

Section 11. [Illegible]

[Illegible text]



BX5918
M4 H7

13A
1117

LIBRARY OF THE
LOGIC LIBRARY

DEFENCE

OF THE

CONVENTION

OF THE

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH,

IN THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS,

AGAINST CERTAIN EDITORIAL STATEMENTS

OF THE PAPER, CALLED

'THE BANNER OF THE CHURCH.'

BOSTON:

STIMPSON & CLAPP, 72 WASHINGTON STREET.

1832.

J. E. Winckley & Co., Printers,

NO. 14, WATER STREET.

DEFENCE.

To the Clergy, Laity and Friends of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

FOR the first time in his life, the undersigned is compelled to become party to a controversy. Arraigned, together with many others, before the public, upon the editorial authority of two of his clerical brethren, he has been advised and requested by those whose judgment he respects, and by one especially, whose character and office entitle him to peculiar reverence, to write the present statement, as a defence against grievous misrepresentation. He would not have undertaken so painful a task, on his single conviction of its propriety. He knows the evils of dissension too well, and deplors its mischievous effects too deeply, to enter into it, however provoked, for his own sake alone. But when called to sustain the truth, in a case which not only affects the reputation of many amongst his friends and brethren, but which implicates the government of the church, and the just influence of his Bishop, he does not consider himself at liberty to shrink from the claim of duty, however distasteful the requisition to his habits and feelings.

The subject matter of remark, was presented by the publication of an editorial article in the paper called the 'Banner of the Church,' issued on the 30th of June last, and detailing, at great length, and with extraordinary asperity, the doings of the Massachusetts Episcopal Convention, held in Boston on the 20th and 21st days of the same month. The author of this

account styled it a Manifesto, but whatever its appellation might be, we regret to say that its character was libellous, inasmuch as it charged seventeen members of the Convention by name, together with several others who were not specified, with conduct unbecoming their profession, not only as Christians, but as honest and honorable men. The intemperance of this publication, however, was thought a sufficient protection from the assault. It was believed that no mind of common discernment could fail to perceive the high coloring of personal excitement which marked it throughout, and it was presumed that silence would be its best reply. As friends to the peace and reputation of the church, the accused have reason to lament that their expectations were disappointed. The work which they thought it needless to do for themselves, others did for them, and a popular gazette of the day was unhappily occupied by both sides of the question. At length it was found that a most respectable gentleman of Pittsfield, Edward A. Newton, Esq. a member of the Convention, and high in the esteem of the Episcopal community, had conceived it expedient to visit several of the parishes, and obtain the signatures of fourteen clergymen to a letter addressed to the Delegates elected to the General Convention, advising that three of them should resign in favor of certain others who were not elected, but who, it was alleged, ought to have been; and threatening in very kindly, but very substantial terms, that if this overture of peace was rejected, the future conventions of the Church, should exhibit a warfare, in which the subscribers to the letter promised themselves a certain victory.

The gentleman who distinguished himself by his zeal in this novel proposition, did not stop at this point, but undertook, very sincerely no doubt, to be a voucher for the truth of the 'Manifesto,' professing his entire conviction that the charges recorded in it were correct. This, to the parties accused, was a painful surprise indeed, and showed them that the extent of the mischief was far greater than they could have anticipated. It was not enough that they had quietly borne the attack of their clerical brethren. It was not enough that fourteen clergymen should dictate terms of complete submission to the Delegates elected by the Convention of the Church. It was not enough that two of the clergy, who signed this letter, were not even present at that Convention, and that several of them, in age, in experience, and in the ministerial office, were many years

younger than the men to whom they thus volunteered their unprecedented counsel. All this was hard enough, but in addition to it all, the parties accused, discovered that they had a new and active accuser; a gentleman, whose leisure, whose influence, and whose warm inclination to use it, made him truly, a serious antagonist. The more especially, as the author of the Manifesto had given him a very uncommon character, declaring that '*by the devotion of his whole fortune to the interests and service of the Church, and by the exemplification of her principles in his whole life, he was raised above the shadow of selfish or unworthy imputation.*' This intelligence, indeed, the writer rejoiced to learn, because Mr. Newton is well known to be in affluent circumstances, and the age stands in need of such examples. But he found upon inquiry, that however zealous and liberal the course of this respected gentleman had confessedly been, yet the statement of the editor was, to say the least, an extravagant exaggeration. The inference was obvious, that the Muses had presided over that sentence, as well as many others in the Manifesto; but the consistency of the author was not to be denied, since it certainly was fair that his readers should see a little of the poetry of praise, where there was so abundant a supply of the poetry of censure.

Thus assailed by reiterated and fresh attacks, the accused are compelled at last, however reluctantly, to believe that a defence is necessary. In order to present this defence with perspicuity, it will be necessary to quote from the 'Manifesto' the several points on which the parties are at issue, and this the writer will endeavor to perform in as succinct a manner as possible, consistently with his undertaking. 'To the railing of the accuser,' in the words of the admirable Hooker, he desires to 'say nothing.' To the alleged facts and arguments he makes the following reply.

1. The first allegation of the Manifesto, demanding notice, is that '*though there was no extraordinary business done at the Convention, some of the ordinary business was done in an extraordinary manner.*' It will be shown that, on the very contrary, the business done was transacted in the *ordinary* manner,—the manner used in that body for more than thirty years, without a single instance to the contrary.

2. The second is, that the circumstances connected with the elections for the members of the Standing Committee and

the Delegates to the General Convention, were '*so peculiar, so wholly unprecedented, and so ominous of evil to the Church, that a detailed account is called for. The evil is now done,*' continues the Editor, '*representations of it, distorted and exaggerated, are of course abroad. There should be somewhere, an authentic and unquestionable narrative. Such ours shall be. We shall state facts, and only such as can be substantiated by legal evidence. We meet this necessity not so much in self-defence as for the benefit of others, that they may be on their guard against the stratagems which we have been compelled to witness, that they may see, that when injuries so sustained cannot be retrieved, a protest may at least be recorded.*'

It shall be shown that all this is imaginary. That the circumstances connected with the elections were of the common kind, when men do not happen to agree upon the same candidates. That there was nothing in the case unprecedented, peculiar, or ominous of evil to the Church. That no evil has been done by the accused, and that no good end has been, or could be served by this Manifesto. That it may perhaps be called an *authentic* narrative, because its paternity belongs to the editors of the '*Banner,*' but that it is the very reverse of *unquestionable*. That its author has not confined himself to *stating facts only*, but that the observations on these facts, the sweeping asseverations and general imputations of the piece, are its leading, and by far its strongest features. That many of the allegations of fact are unsupported by any evidence, and that the accuser witnessed no stratagem, and sustained no injury, of which either he, or any other man, has a just right to complain.

3. The Editor proceeds to declare, in capital letters, that the record of the elections is not a true expression of the principles of *the Church* in Massachusetts. It shall be shown on the plainest Episcopal principles, that this declaration is a total mistake.

4. The next paragraph of the Editor introduces the reader to a sketch of the state of the Church, previous to the late Convention, in which he avers that '*until two months before that period, nothing was heard of dissatisfaction or division. There appeared to be a perfect unity of interest in the prosecution of the affairs of the Church. The persons,*' continues he, '*of whom we now complain, were sedulous and constant in public declarations, that we were all united.*' By at-

tending to the declarations of those well qualified to judge, this statement will be found to be erroneous and visionary.

5. The Editor goes on to mention a case determined by the Standing Committee two months before the Convention, which, he admits, produced considerable dissatisfaction. He declines detailing the particulars, but asserts that the committee decided, as they believed '*conscientiously according to the Canons,*' that menaces of '*reform*' were made, and that great pains were taken, under the '*favorable circumstances of an Ecclesiastical visitation, to enlist clerical influence*' to carry it into effect. This decision of the Standing Committee shall be fully detailed, and the grounds of dissatisfaction shown, and the allegation about enlisting clerical influence under the circumstances of an Ecclesiastical visitation, shall be distinctly refuted by the testimony annexed.

6. The account given of the mode in which the Editor says the tickets were formed on his side of the question, as exhibited in contrast with the conduct of Mr. West, shall be examined, and it shall be shown, by the very state of the votes, on the authority of the '*Manifesto*' itself, that there was no sufficient ground for the accusation of *stratagem* or *concert*.

7. The next subject presented by the Editor consists of a set of charges purporting to be founded on the previous statement of facts, accusing the majority of the voters of being organized '*on party principles,*' of entirely '*proscribing those in whom former conventions had reposed their confidence, of concerting and carrying into effect their design secretly, by all the aids and appliances which, in political warfare, are but tolerated, and that in accomplishing its purposes, neither the welfare of the Church, nor the rights of parishes and individuals, nor the proprieties of time or place or person were to be at all regarded.*' All this, with much more of the same kind, will be shown to be gratuitous hyperbole, without any just foundation.

8. The Editor next asserts that acquiescence in these elections was '*treason to the Church.*' This assertion will be briefly tested, by Episcopal principles.

9. The Manifesto proceeds to the motion made to annul the elections, on the ground that they were *unconstitutional and void*, and comments severely on the *parliamentary devices, quibbling, &c.*, by which this motion was evaded, setting out all the formality of names, in order to fix the personal odium

of the course taken, upon the individuals accused. And after arranging the votes in such a manner, as to make the majority appear to be the minority, and repeating the charges of evil done and wrong suffered, the Editor concludes by applying to the accused the scriptural text, 'Every one that doeth evil hateth the light, lest his deeds should be reproved; but he that doeth truth' (to wit, the Editor, we presume,) 'cometh to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest that they are wrought in God.' All this will be easily interpreted, when compared with the simple facts of the case, and cleared from the mists of rhetorical amplification. It is a weary road to travel, for the writer, and, it may be feared, for his readers; but truth demands the real statement of the question, and, having put his hand to the plough, he will not look back.

To commence then, with our history;—it is a melancholy fact that for two or three years past, a growing disunion had been generated in the Church of Massachusetts. Of this, the present writer has no personal knowledge, because his connexion with the Eastern Diocese has been of little more than one year's standing. He refers, for the evidence of the assertion, to the positive declarations of others, who knew and deplored the change. He can only say, for his own part, that before he had been four months in his present situation, he had received abundant proof, that the boasted unity of the Church in this quarter, was sorely defective. That, in truth, the leading clergymen were not united in sentiment with their Ecclesiastical Head, and that the Bishop did not govern this portion of his Diocese with that comfort and harmony, which belongs to the theory of our system, and without the exemplification of which, Episcopacy must always be a very inefficient institution.

Several instances of disagreement between the views of the Bishop and the leading clergymen in the Standing Committee, were detailed to the writer, which fully showed the unpleasant state of the executive department. But the decisive conflict of opinion occurred in the case, obscurely alluded to in the Manifesto, at the meeting of the Committee in April last.

