

DUKE
UNIVERSITY



LIBRARY



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2013

PROCEEDINGS

11

OF THE

CONFERENCE OF FRIENDS

OF AMERICA,

Friends, Society of. Five years meeting.
HELD IN INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA,

1892.

PUBLISHED BY DIRECTION OF THE CONFERENCE.

RICHMOND, IND.
NICHOLSON MFG. CO., PUBLISHERS AND BINDERS,
1892.

PRESSES OF M. CULLATON & CO.,
RICHMOND, IND.

Sch. R,
289.6
F911

AM

1892

MINUTES
OF
FRIENDS' CONFERENCE

HELD IN INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA,

1892.

The following proposition for a Conference of Friends in America, to be held in 1892, was issued from Oskaloosa, Iowa, in 1891, by associated committees of several yearly meetings, viz:

REPORT OF THE ASSOCIATED COMMITTEES OF THE YEARLY MEETINGS ON THE SUBJECT OF A CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN YEARLY MEETINGS.

At a meeting of delegates from committees of the yearly meetings appointed to consider and report upon the subject of organizing a conference of yearly meetings of Friends in America, held in Oskaloosa, Iowa, on the eighth of Ninth Month, 1891, John F. Hanson, of Iowa Yearly Meeting, was chosen chairman, and Mahalah Jay, of Indiana Yearly Meeting, secretary.

From information before the meeting it was found that seven yearly meetings had appointed committees to confer on this subject, viz: New York, Baltimore, North Carolina, Indiana, Western, Iowa, and Kansas. Four of these committees were represented by delegates present, and three, those of New York, Baltimore and North Carolina, had considered the subject at home and written

391499

their views upon it, with more or less fullness, to the chairman of the Iowa committee, to present to the delegates who should meet at this time. The delegates met from time to time on their own adjournments till their deliberations were completed ; and after invoking the Divine blessing and guidance in their counsels, and weighing carefully the views of those represented by letter, the following report to the yearly meetings appointing them was united in :

REPORT.

We believe a conference of yearly meetings of American Friends to consider questions which relate to the interests and growth of our branch of the church and the maintenance of its testimonies, and to give advice thereupon, would strengthen the bonds of fellowship and promote unity in important matters.

We therefore propose, that, provided six yearly meetings, or a smaller number of yearly meetings, containing, in the aggregate, two-thirds of the membership of Friends in America, unite in the concern, such a conference be held every five years ; that the first one be held in the year 1892, after all the yearly meetings shall have had this proposition before them ; that the place where it shall be held and the exact time of its meeting be left to the arrangement of the following committee composed of one member from each of the committees appointed to confer on this subject, viz: Augustus Taber, James Carey Thomas, Joseph Potts, Timothy Nicholson, William L. Pyle, W. Jasper Hadley, and Edmund Stanley, of which committee Timothy Nicholson shall be chairman.

We further propose that said conference be constituted on the following basis, viz :

First.—Each yearly meeting shall be entitled to five delegates at large, and to one additional delegate for every one thousand members or fraction thereof exceeding five hundred ; and, in taking the final sense of the conference on any proposition before it, which it is intended to advise the yearly meetings to adopt, the delegates present from each yearly meeting shall be authorized to cast the entire number of voices which that yearly meeting is entitled to. In case the delegates present from any yearly meeting are divided in judgment on the subject, the absent delegates shall be named in the same ratio.

Second.—Two-thirds of all the delegates in attendance, being representatives of a majority of the yearly meetings belonging to the conference, shall be necessary to constitute a quorum for the transaction of business other than adjournment.

Third.—The expenses of the proceedings of the conference shall be borne by the yearly meetings in such ratio as the conference may itself decide.

Fourth.—This proposition may be accepted by any yearly meeting at any time prior to the date proposed for holding the conference.

Oskaloosa, Iowa, 9th mo. 10th, 1891.

JOHN F. HANSON, *Chairman*.

MAHALAH JAY, *Secretary*.

Ten of the Yearly Meetings of America having approved of the plan in its general features, and appointed delegates, (Baltimore instructing its delegates to refrain from the decision of questions by votes,) the Committee on Time and Place selected the 18th of Tenth Month, 1892, as the proper time, and Indianapolis, Indiana, as the place for holding the Conference.

391499

MINUTES.

At a Conference of delegates from ten Yearly Meetings of the Society of Friends in America, held at Indianapolis, in the State of Indiana, commencing Third-day, 18th of Tenth Month, 1892 :

From the minutes of the several Yearly Meetings, it appeared that the following delegates had been appointed by them, viz :

New England.—Augustine Jones (a), William P. Pinkham, J. Warren Hawkes, Harriette D. Collins, Ruth S. Murray (a).

New York.—James Wood, Augustus Taber, Anna F. Taber, Ann M. Haines, Albert K. Smiley (a).

Baltimore.—Francis T. King (d), James Carey Thomas, John Nicholson, Richard H. Thomas, Jane E. White, Anna B. Thomas.

North Carolina.—L. L. Hobbs, Mary M. Hobbs, Mary W. C. Woody, Josiah Nicholson, Elizabeth W. Nicholson, Joseph Potts, Albert Peelle, Abigail N. Mendenhall, Mary E. Cartland, Hugh W. Dixon (a).

Ohio.—David B. Updegraff, J. Walter Malone, Emma B. Malone, Jacob Baker, Henry Johnson, Judith C. Johnson, William J. Harrison (a), Sarah Healy (a), David J. Lewis (a), William Nicholson.

Indiana.—Allen Jay, Mahalah Jay, Timothy Nicholson, Joseph J. Mills, Anna M. Votaw, Rhoda M. Hare,

a. Absent from sickness or other cause.

d. Deceased.

Elwood Scott, Joseph O. Binford, Mary H. Goddard (a), Stephen Scott (a), Luke Woodard, Emma Hedges, Robert W. Douglas, Martha A. Taylor (a), Francis W. Thomas, Mahlon Harvey, S. Adelbert Wood, Mary E. Baldwin, Irena S. Beard (a), Thomas N. White, Leroy S. Clemens (a), Esther Pugh, Micajah M. Binford.

Western.—Barnabas C. Hobbs (d), David Hadley, Drusilla Wilson, William L. Pyle, Thomas C. Brown, Dinah T. Henderson, Samuel Trueblood, Seth Mills, Andrew F. Mitchell, Lucinda M. Edwards (a), Martha J. Binford, Sylvester Newlin, Phebe A. Cox, William Furnas, Calvin W. Pritchard, Jesse Mills, Mary Emily Ellis, Lydia A. Perisho, Stephen Breed, Enos Kendall.

Iowa.—Charles E. Tebbetts, Elias Jessup, John F. Hanson, Absalom Rosenberger, Isom P. Wooton, Lydia Maria Deane, Abbie G. Mendenhall (a), Matilda W. Atkinson, William L. Pearson, Emma F. Coffin, Truman C. Kenworthy, Mary T. Thomas, Levi Gregory (a), Mary M. Parker (a), Lawrie Tatum, Abigail M. Fry, John Henry Douglas.

Kansas.—Lydia M. Hinshaw, John M. Weeks (a), Jonathan Osborn (a), Caleb Johnson, Penelope Gardner, Edmund Stanley, Jesse W. Wilmore (a), Ellen M. Craven (a), Miriam A. Maxwell, Josiah Binford, James Pitts, Rebecca T. Ballard (a), Oliver C. Macy (a), Simon Stout (a), William Nicholson.

Wilmington.—Charles F. Chapman, Esther G. Frame, Isaac M. Barrett (a), Elizabeth Larkin, James H. Terrell, Levi Mills (a), Ruth W. Mills, Amy Fulghum, Josephus Hoskins, Aaron B. Nordyke (a).

a. Absent from sickness or other cause.

d. Deceased.

The following named Friends were also present, with the proper credentials appointing them by their respective Meetings as alternates to fill vacancies, viz.:

New England.—Olney T. Meader and Deborah P. Atherton.

Baltimore.—Samuel R. Neave.

Kansas.—Sarah H. Morgan, Naomi Hadley, Hannah E. Sleeper, Francis A. Wright, Washington Hadley, Lindley M. Jackson.

Wilmington.—Nathan T. Frame, W. F. Bangham, Edward Walton.

The Conference was called to order by Timothy Nicholson, chairman of the associated committees of the Yearly Meetings, and at his suggestion James Wood, of New York, was chosen temporary president, and Mahalah Jay, of Indiana, temporary secretary of the Conference.

After reading a portion of the twenty-sixth chapter of Isaiah, and a season of prayer, praise, and exhortation, the roll of delegates was called, and ninety answered to their names. Ninety-three delegates and twelve duly accredited alternates were present at this and subsequent sessions. From New England, five; New York, four; Baltimore, six; North Carolina, nine; Ohio, seven; Indiana, eighteen; Western, eighteen; Iowa, fourteen; Kansas, fourteen; Wilmington, ten.

The committee on the Time and Place of holding the Conference, appointed by the associated committees at Oskaloosa, Iowa, reported that they had engaged the services of Anna Taylor as stenographer and S. Edgar Nicholson as reporter for the press. These appointments were approved by the Conference. The stenographer is to keep an accurate record of the proceedings of the

Conference, the same to be the exclusive property of the Conference, and subject to its disposal.

They also reported that, acting under the advice of a number of the delegates, they had arranged the following program for the first two sessions of the Conference, viz :

FIRST SESSION, THIRD-DAY EVENING, 18TH OF TENTH MO.

1. Scripture reading by the Chairman, followed by a season of prayer.
2. Reading the minutes of the Yearly Meetings and calling the names of the delegates.
3. Appointing a committee on Permanent Organization, to consist of one from each Yearly Meeting, to be named by its delegation.
4. The naming, in the same manner, of one from each delegation to form an Executive or Business Committee, to consider and formulate propositions to be presented to the Conference for its deliberation; to report methods of business and rules of proceeding; to appoint a sub-committee of its members, to which subjects for consideration may be presented by the delegates; and to discharge such other service as may be required of it by the Conference.
5. An address upon "The Society of Friends," by James Wood, of New York.

Adjournment.

SECOND SESSION, FOURTH-DAY MORNING, 19TH OF TENTH MO.

1. Devotional Exercises.
2. Report of committee on Permanent Organization.
3. Officers appointed to take their respective places.
4. Other miscellaneous business.

5. A paper by Seth Mills, of Western Yearly Meeting, upon "Our Denominational Literature, including our Church Periodicals."

6. Discussion of the topics presented.

Adjournment.

The action of the committee was approved, and the program for the first two sessions adopted.

The following delegates were appointed to constitute the committee on Permanent Organization: Olney T. Meader, of New England; Ann M. Haines, of New York; John Nicholson, of Baltimore; Josiah Nicholson, of North Carolina; Jacob Baker, of Ohio; Robert W. Douglas, of Indiana; David Hadley, of Western; Lawrie Tatum, of Iowa; Washington Hadley, of Kansas; Ruth W. Mills, of Wilmington.

The appointments on the Business Committee were as follows: J. Warren Hawkes, of New England; James Wood, of New York; James Carey Thomas, of Baltimore; L. L. Hobbs, of North Carolina; David B. Updegraff, of Ohio; Allen Jay, of Indiana; Calvin W. Pritchard, of Western; John F. Hanson, of Iowa; Sarah H. Morgan, of Kansas; James H. Terrell, of Wilmington.

The Conference was then addressed by James Wood, of New York, on the subject, "The Society of Friends and the Maintenance of its Doctrines," Joseph J. Mills, of Indiana, occupying the chair at the time. [Appendix A.]

Adjourned to 9 o'clock, Fourth-day morning.

FOURTH-DAY MORNING, 19TH OF TENTH MO.

After a season of prayer Robert W. Douglas, on behalf of the committee on Organization, presented the following report:

The committee on Nomination of Permanent Officers of the Conference conferred together, and were unanimous in presenting the following names, viz :

For President, Joseph J. Mills, of Indiana.

Vice President, Thomas C. Brown, of Western.

Secretaries, Augustus Taber, of New York, Emma B. Malone, of Ohio.

Treasurer, Lawrie Tatum, of Iowa.

On behalf of the committee.

ROBERT W. DOUGLAS.

The report was accepted, and pursuant thereto the delegates named were unanimously appointed by the Conference to the positions therein specified.

The President, on taking the chair, referred to the great responsibility resting upon the delegates in the discussion of important church questions, and asked for the united prayers of all that Jesus Christ be the real Head of the Assembly.

The report of the committee on Business was presented by L. L. Hobbs, of North Carolina.

After some amendments it was approved, and the Rules of Procedure therein contained adopted by the Conference.

As amended, they were as follows:

RULES OF PROCEDURE.

1. Four sessions of the Conference shall be held each day, viz :

Devotional meeting from 8:30 to 9:15 A. M.

Business session from 9:30 to 12 M.

Business session from 2:30 to 4:30 P. M.

Business session from 7:00 to 9 P. M.

2. The decisions of the Conference shall be made by the ordinary methods in use among Friends, unless there shall be a call for a vote by any one of the delegations.

3. Each delegate, upon rising to speak, shall be recognized by the President, and the name of the speaker and the Yearly Meeting of which he or she is a member shall be distinctly announced.

4. No speaker shall occupy more than fifteen minutes in his address, without consent of the President, nor shall he speak a second time without permission, and the second address shall be limited to five minutes.

It was further recommended that, as a part of the business this morning, Calvin W. Pritchard, of Western Yearly Meeting, be permitted to present an address from a committee of Chicago Friends, on the subject of the proposed Congress of Religions.

The program for the afternoon to include a paper by James Wood, on "Meetings for Worship and the Maintenance of the Ministry," followed by discussion.

The courtesies of the Conference were extended to Henry Hartshorne, of Philadelphia, and to others now in attendance, but without the privilege of participation in the discussion or decision of the questions under consideration.

A proposition that a Synopsis of the Conclusions of the Conference be prepared, was referred to the committee on Business.

A communication, presented by Calvin W. Pritchard, relative to a proposed participation, on the part of Friends, in the Congress of Religions, to be held in Chicago in 1893, was read. [Appendix B.]

The subject was referred to a committee to be appointed by the President at the opening of the afternoon session.

A paper on "Our Denominational Literature, including our Church Periodicals," was read by Seth Mills, of Western, and was followed by a general discussion of the topics suggested. [Appendix C.]

James Wood, of New York; Esther G. Frame, of Wilmington; Timothy Nicholson, of Indiana; James Carey Thomas, of Baltimore; Luke Woodard, of Indiana; Edmund Stanley, of Kansas; Elias Jessup, of Iowa; Isom P. Wooton, of Iowa, and others, spoke upon the subject.

Allen Jay, of Indiana, chairman of the Business Committee, proposed that the subject of the establishment of a Friends' Publishing House be referred to a committee to be selected by the delegates, to consist of two members from each delegation, which was approved.

It was the conclusion of the Conference that all papers for its consideration should be presented through the agency of the Business Committee.

Adjourned to 2 P. M.

AFTERNOON.

The session opened with prayer and singing.

The Business Committee recommended that after the reading of the paper by James Wood, a paper prepared by Joseph Potts, of North Carolina, should be presented to the Conference.

The following nominations were announced by the President, viz :

For the committee in relation to the proposed Congress of Religions : Thomas C. Brown, of Western Yearly Meeting; Esther Pugh, of Indiana; Edmund Stanley, of Kansas; Samuel R. Neave, of Baltimore; Harriette D. Collins, of New England; Mary C. Woody, of North

Carolina: Elizabeth Larkin, of Wilmington; Jacob Baker, of Ohio; Elias Jessup, of Iowa; James Wood, of New York.

For the committee on the Establishment of a Publishing House for Friends: Seth Mills, Dinah T. Henderson, of Western Yearly Meeting; Elwood Scott, Mahalah Jay, of Indiana; Francis A. Wright, Miriam A. Maxwell, of Kansas; Richard H. Thomas, Anna B. Thomas, of Baltimore; James Wood, Ann M. Haines, of New York; William P. Pinkham, Deborah P. Atherton, of New England; Joseph Potts, Mary M. Hobbs, of North Carolina; Esther G. Frame, Chas. F. Chapman, of Wilmington; J. Walter Malone, Judith C. Johnson, of Ohio; Truman C. Kenworthy, Emma F. Coffin, of Iowa.

A paper on "Meetings for Worship, and the Maintenance of the Ministry," was read by James Wood, of New York. [Appendix D.]

This was followed by an address by Joseph Potts, of North Carolina, on "The Ministry, Considered under Three Heads: the Demand, the Supply, and the Connecting Link." [Appendix E.]

William Nicholson, of Kansas, called the attention of the Conference to the subject, especially in its connection with the pastoral question as it is now presented before us. [Appendix F.]

Allen Jay proposed that a committee of five be appointed by the President to prepare the Conclusions of the Conference, and to report at the closing session, which was approved.

Adjourned to 7:00 P.M.

EVENING.

After singing the hymn, "All Hail the Power of Jesus' Name," and engaging in prayer for guidance and

help in its deliberations, the Conference entered upon the business before it.

The following nominations were announced by the President to constitute the committee to formulate the Conclusions of the Conference: Thomas C. Brown, of Western Yearly Meeting; Timothy Nicholson, of Indiana; Mary C. Woody, of North Carolina; Richard H. Thomas, of Baltimore; Isom P. Wooton, of Iowa.

In accordance with the recommendation of the Business Committee, William L. Pearson, of Iowa, presented a paper upon "Church Government in relation to the Pastoral Question." [Appendix G.]

This was followed by a renewed discussion of the question, "The Conduct of Meetings for Worship and the Maintenance of the Ministry." It was opened by Richard H. Thomas, of Baltimore, and continued by short addresses from L. L. Hobbs, of North Carolina; Nathan T. Frame, of Wilmington; James Carey Thomas, of Baltimore; Isom P. Wooton, of Iowa; Francis W. Thomas, of Indiana; Mary M. Hobbs, of North Carolina; Anna B. Thomas, of Baltimore; J. Walter Malone, of Ohio; David B. Updegraff, of Ohio; John F. Hanson, of Iowa; James Wood, of New York; William L. Pearson, of Iowa; Robert W. Douglas, of Indiana; Allen Jay, of Indiana; Luke Woodard, of Indiana; Thomas C. Brown, of Western; Elwood Scott, of Indiana; M. M. Binford, of Indiana; Edmund Stanley, of Kansas; Elizabeth Larkin, of Wilmington; and others.

The question was then referred back to the Business Committee for such action as should seem to them expedient.

Adjourned to 9:30 to-morrow morning.

FIFTH-DAY MORNING, 20TH OF TENTH MO.

The session was opened by singing "Precious Promise God hath Given," followed by vocal prayer.

In the absence of the President, Joseph J. Mills, the Vice President, Thomas C. Brown, took the chair. Augustus Taber, one of the Secretaries, was also absent on account of illness.

The Business Committee proposed that the Conference should close at the end of the morning session on Seventh-day, which was approved.

They also proposed the following subjects for discussion :

1. An expression of the Conference on the subject of Pastoral Care.
2. A communication from Western Yearly Meeting in relation to our Historical Records.
3. Uniformity of Discipline for all the Yearly Meetings of America, to be introduced by Francis W. Thomas.
4. A Foreign Mission Board for all the American Yearly Meetings.
5. The duty of the church towards our cities.

The following minute prepared by the Business Committee, was read :

STATEMENT ON THE MINISTRY AND PASTORAL QUESTION.

This Conference desires to urge upon Friends everywhere the importance of the diligent exercise of the various spiritual gifts bestowed by the Master, especially those of the ministry of the word and of the pastoral care of the flock of God. In connection with these services, the church is reminded of its duty in making such provision as may be necessary for the support of those who give their time to the work, so that the gospel may

not be hindered, nor the shepherding of the flock impaired by the want of pecuniary means. At the same time that we strongly commend a proper pastoral system, we desire that Friends will be careful to see that it is not abused by the assumption of undue authority on the part of pastors, by their standing in the way of any service the Lord may lay upon others, or by leading members of the flock to look to, and depend upon human agency instead of the Divine Shepherd and Bishop of souls Himself. We believe that the faithful exercise of pastoral care is an important agency in the Master's hand in establishing and building up the membership of the church.

Truman C. Kenworthy, of Iowa, opened the discussion, and was followed by Esther G. Frame, of Wilmington ; Elwood Scott, of Indiana ; Micajah M. Binford, of Indiana ; S. Adelbert Wood, of Indiana ; Jacob Baker, of Ohio ; Samuel R. Neave, of Baltimore ; John Henry Douglas, of Iowa ; Robert W. Douglas, of Indiana ; and others.

The minute was adopted as expressing the sentiment of the Conference.

Adjourned to 2:30 this afternoon.

AFTERNOON.

The meeting was opened by singing the Hymn, "What a Friend we have in Jesus," and a season of prayer.

The chairman of the Business Committee stated that a letter addressed to the Conference had been received from Henry Stanley Newman, of England. As the communication was from an individual not a member of the Conference, the Committee deemed it improper to have it formally read, but as it had been printed, delegates

were informed that they could obtain copies upon application to Timothy Nicholson.

A communication from Western Yearly Meeting in relation to our Historical Records was read. [Appendix H.]

The subject was further explained in a paper presented by Calvin W. Prichard, of Western Yearly Meeting. [Appendix I.]

The importance of gathering historic materials, and of having the same carefully preserved, was fully recognized, and the Yearly Meetings were advised to take immediate steps to collect the records of meetings, biographies of Friends, accounts of evangelistic work, minutes of conferences, and such other matter of value to the historian as they may be able to secure, and to deposit the same in safe keeping. It was also thought important that some steps should be taken to prepare an authentic history of the persecutions of the early Friends in Massachusetts, with the view of relieving their names from the unjust aspersions cast upon them : also an account of the sufferings and trials of Friends in the South during the late rebellion, and a history of their faithful testimony in favor of the cause of peace.

The different phases of the subject were presented by Stephen Breed, David Hadley, Robert W. Douglas, James Wood, Nathan T. Frame, Luke Woodard, John F. Hanson, Mary M. Hobbs, Charles F. Chapman, Elwood Scott, and James H. Terrell.

Joseph J. Mills, President of the Conference, now took the chair.

A paper on "Uniformity of Discipline for the Yearly Meetings of America," was read by Francis W. Thomas, of Indiana. [Appendix K.]

John F. Hanson spoke first, followed by Robert W.

Douglas, David B. Updegraff, James Wood, David Hadley, Thomas C. Brown, William L. Pearson, Edmund Stanley, James Carey Thomas, Hannah E. Sleeper, and Nathan T. Frame.

Robert W. Douglas proposed that the whole question discussed in the paper, which had been read, should be referred to a committee, appointed by the President, of one from each delegation, to report at a future session, which was approved.

Adjourned to 7:30 P.M.

EVENING.

An appeal for Divine help and guidance, and the hymn, "Nearer, my God, to Thee," were the introduction to the exercises of the evening.

The President announced the following Committee on the subject, "Uniformity of Discipline for all the Yearly Meetings of America." viz: Francis W. Thomas, of Indiana Yearly Meeting; David Hadley, of Western; Edmund Stanley, of Kansas; John Nicholson, of Baltimore; James Wood, of New York; Harriette D. Collins, of New England; Joseph Potts, of North Carolina; Ruth W. Mills, of Wilmington; Judith C. Johnson, of Ohio; John F. Hanson, of Iowa.

The Conference then entered upon the consideration of the subject proposed by the Business Committee, viz: "One Board of Foreign Missions for all the American Yearly Meetings."

The discussion was opened by Mahalah Jay, of Indiana, and her remarks were followed by those of J. Walter Malone, Matilda W. Atkinson, Micajah M. Binford, Harriette D. Collins, Emma B. Malone, Francis W. Thomas, Hannah E. Sleeper, Timothy Nicholson, L. Maria Deane, Isom P. Wooton, Stephen Breed, Esther

MINUTES.

Pugh, James Carey Thomas, Joseph Potts, William L. Pearson, and others.

James Wood proposed that the question of the formation of a Foreign Mission Board should be referred to a committee to consist of one delegate from each Yearly Meeting, which was approved, and the following Friends were appointed in accordance therewith, to report at a future session : Calvin W. Pritchard, of Western Yearly Meeting ; Mahalah Jay, of Indiana ; Hannah E. Sleeper, of Kansas ; Anna B. Thomas, of Baltimore ; Augustus Taber, of New York ; William P. Pinkham, of New England ; Elizabeth W. Nicholson, of North Carolina ; Amy Fulghum, of Wilmington ; J. Walter Malone, of Ohio ; Isom P. Wooton, of Iowa.

Adjourned to 9:30 to-morrow morning.

SIXTH-DAY MORNING, 21ST OF TENTH MO.

The Conference assembled at the hour appointed, and its proceedings were opened by reading the CIII. Psalm by James Carey Thomas, and prayer for Divine counsel and support.

Richard Henry Thomas asked to be released from service on the committee on Conclusions, on account of his other duties as President of the Peace Conference. His request was granted, and John Nicholson appointed in his place.

The Business Committee having voiced the sentiment of the entire Conference in an expression of heartfelt sympathy with the President of the United States and his afflicted family, it was directed that a telegram, signed by the President and Secretaries of the Conference, should be forwarded to Washington in accordance therewith.

The following telegram was signed and sent immediately :

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., October 21, 1892.

The Conference of delegates from ten Yearly Meetings of the Religious Society of Friends in the United States desires to express its heartfelt sympathy with President Harrison in the critical illness of his beloved wife, commending him and his family to Him "who comforteth us in all our tribulation." II. Cor., 1:4.

JOSEPH J. MILLS, *President*.

AUGUSTUS TABER, }
EMMA B. MALONE, } *Secretaries*.

The Committee in regard to the establishment of a Friends' Publishing House presented their report, which was accepted, and the course proposed adopted as the conclusion of the Conference, the new committee to be nominated by the several delegations at the opening of the afternoon session :

REPORT.

To the Conference :

Your committee, in view of the very general sentiment in the present Conference in favor of concerted action on the part of the various Yearly Meetings in establishing a Friends' Publishing House, with an official periodical for the whole Society, recommends :

That this Conference appoint a committee, consisting of one member from each Yearly Meeting, whose duty shall be to present the subject to the various Yearly Meetings on this continent as they come in course, and to suggest that each Yearly Meeting appoint two Friends to confer with those appointed by other Yearly Meetings, with a view to concerting plans looking to this end.

We recommend that this proposition shall not go into

effect until all the Yearly Meetings shall have had the opportunity of acting upon it, and unless seven of them shall have appointed committees on this subject.

The Associated Committee thus appointed shall report to the Yearly Meetings a plan of organization, if in its judgment this is feasible.

We would suggest that the duties of the Associated Committee shall include :

1. The consideration of the advisability of establishing a Friends' Publishing House in some suitable locality.

2. The advisability of establishing a weekly periodical for the whole Society, looking toward the absorption of the present periodicals of our Society in America, on the distinct understanding that, if started, the new paper is to be, both in its publishing and editorial departments, entirely under the control of the Associated Committee, or of such other organization as may be determined upon.

