by the presence of 30,000 English troops in Ireland. Is that the Home Rule for which Mr. Parnell has "taken off his coat"? Is that the Home Rule prophesied by the "Shan Van Voght"? Of course, if it suits his purpose Mr. Parnell will accept any concession which he may regard as a step in the direction of his main object; but if words have any meaning, and if the wishes of the people he leads have any weight, he cannot and dare not close the question, with any less concession than the full, complete, and uncontrolled legislative independence of Ireland.

How far Mr. Parnell has brought this question within the sphere of practical politics, time — perhaps a short time— may tell. So far, he has done wonders for his party; but so far, his efforts in Parliament have been directed towards objects which have commanded the sympathies of many who do not agree with him on the subject of his "single plank." The canny Northern farmer has no objection to have his rent reduced, but for the same reason—*i.e.*, his own interest—he decidedly objects to Home Rule. O'Connell's influence was based on the fact that he carried "Catholic emancipation." He broke down on his repeal agitation. It may be so in the present instance, though it strikes us that Mr. Parnell is a more adroit politician than O'Connell; and O'Connell never had eighty-five members at his absolute beck and call in the British House of Commons!

However, the question is so close upon us, that it behoves us to ask what the consequences to Ireland would be, supposing it were carried to Mr. Parnell's issue? Would the consequences be peace in her borders, and plenty in her stores? Would there be no decay, no leading into captivity, and no complaining in her streets?

The question might be answered by a reference to those halcyon days bounded by the years 1782 and 1801, days over which the advocates of repeal have thrown the glamour of oratory and poetry, but days which, viewed in the ordinary light of prosaic history, are to the full as chequered and sad as most other days in the annals of Ireland. The great orator John Philpot Curran, in his defence of Hamilton Rowan, pleads the benevolence of that gentleman to the then "starving manufacturers of Dublin;" and in the pages of Froude we read, during this period, much more of riots, squabbles, and jobbery, both inside and outside Parliament, than we do of prosperity.

But passing from speculation, let us put the question in a form which sets Home Rule before us under its most favourable conditions. Let us suppose that Ireland was homogeneous, that its inhabitants were all of one race and one religion,

trained not to the breach of the law, but to its observance. Would the country then benefit by full legislative independence, which of course implies practical separation from England? In the first place, Ireland must needs pass through a state of transition; property would change hands, and capital, scared away, would be slow and shy in returning. Ireland would be a small kingdom in the immediate neighbourhood of the richest and most powerful country in the world. In this time of transition, which would necessarily be a time of great distress, efforts would be made to remedy existing evils, and to stimulate native industries by tariffs and duties, which, however well meant, might only tend to make things dearer and might provoke retaliation from that powerful neighbour, which could do much better without Ireland than Ireland could do without her. Then for defence against outer enemies, in what a position would Ireland be? It might be said, Who is going to make the attack? Who can tell? But if the attack be made, as it might, who is going to make the defence? The Fenian Militia will hardly match the science and implements of modern warfare. Perhaps, however, the defence is to be made by Mr. Morley's 30,000 Saxon troops; but if so, who is to pay for those troops? Is England to do all the fighting and find all the money? If so, John Bull is not so bad a fellow after all; and for any good that separation might do—and it would hardly be much under the most favourable circumstances—it would be a pity to part company from one who exhibited a generosity as romantic as it was unwonted. If Ireland had a great extent of territory with abundant natural resources; if the population of Ireland were thrifty, independent, energetic. and all of one mind, then there might be some wisdom in Irishmen setting up for themselves, though even under those conditions—which in the present case do not exist—it might still be a question, could they not do better in partnership with their neighbours, than by setting up for themselves in these bad times?

But Ireland is *not* homogeneous. There are two Irelands in Ireland; and if we desire to trace things to their source, we may fairly arrive at the conclusion that the discontent of one party in Ireland is very much due to the existence of the other party. It is not necessary for us here to go into the history of the "other Ireland." It will be enough to say that in the province of the country in which it is principally to be found, the conditions of the community, socially and commercially, are very different from those which exist in other parts of the country. In this "other Ireland," law and order are generally respected. There are no stories of maiming dumb beasts, of murdering men and women, and, save on the

fringes of the border counties, in Ulster there are no agrarian outrages. This other Ireland is for the most part Protestant, and one of its counties—Antrim, at the last election—did what no other county in England or Scotland succeeded in doing, it returned all the members within its borders, whether for borough or for county proper, of a certain cast in politics; the four members for the county of Antrim, and the four members for the borough of Belfast being all Conservatives.