The facts were these. Two candidates for Holy Orders, Messrs. McBurney and Babcock, were induced by the pressing wants of the church and the advice of their friends to apply for ordination. They had been entered on the books of the Bishop more than two years. They were graduates of Harvard University, of good standing, and some years older than the

period of twenty-one, which the Canon requires. The Bishop, (the same who has presided over the diocese for twenty years, with the purest character,) had appointed a committee to examine them, and had himself assisted at the examinations. They were found qualified and worthy, and received, as they well deserved, certificates testifying their fitness for the sacred office. The Bishop addressed a letter to the clerical members of the Standing Committee, stating his satisfaction, and requesting them to concur with him in dispensing with the remainder of the three years, in consideration of the pressing wants of the diocese, there being, at that moment, six vacant parishes, in Massachusetts alone. Under these circumstances it was, that the two clergymen, then composing the clerical branch of the Standing Committee, thought fit to refuse their consent, and prevent the supply of these suffering parishes, and the declared wishes of their Diocesan.

But a reason is assigned for this, viz. that the Canon required three years' candidateship; and therefore, it is said, that these clergymen were only obeying the law. Do they mean to insinuate that the Bishop wished to violate the law? Does not every cleric of our Church know, that the Canon in question expressly gives the power to the Bishop to dispense with two years out of the three, whenever *he shall deem it expedient*, provided the clerical members of the Standing Committee concur? The fact is, therefore, that the very words of the law give the discretionary power which Bishop Griswold wished to exercise, to double the extent required. The Canon allows two years out of three to be dispensed with, whereas the Bishop asked for a little less than one.* Plainly, therefore, it was

* The canon in question was passed in the General Convention of 1826, and provides that every person who desires to become a Candidate for orders in this Church, shall, in the first instance, give notice of his intention to the Bishop, &c. ; and if he be admitted by the Bishop, &c., 'he shall remain a Candidate for the term of three years before his ordination, unless the Bishop, with the advice and consent of the clerical members of the Standing Committee, shall deem it expedient to ordain the Candidate, after the expiration of a shorter period, not less than one year.' Vid. Swords' Ed. of the Canons, 1829, p. 30.

It is to be regretted that in p. 76 of Swords' valuable *Pocket Almanack* for 1832, the above Canon is not cited *verbatim*. In the text, the dispensing power is omitted altogether, and the period of three years is set down absolutely, without any qualification. And although in the note at the foot of the page, the omission is designed to be supplied,

a question, not whether a law should be broken, but whether a license given by the very words of the law, should be used. And who was the fittest judge of this discretion, the venerable Bishop, whose office obliged him to provide for all the churches in his diocese, or the Rector of a single parish, with little more than half the Bishop's years, and not half his experience, to say nothing of the great principles of ecclesiastical subordination.

It is perfectly obvious, that this transaction must have excited a great deal of remark. The friends of the candidates, the parishes which were waiting for aid, and the advocates of the Bishop's authority, would all unite in condemning the unseemly spectacle of a presbyter, or two at the most,* thus tying up their Bishop's hands, in a mere question of expediency, under authority of the office of member of the Standing Committee. By the constitution of our Church, this Committee is elected by the Convention, once a year: and it was freely said, by many, that the Convention owed it to their Bishop, to elect, on the first opportunity, such clergymen as should be understood to harmonize with him on the point in question. Some were for dropping both the clergymen who had taken this discordant course; others thought it better to continue Mr. Doane, who was the President of the Committee, and elect with him two others, who could control the decision of similar cases, for the time to come. And of this latter sentiment was the writer, because he felt personally desirous to spare Mr. Doane all unnecessary mortification.

This free expression of opinion was the *threatening* alluded to by the Manifesto, and constitutes the head and front of the offence. But where is the sin or impropriety? Have we some

yet we read, there, that the Bishop *may, upon the recommendation* of the clerical members of the Standing Committee, dispense with the period in question. It is manifest, that in the language of the Canon, the Bishop is the prime mover, but in that of the Almanack, he is only *allowed* to move *upon the recommendation* of the Committee. The common construction of this would be, that the *first act* must come from the Committee—that it was for the Bishop to follow, instead of leading, in the matter. We have positive knowledge of the existence of this misconception; nor is it strange, when we recollect that the Almanack is consulted so much more frequently than the Canons.

* Cwing to the lamented departure of the Rev. Alonzo Potter from the diocese, the clerical branch of the Standing Committee consisted at this time of two clergymen only, Rev. Messrs. Doane and Boyle.

hitherto unheard-of law about lese-majesty, which protects the clerical members of a Bishop's Council of Advice from the frank judgment of their brethren? Is not every member of such Committee, the agent of the Convention, and are the members of Convention to be denied the privilege of uttering their disapprobation of his official course? And above all, shall the opinions and influence of the Bishop, whom the clergy have solemnly promised to obey, be forced to bend to the notions of one or two of his own Presbyters, merely because, in the exercise of a little brief authority, they may choose to think themselves wiser than he? Familiar it is to all, who know but a little on the subject, that Standing Committees are a modern invention. There was no such thing in ancient times. There is no such thing in our Mother Church of England; and in no Episcopal Church on earth, except our own, was a Bishop ever subject to the judgment of one or two of his own presbyters, as to the propriety of ordaining a Deacon. Doubtless, however, the institution is a good one, because it is designed to strengthen, not to paralyze the Bishop's authority. But if its clerical members forget that they were appointed to be a *Council of Advice*, and fancy themselves a *Board of Control*, it is manifest, that the Bishop must lose the proper influence of his office, and that the duty of governing the diocese, one of the most unquestionable parts of his sacred responsibility, must fall into other hands.*

* It may be thought by some, that the writer's views of the power of the Bishop's Council of Advice, or Standing Committee, would make this respectable and important body a mere nullity. But this would be a total misconception. The institution of this Council obliges the Bishop to *listen to advice*, and if necessary, to *remonstrance*, before he acts, in many important questions, particularly in those which relate to ordination, the most important of all. And when this point is secured—when Bishops are preserved from the danger of acting hastily and without due deliberation, all is gained which is desirable; because no man, worthy to hold the Episcopal office, can be supposed likely to proceed in an improper course, after he has had the benefit of a full discussion with his Council. Upon a similar principle, the Cabinet Council of the President of the United States is not a useless body, although they can only advise, without being authorized in any degree to control him. There are, however, those, who prefer the analogy of the Senate of the United States, and we care but little for the difference; since this analogy can only apply in the single instance of the control which they exercise over the appointing power. In all other respects that body is of far higher dignity and importance in the State than

With these ideas, honestly entertained, and freely avowed in conversation by the writer, and he presumes by many others, the Convention assembled. *There was no organization among the persons accused, of any sort or kind whatever.* The writer asserts this on the assurances of all the gentlemen implicated, and their personal testimony will be found annexed. Religious meetings were held, as he was told, but he was not present at any of them; and he has the most absolute confidence in the declaration founded upon the subjoined proofs, that these meet-

Standing Committees are in the Church, not only forming an independent branch of the Legislature, but also constituting the High Court of Judicature, in cases of impeachment. Yet even in the Senate of the United States, a refusal to concur in an appointment of the President, would always be construed as an act of party opposition, unless where plain reasons of *personal unfitness* in the candidate, were alleged as the ground of disagreement. But an Episcopalian would greatly err, who should place his Bishop on no higher ground of authority than a President. By apostolical appointment the Bishop is the Patriarch and Ecclesiastical Judge of the Church within his diocese. These powers are recognized by the title of Father, and the obedience promised by the clergy, in their solemn ordination vows. Our form of civil government, therefore, cannot be expected to furnish a perfect parallel to the relation which a Committee of Presbyters bear to their Bishop; although the writer believes that the nearest on the whole, is the relation which a Cabinet Council sustains to the President. In ancient times, the whole body of Presbyters in a diocese formed the Bishop's Council of Advice. But dioceses were easily convened in those days, consisting chiefly of one large town and a small district of surrounding country. When, however, in adopting Episcopacy into the United States, the sparseness of population and the great extent of territory made it necessary to give a wide boundary to dioceses, and it was therefore thought best to fix the limits of each State, as the most convenient limits for each diocese, the impossibility of convening all the clergy for consultation with their Bishop, dictated the propriety of appointing, each year, a Committee, who, residing convenient to him, could assemble whenever it might be expedient, to give him the benefit of their advice and counsel. And, as it was judged best to admit a large representation of the laity into the Legislative Conventions of the Church, consistency required that the knowledge and experience of the laity should be represented also in this Standing Committee. Hence an equal number of both orders compose these Committees in each diocese, although it must be recollected that the question in dispute, and the principles of Church government which we have been discussing, concern the clergy alone.

Such, as the writer conceives, was the origin of Standing Committees; and he holds them in high respect, as a most admirable proof, amongst many others, of the wisdom which governed in the adaptation of Episcopacy to the condition of things in our own day. But the

ings were for religious purposes alone. When the Convention proceeded to the elections complained of, which was in the afternoon of the first day's session, the writer saw his friends and brethren, on both sides, talking together in the aisles of the church, as is customary on all similar occasions; and tickets were offered to him by different persons, one of which contained no name that was not generally understood to coincide with Mr. Doane; and the other contained only such as were supposed to concur with the Bishop. The writer declined both, and framed his own ticket for the Standing Committee, with the clerical names of Messrs. Doane, Stone and Edson.

And now we arrive at the plain fact admitted by the Manifesto itself, which proves, that at this period of the business, there could have been no concert. It is the fact, that the first vote produced but one clerical election, and that was the election of Mr. Doane. The same men, who, fifteen minutes afterwards, elected the delegates to the General Convention, on the principles of '*proscription, by secret management, and stratagem, and under drill, by all the aids and appliances, which in political warfare are but tolerated,*' according to the hardy assertions of the Manifesto, were so little of one mind, so entirely without party organization, that Mr. Doane was elected on the first ballot, and the votes given for the other two clergymen were so scattering, that the requisite majority did not exist in favor of any one; and the House proceeded accordingly to vote the second time, for the two clergymen required to complete the Committee, when Messrs. Stone and Edson were chosen.