We also recommend that the Associated Committee, after its appointment, shall have the privilege of adding to its body two members from Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, who shall thereupon become full members of it.

On behalf of the committee.

SETH MILLS, *Chairman.*

The committee on the proposed Uniformity of Discipline among our Yearly Meetings, reported as follows, viz :

REPORT.

To the Conference:

The committee on the question of a uniform Discipline report :

That it is their judgment that a uniform Discipline is desirable, and that the Conference should recommend

that the subject be taken up by the Yearly Meetings, as many of them as can unite in the work, proceeding therein as far as they may be able to do so, by the appointment of suitable committees for that purpose.

On behalf of the committee.

FRANCIS W. THOMAS.

The report was discussed by David B. Updegraff, Francis A. Wright, Emma F. Coffin, Francis W. Thomas, Calvin W. Pritchard, William L. Pearson, Luke Woodward, J. Walter Malone, Josephus Hoskins, Timothy Nicholson, S. Adelbert Wood, Edmund Stanley, Richard Henry Thomas, L. Maria Deane, Absalom Rosenberger, Washington Hadley, Elwood Scott, Mary M. Hobbs, Thomas C. Brown, Isom P. Wooton, J. Warren Hawkes, James Carey Thomas, and others.

In view of the divided sentiment of the Conference, it was decided not to make any recommendation to the Yearly Meetings upon this subject at this time.

Adjourned to 2:30 this afternoon.

AFTERNOON.

The hymn, "I Need Thee Every Hour," was sung and prayer offered.

The minutes of the Conference, Fifth-day afternoon and evening and Sixth-day morning, were read and approved.

The following Friends were appointed to constitute the committee on a Friend's Publishing House, as contemplated in the morning session, viz: Calvin W. Pritchard, of Western Yearly Meeting; Francis W. Thomas, of Indiana; James Pitts, of Kansas; Richard Henry Thomas, of Baltimore; Augustus Taber, of New York; William P. Pinkham, of New England; Esther G.

Frame, of Wilmington; J. Walter Malone, of Ohio; Truman C. Kenworthy, of Iowa; Joseph Potts, of North Carolina; and the name of Elias Jessup was added to the committee, on account of the proposed Yearly Meeting of Oregon.

It was made the duty of this committee, in the language of the report, to present the subject of a concerted action on the part of the various Yearly Meetings towards the establishment of a Friends' publishing house, with an official periodical for the whole Society, to the Yearly Meetings on this continent as they come in course, and to suggest that each Yearly Meeting appoint two Friends to confer with those appointed by others, with a view to united action.

The Business Committee presented the following preamble and resolution, which were unanimously adopted by the Conference:

THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

In view of the fact that the liquor traffic is an enormous evil in our land, affecting our religious, moral, and social interests as citizens; and

WHEREAS, We believe that the church of God should be the recognized leader in all moral reforms, and should speak with no uncertain sound on this question; therefore

Resolved, That we call upon all churches and citizens to unite, regardless of social or political affiliations, in the destruction of this unmitigated evil.

The committee in relation to the World's Fair Congress of Religions presented their report:

To the Conference:

The committee to consider the subject of the proposed Congress of Religions, to be held in connection

with the World's Columbian Exposition, next year, report :

That it seems to be advisable that the Society of Friends should take part in the said Congress, provided it can do so independently of any other body claiming our name.

We recommend that the Conference appoint a committee of five men and five women to advise with the committee of Friends in Chicago for the successful accomplishment of the purposes of the Congress.

On behalf of the committee,

THOMAS C. BROWN, *Chairman.*

The subject was discussed by Calvin W. Pritchard, Elias Jessup, Esther G. Frame, Timothy Nicholson, Joseph J. Mills, James Wood, Emma F. Coffin, David B. Updegraff, Augustus Taber, and others.

The report was accepted and the nomination of the new Committee referred to the President.

The President, being compelled by his engagement at Earlham College, to leave the Conference at this time, expressed his gratification at the unity and fellowship in the service of Christ which had characterized its deliberations, his sense of the courtesy which had been extended towards him by all the delegates, and his earnest desire for the blessing of God upon their deliberations.

James Carey Thomas, on the part of the Conference, tendered the thanks of all to Joseph J. Mills, as its presiding officer, for his uniform consideration and kindness towards the members of the Conference, and for the ability with which he had conducted the proceedings during its several sessions.

The chair was taken by Thomas C. Brown, of Western Yearly Meeting, Vice President.

The Business Committee proposed that the session to-morrow morning should commence at 8:30 o'clock; that the consideration of its business should close at 10 o'clock, and that after a time of devotional exercise the Conference should finally adjourn at 11 o'clock, which was approved.

The subject presented by the Business Committee was then considered, "The Duty of the Church towards our Cities."

David Hadley, of Western Yearly Meeting, made a forcible plea for labor on the part of Friends for the purification and elevation of the masses, especially in our cities and larger towns. The discussion was continued by Charles E. Tebbetts, J. Walter Malone, Luke Woodard, James Carey Thomas, Esther G. Frame, Robert W. Douglas, and others, and the subject was continued for further attention this evening.

Adjourned to 7:30 this evening.

EVENING.

The meeting opened with a season of devotion.

The minutes of the afternoon session were read and approved.

The following Friends were appointed to constitute an Advisory Board in relation to the proposed World's Fair Congress of Religions: James Wood, of New York Yearly Meeting; Richard Henry Thomas, of Baltimore; Edmund Stanley, of Kansas; Elias Jessup, of Western; David B. Updegraff, of Ohio; Mary C. Woody, of North Carolina; Esther G. Frame, of Wilmington; Harriette D. Collins, of New England; Mary T. Thomas, of Iowa; Esther Pugh, of Indiana.

The consideration of the question of the afternoon, "The Duty of our Church towards the Cities," was continued.

After remarks by David B. Updegraff, Calvin W. Pritchard, Elwood Scott, Robert W. Douglas, Mary E. Cartland, Elias Jessup, Matilda W. Atkinson, William Nicholson, Isom P. Wooton, L. L. Hobbs, and others, the following minute was adopted :

The Conference, impressed with the great need of our cities and larger towns for the gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and of their claims upon the churches for the diffusion of its truths, would urge Friends everywhere to exert themselves in building up their own meetings in such localities, and to pray for fresh openings and guidance in the work of church extension. All should exercise an enlightened judgment as to means and methods in entering upon these fields around us, which are indeed white unto harvest, confident that the Lord of the harvest will bless all faithful service in His name.

The Business Committee recommended the adoption of a Minute, that in the judgment of the Conference it is not advisable that any change should be made in the name from that of "The Religious Society of Friends," by which it has hitherto been known.

The subject was discussed by many members of the Conference. William Nicholson, of Kansas, proposed the following substitute, viz:

It is the sense of this Conference that the use or disuse of the term, "The Friends' Church," should be left to each Yearly Meeting, according to its own sense of propriety.

Much diversity of sentiment upon the subject was expressed, and no conclusion was reached.

The following report of the committee in relation to a Central Board of Foreign Missions was read. It was discussed by William P. Pinkham, Hannah E. Sleeper, Isom P. Wooton, Lawrie Tatum, and others, and finally adopted by the Conference.

The appointment of the contemplated committee was referred to the several delegations, to report to-morrow morning.

REPORT.

The committee to which was referred the subject of a Central Board of Foreign Missions, would propose that the Conference recommend to our several Yearly Meetings, for their adoption, the following plan for the organization of an American Friends' Board of Foreign Missions.

The Board shall consist of a Secretary, an Advisory Committee of three members, and, from each Yearly Meeting, two Corresponding Members.

It shall be the duty of the Secretary to collect information respecting the condition and needs of foreign mission fields, and to learn, as far as possible, the best means of supplying those needs; to obtain from the Corresponding Members full reports of all the foreign mission work carried on by the several Yearly Meetings, or by the members of these meetings; to ascertain the qualifications and preferences of those offering themselves as missionaries; and, in general, to obtain and impart such information from within and without the church as may enhance the success of Friends' foreign mission work. When new or difficult questions arise

in the discharge of his duties, he shall consult the Advisory Committee.

It shall be the duty of the Advisory Committee to render to the Secretary such advice and suggestions as may contribute to his efficiency, and guard him against errors in office.

The Corresponding Members shall be the medium through which their several Yearly Meetings, the Secretary, applicants for positions as missionaries, and all other interested parties, may receive or impart needed information.

In order to effect the organization of this Board, each Yearly Meeting shall appoint its two Corresponding Members, one man and one woman. These Corresponding Members, after the subject has been presented to all the different Yearly Meetings, and adopted by as many as four of them, shall, in the capacity of an associated committee, select a suitable person as Secretary, and three persons as an Advisory Committee; no two of these four officers to be chosen from the same Yearly Meeting. The Board so organized may at once enter upon the duties for which it is created. The tenure of each officer and the method of appointing his successor to be determined by the Associated Committee prior to the completion of the organization.

The Yearly Meetings shall not be financially responsible for the means to carry out the objects which the formation of this Board contemplates, but the methods of securing the necessary funds for its use shall be left to the Board itself.

The Committee also proposes that the foregoing plan be presented to each Yearly Meeting by a person chosen here from the delegation of that Yearly Meeting; and that the several persons so chosen constitute a committee

to which the further care of this subject shall be entrusted until the organization shall have been formed, as above described.

CALVIN W. PRITCHARD, *Chairman.*

MAHALAH JAY, *Secretary.*

Adjourned to 8:30 o'clock to-morrow morning.

SEVENTH-DAY MORNING, 22ND OF TENTH MO.

After the usual period of devotional service, the business of the Conference was resumed.

The minutes of the meeting last evening were read and approved.

The following nominations made by the delegations for a committee to introduce the subject of a Foreign Mission Board to the several Yearly Meetings, were approved, viz: Calvin W. Pritchard of Western Yearly Meeting; Mahalah Jay, of Indiana; Hannah E. Sleeper, of Kansas; Anna B. Thomas, of Baltimore; Deborah P. Atherton, of New England; Albert Peelle, of North Carolina; Augustus Taber, of New York; Elizabeth Larkin, of Wilmington; Jacob Baker, of Ohio; Lydia Maria Deane, of Iowa; Elias Jessup, of Oregon.

The Business Committee having recommended that the Conference should express its approval of the Christian Endeavor Associations, and urge upon our younger Friends an active participation in their work, the Conference adopted the proposition, with earnest desires for the success of a movement so evidently under the leading of the Holy Spirit, and especially for the encouragement of our younger members in this, their work and service for the Master.

The following proposition of the same committee was approved, and the delegates therein named appointed as

the Printing Committee of the Conference, with the authority and powers therein specified: "The matter of the preparation, printing, and distribution of the 'Transactions of the Conference,' including the form in which they shall be issued and the number of copies, is referred to the following committee, and they are authorized by the Conference to draw upon the several Yearly Meetings represented for their respective shares of the expense, in proportion to their membership. If necessary, they are authorized to borrow the amount required, in anticipation of their receipts. Committee—Timothy Nicholson, William L. Pyle, Joseph J. Mills, and Mahalah Jay."

The Business Committee proposed that the following Friends should be appointed a committee to make the necessary arrangements for holding the Conference five years hence, viz :

Olney T. Meader, address, Boston, Massachusetts.

L. L. Hobbs, address, Guilford College, N. Carolina.

James Wood, address, Mount Kisco, New York.

J. Walter Malone, address, Cleveland, Ohio.

Isom P. Wooton, address, Legrand, Iowa.

William L. Pyle, address, Indianapolis, Indiana.

Charles F. Chapman, address, Waynesville, Ohio.

Josiah Binford, address, Haviland, Kansas.

Timothy Nicholson, address, Richmond, Indiana.

James Carey Thomas, address, 1228 Madison Street, Baltimore, Maryland.

John Henry Douglas, address, Salem, Oregon.

The nominations were approved and this Committee authorized to add to their own number, representatives of other Yearly Meetings, in case such bodies desired to unite.

The committee to formulate the Conclusions of the Conference, presented its report, which was approved and directed to be printed with the minutes.

The death of Barnabas C. Hobbs, appointed a delegate from Western Yearly Meeting, and that of Francis T. King, of Baltimore Yearly Meeting, were feelingly alluded to, and the Secretaries were directed to express in the minutes of the Conference its deep sense of the loss thus sustained by the Conference, by the Society of Friends, and by the religious world.

An expression of appreciative gratitude was heartily endorsed towards all those who have been in any way engaged in the work and service of the Conference; the local committee who have so kindly attended to all our needs; the reporters for the press; the special committees who have worked so zealously and efficiently in their service, and the officers of the Conference who have faithfully endeavored to attend to their respective duties.

The work brought before us having been accomplished, we would reverently acknowledge the gracious presence of the Master in our midst, as from session to session we have endeavored to follow the leadings of the Holy Spirit. With a lively sense of the brotherly kindness and courtesy which have marked the deliberations of the Conference, and with heartfelt prayers for the blessing of the Lord our God upon our beloved Society, and upon all the members of its widely extended organization, and for the extension of His kingdom throughout all the world, the Conference adjourned.

JOSEPH JOHN MILLS, *President.*

AUGUSTUS TABER, }
EMMA B. MALONE, } *Secretaries.*

CONCLUSIONS OF THE CONFERENCE.

At a Conference of delegates from the Yearly Meetings of New England, New York, Baltimore, North Carolina, Ohio, Indiana, Western, Iowa, Kansas, and Wilmington, held in Indianapolis, Ind., commencing Tenth Month 18th, and ending Tenth Month, 22d, 1892:

After a season of prayer and the appointment of committees for the arrangement of business, an address was delivered upon "The Society of Friends and the Maintenance of its Doctrines."

A communication was presented relative to a proposed participation on the part of Friends in the Congress of Religions to be held in Chicago in 1893, which was duly considered, and the Conference decided that it was advisable for the Society of Friends so to participate, and a committee of ten Friends was appointed to advise with the proper committee of the Exposition in the arrangement for the same, as follows: Thomas C. Brown, Esther Pugh, Edmund Stanley, Samuel R. Neave, Harriette D. Collins, Mary C. Woody, Elizabeth Larkin, Jacob Baker, Elias Jessup, and James Wood.

The next subject which claimed the attention of the Conference was "Our Literature, including our Periodicals." After discussion the Conference decided to appoint a committee consisting of one member from each yearly meeting, whose duty shall be to present the subject of establishing a publishing house, to the various yearly meetings on this continent, and to suggest that each yearly meeting appoint two Friends to confer with those appointed by other yearly meetings; and when all of the yearly meetings shall have had the opportunity of

acting, and as many as seven of them shall have so appointed representatives, these representatives shall be authorized to proceed to devise a plan looking to the establishment of a publishing house, with an official periodical for the whole Society. The following Friends were appointed to that service: Calvin W. Pritchard, James Pitts, Augustus Taber, Esther G. Frame, Truman C. Kenworthy, Elias Jessup, Francis W. Thomas, Richard H. Thomas, William P. Pinkham, J. Walter Malone, and Joseph Potts.

The next subject considered was "The Conduct of Meetings for Worship and the Maintenance of the Ministry," the discussion of which took a wide range, occupying three sessions of the Conference, which resulted in the adoption of the following minute:

"This Conference desires to urge upon Friends everywhere the importance of the diligent exercise of the various spiritual gifts bestowed by the Master, especially those of the ministry of the word and of the pastoral care of the flock of God.

"In connection with these services, the church is reminded of its duty in making such provision as may be necessary for the support of those who give their time to the work, so that the gospel may not be hindered, nor the shepherding of the flock impaired by the want of pecuniary means.

"At the same time that we strongly commend a proper pastoral system, we desire that Friends will be careful to see that it is not abused by the assumption of undue authority on the part of pastors, by their standing in the way of any service the Lord may lay upon others, or by leading members of the flock to look to, and depend upon human agency instead of the Divine Shepherd and Bishop of Souls himself. We believe

that the faithful exercise of pastoral care is an important agency in the Master's hand in establishing and building up the membership of the church."

The subject of gathering historic material and depositing the same for safe keeping was considered, and the yearly meetings were advised to take immediate steps to collect records of meetings, biographies of Friends, reports of evangelistic work, minutes of yearly meetings, and conferences, and such other matters of value to the historian as they may be able to secure, and deposit the same in a place of safe keeping.

The next subject introduced was the subject of "Uniformity of Discipline for the Yearly Meetings of America," which was referred to a committee, whose report was fully discussed, but no conclusion was reached.

The Business Committee recommended the adoption of a minute that, in the judgment of the Conference, it is not advisable that any change should be made in the name from that of "The Society of Friends," by which it has hitherto been known. Much diversity of sentiment was expressed upon the subject, and no conclusion was reached.

The subject of "Establishing One Board of Foreign Missions for all the American Yearly Meetings," was next considered and fully discussed, and the Conference decided to recommend to the several yearly meetings for their adoption the following plan for the organization of a Friends' Board of foreign missions: The Board to consist of a Secretary and Advisory Committee, of three members, and from each yearly meeting two Corresponding Members.

It shall be the duty of the Secretary to collect information respecting the condition and needs of foreign mission fields, and to learn, so far as possible, the best

means of supplying those needs ; to obtain from the Corresponding Members full reports of all the foreign mission work carried on by the several yearly meetings, or by the members of these meetings ; to ascertain the qualifications and preferences of those offering themselves as missionaries ; and, in general, to obtain and impart such information from within and without the church as may enhance the success of Friends' foreign mission work. When new or difficult questions arise in the discharge of his duties, he shall consult the Advisory Committee.

It shall be the duty of the Advisory Committee to render to the Secretary such advice and suggestion as may contribute to his efficiency, and guard him against errors in office.

The Corresponding Members shall be the medium through which their several yearly meetings, the Secretary, applicants for positions as missionaries, and all other interested parties, may receive or impart needed information.

In order to effect the organization of this Board, each yearly meeting shall appoint its two Corresponding Members, one man and one woman. These Corresponding Members, after the subject has been presented to all the different yearly meetings, and adopted by as many as four of them, shall, in the capacity of an Associated Committee, select a suitable person as Secretary, and three persons as an Advisory Committee, no two of these four officers to be chosen from the same yearly meeting.

The Board so organized, may at once enter upon the duties for which it is created. The tenure of each officer and the method of appointing his successor, to be determined by the Associated Committee, prior to the completion of the organization.

“The yearly meetings shall not be financially responsible for the means to carry out the objects which the formation of this Board contemplates, but the methods of securing the necessary funds for its use shall be left to the Board itself.”

The Conference directed that the foregoing plan be presented to each yearly meeting, by a person chosen here, from the delegation of that yearly meeting ; and that the several persons so chosen, constitute a committee to which the further care of this subject shall be entrusted until the organization shall have been formed as above described, and appointed the following Friends for this service : Calvin W. Pritchard, Mahalah Jay, Hannah E. Sleeper, Anna B. Thomas, Deborah P. Atherton, Albert Peelle, Augustus Taber, Elizabeth Larkin, Jacob Baker, Lydia Maria Deane, Elias Jessup.

The next subject presented to the Conference for consideration was “The Duty of our Church towards our Cities.”

After earnest discussion the Conference was united in urging upon our yearly meetings the importance of establishing and building up meetings in our towns and cities, using their best judgment as to the best means and methods.

The Business Committee having voiced the sentiment of the entire Conference in an expression of heartfelt sympathy with the President of the United States and his afflicted family, it was directed that a telegram, signed by the President and Secretaries of the Conference, should be forwarded to Washington in accordance therewith.

The following telegram was signed and sent immediately :

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., Oct. 21st, 1892.

The Conference of Delegates from ten Yearly Meetings of the Religious Society of Friends in the United States, desires to express its heartfelt sympathy with President Harrison in the critical illness of his beloved wife, commending him and his family to Him "who comforteth us in all our tribulation." II. Cor., i. 4.

JOSEPH J. MILLS, *President*.
 AUGUSTUS TABER, }
 EMMA B. MALONE, } *Secretaries*.

The Conference expressed its approval of the Christian Endeavor Association, with earnest desires for the success of a movement so evidently under the leading of the Holy Spirit, and especially for the encouragement of the younger members in this their work and service for the Master.

The death of Barnabas C. Hobbs, appointed a delegate from Western Yearly Meeting, and that of Francis T. King, of Baltimore Yearly Meeting, were feelingly alluded to, and the Secretaries were directed to express in the Minutes of the Conference its deep sense of the loss thus sustained by the Conference, by the Society of Friends, and by the religious world.

The following Friends were appointed a Committee to make the necessary arrangements as to time and place of holding the Conference in the year 1897: Olney T. Meader, James Wood, Isom P. Wooton, Charles F. Chapman, Timothy Nicholson, John Henry Douglas, J. Walter Malone, L. L. Hobbs, William L. Pyle, James Carey Thomas, Josiah Binford.

JOSEPH J. MILLS, *President*.

AUGUSTUS TABER, }
 EMMA B. MALONE, } *Secretaries*.

STENOGRAPHIC REPORT
OF THE
PROCEEDINGS OF THE CONFERENCE

AND THE PAPERS READ BEFORE IT.

THIRD-DAY, TENTH MO., 18TH, 1892.—7:30 P. M.

The Conference was called to order by Timothy Nicholson, of Indiana Yearly Meeting, who spoke as follows:

As a member of the committee on arrangements, it becomes my duty and privilege to call the Conference to order, and to state that in an interview with several of the delegates from four different yearly meetings at Wilmington Yearly Meeting, the committee on arrangements for time and place was advised to make provision for program, and also for temporary organization, for the exercises to-night and to-morrow forenoon, in order to save the time of the Conference. I will proceed to show the arrangement which we have accordingly designed, and if it meets the approval of the Conference we need not be delayed.

Inasmuch as this conference is evidently the outgrowth of the conference held in Richmond five years ago, though on a different basis, and inasmuch as the chairman of that conference and one of the clerks of that conference have been appointed delegates to this, it seemed to be the logical thing that just for the temporary organization they should act. That has been the thought of the committee, and of such others as we could consult. So we have proposed that James Wood, of New York Yearly Meeting, act as temporary chairman, and Mahalah Jay, from Indiana Yearly Meeting, as

temporary clerk. And inasmuch as some care will be needed in the preparation of reports for the press, the committee thought it desirable to appoint S. Edgar Nicholson, one of the clerks of Western Yearly Meeting, to report the proceedings of the Conference, subject to such revision as the Conference may desire, for the public press. We also were advised to engage a stenographer, and we have engaged Anna Taylor, the woman who served us five years ago as stenographer. Before going any farther, I would ask the Conference if it is willing to consent to this temporary organization?

The Conference consented to the temporary organization proposed. The program for the first two sessions of the Conference was then read. (See Minutes, page 9.) James Wood took the chair, and Mahalah Jay took her place as secretary.

The Chairman opened the devotional exercises by reading a portion of the twenty-sixth chapter of Isaiah, and leading in prayer. Several other prayers were offered, after which John Henry Douglas spoke as follows:

DEAR FRIENDS—This is an occasion of very great interest to me, from the fact that we are here from so many places, and yet so many of us know one another, and better than all, we know the Lord. We travel rapidly to-night as we locate one another. We remember the days of old—those revivals, those weeks, those months, those years. It comes up like a moving panorama and moves my heart. I love to look at you. I hope you are glad to see me. I love to look into the face of Christ to-night, after an experience in public service of forty years, and believe that he is pleased with me; I never was so delighted with him. We are here in the liberty and freedom of the gospel. I do not see anything to hinder our getting along first rate together if we keep humble enough, and simple enough, and child-like enough, as we have been in all the days of success, in all the days of the church's efficiency. When we have been perfectly simple and humble, was when we had the conscious presence of the Spirit, and I can not see why we shall not

have it here, if we pray to that end and believe to that end, that it may be so with us on this occasion. I do not see why there should not be as much simplicity, as much freedom, and as much liberty, as I read of the early conferences of the church, as I read of those prayer meetings when they all prayed with one voice, as I read the record of their prayers and the work that followed, the shaking of the place where they were assembled, as I read the story of our own people two hundred years ago, meeting in a conference like this — may this be like that. Four days, on one occasion, they met in a general conference before they reached a minute, before they wrote a line, being so mightily filled with the Spirit of God in prayer and in preaching and in testimony; and then two days were spent in business, and then two days in bidding farewell, and then they scattered, taking their lives in their hands, and went all over our dear New England and New York. They were all ambassadors, every one of them. They went to whipping posts; they went into suffering; some of them went in a short time to glory.

The business that the early Friends were in we are in. Is not that so? Do we feel it? We, myself and perhaps many others, are here under circumstances of what looks like a good deal of sacrifice, a good deal of trouble, a good deal of effort. I have not come with any thought of business. You have. My thought has been once more to look into the faces of my old friends in a holy convocation before God as in days past. I have looked forward to this being the time when, whatever else we may do, this one thing shall be done: we shall know the presence of God; we shall be strengthened in heart by our presence one with another and the Lord with us. We shall love one another better, and we shall bid one another farewell as we never have done before, with a covenant and a pledge and a prayer that our few remaining days — and the many days, perhaps, of those who are young and strong — may be very wonderfully characterized with efficiency in the work of God to the glory of his name and the salvation of souls, as we look for the speedy coming of Him who died for us.

Now, these are my feelings. O, how my soul goes out in tenderness and love that we have these opportunities to come into touch with each other, as the disciples did in the beginning, and as our forefathers did.

Let any of us who find ourselves short in our spiritual experience make it an opportunity of seeking that blessing which our souls need. Would not this be a grand place for the descent of the Holy Ghost in power upon some preacher, upon some delegate? for the very best in this house are but poor sinners except by the amazing work of our blessed Christ who died for us. And if there be any short in experience, any here under a sense of inefficiency, and a lack of fullness of love and liberty, let them say to this Conference before we do anything else, Pray for me that I may be free. And above everything else, my prayer goes out for this Conference that it be a time of liberty in prayer; that in some way or other this Conference may be characterized in heaven as a conference pleasing to God; that it may be characterized on earth and in this city as a place of spiritual power and blessing, and that the influence of it may by the abundant presence and power of God be felt from one ocean to the other.

In accordance with the proposition of Timothy Nicholson, a recess of five minutes was taken to allow the delegates from the various yearly meetings to confer together with reference to appointing members of the Business Committee.

The Conference being again called to order, the following names were reported for the Business Committee: (See Minutes, page 10.)

On the proposition of Timothy Nicholson, the Conference instructed the committee on permanent organization to nominate a treasurer, in addition to the other officers.

During the reading of the address of James Wood, the president of the Conference, Joseph John Mills, president of Earlham College, occupied the chair. He made the following remarks:

There is a very eminent fitness, I think, in the action of the committee which has had charge of the arrangements, in securing for this Conference, at its very outset, a review of the present and past condition of our Society by one who has given it such large study as has our President.

The exercise for the time is the paper by President James Wood, on "The Society of Friends, and the Maintenance of its Doctrines."

APPENDIX A.