If we add to the Protestants of Ulster, who number more than 900,000, about 350,000 scattered through the rest of the country, we reach a total of a million and a quarter of loyal men; and if to these we add—as in all fairness we are bound to do—those Roman Catholics who not secretly, but openly and above board, avow their preference for union with England, we reach a grand total of at least one million and a half, out of a population which is certainly under 5,000,000. Now the question arises, what is to become of these? They regard themselves as Irishmen, and what is more, they are the salt of the country. From them have come the great names which have won credit for Ireland, in the field of art and science and literature and commerce, as well as on the field of battle. They comprise, at this present time, the most influential, cultivated, and industrious part of the population. They have shown conclusively that mistakes in government do not utterly mar the prosperity of a people; that in point of fact, whilst government may do a great deal in facilitating and directing matters, it is the character of the people themselves, their disposition to help themselves, and their determination to succeed, which do the main part of the work. Now these people have steadily protested against separation from England, believing that it would be destructive to their best and dearest interests; they have formed this opinion as the result of a long induction, and of a bitter experience. What is to be done with them? They cannot afford to be left out of the account.

Of course the Nationalists will say that this loyal minority is intent on its own miserable interests! Interests, forsooth! and after what, it may be asked, are the Nationalists looking? Have they no individual as distinct from patriotic interests? The loyal minority has a stake in the country, in land, in commerce, in professions and trades; and if the question is to be argued out on the narrow grounds of personal interest, it may be said that it is the interest of the loyal man, having something, to keep what he has, and of the Nationalist, having nothing, to take what he can get. In this case, however, the

interests of the loyal minority are bound up with the real interests of the country at large.

There is, therefore, a double difficulty in the matter of Home Rule. Even on the supposition that Ireland was one in race and religion, there would be room for grave doubt as to her progress and prosperity separate from England. But if we take Ireland as she is, made up of two races and two religions, then the inevitable result of a separation must be that each race and each religion will strive for the mastery. We are not yet far enough removed from periods of similar struggles to look for any other result. Ireland, which has always developed the bump of combativeness, would under such circumstances become a bear-garden or a cockpit, the by-word of Europe, and the disgrace of England. Separation from England must end in a victory for either of the contending parties, with sad results for the conquered; or, more likely, it must end in the utter exhaustion of both, realizing the story of the famous Kilkenny cats who, being shut up in a room all night, fought so bitterly that they finished up by devouring one another, so that nothing was left of them next morning but their tails!

But the question before us has a special as well as a general aspect; one, moreover, which may suggest to us something about an important force which is behind the demands of the Nationalists. We have to consider not simply the effect of separation on Ireland as a nation, nor upon the English in Ireland as a body, but the effect of separation upon the position and prospects of the Church of Ireland.

Every reader of THE CHURCHMAN, of course, knows that the Irish Church does not include the whole body of Protestants in Ireland. The Presbyterians number nearly half a million, and out of a million and a quarter, according to the last census, six hundred and thirty-five thousand, or something more than one-half, belonged to the Church of Ireland.

It is obvious, having regard to the historical traditions of this Church, and to the position, character, and influence of the bulk of its members, that any effect produced by the Nationalist movement on this institution must be of great importance; and when we add to the point already stated, the fact that, unlike the Presbyterian Church, the Church of Ireland is not confined to Ulster, but has her roots and branches in all parts of the country, the effect of the anti-union movement will appear to bear not simply on Churchmanship, but on Protestantism as such throughout the length and breadth of the land.

Now it goes without saying that the Nationalists as a party raise no clamour against the Irish Church. Sometimes,

indeed, Roman Catholic editors of newspapers, or Roman Catholic priests, take exception to what they regard as an invidious name—the term "Church of Ireland." Neither editors nor Roman Catholic priests are singular in this, for Presbyterians have taken exception to the title oftener and more bitterly than the Roman Catholics. But no clamour is raised by the Nationalists, because there is really nothing to clamour against: privileges and endowments have been taken away, only our existence as a self-supporting body is left; and it would hardly suit the book of the Nationalists to clamour openly against *that*, when they are making frantic efforts to bring Ulster and Munster, Protestants and Roman Catholics "into line," as they phrase it, on the Home Rule question. All the same, however, though there is no clamour and no denunciation, and though we are free to confess that the Nationalist leaders have no thought of denunciation, there never was a movement more calculated to do harm to the Irish Church than this Nationalist movement. As a movement in progress it is crippling the most liberal friends of the Church, and removing them slowly but surely from the country; as a movement carried to a successful issue it would entirely sweep away those resources, together with the class to which the resources belonged.