Of the conference, stated by the Editor, between himself and Mr. West, the writer knows nothing beyond what is detailed in the Manifesto. But from that statement it is sufficient-

clergy composing these Committees should recollect, that they are substitutes for the whole Council of Presbyters in ancient times. As it was a maxim with the famous Cyprian to do nothing without his Presbyters, so it is and ought to be a maxim with every Bishop in our country, to do nothing without his Council of Advice. But their influence over him should be the kindly influence of mind upon mind, in the form of advice and recommendation, and not the stern contradiction of presumed control. Nor is it to be supposed, for a moment, that the fathers of our modern Ecclesiastical constitution intended to authorize two Presbyters, as a Committee from the rest, to do more towards restraining their Bishop in our day, than the whole body of Presbyters could do for the first eighteen centuries of the Christian era.

ly plain, that the proof of organization is strongest on the complaining side. The Editor allows, that ‘*at the time of Convention there was, among the clergy and laity, more or less consultation as to the manner in which the vacancies in the two tickets were to be supplied, the Rev. Mr. Potter having removed, and Mr. Clark having died; and as to the other changes necessary to be made, for ensuring, in regard to the General Convention, a full attendance. No caucus,*’ indeed, he proceeds to say, ‘*was held, and no plans were organized, but it was generally understood that the vacancies in the Standing Committee were to be filled by Rev. Mr. Coit, and Joseph Foster, Esq. while, in the delegation to the General Convention, the Rev. Mr. Stone was to succeed the Rev. Mr. Potter, and the Rev. Mr. Parker give way to the Rev. Mr. Edson, who had been before in the representation. For convenience sake, some tickets were written, in accordance with this understanding, but there was no general concert and no plan of efforts to ensure success, simply because, being thought a good ticket, and made without personal or party interest, it would go, it was supposed, of course, and perhaps unanimously.*’ This long quotation is only made for the purpose of showing, that by the Editor’s own statement, there seems to have been more concert among the accusing party, than among the accused. There was, he informs us, more or less consultation—names were suggested and agreed upon,—*there was a general understanding*, and, for convenience sake, tickets were prepared; but no caucus was held, for the candid reason, that none was thought necessary. The Editor, however, and every other man of common sense, must know, that the benefits of caucusing can be had in more ways than one, and there is little use in adopting an unpopular name for a thing, when the design can be attained without it. As to the remainder of the evidence, it consists of a conference which resulted in nothing; but the attempt to accommodate, whether it succeeded or not, exhibits no more concert on the one side, than on the other. All the rest of the Editor’s statement goes to prove a preparation, a consultation, a general understanding, and the actual writing of tickets, by the party that wished to continue in power; while the simple fact, that the majority, (who were able, immediately afterwards, to carry an exclusive ticket for the General Convention,) could not hinder the election of Mr. Doane on the first ballot, distinctly shows that the organization

of Mr. West's friends was, at least, less perfect than that of their adversaries.

The writer will not dwell on the amusing idea, that the tickets were to be formed on the principle of *filling vacancies*, as if our right of suffrage at Ecclesiastical Conventions were not as free as the air we breathe, or as if those gentlemen who like to remain in office, are to be indulged with a perpetuity. Far more reasonable, surely, and far more christian, is it, to adopt the principle of rotation, in order that the burden and the honor of office, whatever they may be, may be shared, as far as possible, in the spirit of fraternal accommodation. Neither would the writer be understood as condemning concert and agreement amongst any body of men, who, laboring under a grievance, in church or state, peaceably and lawfully meet together to make arrangements in reference to an approaching election. True, indeed, the necessity which calls for the exercise of this privilege is greatly to be deplored, and the writer would be among the last, needlessly to recommend its adoption. But the right itself, is part and parcel of the elective franchise, and he would consider any man ready to become either a despot or a slave, who should seriously call it in question. If the Editor's friends, therefore, thought fit to have a previous concert, they had a right to do so. If they thought fit to form their tickets, and have them written for convenience sake, they had a right to do this likewise. But having done thus, the Editor had no right to censure other men, who, possessing the privileges of clergymen and freemen as well as himself, do not appear, by his own showing, to have gone half so far in exercising them.

We pass on to the next stage in this Conventional history. After the election for the Standing Committee was held, the delegates to the General Convention were chosen, and Messrs. Edson, West, Baur, and Stone, were elected, instead of Messrs. Morss, Doane, Edson, and Stone. With the failure of Dr. Morss and Mr. Doane, the writer had nothing to do. His own vote was given for them, and he would have been gratified to see them elected. The difference, however, between the two tickets, only affected half the clerical members of the delegation. Whatever may have been felt, no voice was raised against the result, and the Convention adjourned, to meet the following morning, with the general impression that the main business of the session was over.

Thus far, let it be remembered, the mode of conducting the Convention was not questioned by any one. The elections were made by ballot, each clergyman and each layman giving one vote. The tellers counted the votes, and the result was declared, acquiesced in, and recorded, in *all respects in the usual way*. There had been frankness, but no heat,—difference of choice, but no disagreement; and the Convention adjourned with as little appearance of agitation or disturbance, as the writer has usually witnessed in similar bodies. And at this stage of the proceedings it is, that the Editor of the Banner presents the Episcopal public with the following reflections, which we shall extract, with a brief running commentary.

‘*Thus was it seen, for the first time,*’ says he, ‘*that an organization on party principles existed in the Church in Massachusetts.*’ What sort of party principles does the Editor mean? The desire to sustain the Bishop, by giving him officers with whom he could act in concert, was the only principle which seemed to actuate the majority in the Convention; and in the Episcopal Church, the writer has not been accustomed to hear the friends and supporters of their Bishop, called a party. That term, he has hitherto known to be applied, chiefly, to those who opposed their Diocesan. But the Editor proceeds to say that this organized party contemplated nothing less than ‘*an entire proscription of those in whom former Conventions had, year after year, reposed their confidence.*’ This is certainly a novel doctrine, that electing new candidates amounts to a *proscription* of former ones. A very slight inspection of the records will show, that the gentlemen, who have been passed by, were not *always* the choice of the Convention. Others, quite as old, and probably as capable, were *once* set aside in order to promote them; but there was no complaint of proscription then. Why should there be any now, only because they have to submit, in turn, to the common lot of earthly mutation? Had not the members of Convention a right to vote for whom they pleased? And what is to become of the *liberty of choice*, if an unsuccessful candidate employs the press to impeach its exercise?

‘*Certain men,*’ continues the Editor, ‘*because they held certain principles,—no matter how long their connexion with the counsels of the Church, no matter how identified the parishes which they represent, with its existence,—no matter how great the self-devotion and self-sacrifice of their past, nor the acknowledged*

value of their present services, were to be proscribed. It is to be presumed that these 'certain men' are the unsuccessful candidates already mentioned, and assuredly it is refreshing, in those degenerate days, to hear of so much self-devotion and self-sacrifice; but one is tempted to think of the proverb, 'Let another praise thee, and not thine own mouth,' as entirely applicable to one, at least, of the gentlemen so highly commended. The Editor proceeds, however, to give his readers the antithesis. 'Certain men,' says he, 'because they did not hold certain principles, or held them lightly and to the wind, no matter how unconscious of past services, nor how incompetent of future, were to be elevated to places of confidence and responsibility.' Alas! to which of the clerical delegates is this intended to apply? Is it exactly the language of truth and soberness, to talk of ministerial brethren, who are in good repute for faithfulness and efficiency, as being *unconscious of past services* and *incompetent of future*? Who is this that judgeth another man's servant, and saith to his brother, 'Stand by, for I am holier than thou?'

Let us pass on, however, to the next clause of this extraordinary paragraph, in which the Editor speaks of the way in which this Conventional victory was achieved. 'If,' says he, '*this were the fair expression of the Church in Massachusetts, if the people would have it so, there was nothing to be done but to submit in patience. But when it appeared clearly to be the effect of concert and exertion; when clerical strength was brought into the State within three weeks, and parishes were galvanized into a spasmodic vitality for this special purpose; when it was seen and known that the act of Providence, or the consciousness of a good cause, or pressure of engagements, or, it must be added, culpable indifference, had prepared the way for an unquestionable and confessed minority, under drill, and with auxiliary influences from another State, to force men upon the Convention whom the Convention did not approve, and to give to the world the appearance of a dynasty in its counsels which does not, and which we pray God, never may exist. When these things were so, it seemed that in no sense of duty to the truth, could silence be permitted, and though submission to such a result might be matter of necessity, acquiescence in it were treason to the Church.*'

The writer does not profess to understand these allusions. But very manifest it is, that they are totally unsupported by

proof. It has already been shown, that the stronger evidence of concert and preparation was clearly on the Editor's side. What clergyman was brought into the State, and by whom, he does not inform us ; but it may be presumed that the Bishop knew, because it was necessary that such clergyman should have obtained his approbation in order to take his seat in Convention. What parishes were galvanized, and how this curious application of Natural Philosophy was effected, he leaves his readers to conjecture. By what mode he discovered, that these operations were carried on for the *special purpose* of leaving Dr. Morss and Mr. Doane out of the delegation to the General Convention, he does not intimate. Who the clergyman from another State was, that contrived to perform a feat, hitherto, certainly, unattempted in our Ecclesiastical history, viz. *forcing men upon the Convention whom the Convention did not approve*, and that too, by the very original instrumentality of *an unquestionable and confessed minority*, remains equally the subject of mystery. What he means by these proceedings having given to the Church in Massachusetts, the *appearance of a dynasty, which does not, and, he prays God, never may exist*, it is as difficult for a common mind to conjecture. Assuredly, if the term Dynasty be applicable to our Church at all, it must bear reference to the government for the time being ; and that government, when lawful, is vested in the Bishop, to whom the clergy are bound, by vow, to render canonical obedience. Wo be to that branch of our Church, where any other dynasty is attempted to be established, than that which is united to its Bishop. And wo to that Convention, in which the influence of the members is found to be too strong for the just influence of its head. The dynasty of the Church in Massachusetts, is the dynasty of Bishop Griswold. The Editor does not insinuate that *this* has been weakened or impaired.

As to the last strong expression, the Editor's notion of *treason* must be somewhat peculiar. Acquiescence in the acts of any legislative body, is usually supposed to be the characteristic of a good citizen. It is the opposition to government which is commonly considered as treasonable ; and how the desire to sustain the Bishop, by putting into office, at a regular election, those clergymen whose views harmonized with his, can be called *treason*, or how this term can apply to an acquiescence with such an election, it passes ordinary intellects to discover.

But we leave this branch of accusation without further remark, only referring to what was said, at the beginning, that the Editor does not, as he promises, confine himself to *facts*, but makes his worst and heaviest accusations without any evidence whatever, assuming the grievances of which he complains, and intimating, in strong, but mysterious asseverations, charges altogether distinct from his proofs, so cloudy and obscure, that they insinuate far more than they express, and so undefined, that disapproval becomes impossible. If this be the style in which he should like to be put upon his own trial, he must have as peculiar an idea of justice as he appears to have of treason.

The concluding item of our arraignment is, at last, at hand. The Editor says, that, '*examining the elections under these convictions, and with these views, and appealing to former records and to the constitution of the Church, it was ascertained, beyond the shadow of a doubt, that the proceedings of the Convention on the first day of its session, and of course the elections, were in contravention of the express provisions of the 2d and 3d articles of the constitution, and it was determined on, as due to truth, to the Convention, to the Church every where, to establish the conviction. Accordingly, at the opening of the Convention on the second day, Edward A. Newton, Esq. rose and called the attention of the Convention to an examination of the unconstitutionality of the elections made by this body yesterday. Whereupon it was moved by the Rev. Dr. Morss, that the elections for Standing Committee and delegates to the General Convention, made by this Convention yesterday, being contrary to the 2d and 3d articles of the constitution be hereby set aside as null and void. This motion gave rise to an animated and protracted debate;*' and after an amendment offered by Col. Apthorp, which did not essentially vary the question, the motion was lost, the clergy being in favor of annulling the elections by a vote of fourteen against eight, and the laity being opposed to the motion by a vote of five congregations against three.