THE SOCIETY OF FRIENDS, AND THE MAINTENANCE
OF ITS DOCTRINES.

BY JAMES WOOD.

It is not my purpose to treat of the history of the Society of Friends, but to inquire into the reason for its existence, and the great underlying principles of the gospel upon which it was founded. If these principles are divine truths, applicable to all time, we should see whether the Society is now upholding them. On the other hand, if we find that these principles were such as were needed to be applied to the Christian church and the world at a particular period, when peculiar conditions existed, but which, under our changed conditions, are no longer needed in their distinctness, it may be well for us to endeavor to see whether it is advisable longer to maintain the separate organization which was brought into existence for the special purpose of upholding them. Or, if, upon an honest self-examination, we find that we have so shifted our ground as to be maintaining the principles of other organizations quite as much as those upon which the Society of Friends was founded, it may be well for us to inquire whether, as individuals, we should not join ourselves in membership with those bodies whose principles we have made our own. Practices grow out of principles. Where we are thoroughly convinced of the truth of the principles upon which our practices are based, these are important to us, and we take pleasure in upholding them. If our practices are not in accord with the principles we

profess, we are weakened by the inconsistency, and are liable to be drawn away by them from the principles upon which we have desired to stand.

The examination of these matters seems to be most appropriate at the opening of this Conference, composed of representatives of nearly all the Friends upon this continent, and convened "to consider questions which relate to the interests and growth of our branch of the church, and the maintenance of our testimonies, and to give advice thereupon." But this examination must be without prejudice, or it can have very little value. We must disabuse our minds of any bias they may have received from association or accustomed practice, we must rise above our personal likes and dislikes, and honestly consider the questions before us, or else the examination had better not be made.

The Society of Friends was founded by George Fox, and he was the enunciator of its foundation principles. Good men, some of them able and learned, were associated with him, but they came to him, he did not go to them. They helped to promulgate the principles and to defend them from assailants, and they did this because these met the needs of which they were personally conscious, and accorded with the divinely given understanding of truth in their own souls; but God gave to George Fox the conception of the principles and the duty of declaring them to the world. We, therefore, must go first to Fox for the knowledge of those phases of gospel truth upon which he founded the Society, and not to those associates who did so much to aid the organization, and some of whom wrote very ably in its defence.

But to understand George Fox, we must first understand something of the times in which he lived.

The reformation in England was a slow work. It began under the most unfavorable circumstances. Practically, for a long time, it was but a series of compromises with the Roman church. At first the separation from Rome was merely negative and destructive, and then for a century and a half the reform progressed as clearer and clearer perceptions of spiritual truth were entertained. During nearly all this period there was

continued turmoil and strife, unlike anything known in other countries. The spirit of controversy possessed all classes. Questions of religion divided the time with state affairs in the discussions of Parliament. The courts of justice were continually the arena of religious debate. Discussions were quite the regular thing in the churches, both after the sermon on the Sabbath day and in the gatherings of all parties there at other times for the purpose of debate. As a result, the English people either became callous and indifferent, or were led to make independent investigations for themselves, and they became divided into such a brood of religious sects as never existed elsewhere. Masson, in his *Life of Milton*, mentions, besides Papists and the Churchmen, Presbyterians, Independents, Baptists and Anabaptists, Old Brownists, Antinomians, Familists, Millenaries or Chiliasts, Expecters and Seekers, Divorcers, Anti-Sabbatarians, Traskites, Soul-Sleepers or Mortalists, Arians, Socinians and other Anti-Trinitarians, Anti-Scripturists, Sceptics or Questioners, Atheists, Fifth Monarchy Men, Ranters, Muggletonians, Boheminists, and Quakers. In this seething caldron there was a great deal of the scum of error, and there was also, floating in solution and without definite form, much precious truth. Perhaps quite as important as anything was the fact that men were becoming more and more freed from the religious shackles that had bound the professors of the Christian faith for so many centuries. These activities were signs of life, but among multitudes of professing Christians there were painful evidences of indifference and death. An open disregard of religion was manifested by many, as the pastoral letters of the bishops fully show. In London, in 1646, there were thirty-two parish churches utterly destitute of any pastor. The mayor of Sunderland wrote, in a petition to Parliament: "We are a people who have been destitute of a preaching ministry; yea, ever since any of us who are now breathing were born, to our souls' grief and dreadful hazard of destruction; neither is it our case alone, but also ten or twelve parishes, all adjoining, are in like manner void of the means of salvation." Four years before George Fox

began to preach, and while his name was unknown, a remarkable work called "Gangroena," was written by a Presbyterian minister named Edwards, and published in London. It was addressed to both houses of Parliament, to show them what heresies were then prevalent, and it contains a most extraordinary list of the religious views that were current in the nation. Many of the "errors, heresies and blasphemies" enumerated by Edwards have a peculiar interest for Friends. He said there were some ministers who refused to perform the rite of baptism or to administer the Lord's supper, and who maintained that those ordinances were not necessary to salvation, and that they were not commanded as permanent institutions in the church. Some held that singing psalms and hymns by unconverted persons was blasphemy and telling lies. A lieutenant in the army and a great sectary, affirmed that God revealed his mind and will to his servants, and that "he did it immediately, by himself, without ordinances, ministers or any other means." "A quartermaster belonging to a regiment of horse, said he had a command from the Spirit to preach"—"the Spirit without learning enables a man to the work." "It was held that tradesmen may be ministers of the word, and that human learning and readings of authors are not essential, and that ministers of the gospel ought to work with their own hands for a living;" "that the 'consecration' of buildings and calling them 'churches' was heathenish." It was held that all believers ought to have liberty of prophesying, "and women too, who have gifts, as well as men;" that set forms of prayer were wrong, and that men should pray as moved by the Spirit according to their condition and feelings at the time; that it was unlawful for Christians to bear arms or even to take up arms "for their laws or civil liberties." While these were held, as Edwards describes, they were unavailing because they were detached, fragmentary, and were not known to rest upon a great principle of divine truth which had life and power, and carried much more than these with it. It was given to George Fox to make known and to unfold that truth.

I have been thus particular to state the conditions of

religious life in England, because it is impossible clearly to understand George Fox without bearing these conditions in mind.

Before referring to the Scriptural doctrines that it was given to George Fox to reassert and emphasize, let us glance for a moment at the character of this remarkable man. Those who confine themselves to Fox's acts during the early years of his ministry when he had so recently passed through severe trials and provings, and was naturally disturbed by the excitements of his experiences and the dawning conception of the mission to which he was called, entirely fail to obtain any true conception of his character as a man. This can only be obtained by acquaintance with him in his maturer years. The conspicuous quality of this man was his strength, both mental and physical. Of the latter we have an interesting illustration in that evening ride into Cambridge, along with Capt. Amor Stoddart, when the university students set upon them and unhorsed the army officer, but were unable to drag George Fox from his seat. His mental strength included a remarkable grasp of intellect, as is shown in his many published works, some addressed to the kings of continental countries and others upon a variety of subjects upon which he felt drawn to speak. His moral stamina was illustrated by almost every act of his life.

Colquhoun, in his sketches of "Notable Lives," thus expresses his estimate of George Fox's character: "The truth is, Fox's character, like that of many others, had two sides. We find this man of fancies and visions confronted with controversialists, Jesuits, lawyers, and puzzling them with his subtlety. Now, in a court of justice he confronts the judge, defies the bar, picks flaws in their indictment, quotes against them adverse statutes, and wrings from baffled judges a reluctant acquittal. Then he is in a Protector's court, to meet a man hard to dupe. There he plants himself, his hat on his head, at Oliver Cromwell's dressing table, engages him in loving discourse, sets before him his duty, presses on him the policy of toleration, till the iron-hearted soldier, first surprised, then attentive, at length interested, extends his

hand to the Quaker, bids him repeat his visit, and tells him if they could meet oftener they would be firmer friends. No less remarkable are his courage and skill. As storms thicken, he is always in the front of the battle. Wherever the strife is vehement, there he is—now in Lancashire, now in Leicester, in Westmoreland, or in Cornwall; meeting magistrates, braving them at quarter sessions, vanquishing officers, governors of castles, and judges. Then he sits down calmly to organize, with a forecast equal to that of Wesley, the scheme of Quaker polity which has lasted to our times. If we smile at the oddity of his language, at the cursive missives which he hurls at mayors and magistrates, gaolers and judges, we find, at times, a caustic style worthy of Hudibras or Cobbett, in which he lashes the frippery of the court, or meets the casuistry of the Jesuits or Ultra Calvinists; and as we dwell on those words of wisdom in which he tells us of his faith, and cheers the drooping heart of Cromwell's daughter, we perceive that he is no common man."

William Penn, who had had a wide acquaintance with men, testified, "I never saw him out of his place, or not a match for every service or occasion, for in all things he acquitted himself like a man, yea, a strong man." When his strong natural qualities became developed and were enriched by the graces of the Holy Spirit, the same high authority wrote of him: "He was civil beyond all forms of breeding in his behavior," "so meek, contented, modest, easy, steady, tender, it was a pleasure to be in his company." "A most merciful man, as ready to forgive as unapt to take or give offense." And it is very instructive to us to read from William Penn: "And truly I must say, that though God had visibly clothed him with a divine preference and authority, and, indeed, his very presence expressed a religious majesty, yet he never abused it, but held his place in the church of God with great meekness, and a most engaging humility and moderation."

In the early years of his manhood George Fox was brought into most grave anxiety in regard to his spiritual condition, and very sore were his difficulties and trials.

He afterwards wrote, "I cannot declare the misery I was in, it was so great and heavy upon me." He read his Bible, and consulted many priests of various denominations, some of them men who had had university training, but they were destitute of true religious experience and could give him no instruction suited to his condition. This was a great surprise to him, so that he was profoundly impressed with the worthlessness of an outward profession, and of the impossibility of mere intellectual training giving a knowledge of, or insight to, spiritual things. He alike condemned priests and dissenting ministers, and all men's learning and theories.

He wrote, "And when all my hopes in them and in all men were gone, so that I had nothing outwardly to help me, nor could tell what to do, then, oh then, I heard a voice, which said 'There is one, even Christ Jesus, who can speak to thy condition.' When I heard it my heart did leap for joy."

Then and there the foundation of Quakerism was laid!

What was the situation? In an age of great religious inquiry, when Christian doctrines were everywhere discussed, when ministers had every advantage of intellectual training, George Fox found that, for his needs, these ministers were worthless, and that he must discard them altogether. Every human reliance was swept away. Then he found, by the voice of the Holy Spirit speaking to his keenly perceptive soul, that he could have free access to and intercourse with his Saviour, without the intervention and instrumentality of any human priest, ordinance or ceremony whatsoever, and that thus there would be graciously given him the instruction he needed. Any Christian who understands George Fox's situation, and the great truth that then illumined his soul, understands the foundation of distinctive Quakerism. Whoever comprehends this truth, and practices it, and teaches it to others, upholds and advances true Quakerism; and whoever, having known any thing of this truth, turns from it to rely upon, or by example or precept teaches others to rely upon, any human invention, or agency, or power, is undermining the foundation of Quakerism, and is destroying the influence God designs it should exert upon the

world. The situation is a simple one, and its requirements are very plain.

It is thus seen that Quakerism was founded upon the practical experience of divine truth, and not upon any system of theology or form of belief. It was, in the strictest sense, practical, experimental Christianity. Its true foundation was Christ Jesus himself.

What did George Fox then do? He had been a careful searcher of the Scriptures, and he diligently continued his studies, and, with the blessed Holy Spirit illuminating his understanding, he saw the clear teaching of the spirituality of the gospel dispensation, the high-priesthood of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the priesthood of individual believers. It required the light of his spiritual experience to enable men to comprehend this clear but simple truth which permeates the gospel and lifts men into the closest relations with God. Thus while Quakerism was not founded upon any system of theology, it was the means of developing a theology the most simple, clear, uplifting and efficacious that the Christian church has known since its earliest centuries.

Here was reached the completion of the English reformation that had progressed through so many stages and had now found its climax. For an impartial estimate of its meaning, let us go beyond our own membership, and read what Bancroft, our American historian, says of it: "The rise of the people called Quakers is one of the most remarkable events in the history of man. It marks the moment when intellectual freedom was claimed, unconditionally, by the people as an inalienable birthright. It was the consequence of the moral warfare against corruption, the aspiration of the human mind after a perfect emancipation from the long reign of bigotry and superstition. The mind of George Fox arrived at the conclusion that truth is to be sought by listening to the voice of God in the soul. This principle contained a moral revolution. It established absolute freedom of mind, treading idolatry under foot, and entered the strongest protest against the forms of a hierarchy.

"George Fox proclaimed an insurrection against every form of authority over conscience; he resisted

every attempt at the slavish subjection of the understanding. But he circumscribed this freedom by obedience to truth. To the Quaker, Christianity is freedom." Similar quotations might be made from Carlyle, Spurgeon, and others.

It is not necessary to go into any particulars as to the great and generally accepted Christian doctrines which were emphatically embraced and taught by George Fox, but it may be well to mention that scarcely anywhere can we find clearer testimony to the authority of the Scriptures than in his writings, and in the very able address to the Governor of Barbadoes we find a statement of doctrine that is most clear and explicit as to salvation by Jesus Christ, who "was made a sacrifice for sin," "was crucified for us in the flesh without the gates of Jerusalem," that "we have redemption through his blood," and that "he alone is our Redeemer and Saviour, the Captain of our salvation, who saves us from sin, as well as from hell and the wrath to come, and destroys the devil and his works." It is with the distinctive doctrines of George Fox Quakerism that we are now concerned.

About the great foundation truths which have been mentioned were quickly grouped their necessary corollaries. These were most marked as they applied to public worship. One great fact was ever before George Fox's mind, viz: "God is a Spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." Firmly grounded upon the belief of the direct and perceptible influence of the Holy Spirit upon the consciousness of the believer, any instrumentality as an accessory to worship could not be tolerated. All the subjects of the King met upon a complete equality to worship him. Their first act was that of prostration before their Sovereign, as Bible worship is always represented to be. This prostration necessitated silence upon the part of the worshipers until their Sovereign bade them rise and speak, and then prayers could be offered, or praises sung, or God's revealed truth be read, or the gospel messages declared, as the Sovereign might indicate his will. What a noble conception of worship! How grand

in its simplicity and beauty; above all, how grand in the practical recognition of the wonderful provision of God's grace for the free communion of the believer with his King! And who shall minister to the assembled worshippers? The Sovereign himself, who knows the condition of each soul before him, and who ever desires to bless his children according to their need, and he ministers by whomsoever he may choose. No one can presume to say who his agent shall be; no one can presume to assert that he or she will be such agent, until the commission is received, and no one can presume to say what the particular service shall be; certainly no one can so infringe upon the Sovereign's prerogative as to arrange the services beforehand. And here we have the true position of a minister in a Quaker meeting. We find, as we might expect to find, that God most frequently and most efficiently uses those who through obedience and faith are most attentive to his will, and who have had a deep, experimental knowledge of his grace.

God bestows various spiritual gifts, all of which he intends to be used. Upon some he bestows a gift in the ministry of his word, to be used as servants of the flock, and not as masters. He does not make them a separate class, and nowhere in the Scriptures is there any distinction between the clergy and the laity.

This idea of public worship presupposes keen spiritual perception and perfect obedience upon the part of the worshippers, a condition, alas! too often wanting, and the absence of it has too often frustrated the gracious purposes of God!

And now let us inquire whether these principles were of a temporary character, needed in George Fox's time, but not suited to our own. We find that they are Bible doctrines, and not in any way limited in their application. They must, therefore, continue in force so long as this dispensation, under which we are permitted to live shall continue, and they are as true and as important to-day as they ever were.

Has the Society of Friends truly maintained these principles? Let us see. The changes introduced by

George Fox were so marked and striking that it was quite natural that his followers should feel that they were specially called upon to maintain most prominently the doctrines and practices that differed from those held and used by other professing Christians. Succeeding generations carried this so far that the heart was almost taken out of that which George Fox had established. Concerning the Holy Scriptures George Fox taught that the human mind could correctly understand them, as it was enlightened by the Holy Spirit, who moved the men who wrote them, and that, as he cannot contradict himself, all true influences from him are necessarily in accord with the Scriptures. These illuminations do not supersede the Scriptures, but are their necessary witness and gracious supplement. At length some came to hold that the enlightenment of their own understandings was equal to the authority of the Scriptures, and then it was held that the teaching that is immediate and direct is paramount to that through any instrumentality, and thus the importance and authority of the Scriptures were undervalued, and, as a consequence, they were sadly neglected, to the incalculable injury of many. Since the spirituality of the gospel left no place for material ordinances, many spiritualized away both type and anti-type, until (it is hard to say it) the blood of our crucified Redeemer was itself explained away, and the crimson cord that runs through the Bible from end to end was ignored, resulting in one of the most serious defections that has afflicted any branch of the church in modern times. The doctrine of conversion and the baptism of the Holy Ghost, which George Fox clearly taught, was evaporated into a growth of a natural seed under the Holy Spirit's fostering care. George Fox recognized that every believer had a work to do, and each was to exercise such spiritual gifts as God had entrusted to his use, but the use of agents, in the divine economy, was gradually ignored, until a cold indifference to gospel service prevailed, and of course the active, aggressive, conquering church, that filled all England with its doctrines and marshalled its converts by thousands, became inefficient and almost lifeless. Because it had been taught that true spiritual worshipers prostrated them-

selves before the Lord in silence, it came to be thought that silence was worship, the promptings of the Master were ignored, and all life went out of a vast number of meetings. Since it had been taught that formal singing was improper, and that the singing of hymns and psalms by unbelievers was a lie and blasphemy; therefore, they ignored singing in the congregations of God's people altogether. George Fox's position was that those should sing who "live and dwell in the grace of God, and sing with grace in the heart." Since George Fox had opposed compulsory tithes and sumptuous livings, (but had freely provided for the support of ministers who gave their time to the service,) the necessary support of ministers was ignored, to the serious injury of the spread of the gospel. From these and other like causes we cannot wonder that the Society seriously declined. That God continued its existence is proof that he has purposes yet to be fulfilled through its agency. We may rejoice that in times of distress God does preserve the seven thousands who do not bow the knees to Baal. We must be devoutly thankful to the Lord that he has again quickened so many of his people into newness of life by the blessed operations of his Holy Spirit. But let us not boast that we are better than our fathers. We cannot. Many of them were faithful, according to their light, and it is the Lord alone who has revived his truth in our day.

Where are we now, and what are the tendencies of our times? It is a law of nature that the pendulum shall swing from one extreme to the other, and a similar law seems to operate even in religious things. It is the truth we want, and this is most often found in the "golden mean," rather than in either extreme. In the reaction from the conditions that have existed in the past, and which linger in some quarters even at the present time, there is danger that we may go too far in the opposite direction.

If we neglect to keep the ears of our souls keenly attentive to "the still small voice" of the Holy Spirit, we are away from the foundation of Quakerism. If we do not "hear and obey," we come far short of God's will concerning us. If we do not recognize and own the real

and efficacious baptism of the Holy Spirit, we are not George Fox Quakers. If we neglect to exercise the gifts that are in us, or to recognize and encourage gifts in others, we are false to our profession and to our Lord. If any, by practice, no matter what their theory, recognize ministers as a separate class with any special privileges or authority, apart from the ministry of the word; if any give such the title of "Reverend," or permit others to give it to themselves; if any claim that they have authority to perform the religious ceremony of marriage or any other outward priestly function, they are setting up what George Fox emphatically condemned, because it was inconsistent with divine truth. If a minister of the Society of Friends makes it understood that he performs the ceremony of civil marriage, as a legal official of the state, it is a matter with which we have no concern, but a Quaker marriage has always been regarded as a religious ceremony for the accomplishment of a relation ordained by God. The minister who claims that he performs, or officiates at, the religious ceremony, thereby claims a priestly function. If, on the one hand, any of us deny the right of those who spend their time in the service of the gospel to receive their necessary support from those among whom they labor, or, on the other hand, would make such support "compulsory and chargeable," we are not following George Fox's teaching and practice. If any of us assume to take the conduct of meetings for worship into our own hands, arranging the order of exercises or determining of what the exercises shall consist, or fail to prostrate ourselves before the Lord in such silence as subjects observe who come into the presence of their sovereigns, we do violence to the beautiful Quaker theory of worship. If any of us recognize in any way the so-called ordinances of baptism and the Lord's supper, or either of them, we, in so far, forsake the doctrine of the entire spirituality of the gospel dispensation.

These are some of the dangers of our time. Towards these, in greater or less degrees, the tendencies of to-day are leading. It is our duty to observe the signs of the times. If any of our practices are leading us into paths

where our foundation principles are endangered, it is our bounden duty to correct them.

There is one further consideration in this connection that we should not ignore. If any of us consider that ministers are a class, with special privileges and authority, who can arrange the exercises of meetings for worship and conduct them, who have more religious authority to perform any ceremony than other members of the church, who can receive titles for their profession, who can make contracts for gospel service that are compulsory upon the membership; and if we recognize outward ordinances in any way, are we not Methodists rather than Quakers? The Methodist Episcopal church holds highly spiritual views of the gospel; it believes in the baptism of the Holy Spirit; it recognizes the ministry of women; it is a zealous and most efficient branch of the church of Christ. If we are Methodists in our belief and practice we should also be Methodists in church membership.

If I were asked to name the greatest need of our Society, beyond that of individual faith and obedience, I should say it was a greater love for the ministry of the gospel. The gospel of Christ is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth, and the preaching of the gospel is God's appointed means of presenting it to men and making it efficacious. We should prize most highly a gift in the ministry when God bestows it upon any of us, and we should honor it in others, and encourage and aid its exercise by more earnest prayer, and loving sympathy, and every brotherly kindness, and more devoted use of the pecuniary means with which we have been blessed. To the loving and consecrated child of God there is all needed opportunity for this within the true Quaker lines.

It is always well to take a broad and comprehensive view of religious truth, and of the means employed for its advancement in the world. We should never fail to remember that the first object of the Christian church is to bring men to Jesus Christ for salvation, and the next is to establish them there, and build them up in the faith. There can be no excuse for the establishment and maintenance of any distinct branch of Christ's

church unless we believe that its agency and the special means it employs are the best that have been found for the accomplishment of these ends. Between the ecclesiastical systems and gorgeous rituals of the Greek and Roman churches and the simple spiritual doctrines and entire absence of ceremonial observances of the Society of Friends, there are many successive stages occupied by various denominations, and the believer has a great variety of means for the attainment of the desired end from which to make his choice. If we truly believe in the spirituality of the gospel, in the priesthood of believers, and that all types were fulfilled and ended in the great anti-type, Christ Jesus himself, we will find in the system inaugurated by George Fox a means that has proven itself to be most efficient in the past, and one that will be so in the future, if it is faithfully operated. But it is a system that requires more dependence upon the Lord and a closer reliance upon his power than any other, and one that is meaningless and dead unless quickened and operated by spiritual life.

The correctness of the Quaker system is in a measure confirmed by the evident drift of evangelical churches toward its position. There have been many phases of Christian development in which the Society of Friends has become distinguished, but we need to estimate them in their true relations. It is a good thing to have a Quaker's moral character so highly esteemed that its reliability becomes proverbial, but it is our business to teach first, repentance, faith and love towards God, and then the moral duties that follow, even as the second commandment follows the first. We may be proud of the line of philanthropists who have been famous in the past, and brought much renown to our branch of the church, but let us remember that that is the truest love to man which is exercised because the love of Christ constrains us to it. We may be glad, proud almost, that our body has produced the greatest orator of recent times in England and, in our land, one of the greatest poets of the century, and also a man so learned that he stood among the first of the chosen few to whom was committed the revision of the translation of the New Testament, but

let the church never forget that its duty lies with the graces of the spirit rather than the accomplishments of the intellect, and that the prime purpose must be to have men taught in the school of Christ. We prize as highly as any can the development and adornment of all the natural powers, but we should ever place our highest estimate upon those faculties of our being which are for eternity and will most redound to the glory of God.

Enduring strength is always quiet in its operations, and steady progress is made by calm persistent effort. The boisterous times in England in which George Fox was born settled into peace under his ministry, and, as the Society of Friends spread throughout the kingdom, multitudes found their way into the kingdom of God. As George Fox himself obtained deeper and fuller religious experience he settled into the calm and effective exercise of his powers, and no longer displayed the excitement of his earlier years. And so, as we know in our souls the peace of God that passeth understanding, we are brought into the condition for most effective service for the Master, and, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit and in his power, we will be strong for the accomplishment of the work he has given us as individuals and as a church to perform. We have been given the banner under which we are to march forward, and, if we do not in any way forsake it, our branch of the church of Jesus Christ will be kept loyal to him, and to the truths he has entrusted to it, and be made more efficient in advancing his cause in the earth.

The committees on nominations and business were requested to meet to-morrow morning at 8:30, and the Conference agreed that 9:30 should be the hour for the commencement of the morning session.

After a pause for prayer, the Conference adjourned till 9:30 to-morrow morning.

FOURTH-DAY MORNING — 9:30 A. M.

The second session of the Conference was called to order by President James Wood. Robert W. Douglas led in prayer, after which the committee on permanent organization made the following report: (See Minutes, page 11.)

CHAIRMAN: You have heard the report of the committee with its nomination of members of the Conference for these permanent officers. Do you approve of the report? (Expressions of approval.)

CHAIRMAN: It would appear to be the unanimous consent of the Conference. Of course the uniting with this report carries with it the election of these Friends to the position for which they are named. Are there any objections to the report? (None are made.) If not, we will consider that the Conference approves the report; that the Friends therein named are elected to their positions. I would ask Joseph John Mills to come to the chair, and the secretaries named, Augustus Taber and Emma B. Malone, will please take their places at the table.

The newly elected president and secretaries take their places.

CHAIRMAN J. J. MILLS: My friends, it is perhaps proper that I should say that, while it is customary in most public bodies for the presiding officer, when taking the chair, to thank the convention for the honor which it has conferred upon him, I am very much disposed this morning, in my own heart, to adopt the gospel rule of "in honor preferring one another," and I should have been extremely grateful if this honor had fallen upon somebody else. I certainly appreciate most heartily the confidence which the Friends of the Conference reposed in me in calling me to this position, and yet there are reasons, and a number of them, why I undertake the work with very great diffidence. One is, that certain

engagements into which I have already entered will necessarily make my attendance upon the Conference somewhat irregular. Another is, that since we have come together and have engaged in one session of the Conference, my appreciation of the responsibility that rests upon this body of Friends has become very greatly heightened. I have looked forward, ever since my appointment upon the delegation from Indiana Yearly Meeting, to this occasion as one of very great importance, but now that we are here, and have taken one another by the hand and looked one another in the face, and are beginning to face the questions of great importance that must come before us, the responsibility that this body of Friends has resting upon them is, in my mind, extremely momentous. I only ask that our prayers may be united, that Jesus Christ himself may be the Head of this deliberative body, and ask that, so far as the functions of the chairman are concerned, they shall be simply official, and in the direction of opening the way for God's will to be done in the ordinary routine of business of the Conference.

