

tion of such a letter, even if their indulgence had not made such a document partial and partisan in its tone. A recent criticism of the letter by an earnest and estimable Anglican prelate, who however did not take the time to attend upon the sessions of the conference, or to listen to its discussions, has been so wisely met in some words written for quite a different purpose, in a communication which has recently come to me from the presiding officer of the late Conference, that I cannot refrain from quoting them here. It was my privilege, on behalf of my brethren of the American episcopate, and at their request, to address to the Archbishop of Canterbury a letter expressing our grateful sense of his manifold courtesies, and of the rare benignity, impartiality, and patience, with which he had presided over our deliberations. In his reply there occur these words:

"With a unanimity felt rather than expressed, the Bishops held that it was not the occasion to deal with received formulas, or with semi-political questions of constitution or jurisdiction (affecting only part of those present), or with matters of practice and observance which time harmonizes better than enactment.

"Eschewing such things, the Conference, treated of subjects the most vital to morals, to society, to the knowledge of God's revelation, to Church administration, and to our human future.

"And while those who were present said how they learnt far more from contact with other leaders of Christian thought and work than could be formulated or expressed, and that they were left with matter enough for reflection and for trial, the conclusions which they arrived at, and still more the observation and even experiment they have suggested with a view to future deliberation will, we are persuaded contribute much to the progress of the next ten years."

But whatever may be thought of the more formal utterances of the Conference, the reports, submitted by its committees and now communicated to the Church, mark I think it must be owned, a very memorable advance in the quality of courageous and timely utterance upon anything which thus far has come from the Anglican Episcopate. As an illustration of this, I invite your attention to the report on "Authoritative Standards of Doctrine and Worship," together with the admirable recommendations with which it concludes, which, after expressing "the opinion that the time has come when an effort should be made to compose a manual for teachers, which should contain a summary of the doctrine of the Church as generally received among us," goes on to suggest that "such a manual would draw its statements of doctrine from authoritative documents already existing, but would exhibit them in a completer and more systematic form. It would also naturally include some explanations of the Services and Ceremonies of the Church, and the whole might be preceded by an historical sketch of the position and claims of our Communion." "Such a manual," concludes the report, while "we do not suggest that the conference should be asked to undertake its preparations, or that it should be regarded as an authoritative standard of the Church, would we believe, be of great service in maintaining the type of doctrine to which the Church is a witness, and in helping members of other Churches to form a just opinion of our doctrine and worship. We suggest that his Grace, the President, be requested to nominate three or more Bishops to undertake such a work, and if it seems good to him and to the other Archbishops, Metropolitans and presiding bishops of the Church, that they give this work, when completed, the sanction of their *imprimatur*."

If the late Lambeth Conference had initiated nothing more than this, I, for one, should feel that it had not assembled in vain. If there is

one thing from which we need to be delivered it is the endless and distracting individualism of manuals of instruction, and if our fathers in God can give us something on the lines suggested in the report, they will render, I venture to think, the most substantial service to the more definite and systematic teaching of doctrine and of the principles of Christian worship, which has been rendered to the Church in our generation.

Within these limits, I may not venture to review the several reports submitted to the Lambeth Conference, but before I leave the subject I may be permitted to call your attention to the most impressive and outspoken report on Purity,—a model of fearless and timely teaching, and emanating, I believe it is telling no secret to state, from the hand of the learned Bishop of Durham (Dr. Lightfoot) and to the remarkable paper on Socialism which has already been pronounced by very high authority the most able, fearless and significant paper of the kind which has yet appeared. For myself, I can only say, in conclusion, that taken as a whole the tone and utterance of the Conference were a delightful and inspiring surprise. It disclosed a rare recognition of great opportunities, and a temper not indifferent to their wise and courageous improvement. May God deepen in all of us a kindred spirit!

SOCIAL MORALITY.

