

The Living Church.

No. 9.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, OCT. 16, 1886.

Price 5 Cents.

The Living Church.

A DAILY REPORT

of the Proceedings and Work of the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, held in Chicago, beginning October 6, 1886.

Rev. L. W. APPLGATE, Editor,
Rev. C. R. HODGE, Ass't Editor.

SUBSCRIPTION FOR THE SESSION, \$1.

The Advertising Department is under the care of C. D. Paine, (Paine's Advertising Agency,) 69 Dearborn St., with whom all contracts should be made. Rates made known on application.

Entered as second-class Mail-matter at Chicago P.O.

Sunday Services.

St. James' Church, corner Cass and Huron Sts.—The Rev. Dr. M. N. Gilbert, Assistant Bishop-elect, of Minnesota, will be consecrated at the 10:45 a. m. service. Afternoon service at 4 p. m.; Sermon in connection with the St. Andrew's Brotherhood, by Bishop Doane. Evening service at 7:30. The "Society for the Increase of the Ministry" will observe the 30th anniversary of its formation. Preacher, Bishop Williams of Connecticut.

Grace Church—8 a. m., Holy Communion. 11 a. m., Morning Prayer and Litany, Rev. Dr. Dix, Preacher. 7:45 p. m., annual meeting of St. Luke's Hospital. Addresses by Bishops Garrett and Doane.

St. Marks Church, 36th St. and Cottage Grove Ave.—Holy Communion at 8 o'clock. Morning Prayer with sermon by the Bishop of Arkansas at 10:30 a. m. Evening Prayer with sermon by the Assistant Bishop-elect of Minnesota, at 7:30 p. m.

At Lincoln Memorial Church, 630 and 632 West Indiana St., corner Lincoln St.—The Rev. R. R. Swope, Secretary of the American Church Sunday School Institute, will preach next Sunday at 10:45 a. m., on the Christian Nurture and Education of Children, and the Rev. E. T. Perkins, D.D., of Kentucky, will preach at 7:30 p. m.

Cavalry Church, Warren Ave., between Oakley and Western.—Holy Communion, 7:30 a. m. Matins, and sermon by Rt. Rev. R. W. B. Elliott, D.D., Bishop of Western Texas, 10:30 a. m. Evensong, and sermon by the Rt. Rev. Edwin G. Weed, Bishop of Florida, 7:30 p. m.

St. Stephen Church, between W. 12th and Taylor sts.—The Rev. A. Lechner, Rector. Services at 10:30 a. m. and 7:30 p. m. The Rt. Rev. Bishop Garrett, of Northern Texas will preach in the morning and the Rev. A. W. Little, of Maine, in the evening.

St. Bartholomew's Church, Englewood.—Morning Prayer at 10:30 a. m. Sermon by Bishop Neeley, of Maine. Evening Prayer at 7:30 p. m.; Sermon by the Rev. W. D'O. Doty, of Rochester, N. Y.

St. Thomas' Church, S. Dearborn St. near 30th.—Morning Service at 11 a. m., with sermon by the Bishop of Kentucky. Afternoon service at 4 p. m., with sermon by Bishop Cox, of Western New York.

Church of St. Clement, State and Twentieth Sts. (Wabash Ave. or State St. cars)—7:45 a. m., Holy Eucharist, 10:45 a. m., Holy Eucharist Choral, Preacher, the Rev. G. J. Magill, M. A., of Trinity Church, Newport. 3:30 p. m., Children's Choral Service, address by Father Osborne, S.S.J.E. 7:45 p. m., Evening service, Preacher, the Rt. Rev. Charles T. Quintard, D.D., Bishop of Tennessee.

All Saints' Church, Lincoln Park.—Bishop Walker, of Dakota, will preach at the evening service, 7:30 p. m.

St. Luke's Church, 388 S. Western Avenue, near Harrison and Lexington Sts.—Bishop Whittaker at 10:45 a. m. and Bishop Brewer at 7:30 p. m. Take Adams and Harrison St. cars to Western Ave.

Church of the Ascension; Rink, Cor. of Elm and Clark Sts.—11 a. m. Sermon by the Rev. Calbraith H. Perry; 7:30 p. m., Rev. F. P. Devenport, of Cairo, Ill.

St. Stephen's Church, Johnson St. betw' W. 12th and Taylor. The Rev. A. Lechner Rector. The Rt. Rev. Dr. Garrett, Bishop of N. Texas, preacher in the morning, and Rev. A. W. Little, of Portland, Me., in the evening.

Church of the Transfiguration, 39th street and Prairie avenue—10:30 o'clock a. m., Bishop Galleher, of Louisiana; 4 p. m., Bishop Boone, of China, the Rev. Geo. H. Davis, of Idaho, Judge Prince, of Sante Fe; 7:30 p. m., Bishop Gillespie, of Western Michigan.

Trinity Church, 26th street and Michigan avenue—Sunday Oct. 17, 11 a. m., morning prayer and sermon by Rev. Phillips Brooks, D. D.; 4 p. m., evening prayer. Bishop Harris, of Michigan, preaches before the St. Andrew's Brotherhood. At 7:30 p. m., general Missionary meeting. Addresses by Bishop Cox, of Western New York, Father Osborne of Boston, and Rev. C. B. Perry of Baltimore.

Church of St. Andrew; corner of Washington and Robey streets. Services for Sunday, October 17th:

Holy Eucharist at 7:30 a. m.
At 10:30, Matins, the preacher being the Rt. Rev. Cortlandt Whitehead, D. D., Bishop of Pittsburgh.

At 7:30 a special service for men, under the auspices of the St. Andrew's brotherhood. Preacher, the Rev. D. H. Greer, D.D., of Providence, R. I.

Brotherhood of St. Andrew—Service for men 4 p. m., Sunday, Oct. 17. St. James' Church—The Rt. Rev. Wm. C. Doane, Trinity Church—The Rt. Rev. S. S. Harris, Cathedral Saints Peter and Paul—The Rev. W. N. McVickar, D. D.

The Triennial Reunion of the alumni of the Theological Seminary of Virginia, will be held at Kinsley's, Adams St., Chicago, on Tuesday, October 19, at 1 o'clock p. m. Tickets, \$1: to be had of the Rev. Dr. Beatty, deputy from the Diocese of Kansas.

There will be a public meeting in the interest of the White Cross movement, in Club Room A, Grand Pacific Hotel, on Friday evening next. Bishop McLaren will preside, and among others, addresses will be delivered by Bishop Porter and the Rev. Dr. DeCosta.

The Triennial Reunion of the Alumni of the General Theological Seminary promises to be a pleasant affair. Already twelve Bishops have signified their intention to be present. The breakfast will be at the Hotel Woodruff, Wabash Ave. and Twenty-first St., two blocks from St. Clement's, where the religious services will be held.

A public meeting in the interests of Jewish Missions in the Church, will be held under the auspices of the Church Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews, in the Church of the Epiphany, corner Ashland Ave. and Adams St., Sunday next, 10:30 a. m. Report to be read, and the Rt. Rev. the Bishop of Central Pennsylvania will preach.

Knoxville, for a supper at Kinsley's. The Reunion was a most delightful gathering, nearly forty of the Alumni being present.

The twenty-fourth anniversary of the Evangelical Education Society will be held (D. V.) on Sunday night, October 24, at 7:30 o'clock, in Grace church, Chicago. The business meeting will be held Thursday, October 21, at 7:30 o'clock, in the same church. ROBERT C. MATLACK, Sec'y.

There will be a public meeting in the interests of the Church Unity Society on Friday evening, Oct. 22nd, at 7:45, at St. James' Church, corner Huron and Cass Sts. The Bishop of Pittsburgh, Rt. Rev. Dr. Whitehead, will preside. Addresses may be expected from the Rev. Dr. J. H. Hopkins, of Central Pennsylvania, and other prominent speakers.

The Third Triennial Conference of Church Workers among the Deaf will be held in the Sunday School room of St. James' Church, Chicago, Oct. 25th, 26th and 27th. The first conference was held at St. Ann's Church for the Deaf, New York City, and the second at St. Stephen's Church, Philadelphia, during the last General Convention. Nine clergymen are now engaged in this new and growing department of Church work.

The Alumni of Nashotah House attended a Celebration Thursday morning at St. Mark's Church. Bishop H. M. Thompson of Mississippi, being the Celebrant, assisted by the Rev. B. F. Fleetwood, B. D., Rector of St. Mark's.

The Alumni were hospitably entertained at breakfast by Mr. and Mrs. Fleetwood.

Last evening the Alumni went with the Rev. Dr. Leffingwell, of St. Mary's School,

On Tuesday evening 8 p. m. at the Grace Episcopal Church, Wabash Avenue and 14th street a meeting will be held D. V. in aid of Mission work and homes for the English and Americans in Paris, where Miss Ada Leigh will give a short account of the Mission. The Right Rev'd Bishop Stevens D. D. of Philadelphia, will preside, and addresses be given by the Right Rev'd the Bishop of Tennessee, the Rev'd Phillips Brooks, D. D. of Boston, D. Lanford.

The Triennial Reunion of the Alumni of the General Theological Seminary will be held in Chicago, October 18th and 19th as follows: Monday, Oct. 18 at 8 p. m. Evensong at the Church of St. Clement, State and Twentieth streets. Preacher, the Right Reverend, the Bishop of Quincy. Tuesday, Oct. 19 at 7 a. m. Celebration of the Holy Eucharist in the same Church. At 8 a. m. Breakfast at the Hotel Woodruff. Tickets one dollar, to be had of Rev. J. H. Knowles, 2009 Wabash Ave., Chicago.

On Monday evening, Oct. 18th, (St. Luke's Day), at 8 o'clock in Grace Church a special meeting will be held in connection with the American Church Sunday School Institute, Monday being one of the days specially set apart for intercession for Sunday Schools. The Rt. Rev. the Bishop of Chicago will preside and the Rt. Revs. N. S. Rulison, Cortlandt Whitehead, D. B. Knickerbocker, E. R. Welles, the Rev. John Langtry, of Toronto, and Mr. Geo. C. Thomas, of Philadelphia, will address the meeting. Sunday School Teachers are specially invited.

Girls' Friendly Society.

The meetings held Tuesday evening at Grace Church, and Wednesday p. m. at St. James', in the interest of the Girls' Friendly Society, were so intensely interesting that we feel sure every one who was present will wish to bring or send at least one more person to one or all of the meetings to occur next week, as follows:

Monday evening, Church of the Epiphany; a meeting concerning the training of nurses.

Tuesday evening, Grace Church; something more about the wonderful work among girls in Paris and other foreign points, so forcibly and touchingly depicted by its originator, Mrs Leigh.

Wednesday evening, (probably) at the Cathedral; another Girls' Friendly meeting.

We hope to have space later for a more detailed report of these meetings, but in the meantime we would say that the secretary, the Rev. Mr. Johnson, of New Hampshire, and Mrs. Leigh, are circulating pamphlets containing considerable information about what has been accomplished in this line of Church activity.

Though essentially preventive of evil in that it is productive of good, yet this work belongs in no sense to a "reformatory" class. It originated in the Church of England, but is making rapid headway in this country. In addition to the clergy and Churchwomen who have already spoken on the subject, some of the Bishops, the Rev. Dr. Brooks and others are mentioned as yet to be heard from.

Writing on "Church Growth," in the *Methodist Times*, the Rev. J. S. Banks, Professor of Theology in Headingly College, invites Wesleyans to take a lesson from the English Church. "The greatest event of the nineteenth century," he says, "is the revival that has taken place in the English Church. In the extent and importance of its issues it is not surpassed by the evangelical revival of the last century. For the wonderful energy which that Church has put forth and is putting forth to increase its hold on our town populations, for all the good it has done in town and village alike, we have no feelings but those of admiration and gratitude. We cannot do better than imitate its elasticity of method. If it is right to learn from an enemy, much more is it right to learn from a friend."

As but a small per cent of the population of the West and Southwest are Churchmen, it is manifest that the terms and conditions of Christian Unity will be fixed by men—not Churchmen—and that those terms will almost certainly involve the sacrifice of nearly all of the distinctive methods of the Church. As the Church is a trustee to the present and future, for the maintenance of the faith once delivered, it is manifest that it has no right to make any such sacrifice. When the Church shall have convinced the majority of the people of the justice of its claims, then the time for unity will have come. In the meanwhile by lectures, books, pamphlets, tracts, etc., push on the work, and do not think of surrendering the ground that has cost so much blood and treasure to maintain.

A LAYMAN.

GENERAL CONVENTION.

[Continued from Page 65.]

CENTRAL MUSIC HALL, Chicago, }
Thursday, Oct. 14, 1886. }

EIGHTH DAY.

Mr. E. T. Wilder, of Minnesota—I desire to offer the following resolution:

Resolved, That the report of the Committee of Conference upon the amendment of article 5 of the Constitution, to be found upon page 205 of the journal of 1883, and now part of the unfinished business, be placed upon the calendar.

Carried.

Rev. Mr. Waters, of Louisiana—I desire to offer the following resolution:

Resolved, That the third rubric in the office for the Burial of the Dead be so amended as to permit the minister to use either the 39th or the 90th psalm, or both at his discretion, as provided in the office of the Church of England.

Referred to the Joint Committee on Liturgical Revision.

Mr. S. C. Judd, of Chicago—I rise to a point of order. The preamble to the resolution which I had the honor to offer to this house was made the special order for yesterday at 11 o'clock. My understanding of the rule is that when a subject has been made the special order of the day, that it continues such each succeeding day until the matter is disposed of. Therefore my point of order is that that resolution is now in order.

The President—The deputy from Chicago raises the question whether the special order of yesterday that was left unacted upon continues the special order until it be acted upon. The Chair will state his opinion upon that point. There are bodies in this country in which such a rule prevails, that special orders having once come before the house continue such until disposed of. There is no rule of order to that effect in this house. In the absence of such a rule of order the Chair is compelled to fall back upon ordinary parliamentary rules, which, as I understand it, is that special orders not proceeded with and disposed of on the day when they are made special orders go upon the calendar as unfinished business. If the Chair is in error, he will be glad to be corrected. The resolution presented by Mr. Judd, of Chicago, and the resolution of the Rev. Dr. Adams on yesterday were made the special orders, but not then being acted upon, will come before the house as unfinished business in regular order to-day.

Mr. Bennett, of South Carolina—If the deputy from Chicago desires that his resolution be made the order of the day, it can be made on motion the special order for some other day—say to-morrow.

The President—The house is perfectly competent to make that special order for any other time. It fails through non-action yesterday.

Rev. Dr. Benedict, of Southern Ohio—offered a resolution regarding Article 2 of the constitution, which article specifies the qualifications required for members of the General Convention, one of which is, that they shall be communicants of the Church; the purport of the resolution was to define who are communicants.

Rev. Dr. Benedict, continued: This subject has been brought before the General Convention before this time, and one of those who advocated it is here present now, from Ohio. He was then a delegate from Southern Ohio. It came before the Convention as a memorial from the Diocese of Southern Ohio. It was not acted upon favorably, and after due deliberation and the consideration of others, whose advice was thought as valuable, it has come before the Convention again simply as my own resolution, but I express my opinion that it is really a matter of importance. The Constitution provides that the qualifications of members of this House shall be that

they are communicants. The question occurs who are communicants? The object of this resolution is to define who are communicants. I ask its reference to the Committee on Canons.

Rev. Mr. Vaulx—Mr. President, knowing, as we all do, the feeble physical condition of the deputy from Chicago, who introduced the resolution which was the special order of the day, on yesterday at eleven o'clock, it seems to me it would be a proper expression of courtesy and consideration of the gentleman, that the consideration of that question be taken up at the present time. I, therefore, move, sir, that we proceed to the consideration of Mr. Judd's resolution, the special order of yesterday.

Rev. Mr. Spaulding, of California—I have the following resolution to offer, which, perhaps, the deputy from Indiana will accept:

Resolved, That the resolution offered by Mr. Judd, of Chicago, be made the special order for twelve o'clock to-day.

The President—The business on the calendar will be the order of the day for twelve o'clock.

Rev. Dr. Farrington, of Northern New Jersey—I would like to ask permission from the House to take up No. 5 on the calendar and let it pass. It would lead to no debate I think.

Rule suspended for the taking up of No. 5 on the calendar, relating to a change of name of a Diocese. The name of the Diocese of northern New Jersey was changed to "Newark."

The President—The resolution of Mr. Judd is now before the House.

Rev. Dr. Brooks, of Massachusetts—I cannot allow the discussion on this subject to close without an expression of opinion thereon, as being one of the most important questions presented for the consideration of this House. The proposition is, sir, simply to drop from the title of our Church the words "Protestant Episcopal." I wish to say, before passing to that which is essentially involved in this question, that I feel bound to protest against the way in which the name of the Church has been used here, and the tone which has been associated with it. I believe the title of our Church, "Protestant Episcopal," answers most fully and completely all the purposes of a title. It is easy by a certain method of pronunciation, by a prolongation of the syllables, to make the use of those words appear quite ridiculous to the ears of some who may not be familiar with their signification. If a title should properly be descriptive of that which it is presumed to represent, the name Episcopal answers its purposes exceedingly well. There are two great bodies, one of which acknowledges the infallibility of the Pope, and the Church Apostolic, and the other rejects it. There is no doubt that our Church belongs to the second and not to the first. There are two great bodies of Western Christendom, one of which has, and the other has not, the distinct institution known as the Episcopate. There is no doubt but our Church belongs to the first and not to the second. I therefore see no reason why our present name should be dispensed with when it so accurately expresses the two great characteristics of a Church such as ours. The Chair has said correctly that it is impossible for us to take up the question of the abolition of our present title without, at the same time, considering what title shall be substituted in its stead. The whole debate yesterday proceeded upon the assumption that one or the other of certain names should be substituted in the place of the present one. Such names as "American" and "Catholic," have been mentioned. To take either of these would be to assume that this is a Church of a peculiar theory of life, and distinctively the Church of America. What is it about our Church which warrants us in arrogating to ourselves the exclusive right to be known as the Church of Christ in this land? It seems to me that the more absolutely we can face that proposition, the more clearly we must recognize this truth, the more intelligently may we proceed with this debate and the casting of our votes. Only look this matter in the face. What are the only possible reasons upon which it is

conceivable that this Church should take such a position? I say there are only two reasons which can possibly be given for assuming such a position as will be involved in the assumption by us of one of the names proposed to be attached to our Church henceforth and forever. The first of them is that it is conceivable that our Church is one of so large prominence, so largely representative of the Christianity of America, that all of the other denominations of this land would be practically insignificant; that our Church may justifiably declare itself the one great Christian Church of the land, simply because everything besides is not worth considering at all, that our preponderance is so great. It is sought to give it such a name as the Church of America, that all absorbing name, the exclusive name of America, leaving entirely out of the question the whole of Canada and Yucatan. We are told that the Canadians like it. I can hardly conceive it to be possible. This is the first ground upon which this Church might possibly claim such a great, comprehensive and exclusive title. Now I suppose there is no man in this Convention who for a moment will assert that this is his position. The words which were spoken yesterday afternoon by the deputy from Pennsylvania, simply indicated that our Church is comparatively an insignificant factor in the religious life in this land at present. That neither in its relation to numbers, its relation to the great missionary work of the land, nor in its relation to the great work of the Church everywhere is their foundation of claim to such prominence that it can sweep into its grasp the fantastical Church of America. What is there in our Church which peculiarly reflects the genius and spirit of America more than any other church in America, when we go to England to borrow our traditions, vestments and manner of worship? If it were peculiarly American in its sympathy with other institutions, I should rejoice to know that it was the Church of America. As it is, I do not believe that it has any right to claim to be such to-day. The thing which is supporting our Church to-day more than anything else is its relation to the Church of England. Until our Church shall absolutely identify itself with the institutions and spirit of this country; until it shall stand as the representative of the Christianity of this country; until it shall cease to borrow from the land across the sea, it seems to me that we shall not be justified in taking upon ourselves the title of the American Church. In the time of the revolution our Church was the Church of Royalists. It was opposed to the cause of the colonies in the time when the country was struggling into existence. Upon what other ground than that is it the distinctive Church of America, representing the religious life of this country? Can it be asserted that we are entitled to be known as the Church of America? Upon what other ground can we claim to be the Church than upon the distinct assertion that in substance and essence, and life, we possess something which other bodies have not? It must stand before the country with the distinctive assertion of Apostolic Succession as the very substance and essence and life of the Church. Now there are those who believe the Apostolic Succession to be the essence and substance of the Church. There is no doubt about that. The position which they take in regard to the Church is absolutely clear. That there are other men in our Church who believe nothing of the kind, there is no doubt. I, for one, and I think I am speaking for multitudes in this congregation this morning, do not believe in the doctrine of Apostolic Succession in any such sense as many receive it. I do not believe in the exclusive prerogative which gives to the Church which receives it any such absolute right of Christian faith. That is not the question before us, but there is no conceivable explanation of the desire to change the name of the Church except the distinct adoption of that theory as the absolute condition upon which it lives. We have been told sir, with great rhetorical flourish, that this Church, when it shall have taken its new name, is going to extend its area and take in all Christianity. I appeal to any reasoning man whether in any sense this is to be considered an expansion of the power of the Church. It immediately dooms it. It may be necessary to doom it. It dooms it to live in the corner and minister to men who are convinced of a certain theory with regard to the possession of the privileges of the Christian ministry. The passage of such a resolution, such an action as

should fasten upon this Church the name, the explicit title of the American Catholic Church dooms it to become distinctively the Church of those men who accept the theory which is based upon mere historical argument. Is that going to be the Church of America? Is this going to be the Church for praying people—is this the Church that is going to do a work worthy of the Church of Christ?

Rev. Dr. Adams, of Wisconsin—Mr. President, I regret to say that the position which the distinguished and celebrated gentleman from Massachusetts has taken forbids me to reply to his argument. The position that he has taken is that he denies and does not believe the doctrine of Apostolic Succession. That position shuts me out from answering a large part of the arguments that he has made. In the next place he is one of a number who are regarded as prominent ministers in the Church in this great country who look especially on the multitude, to majorities and to numbers. He is unwilling to have anything to do with this resolution because we have not a great majority. Now, Mr. President, I belong, and always have belonged, and you belong to a Church whose business it is to struggle against majorities, to conquer and become the majority itself. If the argument in favor of majorities, which has been presented by this gentleman who has just spoken, and one who spoke to the house yesterday, had been presented before the primitive Christians and a man had entered Rome or Athens, or any great city of the world, he would have preached no more. Now, sir, I myself hold that it is the business of the Church to enter into every state in these United States, into every state, being then a minority, and rise up and preach and assert its proper right and position and become finally, in due time, a majority. No man has the right to say to any member of the Church that changing the name would lessen the likelihood of the minority becoming the majority. I say, therefore, that if this Church has any right to be what it claims to be, a Catholic Church, in the United States, it is the Catholic Church. If it goes into Boston and has but one single petty congregation there in that great city, and has a multitude of sects asserting their Christianity against it, it is the Catholic Church. If a church has a claim to be the American Catholic Church, it has the claim independent of majority, independent of priority, independent of all things that make men great in the eyes of the world; and therefore I suppose that argument is sufficiently swept away.