Now according to the order of business reported by the original committee of arrangements, and adopted by the Conference last evening, the order at the present time before the Conference is miscellaneous business such as may be introduced by any members of the Conference.

DAVID HADLEY, of Western Yearly Meeting: It seems to me that in view of the concentrated spiritual power that we have here, and this Conference being strictly deliberative in character, there ought to be more time for matters of devotion than simply a few moments in the opening of the sessions, and if there can be any arrangement by which we can come together for a season of consecration and prayer prior to the sessions of the Conference. I think it will be well.

ROBERT W. DOUGLAS, of Indiana: The time was occupied this morning pretty closely by committees. I should think that in future there might be a half hour or an hour before the sessions of the Conference for a

devotional meeting. I would suggest that we meet for worship and devotion at half-past eight each morning during the Conference.

WILLIAM L. PYLE, of Western: I like that proposition, and that the time be for one hour.

(Further expressions of approval.)

JAMES WOOD, of New York: If Allen Jay [chairman of the Business Committee] will report at what hour the morning session will begin, the question of the time to be spent in devotion can be more easily decided.

ALLEN JAY, of Indiana: The committee recommend that the Conference hold its sessions from nine to twelve o'clock in the morning, three to five in the afternoon, and seven to nine at night.

TIMOTHY NICHOLSON, of Indiana: I think other duties were referred to this Business Committee in regard to rules and regulations. Would it not be well to call for those as a further part of the report of the committee at this time? (Consent.)

CHAIRMAN: If, then, the Business Committee has a further report to make, it can be given at this time.

L. L. HOBBS, of North Carolina, secretary of the Business Committee, read the report: (See Minutes, page 11.)

CHAIRMAN: You have heard the report of the Business Committee. This report involves some pretty radical action on the part of the Conference, so far as the management of the legislative work here is concerned. Will the Conference speak to this report, please?

WASHINGTON HADLEY, of Kansas: I rise to a question of privilege. I notice our dear friend, Henry Hartshorne, is present from Philadelphia, and I would suggest that

we admit him to a seat on the floor in the deliberations of the Conference.

ROBERT W. DOUGLAS, of Indiana : I would be in favor of that as a matter of courtesy.

CHAIRMAN : A proposition is made that Henry Hartshorne, of Philadelphia, who is known to all the members of the Conference I have no doubt, be invited to a place upon the floor of the Conference, and to the liberties of the meeting. Friends, speak to the proposition, please. (Several voices in approval.)

WILLIAM L. PEARSON, of Iowa : There are here two or three other well-known Friends, who, it seems to me, might be accorded the same courtesy, R. J. Mendenhall and A. V. Talbert, of Minneapolis.

DAVID HADLEY, of Western : In view of the fact that we are doing this as a matter of courtesy, I am not in favor of establishing such a precedent here at this time.

CHAIRMAN : Is there any further expression from the Conference in reference to the matter of inviting Henry Hartshorne to a place on the floor and freedom of discussion in the Conference ?

FRANCIS W. THOMAS, of Indiana : I am in favor of recognizing Henry Hartshorne on the floor. While we do not hold correspondence by the usual routine of epistolary action with the yearly meeting itself, we can not set aside the membership of that yearly meeting. We can not decide against the presence of Henry Hartshorne in this body, from the fact that he is a member of that yearly meeting. A man who is a member of the Society of Friends in that yearly meeting is a member in any yearly meeting and has certain rights and privileges, and for that reason I would admit him, under the circumstances, to a place on the floor.

LUKE WOODARD, of Indiana : I do not rise to urge any objection against Henry Hartshorne or the other

Friends named, but it seems to me we are in danger of making it necessary for us to make invidious distinctions, as we will have very many visitors whom we shall welcome simply as visitors. I should be in favor of welcoming them as such without any formal recognition.

ELWOOD SCOTT, of Indiana: I think there could be no objection to any person present, and especially those persons named, taking part in the public discussions here, but it seems to me that there are quite a number here, and others will be here, and it would be a distinction. We had better have it understood. I am sure others would like to have the same privilege, and some have already spoken of it, and to make the distinction for one or two would be putting those under embarrassment. I should be very glad myself that all should have the liberty to speak were it the wisest thing and so understood by the yearly meetings. But my opinion is we had better move on just as we have been doing.

DAVID B. UPDEGRAFF, of Ohio: Probably the ground will be quite as well covered if we extend a welcome, as a matter of courtesy, not only to Henry Hartshorne, but to all the Friends that may attend with us.

TIMOTHY NICHOLSON, of Indiana: I will state that this subject has claimed the attention of the committee on temporary arrangements. It is well known that the Indiana delegation, five years ago, took the liberty to suggest to a few Friends of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting to come and be present, not presuming to decide what the conference would do when they came, but inviting them to be present. Four Friends from Philadelphia came. The matter was explained to the conference, and the conference decided, under the existing circumstances and under the character of that conference, which was different from this, to admit them to take part in the discussions, but not to have a voice in determining the decisions. This year this question claimed the attention of the committee on arrangements, and we seemed to be estopped from sending an invita-

tion of that character to our friends, because the conditions of the Conference are different. It opens up a pretty wide question, friends. Now, our dear friends, Elias Rogers and his wife, are here from Canada Yearly Meeting. The Canada Yearly Meeting declined to appoint, not in any opposition to the Conference, but because they were so far off; and so we see how far this will reach, and I think the suggestion that was made by some Friend and endorsed by David Updegraff is about the thing, to extend a courteous invitation to all these Friends to be with us, without participating in the discussions.

DAVID HADLEY, of Western: I want to explain my position. I think there are certain yearly meeting courtesies due, and it seems to me Henry Hartshorne, representing a yearly meeting that is not officially recognized, the Conference should give to him an invitation to the deliberations of this Conference, but outside of that I should be quite opposed to any extension of privilege.

LAWRIE TATUM, of Iowa: The remark was made a little while ago that this would be setting a precedent. I just wish to call the attention of the Conference to the fact that there is a committee, appointed by the various yearly meetings, on Indian work, in which the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, as a meeting, takes no part, but the most efficient workers we have in the Indian committee are from Philadelphia. Friends are crippled there in a way that they are not crippled in any other of the yearly meetings, and I am fully in favor not only of extending them the courtesy of an invitation to listen to us, but I should be glad if we would give them also the privilege of taking part, as no other yearly meeting that has not appointed should take part. They are in a different position from the rest of us. While there are some Friends, I have no doubt at all, who are in hearty unity with us as much as in other yearly meetings, yet they cannot be here in the official capacity, and now the thought is, shall we grant to them the privilege that we do in the Indian committee? My preference would be that we should.

ESTHER G. FRAME, of Wilmington: Our friend has expressed my opinion. There was no opportunity for a delegate to be appointed to represent Philadelphia Yearly Meeting in this Conference. There are a number of Friends whose sympathy is with us in this work. All the other yearly meetings in America have been represented, I think, fully and sufficiently. I think there is a difference between receiving our Friends from Philadelphia and receiving Friends from other yearly meetings that are represented. Therefore, I am in favor of admitting our brother into the discussions in this Conference. I think it is Christian courtesy that we should do it. I do not know about Canada Yearly Meeting. They had an opportunity. They were not against the Conference, I understand, and they had an opportunity and could have been represented. But the Friends in Philadelphia Yearly Meeting had no opportunity whatever. Now, our brother comes with sympathy toward us, and I believe his words of wisdom would be an assistance to us in the discussions that will be made in this Conference. I am, therefore, in favor of receiving Henry Hartshorne into these discussions.

RICHARD H. THOMAS, of Baltimore: I wish to say very much what our friends, Lawrie Tatum and Esther G. Frame, have said. It seems to me the peculiar situation of the Friends in Philadelphia would justify a peculiar decision in their case.

CHAIRMAN: The discussion seems to be general, and the general sentiment, as expressed, I think, is in favor of admitting Henry Hartshorne, of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, not only to the floor of the Conference, but to the discussion in the meetings.

JOHN HENRY DOUGLAS, of Iowa: Before the chair decides, I wish to say there are two sides, and the question is whether a thing like this can be done in a body of delegates like this, where there are strong objections, not against a person but on a principle involved, and where the committee having charge of arrangements

have expressed a hesitancy in the matter. No discourtesy is intended to Henry Hartshorne; he should be invited to a place with us, and to the enjoyment of the meetings, and should be treated with Christian courtesy, but to go farther than that I am decidedly opposed, as a matter of principle. It would be a mistake. I think it would be an injury to the interest we want to encourage in Philadelphia. I think a good many feel that way.

NATHAN T. FRAME, of Wilmington: I apprehend there is not a delegate in the house to-day, but that would gladly and joyfully extend a courtesy to Henry Hartshorne and admit him to the discussions, if there did not seem to some of us to be a principle involved in it. It seems to be unfortunate that any person should belong to a yearly meeting that debars its own members from such privileges and such discussions.

CHAIRMAN: If Nathan Frame will excuse me, I think this discussion ought to be strictly confined to admitting Henry Hartshorne to the discussions. I believe there is a universal agreement in inviting him to the courtesies that are due to Friends from another yearly meeting. The question is whether he should be admitted to debate.

NATHAN T. FRAME, of Wilmington: I should gladly extend him a courtesy.

JAMES CAREY THOMAS, of Baltimore: Unless those Friends who have objected will withdraw their objections, I think we ought to pass from the subject without further debate.

HENRY HARTSHORNE, of Philadelphia: I feel sure that the Friends in Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, like myself, are in warm sympathy with the body of the Society, and will be well content and grateful for the courtesy shown to us by the Conference in welcoming the presence of one who is here. I see the objection, and I shall be well satisfied if the question is now dropped.

WILLIAM L. PYLE, of Western : While I am satisfied with the general consent relative to Henry Hartshorne, I wish to say there are present husbands of wives that are here and wives of husbands that are here as delegates, and we have other friends that have taken an interest in this Conference and in preparing for it who would like to know just what their condition is before it. They do not want to be under any embarrassment. Therefore, I propose that we extend a courtesy to them in the way of seats on the floor while we have them. I am only sorry we have not more room, and I want to say here that if it is thought best to adjourn to a larger room, it can be supplied easily and readily.

ALLEN JAY, of Indiana : The committee this morning decided that everybody should come in as long as there is any room and they would behave themselves.

CHAIRMAN : The sentiment in the discussion seems to be now clearly toward an invitation to Henry Hartshorne to share in all the courtesies of the Conference, but not to extend to him the freedom of debate, and so the chair will decide unless there is a dissenting voice, and Henry Hartshorne will please feel that he is with us most heartily received as a brother beloved ; also other friends already named, A. V. Talbert, of Minneapolis, and Elias Rogers and his wife, of Canada.

ELIAS JESSUP, of Iowa : It seems to me if we extend the special courtesies to these friends, we ought to continue to do so to everybody that is here. I do not see any necessity of making a distinction for these more than anybody else.

WILLIAM NICHOLSON, of Kansas : That is exactly my mind. I approve David Updegraff's proposition that we extend a general courtesy.

CHAIRMAN : I think that all of our visiting friends who are present may very well feel themselves perfectly at home and that they are cordially received by the Confer-

ence. No action has been taken upon the report of the Business Committee as to time of meeting, and the chair has been somewhat embarrassed because of the fact that it has not been acted upon. I will take it as a great favor if members will express their approval, or otherwise, of the report of this committee.

WILLIAM L. PYLE, of Western: It occurs to me that five o'clock in the evening is getting pretty late to close the afternoon session. If the Conference could meet at half-past two, and close at half-past four promptly, it seems to me it would be a better hour, decidedly; and, in view of the fact that all this concourse of people is here, the proposition that was made to have a devotional meeting that all may come to, at half-past eight, seems to be a good one, and that the Conference proper can begin at half-past nine. That would make a session of two hours and a half, from that to twelve, and would be a better division of time.

CHAIRMAN: William L. Pyle's proposition is to amend the report of the Business Committee, by providing for a devotional meeting at half-past eight in the morning, beginning the business session of the Conference at half-past nine, beginning the afternoon session at 2:30, and closing at half-past four. Does that meet with the approval of the Conference?

FRANCIS A. WRIGHT, of Kansas: I unite with the proposition of William L. Pyle, with the understanding that there shall be, say ten minutes, intermission after the devotional meeting before the commencement of the meeting for business.

WILLIAM L. PYLE, of Western: I accept that amendment, and it should be rigidly adhered to.

(The proposition as amended is approved.)

DAVID HADLEY, of Western: The devotional meeting seems to be wholly unorganized, and it seems to me

quite necessary that this Conference should take some preliminary methods by which that meeting shall convene.

CHAIRMAN: Shall that be referred back to the Business Committee? (Consent.)

ELWOOD SCOTT, of Indiana: I should like to know whether this general courtesy, which has been extended, embraces persons from other churches as well as ours. There are some persons from other churches, and strangers in the city from Iowa, that want to come to-day, not members of our church.

CHAIRMAN: If the chair may be allowed to express what seems to be the inference from the discussion, it is that the opening of our doors is already an extension of courtesy to visiting friends of all denominations. Beyond that we can scarcely go. (Consent.)

CHAIRMAN: There was a matter in the report of the Business Committee concerning the deliberations of the Conference, and the limitation of time in the discussions. Under these rules, as I understand them, all addresses and papers will be limited to fifteen minutes. I will ask the chairman of the Business Committee to present to the Conference that feature of the report with reference to the time that may be occupied by each speaker.

SECRETARY: "No speaker shall occupy more than fifteen minutes in his address without consent of the chairman, nor shall he speak a second time upon any one proposition without the permission of the chairman, and the second address shall be limited to five minutes except by consent of the chairman."

CHAIRMAN: I call the attention of the Conference to the fact that that puts arbitrary power in the hands of the chairman with reference to the deliberations here.

A FRIEND: That is right. It was intended to.

WILLIAM P. PINKHAM, of New England: I thought, when this matter was presented, of the manner in which this rule limited the work in the other conference, and instead of an extension of time being granted by the Conference I would suggest that it might be better if the time were made twenty minutes instead of fifteen.

(Many Friends express their concurrence in the report.)

CHAIRMAN: That feature of the report seems to meet with general approval. I will ask the Conference now to consider specially the other feature of the report in reference to the manner in which decisions shall be reached. Will the secretary please read that part of the report?

SECRETARY: "They recommend that in determining the decisions of the Conference the ordinary methods in use among Friends shall be observed, unless there be a call for a vote by any one delegation."

JAMES CAREY THOMAS, of Baltimore: I would like to state the position of the Baltimore delegation on that point. We were particularly instructed by our yearly meeting to take part in the discussions and conclusions reached by the Conference in the ordinary way, but when a question was pressed to vote we were directed to abstain from voting.

DAVID HADLEY, of Western: It seems to me that question belongs exclusively to that delegation and not to this Conference. I concur in the report.

CHAIRMAN: There being no objection, this feature of the report shall be considered approved. Will the Conference approve the report of the Business Committee as a whole as amended?

FRANCIS A. WRIGHT, of Kansas: I should like to object to that feature of the report with regard to calling for a vote by any one delegation. I believe we ought to

think about this matter before we fix it as a precedent. I think we ought to have stronger grounds than the call of one delegation for a vote.

JAMES WOOD, of New York: This matter was carefully considered by the Business Committee. It was recognized, and friends will please bear in mind, that the appointment of delegations by the various yearly meetings was made on the basis of the decisions of this Conference being reached by vote, with the single exception of Baltimore Yearly Meeting, as that method of procedure was designated in the call or invitation upon which the yearly meetings acted; so that the determination of questions by vote is really the legal status of this question before the Conference, but the Business Committee considered that, as the decisions of this Conference were only advisory, that advice would carry much greater weight without a vote than it would if it was simply a decision of the majority of the Conference, and so for the purpose of having the decisions of this Conference carry the greatest possible advisory weight to the body of Friends at large, the committee reported the proposition which you have heard. But this amendment or addition was in recognition of the fact that the right to vote is inherent in this Conference under the call of the Conference itself. And yet it is not necessary to exercise that right unless occasion should occur that seems to require it, and each yearly meeting is to be the judge of whether the occasion arises. Therefore, this power is put in the hands of the delegation from any one yearly meeting to call for a vote if, in the judgment of that delegation, it is necessary. I think this statement covers the whole ground of the question. (Expressions of approval.)

M. M. BINFORD, of Indiana: I should like to ask whether, if a vote should be called by any considerable number of members from delegations, the form of finding any single delegation to ask for the vote would be deemed necessary? It seems to me if a large number called for the vote, the call should have the same weight with the Conference.

CHAIRMAN: The report of the committee is explicit that it shall be the call of any one delegation.

(Expressions of unity with the report.)

CHAIRMAN: The chair understands that the sentiment of the Conference is in favor of approving the report of the Business Committee as a whole as amended.

TIMOTHY NICHOLSON, of Indiana: Let me make one explanation of a point that is perhaps not clear to all members. In the call for this Conference, no provision was made for voting except on those points upon which the Conference proposes to advise the yearly meetings, not on ordinary little matters that may come up.

CHAIRMAN: The secretary has reminded the chair that possibly it might be the desire of the Conference to have a roll call of the delegates at each day's session. What is the will of the Conference in regard to that matter?

JAMES WOOD, of New York: I think it is an unnecessary formality and a waste of time. (Other like expressions.)

CHAIRMAN: With that understanding, we will pass that question.

SECRETARY: The work of the table will be very much facilitated if friends will bring in their reports from the various committees in writing.

CHAIRMAN: It is suggested that there are delegates present this morning who were not present last night, and whose names ought to be called. If the secretary will call the names of the absentees of last evening, it can be quickly disposed of.

Secretary reads and delegates respond.

CHAIRMAN: Is there any other miscellaneous business other than that reported by the Business Committee?

WILLIAM L. PYLE, of Western: I am requested by James Sanders, of Noblesville, to give notice here that he would be pleased to have some minister attend the meeting at Noblesville, if any one feels drawn that way.

ISOM P. WOOTON, of Iowa: Will it not be necessary for us to appoint a committee on synopsis of the work of this Conference, and ought not such a committee to be appointed at this time, so as to enter fully into the work?

CHAIRMAN: You have heard the proposition of Isom P. Wooton. The question he asks is if this Conference ought not to appoint a committee to prepare a synopsis of the proceedings of the various sessions for publication?

ISOM P. WOOTON, of Iowa: Friends will remember at last conference the synopsis was the document that was presented to the yearly meetings by the delegates. It was submitted, together with the statement of Christian doctrine, and formed a part of the information carried back to the yearly meetings by the delegates. I suggest that we appoint, this morning, that committee on synopsis, that it may be able to enter into the work immediately, and be gathering matters of interest.

DAVID B. UPDEGRAFF, of Ohio: Do we need such a committee? It occurs to me that with two clerks and two authorized reporters we might get almost as much report as we would need.

A FRIEND: I should be in favor of appointing a committee that the report or synopsis might be in condensed form.

ELWOOD SCOTT, of Indiana: The conclusions of the Conference ought to be in reach. I think we ought to have a committee appointed to arrange and prepare a synopsis of the conclusions of this meeting.

WILLIAM L. PYLE, of Western: I am of the impression that if we introduce and provide for a committee on

synopsis, and print that statement, it will interfere with the publishing of the proceedings at large. Hence, I think it would not be best to do so. If we want to publish the proceedings at large, and also to publish the conclusions, or synopsis, we may have more publishing to do than will be profitable. I would propose that we submit the whole question now—not take time to discuss it here—to one delegate from each yearly meeting, to report on at another time.

TIMOTHY NICHOLSON, of Indiana: In order to save time, I would suggest that we refer it to the nominating committee that we had last night, or the Business Committee.

CHAIRMAN: The proposition, as it is understood by the chair, is that the question of the appointment of a synopsis committee be referred to the standing Business Committee of the Conference, to report to the next session. (Consent.)

WILLIAM NICHOLSON, of Kansas: I wish to ask a practical question. What will be the decision of the chair as to the method which any delegation shall pursue in determining a call for a vote? Will the chair require that that delegation shall be unanimous, or will he be satisfied if there be a majority of that delegation in favor of calling for a vote? It is a practical question, and it may come into play.

CHAIRMAN: Without having opportunity to consider that question, the chair would feel that it would be necessary to have a unanimous call from a delegation, but it is a matter which is open to the Conference to settle. Otherwise the chair might come into a position where he would have to decide between sections of a delegation, which he would very much dislike to have to do.

DAVID B. UPDEGRAFF, of Ohio: I do not think that was the understanding of the Business Committee, and I do not think it is a legitimate understanding. The

delegations surely have a way of coming to a conclusion. We leave that with them ; but their conclusion arrived at, whether through majority vote or through the submission of the minority, surely would be satisfactory to the chair.

CHAIRMAN : When the minority submits, the conclusion is unanimous, and there is no question in the case.

A FRIEND : The thought arose in my mind that it might be a very difficult thing for a large delegation to take up a vote among themselves while there is a question pending. It would usually be too late for a delegation to introduce its objection. I would much prefer if we could have had a call of ten delegates for a vote of that kind.

CHAIRMAN : The Conference can very readily see that it would introduce us into interminable confusion if it were left to the chairman to decide as to the action of a divided delegation. If by their chairman they make an announcement as to action taken by their delegation, the chair will not ask how they arrived at the decision.

ROBERT W. DOUGLAS, of Indiana : It certainly would be very unfortunate to ask the chair to decide in advance a question that may come up. The best way is to wait until these questions do come up. I think we ought to get to business.

FRANCIS W. THOMAS, of Indiana : I agree with the original decision of this question, and propose that we pass on.

CHAIRMAN : I am informed by the chairman of the Business Committee that the request of Calvin W. Pritchard takes precedence of the regular order reported by the committee on arrangements. By consent of the Conference, Calvin W. Pritchard will present the report.

CALVIN W. PRITCHARD, of Western : I have nothing now to say in presenting it except to ask the secretaries

to read the report of the committee that was appointed at Chicago, that has in hand the auxiliary congresses and Congress of Religions. After that is read, I would be glad to answer any question that may be asked concerning it, or make any explanations that may be desired.

CHAIRMAN: Will the secretary please read the document which is called for.

(APPENDIX B.)

CONGRESS OF RELIGIONS.

To the Conference:

In the World's Congress Auxiliary of the World's Columbian Exposition, a department of religions is organized. A general committee to inaugurate the work is made up by the officers of the congress as follows:

“Rev. John Henry Barrows, D.D., Chairman (Presbyterian); Rev. Prof. David Swing, Vice-Chairman (Independent); Archbishop P. A. Feehan (Catholic); Rt. Rev. Bishop Wm. E. McLaren, D.D., D.C.L. (Protestant Episcopal); Rev. Dr. F. A. Noble (Congregational); Rev. Dr. William M. Lawrence (Baptist); Rev. Dr. F. M. Bristol (Methodist); Rabbi E. G. Hirsch (Jew); Rev. Dr. A. J. Canfield (Universalist); Rev. Jenkin Lloyd Jones (Unitarian); Rt. Rev. Bishop C. E. Cheney (Reformed Episcopal); Rev. M. C. Ranseen (Swedish Lutheran); Rev. John Z. Torgensen (Norwegian Lutheran); Rev. J. Berger (German Methodist); Mr. J. W. Plummer (Quaker); Rev. L. P. Mercer (Swedenborgian); the Secretary (*ex officio*).”

These men are intended to be chairmen of committees made up from their respective denominations in Chicago and vicinity. These special committees are to choose respectively eminent men from all parts of the world to be associated with them as Advisory Councils. This will complete the organization.

To set forth the object of the congress, we quote from the preliminary address of the General Committee, as follows:

“The committee having charge of the religious congresses seek the co-operation of the representatives of all faiths. Now that the nations are being brought into closer and friendlier relations with each other, the time is apparently ripe for new manifestations and developments of religious fraternity.

“It is not the purpose of these conventions to create the temper of indifferentism in regard to the important peculiarities distinguishing the religions of the world, but rather to bring together, in frank and friendly conference, the most eminent men of different faiths, strong in their personal convictions, who will strive to see and show what are the supreme truths, and what light religion has to throw on the great problems of our age. Ample provision will be made for special congresses of all churches, denominations, or religious organizations, which may desire to avail themselves of the opportunities presented by this Auxiliary. The central Religious Congress will, however, rest on a wider basis. We are confident that it may be made illustrious as a representative gathering of men united for the attainment of great moral ends.

“Believing that God is, and that he has not left himself without witness; believing that the influence of religion tends to advance the general welfare, and is the most vital force in the social order of every people; and convinced that of a truth ‘God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is accepted with him,’ we affectionately invite the representatives of all faiths to aid us in presenting to the world, at the exposition of 1893, the religious harmonies and unities of humanity, and also in showing forth the moral and spiritual agencies which are at the root of human progress. It is proposed to consider the foundations of religious faith; to review the triumphs of religion in all ages; to set forth the present state of religion among the nations, and its influence over literature, art, commerce, government, and the family life; to indicate its power in promoting temperance and social purity, and its harmony with true science; to show its dominance in the higher institutions of learning; to make prominent the value of the weekly rest-day on reli-

gious and other grounds ; and to contribute to those forces which shall bring about the unity of the race in the worship of God and the service of man. Let representatives from every part of the globe be interrogated and bidden to declare what they have to offer or suggest for the world's betterment ; what light religion has to throw on the labor problems, the educational questions, and the perplexing social conditions of our time ; and what illumination it can give to the subjects of vital interest that come before the other congresses of 1893. It is proposed to have these and similar themes discussed by great masters of human thought from many lands, and we invite suggestions and assurances of co-operation from those persons and religious bodies, to whom this address is particularly sent."

The plan of work, as we understand it, is to hold one general congress, in which all religions will be represented, and each will have a share in the deliberations, contributing the best it can as to its history, teachings and achievements. This general conference will hold sessions daily through the whole of Ninth month. Beside this the representatives of each faith, denomination, or form of religion may have their own congress for the discussion of their own needs or peculiar characteristics. Apartments will be provided free of expense for the holding of all the meetings, there being one large auditorium in the Art Building for the general congress, and the churches of the city will be devoted to the special congresses.

Friends have been invited to take their place in the congress. Jonathan W. Plummer, a business man of Chicago, and a minister of the Hicksite Friends' denomination, was appointed by the officers of the Congress Auxiliary as chairman for Friends. By consultation, a special committee of ten persons was made up, of whom six are orthodox Friends, whose names are signed to this address.

If the work of going before this congress with a showing as to what we are is undertaken, it is understood that we, as a denomination of orthodox Friends, will be allowed to act independently and alone, as though we were

not associated with others who bear our name. We were asked to organize under one special committee, because those bearing the name of Friends are comparatively small in number, and the machinery would thereby be somewhat simplified.

