

which your correspondent has been most grievously misinformed. I do this most reluctantly, and after protest, which I make for two reasons.

FIRST.—The Master, to whom both Orders alike owe allegiance, was of "no reputation." If our way and work is righteous, we should be content to work without regard to praise or blame. Newspaper defence of attacks upon God's work is as undignified and useless as are newspaper attempts to build up one part of His work by villifying or destroying another. Whatever in *any* work is born of God's spirit, and wrought in accordance with His will, will abide. Whatever is not of God in any work, every true soul ought to rejoice to see destroyed.

SECOND.—Defence, to many minds, implies antagonism. Between these two Orders exists no antagonism, nor can, while the larger says to the smaller, as it has invariably done, "God bless you and God speed." Both Orders have one purpose and one Christ. One confines its efforts to the Church alone. Why should it not, and why should not all be glad to have it, if so it thinks it can best serve the Master's cause? The other works in *all* denominations, and why should it not, if so it believes it can win more to the love and service of our Lord?

In the two societies in question, the interdenominational Order defines its object as "the development of spiritual life and the stimulation of Christian activities." The distinctively Church Society makes its sole object "the spread of Christ's Kingdom among young women, and the strengthening of parish life." If Christ's Kingdom spreads among young women, and the young women grow in years and grace, it means the spread of His Kingdom among older women and among men and little children. It results really in an effort for "the development of spiritual life." Again, if parish life is what it ought to be, it is really a life full of "stimulation for Christian activities" along many blessed lines. Both societies wear the cross that, differing in shape, is alike to all, the symbol of Christ's suffering love and the mark of committal to service both "For His Sake" and "In His Name." The interdenominational society says in its Constitution: "We welcome to our membership whoever is in accord with the objects of our Order, viz., the development of spiritual life and the stimulation of Christian activities, and who holds herself responsible to the King, our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ," and from one of the addresses of the General Secretary of the Order, we quote the following: "Because we would intensify the highest motive and bring the soul face to face with God, because ours is a deeper, more spiritual obligation than could exist toward any Council or Committee or Society, we have said 'The King's Children must hold themselves responsible to the King.'" From the address, given in 1891, of the Rector most influential in the development of the Church Society, I quote: "A Daughter of our King possesses a power to know and do, limited by no finite bounds, a higher, a spiritual in its entirety, a perfect power because she derives it from the King and the King's power is perfect." And he adds: "It would, of course, be idle, in the light of such a definition as this, to arrogate to ourselves or to the members of our Order the exclusive right to the title—Daughter of the King." With points of likeness so many and so close—the same Christ, the same symbol of His suffering love, the same avowed purpose to build up His Kingdom, the same daily prayer, the same unceasing activity to win other souls to the light, and with the great point of difference the fact that one Society may include members not in the Church, is it not strange that one of these organizations should be extolled as "doing more good than all the other Church Societies," and the other said to be "based on a nebulous theory of Christianity, that is not in Church lines, and has eliminated everything of a Churchly character from its work." Now, if we are to understand by being in "Church lines," that the Circle or Chapter works in or for or with members of its own Church alone, excluding all others from membership, even then we can not be said to have "eliminated" these Churchly characteristics, because one can not eliminate an element that never was included. But, if by Church lines is meant a recognition that one's first outside duty is to one's own Church, and that one should not choose the world's work while there remains a field in its own Church; if it means allegiance, assistance, loyal following of Church leadership, then we have not only always been in Church lines, but we are there still, as the waiting testimony of many Rectors and Pastors will prove. We have not only taught loyalty to the Church, but in the very rare instances in which the Circles of our Order have written saying, "Our Rector desires us to abandon the interdenominational Order and come into the Church Order," we have invariably said, "Remember, one of our underlying principles is loyalty to your own Church. You have entered the service of your King. It matters little where you serve; only one thing is important, and that is *how you serve*." And here and there an individual or a little group has gone, and our love and blessing have gone with them. Not a

