

Leeds Church Institute.

TIME ALLOWED for READING, 14 Days.

If, after the expiration of 14 days, the work is demanded by the Librarian and NOT RETURNED, a fine of 1d. PER DAY will be incurred.

(Rule 25.)

This book made available by the Internet Archive.

Threats on the

expensive 23

1550 - 1500

analytical

1000 N/A

1586 2000

T

WHAT GOOD WILL IT DO?

A QUESTION ABOUT THE
DISESTABLISHMENT OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND,
EXAMINED AND ANSWERED.

BY THE
REV. J. C. RYLE, M.A.,
HON. CANON OF NORWICH,

Vicar of Stradbroke, and Rural Dean of Hozne, Suffolk.

Bishop of Liverpool

~~~~~  
"The thing as it is."—JOB xxvi. 23.  
~~~~~

THIRD EDITION.

London :
WILLIAM HUNT AND COMPANY
HOLLES STREET, CAVENDISH SQUARE ;
AND ALDINE CHAMBERS, PATERNOSTER ROW.

1872.

WHAT

GOD WILL IT DO

BY J. G. MILLER, M. A.

WILLIAM HUNT AND COMPANY

WHAT GOOD WILL IT DO ?

There is a subject much talked of just now, about which I wish to say a few words. That subject is the Disestablishment of the Church of England.

The subject is one of real importance, and demands the immediate attention of Churchmen. A Society has been formed for the express purpose of promoting Disestablishment, and has many active supporters. Mr. Miall, M.P. of Bradford, has brought forward, in the House of Commons, a motion for Disestablishing the Church of England, and, though defeated, had ninety-six votes on his side. In short there is, in full operation, an organized crusade against the Establishment. The campaign has begun. These are facts which every Churchman ought to know. It is silly to ignore them.

The world is fond of saying that clergymen cannot give an honest and disinterested opinion about this subject. "They are only fighting for the loaves and fishes,"

the cry. Well, the world may say what it pleases: I am getting too old to care for such charges. I only care for the spread of truth, and I shall not shrink from giving my opinion, and showing "the thing as it is."

In handling the subject I shall say nothing about the justice, or wisdom, or honesty of Disestablishment, though I might say a good deal. I shall stick close to one simple question:—that question is, "What good will it do?"

Let us then suppose that Parliament resolves some day to Disestablish the Church of England, as it has already Disestablished the Church of Ireland. Let us suppose that an Act of Parliament is passed by which the connection between Church and State is dissolved for ever and the State takes possession, as far as it can, of the property of the Church. What would the consequences be?

The practical consequences of Disestablishment, I think, would be something of this kind:—

- (1) The Bishops would cease to be Peers of the Realm and to sit in the House of Lords.
- (2) The income of the Bishops and clergy, from tithes and lands, would be appropriated by the State, and applied to other purposes, as fast as the present receivers of it died.
- (3) In process of time there would be nothing left to the Church, out of all her present possessions, except the church buildings, the pew-rents, a life-interest in the income of the Bishops and clergy for a few years, and the endowments of the last two centuries. This property, on the principles of the Irish Act, would probably be left to the Church of England. Some wild and rabid Liberatorists I believe, have coolly proposed that the clergy shall be stripped of their life-incomes, and turned into the streets as paupers, the very day the Disestablishing Act passes. They have also proposed that parish churches shall be taken away from Episcopalians, and applied to other uses! Whether they are to be put up to auction and sold to the highest bidder, or turned into Libraries, Museums, Mechanics' Institutes or Music Halls, I do not

know. I decline however to notice such stuff as this.

Until the House of Commons is very unlike any House which has ever been elected in this country, it will never pass a motion such as a policy, or ignore vested interests. There

no earthly reason why the Church of England should be treated more hardly than the Church of Ireland. After Disestablishment all churches and sects would be left on a dead level of equality. No favour or privilege would be granted by the State to one more than another, the State itself would have nothing to do with religion, and would leave the supply of it to the principles of free-trade and the action of the voluntary system. In a word, the Government of England would allow all its subjects to serve God or Baal,—to go to heaven or to hell,—as they please. The State would take no cognizance of spiritual matters, and would look on with Epicurean indifference and unconcern. The State would continue to care for the bodies of its subjects, but it would entirely neglect their souls.

This, so far as I can make out, is the state of things which the Liberationists wish to bring about in Great Britain. This is the end and object of all their talk, and noise, and organization, and agitation. This is the delightful condition of matters which Mr. Miall and his companions want to set up in the land. This is what they mean when they talk of "Disestablishment." Let them deny it if they can. Now let us consider quietly, what good will all this do? will proceed step by step, and examine six broad questions one by one. I will assume that Disestablishment actually takes place. I will then ask:—

- I. What good will it do to Dissenters?
- II. What good will it do to the Church? I*
- III. What good will it do to the tithe-payers?
- IV. What good will it do to the poor?
- V.. What good will it do to the cause of Christian charity?
- VI. What good will it do to the State?

I shall try to answer each of these questions in order.

I. First of all, What good will Disestablishment do to the Dissenters? I answer that question without the slightest hesitation. It will do them no good at all.

I take up this point first because it comes first in order. The Dissenters, as a body, are the chief agitators for Disestablishment. They evidently think that it would be greatly for their benefit, and would improve their position. I venture to think that they are totally and entirely mistaken. I will give my reasons for saying so.

Would Disestablishment destroy the Church of England and take the great rival of Dissenters completely out of the way? Would it leave the Dissenters a clear field, and throw the whole population into their hands? It would do nothing of the kind!—Unless the House of Commons resolves to proscribe the use of the Liturgy,—to make it penal to be an Episcopalian,—to confiscate the property of Churchmen, on the principles, of French Communism,—and to imprison and shoot clergymen who work harder than others, on the principles of Sheffield rattening,—unless the House of Commons does this, the Church of England will never be killed by Disestablishment. The Dissenters would soon find that the old Church when Disestablished, was not dead, but alive.

Disestablishment would not even ruin the Church financially. The pew-rents and offertories would still main: Parliament could not take them.—The endow-

ments of the last two centuries would still remain: Parliament, on the principles of the Irish Act, would not touch them.—The life-interests of the Bishops and clergy, on the same principles, would still remain. A judicious system of life insurance or commutation, such as certain lay churchmen in Lombard Street could soon devise, would turn those life-interests into a very large capital for investment, if safe investment could be found.—In short, though sorely crippled and impoverished, the Church of England would not be ruined. We could still get on, and would get on, though many of us might have to reduce our expenditure. The Liberationists would soon discover, after robbing and plundering us as much as they could, that we were not quite bankrupt. We should maintain our position, in spite of our poverty, and not die. Let the Dissenters remember that.

