





LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS



13
Private and Confidential.

PROCEEDINGS OF A CONFERENCE

IN SUPPORT OF THE

CHURCH DEFENCE INSTITUTION,

HELD AT LAMBETH PALACE

ON MONDAY, MARCH 28, 1881,

UNDER THE PRESIDENCY OF

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

CONFERENCE AT LAMBETH PALACE ON CHURCH DEFENCE.

A private Conference of persons interested in the work of the Church Defence Institution was held at Lambeth Palace on March 28, under the presidency of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Amongst those present were the Marquis of Salisbury, K.G., the Earls of Redesdale and Dartmouth, the Bishop of Chichester, Lord Clinton, Lord O'Neill, Lord Henry Scott, M.P., Right Hon. Sir Richard Cross, M.P., the Hon. W. Egerton, M.P., Lieut.-Col. Hon. G. Windsor Clive, M.P., Sir Hardinge Giffard, M.P., J. G. Talbot, Esq., M.P., H. Birley, Esq., M.P., J. Round, Esq., M.P., Right Hon. H. Cecil Raikes, Sir Richard Wilbraham, K.C.B., Sir E. Hertslet, C.B., Dr. Tristram, Q.C., the Dean of Wells; Archdeacons Hessey and Emery; W. U. Heygate, J. Richardson, Sydney Gedge, H. G. Hoare, W. Hoare, F. A. White, J. B. White, J. F. Burnaby Atkins, G. B. Hughes, H. D. Davenport, Esqrs.; Capt. Field, R.N., Revs. Capel Cure, Dr. Alfred T. Lee, Randall T. Davidson, H. G. Dickson, and S. Thackrah. Letters of apology were read from the Archbishop of York, the Bishops of London, Durham, Lincoln, Gloucester and Bristol, Ely, Truro, and Liverpool, the Earls of Devon, Stanhope, and Powis, Lord Penrhyn, Lord Charles Bruce, M.P., the Right Hon. W. H. Smith, M.P., the Right Hon. Spencer H. Walpole, M.P., Sir William Rose, Sir J. Kennaway, Bart., M.P., Sir J. McGarel Hogg, Bart., M.P., Sir J. R. Mowbray, Bart., M.P., the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Cambridge (Dr. Perowne), the Hon. and Rev. E. Carr Glyn, and Rev. Canon G. H. Wilkinson.

The ARCHBISHOP of CANTERBURY: I believe most of those who are present understand the object of our meeting. This Church Defence Institution has now been in operation for a long time, and has done certainly very great service by drawing the attention of people to the attacks which are made by the Liberation Society upon the Church of England, and by answering many of those attacks so far as the funds at their disposal enable them to take steps in that direction. It has seemed to many that the policy which has hitherto been followed of doing everything as quietly as possible requires at the present moment a little modification—that the assaults which are made on the Established Church are very varied and very violent—that they are conducted by persons who have the disposal of very large funds, and that, according to the programme of the operations of those who desire to undermine the National Church, there is hardly a village in any part of England in which there is not now some regularly organised system by which misrepresentations are made more or less damaging to the Church of England. Our object was, if we could, to send lecturers and other

persons who were well acquainted with the subject to meet these misrepresentations, and it seems that, still pursuing the same policy, we must extend our operations, as those who assault the Church have extended theirs. I do not think that it is from any want of zeal on the part of Churchmen that the funds at the disposal of the opponents are much greater than the funds which are at the disposal of our Society. Many persons have felt for a long time that the best defence of the Church of England was the proper discharge of its duties by the ministers and other members of that Church, and that the attitude of quiet pursuance of our duty, without troubling ourselves about assaults, was, as long as it possibly could be maintained, the right position in which to appear before the world. Well, looking to what Dr. Lee will bring before you, and the information he has already placed in the hands of members of this body, we must, I think, be prepared for more active operations than we have hitherto thought it our duty to undertake (hear, hear). Now, just let me read the programme of the Liberation Society as put forward here. I confess that I am not at all sorry that the programme should be of the nature which it is, because, I think, it is so absolutely out of the question and so violent that the very projection of it would be likely to do good. You, probably, have most of you in your hands a programme which states tolerably distinctly what our opponents desire to achieve. I do not think there is the slightest chance of their achieving what they ask for, but the very fact of their desiring it shows a determination on their part to do as much injury as they possibly can, and I hope that this programme of theirs will be read as extensively as possible in order that Churchmen should be made fully aware of what it is that is proposed by those who assault the Established Church. "As regards Cathedrals and Churches. Both ancient and modern buildings, as well as all endowments now appropriated to the use of the National Church, must be regarded as national property at the disposal of the State. The Cathedrals, Abbeys and other monumental buildings to be under national control, and be maintained for such purposes as Parliament may from time to time determine. All Churches existing at the date of the passing of the first of the Church Buildings Acts (1818) to be deemed ancient Parish Churches. These should be vested in a parochial board to be elected by the ratepayers, which board shall have power to deal with them for the general benefit of the parishioners in such ways as it may determine." I think that it is most desirable that that programme should be circulated throughout the length and breadth of the land. Well, then, along with its circulation, we must be prepared for a degree of misrepre-