Mr. Parnell lately stated in the House of Commons that he "was born a Protestant, that he lived a Protestant, and that he hoped to die a Protestant." To this confession of faith he might have added the fact that for some time he sat in the Synod of his diocese, and continued to do so until he was no longer elected by his fellow-parishioners; and yet for all this talk—and giving Mr. Parnell all due credit for sincerity—it does not materially assist in bringing round a hopeful solution of the difficulty. It really matters very little to the Church of Ireland that Mr. Parnell is a Protestant, because the question is not about himself or his own religious views and dispositions, *but about the force behind him;* and by this force we do not mean the eighty-five shadows of himself who surround him in Parliament, but the force that is behind them all. That is a force which they feel now, when it is necessary they should feel it, and which by-and-by they are sure to feel pressing them in on every side with a power which they cannot resist.

There never was anything so calculated to win the adherence of all sorts and conditions of discontented people in Ireland as the Nationalist movement. To the tenant-farmer it came not only with the promise, but the performance of the three "F's," as they were called, viz., fair rent, free sale, and fixity of tenure; and with the possibility, in the not very remote future, of no rent at all! To the Roman Catholic priest it

offered the prospect of the gradual drying up of the resources of the Irish Church, and of her final extinction in the rural parishes of the eastern, western, and southern provinces. In most of such parishes the landlord is the chief contributor to the parochial assessment, which is the backbone of the incumbent's income; his family and household form a considerable portion of the scanty congregation, and their presence gives a sense of protection and support to the scattered families of Protestant farmers or labourers who are well-nigh lost in the surging crowd of their Roman Catholic neighbours. Reduce the landlord's income by one-half, and let that half be badly paid, in some instances not paid at all, and how then is he to pay his subscription to the assessment? Oblige him to fly for his life, and he takes his household with him, and the scanty congregation becomes scantier still; the few poor sheep in the wilderness are left with a shepherd as poor as themselves, in daily expectation of the reduction or loss of his income, which the Representative Body cannot pay, because there are no assets.

This is what is going on at present; and there is another possible danger to the Church in the immediate future connected with the progress of the Nationalist movement, and independent of its success.

When the Representative Body received the commutation money of the clergy at the time of Disestablishment, the sum amounted to over six millions. This capital sum was charged with the life incomes of the commuting clergy; and, of course, if it had not been supplemented by the contributions of the faithful, it would have been eaten up by the time the generation of disestablished clergy all passed away. As a matter of fact these contributions have enabled the Representative Body to discharge their liabilities to the disestablished clergy out of the interest of the commutation money—plus the contributions. So far, therefore, the capital sum has been preserved intact.

The investment of more than six millions of money was a large and critical financial operation, and the sub-committee of the Representative Body, made up principally of experts in such matters, showed a wise discrimination in their investments, some of the money being put into Railway Bonds, which have turned out well, and some—about three millions—being placed in what at the time was regarded as the very best security, first-class mortgages on land. But who would *now* lend money on land in Ireland? Or who that has lent it in better days, would not be delighted to call his money in, if only it would be so obliging as to come? The clergy in Ireland, and no doubt also the Representative Body, as a

corporation, would be glad to see this money safe; that is to say, they would be glad to see it in Colonial, or other fair securities, rather than in the depreciated property of Irish landlords.

These remarks, however, have to do with present effects, and effects likely to take place in the immediate future; in fact with a state of things brought about by agitation and conspiracy, Ireland still continuing in union with England. Another question arises, apparently within the sphere of practical politics: "What if the union were dissolved? what if full powers of legislation were conferred on an Irish Parliament? In such a condition of things what would be the position and prospects of the Irish Church?"

In order to approach this question, we may ask in the first place, What would be the constitution of an Irish Parliament, supposing one to be elected by the present franchise, or by such broader franchise as might fall in with the American proclivities of the enthusiastic Nationalists in their first flush of triumph? We are told that in such a Parliament we should have between one-third and one-fourth of Protestant representatives, because between one-third and one-fourth of the population of the country are Protestants. Arguing, however, on this basis, we may ask: Supposing we manage to get a fourth of the representation of an Irish House of Commons, of what practical use would such a number be when pitted against three-fourths of Roman Catholics, and the question in debate being one in which the Roman Church was supposed to have a real interest? How many of the Roman Catholic majority would, in such a case, be likely to join the Protestant minority?