Disestablishment would not affect the influence of the Church in great towns in the slightest appreciable degree, the tithe-receiving clergy in rural districts would doubtless lose half their income by life insurance or commutation, and be sorely hampered. But the clergy in most large cities, who depend on pew-rents, Easter offerings, and offertories, as a body, would be quite as well off after Disestablishment as they were before. "The great towns govern the country," we are continually told. Yet in most great towns the Church would be as powerful as ever! Once more I say, let the Dissenters remember that.

Disestablishment would not make the bulk of Englishmen or save the Church of England and become Baptists, Independents, Presbyterians, or Methodists. It would

not fill the chapels and empty the churches. It would not make the aristocracy, or the upper and middle classes, burn their Prayer-books, desert Oxford and Cambridge ministers, and fall in love with extempore prayer. Not a bit of it! The vast majority of Churchmen would stick to Bishops, rectors, vicars, curates, liturgical worship, and the old paths of the Church of England, closer and tighter than ever. They would make more of their poor old Church in her adversity than they ever did in her prosperity. They would love her better and open their purses more liberally, when they saw her in plain attire, than they ever did when she was clothed in purple and fine linen. In point of number of adherents I verily believe Disestablishment would soon prove a great loss to Dissenters, and not a gain.

Disestablishment would not give more liberty to Dissenters, or enable them to do anything which they cannot do now. No Christians on earth have such a plethora of civil and religious liberty as the English Nonconformists have in the present day. They have far more freedom than Churchmen! They can build chapels anywhere, preach anywhere, gather congregations anywhere, worship in a way, and serve God in any way, no man forbidding while Churchmen are checked and stopped by laws and restrictions at every turn. What in the world could the Dissenters do more, if the Church was Disestablished tomorrow? I do not suppose they would ask leave to shoot or hang all the clergy, to "improve us off the face of the earth," to confiscate the cathedrals and parish churches and to

compel the millions of English men and women who now go to church to go to chapel, on pain of death. But, short of this, I know of nothing they cannot do. They have free liberty to make all Englishmen Dissenters

they can; and what more do they want? The dissolution of the union of Church and State would do dissenters no good at all.

[In saying all this I would not be misunderstood. I claim the slightest feeling of ill-will towards Dissenters. I have not the least desire to interfere with them, respect their conscientious convictions, even when I think them mistaken. I am thoroughly thankful for any good they do. I wish to let them alone, and to allow them work and worship in their own way. I only express my own firm conviction that Disestablishment would do dissenters no good, but great harm. In their own interest they had better be quiet and let us alone.

II. In the second place, What good will Disestablishment do to the Church of England? My answer is 'fold. It will do it a little good and a great deal of harm.

The advocates of Disestablishment, I am well aware, are fond of telling us that their movement is all for our real advantage! They mean us no harm: not they! They love the Church of England, but dislike its connection with the State. The Liberatorist agitators are in reality our best friends, and we ought to be exceedingly obliged to them for their disinterested labours for our benefit! I rave words these! and I heartily believe that some of those who use them mean what they say. But they utterly fail to convince me. At the risk of being told that I am only caring for "the loaves and fishes," I will give my reasons.

The good that Disestablishment would do to the Church of England is very small. It would doubtless give us more liberty, and enable us to effect many useful reforms.

It would bring the laity forward into their rightful position (from sheer necessity. It would give us a real and proper constituted Convocation. It would lead to an increase of Bishops, a division of dioceses, and a reconstruction of our cathedral bodies. It would make an end of Crown jobs in the choice of Bishops, and upset the whole system of patronage. It would destroy all sinecure offices, and drive all drones out of the ecclesiastical hive. It would enable us to make our worship more elastic, and our ritual better suited to the times. All these are advantages unquestionably, but gains whose value must not be exaggerated.

On the other hand, the harm that Disestablishment would do to the Church of England is very great indeed. It would sorely impoverish the thousands of the rural clergy, whose income depends on tithes, and would make it ultimately necessary to diminish their number by at least one half, consolidate half the livings, and put an end to half the abuses. The voluntary system in rural districts is notorious as an entire failure. It would tax the energies of a disestablished Church most heavily to keep up an Episcopal ministry outside the towns.—It would immensely cripple the power of the Church of England to do much for the Evangelization of the heathen and the general spread of the Gospel. "Sustenance funds" would absorb three-quarters of the Church's attention; and we should find it hard enough to maintain our position, and much harder to extend our lines.—Last, but not least. Disestablishment would almost certainly lead to divisions, schisms, and possible disruption in the Episcopal body. Of course this goes for nothing with some Christians, who seem to think that divisions and schisms are very nice things, and that multiplication of sects is the nearest thing to heaven up to

them. I content myself with remarking that Jesus Christ says, "A house divided against itself cannot stand." The more divisions among Christians the greater the weakness, the smaller the influence of Christianity! To promote increase of division among English Christians

is the 3rd way to help the Pope, the infidel, and the devil.
will not waste words on those who tell us that the
English clergy, after Disestablishment, would preach better,
write better, and speak better, and work better than
they do now, and that, like wild elephants, we should all
be made tamer and more useful by starving. Anybody
make assertions like these; but assertions are worth
nothing when they are contradicted by plain facts. I do
see that the American Episcopalians over the water,
• have no connection with the State, are a bit better
preachers and workers than the clergy of the English
Establishment. Above all, I do not see that English
iconformist ministers, as a body, are at all superior, in
preaching or working, to the clergy of the English Estab-
lished Church.

In short, the assertion of the advocates of Disestablish-it, that this movement would do
the Church of England good, appears to me utterly destitute of foundation. An ounce of facts is
better than a pound of theories. Free Churches are very fine things to talk about, look very
fine at a distance; but matters are not always the same inside. The good that Disestablishment
would do the Church of England is comparatively small and very uncertain. The harm that it
would do is very certain and ^ great. The advocates of Disestablishment may say that they
please about wishing to do us good, but they do not expect us to believe them. They had
better drop that line of argument altogether. The man who

tries to Disestablish the Church of England is, in
my judgment, an enemy of the Church, and not a friend.

-*□ >.

III. In the third place, what good will Disestablishment do to the tithe-payers? I answer
that question very decidedly. It will do them the slightest | whatever.

This is a point that needs clearing up. It touches men's pockets, and therefore they feel
interested about it. Moreover there is an amazing amount of ignorance in men's minds about it.
I have not a doubt that many farmers and small occupiers of land in England are under the belief
that if Disestablishment came they would be a great deal better off than they are now. They
are secretly rejoicing in the vision of "no more Established Church, no more parsons to take
rent-charge! no more tithes! much more money in our pockets!"

Now I am sorry to dispel this pleasing vision, but I am obliged to do it. Facts are stubborn
things, and cannot be evaded. There is such a thing as "reckoning with your host." I
recommend tithe-payers, who are generally sensible, hard-headed fellows, to look at the
subject on both sides. "Wait a bit, my friends," I would say: "don't be in a hurry. Before you help

to destroy the unio Church and State, consider whether the destruction help your pockets." You think it will I tell you it not. Let us see.