We are mindful of the fact that there are serious objections to uniting with all faiths, false as well as true, in a fraternal convocation, while there are cogent reasons *for* so uniting. Many of the most devout Christians have given the enterprise their hearty approbation, others have warned against it. We are unable to decide as to the wisdom of moving forward without the advice, sympathy and co-operation of the church, and come to this Conference of Friends for counsel. We have all confidence that with prayer and due consideration you will be guided in judgment, and we pray your advice as to what steps, if any, we ought to take in acting upon the appointment we have received.

We may further say that we are informed that our Hicksite brethren look upon the movement favorably, and are likely to come before the Congress with a report of what Friends are, have been, and promise to be, from their point of view, and if we are silent, their declarations will go to the world as the true and only statement made concerning Friends as a people.

Respectfully submitted.

CALVIN W. PRITCHARD, *Vice Pres.*

W. B. WICKERSHAM, *Secretary.*

WILLIAM HENRY MATCHETT.

GEORGE D. GRIFFITH.

ALBERT W. MACY.

FOWELL B. HILL.

CHAIRMAN: This communication puts before the Conference the question of whether we shall recommend that the orthodox Society of Friends in this country shall take part in the World's Congress of Religions. Is it the will of the Conference to enter upon the discussion of that question at present, or fix a time for its consideration in the future?

FRANCIS W. THOMAS, of Indiana: I would suggest as a preliminary disposition of the question at issue, which is one of very great moment, that we submit the question first to a committee made up of one delegate from each yearly meeting represented here in this Conference, and that that committee may take all parts into consideration and give its recommendation to the Conference, and we then discuss the recommendation and the propriety of acceding.

CALVIN W. PRITCHARD, of Western: I think I ought to make one further explanation as to this whole matter. This committee, whose names are signed to that report, sent out invitations, or suggested to the authorities of the Conference to send out invitations to a number of eminent Friends all over the world to form an advisory board. I think there were about thirty-five names that were addressed. We have had answers from twenty of those, two of whom are in England and the rest in this country. They include the presidents of all our colleges, I believe, but one of whom has not answered accepting the invitations as members of the advisory board, and others that stand at the front in the ministry and in educational circles. I may say further that I learned in a conversation with Mr. Bonney, just before I left home, that the churches of the city are offered to the Congress to be used by the different denominations to hold their special congresses. So that Friends will have a week, if they desire, in which they can meet to discuss their own matters as a congress of Friends, and other denominations will have the same privilege. This is besides the General Congress, in which we shall have an opportunity of presenting ourselves.

LUKE WOODARD, of Indiana: I think we can not do better than to unite with Francis W. Thomas' proposition. (Several voices in approval.)

NATHAN T. FRAME, of Wilmington: I would like to ask how this advisory board is to be selected?

CALVIN W. PRITCHARD, of Western: The persons invited to make up the advisory board were suggested to the officers of the Congress as suitable persons, and they are appointed by Mr. Bonney.

ISOM P. WOOTON, of Iowa: I rise to ask a question. In some of the states, Iowa especially, there is a commission authorized and expenses paid by the legislature by appropriation, to inquire into all these school and church relations. Charles Ashman, of Guthrie Center, Iowa, is the member in connection with the religious interests of Iowa. He sends in his request for the statistics of Iowa. Now, the state of Iowa does not include all of Iowa Yearly Meeting. I find it very difficult to limit the statistics. We have the statistics of Iowa Yearly Meeting, but to distribute them to the different states, and to have them brought out from each state separately by such a commission in so fragmentary a way in so small a church as we have, we would be at a loss to find the definite relation of our church. Now, is this designed to meet that need outside of this state commission?

CALVIN W. PRITCHARD, of Western: I think this is independent of anything Isom P. Wooton speaks of, and will meet the needs outside of this state commission, I think.

ROBERT W. DOUGLAS, of Indiana: I rise to unite with the proposition of Francis W. Thomas, and after the committee from the yearly meetings is appointed, I think Calvin W. Pritchard could meet with that committee and facilitate matters in that way.

CHAIRMAN: The chair understands the sentiment of the Conference to be in favor of the reference of this question to a committee to be composed of one member from each yearly meeting delegation. Will the delegations present names for this committee.

TIMOTHY NICHOLSON, of Indiana: Can we not save time about that, as there is no great hurry, and let the

names be called for at the beginning of the afternoon session?

CHAIRMAN: It will be taken by consent, and at that time the delegations can have their names in readiness. If there be no other business, we will call for the regular order of business for this forenoon session, namely, a paper on our denominational literature, including our periodicals, by Seth Mills, of Western Yearly Meeting.

(APPENDIX C.)

FRIENDS' LITERATURE.

BY SETH MILLS.

Something has been written, and much said, in public and private, about Friends' literature. There is general unanimity in the opinion that it is not all that could be wished. There are those who think it does not adequately reflect our image as a religious organization, nor effectively supply the demands of our Christian work. It is also felt that our church papers are falling short because of meagre support, and that plurality in number is sustained at the cost of efficiency in character.

Opportunity has not been found, in the preparation of this paper, for a careful study of these questions, nor for any attempt to review our denominational literature, past or present. Discussion enough, however, it seems, has been had to fairly place the subject on the list for examination; and preliminary thereto, some brief suggestions as to what may possibly be underlying principles are offered.

The whole matter is many sided. Its canvass involves wide range of investigation, and really useful results are possible only as the inquiry is intelligently and deliberately conducted.

At the starting point, it may be suggested that the literature of a people indexes their inner life, "Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh," so the pen; that this is true both as to quantity and quality of the article produced. Voluminous literature of the sub-

stantial sort springs only from large and enduring forces. Ephemeral or spasmodic life is not fertile in solid literary product. Each type of civilization evolves its own men and women of letters.

Concede these propositions capable of demonstration, and the conclusions are these: 1. In civil or religious society the tide of literature does not rise higher than its fountain head. 2. Before great wealth in literature there must be life forces, full, steady, and continued.

The literary features of our own religious society illustrate these truths. Proportionate progress in organization and growth has borne fruit to correspond. The corner stone of our system was not laid high on the plane of intellectual culture, but it was settled deep in the spiritual subsoil of the English Reformation. We came along the more lowly way. We took up the thread of religious succession with an humble hand not trained in the learning of the schools. The conditions attending our genesis were not compatible with rapid progress in literary art. It was a period of confusion and unrest. All energies were centered in the adjustment of questions of faith. The parallel extremes of mysticism and ecclesiasticism, one on either hand, absorbed the energies and taxed the strength. George Fox came into the field opportunely. His own writing and that of his colleagues dealt in plain but definite terms with the exigencies of the hour. Herein was the primordial germ of organization. For a century and more it flourished. Its growth became phenomenal. True, the fires of persecution burned; but then, as before, the "blood of the martyrs became the seed of the church." Faithful men and women gave their time and their lives to the cause of truth. Principles were clearly elucidated and established; the spiritual element of the gospel definitely proclaimed and accepted; worship in "spirit and in truth" better understood and practiced; the spiritual nature of the sacraments declared; "peace on earth and good will to men" taught and exemplified; liberty of conscience in divine things insisted on; meanwhile knowledge in all things, "civil and useful," was encouraged. Here was the beginning of wonderful and potential life; here was the initial grouping of marvelous forces, and

evidence of vitality, wanting only the element of time to produce great results for the betterment of the world; among these, a bountiful literature, we may conclude, was foreshadowed not last nor least.

The early literature of our church, as far as it went, was characteristic, and the foundation laid by these chosen men of the times was strong and broad enough to have sustained a superstructure reaching great proportions before the close of the nineteenth century, and one supremely rich in its stores of literature. But were these "signs of promise" to be trusted? It is true and gratifying that some noble names have appeared above the horizon of each generation who have used the pen to the honor of our people, and left behind them footprints of imperishable fame and blessing. But it may be justly suspected that some of these were more the products of individualism, indigenous to our somewhat capricious soil, than the outgrowth of our typical fertility as a "peculiar people."

With the subsidence of the abounding life that characterized our first century came processes of decay. Apathy and disintegration threatened, and the literature of the "middle ages" of Quakerism became correspondingly flavorless and contracted. Under such conditions the inner life of the church wavered. Atrophy and degeneration made inroads. The prestige for grand achievement, so richly promised in the past, weakened. The streams of intellectual and spiritual vitality which were gathering great volumes of force were either thrown back to stagnate and dry, or were turned aside for the irrigation of other fields. Small wonder it is that literature did not flourish, and that when the reaction of the present century came on, it was to find us like unto an impoverished and divided house. Faith in our once princely heritage was well nigh lost. Every aggressive man was ready to become a "law unto himself," and every geographical center was struggling, in a sense, for independent recognition. Unity in the real ground work of our faith "waxed cold," the element of cohesion was largely eliminated, and the latent energies of the people developed along the lines of secular enterprise.

The dawn of the twentieth century breaks upon a scene of revival. The men of the generation just passing have relaid the foundation for a great edifice in the gospel. It is for us to build upon this foundation.

In the matter of literature there is much to inspire confidence. Even now our resources are not meagre, but they need development. And it is certain that before we can rise to the level of the Christian age there must be created, or generated, an institution of great spiritual life and power that shall take on the endurance of which our beginning was the wondrous prophecy.

What then are the measures demanded by our present situation? First among them is more abiding faith in our church and its institutions. There must prevail a spirit of loyalty that will capture and hold and apply all the inherent forces of our membership. The coming generation must be able to find in their church environment that which is entitled to their respect and reverence. The record of the past is not free from deprecating allusions. Disparagement has not always been repressed. Religious vandalism, displaying itself in greed for defacement and caricature, is not the part of wisdom. If, as a church, we will be strong for Christ, we must believe in ourselves and our work as his servants and for his sake.

Then, again, comes the question of unity. Mountain chains, great rivers, and ocean tides must not constitute boundary lines of separate dispensations of "Quakerism." We must be one church and one people. Our characteristic readiness to divide and subdivide is greatly to be deplored. The spirit of faction is destructive to our growth. "United we stand, divided we fall," is true in church as in state.

The great principles of the gospel which we hold in common with other evangelical churches are as dear and vital to us now as ever. These, together with the doctrines of peace; equality of woman's work with that of man; the Spirit's immediate leadership in worship and the positive testimony to the spiritual interpretation of the ordinances; ours, some of them, by charter right, certainly afford a base large and strong enough upon which to build, in our consolidated strength, a great temple to

the praise of our God. For this is it not ours to "labor and to wait?"

And here it is not to be forgotten that rigid sectarian limitations are out of date. A keen and glittering blade has been laid, these years, at the root of denominationism as an exclusive idea, and the safest road for a progressive church is along the pure stream of fraternal fellowship; while organic unity may not be indicated, the spirit of Christian unity must prevail.

Then again, we must show our faith by our works. Among the indications under this head, education comes prominently into view. If we are "rising" it is in great part because of the momentum our fathers gave us in the schools they founded and equipped. From these the head waters of the coming literature are gathering. Not only are writers furnished by the schools, but readers as well; each class is complementary to the other, and mutually reactive in their nature. These influences are to be incorporated into the life of the church. A score of young men and women must be educated as Friends where now there is but one. The outflow of our resources into other territory must be checked, and the study of religious economics turned to our own account. The endowment funds of our colleges must be doubled over and again. The "bone and sinew" of our hope lies hidden away in the homes of the comparatively poor. We must lay hands on it. It must be polarized by the spirit of our enterprises. Thus, latent literary talent will be developed for our use, and the coming writer will write, like Whittier, for us.

Taking precedence in a sense above everything is the spiritual life and activity of the masses. Incentives to Bible study and Bible work; influences that make for personal Christ-likeness and personal devotion on the part of the individual; upon these "hang all the law and the prophets," with respect to our growth and success as a religious body. If ever we have a great literature, it will be because of our strength, and length, and breadth, and height, and depth in Christ Jesus our Lord. So important a factor in this department as the ministry of the gospel will naturally claim the first and best thought

in this connection. The ministry of the church will continue to be as in the past, and with augmented force, as the years go by, the gauge of the spiritual life and fruitfulness of the membership; so that after all is said there is no single question sustaining such vital relations to every feature of our work, literature included, as the development, exercise, and support of the ministry.

Until substantial progress is made along some of these paths, our literature will not reach its golden age. Even born editors can not make strong magazines out of low grade matter. Our crude material must be elaborated and refined for the Master's use.

What then, shall be the type of Friends' literature in A. D. 1900 and onward?

In the matter of periodicals it is submitted that we ought to have *one paper* in America.

There should manifestly be such harmonizing of our interests and beliefs and purposes, as a unified church, that a single, strong, rationally conservative, but thoroughly progressive journal should be made fairly representative of the whole. It should be the medium of communication and interchange on matters of common interest between all geographical sections of the denomination. It ought to be the compendium of the best current thought throughout our borders. It should embrace every department of Christian effort and research; and become, in itself, a mighty agent for the highest culture of our people. Its correspondents, men and women of the most competent qualification possible, and of the most pronounced loyalty to the cause, should be resident in every field and center of Christian activity which claims our interest. The news of the united church should find in its columns their weekly summary. It should be the exponent of our faith in its fullest sense. Its departments should embrace Bible study, Christian doctrine, evangelistic work, education, missionary enterprise, "Christian Endeavor," arbitration and peace, temperance, social purity, school and college news, movements of workers, current thought of the day, progress in science and art, popular reforms, public charities, and so on indefinitely. Its editorial columns should discuss, from our standpoint,

all the leading questions of the day, and furnish a comprehensive review of important phases of the world's work. It ought to be amply illustrated, and in every way of the best typographical workmanship.

It goes without saying that here are great requirements. First, there is to be provided the "wanted man," and still men and men. Then time and labor and skill and patience and money; and almost if not quite "the greatest of these" is money.

Under such an enterprise, there should be sunk out of sight in the beginning a sum of money sufficient to guarantee success. Union in purpose and sympathy throughout the entire church ought to produce the requisite fund and insure patronage that would place the ample support of the publication beyond a doubt.

A forecast like this may be premature and visionary. Perhaps the line of suggestion falls far from a practical range. Undue gravity may be attributed to the situation. But there are reasons to think that we are near the "parting of the ways." Indications point to marvellous developments just ahead. The advance, and with the velocity of the age, of our organization in some form, is unquestionable. But shall our identity be preserved? Is its preservation a demand of the times? What responsibilities face us as the door of the century closes?

Not easily repressed is the conviction that, as a denomination with historic distinctions, our steps are henceforth *aboundingly* forward, or with us, "gravitation, shifting, turns the other way." As our faith is so shall it be unto us.

For the consummation of our most cherished and gilded hopes, let unity and cohesion have always and everywhere their perfect work. Let us be patient, prayerful, progressive. Let our lines be unbroken. Let the banner of the cross lead us on as a triumphing and rejoicing host. To this end let the rear guard quicken its step; the advance column can correspondingly afford to wait.

CHAIRMAN: This paper is now open for discussion by members of the Conference.

JAMES WOOD, of New York: I have listened to the reading of this paper with very great interest and satisfaction. Correct I believe it to be in its historic statement as to our literature of the past, sound in its judgments, and wise in its conclusions. Our past literature stands recorded. We can only refer to it and encourage those who have the time to give it such careful perusal as will reward their effort. It is a peculiarity of the literature of the century in which our Society originated that its forms of expression and its manner of presentation of subjects requires careful research in order that we may arrive at correct conclusions and get a correct opinion in regard to what was written. The future lies before us, and I wish to say a word upon the subject of the periodicals of the future, of the Society of Friends. I entirely agree with the writer of the paper in reference to the desirability of the Society of Friends, on this continent at least, having one periodical, its own. As has been indicated by the author of the paper, that periodical must be conducted on true Quaker lines, but it must be so broad that every possible sentiment and view entertained by any members of the Society of Friends can there find free and welcome expression. While the editorial department should ever hold to the straight and true Quaker line, it should be conducted on a principle very similar to that of the *Independent*, where every shade of opinion, not only in our branch of the church, but in every church of Jesus Christ, can find free and welcome expression.

If we had one periodical of that kind, supported generously by the whole body of Friends throughout this country, what would be the result? The first result would be that it would be pecuniarily self-sustaining, because so soon as you get a subscription list large enough, you can have that amount of advertising thrown upon you that will make the enterprise successful; but so long as the subscription list of any periodical is small in numbers, it is utterly impossible to get advertising matter to support your periodical. The whole thing, as the author of the paper says, is money. It is a question of financial support, because a large subscription list commands the adver-

tising which will give abundant means for the successful carrying on of the enterprise. And right here on this business question is the crucial point, and it is the rock upon which our periodicals are wrecked, to a measure. I give them credit for all the ability they display—and they display much ability and much energy—but nevertheless they founder on the rock of the want of pecuniary support. Now, what could be done, if we had one paper, supported by Friends everywhere, the editor of that paper one who desired to have the best phases of a given line expressed, and who would write to the leading exponent, or, if not the leading exponent, some person competent to give its best expression, saying, We desire an article of so many words or so many columns; enclosed you will find a check for \$100, or \$50, or whatever it may be. If J. J. Mills, or any member of the Society of Friends, gets a letter of that description, it will produce an article with his very best in it; it is no slipshod work; it is not worked in in a recess between other engagements, but it takes precedence, and his very best is given. And just so in every field of thought, in every department of interest, in the whole Society of Friends; and the result would be, we would have a publication so rich that we would eagerly read it, and we would digest it, and we would know what is going on, and would be profited by it.

Now, what is the result at the present time? For years I have been wading through four periodicals, two in Philadelphia and two in the west, to find out what the Society of Friends was driving at, and—well, life is too short for that sort of business. You cannot do it. You can say, I am going to look over these four papers every week, but you wont do it. You will neglect it. You do not keep abreast of the times. You do not know what is going on. And what is the result of that ignorance? You hear some bugaboo story of something that is going on away over there, and it comes to you magnified, and you say, The Society of Friends there is wrecked, there is no doubt about it; it is all going to smithers, because we have heard so and so; haven't you heard it? Why! If we had a periodical in which everything is expressed, as I have indicated, there would be none of this bugaboo

trouble that I have spoken of. We would know what Friends are doing, and be knit together in brotherly love, sympathy, and interest. It is the one great need outside of the preaching of the gospel. The great need in the Society of Friends is just that one paper that shall be our paper, and in which every one of us will feel that we have a direct and personal interest.

ESTHER G. FRAME, of Wilmington: I believe we never can have a paper as thorough as we desire it until we have a publishing house of our own. We have no paper that belongs to our church. There is simply a stock company. We are over two hundred and forty years old, and yet our Society has no publishing house of its own. It has a few little rooms rented. I wonder our editors have done as well as they have. Our literature does not represent our people. We need a publishing house. We have the money; we have the culture: we have the ability; we have the material. It will take an artist to get them together. Never shall we succeed as a church, as God intends we should succeed, until we lay broad our foundations and have a large publishing house, wherein we shall have a church paper, owned by the church, the editor appointed by the church, the paper supported by the church, until it becomes a self-supporting institution; and where we shall have a "book concern" owned by the church, in which all these yearly meetings can take an interest, and will support it. There should be committees appointed by these yearly meetings that shall take into consideration all the needs of the church and report to every yearly meeting that is interested in it. We have mental power and spiritual power enough in our church. Articles might be written, as our brother has said, and if there was some money sent for it, we might have, all over our church, men and women writing for these papers. It would not simply be for the older ones, but our young people would become interested in our paper. People ask me, Where is your publishing house? I say we have a few rooms in Chicago, but they don't belong to us. We have a paper in Philadelphia, and other papers. But, dearly beloved, our church

has been seeking too long to get under the brow of the hill. Now is the time for our church to let her light shine and come up out of the wilderness, and get our money consecrated to God, and get our minds and culture consecrated to God. Then we shall have a paper that we shall be proud, as far as intellectual and literary culture and superior power are concerned, to place beside any paper in America. In this paper we can have our missionary work and our church extension work reported. We have been too well satisfied to have a few Quakers go into a place and commence a church. But God has told us to go everywhere and preach the gospel, to dare to go everywhere. We can have a church extension fund, with which we can go into the cities and build churches, and where there is no means of support for the minister he can be supported by the church. We have not done the work God intended us to do. It is a shame to our church, with all her wealth and intelligence, her energies, her privileges, that she should so fail to let her light shine. We need this publishing house.

TIMOTHY NICHOLSON, of Indiana: I want to express, on behalf of the committee on temporary arrangements, our great thankfulness for the paper which we have had from Seth Mills. I think I ought to say that when we approached him on this subject, in his great humility he said he could not, but we urged him, because some of us knew that he could. I want to say on our behalf that we are very thankful that we did persevere and get him to produce that paper.

JAMES CAREY THOMAS, of Baltimore: I want to call the attention of the Friends to the revival of interest in the periodicals of the Society on the other side of the water under new management. I am not now expressing any indorsement in any way of the papers and all they contain, that is impossible; I am simply saying Friends on the other side of the water have certainly succeeded in reviving two very dead papers, *The British Friend* and *The London Friend*. *The London Friend* is now published once a week and derives its support from the pens of the

best writers in England. *The British Friend*, published once a month, is also filled with thoroughly intelligent and satisfactory writings, so far as style is concerned. I am not now speaking at all of the matter or of the tendencies of those papers in any way. Until we can get editors of our papers who are willing to call out, and able to call out, the best intellectual force in our church, we will never have a paper which represents the Society of Friends. I know that a great denomination like the Methodist Episcopal church may have an organ of a conference or united conferences which shall have business enough and power enough to send that paper into all the different families in the Methodist church. I know that in a conference that represents a section of Friends' church that is large enough to support a paper, a paper is possible. In a society as divided as we are and I venture to say, as poor as we are, for I do not think we are a very rich people, our rank and file are poor people in a general way—we can not afford to take papers unless they meet the need. What we want is a paper which will come into the family, meeting the need of our Society. I believe that we ought to promulgate our principles by the pen, but I believe that we ought to be broad enough, as James Wood has said, to be willing to hear both sides of a question and not be excluding articles sent to a paper because they do not exactly come to the views of the editor of the paper personally. They may be the views of a large section of Friends who differ from him. We must have a breadth in the conception of what a paper for the Society of Friends is, if we are to have what our friend has so graphically set before us as the ideal paper. I think we need it. There is another thing we need, and that is a consecration of our own individual pens to the service of God. While many of us are willing to preach and willing to go about, how few of us are willing to sit down and take the pains and care to write. There is the difficulty. I do not think we are to blame the editors because the materials presented have not been what they might be from those who could write. If we have a general paper now, are we going to support it? It must have writers. Where are the trained

writers that are sent from our colleges? Where do we see them in our papers? Through what paper do they write? Where are the results of their education? I confess I have looked and read with a good deal of interest, and yet I have not been able to see the results of the training, so far as the pen is concerned. I know it comes out in the ministry, and we are very active and busy in our work; but we need the consecrated pen. And I think it ought to go from this Conference, as the expression of this united body, to ask our Friends, who have thoughts and knowledge and the power of expression, that they do not content themselves until they place on paper and give to the world the best they have, so that it can be read by the church at large. I think we need consecrated pens.

NATHAN T. FRAME, of Wilmington: To see in our Society such a paper as has been indicated, with length and breadth and depth and height, literary in all its departments, there must be a commencement somewhere. As we look over the great periodicals in other religious denominations, we find that they began in a corps of Christian men and women earnestly united in action, in coöperation, in doctrine, who had a definite end in view, and set themselves apart and consecrated themselves to that work. We need not only such a corps of men and women as this at the beginning, we need, as far as we can get it, the coöperation of every yearly meeting on the American continent. For twenty years or more, coming from another denomination, it has been our privilege to be associated with the members of the Society of Friends, and I confess that my heart has longed for, and my mind has burned for, and I have looked out to see the time come when something like that which was indicated in this grand paper that has been read by our brother should take place, and I trust we are at the entering in of the door, and our hands are upon that door to open it this day.

LUKE WOODARD, of Indiana: I was very much interested in the paper as well as in the remarks that have

been made upon it. I find myself in a dilemma in which I often find myself in regard to this and other things. I see much better what ought to be done than I see the practical way of doing it. I think I see before me almost insuperable difficulties in carrying out the suggestions that we have had. I think I do not state anything but the truth when I say that in the past our editors have been somewhat boycotted for venturing out upon the line that has been suggested, of liberty in the way of allowing discussions upon some controverted topics. I know what has been said by different individuals. They say, I will drop my subscription; I will not support a paper like that; and of course when the subscription list falls off the means of making the paper better falls away as well. As has been remarked, we need money to make a strong paper. I have heard people complain that our church papers are too weak, that they can get better papers in other denominations, papers already sustained by a large subscription list, and it leaves ours unsupported. I think I am ready to second a motion, as soon as I hear it, that looks toward anything that is really feasible in the way of starting one denominational paper or one that shall represent the whole church, or two or three for that matter, and that will really promote the interests of Christianity and of everything that we wish to promote. I have nothing to suggest, and I have not much money to give, and I say again, I see better what ought to be done than the way to do it. I hope there will be something generated at this Conference.

CHAIRMAN: It will be proper for the chair to remind the Conference that by our own enactment we are limited to 12 o'clock for the closing of this session, and it is worth while that the speeches that are made shall be as practical and as much to the point as possible, and I think it proper, too, for me to remind the Conference that this discussion is essentially in the abstract. We are not discussing nor advertising any paper. I think it wise to proceed toward some practical results in this discussion as rapidly as possible.

CALVIN W. PRITCHARD, of Western: I simply arise to express the great pleasure I had in listening to the paper that was read by Seth Mills, and my entire endorsement of the remarks that were made by James Wood and by Esther Frame and Nathan Frame on this subject. I think we are approaching a period when there is to be a great relief on the subject of publications in our church. I am very glad indeed to see that we are discussing this subject as we are here to-day. I think there has been for a good many years this kind of a desire among Friends. When the subject of the forming of a publishing association of Friends was first introduced into Western Yearly Meeting, and carried to Indiana and Iowa and Kansas Yearly Meetings, they all took an interest in it, and the very thought that is presented here to-day was the thought that gave inspiration to the subject at that time, and the same thing has been before the church ever since. The church did not take hold of it so as to take any financial responsibility in the matter. The thought was to get as large a number of subscribers to stock as possible, and then let these interests, through the stock, extend out all over the country, and in that way create an interest that would be as near as possible to that which has been presented here to-day as the ultimatum of having the publications under the control of the church. But it has been fully demonstrated that nothing of that kind meets the wants. You all know the labor that has been put forth in the West ever since the paper was started by the noble effort of Daniel Hill at New Vienna. I apprehend the same is true with reference to the Friends' Review and the efforts that have been put forth in the East, and I think that all of us who have been connected with this work will rejoice in the day when there shall be a practical step taken by which this whole matter shall be brought under the control of the church. There are great difficulties about it. While the efforts have been put forth to build up a literature by private means and by stock companies and individuals, we have gone along without coming to the time when there has been any serious disaster. That has not been true with reference to other great publications. The great concern that wields so much influence

in the Methodist church went through great difficulties in its start. Some of the papers that now wield the greatest influence in the world went through financial disaster, came to loss, went into the hands of the receiver, and were reorganized, before they got upon their feet to do the great work they are doing now. So that it is a matter of congratulation, I can say it and say it modestly, because I have been somewhat connected with this, I think we have cause for gratitude that it is no worse with us than it is in reference to this. Now, can we not, from this discussion and what we have done today, take some active steps by which we shall get a publishing concern under the control and management of our church, so that it will be really the organ of the church which we represent? I do not know that I am the proper one to propose it, but I thought that, perhaps, we could leave this matter to a committee composed of representatives from all the yearly meetings and let them suggest something to a future meeting.