member of our Council, in public or private, by tongue or pen, has had any word but the loving "God bless you and God speed" for this sister Order. With this view of what Church lines are, much the larger half of our work has been done on Church lines, in a spirit of loyal allegiance, with prayer and study of the word of God, with our Consecration Service emphasized as *most* important in every Convention, with the blessed help and ministry of the clergy invited everywhere. Yet your correspondent, out of the pit into which some equally blind leader has plunged him, condemning *one* Order for the *same* aspirations, purposes, motives and practices which he *commends*, in the other, seems to have been equally misled as to the facts concerning both. The question of priority in organization is not, nor has it ever been felt to be, of importance by either Order. This is proven by the fact that the Church Society has not felt it necessary to give exact dates, nor the other Society to make any special effort to ascertain them, until urged to do so by women of the Anglican Church of Canada, on account of the attack in your journal. And we beg all our readers to understand that we do not *now* consider it of any more consequence than we have done heretofore. It is only worthy of mention in connection with the fact that your correspondent makes it the basis of the following extraordinary statement. He says: "The success of St. Andrew's Brotherhood led to the establishment of this society." The inquiry at the headquarters of St. Andrew's Brotherhood resulted in the statement that they did not know anything about the origin of the Society, but referred to the Woman's Missionary Society of the Church; and the same inquiry received there the same response. And furthermore, the official statement of the teacher of that little Sunday-school class of seven girls in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, New York, whose class name was "The Daughters of the King," says: "On Easter Eve, 1885, the thought was conceived that, several months later," (note she does not say how many months) "led to the organization of the present Order. Desirous of stimulating the members to greater activity, she called them together for the purpose of arousing their sympathy and interest." (Note no mention is made of St. Andrew's Brotherhood. The same official statement says: "This Sunday-school class grew in time" (it does not say how much time) "to 28 members, and the Rector of the Church, after a time" (it does not say how much time) "drew up a Constitution and a set of By-laws for this Chapter or Circle," and so may then be said to have started the Order of the Daughters of the King. Since this Rector did not come to this Church until 1888, the date which the present Rector gives as the date of the organization of the Order, viz; the latter part of 1888 or early in 1889," is unquestionably, and according to their own statement, the date of the organization of the Church Order. And as at this date there had already been in existence for more than three years the interdenominational Order, with a membership of at least 100,000 people, (the first official meeting of which was held January 13th, 1886, and the idea and plan of which was in the minds of its founders long before Easter Eve, 1885) our readers can easily judge as to the truth of the charge that the interdenominational Order founded itself upon the great popularity in the "American Church," and the "growing influence" of this or these Sunday-school classes that existed before 1888, under the class-name of "The Daughters of the King." Four years from Easter Eve, 1885, the Church Society, according to its official report, consisted of 13 Circles or Chapters. Supposing each one of them to have had a membership as large as that of the original and most prominent Circle, the Society had a membership of less than 400 persons; and yet your correspondent proceeds to say, that this little class which, born into a Society "some months after Easter Eve, 1885," and growing at the rate of three Circles a year for four years thereafter, had "become 'very popular' in the American Church" by January, 1886. Our readers can judge for themselves of the extent of the popularity. He adds: that this popularity led certain clever ladies, who observed its growing influence, to form a new Society." The fact is, that at this time there was no "growing influence" to observe, and no popularity, either in the American Church or out of it, to be envied. The "clever ladies" referred to were women past middle life, among whom were more Church women than there were members of any denomination; and so far as we can learn, no one of them had ever, at that time, even heard of the Church Society. Certainly no mention was ever, then or thereafter, made of it in any of their Council meetings. These statements would seem less remarkable if they were not prefaced by the announcement of your correspondent, that he had himself "been looking into" or investigating the Order. The character of the investigation can be judged by the results, and show us at once what reliance should be placed upon the accuracy of his further