But it would seem that the results of the late election show us pretty clearly that the Protestants could never hope to secure one-fourth of the representation. If the Protestants were equally distributed throughout the country they might easily secure much more than one-fourth of the elected members. But even in Ulster they are so grouped that in some counties they are overwhelmingly strong, and in others proportionably weak. In certain places they easily returned their own men, but in other places—such as Fermanagh—though numerically strong, they failed. The same was the case in Dublin, where, with thousands of voters, they were not able to get in a single member for county or borough. Unless, therefore, the Nationalists are prepared to carve out districts for the special behoof of Protestant candidates and voters—which they are not likely to do, and which, indeed, we can hardly expect them to do—things must remain very much as they are, if they do not become worse.

Well, we have our national Parliament, and to be within

the bounds of a safe calculation, we may say we have one-fifth composed of Protestants, not all—not by any means all—members of the Church of Ireland; the other four-fifths Roman Catholics. Then we must look to the power behind the Roman Catholics, the power which will move the springs of legislation, and mould the wills of the majority. What is that power? Is it Socialism or Communism, or the notions of Irish Americans? No doubt the representatives of these "isms" will find something for their hands to do, and will do it with all their might; but there is a power stronger than all, which is none the less strong because it knows when to speak and when to refrain from speaking, when to keep in the background and when to come to the front. That power is the Church of Rome; nowhere so strong—in what constitutes strength for her—as in Ireland; nowhere so full of the traditions of past wrongs; nowhere so sure of unquestioning obedience whenever she commands anything to be done which does not run directly counter to the political yearnings and aspirations of her members.

What those aspirations are none know so well as those who have lived in Ireland, more especially in Roman Catholic districts. And here we would wish to guard against misconception. We are not speaking of Roman Catholics as individuals, or members of society. We have already noted the fact that there are many loyal Roman Catholics in Ireland, well disposed to the union with England; and we have had ourselves Roman Catholic friends whom we never knew to fail, when the occasion demanded a proof of true friendship. But we are now speaking of the general feeling of the mass of the Roman Catholic population towards the Protestant portion of their fellow-countrymen. When the average Roman Catholic peasant of Kerry, or Wexford, or Tipperary, or Limerick, speaks out his mind—which he occasionally does—he will ask, "What business has a Protestant in a Catholic country?" Those who are his superiors in rank, though they may not speak out so plainly, do not leave us in much doubt as to their meaning. Dr. Walsh, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, looking with an evil eye on Trinity College—a Protestant foundation of the Protestant Queen Elizabeth—asks with indignation what business an institution like that has to raise its head in a "Catholic" city like Dublin, and in full view of that noble building, once the House of Lords and Commons, now the Bank of Ireland, which, when purified from its present occupiers and their money-boxes, is to hold a regenerated Parliament? The Irish correspondent of the *Catholic Times*, seizing on this utterance of the Archbishop, has pushed it a little farther on its logical journey.

Archbishop Walsh foreshadowed the doom of Trinity College, whilst on a visit at Cashel, to his worthy brother Archbishop Croke, and this is the comment of the correspondent: "The meeting of two patriot prelates within the shadow almost of the rock of ruins, inspires great hopes in the breast of the nation, and seems to confirm the belief which has taken possession of the popular mind, that before very long new edifices, surmounted with the cross, will arise phœnix-like out of the relics of the past, *and old edifices still standing will pass into the hands of those to whom they legitimately belong.* Through this belief we have arrived at the hope that when 'Trinity' is nationalized, *Patrick's and Christ's will be ours once more!*" The allusion here, of course, is to the cathedrals of Christ Church and St. Patrick's, Dublin.

Now whilst we feel that Irish Churchmen have not a word to say about the Rock of Cashel, they or their representatives having in times past suffered the noble cathedral and other buildings there to fall into utter ruin, and never having had the spirit to repair any portion of them, so far as to fit them for the celebration of divine worship, we regard the case of the two cathedrals of Dublin from a very different point of view. These buildings were not only in full use for sacred ministrations at the time of disestablishment, but one of them, St. Patrick's, had just been restored by Mr. Guinness, at a cost of upwards of £100,000; and since the disestablishment Christ Church, the other cathedral, has been restored and endowed at a cost of little less than £200,000, by the munificence of Henry Roe. These are the buildings they threaten to take from us, buildings in which £300,000 of Protestant money have been sunk within the last five-and-twenty years. Of a verity, "if they do these things in the green tree, what shall be done in the dry?" Indeed, Mr. Justin McCarthy, in an article lately written by him in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, has, in his own plausible and airy way, indicated the course which things are to take, when he tells us that "the Church which so long guided the nation through the valley of the shadow of death, will exercise its loftiest duty as the guide and guardian of a regenerated race."