It is a fact that for centuries nearly all land in Eng , has been subject to the payment of tithes. For hum of years land has been bought and sold, let and h I rented and farmed, at more or less annual payr I according to the amount of tithe. Tithe has be- | regular charge, which has been taken into accour I

□:- i

ry agreement between landlord and tenant for many erations. He that pays no tithe pays more rent, and ihat pays tithe pays less rent. Every farmer of average je knows all this perfectly well. To tell them such igs, to use a homely phrase, is like telling them that and two make four, or that there are twenty shillings i pound. It is a simple fact, which is known from end of England to another.

^Vell, if the Church of England is disestablished and ndowed, it is plain that tithe-payment will either be e away or not. The clergy of course will cease to re- ^e the tithes. But will Parliament do away with the ment of tithes altogether ? or will Parliament decree t tithes shall be paid to some other purpose than the sport of the clergy? One coui'se or another must be •pled, and in either case the tithe-payers would not Q a single farthing.

jet us suppose, on one hand, that tithes are completely dished, and cease to be paid. At once every landlord England would raise his rents, and on every principle justice and equity would have a right to do so. A very e thing it would be for the landlords, and a very pretty lition it would be to their incomes! But the tenants uld gain nothing at all! What they saved in tithes ;y would lose in rent.

Let us suppose, on the other hand, that tithes are not Dlished when Disestablishment comes, but applied to ne other purpose than the support of the clergy. Well, they are not abolished, there is an end of the whole estion. Disestablishment would evidently do no good, I that case, to the pockets of tithe-payers. They would I just where they were before!

I defy any advocate of Disestablishment to show any < 3ape from these conclusions.—Some tell us they would

apply the tithes to the payment of poor-rates and highway-rates. Where would be the good of this? At once landlords would raise their rents. Land is now let hired subject to payment of poor-rates and highway-rates and they make a regular deduction from the rent. Off the burden of poor-rates and highway-rates, and of course the rent would be raised!—Some would-be philanthropists tell us they would apply the tithes to public objects, such as harbours of refuge, public parks for great towns, museums, lunatic asylums, and the like. Public objects, indeed! What benefit would rural tithe-payers derive from them? What would a Suffolk tithe-payer care for harbours at Filey or Dover, or parks and museums; Wolverhampton or Oldham? His tithe-money would annually go away for objects which would do him no good at all. I suspect in a few years the tithe-payers would get sick of the new system, and would wish the old system could be set up again. ••

Let us add to all this, that the Episcopal clergyman, deprived of the tithes in a rural parish, would of course cease to pay any rates, except for his house and garden. At present the clergyman is often the largest rate-payer in the parish. In future what he used to pay must be made up by the other rate-payers.—Let us remember besides that without the tithes the rural clergyman would in no cases be obliged to curtail his expenses, and to spend much less in the parish than he does now. In either case tithe-payers would suffer, and the parish would lose more than it gained by Disestablishment. There is an old fable which tells of a man killing his goose for the sake of the golden eggs she laid. Of course he found that he never got another egg! I often think of that fable when I hear of rural tithe-payers clamouring for Disestablishment, any rate it would do them no good. *

Y. In the fourth place, what good would Disestablishment do to the poor? I answer that inquiry without hesitation. It would not only do them no good, but would do them great harm.

This is a very serious question. "The poor shall never see out of the land." To "remember the poor" is a plain command of Scripture. All changes, whether political or ecclesiastical, which tend to injure the poor, are, on the very face of them, objectionable. This is the heaviest objection I bring against the whole Disestablishment movement. It would inflict grievous damage, both temporal and spiritual, on the agricultural poor, the very poor of all classes in England deserve most consideration. Disestablishment would injure the poor temporally. I challenge any man to deny that in thousands of rural parishes throughout England the clergyman is the means of doing an immense amount of temporal good to the poor. Where is the well-ordered parish in which the clergyman's house is not the mainspring of a large machinery of charity to men's bodies?—Who does not know but it is the clergyman who in every well-ordered parish is naturally expected to take the lead about clothing-clubs, 3-clubs, boot-clubs, coal-clubs, soup-clubs, blanket-clubs, a hundred other means of helping the poor?—Who does not know that in every well-ordered parish the clergyman is ready to be the unpaid friend of every one who needs a friend, whether in the way of money, or advice, sympathy,—and the friend of poor dissenters as well as poor church-goers?—I defy any one to deny this. The quantity of temporal good which the agricultural poor derive from the clergy at present, is something, I suspect, which dwellers in towns, and Liberatorist orators on platform forms, have not the slightest idea. It is good which

is done quietly, and unostentatiously, without parade blowing of trumpets. But it is done; and the last day alone will declare the full extent of it.

Well, there will be an end of a great deal of this Disestablishment comes. Stripped of more than half of his professional income, reduced to be the minister of the Episcopalian alone in his parish, the rural clergyman would of course cease to do what he once did for the poor, most cases he would not be able to do much, if he but the will. He must rigidly confine himself to the members of his own congregation. If any man thinks this would be a nice change, and an advantage to the rural parish I beg leave to differ from him entirely.

The destruction of the Establishment would inflict immense temporal damage on the poor.

Disestablishment would do great spiritual harm to the poor. Stripped of a large part of her present endowments, the Church of England would be able to do far more than she now does for the extension of Christ's kingdom whether at home or abroad. Aggressive measures for the evangelization of mining and manufacturing populations, the building of new churches and schools, the formation of new districts in poor neighbourhoods,—all these things would either be entirely stopped or greatly curtailed. With a rural clergy deprived of more than half their income, with town congregations obliged to give liberal support to the Church in the country, the Church's power of doing good to souls would be painfully lessened and diminished. To sustain her without extending, to keep her alive without increasing, to live without much growth would require the utmost exertions of her children. Nonconformists would suffer so much from this state of things as the par-

The plain truth is, that the voluntary system, on which

to a great measure the Church would be thrown, after Dis-

establishment, is a total and entire failure. Dr. Parker,

an eminent Nonconformist minister, calls it "a miserable

failure." It is a failure in the United States of America,

in spite of all the wealth and energy of the Americans.

There are myriads of poor in New York and in the back-

woods who are just like sheep without a shepherd.—It is a

failure in England among the Nonconformists at this day.

With all their many privileges and advantages, they can-

not pay their ministers sufficiently in rural districts, nor

provide sufficient chapels for poor neighbourhoods. Above

all they cannot provide day-schools for their own poor

children, and are obliged to confess it! At the eleventh

hour they have supported an "Education Act," which

requires schools to be built by a compulsory rate, and by

doing so they have practically admitted that the voluntary

system has thoroughly broken down.

Nonconformists cannot get over facts like these. I advise every poor

man in England who is urged to sign a petition for Dis-

establishment, to think twice before he signs, and to ask

"What good will it do to the poor?" Disestablish the

Church of England, and the very first to suffer from it

Must be the poor. In the interests of the poor, if there
be no other reasons, I see no good, but immense evil in
establishment.