'*Of the manner,*' says the Editor, '*in which the resolution of Dr. Morss was opposed and its consequences sought to be evaded, we will not speak. It will be sufficient in the sight of all candid men, that it was opposed at all. To shrink from the revisal of unconstitutional acts, to shrink from the expression of the sense of the Convention, whether they were or were not constitutional, to resort to every parliamentary device, to seek to apply to the proverbially informal proceedings of an*

Ecclesiastical Convention, the strict rules of the highest judicial courts, and the specialities, the technicalities, the quibbling criticisms that perplex the lowest,—short of an explicit confession of it, we know no more conclusive admission than this, of wrong done, but to be sustained because the doers of it have the power. Truly these are grave charges, and the writer ought to feel them the more, because, if there were wrong done in opposing this nullifying motion, he had a full share in the doing of it; and therefore, the merits of the question must be explained, so as to show what arguments were used, and why they were persisted in.

The constitutional provisions on which the motion was founded, were these. ‘Art. 2. The clergy and lay deputies in Convention shall deliberate in one body, but shall vote in two distinct orders, and the concurrence of both orders shall be necessary to give validity to every measure.’ ‘Art. 3. Each congregation represented in Convention shall have one vote.’

The elections were unconstitutional, it was contended; first, because the clergy and laity did not vote in two distinct orders; 2dly, because the lay delegation voted as individuals, and not by parishes. This constitution was adopted about forty years ago, and there was a new one which had been once approved, and was at this time only waiting for a second vote to become the law. In effect, it was passed the same day, within a few hours after the motion to nullify was rejected. The difference between the language of the new and the old constitution on the subject in debate, was, that the new constitution required the same course to be taken, *when a division was called for*, leaving the Convention to vote in the common way, when a division was not called for.

Now there is no doubt, that, on the mere letter of the old constitution, it might well be questioned whether the proceedings of the Convention on, the first day of its session, were regular. But in an instrument under which the Convention had been acting for forty years, the first question was, what construction had the Church in Massachusetts put upon it? for it would evidently be idle to seek for a new practice under so old a law, the more especially when that law was just about being superseded by a new constitution, which provided the very same course, in express words, that the Convention had actually taken.

As soon, however, as the motion to nullify was explained, the question of practice was anticipated in a manner which the Editor of the Manifesto totally forgets to mention. Bishop Griswold arose from his chair, and declared that he could not sit there if such a motion prevailed; because, upon the principles contended for, the Convention had been doing nothing for upwards of thirty years. He added, that so far as he knew or had ever heard, all the business had been done in the very same mode as the business of yesterday, and that, in practice, the course marked out by the constitution was only used, when a division of the house was called for.

This statement, thus made by the venerable President of the Convention, suggested to the mind of the writer a clear course of action, in opposing the motion to nullify. And he sustained the ground taken by the Bishop, upon the principle, that although practice could not annul the law, yet it might restrain the application of the constitution to the case of a division being called; 1st, because the instrument contained no negative words. It provided indeed, one mode of voting, but did not declare that there should be no other. 2dly, because its peculiar provisions could always be enforced by any member of the Convention who chose to call for a division, and those who did not choose to make this call, but actually united in the common mode of electing, had no right to complain; and 3dly, because the framers of the constitution had the best opportunity of knowing their own meaning, and that they had established the practice which had continued, without interruption, ever since. The writer relied chiefly, however, upon the *necessity* of rejecting the principle contended for, because it would effectually destroy the Convention, and be an act of legislative suicide. For if, as it was insisted, *every measure*, in the words of the constitution, must be voted for by orders, then the vote of adjournment which continued the session must be nullified also. And since the constitution directed the Convention to be held only on Wednesday, and the day on which the objection was made, was the Thursday following, and since it is unquestionable that unless the House were regularly adjourned by a legal vote, its session must expire on the day named, therefore it necessarily resulted, that as soon as the house resolved to nullify the measures of the preceding day, it would, by that very decision, destroy its own being, and so the whole session must break up in disgraceful confusion. Upon the same principle, it was

shown, that we could have neither record nor constitution ; because we could only know that these were our records by our faith in our secretary ; but the secretary was elected in the same way, and therefore if we nullified one act on the principle insisted upon, we should reduce ourselves to the situation of having neither officer or constitution, and thus bring ourselves to the position presented by the Bishop, that the Church in Massachusetts had been doing nothing for more than thirty years. As for those who now complained, they had no right whatever, because they had estopped themselves by their own consent. Their alleged ignorance of the constitution was no ground of objection, because it was their duty to have known it ; and it is a well-settled maxim that ignorance of the law excuses no one. At the time the elections were made, they thought the mode of voting as correct as others. They acquiesced ; the tellers reported the result ; the secretary recorded it ; it was as much a portion of our record as the constitution itself, and it was too late to oppose it now.

In contravention of the Bishop's declaration that this was the invariable practice, one or two instances were adduced from the records, where it appeared that two of the parishes voted by parishes, and not by the individual vote, or by the poll. But these instances occurred *about forty years ago*, and *they were not cases of elections* ; so that it remained uncontroverted by any evidence whatever, that certainly for thirty years past, at least, the proceedings of the Convention had been conducted in no other mode than that which was now attempted to be set aside, as unconstitutional and void.

A very able argument was delivered by Mr. Metcalf, of Dedham, turning not only on the grounds above stated, but on the additional point, that the word *measure* in the constitution did not refer to elections, but to questions of debate ; an opinion which was rendered very plausible by the fact that the constitution prescribed no particular mode of voting in elections, whether by ballot or otherwise, as if it were designed to leave the whole matter to the discretion of the Convention. Two other gentlemen of the legal profession, being all the lawyers who were present, concurred. The Bishop addressed the house several times during the debate, in order to convince the advocates of this nullifying motion of their error, but in vain ; and the question was put to the vote, after the day had been almost consumed by it, and lost, as already mentioned ; the laity

on this occasion, as they have often done elsewhere, sustaining their Bishop, and saving the credit of the Church.

These votes, when compared with those of the previous day, are worthy of attention, because they demonstrate the fact that two clergymen, the Rev. Mr. West, and Rev. Mr. Wolcott, and more than half the laity, making together not less than nineteen members of the Convention, had gone home. The first votes polled, show fifty-three voters, the last shows only thirty-four. The elections being closed on the first day, and no other business of importance being expected, the second morning exhibited a body very differently constituted from the first, so that even if the elections could have been legally annulled, there was no possibility of obtaining the sentiments of the whole Convention upon another ticket. For all these reasons, of which the fact last mentioned is a reason of equity, the accused resisted the destructive motion, so unexpectedly made and so pertinaciously urged upon them, in utter disregard to the best efforts of the Bishop himself; and assuredly, they have never reflected upon the course which they pursued, without increasing satisfaction, to the present hour.

This, then, is a full and detailed account of the unworthy *parliamentary devices*, the *quibbling criticisms*, the *admission of wrong done*, and the *sustaining of the wrong because we had the power*, &c. &c., of which the Editor so hotly complains. True, indeed, the writer was ready to acknowledge that Dr. Morss and Mr. Doane were well entitled to the respectful consideration of the Convention. He had himself voted for them, and would have been gratified if their ticket had succeeded. But after the elections were closed with the acquiescence of all parties, he could not consent to throw the Church into confusion, and make the Massachusetts Convention a public laughing-stock, by nullifying and destroying its very being, in order to please even these esteemed brethren. The very idea seemed then, and seems still, so reckless and so wild, that it furnishes a phenomenon in the history of the human intellect to find good and well-meaning men carried away with it. Had they succeeded, the Bishop must have left the house, all who accorded with him must have followed, and the 'Banner of the Church' would have been compelled to clothe its columns in typographic mourning, when it recorded the suicide of the Massachusetts Convention; along with the edifying story of the sagacity of Episcopalians, who could not find out the

meaning of their Ecclesiastical constitution, although practising under it for forty years, until the very day when they superseded it by a new one.

But the accused must take leave to complain, that in printing this bitter invective against them, the Editor forgot to give them the benefit of their Bishop's countenance. If they have, indeed, committed such a grievous error in the construction of Ecclesiastical law, it would have been but fair to tell the public that he, who is by office an Ecclesiastical Judge, maintained the same opinion. But either by a lapse of memory to which even young men are sometimes liable, or for some other reason, the Editor totally omits the sentiments and conduct of the Bishop. He gives sundry little facts which, to the writer's understanding, appeared altogether out of place in a public history of a Convention; while he passes by the official course of the President of that Convention. He speaks very strongly of the majority of fourteen clergymen against eight, as affording conclusive evidence that the eight were in error; but he does not seem to have asked himself, how many of the opinions of the younger clergy should be thrown into the scale, in order to be a fair balance to the deliberate judgment of their Bishop. The accused, however, desire it to be well remembered that the course which they took, their Ecclesiastical head marked out to them. And although it is true that a majority of their clerical brethren preferred the opinion of Dr. Morss and Mr. Doane,—although it is true that even the youthful deacon who was ordained only the day before, with his solemn vows of obedience fresh upon him, rose up and expressed himself in precise opposition to the declared sentiments of his spiritual father,—yet no man shall deprive the accused of the consciousness that the Church in Massachusetts is that which adheres to her Bishop, rather than even a majority of the clergy who choose some other guide. And in this or in any other decision upon Ecclesiastical questions, we maintain, by the fundamental law of Episcopacy, that the sentiment of the Bishop, with a minority of the clergy and a majority of the laity, is the sentiment of *the Church in Massachusetts*,—the declaration of the Manifesto to the contrary notwithstanding. This principle follows from the very definition of the Episcopal Church. It is the only Ecclesiastical principle which can keep us in the unity of the Spirit and the bond of peace. It is the only principle which can preserve us from confusion and strife and

every evil work. We all know that it is much easier to say 'Lord, Lord,' than to 'do the things which he commands us.' It is much easier to contend about the apostolical succession, than to 'obey them that have the rule over us,' 'esteeming them highly in love for their works' sake.' But the Editor and his adherents may rest assured, however unable they may at present feel to relish the maxim, that if *theoretica* Episcopacy be a good thing, *practical* Episcopacy must be much better.