sentation as to the Church, as to the work of the Ministers of the Church, and as to the property of the Church such as we are generally accustomed to regard as held only by the most ignorant of mankind. But, unfortunately, the most ignorant of mankind are, perhaps, the most numerous section of mankind, and not only so, but I am afraid they are becoming the most powerful section of mankind, and therefore it is necessary for us to see how this ignorance may be counteracted. I am told that there are persons well qualified who are ready to go forth and meet the lecturers who infest every neighbourhood—lecturers disseminating very unfair views of the Church and its work. There are persons ready to go forth and meet them if we can only bear the expense of providing what is necessary for them, and I am sure that a meeting such as this will be a great help towards providing the adequate funds, and also will let it be understood that we think the time is past when we ought to sit perfectly quiet and not take very distinct measures for dispelling the ignorant remarks which are made to our disparagement in every respect. I do not think I need say more, but call upon the various gentlemen who have kindly undertaken to propose Resolutions to propose them.

The Right Hon. Sir RICHARD CROSS, M.P.: Your Grace, I was not in the least aware that I was to be called upon when I came into this room, but I do not think that, in this audience, the Resolution wants very much argument. I have very great pleasure in proposing, "That in view of the strenuous and persistent efforts now being made to prejudice the public mind against the National Church, it is indispensable that a corresponding effort be made on the part of all attached Churchmen, without distinction of religious or political party, to take such steps as may be needful for putting distinctly before the country the truth as regards the work, history, and position of the Church of England." I may say, your Grace, that I have very long taken the view which you have suggested, that the action of Churchmen evidently should not be the aggressive, but that they should put up as their best bulwark the actual work which they were doing in the eyes of the people, and I have, for a great number of years, therefore abstained from taking any very active part in the matters of the Church Defence Institution, believing that to be the best way of furthering the work of the Church. But I am perfectly aware that what your Grace has said is perfectly true, namely, that the untruths that are being told to the ignorant, not only here and there, but I may say in almost every parish in England are now so great and so numerous, and, I am very much afraid, so very much believed in, that I think that it is

quite necessary we should stir ourselves, not in an aggressive spirit, but to show, at all events, how untrue those statements are, and what the position of the Church of England is, and for that reason, therefore, I most heartily propose the Resolution which your Grace has placed in my hands. I am bound to say that I look with the gravest possible apprehension upon the state of the existing House of Commons. I should very much like to say that, having watched the present House of Commons with the most constant attention ever since it has sat, I should greatly fear its action in Church matters. Your Grace has said that this programme is so monstrous that you would hardly think it possible that it could be carried. I wish I could believe that even if it were much stronger than it is the Radicals in the House of Commons would be unwilling to carry it. I am not speaking politically ; but, considering the fresh elements which have come in at the last general election, in the Radical part of the House, I do not think that anyone who has not watched it as closely as I have can have the smallest notion of what they would not to be willing to do. I do not want to discuss political questions here, but I think it right to state, having been in the House a very long time, that we have got an element to deal with which those who have not been in the House of Commons have no conception of. If we stir in the matter I hope that we shall not, in any action that we take, adopt an aggressive policy against others. That I am decidedly opposed to. I think that our work is quite good enough to stand upon its own merits, but as to putting really what the truth is before the public, I believe it to be absolutely essential on account of the misrepresentations which his Grace has referred to.

The EARL of REDESDALE: I have been requested to second this Resolution. I can assure you that I do it with very great pleasure. The matter has been so ably stated by the proposer that I think I need say but a very few words on the subject. I am sure that it is necessary that a movement should be made, in order to correct the misrepresentations which are so prevalent throughout the country, and also that something should be done to show that the Church is really in earnest upon the subject. I think that some harm has arisen from the fact of so little having been done in support of this Society altogether. The impression has been created that really the Church did not care very much about its own preservation, and that people may attack it as much as they please, and that if it turns against us we shall bear up and be contented, and not fight

very hard for it. I think something ought to be done to correct that impression, and therefore I have great pleasure in seconding this resolution.

The Hon. WILBRAHAM EGERTON, M.P. : I should like to say a few words upon the present grave aspect, as I think, of the Church and State question, and mention one or two facts which I think, perhaps, you may not be aware of, which render it more and more necessary that we should at the present time take up this question in earnest as Churchmen. I would just like to remind you what really are the forces which the Liberation Society, and those who attack the Church, now bring against us. First of all, at the present moment, although Nonconformists, I believe, have absolutely no grievance whatever, yet their attacks against the Church are not one whit the less. In fact, their attacks are entirely to level down the Church to their own level. They see that the Church of England is in possession of certain revenues and certain positions in the State, of which they are jealous, and the base of their movement is, to a great extent, a communistic one. It is a movement against corporate property, and indirectly against all property. There is a strong current of communism and socialism which is pervading the Liberation movement (Hear, hear). Next to that we have this difficulty to meet—that every minister of an Independent congregation—I am speaking advisedly when I say every minister of an Independent congregation—is bound, before he is appointed to minister in the congregation, to undertake to take the chair at Liberation meetings. They have no choice whatever ; and you can readily conceive, therefore, what a powerful element you have in every Independent congregation, when you find that the very bread of the minister of the congregation depends upon his being an active member of the Liberation Society. I state this as a fact, which has been told me by a gentleman who was brought up in an Independent college, who was a Liberationist lecturer, and is now a Clergyman of the Church of England. I believe that the great body of Churchmen, and the large majority of Clergymen, are with us in the defence of our national Church. Of course we cannot disguise it from ourselves that there are some who, from circumstances, at the present moment, are indisposed to take the same view as the majority ; and, in consequence of some grievances which they imagine to exist in relation to Church and State, they are not indisposed to welcome Disestablishment as a means of getting rid of those difficulties ; but they are, I believe, a minority, and although they may be, perhaps, a united minority, yet I believe that the majority of the Clergy of the Church of England are