^ . In the fifth place, what good would Disestablishment do to the cause of peace and
charity " ^ I shall answer that question very decidedly. It would do no
|i d at all.

I ?he quantity of stuff, and nonsense, and silly romantic

^ bish, which is talked on this point, is very curious.

I- 3re are many innocent-minded people, I believe, both

B

Churchmen and Dissenters, who really think that, if the union of Church and State were
dissolved, English Christians would get on far more happily and comfortably than they do
now. There would be no more jealousies, envyings, or rivalries, or wranglings, or
squabbings, quarrelling, or party spirit! Ephraim would no longer - ^ Judah, nor Judah
Ephraim! The whole Christian people in Great Britain would become a great Evangelical
alliance and happy family! Baptists, and Independents, and Presbyterians, and
Episcopalians, would fraternize lovingly and exchange pulpits! Mr. Spurgeon would
preach at St. Paul's, and the Bishop of London in the Metropolitan Tabernacle! Such are the
visions with which many worthy Christian laymen amuse themselves, and even laymen who
do not approve of Disestablishment. They regard it as a painful operation, like drawing a
tooth, i. they are very sorry it should ever be performed. But operation once over, and
the tooth once out, they really believe we shall all be much happier and better friends: for it.
Like little children after a quarrel, we should just " kiss and be friends."

Now I believe nothing whatever of the kind. I am for unity, wherever it can be obtained,
and I would willingly make large sacrifices in order to obtain it. I think the present divided
state of English Christianity a disgrace to religion. I disclaim the slightest sympathy with those
who think that you cannot have too many sects and denominations, and that it does not
matter where you worship or what you hear preached. I would see more unity, and I
should like to see more uniformity. But, for all this, I have not the slightest faith in unity being
promoted by force and plunder and spoliation; levelling down. Charity and peace among
Christians

will never be brought about by violence. Peace be-
tween Episcopalians and Dissenters is about the last
thing of which will result from Disestablishment. It will
be like a breach that will never be built up.

Let us just take a practical common-sense view of the
matter in hand. Let us suppose that Mr. Miall and his
companions, by the aid of the English Dissenters, succeed
in carrying out the Disestablishment of the Church of

England. Let us suppose that some reckless House of Commons, and some popularity-hunting Prime Minister, have way at length to Mr. Miall's importunity, and pass a Disestablishing Act for the Church of England, like that which was passed for the Church of Ireland. Such an event could only take place, I believe, after years of schievous strife and agitation, and after hundreds of 3n conflicts between Churchmen and chapel-goers all over the land. Will any man in his sober senses tell that this miserable long-drawn strife would promote unity? Would it not rather leave behind it festering sores that would never be healed? Of course it would! It would make unity between English Episcopalians and their adversaries an impossibility for several generations. A costly China plate would be broken. It might perhaps be riveted, but it could never be mended again. But this is not all. Suppose that the Disestablishing Act should do to deprive the rural clergy, who depend on tithes, of half their incomes, as it certainly would. Suppose that thousands of quiet country rectors and vicars are suddenly obliged to reduce their expenditure, to alter their style of living, to take away their boys from good schools, to give their girls an inferior education, and to sacrifice a great many comforts; and all this in consequence of the attacks of Mr. Miall and the Dissenters.

Suppose all this to take place. Will any man pretend to say that there could possibly be much harmony or friendly feeling between Churchmen and chapel-goers such a condition of things? It is absurd to expect, for centuries there would be a gulf between Episcopalia and non-Episcopalians in England, which nothing would fill up. Disestablishment would be the grave of unity.

"It ought not to be so,"—some innocent-minded man may say.—"The union of Church and State is not essential to Christianity. Men may surely differ about it and be friends. When the battle is over, why not forgive and forget?"—What ought to be, is a vague phrase, which I do not stop to discuss. What would be, is another question and from my

observation of human nature I have a very decided opinion about it. Believers who hold different views on non-essential points in religion can get on very comfortably so long as they are tolerant, and do not assault each other, and tread on one another's toes. But at a moment A begins to say to B, "I shall try to half-ruin your Church, and to get half your income taken away it is nonsense to expect any more friendship between A and B!"—The Bible commands us to "forgive our enemies to do good to them that hate us, and to pray for those that despitefully use us." But the Bible nowhere says that we are to regard our enemies as beloved brothers & friends. The Bible says, "If any man take thy coat, him take thy cloak also." But the Bible nowhere says that we are to regard the man who has violently taken our coats and cloaks as an honest man, and to shake hands with him as a dear friend.

For my own part, I can truly say that for thirty years I have laboured hard to promote unity and good feeling between Churchmen and Nonconformists. I have gone

far in this direction that I have often been blamed, injured, and slandered by my brother Churchmen, as half-Dissenter. I have gone on steadily nevertheless, and we always said that Dissenters deserve much kindness and consideration, because the Church's neglect has made them what they are. But if Dissenters will not let the Church alone, and will not rest till they have destroyed the Establishment, I give up all hopes of unity. You cannot get on comfortably with men who have deliberately given to upset your Church, and to take away half your income!—Co-operation in future would be almost impossible. The Bible Society and the London City Mission would suffer heavily. From the day that the Church of England is disestablished there will be an end of much unity between Episcopalians and their dissenting adversaries. There is little enough now, and after Disestablishment there will be much less. It is my deliberate judgment that those who labour to destroy the union of Church and State in England, under the vain idea of putting all Churches and sects on a dead level, are making unity and good feeling between Church and chapel impossible for two hundred years.

VI. In the last place what good would Disestablishment) to the State. My answer is short and decided. It could do it no good, but very great harm.

This question is far too wide and complicated to be fully discussed in a tract. But I shall try to throw a little light on it. If I can only show that the dissolution of the union of Church and State involves far more serious consequences than most of its advocates dream of, I shall be content. Such clap-trap phrases as "non-interference with spiritual matters,"—"unsectarian legislation,"

—"allowing no special privilege to any denomination," "adopting the principles of free trade in religion," "leaving all Churches and sects to themselves/"—"taking no cognizance of any but secular matters,"—all these { fine high-sounding expressions, and look very pretty theory. But the moment you begin to work them out practice, you find grave objections rising up in your way; objections that cannot be got over.

To begin with. Scripture teaches plainly that God rules everything in this world, that He deals with nations as they deal with Him, that national prosperity and national decline are ordered by Him, that wars, pestilences and famine are part of His providential government of the world, and that without His blessing no nation can prosper. Now do we believe all this or not? If we do believe it is simply absurd to say that Governments have nothing to do with religion, and that they may safely ignore God. That often quoted text, "My kingdom is not of this world has nothing whatever to do with the matter in hand. When our Lord spoke these words He simply meant to tell Pilate that His kingdom was not a secular kingdom, like the kingdoms of this world, by the sword: But, to say that our Lord meant that "Governments will never support or countenance religion," is a preposterous and unwarrantable interpretation of Scripture. Whether men like to see it or not, I believe it is the first duty of a State to honour and recognize God. The government that refuses to do this, in order to save itself trouble and to avoid favouring one Church more than another, may think it is doing a very "smart" and politic thing. But believe its line of procedure is offensive to the Most High and eminently calculated to draw down His displeasure,

Again, reason itself points out that the moral standard

(of a nation's subjects, is the grand secret of its prosperity.