To sum up the whole, the writer believes it to be sufficiently manifest from the narrative given, taken in connexion with the demonstrative evidence subjoined, that the 'Manifesto' is indeed an eloquent Philippic, displaying abundant talent and ingenuity, but sadly deficient in sobriety and justice, to say nothing of christian charity and discretion. That the accused have formed no party and belong to none but the Church, of which it is the first and cardinal peculiarity that they be united to their Bishop. That in the whole of this affair they have been endeavoring to *exemplify* a principle which their accusers are always ready to *praise*, viz. the well-known maxim of Ignatius, 'Do nothing without your Bishop.' And, finally, that if there be either disturbance or strife in the Church of Massachusetts, it only furnishes another commentary on the importance of keeping the Episcopal portion of the Ordination vow.*

* Inasmuch as these pages may possibly be perused by some who are not familiar with the system of our Church government, it may be proper to state that Episcopalians maintain the establishment of three orders in the ministry by the authority of the Apostles. To the first of these three orders, viz. the Bishops, are committed the *permanent functions* of the Apostolic office, *Ordination* and *Government*, and the other two orders, namely Priests and Deacons, promise obedience and submission to their Bishop at the time of their ordination, respectively, in the following terms. The Bishop asks the Candidate for Deacon's orders, 'Will you reverently obey your Bishop and other chief ministers, who, according to the Canons of the Church, may have the charge and government over you, following with a glad mind and will their godly admonitions?' And the Candidate answers 'I will endeavor so to do, the Lord being my helper.' The same question is put to the Candidate for Priest's orders, only with the additional words, 'and submitting yourself to their godly judgments:' and the answer is a little more positive: 'I will so do, the Lord being my helper.' It may be observed here, that although in the mother Church of England, there are many ranks in the hierarchy to whom the words 'other chief ministers' apply, such as Archdeacons, Deans, Canons, Prebendaries, &c., in our branch of the Episcopal Church, the primitive simplicity pre-

That the Church has sustained any harm by the doings of *the Convention*, is utterly denied. It is probably true enough, that the violent and partial statement against which the accused are thus compelled to defend themselves, together with the various anonymous publications to which it gave occasion, has injured the Church, and degraded her ministers in the opinion of many, far and near. It is very probable that the author of the Manifesto has done more mischief by the rashness of that single act, than the labors of many years may repair. And it ought to teach all men, especially clergymen, a lesson of caution, how the dangerous facilities of the press are abused, since the same intemperance which, when confined to conversation, evaporates and is forgotten, when transferred to type, may become a moral epidemic, diffusing its baneful influence to an incalculable extent, and invading the peace and comfort of thousands. It is a wholesome adage that '*littera scripta manet*,' and those who are fond of writing, and particularly of printing what they write, would do well to adopt it for a motto. But all this is wide of the doings of the Convention. That body assembled, listened with great pleasure to an excellent sermon from Mr. Doane on the Unity of the Spirit, elected its officers in quiet, and adjourned in peace. And although on the next day some members of the Convention produced a very painful fermentation, by attempting to nullify and destroy the proceedings of the previous session, yet *the Convention* refused to sanction the disorganizing principle, and closed its proceedings in harmony and order. There the matter ought to have ended. Too much had been said already; but it was only right to set it down to the score of human infirmity, and the sooner it was forgotten the better. *The Convention* did not enter a libel on its journal, and scatter it to the winds of heaven. *The Church* did not direct the printing of a 'Manifesto,' nor appoint its author as the organ of her sentiments. *The Bishop* who is the only permanent Executive of our Ecclesiastical system, did

vails, which at present confines the application of these vows to the Bishop only. And very manifest it is, that promises so made, at the time of ordination, with an appeal to the help of God, and under all the circumstances of an oath of the most solemn character, cannot lawfully be trifled with, or lightly construed away. Good men may differ as to the definition of this obedience and submission, and it is easy to imagine times and circumstances when the effort to play the Episcopal tyrant would make resistance a duty. But in our day, all the danger seems to be upon the other side.

not directly nor indirectly countenance an assumption, for which it is believed that the experience of the American Church contains neither precedent nor parallel. And, if it be asked, who has set up this new tribunal of censorship over Bishop and clergy? we answer, in the language of the Prospectus of the 'Banner' itself, that the paper was 'established solely on *individual responsibility*.' On the same individual responsibility, then, let the doings of its Editor rest, and let the evil consequences of this extraordinary arraignment, in which he fulfils the treble office of party, witness, and judge, be placed to his credit, and to the credit of those who choose to vouch for him. The Church is free!

But we do not think it fair to rest this question here. The doings of the Convention gave the Bishop a Standing Committee, the majority of whom, in the clerical branch, may be relied on to accord with his views and strengthen the wholesome influence of his advice and example. The candidates formerly rejected, have been ordained, and are now quietly and happily performing their ministerial duties to regular parishes, previously destitute, and in danger of falling into decay. And the laity of the Church have discovered the value and importance of that admirable feature in our Ecclesiastical constitution, which enables them, in times of difficulty, to rally round their Bishop and sustain him in the official government which belongs to his station. Nor, after all, is it so much to be lamented that even the delegation to the General Convention should be so constituted, as to show to the Church at large, the substantial respect in which the character of Bishop Griswold is held in Massachusetts. It is well that the principle of unity should be carried out as much as may be, so long as there is, in our Bishops, no desire to usurp authority, and so long as there is, in our clergy and laity, no tame and implicit servility of acquiescence. Of neither of these can any man be afraid, who knows the Church in Massachusetts. A ruler more meek, and a people more free, the dream of the poet could hardly picture.

And now that the writer has closed his task, he trusts that he has redeemed his pledge to perform it, without 'returning railing for railing,' or forgetting the maxims of christian temperance and moderation. Any serious departure from these maxims he would be among the first to acknowledge and deplore. He is fully aware that he should make the largest allowances

for the errors of his brethren, 'remembering that he himself, also, is compassed with infirmity.' Personal unkindness towards any of them, he has none; and his unwillingness to display even the appearance of it, would have led him to bear the imputation of being one of those who '*hate the light, lest their deeds should be reprov'd,*' rather than take up the pen of argument, if the character of others and the interests of the Church had not induced his friends to put this defence upon him. The truth indeed required 'plainness of speech;' but the writer has anxiously endeavored to be on his guard against the common vice of controversy, where the necessity of self-defence is made an excuse for aggression. If he does not greatly deceive himself, he has long since framed the best apology he could for the very mistakes which he has been called upon to rectify. He holds himself ready to allow the virtues, to admire the talents, and to rejoice in the usefulness of those, whose Ecclesiastical and editorial course he has been compelled to disapprove; and while he does not affect to be insensible to injury, as he trusts that he is not ungrateful for favor, he feels that it ought to be very easy for him to forgive, who has so much to be forgiven.

JOHN H. HOPKINS.

APPENDIX.

The foregoing Defence has been submitted to me in manuscript. So far as my knowledge and recollection of facts stated, or circumstances alluded to, extend, it appeared to me to be correct; and I humbly hope that its publication, through God's blessing, may serve to rectify some wrong impressions, respecting our late Convention.

ALEXANDER V. GRISWOLD,
Bishop of the Eastern Diocese.

I have examined the foregoing Defence, and have no hesitation whatever in certifying, that I think it substantially correct.

T. EDSON,
Rector of St. Ann's Church, Lowell.

Having read the foregoing very able and conclusive refutation of the Manifesto, the following testimony is offered in relation to facts within my personal knowledge.

It is a matter of notoriety that the state of the Church in Massachusetts was peaceful and harmonious until recently. This resulted, however, not from the absence of diversity of sentiment in polity and doctrine, but of any such intolerant measures on the part of those who were in power, and who assumed to be higher than mere churchmen, as rendered resistance a conscientious duty. During the last two or three years, the church, under the conduct of the Rev. Mr. Doane, has been assuming a belligerent attitude. In the management of the Missionary Society, of the official concerns of the church, and of the more private subordinate means of giving character to a cause, the general aspect of measures was decidedly partizan. Harmony was preserved by submission and conciliation on the part of a minority of the clergy, in which they were in no small degree aided by the able counsels and peaceful spirit of one whose removal we have had occasion to lament, and still more by those

of him who has been so eminently an example of christian meekness.

The peace of the Church might have continued undisturbed, but for the occurrence of some such oppressive and high-handed stretch of power as that of the Standing Committee in refusing to extend the dispensary provision of the Canon to two Candidates for orders, in the face of ample testimonials to their fitness, of the most pressing necessities of the Church, and of the anxious desire of the Bishop. This, and not any party object, was the single cause of division in the recent elections of the members of the Standing Committee; and it was in anticipation of another still more intolerant measure that a division occurred in relation to delegates to the General Convention. I refer to a threatened opposition on the part of Mr. Doane and his friends to the consecration of the Rev. Messrs. Smith and McIlvaine as not 'apt and meet' for the office of Bishop on the sole ground of their not being *high* Churchmen.

It would extend this communication too far to go into the particulars of the palpable misapprehension of facts which pervades the unfortunate Manifesto. It may be sufficient to oppose a denial, and to challenge proof in regard to the charges of unjustifiable measures and partizan arts in accomplishing the results of the late elections. An examination of one or two of them will afford a clue to the explanation of the residue.

The prayer meeting which was held on the morning of the Convention at Bedford St. Chapel, of which public notice was given, and which was begun, continued, and ended in the spirit of devotion, has been branded with the charge of being perverted to unholy and partizan purposes, on the ground of a single inquiry being made, after the conclusion of the services, and as we were about separating, in relation to what was intended to be done in the Convention; although the question was instantly met and silenced by an intimation that the time and place were unsuitable for the subject. The explanation was given by the writer to Mr. Doane as being susceptible of the clearest proof, and he professed himself satisfied with it. Yet it was subsequently repeated, and at length found its way into a public journal, in the form of a deliberate charge.

The only remaining point that I shall notice is the perversion of a conversation held between the writer and Mr. Newton respecting the ticket for delegates, so as to implicate my character to a painful, if not a ruinous extent. The charge is as follows—'For the delegation to the General Convention, it was expressly stated to Mr. Newton, that no ticket in opposition to that formed by filling the vacancies in the old, would be run. But *little confidence*, of course, could be placed,

after the recent experience in relation to the Standing Committee, in *such a declaration.*'

I subjoin the testimony of Mr. Newton and the acknowledgment of Mr. Doane as to the utter groundlessness of this cruel and libellous charge. In answer to a request on my part for explanation, Mr. Newton wrote me as follows:—'I did not so report the conversation that took place between us as to justify the accusation of Mr. Doane, that you disavowed the intention of running a counter ticket. The *instant* I saw that statement in the "*Banner of the Church,*" I wrote to Mr. Doane, and acquainted him that *no such understanding existed; and he has promised to make the proper explanation at the proper time.* So careful was I, in this respect, that I did not allow a single post to escape me without this explanation being made.'

These explanations may be sufficient to demonstrate that the rashness of this public accuser of his brethren in taking up with loose reports, aided by a misguided imagination and excited feelings, gave the coloring of criminality to the most guiltless and justifiable occurrences in connexion with the late Convention of Massachusetts.

JOHN WEST,

Rector of St. Thomas's Church, Tunton.

