

saw that if he did sign it he would compromise his position as an Episcopal clergyman in the eyes of his fellow clergymen and the better informed members of his flock. He was in a dilemma; but he saw a way of getting out of it through "a little Baptist minister" who had recently taken up his abode in the place. None of the other ministers as yet had called upon this brother, except Mr. Talbot himself, and therefore he did not feel very well disposed towards them, and the Episcopal clergyman "took refuge behind his little Baptist minister" in this way. He represented that it was scarcely fair to expect a brother who had so recently joined them, and one too whose ways and doctrines were so diverse from all the rest to bind himself so closely to a uniformity of belief and practice. He did not see how he could be asked to sign such a document and he thought that the least they might do would be to give him some time to consider so momentous a question and the probable effect it might have upon him and the "important doctrines" which he represented. In deep gratitude up jumped the Baptist minister and declared that, as had been so well represented by "brother Talbot," he could not sign any such document as that introduced amongst them. Then one of the Methodist ministers said that he "quite agreed with the brethren who had already spoken and that it would be unfair to expect their Baptist brother to sign such a document as that produced, and indeed, when he thought of it, he did not see very well how he himself could sign it and for that matter he scarcely thought that *even brother Talbot could sign it.* Oh! happy thought and deep design! How the "dissenting brethren" were made to extricate the man of the ancient Church from the horns of a dilemma!

This ready tact, accompanied with the best and kindest humor, has gone with Dr. Talbot in his episcopal work and the American Missionary bishop, as represented by him, is one to command respect not only for his high and noble work, but for his original and successful methods of carrying it out.

THE AMERICAN CHURCH CONGRESS.

The twelfth annual meeting of the Church Congress in the United States opened in Buffalo, Diocese of Western New York, on Tuesday, Nov. 20th, under the presidency of the Rt. Rev. Dr. Coxe, Bishop of the Diocese, and closed on Friday afternoon, Nov. 23rd.

The unwearied Secretary, Rev. Dr. Wildes, was present, and directed the movements of the Congress. The subjects discussed were the following:—

1. "The Present Value of Patristic Studies."
2. "Colleges and Universities in their Relation to the Church."
3. "The Question of Race in this Country."
4. "Sunday Schools."
5. "The Limits of Discussion in the Church."

6. "What Principle should Govern Church Extension in our Country in Fields Already Occupied by Others?"

7. "Devotional Reading."

These questions were well and freely discussed by a number of eminent divines and laymen of the United States, assisted by some clergymen from our own country. Those from Canada were Rev. Canon Du Moulin and Rev. Professor Clark, of Toronto, and Rev. Dr. Mockridge and Rev. H. Carmichael, of Hamilton.

The questions, on which there seemed to be the widest differences of opinion, were (1) The limits of discussion in the Church, and (2) the principles that should govern Church extension in fields already occupied by others. The former of these two questions evidently had some reference to the powers of the Church Congress itself and to what extent, if any, limitations should be placed upon the subjects discussed, and this, no doubt, sprang out of the objections so decidedly taken to the discussion of the historic episcopate and other kindred questions at the Congress held last year at Louisville, Kentucky. The opinion seemed to prevail that if a Congress is to possess any value whatever the freest and fullest liberty should be allowed in the discussion of all kinds of subjects in any way affecting the church. This seems to be the custom followed in England where, at the late congress, for instance, expression was given to views and doctrines by no means in harmony with the usual tenets of the Church. Evils no doubt exist on both sides, but the life and energy of congresses must go forever if milk and water subjects only can be chosen and if speakers are selected on the sole principle of moderation. Let men of widely different views come together and let them discuss vital and burning questions and the Church Congress will be attractive and, as we think, useful. If it cannot be this it had better not exist at all.

The question as to occupying ground already in possession of others brought out some widely different views, and on the whole produced perhaps the most lively discussion of the Congress. It is very evident that in the American Church there are men of widely different views and trend of mind, and these views were represented at the Congress. Some held that in a village already overburdened with sects and "churches" further trouble should not be made by the introduction of still another. Others held that the Church did not go as a sect but as a true branch of an ancient Church having within itself the element which ought to produce union instead of disintegration among the various denominations and sects. Possessing in her historic position a *raison d'être*, which the ordinary Protestant sect does not possess, she had a right to push her missionary operations in all directions no matter what form of Christianity, by doing so, she may have to encounter.

These were the two positions taken. Bishop Talbot, of the missionary jurisdiction of Idaho and