(Gold mines, and manufactures, and scientific discoveries,

and eloquent speeches, and commercial activity, and demo-

cratic institutions, are not enough to make or to keep

nations great. Tyre, and Sidon, and Carthage, and Athens,

and Rome, and Venice, and Spain, and Portugal, had plenty

of such possessions as these, and yet fell into decay. The

secrets of a nation's strength are, truthfulness, honesty,

simplicity, purity, temperance, economy, diligence, brotherly

friendliness, charity among its inhabitants. Let those deny

it who dare.—And will any man say that there is any

other way of producing these characteristics in a people

an by encouraging, and fostering, and spreading, and
 aching pure Scriptural Christianity? The man who
 ys there is must be an infidel.—Then, if these things are
 , the first duty of a State ought to be to encourage and
 juntenance religion among its subjects in every possible
 ay. Does a State want its subjects to be provident, truth-
 d, diligent, temperate, honest, moral, and charitable ? Does
 or does it not ? If it does it ought to support religion. To
 anish vice and yet not cherish virtue,—to spend public
 loney on building jails and yet not encourage churches,
 1, to say the least, an absurdly inconsistent policy. The
 lore true religion the better subjects! The more good
 abjects the more prosperity! The government which
 ;^ores religion, and coolly declares that it does not care
 whether its subjects are Christians or not, is guilty of an
 ct of suicidal folly. Irreligion, even in a temporal point
 f view, is the worst enemy of a nation.

Once more, the practical consequences which logically esult from carrying out the
 principle of Disestablishment, ire so monstrous and appalling, that one can hardly
 believe

that people who clamour for disconnecting Church a State, have ever fully considered
 them. Let us look them. Grant that the Church is Disestablished, and tl the English
 Government resolves to have nothing more do with religion, and to leave it to the
 voluntary syste In order to carry out this principle consistently, the Si cession Acts must
 then be repealed, and our Sovereig might be Papists ! Our Kings and Queens, if we had a
 more, would be crowned without any religious servi Our Parliaments would carry on
 their proceedings withe prayer. Our regiments and men of war would no lon^ have
 chaplains. Our prisons and workhouses would ha no chaplains. Even the religious
 observance of Sund i would be in danger.—" Nonsense !" some may say. " course we do
 not want such a state of things. We or want to dissolve the union between the State and t
 Church of England." People may cry " Nonsense," if th like, but they will never prove
 that the state of things have just described will not be the logical consequence
 Disestablishment, if followed out to its legitimate co elusions. After Disestablishment,
 the State, if it a(consistently, must either leave the souls of soldiers, sailo prison and
 workhouse inmates entirely alone, or else > must get over the difficulty by putting up
 chaplaincies public tender, and jobbing them out to the lowest bidd(whether he be
 Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Congregatio alist, Socinian, or Papist! There is no other
 course op< to us. If the rulers of the State, after Disestablishmei appoint any particular
 chaplains to ships, regiments, wor houses, and jails, they are at once open to the charge
 showing favour to one denomination more than anothe(Of course Mr. Miall and his

companions will not let tl State do this!

The example of the United States and the Colonies is t the slightest reply to what I am saying. The Americans

not entirely separate religion and the State. The nerican Congress, no donbt, has a chaplain, and is opened th prayer. The army and navy, the prisons and refor-itories of America have chaplains, I have no doubt, it even then I can find no guarantee that these chaplains ly not be Sociriians or Papists !—And after all, the case America only shows that our shrewd cousins, unlike \ Miall, see the utter uselessness of trying to carry out 3 principles of the Liberationist Society to their logical ;ults. In practice even a new country like America, not tered by old precedents, finds it impossible entirely to lore God. I cannot quite persuade myself that what Qericans find impossible will ever be attempted in igland. When Mr. Miall and his party have upset the ion of Church and State, they will have to connive at 'Ue inconsistencies!

What may be before us no man can tell. But in an age e our own,—an age of restlessness,—an age of liberality, sely so called,—an age of popularity hunting,—an age sensationalism and surprises,—an age of idolatry of the)b,—an age of contempt for old things, riierely because 3y are old,—an age of spasmodic feverish zeal for new ings, merely because they are new,—an age of change • the sake of change,—an age of laziness and apathy long the defenders of the old things, and of earnestness d perseverance among the advocates of the new,—in 3h an age I shall never be surprised if Disestablishment •lies. When it does come, I believe it will inflict such

amount of damage on the State, as the mind,of man '1 hardly conceive. I declare I had far rather see the oiscopal Establishment upset, and the Baptists or Inde-

pendents made the Established Church of England, tb see the State ceasing to recognize God. I had far rati see our next Sovereign crowned in Westminster Abbey . Mr. Spurgeon, or Mr. Binney, or Dr. Gumming, with extempore prayer, and the Archbishop of Canterbu standing as a private individual in the crowd, than see o Government turning its back on Christianity altogeth

When I read English history, I see plainly that t real greatness of this country dates from the Protesta Reformation. I see that it was under Sovereigns w ordered the Bible to be translated and circulated—a under Parliaments which ratified the Thirty-nine Articl and took great practical interest in religion, that our r tion took its first great start in its career of freedom, Aveal and power. I see that the influence of England □v\ seldom more felt in Europe than it was in the days Oliver Cromwell, when that great though misguided m threw the shield of England over persecuted Protestai in Savoy, and even awed the Pope by interfering religious matters. Seeing all this, I will never belie that Disestablishment would do no harm to the State. (the contrary, I believe it would bring down God's heavic judgments on this realm. The Act of Parliament whi dissolved Church and State would do great damage the Church; but it would be as nothing compared to t injury it would ultimately inflict on the State.

In what manner God would punish England, if Engli Governments cast off all connection with religion, I canr tell. Whether He would punish us by some sudden ble such as defeat in war, and the occupation of our territo by a foreign power,—whether He would waste us aw gradually and slowly by placing a worm at the roots our commercial prosperity,—whether He would bre;

to pieces by letting fools rule over us and allowing rliaments to obey them, and permitting us like the

dianites to destroy one another,—whether He would in us by sending a dearth of wise Statesmen in the per ranks, and giving the reins of power to commu-;ts, socialists, and mob-leaders,—all these are points lich I have no prophetic eye to see, and I do not 3tend to determine. God's sorest judgments, the aunts said, " are like mill-stones,—they grind very slowly t they grind very fine."—The thing that I fear most

my country is gradual, insensible dry-rot and decay. it of one thing I am very sure,—the State that begins

sowing the seed of national neglect of God, will sooner

later reap a harvest of national disaster and national in. If Disestablishment comes, it will do no hurt to the le Church of Christ, the body of real believers: that is yond the power of man to harm. It will do little com-rative injury to the visible Episcopal Church of Eng-id: though impoverished and crippled in many ways will still live and not die. But it will do boundless rm to the State, and in the end will prove the ruin of

our greatness.