In the next place, Mr. President, the gentleman from Massachusetts believes in a great Church—the Church which was Roman Catholic, the Protestant Episcopal Church, the Unitarian, Baptist, the Mormon and such. It seems to be the most exquisitely absurd idea which could possibly be entertained, not worthy the consideration of any man who has reason or Christianity. Now sir, in reference to this matter I will say that one great fact here is true, and that great fact is, that this matter has come up, this proposal to get rid of the name, Protestant Episcopal, and substitute for it some other name. I say that this is not a mere fictitious thing got up by you or anyone else; it is a thing that comes to you developed by the growth of the Church and of this nation. I say, sir, that the Church cannot avoid this question. At the time of the Revolution this Church was a distinguished descendant of the English Church, and as the English Church it was under great prejudice. It was in an undeveloped state, just beginning to live, to exist, in that time, when this term Protestant Episcopal was fixed upon it. Now, Mr. President, I have been a clergyman of this Church for these last 45 years, and no man ever heard me joke or sneer at the term Protestant Episcopal. That was language that I accepted. Accepted it, why? On the condition that Bishop Lee of Delaware laid down: The Church is Protestant against all the errors of Rome, and she is Episcopal against all the errors of dissent. In that sense the Bishop laid down the distinction, and I am willing to accept. I say that that is true, and a deep truth that we stand here Protestant as opposed to all the errors of Rome, and Episcopal as against all the errors of dissent.

Now, Mr. President, that being so, the question comes up, why shall we change? The answer is, it is in the course of God's providence in this land and in His Church. I will say, and it may sound to some portion of this house as an absurd thought, but it is a thought

which embodies the heart of this nation, that the United States of America is the termination of all in the histories to come and the end. There is, therefore, by the constitution of the Church in the United States the existence of a great national Church different in every respect from other national churches, and that it ought to correspond in this country and should be a great Church different from sect churches; different also from all sects and denominations; a church which is a Church, and not a sect, and not sect bound. And this great conception of the ages was seen long since by Bishop Berkley, and he knew that its latest offspring was its last and that its latest offspring would take a great burden from the state containing it. Now, Mr. President, that being so, if the Church has holiness belonging to it, it should grow up and gradually show this spirit and intention. It should show the spirit that hates the subjugation and domination of a Caesar. It should be a Church, free from sect in all respects—a Church pure and catholic in its action.

Now, Mr. President, I wish you who are here to follow me in this serious thought. You have known, all of you, that from the time the Church received Apostolic Succession, there was something exceedingly different in it from what we call denominationalism. When Seabury was the one Bishop, and he had merely a few clergy in the State of Connecticut, did he not then temper and tone in an entirely different way from those around him? Certainly, he did. Now, sir, I wish those who are here would listen to me while I point out this fact. Every man, woman and child, or member of the Episcopal Church, knows the fact—that our following is not from the sects. We are not securing anything from them. Have we not cast aside that exceedingly able doctrine that was brought out by John Calvin? Do we not believe in the simple doctrine of the Apostolic Creed of the Church announced in a few words? Then, sir, if we were a sect, having what is called a following, we should be confined, each man of us, to the large churches in Boston, New York and Philadelphia. The missionary spirit would not exist. Have you not gone with our Missionary Bishop to those stations with ten times the population? Here it is that this propaganda exists which can only exist if this spirit is kept alive. Do we not know that there was a peculiar architecture connected with churches fifty years ago? Yes, we all did. What has become now of church architecture? It is everywhere. And everywhere the church has music, and it is free. Everyone strikes music in a church everywhere. The Church has an influence all over, and we know of no other reason than by reason of such a fact that it is to be a Catholic church in the United States. We certainly had twenty years ago prominent Congregational churches, with a building in the city of Milwaukee, and church buildings here with leading and eloquent men for their pastors. I went through that church and looked around upon it, and said that will be our Church, that is, a Catholic Church. And so every building that has Catholic architecture all bear testimony to the fact that there is to be One Catholic and Apostolic Church, we are to be the foundation basis of it. Now, sir, I wish to say one thing in reference to this matter. I turn aside to a matter of some importance. Yesterday a distinguished member of this convention from the Diocese of Maryland, spoke in reference to the Protestant Episcopal Church. Mr. Stewart said, and he said truly, that Mr. Gladstone had addressed the Church in Ireland as the Protestant Episcopal Church of Ireland. He was entirely clear in expression, but the suppression of a conclusion sometimes amounts to an untruth. That paper, that document which I have myself, was addressed to what we should call the synod of the Irish Church. It came before them when they were assembled, as we are now, and at the motion of a distinguished lawyer it was repudiated, and was sent back as a statement that they could not accept such a document, inasmuch as they were not a Protestant Episcopal church of Ireland, and could not recognize such a document. Now, sir, the gentlemen did not tell this fact, but I tell it now, and it makes a great difference in the fact. Mr. Gladstone acknowledged the error, and I tell furthermore that it was sent to the English government, and the English Government made a humble apology to the Church of

Ireland, addressing them as the Church of Ireland. Another matter that I want to speak in reference to is this, that that Church adopts the term Apostolic, and is hostile to Romanism, and I would say that this church in Ireland objects to the term Protestant Episcopal, and is intensely hostile to Rome, so that the argument that we wish to Romanize this Church by rejecting the term Protestant falls to the ground. One gentleman says that if we claim the title American Catholic Church, we would do wrong to the Church in Canada. Has he the history of the Canadian Church? The Church in Canada is not called the American Church at all. It is the Church of England in Canada. Therefore, taking the title of American Catholic Church would not prejudice the Church in Canada. Another thought it would conflict with the Church of Mexico and Peru. What right have we to take the title when they were recognized as Catholic? We may recognize them as Catholic, I do not. They do not claim the title itself. If any part of this council wishes to go over to the Church of Rome, he is induced to do so by the distinct pronouncement and declaration, and in that declaration of renunciation, which is to be found in the second council of Baltimore, he will find that the man changes his profession, and in the second place that he does not profess the acceptance of the holy Catholic Church, but of the Apostolic Roman Church. So far as that is concerned, we make no claim to the title of infallibility, and there is no liability or difficulty at all about it.

I would like simply to speak five minutes longer.

By the consent of the house leave was granted Dr. Adams to speak five minutes longer.

This whole Convention will see in this a movement—personal movement—it is a movement that now has reached this position; that the cries of this Nation, and the cries of this Church, and the fact that the consciousness of what they are has got out in the great American Nation; and the consciousness of what we are has got out; and therefore whether it take place now, or whether it takes place after awhile, it is certain to come, because it is now as it was in Israel and Samaria. There was a difference between Samaria and Judea; Judea was but one tribe, only a few, and Samaria had all, or ten tribes nearly. But Judea had the true faith. If you will look at the arguments that were brought forward for the rejection of this motion, if you will look through the arguments, you will find many exaggerations. The gentleman stated that we were making the claim that if the name was changed into the American Catholic Church, it would result in bringing in people, but that was only an exaggeration.

There is a certain amount of sentiment connected with this matter, and I have no objection to it provided the sentiment is in the right shape, but my sentiment is not toward the Protestant Episcopal Church. My sentiment is towards the Holy Catholic Church, which is the mother of all Christians. That is my sentiment. Another of these gentlemen has taken a third method; that is the method of scare. Scare because they say we want to Romanize this Church by calling it the American Catholic Church. I don't see, Mr. President, that any member of this Church is in danger of being scared in any way. We are like the boy of whom the story is told that he didn't scare worth a cent. Again I say that the nature of the Church, the nature of the Scripture, the nature of the nation in this land leads onward, and the demand is that we assume our proper position that is distinctly defined, and instead of being acknowledged to be indistinct in name I hope we shall adopt the name American Catholic Church.

Rev. Dr. Gibson, of Central New York—I have attempted several times to speak on this subject. I think a full ventilation of this question would do us all good; I am sure it will do no harm, for this great American public wants to know what is the reconciliation between the title on the title page of the Prayer Book and the contents thereof, and, I think, we ought to lift up this question above the level of mere society. It is not a question of mere denominationalism or names. We are making history, and although it is but a small chapter of history that we can make here, yet we ought to see to it that it fits into our antecedents and into the history of the past. When the Bishop of Rome, about three hundred

years ago, declared that the Archbishop of Canterbury was going to be the pope of another world, he builded better than he knew, and I wish to say that it is because I wish to identify the Catholic Church with this Anglo-Saxon empire of America, I am in favor of dropping the word which no respectable denomination of Evangelical Christians in this land has incorporated into its title. Perhaps the Bishop of Rome did not quite see the extent of that great movement of the reformation in England which spread itself out into the colonies, whose drum-beat, as Daniel Webster said, follows the rising and setting of the sun around the globe. I want to have it understood, before the world and among all English-speaking people, that we, too, have a Catholic Church. The question is not less than this, whether we are prepared to stand by the Church of England in its reformation; that is the question, whether we are an offshoot, a daughter of that Church. The Church of England first in the year 1534, in its highest legislative assembly of convocation, passed this resolution, "The Bishop of Rome has no jurisdiction in this realm." Is that a fact or a mere theory? And is it a fact, or is it a theory only, that the Church meant to say that the Bishop of Rome never had any rightful jurisdiction in that land? Did she mean that she was going to have it no more? Is that a fact or is it simply a theory? Now the Church of England presents that attitude before the civilization of Continental Europe, that she is an integral, constituent branch of the Holy Catholic Church from the days of the Apostles, and she has never taken up any sectarian name; she is the Church of England, because she is the Church in England, and all her colonies are daughters spread over the world who retain this name. The Church represented in that convocation did not think it necessary to take up the name which Milton used before the Diet of Spiers, as protesting against something she could not help. No, sir, she could help it; by the grace of God she meant to help it, and did help it—this submission to the domination of the foreign Bishop. And, sir, I believe what the author of that remarkable book, John Inglesant, says—not in that book but in another book—that the highest type of civilization, the highest type of manly character, the highest type of spiritual religion, the highest type of domestic life, has been realized and brought about in English society by the influence of the Reformation and the Church of England, and as the legitimate product of that Reformation. Are we ready to stand by that? Don't we believe in it? It is not a question of a mere local society, but whether or no we have the quality or organic unity, or historical descent. If we talk about mere names it will do, if we adopt the theory, which I fear my reverend brother from Massachusetts and the other member from Pennsylvania adopt, that the day of Pentecost did not leave an organic body with its polity, its faith, its discipline, its sacraments, and continuing steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and prayers. Now, all other branches, as I said, of the Church of England have kept up with its principles. There is a school, I admit, among the politicians in England called the Erastians, who believe the Church is a function of the state, and depends for all its jurisdiction and the exercise of its power upon the state; therefore, in their eyes a disestablished Church must be nothing but a Protestant Episcopal Church, and they tried to clap that name on the Church of Ireland, but the General Synod of that Church has repudiated it. Why should we be so sensitive over that word Protestant, when even the most Protestant of all Protestants do not profess to use it, do not incorporate it in their legal titles. And then as to that word "Episcopal." I do submit that if there ever was a historical blunder it is in the assumption of that name which has characterized our branch of the Church. When Mr. Osham, the historian and Bishop, was asked about the Episcopal Church, that old patriarch stroked his beard and repeated the words "Episcopal Church; why, who ever heard of a Church that was not Episcopal?" Then he says Episcopal is simply one of the very characteristics of the Catholic Church. Nobody claims to be an Episcopalian in the sense in which my brother would call himself a Presbyterian. The Presbyterian is a Presbyterian because he believes only in Presbyteries, in one order of the ministry, and that is the order chosen out and adopted, and he goes by and rejects the other orders. But you claim to be Episcopals in the

sense that you do not believe in anything but bishops' control. A Baptist lady once asked me if the bishops wrote all the sermons that the clergy preached. I do not wonder at all at the impression. Our brother says that it is a mark of presumption for us to call ourselves the Catholic Church. A presumption of what? When a Baptist claims to be a Baptist, it is the Baptist Church, it is nothing else than the Baptist Church. I was called to visit a dear, good old friend in his last sickness, and of course it occurred to me, and I took it upon myself to ask him whether he had ever been baptized. "Oh, no," he said, "I was brought up a Baptist."

I know there is difficulty in the matter, but this General Convention is not an incorporated body, and we could at least say that in our formulas of worship we will not have that title. So far as the secular and temporal interest go, I have no objection to the name as a name of the corporation, but I say that is not the banner that we should fling forth to the world, or that we should stamp upon that venerable and historical work, the Book of Common Prayer, upon the title page.

Rev. Dr. Harwood, of Connecticut—I confess, sir, I am one of the number feeling very deeply upon this subject. I have listened with respect and attention to the disquisitions of our learned deputies upon the nature and the power and the inherent right of the Church of which we are members. I submit that this is not the question before the house. The question before this house is whether we shall abolish and sweep out of existence the name by which we have been known ever since our organization immediately after the revolution. That is the whole question, as I understand the resolution of the deputy from Chicago, whether we shall drop the name of Protestant Episcopal; that is, the question before us now, and no other question. The statement of the question suggests, or brings back to mind, the story which had great circulation immediately after the war, called, "A man without a country." You would make us to-day a Church without a name, and the mere fact that any such proposition has come before this body shows that? Does it show that we are a body at unity with itself? Does it show that we have that great proud consciousness of the inspiration of the Holy Ghost by which we can move forward in the work of evangelizing this country? Nothing at all. It shows we are in a state of confusion, that we are in state of discord, and the only question that can come before us thereby is a *modus vivendi* where the differences exist. That strikes my mind, the profound differences brought about in the course of this debate. That name we shall adopt? What inherent strength have we? What is our conception of the power and scope of the Christian religion? Of all times, this is the least appropriate time for even considering the question of the change of name of this Church. If we only were careful, if in our profoundest convictions we only were alike, then, sir, I might say, and other men might say, this is a very good time to discuss this subject. Now let me say a word in reference to the principle here involved. The name of this Church is Protestant Episcopal. We are worried with the changes which have been rung upon that name, and I will not consider them at length, but I would like to bring this matter before the attention of every theologian, of every man that knows anything of Church history, and of Church doctrine, what it is that this name Protestant Episcopal suggests or implies. It suggests and implies both that there are seventeen hundred years back of us, and in those seventeen hundred years the unity of the Church has been broken. It was broken first when the great schism occurred between the East and West; it was broken last and shattered in the sixteenth century, when the northern races went off; and instead of the one Church under the control of one man at Rome, you had the Church of England, the Church of Sweden, the Church of Denmark, and all other Churches which were organized under Protestant principles or Protestant sovereigns. I say the unity of the Church was then broken, and has never been recovered. And when, in the providence of God, this Church here came forth from out of the revolution with scarcely any clergy left, with scarcely any people left, not one of those parishes in all New England self-supporting, with a few people scattered here and there, that it became a question

with them whether they could live at all. That was the position, and what has occurred to them? It was the name which described their position in this country. They were not the Church of the nation, they were a part of the Christians having in themselves all great possibilities for the future; but they were Protestants upon one side, and upon the other side they recognized the Episcopal and historic continuity of the Church by their whole action in the adoption of the Prayer Book and in securing the Episcopate and in receiving and accepting that they placed themselves in the position which entitles them to the name of Catholic. It is not for us in this Convention to settle any question as to the authority and power of this Church, but I wish simply to say that back of the name Protestant Episcopal we are to consider the history of the Christian Church. We see the reason for the name in the fact, and we see that it appears, considering what we are and who we are, that it is not well and wise for us as yet to change this name. We have been told that the change of the name would work wonders. I believe it would work wonders. I believe it would convulse this Church from one end to the other; I believe that instead of people coming to us we should alienate all the Protestants east of the Alleghenies, whatever might happen west of the Alleghenies. I believe that any man who knows anything about Scandinavians and Roman Catholics believes that under no circumstances would either of them go to the Church where the name had been changed. The Scandinavians and other northern people of Europe hate the name Catholic, and by the adoption of the word Catholic you could not deceive a Bomanist five minutes if he were to begin to ask you questions. Therefore, sir, I ask myself who are the gentlemen, and how large a proportion of the Church is there, that desires this change of name? I find the same advocates for the change on the floor of this house who have advocated it before in previous conventions. I have known but one and seen but one new advocate, and that was the deputy from Springfield. He was the one new man who made a good, telling speech on his side; but, sir, when I consider just the facts which I have presented to you, that the history of the Church ought to suggest to us that we should never change this name, or at least not as yet, when I consider the utter inexpediency of it, and moreover when I consider that there is great power in the name, if you strike out the word Protestant, which has always been there, you seem to me to move backward, and deny your Protestantism; then, sir, I do think the thing becomes most serious, and I do hope that we pray Almighty God that we may be preserved in this Church from all error, pride, ignorance and prejudice, so that prayer may be answered in the refusal of this convention by an overwhelming vote to pass the resolution offered by the gentleman from Chicago.

Rev. Dr. Courtney, of Massachusetts—I desire to say a word or two respecting the matters which have been imported into this debate; I mean the letter that was addressed to the Church of Ireland, I believe not by Mr. Gladstone but by his secretary, Sir William Harcourt. I don't think, from what I know of the character of Mr. Gladstone as a churchman, that he would have been led to make so egregious a blunder as was made by Sir William Harcourt. The reason why the Church of Ireland protests against being called the Protestant Episcopal Church, is because when the Church in Ireland was disestablished some years ago, her title, "The Church of Ireland," was explicitly reserved for her exclusive use; and the reason why its claim was urged by Sir William Harcourt was because he knew that legally that was the title of the Church. There is a body existing in Scotland which is ordinarily known in that country and in England as the Episcopal Church of or in Scotland, of which I was at one time a minister. But the Church of Scotland is the Presbyterian Church. We, as Episcopalians, if you will allow me to say so, or Catholics, or churchmen of any other title, do not like that the Presbyterians should be the Church of Scotland, and would prefer that this Episcopal, or whatever you call it, were the Church of Scotland. But as the history stands, the one is the Church of Scotland and the other is not. Now, I will pass from that to the subject before us. The subject is to propose to drop the words, "Protestant Episcopal" from all laws and formulas, I believe. I think it

is equally certain to anybody that no question can come before this convention about which deeper interest was manifested, both on the part of members of the convention and also on the part of the outside public, and I suppose that where such deep interest is manifested, it is because that some principle or other is involved. I ask myself, therefore, what is the principle, or what are the principles intended by those who propose and those who oppose the resolution. I find, as far as I can learn, that the principle of those who propose to drop these words Protestant Episcopal from the title of the Church in which we are ministers and members, is the desire of bringing out into prominence as in contradistinction to others that the Church has freed itself from all sectarianism. I trust I am perfectly fair to those who are advocates of the proposition before this House. I would like to say while passing that it has been suggested to me that some misapprehend the purpose and the motives of those who do so advocate this change, that it would seem that many people have no idea of what is involved in the Church, and that therefore they loosely speak of the Church of the Congregationalists, the Church of the Presbyterians, the Church of the Episcopalians, and so on, and that we should therefore arrogate to ourselves some exclusive title, and that it would be different if you said the rites and formulas of the Church, and it would be another thing if you said the rites and formulas of the Church; and that fact would, in the minds of some people, alter their idea respecting the difference which exists between the sects and the Church. I have said that this was a principle advocated by those who propose a change, namely, bringing out the idea of what is involved in the term of Church. I wish to speak a word now about what I believe to be the principle that is involved in the minds of those who oppose it, and that is, that giving up the term Protestant would be the surrender of that which is understood by that term, and it would, whether we like it or not, be so regarded by the great mass of the people.

If I am correct, and inasmuch as one party advocates this claim, and thousands press it as necessary, I would like to ask if it is not best, if it is not expedient to drop this matter; as an arrival at any practical agreement under the resolution is practically out of the question. The proposition is reduced to this, practically: the question is, is it advisable or is it expedient under the circumstances that at present exist? Now I make this charge. If the one of these parties that says it is operative, or the party that says it is not practical, should give way, then it might be expedient to go on; but there are objections on both sides—either the one or the other—and I trust that it will be patent to the members of this body that in the nature of the case it is inexpedient to make this change at this time. Now, it may seem to some that expedient is not the word, but I will quote the language of a distinguished divine who often used the word expedient, and who, when criticized in reference to it, replied to his questioner by saying, "Did you ever do anything that you thought really inexpedient to do?"

I think that is the last resort, because the expressions made in this house have demonstrated the objections on each side to the other, and I think it is impossible to adopt the resolution, as is shown by the remarks by the Rev. Deputy from the Diocese of Wisconsin. I don't think it is possible to bring this sentiment into harmony with those who oppose it, and I don't think it is possible to adopt this change and not have clashings; because it is unity in the Church which we want. And if we are to have unity, then we must have something on which we can unite. I want to say, I want to ask you as quietly as I possibly can, without any appeal to passion, without any appeal to prejudice, but simply appealing to that intention, that desire which is born of the Reformation, did it or did it not proceed almost entirely in its religious aspects, as distinguished from the secular? And is there not—I do not say there is, I may be wrong—but is there not a very widespread impression all through this land, outside of the Church and inside of the Church, that the change of name now advocated will lead in the direction which will tend to obscure the minds of the people generally, and that they will no longer be able to make a proper distinction, any distinction whatever, between the one and the other of these two names? And

if that is the case, then I do earnestly hope for such action by the members of this Convention as will agree with the spirit of those who were the conductors and the immediate successors of those who conducted the Reformation in England. I stand here before the Convention in a very anomalous condition. I stand here by ordination a priest, imported from England, not naturalized, and I do think I am perhaps peculiarly placed so as to be able to understand this important matter; and I am able to say heartily and sincerely that I agree with the sentiments of my distinguished colleague in what he says as to what may be called the genius of the American people. The American people is a people such as has never existed before on the face of the earth. It is made up of a mixture of all the races that live on the earth, and I do believe that our great object should be to take care of this people, and I trust that we may not have this erasure of these two names from the front of the Prayer Book, because it is inexpedient.

The President—The hour for recess has arrived and the House will take a recess until half-past two o'clock p. m.

The Woman's Auxiliary.

BOARD OF MISSIONS.
CHICAGO, October 11, 1886.

Bishop Doane, of Albany—Mr. President—It is a matter of infinite pleasure to be called upon by this Convention to speak before this Board of Missions upon this subject. I take it that the subject with which I am charged this afternoon addresses itself in its larger range to the great question, and ordinary work of woman, while in its smaller range it deals with the question of the Woman's Auxiliary; but in either instance, it seems to me, it acknowledges in passing upon the things tenderest and nearest to all of us, because it deals with the work of the mothers, the wives and the sisters of men, and, passing by that, it reaches further back, touching the great truths with which this earnest body is fraught—I mean the personal ministries of love, in the person of the Lord Jesus Christ and the mission as message-bearers from Him, which in the first and largest instance has been discharged by woman. We must not forget and we never should forget that the only place where the Son of Man could lay His Head when He was here on earth was upon the maiden breast of His Mother. We know that in later years, when He needed refreshment and was tired, from going about doing good, it was still a woman that cast tears and the sweetness of ointment upon his feet and wiped them with her hair, and refreshed them. Later on, when the Lord's last day came, this same woman, with others in that hour of utmost darkness, with that patient reverence which belongs to women, throughout the weary length of that last Sabbath, watched until they could prepare the spices, the linen and the offerings of Joseph, the rich man. It does not seem to me that I am seeking too far nor too high for argument or analogy for woman's work, first in this matter of personal ministrations to our Lord and Savior, and next in the matter of being messengers for Him; for it must be remembered they gave up what was to them the dearest of all things—the right and privilege to touch Him, to worship him, when after the Resurrection He said to them, "Touch me not, but go and tell the disciples." And the women were the apostles to the Apostles. So it seems to me it is neither too high or too far to go back to them for the analogy of women's work.