Having read, in manuscript, the foregoing Defence, &c., the subscriber freely offers, in reference to it, the following:—

He had been a clergyman of the Diocese of Massachusetts for a few days only before its late Convention; and is, therefore, destitute of any personal acquaintance with the state of the Church previous to that time. With the doings of the Convention itself, however, and with what has since transpired as its consequences, he is familiar.

So far, then, as the facts, embraced in the foregoing defence, fall within the period of his residence in Boston, he can testify that they are not only substantially, but even minutely correct;—while the reflections and reasonings upon them are such as meet his entire and cordial approbation.

With regard to the meeting, at which he was present, for early devotion on the morning of the first day of the Convention, he declares his entire ignorance of any circumstance, derogatory to its character as a meeting for purely religious exercises. It was begun, continued and ended in a religious manner, and without any consultation, in reference to the business and Elections of the Convention. The only remark even, which he heard after the close of the exercises, in relation to that business and those elections, was promptly met by the sentiment, that neither the time nor the place was appropriate to

the subject. No religious meeting, he believes, was ever more strictly confined than this to its proper object, prayer and exhortation to christian duty.

During the transactions of the first day of Convention, he saw no evidence of previous party organization amongst those who made the elections, which, on the succeeding day, were sought to be set aside. He was aware of no general ticket agreed on by them. He witnessed no stratagem. He heard of no secret concert. That there was a disposition, on the part of different individuals, to elect different candidates, he was, indeed, apprized. But, during the whole election, he saw nothing, at least amongst those, who are defended in the foregoing statements, which is not usual in all similar Conventional elections;—nothing, unbecoming the serious importance of the business in which they were engaged.

As to the debate on the second day of Convention, although the motion, which introduced it, was, to him, a matter of utter surprise, yet he saw nothing in the spirit, with which, on the part of those who maintained the constitutionality of the elections, it was conducted, but what was dignified and befitting an Ecclesiastical Assembly. To his mind, the arguments used by both the Bishop and the members who accorded with him, were singularly convincing; and to the very close of the discussion, he was constrained to admire the *propriety* as well as the *force* with which the latter, in support of their Bishop and of preceding Conventions, met and resisted what appeared to him an altogether unparalleled movement in the annals of Conventional doings.

Finally, as to what has transpired since the Convention, in the article in the 'Banner of the Church,' and in the proposal of E. A. Newton, Esq. to the delegates to the General Convention, he fully concurs in the statements and Defence by the Rev. Dr. Hopkins, to which this is appended.

JOHN S. STONE,
Rector of St. Paul's Church, Boston.

Having read the foregoing Defence, I hereby declare that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, it is substantially correct.

So far as my knowledge and belief extend, the elections were conducted as they have been from time immemorial, and effected by as fair and honorable means as on any former occasion.

It has been said, that the Episcopal visitation holden at Taunton and at other places in May last, was abused, by the use of partizan arts, and for the promotion of party purposes. Having

been present on these several occasions, it affords me much satisfaction to state, that such was not the case; unless the piety and zeal evinced by the Bishop and clergy present, in performing divine service, and preaching the gospel, for several successive days, can be so construed.

Nor have I knowledge of any parish being organized, or revived for temporary purposes, or by artificial means, with a view to any special results having relation to that Convention.

As it has been more than intimated, however, that such was the case, in regard to the ancient church at Hopkinton, perhaps the following facts, may serve to show that such an assertion has no foundation in truth.

The church in that place was first established about the year 1747, by the Rev. Roger Price, Commissary to the Bishop of London. That gentleman endowed it with a valuable glebe, of nearly two hundred acres, for the benefit of a clergyman performing service, according to the Liturgy of the Church there, forever. This Church, like many others in our land, from measures growing out of the revolutionary war, became almost extinct; nor, until 1810, was any attempt made for its resuscitation. At that time, an act of incorporation was obtained from the State Legislature. A small, but neat edifice was erected, and consecrated to the service of Almighty God, by Bishop Griswold, in 1818; since which, to the present time, it has been considered a missionary station, supplied at intervals, and for a longer or shorter period, by the Rev. Addison Searle, Wm. T. Potter, James H. Tyng, James Morss Tappan, &c.

For more than ten years past, being the nearest Episcopal clergyman, I have occasionally visited this vacant parish, for the purpose of holding divine service, &c.; and during the greater part of 1831-2 officiated there one Sunday in almost every month. So favorable was the prospect of this little church becoming numerous and flourishing, that, in the spring of the present year, the Rev. Messrs. Doane, Wells, Blake, Crosswell, Boyle, Price, &c., at the suggestion of the Rev. Dr. Eaton, consented to officiate there, each one Sunday, until some clergyman could be found disposed to assume the charge of this congregation.

At the visitation before referred to, the Rt. Rev. the Bishop, admitted Mr. Ephraim Munroe to the holy order of Deacons, in St. Thomas's Church, Taunton. Being in the city soon after, endeavoring, in conjunction with Mr. Doane, to secure the services of some one of the clergy to officiate the following Sunday at Hopkinton; finding this impracticable, as it was the plan just named, of the settled clergy supplying them regularly for a time; Mr. Doane inquired why Mr. Munroe, would not go there? In reply, it was stated, that there was a disposition

evinced to retain him in R. Island ; and that being a native of that State, he might prefer remaining there. The question was then proposed, whether the Missionary Society would appropriate a hundred dollars for Mr. Munroe's benefit, should he consent to become their missionary at Hopkinton? Mr. Doane did not know the amount of funds the society might have at their disposal, but thought, that on application, such an appropriation would be made.

I held no correspondence with Mr. Munroe, in regard to his going to Hopkinton, nor had I the pleasure of again seeing him, until he very unexpectedly called at my residence, and requested a letter of introduction to the wardens of that Church. This being cheerfully granted, he proceeded to the place of his destination, and has continued there to the present time, in the faithful, and it is hoped successful, discharge of the duties pertaining to his sacred office.

Mr. Munroe, of course, attended the annual Convention, and took his seat among the members of that body, as other clergymen in like circumstances had always done, no man forbidding him. He was attended by a lay delegate ; and it will be found on inspecting the journals, that, no Church in this Commonwealth, destitute of a settled Pastor, has so uniformly been represented in Convention as St. Paul's, Hopkinton.

It may also be proper for me to state, having been present at a 'prayer meeting' held in Bedford Street Chapel, on the morning of June 20th, that said meeting was not, to the best of my knowledge and belief, used in any way for party purposes. And, further, that the sole object of the clergy in remaining, for a few minutes after the congregation had retired from the chapel, was, to make arrangements for similar services during the session of our Convention. This, and no other business was transacted there.

That God may overrule these unhappy divisions to the glory of his name, and for the good of his Church, is the fervent prayer of

ALFRED L. BAURV,

Rector of St. Mary's Church, Newton.

As it respects the alleged charges in the 44th number of the Banner of the Church, against a number of the clergy and laity of this Commonwealth,—I hereby testify to the following facts:—1st. That, until our Convention of 1829, the most perfect harmony and union existed among our brethren. Since that period, however, an increasing difference of opinion has prevailed, on several important sub-

jects.—2d. As it respects the late visit of our beloved Bishop, to Bridgewater, Hanover, Marshfield, &c., it was not abused to any party purposes whatever, to my knowledge or belief.—3d. No parish has been organized or *revived* in this Commonwealth for any temporary or party purpose, to my knowledge or belief.—4th. I was present at the prayer meeting in Bedford Street Chapel, on the morning of June 20th; but am wholly ignorant of its being abused to any party purpose whatever, nor do I believe it was so abused.—5th. As it respects the choice of Standing Committee and delegates to the General Convention, I know of no stratagems or unfair means being used, but believe the result of the elections to be the honest and conscientious voice of the Church in this Commonwealth.

CALVIN WOLCOT,

Rector of St. Andrew's Church, Taunton.

With respect to the alleged charges which appeared in the 44th number of the Banner of the Church, against a number of our brethren, (clerical and lay) in allusion to the proceedings of our late Convention, I hereby testify to the following facts.

1st. That when I took charge of the Parish of Trinity Church, Bridgewater, in April, 1831, I was perfectly sensible that a serious difference of sentiment and opinion *then* existed among our brethren, upon some points greatly affecting the prosperity of the church.

2d. That if the elections of Standing Committee and delegates to the General Convention, (in this State) were effected as the result of party organization, or secret concert, I can only say, *I* am ignorant of it. That we frequently spoke to one another, however, upon the subject of existing evils, and how they might be remedied, I do not deny; but so far as my knowledge extends, it was done in the most frank and open manner.

3d. That, as it respects the late visit of our venerable Diocesan, to Taunton, Bridgewater, &c., it was not at all abused by the use of any partizan arts, or for the promotion of any partizan purposes whatever, to the best of my knowledge and belief; and I humbly hope and pray, that the purposes for which it *was* undertaken, viz., the glory of God, and the extension or building up of the Redeemer's kingdom, may be *fully* realized.

4th. That no parish has been recently *organized* or *revived* for any *temporary* or *party* purpose, within the limits of this

Commonwealth, to my knowledge, with a view of securing any special result in the elections or other doings of the late Convention.

5th. That I attended the prayer meeting at Bedford Street Chapel, on the morning of the 20th June last, but am entirely ignorant of its being abused to any party purposes whatever.

MATT. MUNROE,
Minister of Trinity Church, Bridgewater.

Whereas an editorial article in the 44th number of a paper, called the 'Banner of the Church,' sets forth allegations which charge a large portion of the clergy, and a majority of the laity, who were members of the Massachusetts Convention in June last, with unfair and dishonorable conduct in relation to the election of Standing Committee and delegates to the General Convention, the undersigned, lay delegates to the Convention first named, do hereby declare that we believe said allegations to be both unjust and untrue.

HENRY CODMAN,
JAMES C. DUNN,
BENJAMIN HOWARD,
THOMAS W. HASKINS,
THERON METCALF,
ELISHA THAYER,
JOHN HOWARD,
JOHN PARNELL,
STEPHEN B. IVES.

The construction given to the constitution of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the State of Massachusetts, by the late Convention, on the second day of its session, having been censured in the 44th number of the Banner of the Church, as detailed in the foregoing defence, I have been requested to state a fact within my own knowledge, which shows, that the question was not a new one, but had been settled, as far as the opinion of the Convention could settle it, in the manner stated by the Bishop of the Diocese.

Some eight or ten years ago, at a Convention held at St. Paul's Church, Boston, one of the members called for the reading of the constitution. I was at the time a member. I well recollect, that there appeared to me an apparent difference between our manner of proceeding, and the words of the constitution.

I had never known an instance of voting by orders, though I had often been a member of the Convention. One of the clergy

stated, that the construction of the constitution had been settled by practice ; that from the adoption of the constitution, voting by orders had not been deemed necessary, unless called for by some member present. To this there appeared to be a general assent. On this occasion no motion was made, and I presume no notice was taken of it on the record. I know not whether any member then present, except myself, recollects the discussion ; but I considered it as settled, that unless a vote by orders were called for by some member, the votes might be given in the usual way. JAMES C. MERRILL.