conclusions. The so-called "new Society" owes its name to the oldest and most pronounced Church woman of the entire number of its original Circle. She was formerly a Canadian Church woman, an educator of the daughters of many of the Canadian clergy; certainly not one to be accused of any dishonorable "appropriation" of that which belonged to others. She told us, as we were discussing various names, of her own habit of sending out her graduates with a tender plea that they go forth as true "Daughters of the King;" and said the influence of this loving last word had been marked in the spiritual life of many precious girls. As the earnest desire that had brought this original Circle together was to intensify the religious life of its members, they were touched by these facts and prayerfully chose for themselves the name this noble Christian Church-woman offered. Yet your correspondent states "that the new Society appropriated for itself as much as possible of the name of the 'Church Society.'" We have seen that this little class, that at this time was sweetly working God's work, and patiently waiting His will, if it existed as a Society at all, which it does not claim, had made no progress to arouse emulation or envy. In the light of this fact, note the *motives* imputed to this company of Christian women, a majority of whom were members and zealous supporters of the writer's own communion. He proceeds to say that, "The New Society appropriated not only the name, thus availing itself of popularity and influence that were not in existence, but it appropriated also the trade marks of the original Society as well." Now, notwithstanding the difference in shape, the cross was the badge of both Societies. To both alike it was the symbol of Christ's blessed life and atoning death, and we doubt if it would be less shocking to one than to the other to find it claimed one of the "trade marks" of any organization. Again, lest these motives should not suffice to characterize these clever infringers upon the name and trade mark of his organization, he suggests that there might have entered into the choice of the name, the fact "that King's Daughters is a very attractive name among our democratic friends." Possibly, in the entire absence of facts, your correspondent may have thought it necessary to descend to an imputation like the above; but we have abundant evidence that the Society, in whose interest he wrote, would be the first to question if *this* method of doing it service was either churchly, courteous or Christian. Let it not be imagined from the comparison of 150,000 as five years' growth, with about 500 for the same time, that the interdenominational Order counted its large membership an advantage. One of its great regrets was that it grew so rapidly. No meeting was ever held to increase its membership; many of its leaders never invited any person to unite with it, because they felt that people should come to it inspired by the spirit of God and not by any outside influence. Its circulars, announcing its objects and purposes, neither urged nor invited. Many of its leaders deprecated its abnormally rapid growth. We emphasize its membership to show that no possible motive could have existed for it to hold an "adverse attitude" toward a smaller organization. Your writer proceeds to say that "Many are under the impression that 'The King's Daughters' is a popular and widespread Society in the Diocese of Huron." He refers to the last report of the Huron Lay Workers' Association, a pamphlet of 31 pages, giving an account of all the Guilds and Societies in the Diocese, and he says: "There is less than a single line given to the King's Daughters." But in that one line the report does say that "There are 24 Chapters or Circles in the Diocese," while it gives three Chapters of the Daughters of the King. In another half line it says: "The Society is doing good work, financially and spiritually." Your correspondent, we notice, does not quote the remarks of rectors, who, in the same report, recommend the King's Daughters in their own Churches, but he does quote the Chairman of the Dio. S. S. Committee who says: "He has had a great deal of experience in Church Societies of every kind, but had never met any that had done so much real good as the Daughters of the King," yet most of those Societies have been many years at work. If he is speaking, as we are led to suppose, of the Diocese of Huron, and it is true that the three Circles of the Daughters of the King have done in their brief life more real good than "any of the other Church Societies of every kind," we must, of course, accept the conclusion that there is work enough undone in that Diocese to require the combined efforts of these three Circles and as many more as can be created, and the added effort of the interdenominational Society as well. The Dominion Secretary of the Order in Canada, in her recent report, says: "These Circles, 23 or 24 in number, in 19 different towns, are working earnestly and harmoniously in the Church of England, Diocese of Huron, under their respective rectors. Among other things, they contribute \$100 a year toward the salary of the Lady Missionary at the Grand River Reservation,

Diocese and pas
iliary.
in the l
that "n
Church
ation, l
marks,"
only say
indicat
protest
dial; tl
other cc
first sta
lately t
ever be
agreem
been co
God's v
led us.
will, ar
strongly
and mis
explains
ize the
borderli
satisfac
the Ord
tives h
been de
insinua
your co
the cle
true, tl
Society
not exp
of King
tice wit
Dean c
a perio
self and
and ye
proper
never to
tering c
have to
on the
state of
the Ca
afford
done, n
out Can
no plea
see tl
velop
Church
never l
organiz
where
except
with t
grown
in its
scientific
done b
union
pathy,
ation tl
the bo
tion w
propor
The dc
buildin
big en
both ce

Th
SIR,
head i
Canadi
of mak
church
By an
demne
concur
ably tl
tends t
held on
less bu
faith,
Churcl
diction
to ever
womer
a posit
unique
church
womar
Churcl
sire to
tryme
such a
(1)