Mr. President—The question of the application of the fact of evolution in nature—which is the doctrine of the development in religion—depends entirely upon the question as to whether or not that which is evolved was ever involved, and that which was developed was ever enveloped; that is to say, it depends upon the great law that everything shall be brought forth after its kind. I mean by that, simply to say, that while it is not in kind or after its kind to develop a man out of an egg, or a bird out of anything but an egg; because we cannot gather grapes and figs out of thistles, so in the same way with religion. It is claimed that the story runs this way: That as woman was to be a helpmeet to the first Adam, and was taken from his sleeping side, that was evolved and developed into the taking of the matter of all spiritual love out of the sleeping side of the second Adam, so that same process of evolving and de-

veloping takes place when the body of woman becomes not the legal language an Auxiliary, but the evangelical language the helpmeet to the man Christ—the second consecrated Bishop of our souls—when He was upon earth. So we may consider the Woman's Auxiliary precisely in this light. I take it there is no need to enter into any full detail of the manner of the work they are doing, and yet it may be well to merely ask what the motive is that adds to its value; those quick hands and nimble fingers, those loving hearts which in parish school and other schools, and sometimes in the households of the poor, are teaching children to-day, are all aglow with the mind and heart of Christ, and the hands that had the very healing touch of Jesus in them are in the sisterhoods, the schools, and as nurses in our hospitals, ministering to the sick and suffering poor. It is worth our while to recall for a few moments what this Woman's Auxiliary in all its branches has done. At its first organization in the year of our Lord, 1872, at St. Peter's church, only a few women gathered there that day, and now there are a number of thousands in forty-four dioceses. They teach home missionary schools, and the colleges of the Church, they go out to every class of white people and colored people, Indians and Chinese, and we owe to them the existence to-day in our society of the beneficent provision for correspondence and communication among women. And they have raised in money \$234,000, while this great society have only raised \$280,000. The women, in the strength of their weakness, and wealth of their love, have come within that small amount of equaling the gift, and one may say it is a practical moral instance of the widow's mite, who cast in more than they all. And if you add to this, which is the least standard that can be applied to anything, but if you add to its value the costliness of time, of pains and personal thought which have weighed down each book that has gone out with the good measure that has come from the woman's sympathy and love, I am sure there is no need for us to do anything more than to say that this Woman's Auxiliary deserves what it has received, the blessing of Almighty God and the loving thanks of all who are concerned and interested in the Church of Jesus Christ throughout the world. It seems to me there are two thoughts involved in this whole matter as underlying principles, and those are, organized love and love of organization. I am quite sure that this is no age nor time nor place to speak of the value of organization, because the world has run mad about the matter of organizing. There is nothing, from the least to the greatest, that is not organized, and sometimes after the manner of the boy soldier, with more officers than men, and I am equally sure that there is no need of urging the love of woman, because it comes always without urging, and I ask you to bear these things in mind. What we want are two things, the organization of love and the love of organization, and that is what the Woman's Auxiliary offers. I have only one thing further to say, and that is, how are the bishops, priests and influential laymen in this Church to help, to have confidence in these workers? And in answer to that I do earnestly ask that the women will not neglect their work, no matter what the demands of society are; and some are doing good work, with the blessings of wise guidance and direction about that work.

Bishop Dudley, of Kentucky—Mr. President—I desire to make an explanation. In the hurried and extemporary utterances of the morning, in the space of twenty minutes, I was trying to press so much that I have been totally misunderstood; that I traduced the men of the South. God forbid! I understand that I made the impression this morning that throughout the Southern Church there was a general indisposition to have the Clergy of the Church engaged in any work among the negroes. Certainly I desired to make no such impression. Let me say, gentlemen, first of all, that in my own diocese of Kentucky, there are three colored men, clergymen, who sit in our convention with as much freedom of speech as any man. Let me say, in the second place, in the Diocese in Virginia there are a number of Clergymen who sit in their council, and so with North Carolina and the rest of them. I was totally misunderstood if I made that impression. My recollection is, in my eagerness and my desire to urge upon the men of the north that they would give us better men in the south and means to help

with, I was betrayed into too strong an expression when I said I could not get money to carry on this work among the men there. But I still must repeat that because of the lingering remembrances of the years that are past, because of the dreadful trials through which some of us have passed, there was some indefinable, undefined sentiment, if you please, prejudice, if you please, that would hinder the men from giving for this work, and therefore I came to ask help of men who do not feel this sentiment, and who are not held back by this prejudice.

But believe me that there is going, throughout this Southern Church, a mighty work, and I believe that the bishops and clergy are as eager as you can be that this work shall be done.

Rev. Mr. Rogers, of Texas—I do not desire to interfere with the consideration of the order of the day, but I do desire to introduce a resolution that I believe this body will see to be important enough to assign a day for its consideration. It is a resolution in regard to our work among the colored people. For thirty years or more that people have been around me, and for twenty-five years or more they have been upon my heart, and I want to be heard as to that work. It is from a side that has never been heard heretofore, and it is enough to say that, in order to authorize me to propose a new scheme of work—

The President—The order of the day must be carried out, unless the House choose to suspend the order of the day for the purpose of the gentleman introducing his resolution.

Rev. Dr. Rogers—I move that the order of the day be postponed for one moment. I ask to introduce a resolution, and for a time to be set, which I propose to be immediately after the two orders, now assigned, shall have been heard.

Motion seconded and carried.

Rev. B. A. Rogers of Texas, Dep—Resolved: That this Board hereby declares its desire for an early and effective extension of the work of the Church among the colored people in the United States, and it recommends that this General Convention take such canonical action as shall authorize and secure to that people a Missionary Episcopate in one or more Jurisdictions, to be determined as to boundaries by the House of Bishops.

I now simply move that the consideration of this resolution be taken up when the two assignments have been proceeded with and concluded.

Motion seconded and carried.

Mr. Benj. Stark of Connecticut—Mr. President, I desire to move, sir, that that portion of the order of the day which relates to the changing of the constitution of the Missionary Society, be postponed and made the order of the day on the next day after this to which the Board of Missions may stand adjourned. I make this motion, sir, for the reason that the subject matter of that part of the Board of Managers' report to this body is not yet ready for consideration by the Board of Missions.

Rev. Dr. Hoffman of New York.—I rise to second that motion, and to ask the Deputy from Connecticut that it be made the order of the day for eleven o'clock, on the first day after this to which the Board of Missions may be adjourned.

Mr. Stark of Connecticut.—I accept the amendment.

Motion as amended carried.

The President—The first order of the day is disposed of. The next order of the day is the proposition respecting the Enrollment Fund.

Rev. Dr. Hoffman of New York—I do not understand that this sets aside all the recommendations of the Board of Managers. I suppose it only postpones the consideration of the one recommendation of the Board of Missions; the other, I presume, was still the order of the day before we take up another subject; and I would like to make a motion, sir, asking the opinion of the Board of Missions as to the resolution found on the ninth page of the report of the Board of Managers, in reference to the principle of making an annual appropriation for missionary work.

Resolution read by the Secretary.

The President—The question is upon the resolution that the Board of Man-

agers recommends that the Board of Missions establish the principle that hereafter the annual appropriation for mission work shall not exceed the amount of receipts for general purposes, exclusive of legacies for the preceding year. Is the house ready for the question?

Rt. Rev. Samuel Harris, Bishop of Michigan—Mr. President, I would suggest that the consideration of this resolution be allowed to pass over until the Board shall be ready to take up the consideration of the proposed changes in the Constitution. I think, sir, that we shall all be ready to discuss the whole report very intelligently, and if I may be permitted to say, in a better spirit, if we be allowed first of all to dispose of what might be called the burning question in this report. In the interest of harmony and unanimity I would suggest that the whole report go over until the time fixed by the resolution last offered. I make the motion to that effect, the hour being, as I understand it, 11 o'clock of the first day after this when we meet as a Board of Missions.

Motion carried.

THE ENROLLMENT FUND.

Rev. J. Andrews Harris, Pennsylvania—A deputy from Central Pennsylvania has asked for information with reference to the movement known as the Missionary Enrollment Fund. I am prepared to speak with reference to one of the aspects of this case, and some of my colleagues will touch on other points. I shall confine myself to the hard, practical business aspect of the facts. There are other considerations in which this case may be viewed; I shall speak simply with reference to the fact, and shall comprise what I have to say under four heads, each of which will be touched upon briefly. The first is the origin of the plan, the second its present condition, third the question of who is responsible for its present condition, and the fourth is the question as to future action.

This movement was originated by, although not in this body, at the General Convention of 1883; then, as always before, and as at the present time, the universal complaint went up of lack of means to carry out the work, and this complaint produced the result of prolonged insomonia; and the question became and is, what practical thing can be done to remedy the perennial evil in the Church? A lay member of this deputation lay awake at night endeavoring to solve a scheme, and that scheme was as follows: That every communicant in the Church should be allowed to have an opportunity to contribute money toward carrying on the work of the Board of Missions.

One essential feature of the plan proposed by him was, that this being a layman's movement, he should be guided by the principle "nihil sine episcopis," and so before taking any action he laid the matter before the Bishop of his diocese, who heartily concurred in the proposed plan. It was also communicated to the Missionary Bishops of the Church, and received their hearty indorsement. It was also communicated to the Board of Missions, and a copy of the letter which I hold in my hand, from the Assistant Secretary of the Board of Managers, showed that it received the assent and indorsement of the Board of Managers. The plan was simply this: That within three years from the Convention of 1883 to the Convention of 1886, \$1,000,000 should be raised by the laity of the Church, acting under the direction of the Bishops and clergy. It was proposed that this should be made a general work; that it should be within the means of all, poor as well as rich; and one essential feature of the plan was that no person should be allowed to contribute more than \$5. The calculation was that within three years the setting aside of 3 cents per week by anybody would produce the required sum of \$5. It is proposed also that the putting of the machinery in motion by which this result could be brought about, should be without one cent of expense to the Church, that the fund which is raised should not be burdened by expenses. The layman who proposed this plan offered to bear the expenses himself, the expense consisting of furnishing books for enrollment, the necessary correspondence and postage. Correspondence was had with all of the Bishops of the Church. The correspondence was frequent, and so extensive that it became necessary to employ a clerk. A committee worked earnestly and unselfishly at an expense of time and money. The committee expended, in order to put this thing before the Church, and without a possibility of

deriving a cent from this fund, some \$2,000 or over. Their interest in the matter thus being very apparent, it was understood that while it was a layman's movement it should not be carried on entirely by the laity, but that the assistance of the Bishops and Clergy should be given. The plan was to appoint a parochial canvasser and a parochial treasurer. Now, as a matter of fact, part of this pledge has not been fulfilled, and it has not been fulfilled from the necessities of the case. No part of this money has been brought to the General Convention to be offered on God's Altar at the opening service. Why was this is the question, and it has been questioned in many ways, and unfortunately the Central Committee of the Diocese of Pennsylvania, which has had charge of this thing, has been blamed. Their work will show, to any unprejudiced observer, that there is no jot or tittle of blame in this matter to be attached to them. They have done all they could. Why then was it that this money was not brought here? For two reasons. In the first place the amount was not raised, and in the second place the amount that was raised did not amount, by a very long figure to \$1,000,000. I have the statement, which is unnecessary to read in detail, which shows that from the whole of this Church in the United States, not more than about \$78,000 has been pledged, falling short to a very great degree of the amount needed. But, it has been said, why was not that amount, which has been pledged and paid, not brought up here? Simply because there was no right to do it. There was no right to be guilty of a breach of trust; it was nominated in the bond that \$1,000,000 should be raised before this offering should be presented; and consequently when it was found that the amount had not been raised, the Central Committee of Pennsylvania who had general direction of the scheme, notified the treasurer to hold the sum which had already been given to them until further directions. Now, the question is, who is responsible for this? Mr. President, I do not desire to answer that question, because in answering it I might be considered out of order, so I shall simply devote myself to the reiteration of the statement that the Committee who has the general oversight of this scheme is not responsible. Let the responsibility lie elsewhere, where it will and where it ought to be. This Central Committee, requested by a resolution passed towards the end of September, that the deputy from Pennsylvania to the General Convention would lay the facts of the case before the Convention and ask for instructions. It is evident that in accordance with the very promise of the subscription, no part of the \$78,000 in hand, or promised to be in hand can be used. This is without question, I take it, according to the terms of the bond and covenant. Now, the question is, shall the work be given up, or shall it be carried on within the next three years? If that be the resolve of this General Convention or Board, the General Convention sitting as a Board of Missions, then we would suggest, with all respect, that that resolve be a very unequivocal one, that there may be no question or misunderstanding about it, and that the deputies to this General Convention should consider this pledge, and see to it, upon their return to their several dioceses, that this scheme is carried through by the next General Convention, and the Central Committee of Pennsylvania relinquished henceforth all responsibility in the matter, except in the Diocese of Pennsylvania. It is not a matter for the Diocese of Pennsylvania alone. It is a matter for the whole Church, and with the Church we leave it. I have no resolution on behalf of the deputation from Pennsylvania to present. I simply have the question to lay before the house—what are you going to do about it?

Mr. Geo. C. Thomas, of Pennsylvania—It has been assigned to me to follow my reverend colleague upon the subject. I desire to speak upon the practical working of the plan in the Diocese of Pennsylvania, and why it is that we think it can be made a success throughout the Church in the entire country. I am also a member of the Central Committee, and familiar with the work from the outset, and also as treasurer of the Diocese of Pennsylvania. I now hold in my hands between \$24,000 and \$25,000 raised in that diocese, out of between \$31,000 and \$32,000 pledged to this fund. It seems to me, sir, to be a matter very practical and plain and simple when we look at it entirely from a business man's

standpoint. The question in the outset was this, that each communicant member of the Church should be asked during three years to pledge the sum of \$5 to the missionary work of the Church, and the originator of this scheme believed that 200,000 of such communicants might be found who would give this \$5 each. Unfortunately this is not the case; but we do not regard the work that has been done as a loss. Looking back over the past we consider the work as preliminary. We look upon it as work well done, and in the right line. My experience as a business man teaches me that no work can be done that is not done thoroughly from the start, and every portion of it and every part of it covered. Now I think, therefore, the work which we have done has been well done because we have covered the preliminary part, and to-day we have accomplished a great deal in awakening this convention of the Church, through its deputies, to the fact that this condition of things exists, as when I came in to this House a few days ago, I was met here by members from other dioceses, and one of them was a member from the New York delegation who had never heard of this movement. Therefore, Mr. President, I think we have done a good work, if we have only succeeded in bringing the matter before the Church and letting them know what can be done in one diocese by hard work and the enthusiasm of the people. To carry on this work, everybody in the Diocese of Pennsylvania has understood, through its Bishop, that there was no such word as fail. Our Bishop has taken the most thorough and earnest interest in it. When we started, each parish appointed its treasurer, and I hold in my hands a list of between ninety and one hundred churches and parishes in the Diocese of Pennsylvania, out of the 126 on the list, that have subscribed to the fund. Now, sir, in the list are parishes composed of people well-to-do and parishes composed of the poor, and the parishes composed of the poor and working classes are represented on that list, sir, not only in an honorable way but in a very remarkable way.

In one of these parishes in the northern part of the city, with great enthusiasm and earnestness, people would bring in their subscriptions in whatever amount, and would request to have their names put upon the list; and in families where they were unable on account of the limited amount to put it down to individual members of the family, they would select from among the family either the father or mother, or probably an older child, and have that one name registered on the book. This enthusiasm ran through that parish, and another parish in the extreme south western part, with an interval of fifteen miles between the two, were taking up subscriptions in the same way, and one hundred and seventy-one names were enrolled in that parish, with the amount of \$880 subscribed. Eight hundred and thirty dollars for missions in one parish in the City of Philadelphia composed entirely of workmen and working women. And I claim sir, that any scheme that produces such a result is born of God, and is a scheme that ought to be endorsed by this Church (applause). Not only that, but in wealthy parishes the scheme was taken hold of, and in some of these parishes, that of St. Mark's in the City of Philadelphia, the sum of \$3,100.00 was subscribed. The parish of Trinity Church subscribed \$3,000, another, \$2,000, so that this scheme was entered into with enthusiasm, and it was concluded that a great meeting would promote the cause and a committee was appointed who at their own expense rented the Academy of Music, which will seat from 3,000 to 4,000 people; but the committee representing the movement, feeling thoroughly interested, and believing that a larger audience could be collected, went on and rented another hall adjoining which would seat 2,000 people, and on the night of the meeting from 7,000 to 8,000 people were gathered, and 2,000 went away that could not gain admittance. The meeting was addressed by Bishops and by the laity, and was a grand success.

Now, sir, not to take your time, I believe that it is possible to raise this money in this way. Men have expressed an opinion that the money could not be raised; and that is the remark that is made. Well, sir, my experience is exactly to the contrary. My experience is exactly opposite to that; that church that I spoke of in the southwestern part of the city which I have known more about than any other, and which I have

no doubt, reflects truly the feeling of the people, from them subscriptions have been coming in to the Board of Missions during the summer, and in many cases work was scarce and salaries had been reduced in that working congregation, and they brought in \$113.65, and wanted to be put upon this enrollment as contributors to the Board of Missions. [Applause.] One other point, and that is the remark that it is an easy way for men of means to get out of giving more than \$5. All I can say about that is simply this, that the man that would take refuge behind a \$5 bill in that way would not give anything anyhow and we need not be afraid of him. The men that are going to give will give, and certainly it is a grand thing that in this manner by one fund presented to the Church, poor men and men of ample means can give together without their self respect being invaded, where they all go on the same footing. Where another man would go with a subscription list headed by a \$100 subscription people will not give themselves, and will excuse themselves by saying they cannot give so much. But here is a practicable thing; it is a free thing, it is a thing that interferes with the self respect of no man, it is a thing which can be worked successfully, and if the Church will take hold of it with the enthusiasm which belongs to it, it can be carried to a successful termination. [Applause.]

Mr. President, I desire to offer the following resolution:

Resolved, That the matter of the Enrollment Fund and the principle authorized in its collection be referred to a committee consisting of two bishops, three clergymen and three deputies.

The President—The motion is to refer to a special committee.

The Bishop of Ohio—I merely wish to ask if it would be possible to say anything on this subject if this resolution should pass.

The President—I think it is proper to discuss it now.

The Bishop of Ohio—I think there is scarcely anyone who has taken a deeper and stronger personal interest in the matter than myself. I believe in this plan thoroughly. I believe it can be accomplished, with one proviso. I always thought it a mistake that the plan was for making the contribution conditional. I believe if you will strike out the condition you will get the million dollars. All the trouble that I have found in Ohio was an objection to the condition. People would say: we can never raise a million dollars, and that interfered with subscriptions, then they went away and gave nothing; therefore I think that the movement is practical with the one exception of the condition. I want the condition stricken out; then we will proceed.

Right Rev. Dr. Brewer stated that there was a Church in the Territory of Utah which gave one thousand and ten dollars for the missionary enrollment fund [applause] given unconditionally.

Rev. Dr. Brooks, of Massachusetts—[Applause]—It seems to me that all the advantages of the matter asked for should be absolutely pressed. It seems to me that the value of the whole scheme arises from the condition of raising the million dollars. It seems to me that it is the condition attached to this enrollment scheme which gives value to it in the eyes of the people; that the amount of money that was to be raised, to be given, is one of the necessary elements in the scheme. From the first that was a distinguishing feature. The house expected it, and it was the individual ambition of the people that the Church should do the work in that way; the largeness of the expectations, the largeness of the idea, was an element in its favor and entered into it to distinguish it and was a valuable consideration of the whole scheme. It seems to me dishonorable to the Church to change that; that it would do more harm than good. If, indeed, the scheme shall go on, and that not one dollar shall be used until the million dollars shall be raised [Applause]; then take the inspiration of that, take advantage of it to draw into our treasury the sum; no amount is insignificant that comes to the fund.

I trust also that the other conditions

will be observed in any further attention that is paid to this scheme. I have no particular objection to this reference to a committee composed of clergymen and laymen; but it does seem possible that this scheme shall be what it is claimed to be, a million-dollar scheme. There were two conditions that recommend this very strongly. One was that it was a laymen's scheme, and the other was that it was a scheme for the collection of money in small sums. It seems to me that it was never the amount of money that was of so much importance as this, that it lays the matter upon our people's shoulders. We are too much a clergyman's Church, too much a Church of rich people. A scheme that calls upon laymen, which seemed to have this distinguishing feature, is what commends it. On the other hand there seems to be an attraction to the getting of money in the easiest way; men are inclined to seek subscriptions of a \$1,000 or \$10,000 from some rich man or some rich woman, and seem to be attracted by it from the ease with which the money is gotten, and are not pleased with sums that are drawn in one or five dollar bills or in half dollars [Applause]. It is the idea that our Church should be interested in the one dollar [Applause]. And that is the condition of things, the money which is raised throughout the Church and not through the ministers in large contributions, but through the people. These two feelings, that our Church was too largely a Church of clergymen and a Church of rich men, and on the other hand that it was a Church that appealed to individual rich laymen; both of these things I say are wrong. In the first place that it is a great, a large scheme should be kept before the people's eyes, and that no dollar is available until a million dollars is raised.

And second, that it is distinctly a layman's scheme, and a scheme that contemplates the assistance of the multitude through small contributions. I am very willing that it should be referred to the committee, but I trust that it will not lose any of the essential features which give it real value [Applause].

Rev. Dr. McVickar, of Pennsylvania—I only want to ask a question whether this should be postponed. On what occasion shall we have a better chance of moving and adopting some practical action than on this present occasion? It seems to me that now is the time to act upon it. I do not think we shall gain anything by putting this off five or six days by reference to a committee. Now on what occasion shall we have a better opportunity for discussing this question? This is always to have my vote, and I do hope that the motion to refer to a committee will be voted down, and discussion of this question will be had, and an adoption of it.

The Bishop of Maryland—I would like to offer an amendment to the resolution before us. If it should pass in its present form, it would take the matter entirely out of the hands of the laymen and commit it to a joint commission, in which both parts of this body are represented. It would be effectual to destroy the enthusiasm which has been kindled in the matter. My amendment supposes that it will be entrusted to a committee of five laymen, who shall report upon the subject. [Applause.] I well remember, sir, with what interest and with what ardent hope the proposition was received as it was first published, and how large a part in inspiring that hope came from the fact presented that it was peculiarly laymen's work, and from the suggestion which was plainly made that the laymen proposed to carry it forward, and it was clearly stated that the clergy of the Church would be embarrassed if they should take upon themselves the labor of presenting it, and if the laymen carried it on it was in their power to make it successful. If the Bishops and clergy are asked, they make appointments of treasurers; if the laymen call upon the clergy to assist in soliciting, they can help the matter on by their personal influence and power. The Bishop of a diocese called upon me to nominate a diocesan treasurer, and I did so. I was called upon in no other way or manner whatever, and I was glad of it. But I do hope that the same laymen who started the plan will go forward and carry it on. It is the only way to success. The laymen may still control it, and it appears to me that it should be referred to five laymen to report.

The deputy who made the original motion:

Mr. President, I will accept that amendment. My only object was to

preserve and continue the movement, but as no gentleman has any plans now to propose; my desire was in offering that resolution whenever this board meets that the committee shall embody it. I do not care to postpone action, I am ready for action now; if any one has a plan to propose, let us hear it.

A deputy—I offer the following amendment:

Resolved, That the Board has heard with entire satisfaction the statement of the Deputy from the diocese of Pennsylvania in regard to the missionary enrollment fund, that it heartily concurs with what has been done hitherto, that it has been well done, and that it bids the laymen who have it now in hand to go forward, in the full conviction that their great object can and will be accomplished.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that there is nothing to be gained by this reference, and I am sure that we could not be enabled to act with more unanimity in regard to this matter by postponement.

As I understand, the laymen who have charge of this have come to us for our approval, and I believe, that by a little additional effort the great object which these gentlemen have in hand can be accomplished. Now it seems to me that all we have to do is to give to these gentlemen our hearty endorsement, and I do trust that nothing will be done by this Board which will seem like detracting from their labors.