Judging from these and other similar indications, there is much more than a suspicion that high-handed proceedings on a large scale, would be put in force against the loyal minority, should a measure of separation throw the great preponderance of power into the hands of the Nationalist majority; in such a case, the members of the Irish Church, and indeed all Protestants must expect to be ordered to "move on!"

One of the stock grievances of the Home Rulers, at least at the beginning of the movement, was the prevalence of ab-

senteeism. We remember hearing this matter and the evils connected with it strongly urged by a distinguished follower of the late Isaac Butt. This gentleman, a Protestant and a Protestant clergyman, regarded the Home Rule movement as likely to produce a beneficial effect upon the higher schools in Ireland, and upon Trinity College, Dublin, because under the conditions of such Home Rule the gentry would be likely to educate their sons in Irish schools and in the Dublin University, rather than in English schools and in Oxford or Cambridge, as at present. Whether Home Rule would have had such an effect on the landed gentry is doubtful. They would most likely, under any circumstances, wish to push forward their sons on the widest and most promising path, and to send them where they would be in a position to form connections useful to them in after life. But if we look to the particular phase of the Nationalist movement which is now before us, we can at once see that there is little hope for the rehabilitation of the classical schools or Trinity College by the influx of a crowd of the sons of the landed gentry in the event of the accomplishment of Home Rule. The crowd that would then knock at the doors of educational institutions would consist much more of those who were looking for bursaries than of those who came with money in their hands to pay for the education they required.

If absenteeism is an evil, and it is and has been an evil of the first magnitude for unhappy Ireland, the Home Rulers are preparing to make it utterly impossible by abolishing the class which furnished the absentees, *i.e.*, the landlords, and so putting an end to absenteeism by leaving none to be absentees. This may be regarded from one point of view as a terrible piece of vengeance on the landlords, and from another as an Irish way of solving an Irish difficulty.

It is to be feared, however, that absenteeism would go beyond the class of landlords, and reach those industrial and professional classes who would find that the confusion and chaos which must usher in the introduction of Home Rule would be no more beneficial to the advance of trade and influx of capital than the present system of tyrannical boycotting under the direction of the National League. Those who would replace the landlords, the farmers, the tradesmen thus ousted, would be adventurers who have followed Mr. Parnell for pure love of their country and what they could get out of it, and the rank and file of those who did the boycotting and other agrarian work for the National League, and who will naturally look for their reward. And so there would be an advance all along the national line. Those who had been loyal to their Queen and faithful to the Union would be marked out for vengeance;

in some instances they would be openly attacked, in others harassed by petty persecutions — their schools, colleges, churches would be taken from them, their liberties as citizens curtailed, if not annihilated, until at last the remnant that was left must take up arms for their altars and their homes, or go sadly to some land over the sea, where there would be more liberty and more fair play than in regenerated Ireland!

Under these circumstances, we Irish Churchmen "beckon to our partners in the other ship to come and help us." We did so some sixteen or seventeen years ago, but we did so then in vain. Shall our signal of distress be in vain now? We are not asking to be maintained in privileges and endowments—these have been taken from us; we ask for no ascendency but the ascendency of law and order; we, fellow-citizens and of the same household of faith, plead with our English brethren to stand by us in the struggle for existence. Catholic we are, clinging to the eternal verities of the faith once delivered to the saints, but Protestant we also are; for in Ireland, if as a church we are not Protestant, we are nothing. We plead with them, that after the experience of two hundred years, they see to it that Mr. Gladstone shall not repeat history, by bringing round practically another Edict of Nantes revocation; and we plead with them, not for our own sakes only, but for theirs; for if this concession be made, it will prove to be a leap in the dark such as England has never yet taken since she became a nation!

JOHN W. MURRAY, LL.D.

ART. II.—THE ADVENT MISSION IN NEW YORK, 1885.

THE blessing which in many ways and parishes has confessedly attended the revival movement of late years within the Church of England, and which, under the name of a "Mission," has so quickened the spiritual life of pastor and people at home, could not fail to attract the attention and excite the interest of other Churches in communion with her. It was a true report that was heard in other lands. This remarkable and God-owned special effort, which has become now a recognised agency for winning souls to Christ, reclaiming the lapsed, and deepening the spiritual life of believers, has been watched and noted by those who before committing themselves to it, or adopting its methods, desired to be thoroughly satisfied that the movement itself was not of an ephemeral nature, but, under God, productive of solid and enduring good.