ALLEN JAY, of Indiana: I want to make that proposition, that there be a good delegate selected out of each yearly meeting. Let them get together and talk this matter over, and then make any suggestion they see proper at some future time.

ELWOOD SCOTT, of Indiana: There are a good many here who would like to make speeches, but the time is limited, and I rise to concur in the proposition of Allen Jay, that we appoint that committee.

(Expressions of agreement.)

CHAIRMAN: The proposition is that a committee be appointed, the names of those who are to constitute the committee to be reported at the beginning of the afternoon session. (Consent.)

CHARLES E. TEBBETTS, of Iowa: In view of the importance of the subject, would it not be well to have two from each delegation?

EDMUND STANLEY, of Kansas: I should like to make one suggestion in reference to this matter, as to what kind of a committee should be selected. It seems to me, for the members to do anything in a practical way, it will be necessary for this committee, if appointed, to meet and consult with the individuals or corporations that have charge of the papers now in existence. It would hardly be a practical thing for this Conference to devise a plan for the establishment of a paper and do anything that will result in good. It seems to me we will have to bring together the different organizations, corporations, and individuals that are managing the papers at the present time, and try to accomplish something in the way of consolidation.

THOMAS C. BROWN, of Western: It occurs to me that the suggestion is a very appropriate one, and that it will be a good thing for the members of the committee to call in such persons in consultation.

CHAIRMAN: That will be left to the committee, I should think.

JOHN HENRY DOUGLAS, of Iowa: Was it decided to have one or two members appointed from each yearly meeting?

CHAIRMAN: The suggestion was made that it might be well to have two members from each delegation. No further expression was made in regard to it.

WILLIAM L. PYLE, of Western: It occurs to me that the thought introduced of that committee being privileged to call in just whom they pleased, would make a more practical working committee than if there should be two members from each yearly meeting. Might they not then get as a second member of the committee the one that would be the most useful to them? I like the thought of one from each yearly meeting, they being instructed to call on any one that they see proper. I think it would be more practical to work on that line.

ESTHER G. FRAME, of Wilmington: It seems to me a question of such vast importance that two members from each delegation would be very necessary to take the subject into consideration.

ELIAS JESSUP, of Iowa: I think if there is any increase in the committee, it should be made by the appointment of two from each delegation. (Consent.)

CHAIRMAN: It is understood to be the sentiment of the Conference that each delegation shall report two members for this committee at the beginning of the afternoon session.

ISOM P. WOOTON, of Iowa: The suggestion made in the rear of the house was not that there should be called in any persons to act on the committee, as I understand it, but that there might be called in conference those who have been connected with papers and publishing interests, just simply to give information as to what the plans are, and what the connection of the papers now existing would be to a paper instituted by the yearly meetings. Such persons being called in would constitute no part of this committee.

NATHAN T. FRAME, of Wilmington: We can bear in mind that what we do here will be only a matter of advice.

TIMOTHY NICHOLSON, of Indiana: I would suggest that we had better take the time just at the rise of the meeting to select the committee.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps it would be wise to remind delegates that there is another committee to be reported at the opening of the next session, the committee on a World's Congress of Religions.

The Business Committee reported on program, for the afternoon session, a paper by James Wood, on "Meetings for Worship, and the Maintenance of the Ministry," followed by discussion.

ALLEN JAY, of Indiana : I am requested to announce that the *Evening News* will be the paper that has the official report of this Conference by S. Edgar Nicholson.

JOHN F. HANSON, of Iowa : I would like to say that it is my understanding that the whole pastoral question comes up this afternoon, in connection with the production that is to be read and discussed, and perhaps others who may have had a thought, if it is announced now that the whole question will be up, will look toward bringing any productions they may have on the subject.

CHAIRMAN : It would perhaps be well for the Conference to learn from the Business Committee what members of the Conference who have papers that they desire to present ought to do. Is it understood that if a member has a paper which he desires to present he shall appear before the Conference with it, or shall all papers come through the Business Committee? The chair has no suggestion to make, but it is a question that is likely to arise this afternoon and it is well to settle it now.

FRANCIS W. THOMAS, of Indiana : I would suggest that they all come through the Business Committee. (Consent.)

CHAIRMAN : It is then understood that if members of the Conference have papers bearing upon the subject for discussion this afternoon or any other time, such papers are to be presented to the Conference by authority of the Business Committee.

WILLIAM NICHOLSON, of Kansas : I would like to know whether or not a person who is to enter into the debate will be allowed to write out his remarks and read them?

CHAIRMAN : It is a question that ought to be settled definitely by the Conference. There is a great difference between written addresses and those made in the course of the discussion.

DAVID B. UPDEGRAFF, of Ohio: I would think any paper that was in the nature of extemporaneous remarks would not be included in the requirement to be submitted to the committee.

WILLIAM NICHOLSON, of Kansas: I should protest most certainly against the assumption of the Business Committee that a man can not present his views in writing as well as in speech, and I do not understand the limitation that is implied in this manner. Does it mean that if my voice is not equal to speaking what I want to present to this Conference, and I put it on paper and ask a member to read it for me, it is not proper unless the committee reads it and passes upon it? If that is it, I enter my protest.

JAMES WOOD, of New York: I would like to say that this whole question is irregular. Any member can speak before the house on the business before the house in any way he pleases, extemporaneously or by written paper; but the introduction of a new subject that is not before the house is out of order and the chairman would so rule. The whole question that is before the house is covered in that way. If a person is speaking upon a subject that is not before the Conference, it is the duty of the chairman to call him to order; but he is at liberty to speak in any way that he pleases on any subject that is in order.

WILLIAM L. PEARSON, of Iowa: I want to raise a question here about the subject, as I understand, announced for this afternoon, covering the whole pastoral question. It seems to me there are so many different sides of the same great question that we would be put under great embarrassment if we consider that the support of the ministry covers all the questions.

CHAIRMAN: We shall perhaps be better able to decide whether it covers all the questions or not after hearing the paper read.

JAMES WOOD, of New York: The paper does not assume to cover the entire field, but the committee decided

that as it had reference to a portion of the subject, the whole subject should be discussed at the same time.

CHAIRMAN: The time for adjournment has now arrived. It is unnecessary to remind the Conference that we are met here as a Conference, dependent in the end upon the Holy Spirit for leading in all our discussions, and we ought to begin and close with a reverent regard for his leading, and we will spend a little time in prayer before adjournment. (Prayer.)

The Conference is adjourned till half-past two o'clock.

AFTERNOON SESSION—2:30 O'CLOCK.

The Conference was called to order by the President, and the session was opened by singing and prayer.

CHAIRMAN: We will now hear nominations from the various delegations for the committee ordered at this morning's session on the question of participating in the exercises of the World's Congress of Religions. The secretary will call the roll of the delegations.

(For the nominations, see Minutes, page 13.)

CHAIRMAN: We will now receive the nominations from the various delegations for the committee to which the question of the Friends' publishing house is to be referred according to the action of this morning. (See Minutes, page 14.)

CHAIRMAN: Is there any miscellaneous business which ought to occupy the attention of the Conference at this time? If not, it is in order to introduce the paper by James Wood, which is the subject for the afternoon session.

JAMES WOOD, of New York: It is proper to state that this paper is drawn in form, with the idea of being sent out as a declaration of this Conference if it is approved.

APPENDIX D.

MEETINGS FOR WORSHIP AND THE MAINTENANCE OF
MINISTERS.

BY JAMES WOOD.

Each religious denomination has its reason for a separate existence in Christian doctrines that its founders deemed to be particularly important, and which they apprehended other denominations had overlooked, or to which had not been given that prominence that the truth required. These doctrines must always be kept prominently in view by the members of each denomination so long as its separate existence continues, for when they are abandoned the necessity of a separate organization no longer exists. On the other hand, the proper balancing of truth requires that these doctrines should not receive such undue attention as to lead to the undervaluation of others which may be held by the church at large, for this might result in ignoring the very foundations of the Christian religion.

The Society of Friends was founded by men of deep religious experience, who were enabled, by divine enlightenment, to grasp and to unfold certain Christian doctrines of great spiritual importance. Those who came after them naturally laid particular stress upon these doctrines and the practices founded upon them, without intending to ignore, in any degree, the scriptural truths held by other churches. In succeeding generations this was carried so far by some as to produce very sad results. It is necessary at all times to carefully avoid the dangers that may be upon the right and upon the left, and to give to every phase of the fully rounded gospel its due measure of consideration.

At the present time, we believe there is no serious disagreement in the Society of Friends in America upon any prominent question of doctrine, but there appears to be a diversity of practice upon some matters in which our doctrines are more or less involved, and upon which it is very desirable that there should be a closer agreement. This is more particularly the case in reference to

methods of conducting our meetings for worship, and to the maintenance of our ministers. It is hoped that by calling the attention of all Friends to the fundamental principles that underlie these questions they may be enabled so to regulate their practices as to bring them into substantial agreement, and increase the efficiency of the church in its agency in spreading the knowledge of the gospel in the earth, and in building up believers on their most holy faith.

MEETINGS FOR WORSHIP.

The chief distinctive doctrines of Quakerism are those of the High Priesthood of our risen and ascended Lord and the individual priesthood of believers; the immediate and perceptible influence of the Holy Spirit upon the human consciousness; and that each soul has access to God, through the Lord Jesus Christ, without the instrumentality of any human priest, ordinance, or ceremony whatsoever. Worship is the act of the individual soul. Public worship is the united action of individual believers met together in obedience to Scriptural injunction, and because of a knowledge from experience of the benefits resulting therefrom. The first idea of worship, as illustrated in the Bible, is that of the prostration of the subject before his sovereign. In the outward form it is the prostration of the body; in the spiritual it is the prostration of the soul. In either case it must begin in silence on the part of the subject, as otherwise it cannot be complete prostration. This silence must continue according to the Sovereign's will. It may be for a few moments only, or it may be longer. When he bids us rise we can make our requests or speak his praise. But whatever is done must be from the promptings of the Sovereign's will. It was George Fox's injunction to "Keep all your meetings in the power of God." God alone knows what will best promote his glory, and he chooses such instruments as may please him. He may give his promptings to one who has had much spiritual experience, or, from the mouths of babes and sucklings, he may perfect his praise. He may direct that a portion of his revealed truth be read, or he may choose to hear

from one or from another the petitions of the congregation. He may choose to have his praises sung by one alone, or by many united voices as he did of old, or he may choose to have all wait before him in silence to meditate upon his goodness, and to receive, by his "still small voice," the truth needed by the individual soul. Whatever the exercises or however the time is spent, it should close in that reverent silence which subjects observe who have been permitted to enjoy a season of communion with their King in his gracious presence, and which affords the best opportunity for him to give to each his precious benediction. This idea of public worship presupposes keen perception of the divine will and entire obedience on the part of the worshipers. No true subject of a temporal king would remain silent when he was bidden to speak, nor would any presume to speak until he had been bidden. With true consecration before the Lord whatever is said or done aids the common purpose, whether it be the cry for mercy of the soul then made to see its need, or the rejoicing of another knowing little more than the consciousness of having found forgiveness, or the expounding of truth by one who has deeper knowledge of the revelations of God. We find, as we might expect to find, that those are most often and most profitably used who are the most attentive to the divine will, and who, because of their obedience and faith, have been permitted to know "the secret things" of God.

Such were the meetings of the early Friends, of which Robert Barclay said: "As our worship consisteth not in words, so neither in silence as silence, but in an holy dependence of the mind upon God, from which dependence silence necessarily follows in the first place, until words can be brought forth which are from God's spirit."

While this idea of the proper exercises of a meeting for public worship does not, ordinarily, admit of the use of a written sermon prepared expressly for the occasion, it makes the thorough study of the Scriptures, both general and topical, all the more necessary, in order that God may use our natural faculties for the greatest good and draw from our stores "things new and old" as may

be required. Nor can we so limit the operations of the Holy Spirit as to say that he may not impress upon the consciousness of the consecrated servant, at any time before the meeting, the service that may be required of him. But in the meeting itself all spiritual exercises must be in accordance with the leadings at the time.

In view of these great truths, it is evident that no individual can presume to conduct, by prearrangement, the exercises of a meeting for worship, for that would be a usurpation of the sovereign's prerogative. It is a similar usurpation for any one to say that any particular thing shall or shall not be done. As we have our treasure in earthen vessels persons of recognized spiritual discernment are appointed to encourage to obedience such as may shrink from their duty, or to restrain such as speak without having been duly qualified to do so. They are to see that all have an opportunity for the exercise and development of their spiritual gifts and are aided therein. Friends should ever bear in mind that it is a great privilege to meet for the public worship of God, and they should never forget that the privilege has its attendant responsibilities. Before going to their meetings they should pray that the Master will graciously condescend to crown their gathering with his presence, and enable each soul to be obedient to his will.

GATHERINGS OF UNBELIEVERS.

The regular meetings of a religious body are composed of its members who are presumed to be members of the spiritual household of God. When unconverted persons are present at these, they are impressed by what they see and hear, and the Holy Spirit often puts into their hearts a desire to obtain forgiveness and to experience the divine blessing for themselves. God often directs a portion of the exercises of a meeting for the instruction of these. When meetings are held among unconverted people with a view of showing them the way of salvation and of leading them to the Savior the situation is materially changed. This difference was clearly recognized in the early years of the Society, and

such meetings were differently conducted. It should be shown to all how the Heavenly Father's love is over them and his mercy is freely offered to each. The indifferent must be aroused, the careless must be shown their danger, the ignorant must be instructed. Such meetings can not be profitably held and sinners brought to the cross without a special qualification from the Master, and they must be conducted under his guidance with the soul attentive to his will. Without this we can not expect him to own and bless the undertaking, but with this his truly consecrated servants will be enabled to use such means as the circumstances may require, and all will redound to the glory of God. In the gatherings of unbelievers, as in the meetings for worship of converted persons, the children of God are always safe in watching the leadings of the Holy Spirit, which Spirit, as Robert Barclay states, "being the Spirit of order and not of confusion leads as many as follow him into such a comely and decent order as becometh the church of God." The Holy Spirit leads believers into harmony and not into discord.

THE MAINTENANCE OF MINISTERS.

The considerations offered on meetings of worship indicate that in them all meet, from the human standpoint, on an entire equality. There is no class to be recognized, and no one has precedence or can claim special privileges, and it would seem that no one could permit any title to be given him that would indicate that he should be revered. Some kind of work is given to every believer, each wears the livery of the one Master, and each commission bears the royal seal. While one service may be more important than another, there is no warrant for the recognition of classes or ranks. A distinction between laity and clergy is not found in the Scriptures. But God does, in the distribution of his spiritual gifts, which are to be freely exercised by all who receive them, call some to, and qualify them for, the important service of the ministry of his word. He intends them freely to hand forth that which they have received from him, and to serve among their brethren.

A practical question has arisen as to the propriety of a minister's receiving the means for his own support and that of his family from the hands of those among whom he labors. For a century or more such means have not been openly given in the Society of Friends, but the question none the less demands our careful consideration. Upon so important a matter we can not suppose that the all-wise Founder of the church failed to give his disciples the necessary instruction, and we find that his words are precisely suited for universal application in all ages of the church, but in all ages they are to be applied by the spiritually enlightened judgment of his followers.

He said: "Freely ye have received, freely give," and at the same time he said: "The laborer is worthy of his hire." These declarations are to be harmonized in all cases. No hard and fast rule can be formulated to define where they are to meet in every instance. That must depend upon circumstances of which the church, with all its possessions consecrated to the Lord, is to judge. But those principles are of universal application. They are no more opposed to each other than are many precious truths that at first seem paradoxical, as when our Saviour declared that "he who would save his life shall lose it," and when the apostle said "when I am weak then am I strong." It was not intended that we should adhere to one of these and ignore the other. We can not use, in breathing, either oxygen or nitrogen alone, but when properly mingled they form the pure wholesome air in which we live and grow and serve the purposes of our creation.

It is evident that where the minister has been blessed with the means for his support, or can readily secure such by his own effort, he need not depend upon others, even as the apostle Paul labored with his own hands for his support, but when the gospel would be hindered or the service marred by the want of pecuniary means, the minister should receive all needful assistance from the believers, even as the apostle Paul received, it "taking wages" to enable him to perform his required service. The gospel should never be preached for money, nor should it ever be hindered by the want of it.

These principles were well understood and were clearly practiced during the early years of the Society. The position then recognized was stated by Robert Barclay in the XXVIII. section of his X. Proposition. He said: "We freely acknowledge that there is an obligation upon such to whom God sends, or among whom he raiseth up a minister, that if need be, they minister to his necessities. Secondly, that it is lawful for him to receive what is necessary and convenient. To prove this I need not insist, for our adversaries will readily grant it to us, for the thing we affirm is, that this is all that these Scripture testimonies relating to this thing do grant. (Gal. vi: 6; I. Cor. ix: 11-14; I. Tim. v: 16.) That which we then oppose in this matter is, First, that it should be constrained and limited; Secondly, that it should be superfluous, chargeable and sumptuous, and Thirdly, the manifest abuse thereof." That difficulties upon this matter soon arose among Friends, and that it has been subject to great abuse in the church at large, alike illustrate the frailties of human nature. To say that ministers shall not receive assistance in their proper maintenance is to limit the extended work of the ministry to such as have pecuniary wealth of their own, and this is placing a property qualification upon the preaching of the gospel that can not be tolerated.

THE LOCATION OF MINISTERS.

Closely allied with the foregoing is the question of the location of ministers in particular fields.

The Lord of the harvest knows best whom to choose for service and where to send laborers into his field. If there is need of ministerial or pastoral service in any quarter it is right that the church should seek to have the need supplied. It should be a matter of prayer on the part of the membership, that they may know the divine will. Ministers also should seek divine guidance as to their fields for service. Where the Master thus brings the work and the workers together, the sanctified common sense of the church should make all necessary provision for the successful accomplishment of the divine purpose.

Friends, together with all Christians, have grave responsibilities as stewards of the manifold grace of God. As a separate branch of the church of Christ we are to bear aloft the special banner that has been entrusted to us, that the precious truths committed to our charge may accomplish that for which the Master placed them in our hands.

CHAIRMAN: I am informed by the Business Committee that it is their recommendation that immediately following the reading of this paper of James Wood's, a paper may be presented by Joseph Potts, of North Carolina, bearing upon the same subject.

JOSEPH POTTS, of North Carolina: You will find, dear friends, that my paper is a very different one from that which you have just heard, and I do not know that I ought to be surprised to notice that what our brother has argued is what I have proposed in what I have written, so that it just carries the matter a little further on.

(APPENDIX E.)

OUR MINISTRY, CONSIDERED UNDER THREE HEADS: THE DEMAND, THE SUPPLY, AND THE CONNECTING LINK.

BY JOSEPH POTTS.

There are two occasions for the ministry of the word, or preaching: the opportunity to preach, or the desire in men's hearts to hear the word, which I here call the demand; and the constraining of Christ's love, known as the call, accompanied with spiritual and other qualifications, which together make the supply.

The Christian religion is not a system of commandments, of ordinances, of rules and regulations. Its Author, by his personal declarations, and by the teachings of those whom he sent forth, was scrupulously careful to avoid giving any satisfaction or comfort to any who sought these in observances of any kind. There is no possibility of seeking to be justified even by the perfect law of God, without falling away from grace. Christ's salvation, in

its inception, and in its momentary, continuous application, is all of grace, and he becomes of none effect to such as hope for justification in their doings of any kind. It is very evident, also, that our Saviour never perfected an organization of the church on earth by positive enactment. The widest liberty is consistent with the reign of grace. It follows from this that all Christians are responsible to avoid, in their church arrangements, every yoke of bondage, while gladly submitting to what is needful, that all may be done decently and in order, consistently with the divine will.

If no written enactments from the Bible can be urged upon us, much less can the wisdom of past ages of men be urged as conclusive of our duty in the present; or as defining for all time what course will best promote Christ's cause. A fundamentally important consideration for us at this juncture regarding the ministry is

THE DEMAND.

Go where we will, in this our country, the facts are about the same; and I have no doubt at all that it is the moving of God's spirit upon the hearts of men that causes so large a proportion of Christians, and what we may call well-disposed people, to desire to have preaching at least once a week. It is a good sign, and one for which we should have no feeling but thankfulness, even if the ministry they secure be not as spiritual as it should be.

Surely it is a loud call upon the best of God's people to do all they can to provide the best kind of supply for the demand. If this class of Christians are as earnestly active as they should be, is it possible to suppose that God will not endue with spiritual gifts? It is a great lack of faith, perhaps of common sense, to presume that a congregation is more earnest to be fed, or its best men and women more concerned that it should be, than God is to really supply their spiritual needs. He always cares more for this than we can possibly do; but in his wisdom his supply awaits our demand.

Our practice thus far, however, has often seemed to imply quite the contrary; that we can only hope for

occasional spasmodic help from the Holy Spirit, and have therefore concluded it must be best so, rather than a belief that our filling is simply conditioned upon our readiness to receive. Surely the great Giver of all good is perfect in power, in love, and in unvarying willingness to bless!

That men, women, and children, the high and the low, the rich and the poor, the wise and learned of this world, and the ignorant also, will gather from time to time in places of worship, keeping good order, and none making them afraid, is a call upon God and his faithful children to feed hungry souls. If they are not fed there is no blame upon God, but upon the heedless, criminal neglect of those who know to do right and do it not, or who will not give their hearts to know how this demand must be met.

THE SUPPLY.

The full development of Bible Christianity surely presents the most perfect relation of human beings to their Heavenly Father that we can imagine to be possible on earth. In it is realized (if we will have it so) Moses' desire (Num. xi: 29): "Would God that all the Lord's people were prophets, and that the Lord would put his Spirit upon them!" Joel assures us (Ch. ii: 28, 29) that this would be fulfilled in the establishment of Christianity; that God *would* pour out his Spirit on all flesh—all sons and daughters, servants and handmaidens—and they should prophesy. Peter informs us, further, that it was realized on that wonderful Pentecost after our Lord was glorified. They were *all* filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak as the Spirit gave them utterance. The gift was general, and evidently intended to be realized in all Christians. "According to your faith be it unto you," is the only limitation God proposes. It is an utterly unnecessary conclusion that such language applies to preachers only. All who have no physical impediment should be found testifying vocally for Christ, prophesying, not foretelling events, but forthtelling a Saviour's love. None can call Jesus Lord but by the Holy Ghost. This witnessing may vary in every degree.

A failure to appreciate this general endowment of every Christian who occupies his right place, and delight to find it occupied now and then by some faithful brother or sister, in contrast with the common unfaithfulness, has caused the local churches, sometimes, to designate as preachers excellent persons whom God has not called to devote themselves to the more extended work so much needed, and for which he so evidently does make provision in his word. Such persons, left at liberty (as we may express it) to pursue the ordinary honest callings of life, can feel at ease when colonized ten or a dozen in a place, which would then be a blessed "city set upon a hill," as indeed all our communities should be. Were they really called of God as ministers, the blessed economy of the gospel, and the self-denial instilled with the call into every minister could never permit them to be thus at ease. Did they really labor, ministerial work would be overdone in that locality, while many broad fields elsewhere would be neglected.

Are we not convinced that any other distinction of classes in the church is mischievous than that which God makes simply by calling and qualifying some to labor so much "in word and doctrine" that their time, strength, and abilities are fully occupied? A call to the ministry means this, and not that God has put his Spirit upon the individual, which should be realized by every Christian. *All* are, of course, in the army of the Lord, the church militant; but the apostle's language does not apply to all alike when he uses the figure of the soldier entangling not himself with the affairs of this life. What would be no entanglement at all to some would greatly interfere with the usefulness of others, because they are chosen for a work which requires the whole man. An editor, for instance, who is in his right place, gives himself to that form of ministry, and it fully occupies him, and he lives by it if his efforts are appreciated by a sufficient audience; and sometimes when there is a lack in this particular, the church feels bound to supply the deficiency.

Christians in few localities approach very near a full occupancy of their general gift of prophesying; and even were they to do so anywhere, much room would be

left there, and still more everywhere else, for more extended labor in word and doctrine. A realized need of gifts is essential, and goes far toward ensuring a supply. The whole tenor of New Testament teaching, and the experience of the ages, prove that our loving Father intends to work in this way among men. Some, who are in no other sense superior, it may be, to many of their brethren, are to be over the flock "in the Lord," to admonish and instruct them at any needful length, and to shepherd them: and also to go out after those that are without. These must lead because God's call puts them in the front, and a responsibility rests upon them that others do not feel. In order to lead they must precede. Whether we can or can not find in the New Testament a detailed description of such a leader, who is, as Paul puts it, not a novice, such precedence demands qualifications beside the indispensable one of entire devotedness to God's will. Every one who is truly called will be acutely sensible of his own deficiencies, and seek every possible means to remedy them; in which efforts his brethren will earnestly cooperate, that God's purpose may be carried out. Whatever standard of education prevails, it is surely desirable that he who may be the only public teacher the people of his congregation hear, should be qualified to lead them in this regard.

However truly they may take knowledge of him that he has been with Jesus, avoidable ignorance does not and can not commend the gospel, but will detract from its ready reception. He is the best preacher who, being called of God, is most devoted in every faculty of his being to learn and teach the most intelligently "all the words of this life." It is a strange position to take, that the deepest spirituality can ever be found ignoring this devotedness; but we gladly acknowledge that both the spirituality and the devotedness to improvement may exist and be recognized in one who has many as yet unavoidable deficiencies.

Our preacher being called and gifted by God, if not more, at least differently from the other brethren, and preparing himself as well as his circumstances permit, because he is conscious of the call, his church

brethren are responsible also to recognize for what he appears to be chosen of God ; and without this recognition by both him and them of such a separation unto gospel labor being called for, there is no occasion, I am convinced, for any church action in the case.

But should there be such a call and recognition of it, such an one can always find a field for service wherein, by his Master's ordering, he is entitled to a support. Compensation, in the sense of equivalent, can never be given for spiritual services, but food and raiment can be supplied, and that generous-hearted appreciation, the expression of which is so helpful. Our dear Lord will never call and qualify for such work one whose labor will not be enough in quantity and quality to rightfully secure his livelihood where he ought to be engaged.