The Rev. Dr. Harris—Mr. President, I would say on behalf of the Diocese of Pennsylvania, that they consider their work, except as it relates to the Diocese of Pennsylvania, entirely finished. I don't think they will go any further than that; they have instructed us to bring this matter before the General Convention, in order that each diocese may take it up, and I feel sure that they will not be willing to take up the burden of the whole Church. I think they are decided upon that. I think they will act for their own diocese, but decline to be further responsible.

The President—The question before this House is to commit to a special committee of five laymen.

Mr. Thomas, of Pennsylvania—I have been asked a question by several deputies regarding the pledges in dioceses where a large number of communicants have contributed. We have pledges for between thirty-one and thirty-three thousand dollars, and the number of communicants is thirty-one thousand, therefore, it is one dollar per communicant. I would also like to ask about going on with the work in that diocese.

Bishop Lee, of Delaware—In regard to the practice of raising money in dioceses, I would take the liberty of stating what has been done in a diocese which has been referred to as a sort of minimum diocese. The clergy in drawing any comparison have spoken of Delaware. Now, the Diocese of Delaware through its delegates brought to the convention the sum, I think, of twenty-two hundred dollars, perhaps a great deal more, but not less, as our contribution to this enrollment fund.

The Bishop of Montana—I do not see any reason for appointing any committee to which this subject shall be referred. If they come in when they report to-morrow or next day we shall not be any better prepared to take action, so far as I know, than we are now. What we want is that a discussion of the whole thing shall be had to-day, which shall so impress the hearts of the laymen and the clergymen of every diocese in the country that they will go home and resolve during the next three years to carry this out, and I think our action should be a resolution of approval of the whole plan. That is the idea, so that the deputies from every diocese shall constitute a committee to carry this out during the next three years, and I believe they will adopt that resolution [applause] and will work for its success; that they shall go from here and do work from which the mil-

lion dollars shall be pledged. What we want to know is whether our action was received with favor, and what advance is to be given towards the better accomplishment of this object. In the first place, I do not believe that the laymen will ever accomplish it alone, because you may take any man, no matter how good a man or how prominent, and he cannot go over the whole field and reach one-half of the men. We must devise some plan by which dioceses and missionary jurisdictions can be reached. The Bishop and every clergyman and every layman of the Church should take hold and help carry to a successful conclusion this work. Then I should say that every Bishop should go about his diocese, and during his visitations and in every way men should be urged by those laymen, and that we should all work together, and in this way alone can we accomplish what has been proposed. In Montana we have raised one thousand and thirty dollars for the enrollment fund. [Applause.]

I said I did not know what would be done with it. It shall be made an offering to Almighty God for an extension of His Kingdom, and wherever it goes, we shall send with it our prayers and our blessings. But if I had done nothing, if they had done nothing and said nothing, or the laymen had done nothing and said nothing, it would not have been accomplished. I said I meant to give one hundred dollars myself towards this. I have not any Church of my own. I do not own any Cathedral, I cannot say I want to own one, but I call every Church in my jurisdiction my own, and every Church in my jurisdiction my Cathedral; and I wrote a letter to my Clergymen, saying I wanted them to give so much for this enrollment fund and they did something; and as I went about the Territory I raised here and there something, so that we made up the whole amount of \$1,030. There is one little mission with fifty communicants that had forty-seven subscriptions and sent to me \$235 [Applause] and it is not self-supporting by a long ways; but that clergymen divided up the town into committees, and they went to all the people and they beat the whole of Montana in what they accomplished, and I do not believe that there is any parish or mission in the whole Church of equal strength that has done as such. Now if we can take it up that way in the next three years, each parish agreeing to act as a part of that committee, and the whole delegation from every diocese, clerical and lay, agree to act as a committee and agree that they will give their brethren no peace until they do what they can in their meant, I am sure that the work go on and the \$78,000 will become hundreds of thousands and in the end a million. So let us not refer the resolution. Let us act now and say what we will do about this good work.

Rev. Mr. Davis, of Northern California—As a delegate from one of the Missionary Jurisdictions where the work has been carried on in a measure, I was able to bring \$860 for the fund. I would like to add one word against the reference. The work can be carried on as has been shown in the places where it has been carried on, according to the plan of the committee from Pennsylvania; but if that plan be carried on in every diocese and missionary jurisdiction, I am sure that the whole sum can be raised before the next General Convention. It is not a need for further organization. There is organization enough in connection with this plan, but what is needed is the earnest and sincere purpose of every clergyman and layman in the Church to take it up, not as a small thing, as it would be if you leave out the condition of raising a million, but raise it and much more as an effort of the Church, and let every man and woman in the Church feel that here is a work that calls upon them especially—not to interfere with any of their other work, but something which will give the Missionary work of the Church an impetus such as is not known in the history of this country. I believe, from the experience of the Missionary Jurisdiction in California, for it was worked there by only a few, that it can be made a success, I could get but one layman to take hold of the matter, and he raised over forty subscriptions. And I believe if the clergy and laity will take hold of it, there is plan enough. We ought to decide upon something; as was said by the Bishop of Montana, what is needed now is not further organization, but the striving to press home to the hearts of the

men and women of the Church that here is an opportunity which is feasible and practical, and which every one ought to do his utmost to carry out.

Bishop Boone, of China—I want to say that I came to this Convention bringing a contribution from that ancient city Hanchang, China, dating 500 years B. C.

This was a contribution from the people of China, and other contributions are on their way.

Bishop Paret, of Maryland—Although I have already spoken once, I occupied but a few minutes, but the principle which I have presented seems to me of so much importance that I wish to make two further remarks. I do not believe that the clergymen and Bishops should force themselves into this work until the laymen of the Church ask for it. I think that the laymen have begun the work, should keep the glory of the work to themselves, and let the Bishop and Clergy help them when they ask for it, but until they do, I hope that no help will be offered.

Rev. Dr. Gray, of Massachusetts—I only want to say one word. The reference is contested and there is a possibility of its being defeated. It seems to me that the reference is very important for one reason. I have taken some interest in it because of the experience of the chapel with which I am connected and which, I believe, stands second in Massachusetts; and, from my experience, I want to say that the principal difficulty has been the proposed distribution. I am surprised that some lips are silent which have not been silent on paper, and, therefore, it seems to me that this scheme should be committed, in order that, before it goes any further, it be put into proper shape. The laymen want to know what you are going to do with the money. That they have a right to know; I will ask that question, and I don't know how many times that proposed distribution has been brought before me with the question, is that final? I have said, No. The Board of Missions are at General Convention and have the power to do as they think best. Now I want this matter referred, and when it is known what is to be done, then the work can be accomplished, I verily believe. But it never will be done as long as it is felt that some will be left out in the cold; therefore, I hope it will be committed to a committee that will exercise, at least, more worldly wisdom than was manifested in the circular that was issued.

Rev. Dr. Rogers, of Texas—Am I in order in moving a substitute?

The Chair—It depends upon the nature of the motion.

Rev. Dr. Rogers, of Texas—I will read it.

Resolved, That the Board has heard with entire satisfaction, the statement of the deputies from the Diocese of Pennsylvania in regard to the Missionary Enrollment plan; that the Board hereby agrees that what has hitherto been done has been well done; and that the Board bids the laymen who have it in hand to go forward in the full conviction that their great object can and will be accomplished.

Resolved, That the whole subject of the Enrollment Fund be referred, with power, to a committee consisting of Messrs. Fuller, Coffin, Brown, Chase, Thomas and Buckley of the Diocese of Pennsylvania and such others as they may add to their number.

Resolved, That the lay deputies of each diocese shall be a special committee for that diocese, to be in communication with the Central Committee, shall appoint their own treasurer and prosecute the work to the end.

Resolved, That, in the opinion of the Board of Missions, it is desirable that this fund should be collected upon the same conditions and by the same general methods heretofore proposed.

I believe, sir, that there is what is called

a Central Committee—I believe there is no need of that committee making a subsequent report to us. It seems to me all that we want is the Central Committee which shall have power to go to work at once, and whenever they are ready to go to work and do this thing, the natural sub-committee in each diocese would be the lay members of this body. If these two things are provided, if the lay members go home from this body determined to do their part, with authority from the Church to act, and there is a central committee with which they can work, it seems to me that is all we need.

The Chair—The Chair understands that Rev. Dr. Rogers intends to alter the committee.

Mr. Rogers—It is a committee of five laymen, with power to act.

The President—It is in order. The question will be upon the amendment of the Rev. Dr. Rogers.

Bishop Paret, of Maryland—If it is in order for me to accept that in place of the amendment which I offered, I do it.

Rev. Dr. Jencks, of Indiana—I wish to second this new resolution. The original proposition was to raise a million dollars within three years. That has failed, and now it seems to be entirely proper and desirable that we should undertake some new scheme to secure some means, if possible, to go on and to take a new hold in order that we may add to that and secure the million dollars, if possible, within the next three years. For that reason I second the resolution of the clerical deputy from Rhode Island.

Bishop Harris, of Michigan—I desire and trust that everybody's resolution will be voted down but my own. It has been stated that the laymen who have had charge of this matter are the men to continue it. I believe that these men will continue to carry on this work if this Board of Missions shall adopt my resolution, if they are asked to do it. There is one deputy from Pennsylvania who shakes his head, but I am not willing, until it is decided, to believe that they would not carry on this work at our request. In my estimation, this is not only a layman's movement, but it is a voluntary movement of the laymen. I thought it argued well for our church when the laymen took council among themselves because their hearts were on fire, and set forward in this enterprise. What is the proposition? It is proposed to make this, instead of a voluntary movement, a movement inaugurated by the deputies of this Convention, and I submit, sir, if we carry out this proposition, and especially if the last resolution be adopted which was offered by my friend from the Diocese of Rhode Island, this will organize the scheme out of existence; that there will be so much machinery that it will fall of its own weight; and I hope, therefore, that this will be left just where it is, that we may be thankful to Almighty God for this voluntary movement on the part of the laity of this church, and that we do not now take it out of their hands and make it an ecclesiastical movement. I believe it is the essence of this movement that it should continue a laity movement, a purely voluntary affair, and I do hope, sir, as I said before, that all resolutions may be voted down but my own.

Mr. Biddle of Pennsylvania—Mr. President, it has not been any part of the scheme of the committee of Philadelphia that they should have a word to say as to the distribution of this fund. I repeat it, that there is no plan proposed as to the distribution of this fund. That is the privilege of the Board of Missions in whom we have the most implicit confidence. It was the plan that the million dollars should be placed at the disposal of the Board of Missions to do what they pleased with it. We have no distribution to suggest, and I would say that the proposition was merely a hypothetical proposition, stating to the Church what a million dollars could do, and I think you will find, if you refer to that, that that is the proposition, that such was what a million dollars will do, but what

it will do we leave to the Board of Missions. We want that distinctly understood, because there has been some carping criticism upon that very point which may have wounded the sensibilities of these gentlemen who have devoted their time and money and labor to this cause. But they do not come here to find fault with anybody. Let by-gones be by-gones. Let us all go forward and make this fund what we hope it will be. With regard to the distinguished deputy from Massachusetts, it is difficult for anybody to differ from anything that gentleman rises to say here or anywhere else, but I think he has made a mistake in supposing that anything which is in our minds or the minds of the Convention would make this matter less a layman's movement than it has been from the beginning. All that was ever asked, if I rightly understand it, from the Bishop and Clergy of the Church, was that they should be the means of allowing the laymen to bring it before their people. That is to say, the Bishop commending it to the Clergy, and the Clergy commending it to their congregation. The laymen have not expected them to visit from house to house, as has been suggested from the platform; they never had any notion of putting the labor upon the clergy, but they merely wish the clergy to assist them in bringing it before the church. Now, sir, I think the proposition that the laymen of the different deputations should be constituted by this Board into committees is a very valuable suggestion, and would help to keep it in the line of the laymen's movement. But before it leaves this body this addition shall be expressly taken out of the present plan, that is to say, that the subscription was to be confined to five dollars per capita, and that the money was not to be used until a million dollars was raised. I myself most sincerely agree in what the Rev. Dr. Brookes has said, that if you destroy that you take away all the spirit and all the value of this whole measure, and you merely make it a means of going about from diocese to diocese and saying, "Won't you increase your contribution to the Board of Missions?" and that ought to be expressly understood, whether or not that will be retained.

Bishop Howe, of Central Penn.:

Being of small stature, I am not able to be seen, but I wish to bring this thought before the Board. Inasmuch as it is proposed that all the lay members from the various dioceses shall constitute a committee for this fund between now and the next General Convention, I will illustrate what I want them to do, by telling what once happened in my experience. I was a member of a literary society fifty years ago, in which there was need for some money, and Rev. Dr. Bristey was also a member of that society. In order to raise this money, some one suggested that we should issue a circular, and Mr. Bristey immediately spoke up and said, "Yes, in the form of a hat." He went around and raised the money with his hat. Now, we want to constitute the lay members of this General Convention, of this Board of Missions a committee, and I suggest that now is the time to get them all in a row and begin right here, and they will each feel an interest in that which they have put their names down to, and then they can go to other people with good grace and get money for this enrollment fund. I believe that every member will pledge the five dollars, and that would amount to more than \$50,000 before to-morrow night.

Bishop Harris, of Michigan—I think we want to stir up the Bishop and Clergy first and then after that the laity will come to our aid. I am very much surprised at the remarks that I have just heard in reference to the distribution of the fund. I thought what I heard in reference to that matter was perfectly true, but it has been stated that it would be for us to do thus and so with a million of dollars, and that this thing is the reason for the discouragement that has been shown in this matter, and I believe that it is largely due to that fear lest somebody would get the larger share in this ministration; and I say that we ought to go on and enter into this matter with the spirit here illustrated by the Rev. Deputy from Massachusetts and the Bishop of Montana, enter heart and hand into this work, and if we will do so we can carry it on to success.

The President—The question before the Board is this, on the amendment of the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Bp. Harris, of Michigan—I would like to ask the gentleman, the deputy from Rhode Island, whether he would not be willing to add his two resolutions to my resolution. They are not at all in conflict, and it is very desirable that this Board should express its approbation of what has already been done. I ask my friend to add his resolution to mine, and if he wishes I would be very glad to give the whole matter into his hands.

Mr. Bennett, of South Carolina—I have endeavored in vain to get the floor to offer the amendment just offered by the gentleman over there, and I rise to second the amendment, because it seems to me it includes the provisions of the Right Reverend the Bishop of Michigan as well as those of the gentleman over there. Up to this time the one quality about the enrollment fund has not been for lack of a head; it has had a head and a wise one, and I hope that that head will still be preserved, and the addition of the sub-committee of laymen will give the scheme what it has always lacked, both feet and hands. In every diocese that sub-committee will go to work and will have the assistance of the clergy and the Bishop, and I, as one of the lay members of my delegation, will take great pleasure, as well as the bishops and clergy, in helping on this work with all our power. I also like the scheme suggested by the Bishop of Central Pennsylvania, and I offer myself as a victim to that on the instant. I have not had the pleasure of being enrolled, and I now ask to be enrolled.

Mr. James McConnell, of Louisiana—It would appear from the discussion that has taken place that the great difficulty is to get a working committee to work up the laymen to subscribe to this fund. The principal difficulty has been that laymen know nothing at all about it. According to the reports of this Church at the last triennial convention there were 361,000 communicants in this Church. We may naturally suppose that that has been increased by this time to 400,000 communicants. Why, sir, why should we stay here to discuss for two hours the proposition whether a million of dollars can be obtained from 400,000 communicants? Has this matter to be more than brought to the notice of these communicants? Is there man or woman here who will refuse the paltry sum of \$5? May we not find ourselves in this position, one in which the honor of this council will be preserved by not referring this matter to any committee? Now, sir, there is no trouble about getting the \$5; the only difficulty is that these gentlemen from the Diocese of Pennsylvania had the laboring oar in this matter; but, Mr. President, I would say to them through you that the fault has been that the information has not been communicated to the members of the Church throughout the United States or the measure would have been successful before this; and, Mr. President, this brings me to another thought, a practical one; you may depend upon it, sir, that any movement in behalf of the missionaries, which looks toward the support of the missionaries of this Church, although there may be some not disposed to acknowledge it, will not succeed unless we have in that movement the aid of the ladies of the Church. Now, Mr. President, it is a very significant fact, and facts speak louder than arguments. Take my own case. I am different from the member from South Carolina, I am an enrolled member of the organization. It was difficult for me to recollect for some time how I became such, but I finally came to remember that I had received a letter from a lady in Louisiana, soliciting my interest in the good work and wanting a subscription. Now, Mr. President, I hope that the resolution which has been offered here to refer this subject may be voted down, and that the members of this convention may be constituted a committee in itself, and I venture to say the money will be raised. One word more and I will be done. I have listened with great patience to the Deputy as to what the fund is and how it is to be pro-

vided. Why sir, it is a million of dollars to be raised from communicants, and it can be raised. If I understand it, it is to be put at interest, and the interest of it to be given to these noble missionary Bishops to help put them in a position of independence. Well, now sir, who is to have charge of this fund? The committee will turn it over to the Missionary Board. We have that confidence in the Missionary Board, that it will distribute the interest of that fund in accordance with what they shall deem the best method of doing so. As I understand it, the major portion of it, if not the whole of it, will go towards the support of the Missionary Bishops. The great object is to raise the money. If, after this discussion, this warm interest, this presentation of the case by the distinguished member, deputy from Massachusetts, who has shown the wisdom of the measure conceived, we shall go away without putting this thing into practical operation, you can depend upon it that it will be a great failure, in my humble judgment. Something must be done now, or it never will be done.

Rev. Mr. E. B. Spaulding, of California—Mr. President, I submit that we are at sea, many of us, at the present time, as to the object of this fund. A Committee should develop this matter as far as possible and let us know. The difficulty does not lie in any failure whatever in the principle of the enrollment itself, but it lies in the fact that the matter has never been brought before the Church itself practically so that it could get at it, and there lies the secret of any failure which may be made to-day. The people at large are not familiar with its object. Some practical plan should be developed. We are tired, we are in a hot room, and it is by all means advisable that it should go to a committee for some practical plan which does not involve simply the laity and clergy but the Bishops as well. If the Bishop and clergy will bring this matter properly before the different dioceses, and then the laity will take hold and try to raise the money, we shall have no trouble raising a million dollars to the great blessing of the missionary work of this land. I hope the Chairman may be allowed to state the question with the amendment of the gentleman from Rhode Island. The question we are now upon is the resolution with the amendment of the gentleman from Rhode Island, embodying the substance of the suggestions of the Bishop of Michigan.

Cries of "question," "question."

Rev. Dr. McVicker, of Pennsylvania—Mr. Chairman, I shall not detain you long; I have not had much to say, but I want to say one word. I am not authorized by the Diocese of Pennsylvania to undertake this work again. We came here with very definite instructions to lay down the work, except so far as the Diocese of Pennsylvania is concerned; but I do feel that there may be some hope that that committee may consent to carry on the work which they have so well begun—although perhaps I am not the one to say it. If this convention shall truly endorse the movement, and also pledge its interests by the appointment of lay delegates as a committee in the diocese, and the reason I believe so is, although I am not a member of that committee, it was my pleasure to be present at their last meeting when the instructions were given to us that there was a feeling of discouragement on the part of that committee. There was a feeling that the Church had not understood the work that they had done. They heard chaffing and cavils from all sides, they were told it was a layman's movement, and there was a feeling of discouragement. One of the lay members who has worked very hard indeed has said I do not believe it can be done; it is a simple plan, it is a beautiful plan on paper, it seems just as easy to do it as can be, every communicant giving three cents a week for three years, and the work is more than done, but it depends simply upon this, which I am afraid is not to be depended upon, that every one shall do his or her duty. Now it is all very well to come up here to this convention and here these glowing speeches, such remarks as that so paltry a sum can be raised without difficulty?

These noble speeches are all very well, and the endorsement of the convention is good, but these things are not going to do the work. If we are to come up three years from now and have that sum to put as an offertory in God's hands, it is not going to be simply because it is extolled at this convention, it is not going to be done simply because people get up here and make speeches and create enthusiasm. One gentleman says there are many people who do not know what the work is; how are you going to communicate this work? It has been in all the religious papers. There has been 20,000 circulars sent broadcast, and more than 20,000. This committee has been at an expense of more than \$2,000 in getting this plan before the public, and yet from New York comes the information that they were not aware of the movement. It is supposed that most of the communicants of our Church are able to read. It is supposed that many communicants of our church take the papers. Then how can they come up here and say, we have not been aware or heard anything about it. Why, it seems to be a part of the plan that they should not know anything about it. Well, sir, it is not the fault of the committee. That committee has sacrificed itself, and worked day and night. I am not a member of that committee, or I should hesitate in saying it, but I know something of their work, and I do believe that if this convention will now simply adopt this resolution offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island, I do believe that there is some hope that this committee may proceed in the work. The gentleman who started this scheme is in this convention to-day, but not being a delegate has no right to the floor, but, Mr. Chairman, let us not go away from this convention simply wrought up on the subject, simply having talked it over, and then say we have not been informed about it. I am asked for the name of this gentleman, the originator of this scheme. The name of that gentleman is Mr. Fuller of Philadelphia, a member of St. Mark's Church. (Applause.)

The President—The question is upon the amendment.

Rev. Dr. Vibbert of Chicago—Does that consist of two resolutions? I would ask that these resolutions be put separately. I should be opposed to the resolution which provides for the putting of this matter into the hands of the laity. I should feel that it was my duty to oppose it, because I want this measure to succeed, and if it should be committed to the hands of the laymen I don't believe it will succeed. For instance, to take my own parish, I do not know what layman is capable of going into that parish and finding out my communicants and ascertaining those that are willing to give their assistance to raise three or four thousand dollars there. If it cannot be done in my parish, I believe it cannot be done in any. Now, we want to have this measure succeed, and we have got to have men who are in position to know these communicants who are in a position to approach them, to influence them, and I believe that there is no one in the parish who can do it better than the rector. You see at once how the laymen are going to work at it from what the gentleman from South Carolina has just said. He proposes to poke up the Bishop and his rector. Now we are ready to be poked up, and I think we are ready, bishops, clergy, and all the Church, I think we are all willing to interest ourselves in this grand movement, and therefore I want this measure voted down which commits it entirely into the hands of the laymen. The committee should consist of bishops, clergymen and laymen in order that this work may be carried forward to a successful issue.

Rev. Dr. Brooks, of Massachusetts—I do not believe that there is anything in the resolution as at present framed which distinctly gives our endorsement to the method in which it is proposed this money should be raised. I am opposed to committing this matter to anybody without the distinct, explicit approval of the conditions under which, and the method in which, this money shall be raised. There is already seventy or eighty thousand in hand. It has been contributed under certain conditions, and it is proposed to send it back to that committee under the same conditions and the same methods. It seems to me that it is proper that the conditions

should be explicit and well defined. There is not here any specification of that sort. I desire to offer a resolution governing the objection which I have stated.

Rev. Dr. Rogers, of Indiana.—I have no hesitation at all in accepting the four resolutions.

Rev. J. J. Vaulx, of Arkansas.—Mr. President, it is a strange thing to me that all of the clergy will so often speak of the laity, that they will do nothing, and now when the laity come forward and desire to do something, they say vote against it, you cannot do it. I say the laity can carry this to a successful issue, and they will if you will only trust them. They complain about the work of the laity and when the laity say they will take hold, then we, the clergy, say you cannot do it without the bishops and the clergy. I do not believe any such thing as that. The laity can do it and will do it if we will give them the opportunity. As to the deputy from South Carolina saying he is ready to poke up the bishop and clergy, that is not what we wish the laity to do, but the deputy from South Carolina must do his work in his diocese of South Carolina, and the laity will accomplish this if we will trust them, sir.