'I have now answered the question which heads this ict to the best of my ability. I have done it honestly d conscientiously, and have carefully avoided any ex-geration. It only remains for me to wind up the whole bject by a few words of friendly advice to the various isses into whose hands this tract may fall. (1) Some of my readers may perhaps be men who make) profession whatever in religion, and care neither for urch nor chapel. I fear there are many such men in e land, and I suppose there always will be. Pilate, wha

asked sneeringly, "What is truth?" Gallic who thoug Christianity was only a "matter of words and names Festus who thought it a " superstition concerning o Jesus/"—all these have never wanted successors. Men this sort, of course, do not care a jot whether the Chur of England is disestablished or not.—" It is all the same them. Religion is not a thing in their way."—Yet even these men I offer a word of counsel.

Are you quite sure that it would be a good thing have less religion in England than there is now? course if the Church is disestablished and impoverish there will be less. Now are you quite sure you will li this ? Do you wish your wife, your children, your servan your clerks, your tenants, your labourers, your partners business, to have less religion and to become more godl(than they are now? I should like that question to answered.

If you do not wish this state of things to arise, I advi you to think twice before you allow the English Chur Establishment to be destroyed, and the tithes and la to be taken away. Say what men please, this must ha the effect of weakening the Church, lessening the numl of her clergy, and reducing the whole quantity of religi in the country to a lower level. A tree once felled and c down can never be put up again, and its shade and beau may be regretted in vain. If you stand by and look on wi folded arms, careless and unconcernedj while men are sawi: in two the connection of Church and State, you may li to find out too late that you committed a fatal mistake.

(2) Some of my readers may be zealous Churchme who really believe it would be a good thing if the Chur was disestablished. There are many men of this class England, some very "high," and some very "low" in opini(

< •(

IO are continually building castles in the air about the
hurch of the future." They have pleasing visions of a
e, rich, and powerful Church, no longer fettered by
ection with the State, guided by perfect Bishops, no
iger interfered with by naughty Parliaments and wicked
urts of Law, possessing perfect unity, and able to do a
ndred things which it cannot do now. To these amiable
d well-meaning enthusiasts I offer a word of counsel.
I will ask them to remember two old proverbs. One
irs, "All is not gold that glitters." The other says, " Look
efore you leap." A free Church is a fine thing to talk
out; but it is not always so free as it appears. There are
_ler chains, and screw-presses, beside those of Parliament
d the Royal supremacy. The frogs in the fable found
lit with " King Log," because he lay still like a huge inert
iss, and did nothing at all. But they soon found that
sCing Stork " was much worse.—Appeals to Courts of Law
ill not be prevented by Disestablishment. So long as there
8 rights and wrongs, and questions of place and salary,
long the English Courts of Law will be open to Epis-
ipalians who want redress.—A diminution of ministerial
comes is a very serious matter, and it will certainly
company Disestablishment in rural parishes, to the great
image of the Church's power. Let no Churchman dream
at there will ever be Disestablishment without disen-
>wment.—Last, but not least, unity will not be obtained
If dissolving the connection of Church and State. There
' ill be divisions of opinion among English Episcopalians
ter Disestablishment, and perhaps far more serious ones
lan there ever were before. Look at the American
piscopal Church across the Atlantic. They have no

connection with the State. But they have not attained perfect unity.

In short, I advise my zealous brethren in the Church of England, who are hungering and thirsting for Disestablishment, to be content with such things as they have, to] well alone, and to do nothing rashly. It is not a frier but an enemy, who is whispering to them, " Break off t union of Church and State,—cast thyself down." Let them ask the wisest Episcopalians in the United States and the Colonies whether they advise Disestablishment, a: think it desirable ! Let them beware, lest they learn t late, by painful experience, the wisdom contained in t famous epitaph—" I was well: I would be better: I to-physic, and here I am." I always think of that epita] when I hear of an English Churchman expressing a wi for Disestablishment.

(3) Some of my readers perhaps are honest Dissente'. who have been told by the itinerant advocates of t" Liberationist Society, that it is a Christian duty endeavour to disestablish the Church of England. Their ea have been filled with monstrous stories about the Churc until they regard her as a huge public nuisance whi(ought to be swept away. To them also I tender a fe words of friendly advice.

I may fairly ask to be heard by Dissenters. I am, ai always have been, what is called a " low Churchman." have never in my life interfered with Dissenters, or tum(a cold shoulder upon them. I have long supported tl Bible Society and City Mission, and have spoken by the sic of Dissenting ministers on their platforms. I have nev< refused to acknowledge non-episcopal services. I ha^ never denied that Dissenters have done and are doir much good to souls. I have never vilified them or d« nounced them as schismatics. To none of these thin^ will I plead guilty. When therefore I offer a word (

vice to Dissenters, I may ask to be patiently heard. I advise them, for one thing, to use their own good ase, and not to believe all the gross misstatements that ne Liberationists are continually making about the lurch of England. It is utterly untrue that Disestablish-3nt would enable the State to save twenty-six millions

annual taxes. The whole endowments of the Church 3 not five millions a year!—It is utterly untrue that the shops are rolling in wealth, and the Clergy are overpaid, le Bishops have so many demands on their purses that 3y can hardly make both ends meet, and the clergy, if :omes were divided, have not three hundred a year a piece! It is utterly untrue that the Clergy are paid by the State, that the people are taxed to pay the Clergy: the State ver gave the Church any tithes or lands at all!—It is terly untrue that the Bishops and Clergy are " State-made rsons," seeing that the State cannot ordain any minister, d the Crown can only nominate as Bishops, men who are •eady ordained.—It is utterly untrue that the Church ayers are " State-made prayers," seeing that the ayer-book was compiled by our Protestant Reformers. It is utterly untrue that the Prayer-book is a mere)pish book, considering that the greater part of it is .re Scripture.—All these things are ridiculous untruths, lich it is a shame for any man to circulate, and a dis-adit to any man to believe. May I not ask honest issenters, when they hear statements such as these, to ercise their own good sense, and to put the simple Lestion, " Is this really true ?" A cause which can only

built on a foundation of gross misstatements, is a ry unsatisfactory cause to support. A readiness to Heve falsehoods is not a nice character! If there is lything God hates, it is falsehood. "Thou shalt not

bear false witness," is a commandment not yet repea For another thing, I advise all honest Dissenters to their own common sense, and to make a proper distinct between a

system and the faults of those who work a syst' No doubt many clergymen are worldly, careless, unconverted men. No doubt the endowments of the Established Church are not always well employed. No doubt so many clergymen are half-sceptics and some are half-Papists, doubt some rural parishes are sadly neglected. But this does not prove that the principle of an Established Church is wrong. This state of things will not be cured by dissolving the union of Church and State. Are Dissenting ministers converted men? Do no Dissenting ministers ever spend their incomes badly? Are all Dissenting ministers entirely sound in the faith, and free from any erroneous doctrine? These are unpleasant questions and I have no wish to press them. But there is an old proverb which says, "those who live in glass houses should not throw stones." The abuse of a thing is no argument against the use of it. The occasional inconsistency, the unsoundness of clergymen, in so large a Church as the Established Church of England, supplies no proof that the principle of an Establishment is wrong and unsound.