There are views of this subject put forth among us which are entitled to great respect ; notably the suggestions of the *Friends' Review* ; which ignore a very important consideration, that is not forced upon the attention of the writers as it is upon some of us who are surrounded by different circumstances ; that is, in plain terms, the ignorant, unlettered condition of the people, especially their ignorance of the Bible. The blessing that a teaching ministry may be to such people, and the need there is for it, give ample reason, were there none other, for urging the views I have presented ; that we should elevate the standard of the ministry by recognizing officially as preachers only those who feel called to devote their whole being to such ministry, placing the title where God has placed the responsibility, their friends agreeing in the persuasion as to such a call that, as far as possible, all meetings be supplied ; and that he or she who serves to satisfaction be also supplied with things needful for the body. If the balance of profit be not in favor of those ministered to, they will soon find it out and precipitate a change. Individual dissatisfaction may still exist ; but *now* nineteen-twentieths may be tried in their hearts over existing conditions in this respect, and there is almost no possibility of a remedy.

“Having food and raiment, let us be therewith content,” said Paul ; and my contention on behalf of our recog-

nized ministry, limited as suggested, goes no farther than this. These necessities of life belong of right to every diligent, industrious person; and food, as has been well said, must include nourishment for the mind as well as the body, or the individual can not fulfill his part in the world's work.

It was not idly that Paul uttered the general statement, subject to exceptions in his own case, and perhaps in many others, for exceptional reasons, "Even so did the Lord ordain that they which proclaim the gospel should live of the gospel," (I. Cor. ix:14); nor that our Lord, as well as Paul, speaking of such workmen, said: "The laborer is worthy of his reward, or hire," (Luke x:7; I. Tim. v:18). "Let him that is taught in the word," said Paul to the Galatians (Ch. vi:6), "communicate unto him that teacheth in all good things." We need nothing more than to understand that the obligation, say rather the privilege, is just as great on one side as the other, each to communicate of, or share as a partner, as the word means, that wherewith God has entrusted him. Since the giver is always the most blessed in any loving service, we have need to say to the brethren, "Forgive me this wrong," in having made Paul's exceptional case our general rule. I will recognize your rights as my partners, and may God abundantly bless you. What now of the human appointing and advisory council in our church, the link uniting the demand and the supply?

THE CONNECTING LINK—THE MEETING ON MINISTRY AND OVERSIGHT.

Most naturally we do not "set them to judge who are least esteemed in the church," but compose this body of those who are among our best men and women, setting them apart for the duties implied in their name and stated in our books of Discipline.

Indulge me right here in expressing a few words regarding this Conference. My conviction is strong that this present body of men and women, chosen to represent the yearly meetings of Friends in America, in conference on subjects of vital interest, has very few if any in it who

are not decided "Friends." We do not hold our positions by constraint, nor for any individual gain, but from the glad consciousness of being where we trust we can serve God the best. Nor is it a matter of great importance to us whether such and such theories and practices are consistent with Quakerism, unless first they are proved to be conformed to scriptural Christianity, and commend themselves to us as promoting in the highest degree, at the present time, the spread of Christ's kingdom in the earth. Whether our forefathers thought thus, or acted just thus in carrying out their convictions, is, of course, a matter of interest; but we are responsible only to be faithful to our own right convictions, and to serve our own generation by the will of God; while recognizing the providence which has made us the successors of a body of Christian believers who, with more or less faithfulness and heavenly wisdom, acted out their part in their day. It will not avail us merely to lament, that some of our more immediate predecessors were unconscionably slow to discern divine suggestions of a need of changes in the application of eternal principles; nor on the other hand will it avail us hastily to surrender the principles, and make what we may hereafter find to have been retrograde steps in our practice.

Our convictions regarding the ministry being, that Christ still appoints those who shall thus serve him; and generally calls upon them for slight services at first, differing but little from the evidences which all his people should show that he has poured out his Spirit upon them; we dare not allow arrangements which would prevent or discourage the tender ones, as George Fox said, "if they be moved to bubble forth a few words, and speak in the Seed and Lamb's power. * * * * So every one may improve their talents, every one exercise their gifts, and every one speak as the Spirit gives them utterance." The recognized ministers have no rights which would obstruct these, but rather can well afford to make way for them, and indeed rejoice if God be pleased on any occasion to use such for the chief service of a meeting. It can hardly be possible that this would often occur where a faithful minister is occupying his right

place. But since a succession in the ministry is essential, and we know of no other way of beginning preaching than *to preach*, and this must be done when hearers are assembled; it follows that any arrangement preventing this is, in our view, a sad surrender of a point in which we have always been in advance of other churches.

Supposing that the right amount of care has been taken in the organization of the meeting on Ministry and Oversight, it may be expected that this assembly of ministers, elders, and overseers will have as a very important part of its duties the needful encouragement of both the fledged and unfledged ministers; in the case of the latter helping them to rightly understand what their call is, and being the medium through which they may get needed assistance in their preparation for the ministry.

This "select meeting" would, very properly, be the committee of a Monthly Meeting to arrange with a preacher for his location within their limits; handling the subject in all its bearings, and reporting to the Monthly Meeting. United action would thus be promoted, and the appointment, so far as human choice goes, be made by the same parties as are expected to have the most care over the minister afterward.

I urge the points, that wherever the people will gather in numbers and desire ministry, we should expect to fall in with our Heavenly Father's leading and see that it is provided as frequently as possible; that the ministry we should officially recognize (without debarring the exercises of others) is of those who will devote themselves and prepare themselves to supply to their best ability these providential openings, and, as the suitable supply is always short of the demand (and for other reasons), one minister will serve any ordinary locality better than more than one; that such chosen and located ministers should be freely helped in whatever way they have need, first by the people to whom they especially minister, and if that be insufficient, by a general church fund; that they can not be considered in their right places or doing the most useful work, if they are not in harmony and unity with the meeting on Ministry and Oversight to which by location they belong; and that thus they are

constantly within all the control, as regards doctrine and practice, that our church has ever seen fit to exercise over its members for the individual and general good.

I have not discussed the position of ministers who have especial gifts as evangelists. They seldom fail to be altogether devoted to the ministry, and of course are included in all my suggestions, except in regard to being located in a particular field. On this point of location I have no other thought than that the Lord's leading is always to govern; and should it indicate the propriety of a change, no human arrangements should interfere or make it difficult.

CHAIRMAN: This question is now open for general discussion by the Conference. It may be well to read the original subject of discussion, *The Conduct of Meetings for Worship and the Maintenance of the Ministry*. Friends will bear in mind that we are limited to fifty minutes for this discussion in order that we may close the business of the afternoon session in time.

WILLIAM NICHOLSON, of Kansas: I do not care to be one of the first speakers. I do not care to discuss the papers which we have just heard. The only way in which I would like to discuss them is to tell my own opinion, because discussion of those papers would seem to be more or less personal. I want to speak a little upon the pastorate system. Some call it the pastoral system. I prefer the term, pastorate system.

(APPENDIX F.)

THE PASTORATE SYSTEM.

BY WILLIAM NICHOLSON.

The pastorate system means the employment of a minister of the gospel to take charge of the work of a local church as supervisor and manager; to arrange the services of public worship; to preach the gospel; to conduct prayer meetings; to attend to pastoral visitation; to visit the sick and pray with and for them; to

bury the dead; to perform the marriage ceremony; to represent the church before the world and to the other churches: and in general to give prompt and efficient attention to all matters pertaining to the interest and well-being of the church over which he presides.

Whether such a system, in its details, existed in the apostolic church, has been seriously questioned, but it cannot be denied that it was then to be found in an elementary form. However we may settle this question, no one can seriously doubt the authority of the church to delegate certain religious duties and powers to such of its members as have requisite qualifications, if such delegation shall promote its highest good. In all complicated affairs, a division of duties is indispensable to success. Everybody's business soon becomes practically nobody's. Moreover, in religious matters as well as in others, there is a natural yearning for some one to tell us what to do. Everybody feels more or less the need of some one with authority to suggest what our duty is in regard to very many things. We are anxious to be doing something for Christ and his cause, but we lack definiteness of conception as to what we should do, and so too often we sit with folded arms and let golden opportunities pass. We are brought face to face with the enormous mass of work which needs to be done, and we stand appalled with the magnitude of the labor, and unable to separate our own special part of it. We need a helping hand to find our work for us, and to lead us to it. To a hungry child a slice of bread is worth more than a whole stack of wheat.

The qualifications of a pastor are a good religious experience, a good literary education (if possible a *thorough* one), a thorough knowledge of the Bible, readiness of speech, aptness to teach, the ability to draw an audience and to hold it, a good reputation: and he must be a good organizer and manager. To these ends a special and thorough training in a theological seminary is important and almost indispensable. The special line of work which is called the ministry of the gospel is one unto which God himself gives the call, and also certain natural and spiritual endowments. The minister is then to be further fitted by a special course of study and train-

ing, by which the gifts and calling of God shall be made efficient and practical. In the exercise of all ministerial service. in its great diversity. the constant aid of the Holy Spirit is to be sought and expected.

The manifold duties delegated by the church to the pastor are very exacting and even exhaustive of his time and capacities, and render it impracticable for him to support himself and family by ordinary business pursuits. Hence the simple fact that the church devolves such duties upon one of its members. brings upon it an obligation to provide a support for him. It does not matter whether there be Scripture proof-texts to support such an obligation. It is a simple matter of common moral honesty, and is usually arranged for by way of a salary provided by the church. Of course this is an open door for many difficulties. The qualifications of a pastor almost necessarily acquire a commercial value. according to his learning, eloquence. personal magnetism. goodness of heart. power to organize and direct. power to draw and hold audiences, sensationalism. skill in providing music and other attractions. in short. his general popularity. Thus pastors become graded by a pecuniary standard, all the way from one hundred dollar men to eight or even ten thousand dollar men. This reacts upon the churches. and brings about a great variety of methods for raising funds for the pastor's salary and other necessary expenses, such as pew rents, church fairs, sociables with refreshments to be paid for. public dinners. entertainments with various attractions. even including dancing at times. etc., etc. If a pastor is serving a church acceptably, he is nevertheless at liberty to consider a call to some other church. and to accept the same. and as an inducement to this it is generally supposed to be the duty of the calling church to offer an increase of salary. This often stimulates the other church to offer an increase also, so as to retain the services of the incumbent. As a practical matter. many churches are often left without pastors for considerable periods. and many ministers are without churches. except under the Methodistic plan. in which pastors are assigned by the bishops and presiding elders.

It might not be difficult to enumerate other undesir-

able results of the pastorate system. But we must not omit the statement that there are good results also, especially in the systematic care extended to the whole membership and all the interests of the church. Those who are brought into the church by revival methods are much more carefully looked after and a much larger proportion of them retained in membership, and the pastor, if not himself a revivalist, is seeking and praying for revivals, and arranging for them, so that there may be a constant addition to the church.

Now, between such a system as this and the methods of Friends fifty years ago, comparison becomes contrast. They are utterly dissimilar and reverse. With us, at that time, there was a maximum dwelling upon the divine sufficiency, and a minimum appreciation of sanctified human agency, and so we discarded methods which led to successful results, not from any intention of doing wrong, but from a fear of it. We emphasized the importance of spiritual worship in our public meetings, but left too much out of sight the other grand purposes of the conversion of sinners and the helping of believers, through the preaching of the word. Because God can work directly and without the intervention of men, we seemed to fall into the belief that this is his ordinary plan of working.

Within the latter part of this century, very many Friends, especially in the West, have become seriously impressed with the fact that our church with all its excellencies was diminishing in numbers, and failing to do what others with less advantages were accomplishing, in converting the world to Christ. This conviction led to the introduction amongst us of such revival methods as had already proved successful with other denominations, and similar results were at once apparent. To care for these converts and to build up the church generally, seemed more than our former methods were equal to, and at once the pastorate system suggested itself as not only useful but indispensable for the emergency. Of course it was foreseen by some, perhaps many of us, that a transformed Quakerism would be the result; that it would revolutionize our modes of public worship and

change the basis of ministerial work and service. There was great reluctance and hesitation on the part of these ; but the vigor and earnestness and persistence of those who advocated the new evangelistic and pastoral methods, and the unmistakable efficiency of those methods in extending and establishing the church, have carried the day in most of the Western yearly meetings. Several of these have formally adopted these methods, and most others have so sanctioned their use in their subordinate meetings and in the work of their ministers and committees, that it amounts to a virtual adoption. It is thankfully acknowledged that medieval Quakerism has produced many preëminently excellent examples of Christian character ; that better people have never lived than were many of our fathers and mothers. But it would seem to be undeniable that Quakerism had practically failed in the great work of church extension ; that the very quietism, spiritual introversion and waiting for divine direction, which, in certain individual cases, have been so greatly blessed, have nevertheless through misapprehension, diminished the spiritual activities of multitudes of others by obscuring the urgency and necessity of many precepts of Holy Scripture, as the duty of spreading the knowledge of the truth.

And now the Rubicon has been passed, and the bridges are burned behind an advancing church. The head of the eaglet once out of the shell can never be forced back. The church may seem to many to have plunged into the wilderness, but we need not expect her to retrace her steps. We *may* hope and believe that as she leans on the arm of her Beloved, she will come out on the other side into the clearness and warmth of the sunlight. She is our spiritual mother. If we can not lead her, we must allow her to lead us. She has been suddenly awakened by a sense of neglected and misapprehended duty, and, like a man aroused by the cry of "fire" at midnight, she may be in danger of forgetting, at the moment, some things which are needful to be remembered. But in olden time, when God's people were even rebellious, (which can not be wholly said of us), Samuel was still to pray for them, and also to anoint a king for them, and

to continue to stand between them and God as the Lord's prophet and the people's spiritual guide.

The transformation of our church has proved and is proving a great trial to many. Some are praying between the porch and the altar, "Spare thy people, O God, and give not thine heritage to reproach." Some are more or less restive, and continue to combat under the hope, and apparently the expectation, that somehow or other there will be a reversion of the tide. Like the Jews of old, they will not believe that the fair and beautiful house of their fathers, the object of such blessings, the instrument of so much good, and of which there have been so many hopeful prophecies, can ever come to so radical a change.

Some of our aged and excellent ministers who have been trained to wait in all godly sincerity in our meetings, for the moving of the Holy Spirit unto ministerial service, and who have often been thus led to labor for him and for his church, with great acceptableness, now find our methods of worship so changed as that young and comparatively inexperienced ministers are placed as pastors over meetings to which they belong whilst to themselves the advice is given to keep still, to keep sweet, and to obey the pastor. Surely no better advice could be given, under the circumstances. It is the only way in which the peace of the church can be preserved. It is the only way in which true peace of mind can be maintained by those who thus seem to themselves to be set aside. Our Saviour commanded his disciples to do what they were commanded to do by those who sat in the seat of Moses, and it surely becomes all, who voluntarily remain in membership with any church, to submit cheerfully and lovingly to its regulations and its adopted polity. We must build up ourselves on our most holy faith, pray in the Holy Spirit, keep ourselves in the love of God, and look for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life.

It is true that to these ministers many questions arise. Why continue to worship with Friends, when their mode has become essentially that of other denominations? Why not join those who by long experience have carried

this same system of worship to a much higher degree of perfection than we can hope to attain for generations? Why go to hear our pastor, when we might readily sit under the deeply instructive and delightful eloquence of a Dr. Storrs or a Bishop Brooks? How can we claim that our example is one of true consistency, if we take part in and countenance religious exercises which are on a different basis from that which we have advocated for so long a period?

Now as to this last question, may it not be a mistake to suppose that consistency means a sort of iron-clad, unbending unchangeableness, requiring the same thing to be done in the same way, at all times and under all circumstances? A man is convinced at a certain stage of his religious experience, that he ought to adopt a certain practice. Does that imply that he shall continue that practice as long as he lives? Stephen Grellet believed, soon after his conversion, that he ought to abstain from animal food. But later in life, he believed that he ought to eat it. Was he inconsistent? Were the Jewish Christians inconsistent when they laid aside Moses for Christ? One thing may be a duty now, and a very different thing may be a duty at another time and under other circumstances. Paul refused to circumcise Titus lest he should seem to teach that the Abrahamic or Mosaic law was binding upon Christians, and yet afterwards and under other circumstances, he circumcised Timothy out of a tender regard for the consciences of certain Jews. If Paul were to enter a Friends' church where a woman was preaching earnestly and effectually, we Friends believe that, when it came his turn to speak, he would commend the labors of the sister; and if some Presbyterian brother, who happened to be present, should charge the apostle with inconsistency, and cite against him his own language in I. Cor. xiv : 34, 35, and I. Tim. 2:11, 12, he could very well reply that the inconsistency was only apparent, not real; that the great principle which governed his labors was to get men to accept the gospel; to remove all hindrances; to be careful not needlessly to offend any. Now, eighteen hundred years ago, especially at Corinth, it hindered rather than promoted Christianity

for women to be public preachers. It was lawful, but not expedient. So about slavery. If Paul were here to-day, he would commend the freedom of the slave. Eighteen hundred years ago he said nothing about it; but exhorted the slaves to be obedient to their masters; apparently implying (though not so teaching) that there was nothing wrong in slavery. To have denounced slavery then would have prevented the success of the gospel, which was really the appointed means of the ultimate destruction of slavery. Now we may not be inconsistent with true and sound principle if, by the adoption of new and safe practices in the church, we secure a successful answer to the prayers which we have been offering for many years for the reviving of the Lord's work and the extension of the borders of his kingdom.

And if the church of our fathers, in its earnestness to recover the ground, which we all know it had lost, does seem to be losing its hold upon some things of great importance, shall we not take comfort in the belief that other denominations are taking up some of these? As we look forward and not backward, and see a reconstructed Christendom with a greatly elevated Christian character and an enlarged conception of the duty of the church, not only to preach the gospel, but to remove the grinding burdens which crush the souls of men and unfit them for profiting by the message of God's love, may we not hope and believe that the church of our life-long love and devotion will be a part of that organized, consolidated host, bearing the same old banners, but with their inscriptions re-arranged? Upon one we shall find: "Go preach my gospel; *then* teach what I command to those who accept it." And upon another, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ; *then* let his Spirit teach thee sincerity in worship, obedience to his voice, peace with all men, truthfulness without an oath, guidance in ministry and prayer, simplicity, unworldliness, liberality and cheerfulness in giving." And upon still another, "First life, then light. First salvation, then culture. In Him was life, and the life was the light of men."

To my brethren in the ministry who may feel themselves somewhat superseded by the new methods, I

would speak a word of hopefulness and good cheer. Do not withdraw yourselves from the fellowship of the church. Do not get into a corner, and allow your souls to forget the good that is around you by becoming drowned in lamentations over apparent evil. Let your hearts be full of the peace of God, and of an unwavering trust in him. Let the love of God so fill you that it shall constantly overflow as a benediction upon his church. In this love and peace and trust, humbly take the place assigned you. If you may sit by your pastor, do so; and support him by a cheerful and ready compliance with what he desires you to do. Do not step between him and the congregation. Do not thwart his work in any way, but *help it*, so far as you can. Remember that good wine will not spoil if it is well secured. Wait until the Lord opens the way for your own ministerial exercise, and do not attempt to violate the established order of things. Wait until the pastor and the people want to hear from you. If the Lord really wants you to preach he will open the way, if you keep your soul in sweetness, humility and love. If he does not open the way for you to preach, yet the door is always open for secret prayer unto him, for a blessing upon yourselves and upon his people. Your own Christian life will not only be maintained, but will grow stronger and your course will so commend itself to your brethren that they will esteem you and trust you more than ever. They will see that you are not seeking place, nor power, nor authority, nor prominence in the church. They will see that you are praying for the peace of Jerusalem and for its prosperity. They will open their hearts to you and you will still be able to bring forth fruit in old age and in the fellowship of the saints your own heart shall be fat and flourishing. I know whereof I speak. In modesty I would say that I have been endeavoring for years to live this way myself, and I have no complaint to make of ill-treatment, either from the pastors or the churches where I have lived. I have not deserved the half of the kindness and love and consideration which they have shown me. I pray that my love may answer back their love to me, and I gladly add to the apostolic benediction a prayer for the communion

and fellowship of the saints to abide with us all. Thus it is that whilst my memory often reverts to the blessed meetings of the olden time, and I see the guiding hand of my Saviour through them all, yet I find that the form of worship is nothing to him, and that his only delight is in the fountain of a happy, peaceful, devoted, loving, religious life welling up from the depths of the soul.

And now a word to the church. Do not imagine that the introduction of the pastorate system fills the measure of our duty as to the preaching of the gospel. It is all well to build churches and to provide every necessary means of instruction and edification for those who will assemble themselves at the appointed times and places, but the field is the whole wide world. Thousands upon thousands will pass the doors of the churches and will not enter. The world will never be converted by our present machinery, however excellent may be its results in its appropriate department. But, somehow or other, there must be raised up an army of lay preachers who shall go everywhere and proclaim the gospel message. It is to me a sign of great hopefulness that Bishop Phillips Brooks, that prince of American preachers, lately assembled a hundred laymen of his church and told them that he knew of no reason why every one of them should not become a bearer of the good tidings to the people just around them. And then he gave them his hearty encouragement to enter upon the work, without any special ordination or formality.

Brethren, has not the church waited long enough for the world to come and ask for bread? It is famishing but not hungry. It is insensible to its deepest need. If we wait for it to come, it will perish. The church must multiply over and over again the number of those who carry the bread to the fainting multitudes. Will not our pastors press this duty upon the churches, until every converted man and woman shall become, in some sense, a missionary, and learn how to tell the old, old story of Jesus and his love?

DAVID B. UPDEGRAFF, of Ohio: If the chair please, I have been profoundly impressed that God has been

speaking to us in a very unusual way, and I wish to ask that we spend a little season in silent waiting on God and in prayer and praise, asking that the Lord may deepen the convictions that are upon our hearts and bless us together.

(Several Friends led in prayer, after which Friends joined in singing *Blest be the Tie that Binds our Hearts in Christian Love.*)

CHAIRMAN: The time for adjournment is very close at hand, and there are two or three matters of business that need our consideration.

LUKE WOODARD, of Indiana: I feel impressed that the paper we have heard read by William Nicholson has not done all its mission. If it goes into type I hope we can obtain this address in a form that may be put into a tract for general distribution. I know it can be done with comparatively little expense.

CHAIRMAN: I was just going to introduce a matter of business which will reach the point that our friend has mentioned. I am in receipt of a communication from the Business Committee to this effect: "We suggest that the duty of preparing the conclusions of the Conference be left in the hands of the secretaries of the Conference." That suggestion evidently makes it necessary that the records of the Conference, as made by the secretaries, shall be adopted from time to time by the Conference. This paper would naturally become at once the property of the Conference and a part of its voice. The secretary wishes to speak with reference to this matter, and then Luke Woodard's proposition will very naturally come in.

SECRETARY: I think that the members of the Conference will at once see the propriety of making a different arrangement. To lay upon the secretaries, who have already cares devolving upon them of great importance, this additional one, would be a very serious thing, and the responsibility is one which I do not think either of us

would be willing to assume. In the last conference a committee of five was appointed by the chairman to prepare a statement of the conclusions reached by the conference. Friends will remember that when these conclusions are made by this Conference there will be a resume of them gathered together, and that will be sent out to the different yearly meetings as the utterances of this Conference. It is not only proper that that should be correct, but it should be properly and carefully expressed. It should be submitted to the Conference for its full approval. It should carry with it the full weight of the Conference, as its solemn utterance of the conclusions of the proceedings.

CHAIRMAN: You have heard the remarks of the secretary with reference to the proposition of the Business Committee.

ALLEN JAY, of Indiana: I propose that the chairman be authorized to appoint a committee of five to prepare these conclusions. (Approved.)

CHAIRMAN: I have been requested to call the attention of the Conference to the question as to whether we ought to turn summarily from this very important matter that has come before us. Does the Conference desire to have further discussion on this question?

WILLIAM L. PEARSON, of Iowa: It was my understanding that this was not to be the end of this question in this session. I think some of the committee on arrangements have spoken to that effect, and in view of the important question that is before us, one that has not first appeared at the surface this afternoon, but one which indicates some of the principles that are at work in all the yearly meetings, I think we ought to have a committee appointed to prepare some special proposition on this general subject upon which we should unite. Papers read by this one or that one, however good they may be, will go out as the voice of that individual, and we shall have accomplished very little that is worth any-

thing to our various yearly meetings unless there is some clear, short statement of the matter that cannot be put in just a conclusion we come to, in a sentence; it may take a page or two, I don't know how much, but it seems to me that we need a committee on that subject.

L. L. HOBBS, of North Carolina: I should like to suggest that this subject be open to further discussion. If any should wish to speak on the side which seems to be not the popular one here, I do hope the utmost courtesy may be shown to any opinions we may hold.

CHAIRMAN: Has the chairman of the Business Committee anything to communicate from that committee that will bear upon this question?

ALLEN JAY, of Indiana: We had in view another paper on that subject to be read to-night at the opening of the session, and then to go on with the discussion.

JAMES CAREY THOMAS, of Baltimore: If the Friends who prepare papers prepare them to take so long a time, and the Conference permits the limit of time to be extended for every paper that is presented, it is evident that all discussion of the papers is cut off by that proceeding. The Business Committee limited the time in order that there might be opportunity for discussion. If the Conference in its kindness extends to every one who reads a paper ten or fifteen minutes longer than the time allotted, it is necessarily cutting off all further discussion. I say this, now, not as a personal reference to any paper or any reader. There are a number here who have not prepared papers who have something to say on this subject.

DAVID B. UPDEGRAFF, of Ohio: I hope the same courtesy will be extended to them.

CHAIRMAN: I think I will detain the Conference a moment, to recall your attention to the question of the appointment of this committee on Conclusions. A very

little reflection, I think, will show to the members present that this is about as important a committee as could be appointed in this Conference. It is proposed that they shall be charged with the duty of formulating the conclusions of the Conference to be carried down to the yearly meetings, and whatever influence this body will have upon the action of the church in the future, will be practically put in their hands. I really think, if I may be allowed to dissent from the action already taken, that if there is any committee that ought to be appointed by the delegations, this committee is of that kind. I certainly am quite willing to constitute the committee as best I can, if it is the wish of the Conference, but it seems to me, that, under the circumstances, it is important that the Conference should appoint.

CHARLES F. CHAPMAN, of Wilmington, and WILLIAM NICHOLSON, of Ohio, concur in the chairman's view that the delegations should appoint.

JOHN HENRY DOUGLAS, of Iowa: I prefer the first plan. It is the safest and best to leave this matter to our chairman, to present the names as has been suggested. (Consent.)

FRANCIS W. THOMAS, of Indiana: I am satisfied it should be so left, and when the conclusions are read and submitted to the Conference, the matter is in our hands.

WILLIAM L. PYLE, of Western: I want to make the announcement that the publications of the Conference have been submitted to the *Evening News*, and a boy has been asked to have copies present below, that all may get them. I trust you will patronize him.

CHAIRMAN: Will the Business Committee make a definite announcement of the work for this evening, so that friends may understand it?

ALLEN JAY, of Indiana: We had it in mind to have

a paper read on the same subject, and then go on with the discussion.

After a moment of silent waiting, the Conference adjourned until 7 P.M.

EVENING SESSION — 7:15 O'CLOCK.