Mr. Bennet, of South Carolina:

I did not use the words "poke up the bishops and clergy." They came from the mouth of my distinguished friend from Chicago, Dr. Vibbert.

Rt. Rev. W. W. Niles, Bishop of New Hampshire:

Mr. President, if this resolution presented by the deputy from Massachusetts is to be added, is expected to be added to the motion now before the house, I wish to inquire whether we are tied in the previous plan to the securing of five dollars from communicants only. Now that is the plan upon which we are working, I believe.

A deputy from Massachusetts: Baptized persons.

Bishop of New Hampshire:

Well, I should think if it included baptized members of the Church, that it might also include all well-disposed people attached in any way to the Church. We might secure this sum of money, and ought to be able to do it.

Rev. G. W. Dumbell, of Tennessee:

Mr. President: I think, sir, that this debate has taken an unfortunate turn in several quarters, and that has fallen from the lips of many which we regret to hear. I cannot conceive that we ought to judge otherwise in this matter than to decide to leave it entirely in the hands of the laity. We of the clergy have amply sufficient to do. We will of course give the gentlemen assistance with all our hearts and all our strength, but I am strongly of the opinion that it should be left in the hands of the laity, and that it is ungracious for us to discuss this matter in great measure as we have done. This matter originated voluntarily with the laity, and unless they are determined to drop it and let it fall through so far as they are concerned, which I am satisfied that they are not, then we ought to strengthen their hands by whatsoever promise they may deem worthy of receiving; but they ought to go on with it to the end; but I am satisfied that after what has past, and the encouragement we may be able to give them, that before we meet in General Convention three years hence the good work may be carried through as laymen's work by the laity of the church.

The President announced that the original resolution, together with the several amendments offered and discussed, were four distinct propositions, the first of which, as they now appear, the Secretary then read, and the resolution was adopted.

The Secretary then read the second resolution, which was also adopted.

The Secretary then read the third resolution, and it was also carried.

The Secretary then read the third resolution, and it was also carried.

The President—These resolutions are in the nature of amendments to the original resolution to refer to a committee to be nominated. Now shall it be referred to such committee?

Mr. Parker, of New Jersey—If I read aright the pledges of that is contained in the plan of the enrollment; that it is there distinctly stated that no money is to be collected from dioceses by the treasurer until it is understood that a million dollars is raised, and then it will be called for.

Bishop of Pittsburg—I ask that the resolution be read by the Secretary.

Rev. Dr. Richards, of Rhode Island—I rise to a point of order. The whole subject of the Enrollment Fund has been referred to a Committee. Have we anything more to do with it?

The President—The Chair decides the point of order well taken and rules the present resolution out of order.

The Board of Missions then adjourned until Friday morning at 11 o'clock.

NINTH DAY.

CENTRAL MUSIC HALL, }
Friday, Oct. 15, 1886 }

The House of Deputies was called to order by the President. Minutes of the eighth day's proceeding were read and approved.

The President—The President has the pleasure of presenting Mr. Astor, Treasurer of the Convention, and will announce that the Treasurer is now ready to receive money as is coming to him as such Treasurer.

The Treasurer—The House will now receive messages from the House of Bishops.

Message No. 14—The House of Bishops informs the House of Deputies:

Message No. 14.

The President—Under the rules this goes on the calendar.

The House of Bishops informs the House of Deputies that it has adopted the following resolution:

Resolved, The House of Bishops concurring, that Title I, Canon 5, Section 6, concerning a provisional Bishop, be repealed.

Message No. 15—The House of Bishops informs the House of Deputies that it has adopted the following resolution.

The President—No action is required by this House.

Message No. 16.—In reference to the change of name in the diocese of New Jersey, and providing for the substitution of that change. Message No. 16: The House of Bishops informs the House of Deputies that it concurs in Message No. 18 of that house giving the consent of this convention to the change of name of the diocese of Northern New Jersey to "the diocese of Newark" and providing for the certification of the same.

The President—No action is needed upon that message.

Message No. 17.—The House of Bishops informs the House of Deputies that it has adopted the resolution of the house in reference to the relief of aged and infirm clergy.

It was moved that the message be concurred in. Carried.

Message No. 18.—In reference to Christian Education under the auspices and control of the Protestant Episcopal Church, with which message was the following resolution:

On the motion the house concurred in the resolution contained in Message No. 18.

Message No. 19.—On the subject of Christian Unity.

The President—No action is needed by this house on this message.

Message No. 20.

The President—No action is required on No. 20 from the House of Bishops.

The House of Bishops informs the

House of Deputies that it has adopted the following resolution:

Resolved, That the House of Bishops, while sympathizing with all wise and well directed efforts for increasing our knowledge of Bible lands, does not deem it expedient to assume any responsibility, whether pecuniary or other for particular assistance or expeditions having this end in view, and therefore it does not concur with Message No. 11 from the House of Deputies.

Message No. 17—The House of Bishops informs the House of Deputies that it has adopted the following resolution:

Resolved, the House of Deputies concurring, that a joint committee be appointed to whom shall be referred the report of the matter of the need for the relief of aged and infirm clergy, etc., and name on the part of this house the Bishop of Rhode Island and of Western Michigan.

Message No. 18—The House of Bishops informs the House of Deputies that it has formed the following resolutions, with preamble:

WHEREAS, By the action of both Houses of General Convention it has more than once been formally declared that Christian education under the auspices and control of the Church is one of the most important subjects that can engage the attention of this body and of the Church; and

WHEREAS, Though the standing committees of both Houses on Christian education have in several elaborate reports made sundry recommendations and suggestions for the advancement of this cause, none of which have been carried into effect; therefore

Resolved, The House of Deputies concurring, that it be referred to standing committees of the two Houses on "Christian education under the auspices and control of the Church" acting as a joint committee to revise and report to this General Convention such ways and means as may seem to them most effective for giving practical force to some or all of the recommendations and suggestions touching this great interest which has been reported at sundry times during the past twenty years.

Message No. 19—The House of Bishops respectively inform the House of Deputies that having, from the first day of its session, had before it the momentous subject of Christian unity and the unity of Christendom, it takes the opportunity presented by the House of Deputies, communicated in Message No. 12, to assure that House of its profound sympathy with the spirit of their resolution. This house declares its hearty respect and affection for all who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, and at this time especially for their fellow Christians assembled in this city as the "National Council of Congregational Churches in the United States." This House also avows its solemn purpose, under the Holy Spirit, to promote, with the concurrence of the House of Deputies, some practical plan for bringing before all our fellow Christians in this land the duty to our common Lord and Saviour of terminating the unhappy differences which dishonor His blessed name, and hinder the plans of His glorious kingdom.

Resolved, That Message No. 12 from the House of Deputies be respectfully returned to that House with the above statement for the reason for the House of Bishops to approve the resolutions contained in such message.

Message No. 20.

Resolved, That the House of Bishops consents to the consecration of the Rev. Mahlon Norris, Assistant Bishop elect of the State of Minnesota, and request the presiding Bishop to take the necessary order for such consecration.

The President—The next business in order is the reception on report from the standing committees.

Under the call for the reports on the standing committee on canon, the Rev. Dr. Goodwin, chairman of that committee, presented three reports, the text of which has not come to our hands. They will appear in Monday's issue.

¶ The President—Report of Committee on the State of the Church.

Dr. Shattuck, of Massachusetts—I have to announce having received, from the treasurer, his report, and I wish to present his report and ask that the report be referred to the Committee on Expenses. I move, sir, that the report of the treasurer be referred to the Committee on Expenses. It was so referred.

The Rev. Dr. Hale, of Iowa—We are desirous to facilitate the action proposed by that committee, and I would suggest that it would relieve the committee of a very great responsibility if some form of vote can be taken before the matter is handed over to them. I would therefore move that it be the order of the day on Monday.

The Rev. Dr. Hoffman, of New York—I arise merely to say that there will be a minority report for the committee that has this matter. It is not quite ready for presentation to the house, but we shall probably have it ready for presentation to-morrow morning in order that it may go to the house at the same time that the majority report goes.

Mr. Burgwin, of Pittsburgh—I would suggest to the committee or the gentleman from Iowa, that he add to his motion to continue such order until disposed of. We have had a little question here of very little importance which has occupied three days, and is not yet decided.

The President—It is moved and seconded that the report of the joint committee presented by the Rev. Dr. Hodges, of Maryland, be made the order of the day for Monday next at eleven o'clock, and that it continue to be a special order until disposed of.

Motion carried.

Resolution of Mr. Nash, of New York

Resolved, To amend article 3 of the Constitution by omitting all after the words "both houses" in the sixth line of the seventh page.

Upon the subject of the relation of the two Houses of the General Convention, the report favors an amendment, to Article III., of the Constitution, and I will state the general nature of the proposed amendment.

Article III. of the Constitution is, to a very large extent, obsolete. There is one place in it which operates, to a very large extent, to obstruct the legislation of the Convention. It provides as follows:

The bishops of this Church, whenever there be three or more, shall, whenever General Conventions are held, form a separate House, with the right to originate acts for the concurrence of the House of Deputies, composed of clergy and laity, and when any proposed act shall have passed the House of Deputies the same shall be transmitted to the House of Bishops, who shall have a negative thereupon, and, in all cases, the House of Bishops shall signify to the Convention their approbation or disapprobation within three days after the said act shall have reported to them for concurrence.

The article in the form it now is dates from the year 1808, and the paragraph which requires the House of Bishops to signify to the convention their approval or disapproval in three days, is found to stand in the way of the progress of the business of the convention. At the time it was adopted it will be seen at once the business of the convention had not reached by any means the magnitude which it has now. It is almost impossible considering the large amount and character of the legislation which is constantly presented to the House of Bishops for them to act intelligently upon all propositions sent up by this house for concurrence within the three days fixed by this provision of the constitution, and the result is that because they are not able to act intelligently they acted negatively in a great many cases. The object of the amendment of the article is to remove this obsolete article and to remove these restrictions which pertain to that period that

we passed nearly seventy years ago, and to remove thereby an obstruction to the harmonious action of the two houses in matters where they substantially agreed.

I move that the report be referred to the Committee on Constitutional Amendment. It was so referred.

Mr. Foster, of Pittsburg, presented a resolution in reference to the late Robert Malcom Hale, at one time a member of this General Convention.

Referred to Committee on Deceased Members.

The Rev. Mr. Little, of Delaware—I beg leave to present a memorial on the subject of reunion of Christendom signed by 1,100 clergymen and 1,100 laymen of our Church.

Referred to standing Committee on State of the Church.

The Rev. Dr. Beardsley, of Connecticut, offered the following resolution:

Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That a committee consisting of two Bishops, two clericals and three lay deputies, be appointed to select and recommend the place where the next General Convention shall be held.

Carried.

The Rev. Mr. Farrington, of New Jersey—I desire to offer the following resolution:

Resolved, That a committee of three clergymen and three laymen be appointed to nominate twenty-five persons for election by this House as trustees of the General Theological Seminary.

Resolution adopted.

Rev. Mr. Hughes, of East Carolina, presented a resolution in reference to a new order of business providing that when a regular order of day is under discussion at the hour of adjournment, it shall be continued the order when the house meets the next day.

Referred to the committee on Rules of Order.

Mr. Nash of New York—I have a resolution which I wish to offer and refer to the committee on Rules of Order. It is in the interest of expediting the business as between two houses.

Resolution referred to the committee on Rules of Order.

Rev. Mr. Taylor of Springfield offered the following resolution—

Resolved: The House of Bishops concurring, that article 7, section 7, of canon 15, title I, the words "shall be eligible to the office of Diocesan Bishop within any organized Diocese in the United States" be stricken out.

Referred to committee on Canons.

Mr. Nash of New York—Now, if I am in order, I wish to move that the vote on the proposition before the house to change the name of the Church be taken to-day at eleven o'clock.

The President—If there be no further motions or resolutions, the business now before the house is the resolution offered by Mr. Judd of Chicago. It is moved and seconded that the vote of the house be taken upon that resolution at eleven o'clock to-day.

Mr. McConnell of Louisiana—I am opposed to the resolution. I think there is a large number of people to be affected by this resolution, independent of the clergy. I believe they have not yet been heard, and I hope, therefore that this discussion will not be limited but will be closed to-day at some reasonable hour.

A Deputy of New York—I desire to offer an amendment to the resolution so that the vote be taken at 11 o'clock on Monday morning.

Rev. Mr. Egar, of New York—If that resolution is carried, would not that exclude all other amendments and matters pertaining to it? I desire to offer an amendment at the proper time to Mr. Judd's resolution, or a substitute for it which I ask the privilege of reading in order that you may see what it is.

Resolved, That the joint committee on revision of prayer book be requested to report amendments to the title page of the book of common prayer, etc.

I do not propose to put it in the form of excluding or blotting out the term Protestant Episcopal, although the word Protestant would not appear, but I desire that the prayer book should have a title corresponding with the title of the prayer book of the Church of England. It seems to me there are a good many reasons which I shall not state now, but

which I hope to have the opportunity of stating, why it should be put in that form, and I think that if you consider that this book—

The President—The chair will have to interrupt the Rev. Deputy, because the question before the house is the one for fixing the hour at which the vote shall be taken. When the house has acted upon that question it will be in order for the Rev. Mr. Edgar to speak. The chair would also state that in the judgment of the chair, before the final vote is taken upon the resolution, amendments and substitutes will be in order.

Mr. Stotsenburg, of Ind.—I move to amend the resolution of the deputy from N. Y.; I move to close the debate at 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The President—The question, then, before the house is that the vote on the pending subject be taken at 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

Mr. Prince, of New Mexico—I have an amendment to offer to that, that the vote be taken at half-past 12 o'clock on Monday. The reason for offering this is this: To-day we are to be in the Board of Missions all day. To-morrow the session will practically amount to nothing except to run through the order of business, because we adjourn at 12 o'clock to go to Racine. There is really no practical time except Monday, when these gentlemen who have not spoken may be heard. Mr. Judd, who is not here to-day, if he is able will desire to say something at the close of debate, and as I have had the burden of making the opening argument on this subject, and endeavoring to condense into 15 minutes that which requires a good deal more time, I know that I desire to ask the courtesy of the house, at any rate, to enable me to reply very briefly to some of the things which have been said. I therefore move you that the vote be taken at half past 12 o'clock on Monday.

Upon division of the house it was decided to vote upon the question to-morrow at 11 o'clock by a vote of 192 in favor to 92 against.

Rev. Dr. Van Antwerp, of Iowa, moved that the debate be limited to 10 minutes, except the concluding speeches of the proposer of the resolution.

Rev. Mr. Penick, of Kentucky—Moved as an amendment that the debate be limited to five minutes. Lost.

By a unanimous vote speeches were limited to ten minutes.

Mr. Burgwin, of Pittsburgh—I move that the question be taken up at 10 o'clock to-morrow morning—the question in reference to the change of name.

Motion carried.

Mr. Benet, of South Carolina, offered a resolution as an amendment to the rules of order as follows:

Resolved, That the Rules of Order be amended by adding thereto the following as rule 12: When the special order of the day is not disposed of on the day set for the consideration for the same, it shall continue the special order of the day until disposed of.

Resolved, That the numbering of the rules in order be so changed to make this addition.

The President—The resolution will go to the Committee on Rules of Order without discussion. The Chair would desire to state that in explaining the rules the Chair understood that we should proceed at the hour of 10 o'clock to-morrow under the order to suspend the rules to discuss the pending question.

Mr. Egar—I believe the report is printed and will be distributed.

The Rev. Mr. Farrington—Then it can be distributed.

The Rev. Mr. Hilliard, of Easton—I desire to ask what opportunity will be presented to-morrow for the offering of any substitutes for Mr. Judd's resolution. May I ask the ruling of the chair?

The President—In the opinion of the chair the House has suspended its rule and will proceed at ten o'clock to-morrow to the consideration of the subject before it. When the subject is before the House, amendments are in order, and substitutes will be in order.

(Continued in next issue.)

GENERAL CONVENTION.

CENTRAL MUSIC HALL, Chicago, }
Thursday, October 14, 1886. }
EIGHTH DAY.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The House was called to order by the President:

Rev. Mr. Spalding, of California.—Mr. President, I had not intended to say anything upon the question which is before the House presented by the very learned delegate from the Diocese of Chicago, but the strange course which the debate has taken leads me to speak. In the first place it was my privilege three years ago to second a similar resolution at the General Convention held in Philadelphia, and it was also my privilege to add my own experience on that question, and my conviction that it was needed has deepened ever since. It strikes me that the arguments and objections are not of weight, and I have come to the profound conviction that there is scarcely any reasonable objection to the changes proposed; there are many reasons in favor of it.

I have listened to the debates that have been going on before this House, and my conviction has been confirmed that there was scarcely one objection raised in this House that rightly considered would not be an argument in favor of the change proposed. Let me refer to some of these objections that have been raised. The learned Deputy from the Diocese of Pennsylvania and the distinguished delegate from the Diocese of Massachusetts have raised the objection that because this church is comparatively speaking a small church, feeble folk with reference to the different bodies that are about us, that it would be assurance on the part of this body, assuming a more ambitious name than as a church, would be proper. This is the first time, Mr. President, in the whole course of my life, that I have ever heard even of a case where a man had not a right to his own name. And that is the question before this House that is the name of this Church. We are committed to it in our creed, and to it in our forms of worship; did these gentlemen who raise these objections forget that 1900 years ago, when in Jerusalem 120 men gathered together, a feeble folk at that time, surrounded by different religious sects all about them, for religious theories and sects filled the world, and different schools of philosophy were everywhere, did they forget that that body of men gathered together assumed and claimed for itself to be the Church of the Living God?

Another objection that is raised has been this: That this is the name which the Church had been known under for one hundred years, and it had been good enough in the past, and it would be good enough in the future.

This, Mr. President, is what I might call the facile objection, and it recalls to mind an anecdote told by the Rev. Bishop Armistage that, in a small town, where a movement had been started to repair a church, and the little town was wrought up with excitement, and as it was some thing desirable, a meeting was called and one after another got up to argue the matter. One old gentleman, a man over 70 years old, began his argument against this movement in this way: "I sat there now for nearly sixty years, and sister so-and-so she sat there so many years, and brother so-and-so he sat there so many years, and now if the people do this thing we won't know where we are. There will be folks in here that we never heard of before."

And that is the very point. We will have people in this Church that we never heard of before, and people that we could not reach in any other way. If we rehabilitate the Church by this change, for the reason that men, the best men, as they realize our Catholic spirit and see that the Church is the purest and strongest opponent to the Romish Church, they will come to us earnestly and willingly, and we shall be a rallying-ground away from Romanism and Schism.

But there is another reason and that is the natural sentiment of love for a thing to which we are long accustomed. I heard an aged and reverend brother speak of the Protestant Episcopal Church as the dear old name, and as the dear old Church to which

he was attached, and I was not sure but that it was something that ought to be weighed by the Church, even as a mere sentiment; but I have thought much about it in the last three years, and I believe that the growth of the Church and its needs should be considered before sentiment.

It is a subject on which some have said that they hoped that the name might be retained as long as they lived, and it is a sentiment sir that had weight in moving me when the question of the enrichment of the Prayer Book came up; and this sentiment had weight with me until the learned delegate from Connecticut gave the history of the form by which it arose and said the name Protestant Episcopal came from they know not where, and they could not tell how nor by what authority it was born; and was first pressed upon the Church as a compromise measure, then largely this feeling passed away; it seemed like a foundling picked up in the street, and the consequent duty would be to restore to the Church the name which belongs to her.

Another objection that was raised, was, if I may coin a word, that this movement was in the direction of unchristianizing the Episcopal Church, and Mr. President I heard another cry, that cry, that slogan which marked the Church a few years ago, that cry of Romanizing, which has been in this Church from the first to last whenever any man has arisen who was bold enough in our Church to attempt any reform. I heard that cry raised when a little child my father was stoned in the streets for teaching Romanism, and my father was a member of this Church and had no love for Romanism.

I have heard the sound of that cry over men who had taken their places in the Church, and were among the most able and noble workers in it. That cry was raised around many of the best men in that day, and some of them were stricken down by it.

It was such an one whose remains sleep to-day beside the chapel which he loved, in the midst of the work that he was instrumental in building up; that life which was so useful and so grand that if he could be raised to take his place in the councils of this Church again, if we might again see his face here, I believe there is not one in this Church who would not freely accord to him the highest place, and I hope it will be relegated into the dark and sad past.

Another objection made is that it will tend to unprotestantize the Church. With what reason that the Protestantism of the Church will be less than it has ever been before.

What is Protestantism? It is nothing else, in the name of God, than a protest against any part of the errors of Rome only.

Is there no sin and shame, no indifference all around us in this land? Is there no gross wrong in the divorce laws and practices, no gross skepticism, no infidel ty? Is there no rationalism within the very Church of God, which even here protests against this change, pleading against in the name of the catholic spirit of the Church.

Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus.

That truth, which is unchanging that the Church goes out in protest against all sin, will not be changed, she will still be against error, and all sorts of error.

I speak of the great work that is before this Church; it has come to give us a realizing sense of the great work of this Church in the world and it is in regard to that I would speak.

I do not know how it is in the east, but I can speak of my own knowledge of what it is in the Mississippi Valley where the people are coming in teeming thousands who have to be taught the very rudiments of Christianity, many of whom know no language which is not profane. This people covers thousands of miles of territory whom this Church must go out to meet. Well now what is to be done with places like this. Go and endeavor to convert the subtle, shrewd, Chinaman, and let us begin to preach to him, and you have to explain the meaning of the title of the body which you represent, and he keenly looks you in the face and follows you closely, and when you explain to him that the differences, the divisions, and hatreds and animosities that has masked the Church of God has made these names, he will turn with a sneer from you and perhaps ask you whether it is a Metho-

dist, or Baptist, or Protestant Episcopal God of which you speak.

There is a necessity to reach these thousands that come to our land, those who do not even know the name protestant, and it is for this that I would change the name.

Mr. President, if I could by any specious argument influence a vote, I would not do so, but one thing I do hope, before I pass away, before the sods fall upon my coffin that I may see the true title of the Church of God given to her, and the words Protestant Episcopal will not be known in it.

Rev. Dr. Greer, of Rhode Island—I desire to be heard briefly on this question, and say why I believe the words "Protestant Episcopal" should not be expunged from the fore front of our Prayer Book, and why I think it is sufficient.

As has been said in the course of the debate a gentleman stated that it was an accident, and one of the speakers professed to give the manner in which this name came into being.

But do we not know very well that many great historical names have come into existence in the same way? and that should not be brought against the name of the Church; and I would say with reference to the religious confusion in the name that it would certainly occur. But from the point of view of the ages, it would furnish us some point from which to act for the Church with respect to itself in the present, and would be a warrant for it to do so. Some point has been made in trying to show that it was a Church that need not protest against the expenditure of love and peace, as against the errors of the Church of Rome longer. Has the Church of Rome changed its teaching? Does the Church of Rome ever change? Does it ever expunge anything, or any name from any of its formulas, or anything from any of its doctrines or symbols? If the Church of Rome has not changed, why should we change? Have our doctrines with reference to conformity to the Church of Rome, has that changed? In that we have not changed, and could not; there is still the same need of protesting as there was in the past. But we not only protest against the errors of the Church of Rome, but we protest against the sins of Rome, against being non-Protestantized. Is it not true that the Church of Rome has never allowed anybody to protest? Was it not that which created the great movement in the body of the Church.