thoroughly in earnest in maintaining the Establishment and the union of Church and State. But the fact is, that there is a great number of them who have practised what Sir Richard Cross has alluded to. They have done it religiously, and, to a certain extent, they were quite justified in doing so. They have taken the ground that they ought not to take any active means of defending the National Church, and they have contented themselves with doing what they believed to be their parochial duties, and now, perhaps, more than at any other time, they have shown the greatest zeal in working the machinery of the Church of England, and in carrying out their simple duties in their parishes. But I think that a Society like this, of which your Grace is the President, ought to lay before the Clergy the real state of things; and the fact that, unless they stir themselves more actively than they have done, the time may not be very long distant when this machinery, which has been at work for a long time, and which is comprehending nearly every county and parish in England—the machinery of the Liberation Society—may have got such power by spreading what I can only say are deliberate falsehoods about the Church of England, that they may influence the constituencies in such a way as to threaten the union of Church and State. I think that we really, at the present time, ought to consider this as a grave question—not only a grave question for the Clergy, but still more for the Laity, to determine. The only way in which we can do that is by not allowing these Lecturers to go about the country and to spread these inaccurate statements without contradiction. I am not an advocate in any way for sending Lecturers about the country with no object and no deliberate purpose; but the object we have is, that whenever a Clergyman finds a Liberationist lecturer within his parish, and that statements have been made which he cannot himself answer, and he asks us to send a Lecturer down, we should have the means of sending one. We have had numbers of applications from different parts of England for lecturers, and from want of funds we have been unable to send them. Some years ago we had one gentleman who was an admirable lecturer, Mr. Lyon, and his salary for the year was paid by the munificence of one of our body, the Right Hon. George Cubitt, M.P. We have been unable to carry out that system of lectures simply from want of funds. I may say that, in the prosperous years of 1874 and 1875, we had an income of £4,333 and £4,564. That was by no means a big income; but now we have come down to £2,900, and the paper which Dr. Lee has drawn up will show that we require several Lecturers both in the North and in the South of England. We must get men thoroughly well

up in the subject—men of sound judgment, and men who are able to face the cross-questioning of these Liberationists in public meetings. In order to get good men, and to enable them to travel about the country, you cannot reckon the expenses of each man less than about £500 a year. We have been fortunate in some cases to enlist the services of some schoolmasters, who, with the classes with which they have to deal, are very valuable men, especially in the country districts. We should be very glad to have some of those in our employment, and some of them are very competent and willing to take up that post. But we must have men for all classes of society. We must have them not only for country villages, but to face intellectual audiences in large towns, to face the searching criticisms of popular audiences in the North of England, and also in the more intellectual centres in the South of England. No towns in the South of England—not our Cathedral towns—are exempt from the visits of the Liberation Society, and we are unable at the present to meet them. I trust that the outcome of this meeting will be, that we shall be able to influence the great masses of the people of England in favour of the National Church, to which we believe they are generally inclined to be favourably disposed, but who in consequence of mis-statements which are made both as to the objects and the revenues of the Church of England are being influenced in a way contrary to the true interests of the Church of England, and the true interests of the union of Church and State. For that reason I trust that this meeting will not separate without giving this Church Defence Institution some substantial means to enable us to meet and to successfully cope with the machinery of the Liberation Society. I have great pleasure in supporting the resolution.

The Resolution was put to the meeting by the Archbishop, and carried unanimously.

The EARL OF DARTMOUTH moved the following Resolution: "That in order to carry the above resolution into effect, it is necessary to make an immediate and substantial addition to the funds of the Church Defence Institution, and that his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury be requested to commend the matter to the serious attention of the Clergy and Laity of the Church." He said: In the first place, I thank your Grace heartily for inviting so many of the laity as well as of the clergy here to-day. In the next place I must apologise for my unpunctuality, which prevented my having the privilege of hearing your Grace's remarks, and therefore if in the very few remarks which I intend to address to the meeting, I should go over the ground