Although it is entirely unusual to insert the whole of any publication, to which it is thought necessary to reply, yet, in the present instance, it has been determined that the original 'Manifesto' should be given *verbatim*, in order that every reader, who desires it, may judge for himself, both as to the accuracy of the quotations, and the violence of the provocation.

[Extract from the 'Banner of the Church,' published June 30th, 1832.]

CONVENTION OF MASSACHUSETTS.

This Ecclesiastical body held its annual session, by appointment, on Wednesday, the 20th instant, in Christ Church, in the city of Boston. The Rt. Rev. Bishop GRISWOLD presided; and 26 Clergymen, and 39 lay delegates, representing 21 parishes, were present. The Rev. THOMAS W. COIT was re-elected Secretary, and, in his absence, on a journey for the recovery of his health, the Rev. WILLIAM CROSWELL was elected Secretary, and the Rev. WILLIAM T. POTTER Assistant Secretary, *pro tem*. Morning prayers, at the opening of the Convention, were read by the Rev. TITUS STRONG, Rector of St. James' Church, Greenfield, and the Convention Sermon preached by the Rev. GEORGE W. DOANE, Rector of Trinity Church, Boston, from Philipians i. 27; *Stand fast in one spirit, with one mind striving together for the faith of the Gospel*. The Convention, by a standing rule, declines to print any sermon delivered before it. At the request, however, of the members of the Convention, presented as individuals, the Sermon has been put to press.—The Rev. George C. V. Eastman was admitted to the order of Deacons, and the holy communion administered by the Bishop, assisted by the Rev. Mr. Strong.—There were also, during the session of the Convention, and by an unanimous vote, early morning prayers on Thursday, in Trinity Church, by the BISHOP; and on the same day the usual morning service at the opening of the Convention by the Rev. JAMES MORSS, D. D., Rector of St. Paul's Church, Newburyport; a sermon in Trinity Church, at 3, P. M., by appointment of the Bishop, by the Rev. SALMON WHEATON, Rector of Trinity Church, Newport, R. I., from St. Luke xi. 32; *The men of Nineveh shall rise up in the judgment with the men of this generation and condemn it, for they repented at the preaching of Jonas*; and a sermon in

St. Paul's Church at 7, P. M., also by appointment of the Bishop, by the Rev. TITUS STRONG, from Amos vi. 1; *Wo to them that are at ease in Zion.*

There was no extraordinary business transacted at the Convention, though some of the ordinary business, as will be seen below, was done in an extraordinary manner, and led to extraordinary results. Passing this over, which occupied the greater part of Thursday, the remaining business was the adoption of the new constitution, certain amendments to which were laid over for adoption at the next Convention; the appointment of the Rev. Daniel L. B. Goodwin and the Rev. William T. Potter, as preachers before the next Convention; and the nomination of the Rev. Dr. Eaton, the Rev. Mr. Doane, the Rev. Mr. Ballard, Dr. E. H. Robbins, and H. Codman, Esq., as Trustees of the General Seminary.—The next Convention is to be held in Trinity Church, Boston, on the third Wednesday in June next ensuing.

Standing Committee, the Rev. George W. Doane, the Rev. John S. Stone, the Rev. Theodore Edson, George Brinley, Esq., Henry Codman, Esq., Joseph Foster, Esq.—*Delegates to the General Convention*, the Rev. Theodore Edson, the Rev. John West, the Rev. John S. Stone, the Rev. Alfred L. Baury, Edward A. Newton, Esq., William A. Crocker, Esq., Solomon D. Townsend, M. D., Edward Tuckerman, Esq. The circumstances connected with these elections were so peculiar, so wholly unprecedented, and so ominous, as we think, of evil to the Church, that a detailed account is called for, as well to prevent misunderstanding as to enforce upon our brethren in other places, and those who may come after us, in these, a salutary admonition. We shall proceed to furnish it without fear or favor, speaking the truth, and endeavoring to speak it in love. If it be said that statements so particular and personal are of questionable propriety, we answer, that before the adoption of the measures which we feel called upon to discountenance, no consideration should have led us to such a course. The evil is now done. Representations of it, distorted and exaggerated, are of course abroad. There should be somewhere an authentic and unquestionable narrative. Such ours shall be. We shall state facts only; and only such as can be substantiated by legal evidence. It is a painful necessity that we feel is thus laid on us. We meet its requisitions not so much in self-defence, as for the benefit of others,—that *they* may be on their guard against the stratagems which we have been compelled to witness; that *they* may see that where injuries so sustained cannot be retrieved, a protest may at least be recorded. We should gladly have kept silence. It is pain and grief to us to speak. But the record of the elections will be supposed to carry with it the expression of the principles of the Church in Massachusetts. SUCH IS NOT THE TRUTH. We are concerned to make this contradiction, not more in justice to ourselves, than to obviate the influence of a contrary belief on the interests of the Church at large.

We must go back a little to make our MANIFESTO the more intelligible and the more complete. Previously to the Convention of which we write, whatever divisions in sentiment there may have existed among the Churchmen of Massachusetts, they were never made apparent in the Convention. There, the proceedings have been almost always in perfect harmony; or, if an honest difference of opinion were expressed, it bore no marks of a division on those great and permanent principles which indicate the existence of parties. In the Convention of 1831, for instance, several important measures were earnestly debated, but it was with the warmth of individual conviction, not of partisan devotion. There were different opinions maintained, but a single interest. The elections were, as in all former cases, harmonious: no division of tickets, no disagreement,

it is believed, as to a single individual. These were, for the *Standing Committee*, the Rev. Messrs. Doane, Potter, and Boyle, and Messrs. Brinley, Codman, and Clark; for the *delegation to the General Convention*, the Rev. Dr. Morss, the Rev. Messrs. Potter, Doane, and Parker, and Messrs. Newton, Robbins, Sargent, and Crocker. During the whole recess of the Convention, until within two months, nothing was heard of dissatisfaction or division. There appeared to be a perfect unity of interest in the prosecution of the affairs of the Church. The persons of whom we now complain were sedulous and constant in *public* declarations that we were all united,—that there was no party in the Church in Massachusetts. In the latter part of the month of April, the Standing Committee were to hold a regular quarterly meeting, at which an application of some importance was to be made,—the particulars of the case for simplicity's sake, we now omit, but are in perfect preparation, if called for, to defend it to the uttermost,—the result of which, interesting to several individuals, was to be determined by a reference to Canonical provisions. Previous to this meeting, great pains were taken to prejudge the case, and forestal the decision of the Committee; and it was more than intimated that if the leading thus suggested was not followed, the Standing Committee must be, in the dialect of the day, 'reformed.' They met, and decided the case, as they conscientiously believed, according to the Canons, and, as their unanimous resolution on record declares, in reference to the best interests of the Church. After this, it is well known that the menaces of 'reform' were repeated, and that great pains were taken, and in one instance at least, under the favorable circumstances of an Ecclesiastical visitation, to enlist clerical influence to carry it into effect. At the time of the Convention, there was among the clergy and laity more or less consultation as to the manner in which the vacancies in the two tickets (the Rev. Mr. Potter having removed, and Mr. Clark having died,) should be filled, and as to other changes necessary to be made for ensuring, in regard to the delegation to the General Convention, a full attendance. No caucus was held, and no plans were organized: but it was generally understood that the vacancies in the Standing Committee were to be filled with the names of the Rev. Mr. Coit, and Joseph Foster, Esq.; while, in the delegation to the General Convention, the Rev. Mr. Stone was to succeed the Rev. Mr. Potter, and the Rev. Mr. Parker give way to the Rev. Mr. Edson, who had before been in the representation:—the lay delegation to be, E. A. Newton, J. T. Apthorp, H. Codman, and J. W. Treadwell, Esqrs. For convenience' sake, some tickets were written, in accordance with this understanding, but there was no general concert, and no plan of efforts to ensure success;—simply because, being thought a good ticket, and made without reference to personal or party interest, it would go, it was supposed, of course, and perhaps unanimously. It was not until after the religious exercises at the opening of the Convention that any intimation to the contrary was heard. It was then stated to the present writer that a ticket was in circulation, from which, with the exception of a single layman, the former members of the Standing Committee were entirely excluded, and he was referred to the Rev. Mr. West, as one with whom any conference on the subject might be held. The Convention had just been exhorted earnestly, and in terms of which a very unanimous approbation was expressed, to stand fast in *one* spirit, and strive *together* with *one* mind for the faith of the Gospel; and in that spirit it was felt that the matter ought to be, and, it was believed, might be, adjusted. To the desire expressed to Mr. West, that all division of interest should be avoided, and but one ticket run, he with apparent cordiality assented; and after a conversation, which it is believed was as free and frank and friendly, on the one side, as it certainly was on the other, the parties separated, with a general agreement as to the

persons to be supported, and a promise on the part of Mr. West, that, if found possible, on consultation with his friends, but one ticket should be run. The Convention then adjourned for dinner, and the feeling on the writer's part, which he heartily expressed and encouraged in others, was, that the Convention would go on, as always before, in perfect harmony; and that, the fears of division and dissension being dispersed, the exhortation of the Apostle would be felt and followed by all. At the opening of the afternoon session, Mr. West was called on for the answer of his friends, and, to the astonishment of all who had heard of the former conversation, his reply was, that no agreement could be made, and that the ticket for the Standing Committee was the following: Rev. Messrs. Baur, Edson, and Stone, and Messrs. S. A. Parker, Codman, and Howard. The election then ensued, and resulted, without effort or intervention on the part of those who voted for the former Committee, as follows:

'The Rev. Mr. Strong, from the Committee, reported that the whole number of votes collected was 53; necessary to a choice, 27;—and the following gentlemen, having received more than that number, were returned as duly elected; From the Clergy, the Rev. George W. Doane; from the Laity, George Brinley, Esq., Henry Codman, Esq., Joseph Foster, Esq.

'The places of two of the Clerical members of the Standing Committee being still unsupplied, the Convention, on motion, proceeded to a second ballot, the same Committee as before acting as tellers, and the following gentlemen were returned as duly elected to supply those vacancies, viz. the Rev. John S. Stone, and the Rev. Theodore Edson.' *Journal*, p. 10.

The conference thus far alluded to, it will be seen, was entirely in reference to the Standing Committee. For the delegation to the General Convention, it was expressly stated to Mr. Newton, that no ticket in opposition to that formed by filling the vacancies in the old, and which, so far from being an exclusive ticket, contained three of the names returned as elected, would be run. But little confidence, of course, could be placed, after the recent experience in relation to the Standing Committee, in such a declaration. It was, however, too late to agree upon any course; and if it had not been, there was no disposition to attempt an organization, even on the ground of retaliation. The result of the election, which immediately ensued, appears from the *Journal*.