I advise honest Dissenters, for another thing, to remember the broad fact that many of their forefathers and predecessors, among Nonconformists, were strongly in favour of an Established Church, and never admitted the principle that Governments should ignore God, and have nothing to do with religion. Owen, and Baxter, and Flavel, and Howe, and Matthew Henry, were men of whom Nonconformists are justly proud. They were men whose names would do honour to the rolls of any Christian Church. Yet every one of these good men was strongly

i

WHAT GOOD WILL IT DO. 3

rare of the connection between Church and State. No one loved religious liberty more. None contended more earnestly against the narrow-minded requirements of churchmen in their day, and made more sacrifices for nonconformity than these good men. Yet none of them dreamed of maintaining that the connection of Church

State was "an adulterous connection," or that Governments had nothing to do with religion. Alas, we may well say, "How is the fine gold become dim!" I firmly believe that if Owen, Baxter, Howe, Flavel, and Matthew Henry did rise from their graves this day, they would be among the foremost opponents of the Liberationist Society.

ask honest Dissenters, in the last place, to consider especially what one single grievance they labour under now, what disability, what hardship, what disadvantage,—which would be removed by Disestablishment. Let them see one if they can. I declare I cannot put my finger on one. They may possibly complain that Nonconformist ministers are not made so much of as Church ministers, and not occupy so high a social position. Well, if that really

grievance, I defy them to show how Disestablishment would remove it. The plain truth is, that until Dissenters

persuade the great bulk of the English people to give Episcopacy and the Liturgy, and to become Baptists, Independents, Presbyterians, or Methodists,—until they

do this, I say, they will never prevent the bulk of the English people making much of their own ministers, and giving them a social precedence. The alleged grievance is nothing to do with the connection of Church and State, and Disestablishment would certainly not take it away. Why then cannot Dissenters keep quiet, and let

Church alone? (4) And now, last of all, this tract may perhaps be

c

read by some honest Churchmen who are content with the present relations of Church and State, and have wish to see them changed. To them also I shall offer word of advice, and I earnestly hope it may not be thrown away.

For one thing we must awake to a sense of the danger in which we stand just now, and must work hard to oppose our enemies. There is no safety in apathy. If others combine, we must combine. If others agitate, we must boldly resist the agitation. If others assert falsehoods we must assert truth. If others flood the country with cheap tracts and leaflets attacking the Church, we must meet the attack by a counter-flood of cheap literature to the Church's defence. "Defence not defiance" must be our motto. Controversies and conflicts with other profiting Christians are odious things. But the conduct of the Liberationists leaves us no alternative. If they will not let us alone, we must fight.

We have nothing whatever to fear for the connection Church and State, if Churchmen will only awake, arise and do their duty. Twenty thousand clergymen and ten million laymen are a force which Mr. Miall and his companions ought never to overthrow. But we must combine, organize, work, write, speak, and spread information; and above all, we must not go to sleep. The Churchman who folds his arms in our camp, and says, "Peace, peace anything for a quiet life: let things take their course" may be a very nice amiable Churchman, but he is not a true friend to the Church of England. I declare I dread the laziness of Churchmen more than the whole attack of the Liberation Society.

For another thing, if we would prevent Disestablishment we must spare no pains to reform the Church of England.

We need reform: there is no mistake about that. Our reformed abuses are the worst foes of the union of Church and State. Our large undivided dioceses, our useless cathedrals, our anomalous and ill-constituted Consecration, our want of elasticity in liturgical worship, our listless adherence to old-fashioned modes of evangelization, our helpless inability to arrange systematic cooperation of clergy and laity, our barbarous ecclesiastical courts, - all these, and not a few more, are weak points in our defence, which skilful enemies are not slow to detect. They are points in which reform would not be difficult, if the matter was not trifled with, but heartily and earnestly taken up. Oh, that God would raise up among us some powerful, wise, energetic Church reformer! Church reform is one of the best bulwarks against Church Disestablishment.

We all know what is done on board a man-of-war when an enemy is in sight, and an action is about to begin. The decks are cleared; the lumber is thrown overboard; every man is sent to his quarters; useless passengers and non-combatants are put under hatches or consigned to the hold. It is high time to do the same with the Church of England, if the struggle for Disestablishment is at hand. It is nonsense to ignore the weak points in our system. We have weak points, and they are part of the strength of our adversaries. Let us strive to get rid of them without delay. Let us resolutely and energetically take up the subject of Church Reform.

I leave the whole subject now with feelings of sorrow, grieve to think that English Protestant Christians should be on the point of wasting time, and energy, and strength, and talents in such a miserable, unprofitable controversy as this about Disestablishment! If ever there was a time

when British Christians should cease from controversy and unite as one man, in order to resist the rising flood of Popery and infidelity, that time is now. Yet this is the very time when Mr. Miall and the Liberationist begin to choose to stir up strife all over England, for the

useless and unprofitable cause in the world,—a cause-1 which their success will do good to nobody, and do hi to many. Well! be it so. The Liberationists are sot\ the wind, and they must reap the whirlwind. They the first to begin the miserable strife, and the blam all the wretched consequences must lie at their door. ' . when I think of the ill-feeling they are stirring up, angry passions that will be called forth, the hard W(that will be spoken, the divisions that will be made ever in parishes, the sin that will be caused, the g that will be for ever stopped, and the harm that wil for ever done,—when I think of all this, I cannot 1 saying with a wise old Statesman, " Why cannot you things alone T*

P.S.—Since the day when I began to write this paper, son the pomts which I have handled have received such remari illustration from public events, that I think it a plain dut invite attention to them. I need hardly say, when I spea " public events," that I refer to the recent illness of the Prin Wales, and to the nature and amount of national feeling w that illness has called forth. I cannot lay down my pen wit saying a few words about the subject.

Tl is notorious that there are men in Englaiid,—men of large inds, of highly-trained intellects, of great attainments in science, lie writers, powerful speakers,—who do not scruple to make ;ht of " national religion," and the superintending providence of 3d. These men almost scoff at the idea of God ordering and anaging public events, of God hearing prayer and removing ils in answer to prayer, of the usefulness of a nation humbling iell before God, and uniting in prayer and intercession. I say is notorious that there are not a few Englishmen who hold such ews as these. They do not flatly deny the existence of God; it they place what they call the " laws of nature " above God. o one can read with attention the daily and weekly newspapers, id the monthly periodicals, and fail to see that there are among 5 many clever men of this kind, men who are gradually sowing ischief over all the land.