which your Grace has travelled over, I trust that I shall be forgiven, not having had the advantage of hearing what your Grace said in opening the proceedings. Having had this Resolution unexpectedly put into my hands, I venture to move it in a few words, for I think that it speaks entirely for itself; and I for one most cordially support the latter part of the resolution in which a request is addressed to your Grace to commend the matter of the paucity of the funds of this Institution to the attention of the Clergy and Laity of the Church (hear, hear). Now, I may venture to remind many of those present who, I am afraid, are only too well aware of the facts, that there is an opinion among both the Clergy and the Laity of the Church, that the best means of Church Defence are a man's doing his duty in that position in which he is placed in the Church. No longer ago than last November I heard your Grace's Right Reverend Brother, the Bishop of Lichfield, speak in that strain, and although, of course, there must be a certain amount of advantage to the Church in the fact of the lives of the Clergy, their energies, and their successful efforts to counteract the sin and poverty of the country being what they are, yet at the same time it must not be forgotten that in many a parish which is presided over by a most successful Clergyman, the Liberation Society find a hold, and they seem really to make their attack with the greater zest an account of the work which the Church is doing in that locality (hear, hear). On the other hand, your Grace, I have heard the Secretary of the Birmingham Church Defence Association say that since the very successful series of meetings which were held in Birmingham some six or seven years ago, the Liberation Society have made no way whatever in that great town, and I think that this may be to a certain extent an encouraging fact, because having been born within a very short distance of that town, and knowing something of it, I believe what has been stated on authority in my hearing lately, that the opinions of that town are by no means so unanimous as they are generally supposed to be, and with regard to that particular part of the world which is known as the black country of Staffordshire, with which I happen to be connected, and of which I am a native, I can say that I believe that where these matters are properly brought before the people in that locality, as in other great manufacturing localities, the Church makes way, and the efforts of the Liberationists are counteracted. Now, your Grace, I have another point to touch upon. I hope I am not speaking at too great a length; but as it bears upon the latter part of this resolution I venture to touch upon it. The fact is that in some parishes—and I will mention an instance presently—a Clergy-

man being asked to take part in Church Defence says, "No, we are on such good terms with the Nonconformist inhabitants of this locality that it is a pity to stir up strife." Now, I remember that in one particular instance—the instance to which I said I would allude—it was intended to create a Central Church Defence Association for the Midland Counties. There was an active Clergyman in a district parish in my own neighbourhood who was associated with myself as the representative to the central body. When the time came for his co-operation his answer was that the Nonconformists and the Churchmen in his district were so remarkably friendly, that he must beg to decline taking any active part whatever, having already accepted the office. Now, I venture to think, my Lord, as I said before, that the Clergy who argue in this way are not at all aware of what is going on under their very feet and behind their backs. I believe that in almost every parish in the country, as I think Sir Richard Cross said, there is something of this kind going on. The weekly papers and tracts which are distributed by the agents of the Liberation Society find their way into the cottages, and, in spite of the Clergyman doing his duty to his utmost, and sometimes more than his utmost, his efforts are counteracted by these means which the Liberation Society have so largely at command, and which they know so well how to employ. But I think that if your Grace will agree to the request conveyed to you in this resolution, and issue an unmistakeable and plain request to the Clergy and Laity of the country to unite, as they ought to do, for what I may call the sacred cause of Church Defence, your Grace's admonition and your Grace's exhortation will not be given in vain. With regard to the first part of the resolution it speaks for itself. After what has fallen from my friend Mr. Egerton, in supporting the last resolution, I think that no words of mine are the least necessary to add any force to it, and therefore, your Grace, I beg to move the resolution.

The BISHOP OF CHICHESTER: Your Grace, if it had not been that from the very beginning I have watched the proceedings of the Church Defence Institution, and observed the great value which it possesses and the great necessity that there is for such an Institution, I should have been content simply to second what has been already so happily proposed by Lord Dartmouth. There is no doubt, I think, looking round and judging from my own Diocese, that there is an immense amount of indifference and supineness among the parochial Clergy among this matter. They are so comfortable in their benefices; all goes on from day to day so happily and so pleasantly, that they think that this peace and

contentment can never be disturbed, and they are exactly like persons against whom the Nihilists are springing a mine, and do not know the amount of dynamite which is under their feet and may explode at any moment. They are not political persons. They read a paper, I suppose, as most Englishmen are able to do, at a cheap rate, and they probably take in the paper that suits their own convictions, and in these papers, which are entirely adapted to their own tastes and inclinations, they see exceedingly little of what is going on upon the other side. That false security is incident to an Established Church. But anybody who is familiar with the reflexions of Burke made long since will see that what he foresaw is now actually coming to pass. What he dreaded was the reign of Atheism in this country fostered by the French Revolution, and that is what we now have to dread. It is nothing less. It is not this form of religion, or that form of religion, but it is no religion at all. It is the absolute denial of a Providence and of a God. I think that the Clergy are not enough alive to this or to the importance of the matter, not only in their position as pastors of parishes, but as essential members of a vast national institution. If the Archbishop can persuade them to this—if his Grace's Pastoral can move them, as I confess no Pastoral of mine has ever been able to move them,—I shall be extremely happy, and I shall think that we have done that which it is now at this very moment most necessary to do. His Grace will speak for himself, and no one can speak so well. I have no doubt that his Grace will in that pastoral letter address the whole Church of England—the great body of the Laity as well as of the Clergy, and he will show them that the interests of the Laity are really mainly concerned in the maintenance of the Established Church as it now exists. It is not a question simply for the Clergy of the present day. I suppose they will not be inclined exactly to say with the good king of old, that as long as it lasts our time it is well. I suppose that that would not be exactly their sentiments; but it will so far last their time, for even under those most cruel proposals it is provided that the Clergy should not be left entirely and turned into the world entirely naked, but that they should have some sort of pension—I suppose pretty much the same sort of pension that King Henry in his munificence allowed to the monks when he turned them out of their convents. That is the sort of provision which I think we might expect from the mercy of the Liberation Society. But something they would have, and therefore, as far as they go, they are provided for for their time. But we trust and hope that there is no such selfish feeling among them, and that they would rather