Thus was it seen, for the first time, that an organization on party principles existed in the Church of Massachusetts; that it contemplated nothing less than an entire proscription of those in whom former Conventions had, year after year, reposed their confidence; that it was concerted and carried into effect secretly, by all the aids and appliances which in political warfare are but tolerated; and that in accomplishing its purposes, neither the welfare of the Church, nor the rights of parishes and individuals, nor the proprieties of time, or place, or person, were to be at all regarded. Certain men, because they held certain principles, no matter how long their connection with the councils of the Church; no matter how identified the parishes which they represented with its existence; no matter how great the self-devotion and self-sacrifice of their past, nor the acknowledged value of their present services,—were to be proscribed. Certain men, because they did not hold certain principles, or held them lightly, and to the wind, no matter how recent their connection with the Church; no matter how unconscious of past services in her behalf, nor how incompetent of future, were to be elevated to her places of confidence and responsibility. Under whatever circumstances this might occur, it were bad enough. But if it were the fair expression of the Church in Massachusetts, if the people *would* have it so,—there were nothing to be done but to submit in patience. But when it appeared clearly to be the effect of concert and exertion, when clerical strength was brought into the

State within three weeks, and parishes were galvanised into a spasmodic vitality for this special purpose,—when it was seen and known, that the act of providence, or the consciousness of a good cause, or pressure of engagements, or, it must be added, culpable indifference, had prepared the way for an unquestionable and confessed minority, under drill, and with auxiliary influences from another State, to force men upon the Convention, whom the Convention did not approve, and to give to the world the appearance of a dynasty in its councils which does not, and which, we pray God, never may, exist;—when these things were so, it seemed that in no sense of duty to the truth, could silence be permitted; and that though submission to such a result might be matter of necessity, acquiescence in it were treason to the Church. Examining the matter under these convictions and with these views, and appealing to former records, and to the constitution of the Church in Massachusetts, it was ascertained, beyond the shadow of a doubt, that the proceedings of the Convention on the first day of its session, and, of course, the elections, were in contravention of the express provisions of the second and third articles of the Constitution; and it was determined on, as due to truth, to the Convention, to the Church every where, to declare, and, if possible, to establish the conviction. At the opening of the Convention, therefore, on the second day, the subject was proposed by one who was himself elected, and so, by that circumstance, as by the devotion of his whole fortune to the interests and service of the Church, and by the exemplification of her principles in his whole life, is raised above the shadow of selfish or unworthy imputation.

Edward A. Newton, Esq., rose and called the attention of the Convention to an examination of the unconstitutionality of the elections made by this body, yesterday;—Whereupon it was

Moved, by the Rev. Dr. Morss, that the elections for Standing Committee, and delegates to the General Convention, made by this Convention yesterday, being contrary to the provisions of the second and third articles of the Constitution, be hereby set aside, as null and void.

This motion gave rise to an animated and protracted debate, which continued till two o'clock, when a motion was made for an indefinite postponement of any farther consideration of the subject. *Journal*, p. 11.

Of the manner in which the resolution of Dr. Morss was opposed, and its consequences sought to be evaded, we will not speak. It will be sufficient in the sight of all candid men, that it was opposed at all. To shrink from the revisal of unconstitutional acts, to shrink from the expression of the sense of the Convention, whether they were, or were not, constitutional, to resort to every parliamentary device, to seek to apply to the proverbially informal proceedings of an ecclesiastical Convention, the strict rules of the highest judicial courts, and the specialities, the technicalities, the quibbling criticisms that perplex the lowest,—short of an explicit confession of it, we know no more conclusive admission than this, of wrong done, but to be sustained, because the doers of it have the power.—To have reversed the proceedings of the previous day, however just, might not have been desirable, and was not desired. Had it been desired, it could

* The constitutional provisions alluded to are these:

Art. II. The clergy and lay deputies in Convention shall deliberate in one body, but shall vote as two distinct orders; and the concurrence of both orders shall be necessary to give validity to every measure.

Art. III. Each congregation represented in Convention shall have one vote.*

The elections were unconstitutional, it was contended; *first*, because the clergy and laity did not vote as two distinct orders; *secondly*, because the lay delegation voted as individuals, and not by parishes. To the argument of usage, it was alleged in reply, that though it might explain or modify, it could not annul the letter of the Constitution.

easily have been done. Two thirds of the Clergy were in favor of it. The lay delegation from two parishes who would have voted with them, were within reach, and could have been brought in, to create an even lay vote, and so give the vote to the Clergy. But it was not attempted. All that was aimed at, was an expression of the Convention, condemnatory of the spirit and manner of the elections. It was conclusively afforded. All that we now purpose to add is the evidence of this expression, as contained in the several votes. In the morning, after much discussion of the subject, an attempt was made for an indefinite postponement of the Rev. Dr. Morss' motion, and the vote was taken under the consciousness that those who voted against it, were liable to the charge of protracting an irritating discussion, and that an attempt had been made, to fix upon them the responsibility of involving the whole proceedings of the Convention in the unconstitutionality alleged against the election, and thus dissolving its session. Yet the votes were, *for* the indefinite postponement,

The Rev. Messrs. Baury,	Edson,
Everett,	Fenner,
Goodwin,	Hopkins,
Stone,	E. Munro,
M. Munro,	Shaw.—10.

Against the indefinite postponement,

The Rev. Messrs. Ballard,	Blaisdale,
Blake,	Boyle,
Croswell,	Doane,
Eastman,	Eaton,
Jones,	Morss,
Potter,	Price,
Strong,	Wells.—14.

Now let it be noted, that, of the first named, the Rev. Mr. Everett in the afternoon voted both for the Rev. Dr. Morss' motion, and for Col. Apthorp's amendment,—that the Rev. Messrs. Goodwin* and Shaw repeatedly declared, in their places, their conviction that the proceedings were unconstitutional,—and that the Rev. Mr. Haskins,† who, at his own request, was excused from voting, made the same declaration;—and the Clerical votes will virtually stand *seven* for, and *eighteen* against, the indefinite postponement.

The votes of the laity on the same motion were as follows:

For the indefinite postponement,

St. Paul's Church, Boston.	{ Codman,
	{ Dunn,
	{ Davis,
Grace Church, Boston,	{ Howard,
	{ Dix,
St. Paul's Church, Dedham,	Metcalf.
St. Paul's Church, Hopkinton,	Walker.
St. Michael's Church, Marblehead,	Russel.—5.

* The case of the Rev. Mr. Goodwin was one indicating a sense of honor, or rather a tenderness of conscience, not often met with. Because at the time of the elections he thought them unconstitutional, and did not say so, he felt bound to sustain them.

† The Rev. Mr. Haskins, though a member of the Convention, also declined voting, from a very commendable delicacy, on the ground that he had been for some months temporarily absent in Rhode Island. We are sorry that *all* the delicacy should have been on one side.

Against the indefinite postponement,
Trinity Church, Boston,

Christ Church, Boston,

Christ Church, Cambridge.
St. Stephen's Church, Pittsfield,

Apthorp.
Bacon,
Wilson,
Ingraham.
Foster.
E. A. Newton.—4.

On the motion of Dr. Morss, and the amendment of Col. Apthorp, which was in the words following :

“Whereas, upon an examination of the Constitution of this Convention, it appears that the elections, made yesterday, of the Standing Committee, and delegates to the General Convention, to be held in New York, in October next, were irregular, the same are hereby declared null and void; and it is therefore voted to proceed to a new choice of a Standing Committee and delegates, for the purpose aforesaid, in a constitutional manner.”

—the votes were as follows :

For the resolution and amendment,

The Rev. Messrs. Ballard,

Blake,
Crosswell,
Eaton,
Jones,
Potter,
Strong,

Blaisdale,
Boyle,
Doane,
Everett,
Morss,
Price,
Wells.—11.

Against them,

The Rev. Messrs. Baury,
Fenner,
Hopkins,
M. Munro,

Edson,
Goodwin,
E. Munro,
Stone.—8.

—or, counting, as before, the votes of the Rev. Messrs. Goodwin and Haskins, where they properly belonged, in the affirmative, the *virtual* strength of the Clerical part of the house was divided, 16 *against*, and 7 *for*, the elections.

Of the Lay Delegation the votes were,

For the resolution and amendment,

Trinity Church, Boston,
Christ Church, Boston,
St. Stephen's Church, Pittsfield,

Apthorp.
Bacon,
Ingraham.
E. A. Newton.—3.

Against them,

St. Paul's Church, Boston.

Grace Church, Boston.
St. Paul's Church, Dedham.
St. Peter's Church, Salem.
St. Paul's Church, Hopkinton,

Codman,
Dunn,
Davis.
Howard,
Dix.
Metcalf.
Howard.
Walker.—5.

In other words, taking the whole house, the votes, reckoning the lay delegation, (as the constitution provides,) by parishes, the elections were declared unconstitutional by a vote, *virtually*, of 19 to 12, and, *actually*, of 17 to 13. Or, even taking the whole house by individual votes the ELECTIONS WERE STILL DECLARED UNCONSTITUTIONAL, BY A VOTE, VIRTU-

ALLY, OF TWENTY TO FIFTEEN, AND, ACTUALLY, OF EIGHTEEN TO SIXTEEN.*

We have no more to say. We have stated these things because they were true; and because, being true, they ought to be so known. We have confined ourselves to facts. We impugn no man's motives. A great wrong has been done, both to individuals, and the Church. Measures and modes of action have been introduced into her councils which should never have been known there. And the charge of party operations was advanced, even before the session had ended, against those who, as we have shown, acted throughout on general principles, and in the spirit of compromise. The statement thus made places the charge where it should lie. "*Our withers are unwrung.*"—We have now done with the subject. Perhaps forever. We had resolved never to be engaged in such a controversy. We were drawn into it by surprise. We shall not be surprised again. Could we have suffered without involving the interests of the Church, we should have suffered in silence. We could not; and we have deemed firmness of action and plainness of speech our bounden duty. We have done no more than Paul, who at Antioch withstood Peter to the face, *because he was to be blamed*. If there are any, to whom the truth is troublesome, we can only say, that for the past the blame is upon themselves, and advise them for the future to keep out of the way of it. There is nothing proper to be done that is not proper to be known. That which it was not proper to do, being done, should be made known, that it be not done again. *Every one that doeth evil hateth the light, lest his deeds should be reproved. But he that doeth truth cometh to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest that they are wrought in God.*

* The only evasion of this arithmetical argument, that we can imagine, will be found in the allegation, that some were absent on the second day, who would have sustained the elections. We reply, that it was still the Convention duly in session, and the Clerical members absent had no leave of absence. We answer farther, that others, who would have voted against the elections, were also absent; some of whom were present in the morning, and, had the slightest intimation been given, would have been present in the afternoon.—We make one more remark,—several of the contested elections were by a *majority of one vote!*

GAYLORD BROS. Inc.
Syracuse, N. Y.
Stockton, Calif

BX5918 .M4H7
Defence of the convention of the

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00020 5601