In the 16th Century, the Church of Rome stifled intellectual inquiry, suffered; no protest, and stifling intellectual inquiry it stifled morality. It is to the glory of our Church that it promotes, encourages and inspires with intellectual freedom, independence of inquiry, which is conducive to the highest lives. But, sir, not only because of what the name signifies when we look away back into the past, not only because of the glory that it gathers about itself, but because of the very reason that has been intimated by the eloquent gentleman from California, I will turn this argument against himself. This is not a time to drop the word. Reference has been made to the great burning questions which are disturbing and perplexing men's minds to-day, and it is to be hoped that by changing the name of the Church those questions may be settled, and those sores may be healed. With those references I have the keenest sympathy. These are perplexing questions, and for that reason let it be known that we stand as a Church, strong for the truth as it is in Jesus Christ, to protest against all errors in doctrine, everything that is vicious and immoral in life, in conduct and in practice. If there are other Christians that do not have the name, that is their weakness, not their strength. If we have it, it is our strength, not our weakness; and so it is the work of the Church to gather people into peace and grace. Yes, in the presence of the criticisms that are trying to undermine the historical foundation of the Christian faith, let it be known that we are the Church holding protests in the interest of true scholarship and sound historical criticism. In the presence of that philosophy which is telling us that she is but a product of evolution, that there is no real, determined moral foundations, let it be known

that we are the Church that protests and declares that there are such moral and eternal foundations, though the whole physical universe should dissolve and leave not a wrack behind. In the name of the false philosophy which declares it is not possible to know our God, and have real communion with Him, let it be known and go abroad among the nations and throughout all society that we are the Church that protests against that which in my judgment is as false as pernicious. In the presence of the age where it is held by many of our Churches that we can worship God and mammon at the same time let it be known that we are the Church of the Living God, and that having the name already on our books we are also a protesting Church, and in the name of our Master let it go out to-day in this mammon-worshipping, worldly age, that we cannot worship God and mammon. So I say it is a providential name given to us, not accidentally, or accidental if you please, but I still hold most providential, for accident is but Providence, and it is a providential name that has been given to us, and it is because we have the name we are ready for the world which surrounds Christian people to-day. So in this evil day, having done all this by protesting—and how can you defend the truth except by protest—having done this in the past by protest, let us still protest and have it go on still.

Rev. Mr. Minnigerode, of Virginia—A short time ago when a resolution was offered in favor of Christian Unity a brother close to me whispered in my ear, "I never have heard so much Christian Unity, nor seen so little." Mr. President and brethren, a great many things have been said in a derogatory spirit, of the name of Protestant Episcopal; but sir, this is a name that has come down from the days of the colonies, and I look upon it as my heritage. In those days there was an aristocratic class among those people, and people who served their aristocratic Masters. While one of our clergymen was preaching in the neighborhood of the possessor of a great estate, and while being driven to another place, he asked the driver if he had been at church. The driver excused himself. Then he asked him if he attended the Baptist Church. The driver said: "No. I will just tell you how it is. I've got no religion, I belong to the Church!"

I think we have to try this question by what to us is the great authoritative voice of the Church and the Prayer Book. Our Lord nowhere, with one living exception, spoke of founding the Church. He every time spoke of the Kingdom of God, and that was the subject of his preaching. In that passage in the 16th Chapter of St. Matthew he referred to the Kingdom of Heaven as to be established in the visible Church on earth. That is true, but you go on with your Bible, take Apostle after Apostle, and you will find that the word Church always there means the congregation. And the only exception will be found in the chapter referred to. Every Apostle speaks of the Church in its highest terms, as "the Church of the first-born, whose name is written in Heaven." I do not believe that out of the Bible you can consider the theory which would give a substantial basis to the motion which has been made before us, for the term Protestant Episcopal Church in placed in the very nature of the Church as it now exists within certain limits. All Christians are divided into two branches; the question is on which side you stand. The clerical delegate from Pennsylvania said yesterday, and the celebrated clergymen from Massachusetts to-day, it is the question which divides the Church and who do not wish to be Protestants in the sense of its being an Episcopal Church must range themselves on one side, not ours. We have to protest because, it is the very foundation of the Church in which I have been brought up, and which we are to serve to the end in serving Christ. As to the question of Episcopacy we have decided that ourselves. It is well known that the Bible does not positively decide this question, but we have settled it ourselves that the Episcopate of the Church dates from the time of the Apostles, and we assert that that is proved as well as it can be proved, I think, from the Epistles of the New Testament. The American Prayer Book means by

our Church, not the Protestant Episcopal Church of Great Britain, or Ireland, or any other country; it is the order which we consider as having existed in the Church from the time of the Apostles. It is the teaching of the Church that this organization is binding upon our conscience. And we are in conscience bound to shape our organization in accordance with what we perceive to be the primitive form. That is the position of the Church. Now if we stand upon that platform, we have no right to go into other congregations or communions and legislate for them. Oh, if it was not for the fact that the Church was altogether likely to become corrupt, I would gladly see every soul in the Episcopal Church, for there is no Church, so help me God, according to my best studies and all my Christian experience, so blessed with the truth, so blessed with a noble organization, and so blessed with the means of grace as the Episcopal Church. I do not think there ever was a purer branch than the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, and I hope we will keep it so. I have been more than pained in reading the sneers at the term Protestant Episcopal. I only know that I stand on the side which protests against Rome, I know that God has led me into this Church which has so many advantages, and I will gladly communicate to all others, and I mean, by God's help to live and die in the Protestant Episcopal Church, and let it be put upon my epitaph that I was a presbyter in the Protestant Episcopal Church.

The Rev. Mr. Hewett, of Nebraska—The question before the House, it seems to me, has been fully discussed and very satisfactorily debated; and I am very sure sir, that the members are now ready, or almost ready, to take a vote upon it, and that further debate and time will only give opportunity for members to ventilate their various opinion; and I therefore move you sir, that the debate on the question before the House be closed, and a vote taken on the same at half past three.

Motion seconded.

Mr. Bent offered an amendment that the vote be taken before the adjournment this evening.

Amendment not accepted.

The Rev. Dr. Goodwin, of Pennsylvania, raised the question as to whether or not the question was debatable.

On motion of Mr. Dumbell the question of closing the debate at half past three o'clock was laid upon the table. Motion to lay upon the table was carried by 196 in favor of laying upon the table, and against laying upon the table, 113. The motion to lay upon the table was lost.

The Rev. Mr. Farrington, of New Jersey—I now move, sir, that the speakers be limited to five minutes.

Mr. Stotsenberg, of Indiana—I rise to a point of order, that is that the limit is unconstitutional.

The President—The Chair decides that the point of order is not well taken, for in the experience of the Chair it has been the invariable rule of this Convention, at certain portions of its proceedings, to limit debates, and that is absolutely necessary to keep the House going.

Upon motion, the House then laid upon the table the motion of the Rev. Mr. Farrington, and the debate proceeded as follows:

Rev. Mr. Faude, of Indiana—Notwithstanding the improbability of the passage of this resolution at this Convention, it is of the utmost importance that it should be fully discussed; for it is one of the growing questions in the Church as manifested by the several votes upon it in the last General Conventions. In looking about among the deputies I believe that we shall find that there are many changes since the last Convention. Indeed, one of the most prominent members of the last Convention, who opposed it, has since that announced his conversion upon the subject. I believe that there are in this Convention, just as there were in the last, many who will vote according to their convictions, and not merely because they believe it to be inexpedient at this time to make a change. In the Prayer Book of 1889 or 1892 or 1895, or whenever the revised Prayer Book shall be adopted, I firmly believe that we shall not find the

words Protestant Episcopal. It has been asserted that dropping the words Protestant Episcopal is attaching a stigma to the Church, rather say the stigma was attached when the name was carelessly and thoughtlessly introduced, and that now recognizing this long-borne and undeserved stigma we determine as soon as possible, and, as is felt by many, in the very near future to remove that undeserved stigma. The stigma is not at the present time, but has been in the past. Again, it has been said, and the question was asked with considerable pathos, whether this House intended to enter upon a repudiation of the past. By dropping the words Protestant Episcopal, or even Protestant, I have no hesitancy in saying that the spirit which gave us this name, I am not only perfectly willing but very anxious to repudiate, and will state my reasons. Is it not a significant fact, that for the first fifty years of the history of the Church of this country there was not sent out a Missionary to foreign lands, or to the great Territories? Is it not significant, also, that during the same time all the sermons and all the presentations of the Church were apologetic, that is to say in the sense of defensive, in the sense of going before the people in this country, and asking them for the same privileges that are accorded to all religious bodies, of being allowed to exist at all? That spirit is not so much the spirit of indifference as the spirit of inactivity, or the spirit of cowardice which adopted the negative term in the characterization of itself, and therefore I say that that spirit ought to be repudiated, and every sign and every name that continues it in memory. Now it will be said that in those early days of the Church's weakness and humiliation, brought on not by herself, that it was impossible for the Church to be active because of her lack of means. Let me ask, Mr. President, whether it was when the Church of the Apostles was rich that she sent her missionaries into all lands, and I ask whether the Saviour of the world said, when ye shall become rich, when ye have grown to certain numbers, then go into all the world and preach the Gospel. It was the negative spirit which was the defensive spirit, which was the craving spirit that gave us this name, and the results are perfectly plainly shown. It seems to me that this spirit ought to be lifted. I read for the first time a sermon from a well-known brother of this House, and which I hope to read again many times, and the pervading thought in that sermon was deeply impressed upon my mind. It was that the individual is not to stand waiting for signs of evil propensity in his nature, and to stand ready to smite them on the head. But he is rather to go forth doing and developing the fruits of the Spirit, and then the works of the flesh will have no hold upon him. That sermon, Mr. President, is applicable to this present debate. Suppose now any Christian would say, I am opposed to all sin, I believe it is the curse of the world and therefore I declare myself a unit; what would we say! The Church says that she is a unit, and it seems to me that if we will but follow out the teaching of one of the very ones who has been engaged in the defense of the present word Protestant in the title of the Church, no further, if we will adopt the whole Scriptures and walk in the Spirit, that is to say, go forward positively instead of negatively, we shall be far better than by adopting negative names in a negative spirit. But a few moments ago we had the pleasure of listening to a splendid oratorical effort in which it was endeavored to show that the term Protestant was responsible for every particle of growth that this Church ever had. Moreover, Mr. President, I do not believe that it is well for this Church in America to hold up the great and corrupt Roman branch of the Catholic Church; that is, by the very name which we adopt, admitted by us to be the one great power in this land, and that it is our fear of it by the name that we adopt, to say that we are Protestants. I do not believe in this, and therefore I feel certain that we shall do well to draw away from this word Protestant, which is but a negative term, and also the term Episcopal, which is superfluous, and then Mr. President, I would say for myself, let us stop there. It has been suggested

that the term Catholicity should be applied, but Catholicity is but one of the four marks of the Church. The Church is Catholic, the Church is Apostolic, and I believe that the only consistent course, if we characterize the Church at all, is to give more to the Church or none at all. Now, another thing, which has been cautiously advanced, but none the less certain, is that we should be exposed to ridicule if we drop these words, Protestant Episcopal, because it will be said that we are so small a body that we do not deserve the name of the Church. In other words, it is a question of size. Suppose that the great dry goods firm of Marshal Field & Co., would send out some man, who was only five feet and two inches in height, but who had a splendid head and was a man of finest ability, and yet some one would say when he represented himself as the head of that House, we cannot accept you as the representative of that great House. Marshal Field & Co. should send out a giant to represent them. It is not a question of size. In the early days when the Apostles had nothing it didn't matter to them; although there were many errors of religion, yet they still declared themselves to be the Church of the Living God, the pillars, and preached the truth. It is for us to say fearlessly that no matter what the consequences may be, this or that course is right, and therefore it is to be proceeded with. It is ours to do the right, go there prosperity, or go their failure, and therefore I say it is not a matter whether we be ridiculed, whether we drop those who remain out, or whether on the other hand others come in. That is not the question at all. The question is, is it right to assume a negative and meaningless title? Superfluous words in giving a title to this great Church of Christ, great not, if you please in numbers, but great because she is the pillar and ground of the truth.

Mr. Packard, of Maryland—I have no desire to make a speech on this subject. I wish only to call your attention to a few facts to which I will not say ignorance is shown, because that is not the proper term to apply to the learned gentlemen who have spoken, but I will say an unaccountable lack of information. The facts to which I allude are these, that the word Protestant, which the last speaker said was adopted in a craven spirit, and which some one else said was adopted in a careless spirit, was the word by which the common people of this country knew this Church one hundred years ago. Now the facts which I am to mention to bear out that statement are these: In the Diocese of Maryland, at this time, the relation to a certain extent of rectors to the tenure of church property is regulated by the Statute of the State. The act of 1798 provided the general rules for vestries of the Protestant Episcopal Church. That act was a successor to the act of 1879, and that in turn was the successor of a number of preceding acts. The first of them all was this "An Act for the Service of Almighty God, and the Establishment of the Protestant Religion in this Province." Ten years later that act was followed by another act, which more correctly describes the Church, namely, "An Act for the

Continued on page 80.



The Great Retail

DRY GOODS HOUSE

—OR—

Jas. H. Walker & Co.,

Wabash Ave. & Adams St.,
CHICAGO.

Next block South of the Palmer House.

Visitors to the city will find many choice novelties in all the departments, at very low prices.

JAS. H. WALKER & CO.

THE EDWARD ELY CO.,

Tailors,

We deal only in the

Best Goods Woven.

Our garments produced are the embodiment of experience and taste.

Gentlemen's Wedding Apparel
A Specialty!

We make a ten per cent. discount to the Bishops and clergy.

163 & 165 Wabash Ave., Corner
Monroe St.

Established 1854.

CARPETS.

OF EVERY GRADE.

Largest Stock in the West

AT LOWEST PRICES.

THE CHICAGO

CARPET COMPANY.

WABASH & MONROE ST.

Medical Lake Toilet Soap.

NATURE'S GREAT SKIN CURE.

Nature's remedy for all skin and scalp diseases—the most wonderful curative agent for cutaneous affections ever discovered.

Most excellent for the toilet and bath and is unequalled as a nursery sanative. Exquisite skin beautifier, clears the complexion, removes all skin blemishes, chapping, tan, etc., cures sores, wounds, scalds, burns, salt rheum, eczema, chilblains, etc.

MEDICAL
LAKE
SALTS.



ASK YOUR DRUGGIST

FOR

MEDICAL LAKE

REMEDIES.

NATURE'S PEERLESS REMEDY.

Cures rheumatism, dyspepsia, indigestion, sick headache, nervousness, catarrh, kidney and liver troubles and all diseases of the blood and skin. Is Nature's remedy and a positive cure.

TIPSO! Siwash Limichin, the great Nez Perce Indian Remedy, warranted to cure constipation, biliousness and liver troubles. If your druggist does not keep Medical Lake Remedies and Tipso ask him to send them for you. If he will not do so, send us 50c. \$1 or \$1.50, and we will send the amount of remedies by mail. Prepared by

MEDICAL LAKE TOILET SOAP MFG. CO., 54 Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill.

Establishment of Religious Worship in this Province according to the Church of England," giving the name correctly.

The next act relating to vestries is in 1816, prescribing that no vestryman should act as such until he had taken the three oaths of allegiance, abjuration, and of abhorrence; of allegiance to the king, abjuration of the Pope and abhorrence of doctrine that the life of a ruler might be sought at the command of an ecclesiastical superior, and in addition to that he was obliged to take the test oath, showing that he did not believe in the doctrine of the Mass. Now I say, sir, that the word Protestant was the only name by which the people knew this Church, and I say in answer to the gentleman who spoke of the craven spirit in which the word was adopted, that, on the contrary, it was adopted with a courageous spirit which added the word Episcopal at a time when the country was thinking of Bishops as adjuncts of the House of Lords, and would none of them. Those people who adopted it stood by their convictions. I do not know the form of the acts in other States. I do know, for I have seen them, that the old books in the Diocese of Virginia, as well as the Diocese of Maryland, show that all those old worthies subscribed to these same oaths and declared that they believed in the Protestant religion. Now sir, those are the facts, and the only argument I have to make on the entire subject is this: If this is the Church of America, it will be known by its fruits; if it is not, calling it so will not make it so.

Rev. Mr. Rogers, of Texas.—Mr. President, I do not propose to occupy much of the time of this Convention in argument, but I desire to state a single point. It is a question of intense practical effect whichever way we may decide it, and with this view I ask to be heard for a moment. My work in this Church has been almost exclusively in that portion of the country where every city is overwhelmingly overshadowed by the Roman power through the Roman Church. In my own parish I have had this experience. They proposed to build a large educational institution, which has been built and completed. They have built a large church to go alongside of that institution. While that was building, the priests in charge brought to their aid a deputation of Jesuits, all with one purpose, and they held a series of services for the same purpose, which was to convince the people of our city one by one, of this fact, that all that there was of value in the Episcopal Church stood a-hwart the Roman—to convince the people of the city that all that was of value in the Episcopal Church came from their Church, and that we were copying and aping them. Right then and there I felt as any man in a like situation must feel, the value of the name. My first answer to that attack upon the Church was to call the attention of the people in the city to the fact that we were a Protestant body, that our Church was organized in a spirit of protest, that we had remained a pure Church in contrast with them, by virtue of our protestantism. I called the attention of my people then, as I call now your attention, it was effective then and I hope it may be so now—to the fact that our Church in its departure from the Church of England protested against Papal infallibility. I told the people also of the corruptions in the creed of the Roman Church. I told the people that there was a difference in the two churches in name, and that we were protesting against the corruptions of the Catholic church. I declared to them what I declare to-day, that the very name which we bear showed then and shows now that we protest as a Church and educate as a Church against the convictions enforced by the Catholic teaching. I will go a step further. We are surrounded again upon the same line. Whenever I find a class of men or women who say to me, why you are like the Church of Rome, you have your ritual, you have your garments and you pronounce your creed, we see no especial difference, why not go to the Roman Church? I answer them that the difference is found first in the fact represented in the name, that we are protestants and they are Romans, and that single word protestant entered into the minds of men under such circumstances and held and kept them anchored in our Church.

There is another class of people. When

they come to me and declare that we are so much in appearance like the Church of Rome, and that there is no difference to be seen, I tell them the difference is in our standards.

Another reason why I object to this change is this: there is, and you know it gentlemen, a drifting away from the standards and principles of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and the inclination is to take away the boom that lies across the river of the Church. The action which has hitherto stopped the drift largely when it reached that boom has been the Protestant Episcopal Church; it is marked all along the line. It has not only stopped the drift in the ministry more or less, but it does stop very much drift in the parishes of our Church, and I am not willing that that boom should be removed. I am not willing that any man should be able to turn to one of my candidates for confirmation and say to him that it was once a protestant church but that it is now a catholic church. It is catholic, and I have always taught that, but not the idea of catholicism which sweeps away the idea of protestantism and which allows a change in the teachings in regard to the sacramental system and other teaching in our Church. I do not desire that any man should have the privilege, before a body of men or in the closet, of approaching candidates for confirmation with the argument that we have thrown away our faith, when we have thrown away our name, and I firmly believe that the practical effect of changing the name is to give into the hands of this class of men a right to claim that we have practically ignored all protestantism in practically ignoring the protestant name to which we have clung and which belongs to us.

Rev. Mr. Gailor, Tennessee.—Mr. President, I am sure I do not desire to prolong a debate which has already perhaps occupied too much of the intelligent attention of this House. Sir, I shall not prolong it, without promising to say briefly and pointedly the few words I have to say. In the first place the arguments from Divine Providence strike me as being arguments which would endorse and justify Mohammedanism and Mormonism as well as the name Protestant Episcopal. They are utterly irrelevant, and I am surprised at the reflection upon the intelligence of this House by the use of any such arguments. We have discussed the question now from the beginning. The history of the word Protestant is clear before us. The word Protestant was adopted at the Diet of Spire, in 1529, by those who protested against the revocation of the edict of the Emperor, and of course at that time had no significance for anyone outside of Germany. It was afterwards used—and rightly used—in connection with the Church of England to describe her as one of the reformed Churches of Christendom a Church which justly protested against the usurpations of mediæval Romanism. But in our day the word has another meaning. I know not what may be the case in the centres of culture, in the studies of the gentlemen who have spoken upon this floor, but certainly in my experience with the names of the people the word Protestant is used to describe that system of theology and those religious opinions which present a man's salvation altogether in the future life, deny Baptismal Regeneration, and base a man's hope for eternity and his peace with God upon his own consciousness, which does not accede the ministry nor Episcopacy in any true, or historical sense of that word. It is therefore not an adjective to be applied to Episcopal. When we say Protestant Episcopal we are simply saying transparent opacity, if I may use that expression. The word Protestant in the modern sense as far as I have any experience, has drifted utterly away from the very idea of Episcopal. I am also opposed to the name Protestant generally speaking, in modern times, on the ground stated by the gentleman, I think from the Diocese of Indiana. I am reminded of a celebrated controversy between Herbert Spencer and Frederick Harrison, wherein Mr. Harrison ridicules the conception of the great Agnostic—the conception of an unknown and unknowable force as the object of religion—and says that such a theory has all the magnificent indefiniteness which is illustrated in dissidence of

dissent and the Protestantism of the Protestant religion, whereas religion is not to deny, but to affirm; and a creed, in any worthy sense, must be not a negative but an affirmative.

But there is one thing which I believe has not yet been adverted to, and that is that this proposition, the proposition of the distinguished gentleman from the Diocese of Chicago, if it were adopted by this House to-day, such action would not wipe out the name, Protestant Episcopal, from all the formularies and constitution of the Church abroad. If the resolution were adopted, it would lie over for three years for the subsequent action of another Convention, because it would be nothing less than an alteration of a wording of our constitution; and there would be abundant opportunity for the expression of opinion on all sides from every quarter, and suggestions of whatever name might be thought properly applicable to describe this church. Sir, I believe that if a vote were taken now, there are few men in this House, if any at all, who would not vote that it was their opinion that the name Protestant Episcopal, is not an adequate and complete definition of this Church of ours; nay more I believe there are men here who would be glad to vote their opinion that the Protestant Episcopal is not an adequate or proper designation of this Church. That has been scarcely denied by any man upon this floor to-day. Some of course, perhaps many, are ready to go further, and maintain that it is not only not a proper designation, but also that it is better right and expedient that these words should be immediately expunged.

There is one other question, Mr. President which I am obliged to touch upon because it has been brought upon the floor of the House, and while I would be very sorry to enter upon a discussion of theology, yet it seems to me that I am obliged to do so when those principles are made the subject basis of an argument for or against a change of name, which involves every particular and essentially the whole range and character of a man's theology. We have been treated here to-day to instructions which have been delightful, discourses eloquent, sometimes beautiful, upon that theology which would embrace the human race. We have been unfairly treated to statements by members of this House who would imply that we would refuse to admit that the Holy Ghost could be given to those who are outside of the Protestant Episcopal Church, or that the baptism of any one outside of this church was lawful. I submit that this is unfair. It is not fair to suppose that because one believes in the Apostolic succession and regeneration by baptism and that there is not such a thing as an organic historical Church, it is not fair to suppose for that reason that a man has no breadth of mind, no depth of feeling, no thought for the reunion of Christendom. This issue practically rests upon this, and that issue has been made in this Convention, that either we must say that there is an organic church reaching with historic ministry, valid sacraments, and a definite faith, or else we must say that there is no such thing as an organic church in history and we are simply in the delightful position of a number of sects, a number of these bodies all moving the same way, a man desiring the same thing, differing perhaps in unimportant details but striving for that mastery which will be achieved and guaranteed by adaptability to the genius of the American people or to the customs and institutions of any nation wherein that church may seek to be developed. This, it does seem to me, was not the principle in the past I try to be broad sir, I try to take in every one in this land, but I am always reminded that in my effort to be broad and to get a high outlook so that I will have a wider horizon, I shall not put my head in the clouds and get my feet off the earth. I must have some basis and some principles on which to rest. However, the issue is made and it must be met. And it lies deeper than many would have us suppose. It is not merely a question about Episcopacy and sacraments. A book has been issued in New England, a startling book, but not in my estimation a profound book, which strives to upset all our notions upon the truths of Christianity. I am told that it ex-

presses the popular theology of the best, at any rate it declares that the issue is not simply between a sacramental system and an organic Church, and no Church no sacrament. But the question is as to whether there is any valid distinction between the natural and supernatural order? It asserts that there is no such distinction; that there is no such thing as grace imparted to the soul of man other than that which proceeds from "realizing his own divinity;" that we must sweep away, not only our Church and sacraments, but our old ideas on the subject of Christ's redemption and the work of the Holy Ghost. If this, then, is the issue, I shall accept it. I do not fear to appeal to the Christian minds in this Assembly on the question whether we shall base all our hope on the subjective consciousness of man, or whether we are to have some organic speaking body coming down through the ages, which shall preach the truth and give gifts to men. I, sir, have my own opinion, and cannot believe that Mistiness is the Mother of Wisdom, to quote the words of a modern writer. I do not believe in that system which would prevent a man from putting down half a dozen propositions without guarding himself against being supposed to exclude the contradictory, which places a man who believes in and has sacraments in the same position as one who does not believe in them; which says it believes in Episcopacy, and yet that those who have it not are in the same religious condition as those who have it. This is the system and the way to guide the Church in the channel of no meaning between the Scylla and Charybdis of aye and no.