look to the interests of the Church hereafter. I am sure that we all feel that this is not an offence society, but that it is a defence society. It is not proposed if the Society had the command of unlimited money that they should go into the parishes and towns and fight the Dissenters, and provoke them to a contest, that is by no means the intention. What the intention is, is that when a meeting is announced at which some Liberation Lecturer is to appear, and at which he is to disseminate all manner of falsehood—falsehoods a thousand times contradicted, but really rising up ever fresh and new, as if they were possessed of essential verity—when a man of this kind comes, a plausible talking fellow, then it is that we want to have a man ready to meet him, and ready to controvert his statements—ready if possible to carry the common sense of the meeting with him. Really, after all, it is only to the common sense and fairness of Englishmen that our Lecturers appeal. I will mention an anecdote which bears upon this very subject. I suppose that what one says goes no further than this room. In the town of Horsham, a very considerable and increasing town in Sussex, one of our most important towns, the vicar said to me casually one day, “The Liberation Society are coming down. They are going to send a lecturer. I think I shall take no notice of them, we are going on very comfortably here. I have no fear that the people will be misled. I said, “For goodness sake don’t act in that way. That is exactly the way to ruin your cause. Appear yourself if you feel yourself equal.” He said, “I am not used to this kind of discussion, and I do not think that I could meet the sort of objection at a public meeting.” I said, “Send up to the Church Defence Institution, and ask them if they can help you, and see if they have got any champion whom they can send down to meet our opponents.” He wrote up to Dr. Lee; a gentleman was procured; he came down, controverted the statements of the Liberation agent, and he carried the meeting with him, and the people went out singing, at the vicar’s invitation, a familiar Church hymn. That is just the effect of a little energy infused into the parochial Clergy. I may say that, unless the thing had been mentioned to me, and unless I had stirred up his latent zeal, the whole thing would have been carried with acclamation, and there would have been a victory for the Liberation Society in the town of Horsham. What has happened there happens elsewhere, and we really suffer from the lack of champions. We suffer too, from the lack of literature, such as we ought to spread through the country, leaflets plainly written, stating the truth in plain words, controverting the facts on the other side as they pretend them to be. But these leaflets ought

to be written in a plain way, so that the most illiterate man who can read at all can read them, and if they were put forward by persons whom the people may trust, we should hope that they would carry greater weight than assertions of the Liberation Society. I have very great pleasure in seconding the resolution. I have some hesitation in doing so, because I feel that it will throw a burden upon the Archbishop which, perhaps, as falling upon his high office, he will not refuse, but it is a burden still.

MR. WILLIAM U. HEYGATE: Your Grace, I feel that it is hardly necessary to do what your Grace has asked me to do, which is to say a few words in support of the Resolution which has been proposed and seconded with so much ability and clearness. But, having been connected with this Institution for a very considerable period—I think I may say since its commencement—and seen its working during all the past years, I feel that I have some authority to say that I never at any time knew it to be so much in need of the practical support of the people of this country—those who are connected with and interested in the maintenance and the welfare of the Church of England—as it is now. At the same time it never was in so poor a condition as it is at this moment, seeing that its income is decreasing year by year at the very time that its resources are most in need of increased strength. Now, your Grace, if I were asked to say in a few words what we came here for to-day, I should reply by asking my questioner to look at page 2 of the printed document in our hands, paragraph No. 10:—

“The income of the Liberation Society for several years past has averaged over £14,000 a year.”

And then I would ask him to look at page 4—the last paragraph but one—which will show that for such purposes as this, this Church Defence work, the Institution needs largely increased support. Its annual income at present from subscriptions and donations is barely £3,000 a year. I think this year it was £2,900. Hence we have to prepare for the defence with only that sum against £14,000. I do not mean to say that arguments are to be measured altogether by the money which there is at their back to support them. But there is that immense income on one side to provide for Lecturers all over the country without anyone to answer them, and to deluge the country with pamphlets and leaflets, and subsidise the newspapers. This last is a very important matter indeed to consider. Many of the country local newspapers are getting into the hands of Liberationists. When they make use of agencies such as that of Mr. Joseph Arch, and everything which