Now I ask the readers of these pages to observe the remarkable yht which the illness of the Prince of Wales has thrown on the ue value of the views I have just described. Let them notice te following facts.

(1) It is a striking fact that, during the ten painful days of ispense, when the Prince's life was in imminent danger, the men ho deny God's providence and the usefulness of intercessory cayer, were almost entirely silent! You could hardly take up a lily paper, without finding something about " heaven," " God," Providence," " a nation's prayers," " a people's petitions," and le like. There was a conspicuous absence of the least attempt) deny that there was a God in heaven who could do more for le Prince than Dr. Gull or Dr. Jenner! No one dared to tell s that God could not interfere with the " laws of nature," and aat it was useless to pray for the Prince's recovery! Let this let not be forgotten.

(2) It is another striking fact, that the views of these unhappy len who sneer at God's providence, and deny the usefulness of irayer, turned out, during the Prince's greatest danger, to be itterly unacceptable to the great bulk of the English people, 'jvery one seemed glad when the Archbishop of Canterbury sent orth a form of prayer and intercession for the Prince's recovery.

Telegraphic wires flashed that prayer, like lightning, from o end of the realm to the other, and no one dared to say that t wires were wrongly employed. Churchmen and Dissenters, i once, were of one mind, and the Prince was prayed for in chapi as well as in churches. The great heart of the nation was stirr to the very bottom, and gave " no uncertain sound," either abc God's providence or the value of prayer. In short, there arc from the earth in a week an enormous mass of Christian evident It became clear as daylight, that however much Englishmen m admire clever sceptical writers in the day of ease and prosperil in the day of real affliction they find them " miserable comforters

They are obliged then to confess their belief in a God of providence, and a God who hears prayer.

(3) Last, but not least, it is a striking fact that even in foreign countries the attitude of the public mind in England, during the Prince's illness, excited much attention. No one dared to despise the nation for exhibiting such belief in God's providence and the efficacy of intercessory prayer. On the contrary, there were not wanting proofs that Frenchmen would be glad to see as much national faith among themselves! The following article, translated from the French newspaper *La France*, and copied into the *Times* of Monday, December 18th, deserves attentive perusal, and speaks for itself:—

" *La France* says:—

" Political life is suspended in England. One sole anxiety absorbs all minds—the health of the Prince of Wales. An entire nation, which is still impressed with strong convictions, turns Godward and partakes of the grief which afflicts its Sovereign, who; son is, perhaps, about to die. Alas! yet the Prince of Wales appeared to be far from popular. He possessed neither the qualities nor the defects which old Albion admires or tolerates, and the English people were sometimes disinclined to regard in him the nominal master of their destinies, the future guardian of the Charter which is the basis of their liberties. But when death was threatening him the whole of Great Britain was at once excited. In its patriotic loyalty all errors and mistakes were forgotten, and nothing was remembered but the danger which threatened the Heir to the Crown. What a spectacle and what a lesson! The

Prince of Wales is dying, and yet upon the other side of the Channel no one laughs, no one insults the high-placed personage rickled down by sickness. The Princess of Wales quits the bedside of the dying man, not to seek necessary repose, but to hasten to the church to pray and to listen to prayers—and no one laughs. The Queen, whom calumny sought to wound but the other day, kneels with her veil of widowhood beside the probable death-bed of her first-born—and no one laughs. The Council—Messrs. Gladstone, Forster, the Lord President and Lord Chancellor, whom England holds in highest esteem for talent, or position, or age, which is also a dignity—address themselves to the Archbishop of Canterbury and call upon him to prepare 'new Prayers of prayer to appeal to the Almighty on behalf of his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales.' And the people, instead of looking at this, rush to obtain copies of these prayers, and relate them in their places of worship. Lutherans, Calvinists, Methodists, Anglicans, Catholics, Jews, all implore the Deity to prolong the days of the future Sovereign of England. This

ople has the courage, the good sense, not to disown either its
 story, its past, its Government, or its God, and yet it is a free
 Dple among all—who will dispute that ? Such a spectacle affects
 greatly, and we look around us with bitterness. In vain, alas!
 we look for one of these powerful bonds of union upon which
 might rely in a moment of trial, and which might unite a
 bion in a common sentiment. We have no greater faith in men
 in we have in God. There is disunion even in our churches.
 id yet we are always talking of our unity, and declaring that
 are the envy of other nations on that account. Is not this one
 our self-complacent illusions ? Switzerland, the United States,
 i England, those three countries where the dignity of man is
 well understood, retain respect for the governing principle;
 iy accept public prayer and humble themselves; we in our dis-
 ers and misfortunes could think of nothing but mutual recrim-
 ;tion, and blush to address a prayer to God. Is that an advance ?
 3 may be allowed to doubt itA^ Faith has never derogated from
 tiU's dignity, it has never rendered him less desirous of liberty.
 I iio would dare to say that England had abased itself because it
 [:iiakes of the grief which afflicts the family that governs it, because
 i)beys its natural chiefs who direct it to pray, as it would obey them

if they called upon it to fight and to sacrifice itself for the pre servation of its old liberties
 ? Since we are talking so much a present about reforming ourselves, let us begin by
 learning tha affectionate respect for authority of which England is at thi moment
 affording us so striking an example. And if the Britial Monarchy should appear to our
 Kerepublican intolerance a ba* model, let us look towards the Amerian Republic. All who
 hav visited the United States can afl&rm that the expression of sympatli with the rulers,
 a belief in God, and even the outward practice < religion are not incompatible with
 Republican virtues. At Nw York and at New Orleans prayers were offered up for
 Presideu Lincoln, as to-day prayers are offered up throughout the thre kingdoms for the
 Prince of Wales. When shall we learn how t pray, all together, for any one ? "

In the fece of such facts as these, I cannot help hoping that n English Parliament will
 ever be found so misguided as to vote fo the Disestablishment of the Church of England,
 and the diasc lution of the union of Church and State. When the Governmen of this
 great Empire ceases to recognize God and ignores religioi I shall begin to despair of my
 country. The country which retuni to Parliament a majority of members who wish the
 State to har nothing to do with God and religioUj must be a country givK over to judicial

blindness. From such a blindness, good Loft deliver us! The illness of the Prince of Wales, I firmly believe has done great things for the maintenance of Monarchical Institutions among us. I trust it may also help to remind Englishmen that it is not a bad thing to have an Established Church.

Stradhrohe Vicarage,

20th December, 1871,

LONDON : WILLIAM HUNT AND COMPANY,

53, Holywell Street, Cavendish Square; and Aldine Chambers, Paternoster Row,