This duty brings us into conflict with social immorality. It is true that morality and immorality are as much personal as religion or irreligion, or faith and unbelief. That does not alter our responsibility for sins which are aggravated, and sometimes may be said to subsist, by their aggravation. Vices are not organized except in states of society demonically corrupt. But they are always gregarious; and in these very communities where we live they have sunk to that depth of mad and infamous depravity where they are propagated and made at once attractive and destructive by social combinations. They publish themselves, by signs more or less intelligible, in a subservient and mercenary if not salacious newspaper press, in buildings, in streets, in conspicuous and soliciting entertainments. They come in contact with legislation. What do I say? Legislation itself is bought up, enslaved, prostituted, by them. Unless the recognized organs of public information are grossly untrue, there are senators and assembly men who bend in abject slavery to their dictation, or are enslaved by their blandishments. Votes are sold, rulers are made merchandise, elections are made mockeries, the honest rich are robbed and the honest poor are pauperized by them. They tax, tempt, torment, every class of the people. Intemperance, and licentiousness are not single iniquities; they live in broods; they herd together; go delirious by the herding. They spread by ingenious inventions, they advertise their poisons and seductions, they carry on a traffic, they are better known in these cities, and in the villages too, than libraries or museums, or houses of mercy. Their resorts cost more money, they are better supported, in some places they are more frequented, and they are more constantly open, than the churches. Family-life is polluted at the fountain. It is strangled in the womb. It is murdered by science, by art, by vanity, and alarm, and indolence, and parsimony, and lust. Domestic safety and honor are imperilled by the commercial custom which separates thousands of young men, married and unmarried from any home the greater part of their time, exposing them to innumerable mischiefs with their own and the other sex. It is a terrible tariff on pictures and printing that the purest eyes of

men and women, of our own sons and daughters, can not escape the sight of what is defiled and defiling. Not one interest of human welfare in either world is left without injury, even to misery if not destruction, by a public sale of alcoholic drinks. In effect, the saloon in this country is an institution. In its practical alliance with seduction it is doubtless the most malific power organized and tolerated in any country where Christianity is the religion of the people—an institution with an immeasurable scale and with persistent energy, gives what is lowest and baseliest in human nature a command over what is right and good in it. Worse than all, this malignant despotism lays its savage hand on the Ark of God. Are there no communicants at our altars, no women sworn to be daughters of God, who are bound by an unwritten but actual bondage, to Prince of this world? Do we need to be told that there are men who go out of the church door to follow a business where, as they privately confess, honesty would be ruin, and truth impossible, who have agents to collect their rents for houses of debauchery, who build fortunes on falsehoods, and are afraid to do right, and twist or hide or disown their consciences lest they should offend a customer or disappoint their party, or by missing a bargain part with their money?

Here we are, a body of Churchmen, officers and members of a kingdom which has no reason or function except as Christ Jesus set it up to save mankind, body and soul. Will it do for us to meet and part, and to go through the routine of yearly parochial performance at home, pretending that we do not know these things, shutting our senses or stealing our consciences towards them, saying what Cain said to his Maker, infidel to the truth that men are brothers, and thereby infidel, as says St. John, to the other truth that God is our Father?

Every effort to separate either the practice or morality of the science of morals from the religion revealed in Christ has failed. There have been virtuous heathen and non-Christian ethics, but history, psychology, and in large part intuition, stand with the Bible in immovable contradiction to any scheme for making good men without God, or the human race right and true and clean without the new creation in the Second Adam, the Incarnation with its perpetuated power. This makes our way plain. Only by an utter abnegation of our baptismal and ordination promises can we hold ourselves aloof from an open strife with that impious trinity—the world, the flesh and the devil—which in all the nine cities of this diocese celebrates its filthy feast every day in the year. Indifference will be disloyalty. An apology that we are pre-occupied with other things, will not answer because those things are less than this thing. I go farther. Here again it is our privilege to march, in many instances and many ways, with those Christians whose names are not on our army-roll. There will always be a question how to run the line between compromise and honorable co-operation, for common sense to settle. There will be difficulties; they are there to be overcome. For one, I am willing to fight, in an invasion of the King's country from the empire of darkness, alongside of volunteers, so long as they do not fire on the regulars, till the war is over, referring the matter of commission and constitution to another field. I think it deserves a fair inquiry with us whether the Church is vigilant enough, active enough, fearless enough, in a public contest with public vice.—From *Convention Address of Bishop Huntington*

WE WANT a Correspondent and Agent in every Deanery, and in the large cities. It is suggested to us that the Clergy should choose such an one.

WE WANT 10,000 Subscribers; who will help in securing them?