turns up, in point of fact, which is likely to support their cause, I say that it is time for us to consider whether we should not do a little more than we have hitherto done. Therefore, I say that this resolution is now very opportune. There is only one other observation which I would make. I have heard a great deal said both by Lord Dartmouth and by the Bishop of Chichester with reference to the inaction of the Clergy, and the necessity that there was on their part for taking a further and more prominent part in supporting this Institution, and a complaint has been made in some respects of their absence from discussions and of apparent slackness in taking advantage of the occasion when lecturers from the enemy appear. But I would say that, as far as my personal experience is concerned, I have seen that the Clergy have done a great deal more in proportion for the support of the Church Defence than the Laity have done, and I have always maintained that this is a laymen's question to a great extent, and to a very much larger extent than it affects the interests of the Clergy. If we let it go about that we are simply supporting the Church of England for the sake of the Clergy, the case is gone. People will not rally round us merely for the support of the Clergy. But let it be once felt and understood, as Churchmen do feel and understand, that it is for the interest of the layman far more than it is for the interest of the Clergyman that the connection of Church and State should be maintained, and that the Church should be maintained in all her strength and with the influence which her present position gives her, and then I think that we may appeal, with every prospect of success, to the general public. In reference to the action of the Clergy, when I look at the subscription lists which are published monthly in *The National Church*—(a very useful little paper, as to which I think we may all feel very grateful to Dr. Lee for the manner in which he has managed it for many years past)—we see, I think, that something like nine-tenths of the subscriptions which are poured forth from the country districts come from the Clergy and the Clergy alone; and therefore I would more especially ask your Grace not only to call upon the Clergy, but to call the serious attention of the Laity of the Church, and show them that it is to their interest that they should now come forward and help to supply the means so much needed for the support of an Institution which we so much love and cherish.

The Right Hon. H. C. RAIKES: My Lord Archbishop, I really do not quite know why my friend Dr. Lee is very anxious that I should speak to-day. I am sure that I have nothing to say, but what has been very well said since I came into the

room, except that I may refer to the fact that for many years I had a responsible share in the management of this Institution (Hear, hear). That was during times when our future was, perhaps, quite as overcast as it is now. But, to the steady front which was shown during the years from 1867 to 1873 by the Church Defence Institution, I have always attributed the fact that the agitation against the Church at that time, stimulated as it had been by the overthrow of the Church in Ireland, died away. And I trust that, if we can bring the same energy to bear now, the same result will again be attained. A great deal has been said as to the unwillingness of the parochial Clergy to engage in strife and controversy upon these topics ; and I think that we must always feel that, although that may be in some sense unfortunate, yet it is, in another point of view, greatly to their credit, and that they must feel a special delicacy in being the foremost men in a battle which is, in a great measure, to be waged about their own status and their own emoluments. I think, too, that the natural love of peace, which is one of the attributes of their profession, may lead them to be unwilling to mix in broils upon public platforms and even in the public press ; and I feel sure that, if his Grace accedes to the request of this meeting, and issues an address to the Laity and Clergy of the Church of England, he will be able to satisfy them that, in the part which we ask them to take now, we are not asking them to engage in warfare, but we are asking them really to take steps which may lead to peace. Our object is peace. We only wish to be let alone. We only wish the Church to be allowed to pursue her mission without disturbance. But it is the old story,—

“ Si vis pacem para bellum.”

We must show that we are able to take our own part and quit ourselves like men in contending for that which we believe to be the greatest of blessings. I do not know that there is anything further that I ought to say to the meeting, except that the immense funds at the disposal of the Liberation Society are, after all, nothing to what the Church of England, if really and fully aroused to a sense of the occasion, might be able to employ ; and therefore, in this country, with our great universities constantly producing young and ardent Churchmen, there ought to be no real difficulty in finding a sufficient supply of raw material out of which to work out Lecturers who ought to be able, at least, to cope with those who are employed by our enemies. I feel sure that if the Clergy and the Laity are brought to realize that our position is one which we do not mean to sur-

render if we can possibly hold it, and if we can show them, also, what the English people particularly like to know, not only by historical argument which we believe to be upon our side—not even only by an appeal to scripture by which we think we can fortify our position—if we can appeal to the real good which the Church of England is doing at the present time, and if we put it to them whether they are willing to allow so great an engine for the public good to be suppressed, merely to gratify certain crotchets or the envy of certain persons, I feel no doubt that the response of the country will be one which will be quite worthy of the effort which we now appeal to the Primate to make.

MR. HUGH BIRLEY, M.P. : My Lord Archbishop, my Lords, and Gentlemen, I have been asked to say a few words concerning that part of the country with which I am most concerned, which is the North of England, or a certain part of the north of England. I have taken considerable interest in the Church Defence Association, both here and in Lancashire, for a great number of years—almost from its origin ; but at the same time I can sympathise very much both with those Clergy and Laity who say that the best defence of the Church is in the active discharge of the duties belonging to the Institution, but also with those who say that, living in amity and concord with their Dissenting neighbours, they hesitate to take part in any active career against them, or to encourage Lecturers in their parish who are sent by the Church Defence Institution. Now, as regards the latter point, I may mention here what I have recommended to my neighbours and to the Association in Manchester. I have said that I think that we go too far in polemical discussions, and that if we dwelt rather more in our lectures upon the history and the antiquities and the biography of the Church, we should create a greater sympathy in the minds of the audience. We have there a store of information which the Dissenters cannot possibly rival. And I also find in my own neighbourhood a very strong attachment to the Church, which is in great measure no doubt sentimental, but, still, there it is, and it ought, I think, to be utilised in a crisis like this. It is quite true that the Nonconformists and the Liberation Society have a much more active organisation and much larger funds than we have. That, I fear, will always be. They are an aggressive party—I was going to say by nature—much more active than we are. You will not find a number of Churchmen who will exert themselves either personally or from their pockets to anything like the extent that the active Dissenters ; but still I think that if we did use the means at our disposal to the best