As far as the Apostolic succession goes, I have no belief about it. It simply seems to me that it is a question of looking at the facts. I have been trying to find them, and it seems to me I did find them. I know not what other men believe, I have charity for every one's honest conviction. But for my own part I am willing to take my chances with Augustine and Cyprian and Basil, and the Gregories—and to accept the fact of the Apostolic succession of the ministry in the Church of God. Upon that ground I am willing to die, and upon that ground, God helping me, I am willing to be judged!

Yet that does not interfere with my belief, also, that every man baptized in the name of the Three Persons of the Trinity, by a man who believes in a Triune God, is a member of the only great Church of God. Every man who has received baptism in the name of the Trinity is a member of the Church of Christ, but that is perfectly compatible with my belief, also that there is such a thing as a right way and a wrong way. That some baptized Christians are realizing and some are not realizing the fulness of the privileges and the duties and responsibilities which Christ has laid upon them, that some, whether consciously or not, I do not know, are neglecting duties and rendering the body of Christ, while there are those who strive to keep the faith as it was once for all delivered.

This Church does extend back to 1789, and it goes back further than that. It reaches to the time when, five years after the English Church had declared that "the Bishop of Rome hath no more authority given him by Divine right in this realm of England than any other foreign Bishop,"—the first authorized statement of faith was put forth by the reformers, saying that the Roman Church is a Church, and the Greek Church is a Church, and the English Church is also a true historical Church. The act of Parliament distinctly asserts that it is not intended to form a new sect, a new Church, but that this Church of England is and has always been a Catholic Church, and that word Catholic, mind you, does not mean in a vague way universal, but after the council of Nice was constantly used as a synonym of orthodoxy, that is, the Church which adhered to the ancient faith—and so the word was used in the creed. But it goes back further even than that. The gentleman yesterday spoke of Bishops Seabury and Hopkins. I would be willing to call up the spirits of Bishops Seabury and Hopkins, and here to-day to vote upon this question, and it is not difficult to conceive how the votes of those men, with their lives and principles and

character would be cast. One hundred years is an episode in the history of the Church of Christ. We cannot turn our backs, as I said yesterday, upon that great past. We are willing to stand upon the ground of the early Apostolic Church and to be judged by that ground, and to live by it, and die by it, if God will; and it is not an unfair thing to say at this time, for the issue is practically there. Mr. President, I have really spoken longer than I intended, but a man's heart must be moved when he feels how great is his responsibility to stand up here officially as the spokesman of the Church; however much a man's opinion might satisfy him, however beautiful and attractive his liberality might appear to the public, it is not me and no place for us to say anything but what we would be willing to answer for before God. It is a not question of expedience, but one of truth, and believe me this, sir, I must say that I have sympathy for American institutions and for the Church that shall be the American Church in this land. I hope for it, and pray for it, but my convictions and my responsibility to their Great Head cannot be forgotten. I don't say anything of the name of the Church. I don't believe it is necessary for us to decide about it to-day, to-morrow, or during this session, what the name shall be. I don't believe that if this resolution is passed we need be at all afraid that during the next three years this great Church shall not find out whether she is willing to take any name or not, but I do believe, sir, that whatever Church the American people shall accept as the embodiment of the religion and devotion of this nation, it will be a Church that will be able not merely to look forward to the future, but be able to put its hand upon the past, and under the Cross, in the company of the Apostles, and bind this nation not only to the ages which are to come, but to those great ages also which have gone by.

Rev. Dr. Royce, Wisconsin—We are drifting away from the standard of the Church. I had planned some thoughts upon this subject which have been expressed by others, and I shall confine myself simply to the one thought which has not yet been touched upon. I object to the term Protestant Episcopal, because I would not wish to have the idea conveyed that this Church of ours has any hobbies whatever. It is thought by an outsider that if we are loyal to the Church as the name stands, Protestant Episcopal, the burden of our teaching must be a continual protest against the errors of the Church of Rome, and not to be continually and forever harping and talking about Apostolic succession. I do not believe that we should be placed in such a false light before the world. She does indeed protest against the errors of Rome, she does indeed teach the Apostolic Succession in no uncertain sound, and with this she holds and keeps a due proportion of her faith. There are bodies we know, like the Sabbatarians, who are continually preaching and teaching about the observation of the Seventh day instead of the First. There are those who call themselves Adventists who are continually preaching upon the second coming of the Lord. There are those who hold the doctrine of Immersion and that seems to be the burden of their teaching. Now this Church of ours teaches all these things; she holds to one day in the seven, she teaches

Continued on page 82.

Church Book Department.

A. C. McCLURG & CO.,

Publishers & Booksellers,

117, 119, 121 Wabash Ave., Corner Madison St.

Ask the attention of Delegates and Visitors to the General Convention to their attractive store and to its unrivalled collection of books in all departments of literature. They have made special arrangements for the comfort and convenience of all who may have leisure time to spend among the books, or who may wish to make appointments with others. The Location is Central and all will be made welcome.

CONFIDENCE

in the superiority of the "Oxford" editions leads the publishers to make the following announcement and simple request.

"Oxford" India Paper.

The India Paper used for the "Oxford" Thin Editions of BIBLES, PRAYER BOOKS and HYMNALS is a specialty of the "Oxford" University Press, and is used EXCLUSIVELY for "Oxford" Books. Its characteristics are extreme opacity, great toughness and softness, and an agreeable tone. The strength and flexibility of the fibre is so great that the paper may be used for years without becoming injured by wear; and the material is so opaque that it can be made to a degree of thinness only limited by the possibilities of printing. In the case of some editions a ream of this paper—four hundred and eighty sheets, each sheet measuring 17½ x 22½ inches—weighs only seven pounds, and yet this paper is beautifully soft to the touch, strong enough to bear a great strain, and of such opacity that the impression on one side does not show through when the other side is being read. The "Oxford" India Paper has been manufactured in order to meet the popular demand for thin books, and is admitted to be without a rival.

Messrs. Thomas Nelson & Sons ask you to carefully examine any so-called "India" Paper Editions from presses other than the OXFORD before purchasing.

"Oxford" Bible Warehouse,

42 BLEECKER STREET, NEW YORK.

MASON & HAMLIN ORGANS.

Winners of highest honors at all Great World's Exhibitions for 19 years.

Celebrated for their volume, purity and sweetness of tone and for their great durability.

Remarkably adapted for Churches and Sunday Schools, as well as for the home and other uses.

Over 100 styles, for cash or easy payments.

PIANOS.

The improved method of stringing, introduced and perfected by MASON & HAMLIN, is conceded by competent judges to constitute a radical advance in pianoforte construction.

Do not require one-quarter as much tuning as pianos generally. Great refinement and beauty of tone, and unsurpassed excellence in every requisite of a first-class instrument.

Send for descriptive catalogue, etc., etc.

ORGAN & PIANO CO.

149 Wabash Ave., Chicago.

CLERICAL CLOTHING

Made to order from the best materials, at low prices. Church vestments, gowns, surplices, cottas, cassocks, stoles, hoods, etc., correct styles, fine workmanship, best materials, low prices and satisfaction guaranteed in every order. Orders by mail will receive prompt attention.

T. A. NEALE & SON, Middletown, Conn.

BARGAINS

AT OUR
CHEAP BOOK COUNTER.

Standard, Religious, Devotional and Juvenile. Sunday-School Cards in great variety. AMERICAN TRACT SOCIETY, 153 Wabash Ave., Chicago.

Full Line T. WHITTAKER'S
PUBLICATIONS.
Oxford and Bagster Bibles, Prayer Books and Hymnals.
FLEMING H. REVELL,
148 & 150 Madison St.,

GORHAM M'FG CO.,

SILVERSMITHS,

Broadway, Corner 9th St.,

NEW YORK.

Ecclesiastical Department.

Alms Basons.
Altar Crosses.
Altar Desks.
Altar Lights.
Altar Railing.
Brasses.

Candlesticks.
Chalices.
Chancel Screens.
Communion Plate.
Crosiers.
Cruets.

Eagle Lecterns.
Ewers.
Flagons.
Flower Vases.
Lecterns.
Memorials.

Patens.
Pocket Sets.
Pulpits.
Sanctuary Lamps.
Tablets.
Vases.

SOLE AGENTS FOR HEATON, BUTLER & BAYNE, LONDON, ENGLAND, ARTISTS IN
STAINED GLASS, MOSAICS AND DECORATION.

During the Meeting of the General Convention at Chicago, Samples may be seen and all Information
Obtained at

Room No. 30, Palmer House.

McCULLY & MILES,

Artistic Stained Glass,

1, 3, 5, 7 and 9 Madison St.,

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS.

MEMORIAL WINDOWS.

Special attention is invited to the

New Church Records,

Arranged by

The Rev. Irving McElroy

and published by John F. Paret, Washington, D. Bishop Stevens says: "Their fullness of record and their specialties make them the most complete of any Church records which I have seen." Sample copy may be seen during Convention at the desk of the Rev. L. W. Applegate, editor Special Convention edition of THE LIVING CHURCH. Orders should be addressed to the publisher who will gladly send special samples to any address desired.

THIRD THOUSAND.

REASONS FOR BEING

A CHURCHMAN.

By the Rev. Arthur Wilde Little, M. A.

Rector of St. Paul's Church, Portland, Me

Neatly bound in cloth, 282 pages, Price \$1.00 net; By mail, \$1.10.

PUBLISHED BY THE YOUNG CHURCHMAN COMPANY,

MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. L. H. Morehouse, General Manager of The Young Churchman Co., will have an office in Central Music Hall during the sessions of the General Convention, and will be glad to welcome all who will call, and to show samples of the company's publications.

ST. MARY'S SCHOOL FOR GIRLS. Established 1842, RALEIGH, N. C.

For Catalogue address the Rector,

REV. BENNETT SMEDES.

"The climate of Raleigh is one of the best in the world."—BISHOP LYMAN.

BROOKVILLE ACADEMY. A healthful, home-like, thorough school for boys. Twenty miles from Washington and thirty-five from Baltimore. REV. DR. C. KNEELSON, Brookville, Maryland, Principal.

CHELTEMHAM ACADEMY.

Cheltem Hills, near Philadelphia.

The REV. SAM'L CLEMENTS, Pastor and Principal Sixteenth year. Established 1871. Enlarged 1883 and 1886. Fine buildings and grounds. First class school for boys. Resident masters. Military drill. Prepared for college or business. Terms \$500. For circulars address the Principal, Shoemaker-town, P. O., Pa.

PHONETIC SHORTHAND. OSGOODBY'S METHOD. For self-instruction. "The Great Moon Heax," handsomely engraved. \$1.50. Epitome, 25c. Sp. instruction by mail, \$6.00. W. W. OSGOODBY, Publ'r., 348 Monroe Ave., Rochester, N. Y.

KEBLE SCHOOL, Hingham, Mass. A Boarding and Day School for girls. Recommended by Bishop and Clergy.

ST. CATHARINE'S HALL

Augusta, Maine,

DIOCESAN SCHOOL FOR GIRLS.

The Rt. Rev. H. A. NEELY, D.D., President.

The Rev. WM. D. MARTIN, A.M., Principle.

Clinton, N. Y.

KIRKLAND HALL,

A Church School, fitting for the best colleges or for business, after the highest standards of instruction, discipline and personal care.

Address

REV. OLIVER OWEN, M. A.

St. Hilda's School, Morrisown, N. J. Under the care of the Sisters of St. John Baptist. For circulars, address the Sisters in charge.

that we should observe one day in the seven, the second coming of our Lord and the doctrine of Baptism. We preach all these doctrines. We hold to them and hence the Church is Catholic in all her teachings. Have we, as has been intimated on this floor to-day, the exclusive right to that word Protestant? No! It has been forcibly shown that it is a word which belongs to all those whose name is Christ's name. It is not only a protest against the errors of Rome, but it is a protest against error of every form, and that should be the work of every Christian, of every Christian name. We have not, then, the exclusive right to that word Protestant, and it seems to me that a grander argument which we have against that would be calling ourselves the Catholic Church of America. Do we call ourselves the Episcopal Church because we hold to the Episcopacy? because we have Bishops; because we have also Presbyters? With the same show of reason we might call ourselves Presbyterians, and so on. These terms have, as it were, no significance; they are not descriptive. They do not give a true definition of the position of the Church. What was the Church called in Apostolic days? Was it called the Presbyterian Church, the Baptist Church, the Methodist Church? No, the Church in Ephesus, the Church at Corinth, the Church at Thessalonica. Why not then, in all reasonableness, call ours the Church, the Catholic Church in the United States of America?

Rev. Dr. Beers, of California—Mr. President, one of the deputies exhibits remarkable courage in arraigning this Church in its American origin for the craven exhibition of its spirit. When we think of the handful of men who organized, under God, this Church in the United States; all the difficulties which surrounded them, and then think of the result which has come out in less than a century, has a craven spirit animated the Church which has gone on conquering and to conquer because of, or in spite of—it matters not for the argument's sake—of this incongruous and improper name which has been hanging as a dead weight to her all these years? I quite agree with the sentiment expressed by the deputies who have spoken in favor of a change, but I am not in favor of a change at this time. It has, as every question of legislation has, an expediency side. Will it be best to do it now or to wait until a ripe condition of things has come. Somebody has said, and rightly, too, that this is a growing question. I have no fears but that if it is permitted to grow it will attain a giant manhood, but will demand and obtain the change when it will be well for the welfare of the Church. As I listened to the venerable deputy from Wisconsin this morning, who entertained us with his wit and instructed us with his learning, and thought over and over the quarter of a century in which my mind has always accorded a deference to him as a kind of theological library and a law-giver something like Moses was, it occurred to me whether I dared to differ from him. It seemed almost like a doubt as to the Apostles' Creed to think of anything different from that which he had advocated, and to which question I knew he had given the strength of his years and learning. Then it occurred to me that the venerable deputy had lived in the sacred seclusion, beautiful beyond description, charming to the eye and to the mind and to the fancy, in that school of the prophets, Nashotah, for so long a time, I thought it might be possible that his institutions did not reach out to the fields occupied by the Missionaries and parish priests; and so, being of the latter class, I am satisfied that his appeal is not the only side of this question, because there are a great many laymen who are vastly behind the clergy in the consideration of this question. They do not understand its ins and outs. They know they are taught by the Church to say on every occasion, morning and evening—"I believe in the Holy Catholic Church," and they do believe in it, but if you change this designation, it will worry and distress and confuse them; after a while, after you have adopted this in General Convention, two or three sessions perhaps, it may be within a single session more, then the intelligence in the Church will understand their use and take a shorter cut to the result than this circumlocution,

"The Protestant Episcopal Church." I don't like that name, I never did, but I believe it is better to stand upon the more ancient names, with their authority, and believe that when the time shall come that we will be ready to make the change, and I think it would probably be easier and simpler after we have devoted all the earnest thoughts in the Church to it.

Rev. Dr. Girault, of Louisiana—

Mr. President—I began by saying, first of all, that I protest. I protest against one view that was taken here upon which there has been no proof given, and which I think cannot be given, that this Church by changing its name at this time will go forth before this country armed for its contest better than she has ever been before; will go before this country and be relieved from the weight of a name that the people are accustomed to. I don't believe that to-day that is the sentiment. I don't believe that the Protestant Episcopal Church has ever failed to prove its fidelity to the principles of the early Protestant Church. I do not believe, sir, that if that name is changed at this present time, that so far from this great and glorious work taking new impetus and going round through the governments of the whole land, and drawing people to us, I don't believe it, and I protest against it. I will state a few facts upon which to base my opinion. I live right among Roman Catholics. My birth, sir, was among Roman Catholics, and I have labored among them in this capacity. I have had to do with these very men, and I have invariably won them by the name which we hold. I have had them attracted by our usages, and I have had them come to us to know the difference, and I would explain it. And I would state just here that I have in the years past drawn into our Church some of the most bigoted Romanists. I had on one occasion, one class of eleven adult Spaniards, or of Spanish extraction, and I have many French, or men of French extraction, I won't say very many, but I have some. And during my services in that portion of that city, I have scarcely ever presented a class for confirmation that did not have in it Roman Catholics, Presbyterians, Baptists, or Methodists. Now, sir, these are facts, and I can state that they were brought about simply by the opportunities which the name of the Church gave me of proclaiming these truths to these people. (A voice, "Oh!") You may say, Oh! but I mean it. I mean just what I say. I will state a single instance; one single instance. A lady, one of the most bigoted Romanists, whose whole family are members of that Church, was directed one Christmas Day by some accident, or some providential means, to attend the service in my parish church, and she was particularly struck when she heard the Creed; the following Sunday she came past the Church, and told me if I would come and see her she would be pleased. I did not see her for three or four days or a week, and she had read the Bible through in course three times, the last time upon her knees, and had carefully studied it. I attempted to tell her that our Lord had promised to be with his Church to the end of the world, and that there must therefore be a historical Church somewhere in the world, and she finally came to the point where she said, I am satisfied that what you have told me is true; I am satisfied with your exposition of the Scripture, and from what you have told me I am not in the right Church. I immediately turned my attention and gave her instructions two or three days, and after going through with them she then asked with regard to what we call the mutilated sacrament. I appointed a time to see her and I explained it to her, and she appointed a time that I should call at her house. I don't know whether it was preconceived or by accident, but when I reached her house I found there a Catholic priest. She came out and requested that I should go in. I told her that I wanted to understand about the matter, and she gave me the impression that I was to say whatever I pleased, and I went through the whole matter, and retraced the history of the Church according to my belief, for her information; and I showed her to her satisfaction, that all we had of the Creed came directly from St. Paul himself. For the first half hour we

were there talking, I found the priest was very much excited. I then alluded to something about the Church of Rome, and the gentleman became very much excited again, and when I was instructing her with reference to the mutilated sacrament and told her that she must eat of the body and drink of the blood of her Lord, and I said to her that "except you eat of the flesh and drink of the blood of the Son of Man you have no life in you." When she arose and with eyes flashing, shook her finger right in his face and said, "I believe what this gentleman has told me, and I believe that it is essential that I partake of both these elements;" and she and her whole family are now communicants of my Church. I state this to show that the name does not interfere with the working of the Church. I am satisfied, from my knowledge of that class of people, from information and belief, that instead of the overtures you make being accepted, you would drive them off. But you say you want to teach your children that they are members of the Holy Catholic Church. That is a useless argument. Who ever heard of a parish priest that does not teach in the Church Sunday School the belief in the Holy Catholic Church? When you prepare your classes for confirmation, what do you do but give them the history of the Church; teach them everything connected with the Holy Catholic Church. You show their connection with the past so that the knowledge grows with their growth and is strengthened with their strength. One of those Spaniards said to me, "I hope you will not; take up the subject or change," He said, "I have thought over this subject since the age of ten years, and been taught from the age of fifteen, and I feel as if I was an infant of three in this matter; you have brought something that has nourished and refreshed my soul." No sir, it don't drive them off at all, but it will alienate those already in the Church if you make this change.

M. Benet, S. C.—I tried sometime ago to get some outline of argument presented by the distinguished deputy from Kentucky, and also of the distinguished divine from the state of N. Y. His argument was the finest specimen of an attempt to throw burden of proof on the wrong side of the case. His whole argument was addressed, not in support of his side of the case, but against our side of the case. Now, Mr. President and gentlemen, the burden of proof lies upon the mover of this resolution, and his support is to show why we should change the name of the Church. If I have understood them properly, the only arguments presented by the supporters of the resolution are three-fold. One is historical, the other is, as you might call it, philological, and the third is practical.

Now, Mr. President, as to the historical argument; historical accuracy is very good, but it is just about as rare a thing as the blooming of the century plant. We grant from our side of the argument that Protestant Episcopal is not historically accurate as the name of the Church, but how was the name of this continent not America? or by analogy! How does this continent happen to have the name America? It was discovered by Christopher Columbus, and yet an obscure navigator who published the first map of the country, his name is given to it. Americus Vesputius. His name was taken and applied to America. Historical accuracy with him certainly cannot be but it is an example, showing how carelessly such things are done, and as so many of the followers of this Church, these men who burrow into the past and discover that some statement which we all think right or true, is wrong, and the fact is pressed upon our notice, Why Mr. President, where is the apple which Wm. Tell's boy had upon his head? It was gone? I believe George Washington's has been buried. (Laughter.)

Now this Church, this Protestant Episcopal Church of America, is asked to change its name, because it is not historically accurate. Now, as to the philological objection, they say that the Protestant Episcopal Church is not protesting. Very well, maybe it does not protest, but if the argument is followed out, every man whose name happens to be Smith must have his name changed unless he is a blacksmith. Unless Webster is a weaver or is carrying webs, we

must change his name, and the tailor similar situated.

(Laughter.)

It is not to be an argument that because man is not a tailor, his name is not to Taylor.

The only serious argument that has been addressed to us from the other side is the practical one. And I sincerely sympathize with the gentlemen from the west and northwest; what they state here I believe to be true; but it would not follow that the name, if the words Protestant Episcopal were expunged from the Prayer Book, if it were to be called the Holy Church of America, would make the difference great. I have no doubt they believed it would, and perhaps it might, if their desires were conceded. The Church of America—I know that in the Diocese of South Carolina, were we to use that language to-day, it would have a feeble effect. We would, on the other hand, be condemned if we made the change. We would have a renewed battle on our hands if we were to call our Church the Church of America. And then what would the shade of Richard Grant White say about it? He has published chapter after chapter denouncing the use of the term American, as not belonging to this country. Yes, sir, he repudiates it.

[Laughter.]

You will see then, upon what rests the philological point in the case. Then as to the name Catholic Church. Now you may as well try to turn the course of the Gulf stream as to try to turn the course of public acceptance of the English language. You may define Catholic as you please, but in the public acceptance of the term, Catholic means the Roman Church. I said public acceptance. It means that, and it will mean that, and it will not change it in the minds of the Presbyterians, Methodists or Baptists; but I was not contemplating saying so much and having said so much upon the philological question, I will turn to the next.

I am told that we must educate the masses. Well, we can educate them more by our work than by our words.