advantage, the mere possession of large funds would not do us any very great harm. But I am thoroughly convinced of the necessity in a crisis like this of our acting as the Jews did, and whilst we rebuild the temple, we must keep our arms by our side. The work of the Church must be an active and progressive work, and must be so to a greater extent than hitherto. We must see whether there are any blemishes that can be cured. We must take care to make our grand position which we now occupy in this country as useful as possible for the benefit of the enormous mass of the population around us.

LORD HENRY SCOTT, M.P.: I was not prepared to speak to-day, but as Dr. Lee has asked me just to say a few words, I feel perhaps that I am bound to respond to the invitation, and say something in support of this Institution. This is a very important meeting which you have kindly given us here to-day. I hope that it is one which will bear fruit. I am quite sure that what is really wanted is more funds to carry on the Institution, and I think that it has been admirably pointed out that that is really a matter which devolves much more upon the Laity than upon the Clergy. I understand all the arguments that have been used showing that the defence of the Church is more important to the Laity, if I may say so, than to the Clergy. But I will also say this, that I think that it would be a very great thing if we could unite the Clergy of all classes and all shades of political opinion in support of the Church. It is with very great regret that year by year, as I look up and down the list of members of the Church Defence Institution, I fail to see any single name representing any political opinions except on the Conservative side. I cannot doubt that there must be a great number of Members of Parliament and Peers and others who really and sincerely sympathise with the work that the Church is doing. I think it a very great pity that we cannot by some means or other enlist them to associate with us. I have made this remark before. I do not know how the difficulty is to be overcome, but I think that it would be of very great use to this Institution if we could possibly get some really good men belonging to another political party to be added to that list. I know very well what difficulty those who hold liberal opinions have in associating their names with an Institution of this kind. I know how largely they depend for support upon the Nonconformist party, but I do sincerely hope that one outcome of the meeting to-day will be that some attempt will be made to induce members of the Church of England, whom we believe to be warmly attached to the Church, and who hold different opinions from our own, to

join this Institution. It is of very great importance; and when we see who are the advanced party who form the basis and rally round the work of the Liberation Society, and when we see what they are, and when we see what their hopes are, I am sure that it is time that we should try to gather into our forces all those who see, and must see, that the safety of the Church depends upon our resisting the attacks that are made upon her. I do not wish to occupy the time of the meeting farther; but unless we have funds, and larger funds than we have at present, it will be found impossible to carry out the scheme which has been proposed to us in the last page of the paper which has been handed round to us—that of having two Organizing Secretaries for the Southern Counties, and one for the North, and two competent Lecturers for the South and three for the North. Unless we can carry out that programme, I am afraid that the work of this Institution will not be as efficient as it ought to be. I cannot help hoping, therefore, that the result of our meeting here will be to infuse new energies into the Church Defence Institution, and with that object I will try to do my best in that direction.

Mr. J. G. TALBOT, M.P.: It would be shameful to detain the meeting with any words after so much has been said, and after what has been said. The only reason why I feel that I ought to respond to his Grace's appeal is, that I believe that I am the only representative of the Universities present in this room. Unfortunately, we know the cause which detains one of our most valuable and faithful friends from attending here to-day; while my old colleague of the University of Oxford is engaged on the business of the Ecclesiastical Commission, and is not able to be here. I only mention this because I think that it would be most undesirable if we thought that the Universities were in the least indifferent to the great question which has called us here to-day. I am quite sure that whatever may be the feeling of some of the resident members of the University who, at the present moment, may be unfortunately adverse to the true interests of the Church, there is, as has been said, a very large number of the junior members who come forth from these centres of national life year by year who are as deeply attached to the interests of the Church as any of those who have gone before them, and I feel certain that we have nothing to do but to rouse them up by an appeal such as your Grace can so well make, in order to show that that is so. I wish to emphasise two remarks made to-day. After having heard so many speeches it would be very difficult to say anything with reference to this question which has not been said already. I think that it is most desirable

that all our lay friends, and all our clerical friends too, should feel that this is a matter which most emphatically affects them. The existing Clergy are almost certain to be provided for by any scheme which even the Liberationists can devise ; but it will be upon the Laity of the Church of England that the great burden of Disestablishment would fall, if, unhappily, it should ever come. They, of course, would not only have to maintain to a great extent whatever parochial charities the Clergy now so largely contribute to, but, unless they wish irreligion and atheism to spread all over the land, they would have to contribute very largely to a great central fund, which would be the only means of supporting the National Church. And, therefore, it is upon the Laity that the question of Disestablishment chiefly and mainly bears, looking at it chiefly from the point of view of the pocket. That is one point. I wish to emphasize what my friend has said about the absolute necessity of uniting all political parties. I believe that what he says is emphatically true. There is a great number of what are called moderate Liberals who are just as keen in support of the relations between the Church and State as anybody else ; and I cannot do better than quote a few words which I just happened upon in one of the leaflets which have been circulated in this room, which represent the views of the present Prime Minister in the year 1873, which he did not give utterance to in any rash or unconsidered moment, but in a speech in the House of Commons in his place as Prime Minister then as now. Mr. Gladstone then said, "The Church of England has not only been a part of the history of this country, but a part so vital, entering so profoundly into the entire life and action of the country, that the severing of the two would leave nothing behind but a bleeding and lacerated mass. Take the Church of England out of the history of England, and the history of England becomes a chaos without order, without life, without meaning." I believe that Mr. Gladstone's sentiments are now what they were then. Whether they be so or not, I am quite sure that a great number of his political followers entertain the sentiment which he so well and eloquently expressed. I hope that one part of the outcome of this great meeting—(I call it great because, although it is not large in numbers, it is very representative)—will be to unite persons who, though not united on any political question, are all determined that, so far as they can help it, so monstrous a proposition as this programme of the Liberation Society shall not become part of the policy of this country.

The Motion was then put to the meeting by the Archbishop, and carried unanimously.

The Marquess of SALISBURY, K.G. : I have, before the meeting separates, to perform the agreeable task of joining in a vote of thanks, which on this occasion possesses a special significance, a vote of thanks to your Grace for your presence in the chair to-day. It is a matter of no small importance and gratification to us that we should have the first officer of our Church with us and at the head of us in this matter, and, still more so, one who possesses over the Clergy so vast an influence, earned not only by his high official position, but also and mainly by the manner in which that position has been filled. Much has been said of the action of the Clergy in reference to this matter ; and I feel that any plan or scheme of action which does not include their hearty and general co-operation will have a want of reality in it. Let us by all means take upon the Laity the duty which falls upon them. Let us subscribe, as we ought to subscribe, to find the necessary funds for this Society. But do not let us imagine that this contest with the Liberation Society can be decided by the respective length of our several purses. We live under a form of government in which every Institution and every Body which means to exist must defend itself (hear, hear). The means of defending itself is by operating on the sensitive surface of the minds of Members of Parliament ; and, though I quite sympathise with the dislike of the Clergy to enter in any degree the arena of politics, and though I quite understand how much they must shrink from the necessary differences which such action on their part brings about, still, I feel that, unless the Church, aided by the Clergy, girds itself up to the fight in the same way in which the Dissenters are fighting, there can be but one issue to the struggle. Do not misunderstand me. I am not suggesting that the Clergy should belong to one party or the other. There was great wisdom in the words of my noble friend who has just sat down. Both parties contain men who are earnest for the maintenance of the Established Church of England. What I rather complain of the Clergy in political matters is, not that they attach themselves to this party or to that, but that they fight for some special and much smaller object than the maintenance of the Church of England, or that they stand aside in dignified abstention altogether from the struggle. If they maintain this attitude, they are no fair match for the Dissenters. The Dissenting Clergy, especially those of the Independent and Baptist persuasions, live for this one thing. To this purpose every other object for which they can fight is sacrificed. They would not support any government or any party, however closely it might sympathise with their other political opinions, if they did not believe that it

would agree with them in this. And, in this, the Clergy, if they desire to effect any real influence over the national counsels in the future, must not disdain the weapons which the development of our Institutions, and which, therefore, we may say, without irreverence, the decree of Providence has placed within their hands. No doubt it is a far more congenial, agreeable, and dignified position to stand aside from the contest altogether. They may take the view that it is for others to decide whether the Church shall stand or fall, and that they will remain passive and receive the blow which is to come; but do not let them think that they can combine two opposite advantages. They may have the dignity of this kind of martyrdom if they remain still. They may save the Church if they will stir. But they cannot both save the Church and have the agreeable incidents of the position and the attitude which so many of them prefer. I know that there is something in this advice which to some minds will seem to be bordering on the cynical; but I feel that the crisis is thickening—that the moment for such delicacies has passed, and that those who are earnest to save the Church of England must not disdain to fight for her (Applause).

Sir HARDINGE GIFFARD, M.P. : I am permitted the honour of seconding that Resolution.

The Motion was put to the meeting by the Marquess of Salisbury, and carried unanimously.

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: I beg to thank you. I trust that the result of this meeting will be a great increase of the usefulness of this Institution; and I most heartily hope and desire that it will assume more and more a national character, as has been pointed out, and that, at any future meeting which may be called, here or elsewhere, we shall be favoured with the company of many who belong to another political party than the majority of this meeting, and who, I am sure, must, very many of them, desire the same object which you have in view. I cannot help thinking that great good will result from your kind attendance here to-day, and I shall certainly endeavour to do my part in fostering the work.