Now, Mr. Chairman, before the distinguished lay deputy takes the platform, I am anxious to ask one or two questions which I hope you will answer. Lawyers are aware that there are certain reasons why individuals sometimes change their names; I will pass the very obvious one where those of the other sex change their names, although some of us may have had a hard time to bring it about. But leaving the ladies out of the question, let us come to the question. Individuals change their names, when the name is disagreeable or improper. I know of a man to-day, whose father, whose family name was Cobb, afflicted him by giving him the name of Green Corn, thus making his name Green Corn Cobb. You can not blame a man for not liking that, and asking to have his name changed. Is there any such reason for changing our name from Protestant Episcopal? Is it improper or unpleasant? If any one considers it so, let him say so. Another reason for changing the name is, when it is the wrong name. A gentleman sometimes having been in obscurity for some years, discovers when he attains his majority that he has been passing under an assumed name, and the change is permissible. Are we under the wrong name? I hear the word yes; I hope the deputy from Chicago will make it clear to us if it is true, for it certainly has not been made clear to me. If we are not protestant, or if we are not Episcopal then I would ask in the name of common sense, what are we. It always seemed to me that so far we cannot destroy either the word Protestant or Episcopal.

Then there is another reason for changing a name, and that is for the purposes of inheritance, the inheriting of an estate which has been divided, the conditions announced that the name must be taken. Now Mr. President, if there is any inheritance about to fall to the Church, some great inheritance, and that is the exact argument my friends are using in the West and North-west, that there are thousands waiting. As I said before, the question is upon the merits of the Church. Sometimes an organization, two organizations amalgamate, and the union

takes the name, one of the two. So, Mr. President, the answer to the argument in reference to the words Protestant Episcopal that they are not quite proper, is that they have been in use for a hundred years, and the doctrine of acquiescence in use is one that would apply, and unless a strong reason can be given it is entirely good. I did not intend to take up so much time as I have taken, and I hope when the other side shall assume the floor, they will show us the ground on which they stand, and give us good reasons why we should change.

Rev. Dr. Hopkins, of Central Pennsylvania.—I thank you for recognizing me at last. I have tried a half a dozen times to get the floor and I know it is hard work. There is one thing that I want to call attention to, and that is that the use of the term will not bring conclusion.

In the first place I want to call attention to the fact that this is not the first attempt to change the name of a great religious body in this country. Not long ago, the title of the "Reformed Church of Holland, as it originally stood, was thought to need change, but the title was fixed in the staid traditions of this Teutonic race, and they were very much attached to it, and clung to it with characteristic determination, and the very line of argument that has been used here was used; it was carried down, and the mother and the grandmother were called up and every other consideration was brought up, and finally the title of Reformed was adopted, and the Dutch was dropped, and instead of that, they call it the Reformed Church of America. The Reformed Church of America! How very exclusive! Is there no other Reformed Church? (Laughter.) What has become of the Reformed Episcopal Church? (Great laughter.)

There is another great body, called the German Reformed Church, and when they tried to change that name, their mothers and grandmothers were brought forward the same as before; the were German, and you know there is a difference between the Germans and the Dutch, but it is the same Teutonic race, and is to be recognized for its tenacity, and they clung to their name with the same determination; they must have the German upon it, and they made a great argument in the matter, but the German is gone and it is the Reformed Church. (Laughter.) Here is another case of reform, but nobody left the Church because they couldn't find any one where there was more Dutch than there was in that, nor did they lose a dollar of their profit.

No, Mr. President, they lost not a dollar of their property; they did not breed a schism; they did not have any kind of trouble growing out of it. Those that were disgruntled because Dutch and German were dropped, staid where they were because they did not know where to go, and because wherever they went there was more Dutch and more German. The great reason why this name should be changed—you take a list of the religious bodies in the country and you read them down, the Protestant Methodist, the Methodist Episcopal, the Reformed Baptists, and so on, where is the difference? It is a lot of sectarian names from first to last. This name gives to us a label, which in the eyes of the general public looks just as sectarian as any other. When our Church was originally organized after the revolutionary war—she had been known as the Church of England, and the few who remained were known by that title. They took the name of Protestant Episcopal because it was settled at that time by other religions who looked upon us as little better than Romanists. It was the public prejudice, and it was natural, therefore, that at that time, being so feeble and weak they should take the name Protestant in self-defense. The word Episcopal was taken in self-defense, also. That was the only thing which distinguished us at that time from all the rest, and to keep that distinction so we should not forget it ourselves, we put that

in the title also. But it was impossible for the little feeble remnants at that time, overwhelmed by the great bulk of the royalists emigrating out of the country, by the political prejudice, religious prejudice, property confiscation, and ever so many things, reducing us almost to nothing, it was natural that it was then adopted. But at that time that feeble Church could not foresee that the time would come when that Church would be brought into direct relations with the great bodies of the Christian Church in other lands; they would have church buildings in England, in Paris, in Rome under the very shadow of the Vatican; they could not expect that they should have churches in Russia, Constantinople, and other parts of the world. Nor could they assume another thing, that the word Protestant, which when it was adopted, had a very wholesome flavor about it, would before one century was over become so rotten with infidelity, that Germany itself, the very country where the thing and the name were conceived, begotten and brought forth has repudiated it, and the great body of Christians in Germany that were opposed to the Church of Rome now call themselves—not Protestants, because Protestantism means infidelity, but the Evangelical Church, to show that they do have some belief in the Gospel of Christ. Now this word has become so rotten where it was begotten and born that I do not think that at this late day it will be possible to restore any sweetness to it, even in the remote parts of Texas. Another thing, we cannot see what was the influence of this little, almost dead, Church in the first century of its existence. Let me ask you, in considering the condition of this little Church, so small that it was doubtful if it could exist, what the Lord has done, Who chose of the little one to make a thousand, and chose of the weak to confound the mighty. To that little body He has sent the influence which is moving ahead of every kind of religion in these United States. The great body of the Church of Rome in this country is not unlike what she is in the old country. American atmosphere, politics and influences of all sorts and kinds are diminishing day by day the ultra-montane position of Romanism, so that day by day it is drawing nearer to us, whether we know it or whether we do not. So, on the other hand, with the other denominations. Look at the Methodists and every one of them. See what they are, compared with what they were fifty years ago; you will find that the sharpness has been worn away in many respects, and they are drawing nearer to us. The Methodists are changed, and if we wander around we will see that the influence coming from this Church has already moved over every kind of Christianity in the land. Now what shall we do? It is not a question of size granting that we are the tenth and the least; I need hardly remind my most eloquent brother from Boston that the hub is not the biggest part of the wheel. The hub is important because it is that point at which all the spokes turn together. Now, to pass on, why have we this name of ours? Now what we need to do looking toward a re-union of all, is to drop the word Protestant upon the one side, and the word Episcopal on the other, keeping simply the Church of the United States of America; that is what we want. We have had a great deal of talk about un-Protestantizing the Church; oh, dear; well, we are not as good Protestants I confess as our Congregational brothers, because they protest against more than we do. And the Congregationalists are not as good Protestants as the Unitarians, because the Unitarians protest against more than the Congregationalists, and there is not one among them who is half so good a Protestant as Mr. Ingersoll, because he protests against the entire Christian religion from top to bottom. Now, another thing, talking about maintaining the true position of the Church against the Church of Rome. I will call attention to one single

fact. In the process of years there has been an appropriating, a tax upon our property from Henry VIII down to Mr. Capel, and where has the defense come from? It does not come from those who are such sticklers over the name Protestant, but everything has come from those who are on the other side, and who have made the defense upon the old line of the Catholic Church and the old Canons, to prove that our position is right and one which Rome can never overthrow. Now, one thing more, Mr. President, before I close. We are entering upon a new era. We cannot accomplish this object all at once. All that is asked, under this resolution of the gentleman from Chicago, is an expression of opinion. If that expression of opinion is in favor of a change, it will take its own time to bring the change about. It will be three years before anything can be done at the outside, and more properly it will be six years before anything can be accomplished. In the meanwhile, we shall all understand what this change is, and that we are not going to take away the opposition to the Church of Rome? And one thing more; they say you drop the word Protestant and you drive the Protestants out of the Church. Very Good. We propose to drop the word Episcopal likewise. Do you mean to say that by that, we mean to abolish Episcopacy out of the Church? Are we going to abolish Bishops? If the logic will not hold on on Continued on page 84.

DELEGATES

Are earnestly invited to examine the stock of

MEN'S, BOYS' and CHILDREN'S Clothing!

AT

Browning, King & Co.'s

136 & 138 Madison St. | 144 to 148 Clark St.

HENRY L. HATCH, Manager,

NEW YORK. ST. LOUIS. MILWAUKEE.
PHILADELPHIA. CINCINNATI. KANSAS CITY.

S. A. KEAN & CO.

(Suc. to Preston, Kean & Co.,
100 Washington St., Chicago, Ill.)

BANKERS

BANKING counts solicited. Interest allowed on time deposits. FOREIGN EXCHANGE on the principal cities of Europe.

BONDS—Choice State, County, City, School and Leading Railway Bonds, Local Securities and other investments. Send for lists. Land Warrants and Land Scrip which can be used in the location of Government Land.

Home Safe Deposit Vaults, Corner La Salle and Adams Streets.

S. A. KEAN, President.

PUTNAM CLOTHING House!

Visit this Old Reliable House while in the city.

Best Stock of Prince Albert Suits

—IN—

WORSTEDS AND CLOTHS

in the city.

Fall and Winter Overcoats.

PUTNAM CLOTHING HOUSE,

131 & 133 Clark St. | 118 & 117 Madison St

C. M. BABBITT,
Resident Partner.

THE SEABURY DIVINITY SCHOOL,

Faribault, Minn

The academical year will begin Sept. 29. A full theological course provided, with six resident professors. Special students are received. There also a preparatory department with a course study requiring two years. Tuition and rooms free. For calendar and all information apply to the Rev F. D. HOSKINS, Warden, Faribault, Minn.

DE VEAUX COLLEGE,

Suspension Bridge, Niagara Co., N. Y.
Fitting School for the universities, West Point, Annapolis, or business.

WILFRED H. MUNRO, A. M., President.

THE CATHEDRAL SCHOOL OF ST. PAUL,

Garden City, L. I., presents unusual advantages in the way of accommodations, equipment and location. The discipline is firm but kind. Instruction thorough, up to the standard of the best school, and prepares pupils for college, scientific schools, business, military, and naval academies. Chemical Laboratory complete in its appointments. Thirteen teachers employed. For further particulars and terms, address CHAS. STURTEVANT MOORE, A. B., (Harvard), Head Master.

THE CATHEDRAL SCHOOL OF ST MARY

Garden City, L. I., N. Y.

Terms, \$350 per annum. Apply to
MISS CHARLOTTE TITCOMB, Principal.

MRS. SYLVANUS REED'S

Boarding and Day School for Young Ladies
6 & 8 East 53d Street.
NEW YORK.

23d Year Begins Monday, Oct. 4.

The unprecedented degree of interest and scholarship in this school justify its progressive policy and the rule of securing in every department the highest quality of teaching. French and German are prominent features. Classes in History, General Literature and Political Economy are taught by R. H. Sasterton, Ph. D., LL. D. Mathematics, Astronomy, Geology, and Biology are taught by Miss Winnifred Edgerton, Ph. D. English Language and Literature and Anglo-Saxon by Wm. H. Carpenter, Ph. D. Ethics by Nicholas Murray Butler, Ph. D. Painting and Drawing by Wyatt Eaton. The Del Serre system of Elocution and Gymnastics is adopted. All under the personal supervision of MRS. REED.

ST. MARGARET'S DIOCESAN SCHOOL FOR GIRLS.

Waterbury, Conn.

TWELFTH YEAR.

Situation delightful and healthful, with advantages of city and country. The number of boarding pupils limited.

The Rev. FRANCIS T. RUSSELL, M. A., Rector.

TRINITY SCHOOL,

Trenton-Hudson, N. Y.

The Rev. JAMES STARR CLARK, D. D., Rector. Assisted by five resident teachers. Boys and young men thoroughly fitted for the best colleges and universities, scientific schools or for business. This school offers the advantages of healthful location, home comforts, first-class teachers, thorough training, assiduous care of health, manners and morals, and the exclusion of bad boys, to conscientious parents looking for a school where they may with confidence place their sons of the clergy. Special instruction given in Physics and Chemistry. The twentieth year will begin Sept. 15.

EPISCOPAL ACADEMY OF CONNECTICUT.

The Rev. S. J. HORTON, D. D., Principal. Assisted by five resident teachers. Boarding School for boys, with military drill. Terms, \$400 per annum. Special terms to sons of the clergy. Three sessions in the year. Fall term begun Monday, Sept. 13, 1880. For circulars address the principal, Cheshire, Conn. References—Rt. Rev. Bishop Williams, and Rev. Dr. E. E. Beardsley.

FRENCH AND ENGLISH BOARDING SCHOOL

For Twenty Girls.

Unusual advantages. French warranted to be spoken in two years. \$300 a year. Address MADAME HENRIETTE CLERC or MISS MARION L. PECKE, 4313-4315 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

THE HANNAH MORE ACADEMY,

The Diocesan School for girls. Founded in 1832. W. M. K. R., 15 miles from Baltimore. Careful training, thorough instruction and the influences of a quiet Christian home.

Rev. ARTHUR J. RICH, A. M., M. D., Rector
Reisterstown, Md.

ST. MARY'S SCHOOL, Knoxville, Ill.

Nineteenth year. Established A. D. 1868. Enlarged 1872 and 1880. The new building completed, 1883. A first-class establishment, healthfully located; thoroughly conducted by the same officers that founded it.

TRUSTEES EX-OFFICIO—The Bishop of Chicago, the Bishop of Quincy, the Bishop of Springfield. Pupils received at any time. Each one receives personal attention.

Rev. C. W. LEFFINGWELL, D. D.,
Rector and Founder.

ST. PAUL'S HALL,

Salem, N. Y.

Has grown in four years from three to thirty boys through the recommendations of patrons. An illustrated circular giving their names and the school prospectus will be forwarded on application. Six hours from New York.

MONTCLAIR, ESSEX COUNTY, NEW JERSEY

Home and School for Younger Boys. At a beautiful country seat, near New York City. Under the charge of a Church clergyman. Conducted by competent teachers. References—Bishop A. Lee, W. B. Stevens, H. C. Potter and others. Address The Rev. WM. A. NEWBOLD.

SCIENTIFIC PREPARATORY SCHOOL,

Duxbury, Mass.

A Home School for boys. Prepares for college or scientific school. Refers by permission to President Eliot, Harvard Univ., Prof. Lanza, Mass. Inst. Tech. and others. Address for circulars.

FREDERICK B. KNAPP, S. B., (M. I. T.)

FORT HILL SCHOOL, (for boys.)

Canandaigua, N. Y.

Sixteen house pupils, \$800 per annum. Prepares for college, scientific school or business. Thorough scholarship; home training.

Rev. JAMES HATTRICK LEE, Headmaster.

A LADY LIVING AT WAYNE, DEL. CO., PA.,

14 miles from Philadelphia, desires eight little girls or young ladies as boarding pupils. Advantages in English branches, Languages, Music, and Art of the highest order.

For terms, references, etc., address

MRS. LEE, Box 18.

General Wayne P. O., Del. Co., P. R. R.

MACKEY'S NEW PROCESS
ROLLED OATS
CRACKED WHEAT

Rolled Oats
Cracked Wheat.

Superior to all Others.

CHARLES D. DANA & CO., Propr's, Chicago.

foot, it will not on the other. If you try to logic both, they are equally cheerful. Take away the word episcopal, and take away the word protestant, and you won't knock down a single barrier which this Church has erected against the Church of Rome. But remember the Church is opening a wider area. She is brought in contact with Christians the world over. What was proper in the time of her youth and febleness, when she hardly had breath in her to live, is not applicable when she has in this country made her influence felt, not only in this country but abroad. As the province of God seems to extend wider and wider, it is our first duty to remove out of the way, that greater good may be done, every obstacle, however small it may be, which is in our power to remove.

The President—The hour for adjournment has come, but before this Convention arises, I desire to announce, as members of the joint committee, on the spiritual care of immigrants, the following persons: The Rev. A. Beatty, of Kansas; the Rev. E. S. Thomas, of Minnesota; the Rev. Arthur C. Stilson, of Iowa; Mr. John R. Triplet, of Missouri; Mr. S. H. Rice, of Massachusetts, and Mr. W. B. Cutting, of New York.

A member—Would it not be proper here to ask that the messages from the House of Bishops be read for information of the House before rising.

The President—The Chair will communicate the messages from the House of Bishops under the standing rule of this House at a time when it seems to be most convenient for him. It does not seem convenient for the President to communicate those messages at the present time.

This House is adjourned until to-morrow morning at 9 o'clock.

AN Italian bishop struggled through great difficulties without repining, and met with much opposition in the discharge of his Episcopal functions, without betraying the least impatience. One of his intimate friends, who highly admired those virtues, which he thought to imitate, one day asked the prelate if he could communicate the secret of his being always easy. "Yes," replied the old man, "I can teach you my secret, and with great facility: it consists in nothing more than making a right use of my eyes." His friend begged him to explain himself. "Most willingly," returned the bishop, "in whatever state I am, I first of all look up to heaven, and remember that my principal business here is to get there; I then look down upon the earth, and call to mind how small a place I shall occupy in it when I come to be interred; I then look abroad into the world, and observe what multitudes there are who are in all respects more unhappy than myself. Thus I learn where true happiness is placed when all our cares must end, and what little reason I have to repine or to complain."

ST. LUKE'S MISSION BAZAAR.

You are invited to Ladies' Church Bazaar,—benefit St. Luke's Episcopal Mission—every day and evening, till Saturday, October 16, inclusive. Southwest gallery of Exposition, Michigan Boulevard. Bishop McLaren, in the September "Diocese of Chicago," hopes that the "sales will be large, as the object is very worthy."

ANDREWS' FOLDING BEDS.

Andrews' Upright takes the lead for elegance and comfort. Also Cabinet Beds, forty styles. A. H. ANDREWS & CO., Chicago—New York.

Churchman Building
47
Lafayette Place,
New York.

ESTIMATES & DESIGNS ON APPLICATION.

S. H. KERFOOT.

ESTABLISHED 1852.

S. H. KERFOOT, Jr.

CHICAGO REAL ESTATE OFFICE, S. H. KERFOOT & CO.
91 Dearborn St.

Chas. Gossage
& Co.,
State & Washington Sts.

HIGH CLASS

Dry Goods,
CARPETS,
Millinery and Fine Shoes.
Lowest Prices.

The Tobey
Furniture Co.

STATE & ADAMS ST.

Furniture
MANTLES, DRAPERIES.

Bishops, Delegates and Visitors
to the General Convention are invited to visit the
ART ROOMS
of GEO. A. MISCH, 217 East Washington Street,
Manufacturer of stained glass.

P. M. ALMINI,

Church Decorator.
243 Wabash Ave., Chicago.

ANNOUNCEMENT!

Having opened our branch house at 79 & 81 State Street, we desire to call especial attention to our superior class of clothing which our twenty-five years experience as manufacturers affords. Those familiar with our parent house "appreciate" our clothing as dependable, in style, quality and price. Believing that we make it to your interest, inspection is solicited.

WANAMAKER & BROWN, of Philadelphia,
79 & 81 State Street, Chicago.

STORM KING SCHOOL,

Family School for Young Ladies,
On Cornwall Heights,
OF THE HIGHEST CHARACTER.
Will open October 1.
For circulars address, F. M. TOWER, Cornwall-on-Hudson.

HIGHLAND FALLS ACADEMY.

A healthful, homelike, thorough school on the Hudson, one mile south of West Point. Send for circular. CALEB HOUSE, Principal.

THE TWENTY-FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE EVANGELICAL EDUCATION SOCIETY

will be held (D. V.) on Sunday night, October 24, at 7:30 o'clock, in Grace church, Chicago. The business meeting will be held Thursday, October 21, at 7:30 o'clock, in same church.
ROBERT C. MATLACK, Secretary.

DE LANCEY SCHOOL FOR GIRLS.

GENEVA, N. Y.
For circulars address the Misses BRIDGE.

HOBART COLLEGE,

Geneva, N. Y.
Classical, Scientific and Special Courses. For information as to valuable scholarships, etc., apply to President E. M. POTTER.

BISHOP THORPE, Bethlehem, Pa.

A Church Boarding School for Girls. Prepares for Wellesley, Vassar and Smith Colleges. Rt. Rev. M. A. De W. HOWE, D. D., President of the Board of Trustees. For circulars please address, Miss F. I. WALSH, Principal.

BUCK & RAYNOR

Prescription Druggists—Established 1858.
Cor. State & Madison Sts. and
117 South Clark St.
Makers of "The Mars" and "Temple" Cologne.

THE SHURLY WATCH AND JEWELRY MFG. COMPANY,
Wholesale and Retail Jewelers and Manufacturers of Gold Jewelry.
If you wish anything in our line send for illustrated price list.
CENTRAL MUSIC HALL, 75 STATE STREET, CHICAGO.

AMERICAN FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.



Office in Company's Building.
308 & 310 Walnut Street, Philadelphia.
Cash Capital \$500,000.00
Reserve for re-insurance and all other
claims 1,191,413.24
Surplus, over all liabilities 528,957.89
Total assets October 1, 1886 \$2,220,371.13

DIRECTORS—T. H. Montgomery, John T. Lewis, Israel Morris, William W. Paul, Pemberton S. Hutchinson, Alexander Biddle, Charles P. Perot, Joseph E. Gillingham, Samuel Welsh, Jr.

THOS. H. MONTGOMERY, President.
RICHARD MARIS, Secretary.

THOS. S. CUNNINGHAM, Chicago Agency,
220 La Salle St.
CHARLES E. BLIVER, Gen'l Manager,
218 La Salle St., Chicago.

PAINE'S
ADVERTISING
AGENCY

PAINE'S NEWSPAPER
ADVERTISING AGENCY
Can give you lower advertising rates on any newspaper published in the United States than you can obtain elsewhere. No charge for giving estimates or information in regard to advertising. Send for Red-Letter Lists. Address C. D. PAINE, Prop., 69 Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill.



One of the most interesting sights in the city is the

DAVIS & MORSE CO'S
Mammoth Store.

The most perfect in arrangement, best lighted, and most convenient store for shopping in the west. 3 1/2 acres of

DRY GOODS

—AND—

Merchandise

of every description displayed in 80 departments. Visitors are cordially welcomed. Clergymen will be furnished with a special discount card on application at the office.

DAVIS & MORSE CO.,
281 to 299 State St.

FINE FURS!

—AT—

H. H. BROMWELL & CO.,

161 State Street, - - - 2d Floor.

COX SONS, BUCKLEY & CO.,
LONDON.

CHURCH WORK,
Stained Glass, Vestments,
MEMORIALS AND FABRICS.
343 5th Ave., New York.

R. GEISSLER,

Maker and Importer of

CHURCH FURNITURE

127 Clinton Place (West Eighth St.) N. Y.

WOOD, MARBLE, METAL - WORK,
STAINED GLASS,
Embroideries, Banners, Etc.
Send for circular.



McShane Bell Foundry
Finest Grade of Bells,
Chimes and Pells for churches, etc. Send for price and catalogue. Address
H. McSHANE & CO.,
BALTIMORE, MD.
Mention this paper.

FOR KINDERGARTEN GOODS,
and Primary School Aids, call on
WESTERN AGENT FOR
MILTON BRADLEY & CO.,
335 Wabash Ave., Chicago.

F. S. PEABODY,
COAL.

103 Dearborn St. | Telephone, 1303.

FRANCIS B. PEABODY
& Co.,

INVESTMENTS.

115 Dearborn Street, Chicago.

Mortgages on Improved

Chicago Real Estate,

Netting 6 and 7 per cent. furnished to individuals, trustees, estates, etc. All interests of investors protected, and principal and interest collected without charge.

FRANCIS B. PEABODY,
JAMES L. HOUGHTLING,
FRANCIS S. PEABODY.