The Conference was called to order, and the session was opened by singing and prayer.

CHAIRMAN: In accordance with the directions of the Conference in the afternoon session, I will announce the names of the committee to which is to be referred the conclusions of this Conference, which are to be sent down to the yearly meetings represented here.

SECRETARY: If the chair please, I will interrupt the proceedings of the Conference one moment. The friends will remember that this afternoon the Business Committee referred this matter to the secretaries, with the request that they should prepare these conclusions. The secretaries felt themselves entirely inadequate to this work, and suggested that it should be referred to a committee of five. Further deliberation upon this subject has led me to ask this permission to interrupt the proceedings for one moment that we may think whether that is the wisest conclusion after all. The conclusions of this Conference are advisory only. They have to be submitted to the yearly meetings for acceptance. It is exceedingly desirable that all the conclusions of the Conference should be such as to commend themselves to all our yearly meetings. It has therefore seemed to me, after careful deliberation upon this subject, that it would perhaps be wiser that one member from each of the yearly meetings should be appointed on the committee on resolutions, in order that each of the yearly meetings, when these propositions come down to them, shall recognize the fact that one member of their yearly meeting was present, and that they had in that way a voice in the preparation of

these conclusions. I only throw that out as a suggestion, and if not thought advisable, we can go on as we are.

ROBERT W. DOUGLAS, of Indiana: I think we canvassed the matter very carefully this afternoon, and arrived at a conclusion, and the president of the Conference has made his selection. I do not think it would make any difference, as far as the yearly meetings are concerned, if it was a properly prepared digest of our proceedings, whether it was made by one out of each yearly meeting, or by a committee appointed by the Conference. I think the president should be encouraged to carry forward the decision of the Conference in the former session.

DAVID B. UPDEGRAFF, of Ohio: I feel the same way. We have changed about three times now. I am satisfied that the importance of this mission is magnified.

RICHARD H. THOMAS, of Baltimore: While I am entirely willing that the five be appointed, it seems to me Augustus Taber's suggestion is safer, and will be more likely to command influence. Therefore, personally I should like to have his suggestion carried.

CHAIRMAN: As far as the chair can determine the sentiment of the Conference, it seems to be in favor of sustaining the action of this afternoon. I will therefore announce the committee: Thomas C. Brown, of Western Yearly Meeting; Timothy Nicholson, of Indiana Yearly Meeting; Mary C. Woody, of North Carolina Yearly Meeting; Richard H. Thomas, of Baltimore Yearly Meeting; and Isom P. Wooton, of Iowa Yearly Meeting. Is there any other miscellaneous business to be introduced at this time?

(The chairman of Business Committee hands report to the president.)

The Business Committee have provided for a paper by William L. Pearson, of Iowa Yearly Meeting, twenty minutes in length, and also for a continuance of the dis-

cussion of the subject of the afternoon at the close of the reading of this paper.

WILLIAM L. PEARSON, of Iowa: Owing to the limited time, I shall omit some of the first part of my paper.

(APPENDIX G.)

CHURCH GOVERNMENT.—ITS RELATION TO THE PASTORAL QUESTION.

BY WILLIAM L. PEARSON.

I. *The Idea of the Church.* It is the body of Christ, consisting of many members. They are the called of God. This embraces those who have heard the call, that is, have hearkened, those "called to be Jesus Christ's," or *Christ's called ones*. The idea is fuller yet in Scripture: They are those who are born of the Spirit, true believers from a heaven-born conviction, transformed into the image of the Son of God, "called to be saints," sanctified to his service, and seeking his glory. As the body of Christ, the church and all its members are subject to him, as the human body is to its head. They are partakers of the divine life, animated by his Spirit, so that if any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of his. For by one Spirit we are all baptized into one body. Their most marked characteristic is the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. "Where the Spirit of God is, there is the church." This can not be said of professing Christians generally. But the Church and its members are in sympathy with the Head. They enter into his purposes, they participate in his mission and work, they rejoice in his triumphs, they are heirs of his glory.

II. *The true Church is visible.* It is an outward organization, an external society. It is a kingdom with an exalted King whose throne is in heaven, albeit here below the republic of God with a citizenship based upon the priesthood of believers, the equality of all rights, the brotherhood of Christ. Some sort of organization is absolutely necessary for such a body.

Some explanation may be needful here by way of di-

gression from the main subject. We must bear in mind that the external society, whose names are on the church record, who appear in the body, who speak and act in church affairs, is not the true visible church. If it were so, then every outward church organization, including the worst pretensions of popes and prelates ever known, as well as Unitarians and others who actually or virtually reject their Lord and Saviour, would be the church.

If Christ and the apostles make anything clear, it is the difference between "Israel after the flesh" and "Israel after the spirit." This points us to a church within a church, like the little church of Enosh, the son of Seth, that "began to call on the name of Jehovah." The members of this church are they whom the Holy Spirit is ever leading into all the truth. They "have an unction," says John, "from the Holy One, and know all things."

But how is this church visible? Is it not that external society which we see? Of course true believers form themselves into external societies, with officers, laws and qualifications of membership; but that constitutes the outward church. True believers alone constitute the church, apart from the external body. The believers constitute the body of Christ. They are visible: (1) in the manifestation of their faith by works, (2) by walking worthily of their high and holy calling, separate from the world. They are the epistles of Jesus Christ, known and read of all men. (3) The external society is visible as the soul is visible in the body. We see here a mixed body of professing believers and actual believers or true Christians. Such the church has been in all ages.

How, then, shall we prevent such a mixture of good and bad, of real and professing Christians? The best the church has ever been able to do is to insist on repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ as the ground of membership, and then treat those who have made a credible profession of faith as actual members of Christ's body. At best, we shall be obliged to suffer *some* tares among the wheat for generations to come, and trust Christ for the ultimate victory of the true church. He has said: "Lo! I am with you alway." Hence we conclude with the early fathers: "Where Christ is, there

is the true church." Tertullian said: "Where there are three [true Christians] together, tho' laymen, there is the church."

We can never agree with some of our excellent Christian fathers and some modern theologians that the external society is the evidence of the true church. We shall have rather to reject the thought, except in so far as the signs of living faith are manifest. That principle with us would be akin to the common error of Protestantism, that the church of the Spirit *naturally* had to be supplanted in the second century by the church of the form. The principle appears only in its true light in the words of Dr. Sanday, a true historian, and a very liberal Christian, though of Episcopal bias we shall see. He says it was necessary for the church of the Holy Spirit to yield to the church of the bishops—"The *ecclesia Spiritus* had to yield to the *ecclesia episcoporum*." "There must come a time [in the early church in her retrograde from earlier spirituality]," he says, "when the splendid dawn of spirit-given illumination would fade into the light of common day." Then *exit* Holy Spirit from the church of Christ. If so, then Romanists can find all sorts of excuses for the utmost tyranny of middle age papacy. Such is the height of heresy; such is extreme sectarianism. We will advocate the church of the Holy Spirit with a Pentecostal power

III. *The Object of Church Government.* As already observed, the church we see is not the true visible church. The outward church includes many who have only a name to live. With all these, and *for* them, the true church must pray and labor and live. The promise is still not only unto believers but unto their unconverted children, and all that are afar off, as many as the Lord our God shall yet call unto him. The external society, therefore, includes all those professing Christians, together with their children, who voluntarily associate themselves together in separate churches, or in societies of churches, for fellowship, for divine worship, for the promotion of truth and righteousness, and for the edification and oversight one of another.

IV. *The Head of the Church.* The Head of the

church is Christ. He is not only the Head of the invisible church, which comprises all who are born of God in heaven and on earth, but he is equally the Head of the organized church, and likewise of the visible church within it. Hence in all her assemblies of every kind all members of his church should cheerfully heed the precept of our Lord: "One is your Teacher, even Christ, and all ye are brethren." All are to submit themselves one to another in the fear of Christ.

V. *The Perpetuation of the Church.* All the promises of both Testaments imply, and many declare, that the church shall abide, to complete on earth the work of redemption through Christ, in order to share his eternal glory, together with that of the Father and of the holy angels. But how is this to be realized? What shall be the form of the church government of Christ's church? Or is the form indifferent? This leads to an examination of forms of government.

1. The Roman Catholic church, and on essentially the same grounds, all societies with a single human head, that claim to be the true Catholic church, hold that the church is a commonwealth, and that its human head is the vicegerent of Christ, the regular successor of Peter, and that through him Christ has both commissioned the church to conquer the world and continues infallibly to teach true believers, that is, members of the Catholic church. In this, Romanists follow the analogy of the Old Testament church, only the pope transcends the powers of the high priest. He not only and alone sacrifices for the people, but he robs the congregation and family of that ancient theocracy of the teaching of the prophets and elders and fathers, and sends his messengers to lord it over the members of Christ as exclusive teachers and priests. This is the papal and monarchical form of government. The pope is an absolute monarch.

2. A partial reformation of this extreme evolution from the simple apostolic government, and a distortion of it, is that which sets bishops to rule, not over particular churches, as early in the first century, but over many churches and their teachers. Its principal claim is that these bishops are successors of the apostles by an un-

broken line of descent in office. This form deviates toward papacy when it makes the political ruler head of the church. It claims that the Roman church apostatized, and that itself is the real Catholic church. Such is the church of England and the Episcopal church of this country. This form also inclines toward the New Testament government in some sects that accord certain prerogatives of government to church and people, as the Methodist Episcopal church is coming to do. This, in its various modifications, is the Episcopal form of government. It is an aristocracy or a limited monarchy. In the third century it preceded the papacy, and it succeeded it in several countries in the seventeenth century. 3. Another form of church government presumes upon the personal presence, presidency, and power of Christ, the ascended Lord, as continuous, not only in a general sense in the church as an external, organized society, but in particular in the visible, spiritual, regenerate church; that it is the office of the Holy Spirit to execute the will of God in the church and the world to the end of time; and that, as Head over all things to his church, Christ gives the Holy Spirit and spiritual gifts to all members of his body, that they may be his witnesses; that they are all equally, as pertaining to spiritual sacrifices, priests unto God, and, as pertaining to rights, citizens of the kingdom of heaven; that Christ gives to whom he will special spiritual gifts for ministry and oversight, and himself calls, qualifies, and puts forth such, as ministers and elders, that is, "pastors and teachers," to preach and to teach, and to tend the flock of God, for the edification of the church; and that, according to his will, the church should choose, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, these and other officers, as ensamples to the flock and examples of life and good works, to administer the affairs of the church, for preservation in faith and unity, and against the unfaithful, the immoral, the schismatic and the lifeless professor, that such may be restored, and that all may be built up on their most holy faith. So much as to the spiritual functions.

As to its disciplinary side, it is the New Testament church government. It is not historic Presbyterianism,

as we shall soon see ; but it is Presbyterianism in the New Testament sense of *presbyter*, meaning *elder*. It is also a republican form, that is, it governs by representatives from lower to higher assemblies, chosen periodically from its membership. It is a government of the membership, by the membership, and for the membership. The body of the church is the original repository of ecclesiastical authority. As Luther says : "All Christians belong to the spiritual state ; nor is there any other difference between them than that of the functions which they discharge." We are all of one baptism, one faith.

Like the others, this form has undergone several modifications, sometimes with aristocratic, sometimes with democratic tendencies. Such are several Protestant sects, particularly nearly all those in America. The historic Presbyterian and Reformed churches divide, as a rule, and as was done in the second century, the eldership, or the New Testament presbytery, horizontally, into the bishops, or teaching elders, that is, ministers, and the ruling elders. Thus modern Presbyterianism has relegated the entire government, except a mite of democracy left to the congregation, into the hands of these two orders of elders. These two orders of elders are chosen, as their spiritual gifts imply that they should be, for life. But therein lies a very serious departure from New Testament and republican principles, in that the people may *not* freely and *periodically* choose their representatives to the higher assemblies. Moreover, the Lutheran polity generally, and the Presbyterian sometimes, has developed a superintendent above all other teachers, with a sort of episcopal authority over districts ; and in some countries, but after the superintendent had assumed his regular place in the church government, these sects have evolved from him a full-fledged bishop.

Here it should be observed that departments of church work always, when the church is alive and at work, call for central personal superintendency. I am persuaded that there is no great efficiency in our present day whirl-of-business sort of life without general superintendents of departments. But it is both practically a hampering policy, and constitutionally a vicious principle, to incor-

porate them into the form of government. Then, and only then, can the bishop emerge from the body of equal "pastors and teachers" to revolutionize our entire church government. God spare us a revolution; God give us the grace of efficiency in his work to save and shepherd those not yet in the fold.

An opposite extreme is pure democracy. Several dissenting denominations began on this bottom rock "with the people," they said, only to discover that pure democracy is not a pure system of practical government. As soon as the people can no longer meet together *en masse*, the only alternative is to segregate into congregations, after the tribal system, or to establish a government, republican in form, with delegated powers. After this manner, in the seventeenth century appeared congregationalism in Congregational and Baptist churches throughout England. While they have never adopted or had any regular form of government, they have usually resorted to Presbyterian and republican practice, by making their deacons do elder duty. And, while they have measurably counteracted tendencies to dissolution by their centralizing boards, they are manifestly almost powerless to check the inroads of universalism and other errors.

Friends started with the simplest possible democratic ideas; but they soon laid hold of New Testament and republican principles, and the foundation of their church government in monthly, quarterly and yearly meetings, with regular subordination and representation, was the natural result, a system which, logically, should never have had, at least in the same country, but one yearly meeting.

Viewing it from a spiritual standpoint, we see representative men and women gathering in the annual assembly for counsel, for the strength that comes only from union and communion, for the teachings and power of the Holy Spirit. They were a baptized people in the Pentecostal sense.

From the governmental point of view, a completer organization in a series of meetings from monthly to yearly meeting, was necessary for two reasons. In the first place, it was needful, to counteract the extremely demo-

cratic influences which were fostering obstinate individualism; and, what was at the same time even more important, to concentrate the influence and power of the whole Society upon their great mission. It was not long till we can recognize evangelistic, foreign mission, educational and benevolent departments of work, not, it is true, perfectly organized after the custom and requirements of our more complex modern Society.

In the second place, from both the governmental and the spiritual point of view, the introduction of ordinary, as distinguished from preaching elders, was a great gain. Besides the fact that New Testament church government and republican principles were involved, these elders were needed as sympathizers and counselors of the ministers, as mediators between them and the members, and as a check upon any tendency to ministerial control of the Society. Doubtless strong democratic features will always remain both in the worship and the business sessions of Friends' meetings. They are usually a safeguard; they are sometimes an obstruction.

The principles and leading features of three forms of church government have now been stated. These three are the only forms properly called government. They are papacy, corresponding to the absolute monarchy; episcopacy, corresponding to the aristocracy, oligarchy or limited monarchy; and New Testament Presbyterianism, corresponding to the republic.

Now we may not conclude that papacy in the church, or a monarchy in the state, is always and everywhere wholly displeasing to God. Nor may we suppose that episcopacy in the church has no advantages. Any of these forms, wisely, vigorously, and kindly administered, where needed for the blessing of man, may do much good. Those just mentioned have some advantages among less cultured peoples. But the reasons why Friends should uphold their form of church government and perfect it, as God gives them wisdom, are easily adduced: 1. It seems to be in nearest harmony with New Testament principles, and it is republican. 2. These are the highest forms of government that have appeared in God's providence in church and in state. 3. It is the form

which God chose for his church. 4. We have this form ; the adoption of any other would require a revolution, a revolution that must first repress and then kill out the elders. They will die hard. Let us preserve the most efficient form of government known since the apostles' days.

Some fundamental principles involved in what has been evinced should here be deduced: 1. As between man and man the rights of private judgment in doctrine, the manner of worship, the form of government and the methods of promulgating the truth, are matters of conscience, in which man is accountable to God only. 2. The same rights belong to every Christian church, or to every association of churches, so that each may determine the terms of admission into fellowship, the qualifications of its members and of its ministers and other officers, and its entire system of polity. 3. Having these rights, Christians are, therefore, under the highest obligation to maintain the truth against error. For truth is in order to holiness; faith and practice, truth and duty, are inseparable. 4. Friends believe it to be the will of God that they shall steadfastly maintain the scriptural form of government, which the founders of the society adopted under Christ. 5. While members who are of the best Christian character in the same society may differ, it is necessary to unite in making effectual provision that only teachers sound in the faith be admitted and retained. 6. The Holy Scriptures are the only authoritative rule of faith and practice, and regulations and decisions of a church, or a society of churches, can bind the conscience only in so far as they are founded upon the revealed will of God. 7. The foregoing principles and rights, founded upon the truth, themselves constitute the unmistakable obligation upon all members of churches, and of societies of churches, cheerfully to submit in harmony with their branch of the church, as a member of the body of Christ. Faith in Christ must ever form the basis of loyalty to the church. 8. Constituted as above indicated, and holding the principles herein set forth, the Society of Friends, consisting of various meetings in their order, and many

particular churches, is a distinct branch of the church of Christ.

The principles of church government have here been presented as based upon the New Testament form, and in the light of history. He that has no history has also no prophesy, neither does he really understand the present well. I have no desire to turn the Society of Friends back over the Rubicon. I have never had an objection to support of ministers in their right place and work. But consideration should be duly given to the judgment of the best church historians of our time, as Bishop Lightfoot, Pressensé, Hatch, Schaff, Harnack, Sanday, and J. Rendall Harris, of various creeds and church governments, who substantially agree as to the apostolic principles. They agree, that the early church grew out of the Jewish synagogue, and retained its form — in many places the name; that the elders were the same in each, except in the church they assumed spiritual functions; that they were only one order, to them were committed the spiritual interests of the flock; that in the second and third century the revolution came.

In the paper on "The Pastorate Question," this afternoon, I fancied I heard in the Friend, whom I have revered from my childhood, the voice of Ignatius, not many years after the heart of the aged apostle John was stilled, saying to Christians: Honor the bishop as you do your Lord!

It is important for us to look at our form of government on the spiritual side closely. In it appears the Friends' pastoral system, which is substantially the system of the New Testament. In it are involved the relations of ministers and elders as together constituting the pastoral body of the church. In the separate congregations these two classes are one council in charge of the spiritual interests of the entire membership. The choice of them is based upon moral character and the possession of spiritual gifts and qualifications. As to their office they are all of both classes elders.

Hence the elders, including the ministers and elders in any church, constitute the pastoral body, and have the spiritual oversight and care of the members. In their

particular churches they are all of equal station and authority. In Scripture they received different names, indicating their various duties. Since they have the oversight of the flock of Christ they are called overseers, or bishops. Since they feed the flock they are called pastors. Since they instruct in sound doctrine they are called teachers. Since they are to be examples and ensamples of the flock in gravity and prudence, and to govern well in the house of God, the kingdom of Christ, they are called presbyters, or elders. But certain characteristics and qualifications, particularly the nature and measure of their gifts, divide the elders into two classes, ministers and other elders (I. Tim. v : 17). They will be known by these current titles.

1. *Ministers.* They are elders who possess the additional special gift in the ministry. This is indicated in Scripture by the names the minister obtained. As bearing the messages of God he is termed a messenger, or an apostle (Mal. 2:7 ; 2 Cor. 8:23 ; Phil. 2:25). As clothed with authority to proclaim to a world of sinners the will of God, in order to reconcile them to him, he is termed an ambassador. As expounding the wisdom and counsel of God he is termed a steward of the manifold grace, and of the mysteries of God (Luke 12:42 ; I Cor. 4:1, 2). As engaged in the special work of ingathering he is termed an evangelist (I Tim. 4:6).

By virtue of ministerial gifts the minister or ministers, therefore, chosen by any church, fill the foremost place in the worship and work of the congregation ; yet they are only equal in station and authority among the elders, and in the church they are servants of all (I Pet. 1:1). Having the approval first of the eldership, or pastoral body, and then of the church, they speak and act with their authority. While they share, with all the elders of the church, the oversight and pastoral care in which they are given a leading part, their highest duty is to proclaim the gospel of God and to instruct in the way of salvation (I Tim. 1:11) ; to preach the word, being instant in season, out of season ; to reprove, to rebuke, to exhort, with all long-suffering and teaching (2 Tim. 4:2).

2. *Elders.* The elders in the church are selected on

account of their spiritual gifts, the same in kind, but not of the same order, as the gift in the ministry. They must be such as fear God and are faithful, apt to teach, able both to exhort in sound doctrine and to convict gainsayers (Tit. 1:5-9), of good report, ruling their own houses well, ensamples of the flock in word and manner of life. They are to tend the flock of God as a charge allotted to them, watching in behalf of their souls, as those that shall give account, exercising the oversight, not as lords, nor for advantage, nor of constraint, but willingly and humbly. It is their duty to sympathize with all for their growth in the grace and knowledge of our Lord and Saviour, for the development of spiritual gifts in the unity of the Spirit, "for the perfecting of the saints, unto the work of ministering, unto the building up of the body of Christ, till all attain unto the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a full-grown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ." They are to counsel with ministers in love, tenderly encouraging and helping young ministers, advising them all in the wisdom of God.

CHAIRMAN: It is now in order that the discussion shall proceed upon the general subject introduced and discussed during the afternoon session. It is not proper that the chairman should, if it were in his power, wholly influence the proceedings or deliberations of the Conference. It may, perhaps, be pardonable, however, for me to say that it seems extremely important that the very interesting discussion of this afternoon should be continued in such manner that the views of the delegates on all sides of this question shall be fully expressed. My own judgment is that there is no better work that can be accomplished by this Conference than to secure just such a frank and full expression of views from all possible points of view upon a question which is of such vital interest to the present progress of the church. For that reason I hope we shall not be in haste about this matter. If a yearly meeting can spend two days in earnest deliberation upon the appointment of a home mission committee, a simple expedient for the promotion of church

work within the yearly meeting, and I have seen this done, it seems to me that a conference of delegates from all the yearly meetings on this continent will not make a mistake if they spend two days in such a discussion, if it can be as earnest and as sweet in spirit as that in which we proceeded this afternoon.

WILLIAM L. PYLE, of Western: It seems to me it would be very proper for the chair, in a concise manner, to state the question again, as there are many here who will be interested in it who did not hear the discussion this afternoon.

CHAIRMAN: The question is, The Conduct of Meetings for Worship and the Maintenance of the Ministry.

WILLIAM L. PEARSON, of Iowa: I wish, if it is the mind of the Conference, that we might divide this into the two or three questions that it really is. We have three questions before us, at least, and I should take great delight in hearing them discussed if they could be taken up separately.

FRANCIS W. THOMAS, of Indiana: I would suggest that as the question has been largely discussed, on one side at least, if there is another side to be discussed, these should have the opportunity of speaking, and should have as broad ground, in order to have a fair discussion of the whole subject, as those who have already spoken. For that reason I should prefer that it be left open as it is.

(Expressions of concurrence.)

CHAIRMAN: Shall there be any further discussion of this question?

RICHARD H. THOMAS, of Baltimore: What we all want is to have the gospel spread and believers built up, and it seems to me that the nearer we get, in the right sense, to the people, and to all the people, the more we shall be able to bring them to the Lord Jesus Christ. For he

came, not simply to save us for the next world, but to make of us all good men and women here and now. The religion of Christ is not simply for the seminary, is not simply for the ministry, but is for every man. Wherever there is a man, whatever his condition may be, whatever his employment, so long as it is an honest one, that man is for Jesus Christ, and Jesus Christ is for that man. And as our Saviour is for every man, it requires every man, every characteristic, to present him to every man. If we do that which will result in relegating the ministry of the gospel to any set of men with a special training, and with just one line of thought, in so doing we necessarily limit its influence; because the ministry of the gospel is to be inclusive of every characteristic of man. We want ministers who understand the farmer's needs, the needs of the mechanic, the business man, the housekeeper, etc., to speak from personal experience; and we need the learned also. We want people who will preach the message God gives them, learned men who understand the theory and principles of the Christian religion, and also men burning up with zeal for the Lord Jesus Christ, who know nothing more than that which they have been taught in their own experience. The Lord, by calling both learned and unlearned into this work, is in every generation teaching us the need of both. We make a mistake when we begin to say that a minister must go through any special course of training, or that he must have this or that kind of an education. The training we need, dear friends, in a minister, is that which impels him to preach the gospel. It is the training which the apostles had while they were with the Lord Jesus for three years, and if we will so work among our meetings and membership that both our educated and our uneducated members will give themselves to the Lord Jesus Christ, and yield themselves to his call, he will choose from each class those whom he will fit for this service, and the result will be to maintain in the church the true proportion between educated and uneducated ministry. We would not set up ignorance as against education, nor set up scholastic education as against the want of it, but we need some from every class called into the ministry, as the Lord Jesus may lay it

upon them. Because this is our position, we say that there is but one necessary qualification for the ministry of the word, and that is that which comes to a man by living with the Lord Jesus Christ and under his call to that work, and going forth to it in his power and guidance. Then, whatever of beauty, whatever of knowledge, whatever of experience, that man or woman may have, will be under the control of the Lord, and the Lord will use it.

Two or three ministers may be in one meeting, one educated, another uneducated, and each being under the divine teaching, they will together produce the harmony and the message which the Lord wants to have produced.

As I said in the beginning, we want to keep in touch with everyday life, and, if we would only view the matter in this light, we should see that the Society of Friends holds a wonderfully advantageous position on account of this very fact that we have as yet no professional ministry among us, and God grant we may never have it. When the people hear a Friend preach, they hear him speaking as one of themselves, for we are pursuing the same course of life, and are subject to the same kinds of temptations that they are. They see us speaking as common men to common men, and I tell you that there is in this very fact a very real power which we must not forget. We speak of the necessity of education. If anyone will be under the guiding hand of the Lord, the education which he gets in his life and in its daily avocations, is a preparation for the ministry, and is one of the most valuable preparations for it that a man can have. It also keeps us from ecclesiasticism; and it keeps us from preaching merely theoretical sermons. When we have our faces down to the grindstone ourselves, and know how difficult it is to turn an honest penny, and how easy it is to be tempted to get a little better of a bargain, we can speak to the people better than we could from the standpoint of theory. It seems to me the advantage which we have in a non-professional ministry is a wonderful one, and I wish that we might understand that, so far from interfering, the conditions which it necessitates are absolute helps.

We hear it said that it was an exceptional thing for the apostle Paul to follow tent-making. On the contrary, so late as into the second and third centuries, the councils decreed how bishops should carry on their business, and directed that they should be careful in their business to be honest, truthful and straightforward. It was not an exceptional thing.* We remember how Paul, when he came to the Ephesian elders, said to them: "These hands have ministered to my necessities, and to them that were with me. In all things I gave you an example, how that so laboring ye ought to help the weak, and to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how he himself said, It is more blessed to give than to receive." But you will reply that these words were addressed not to the congregation but to the elders. Paul also said, that those that preach the gospel should live of the gospel. Yes, he said it, but there is no contradiction in these two places. None of us are pleading for the non-use of money in the preaching and promulgation of the gospel. We believe there is a right use for money in spreading the gospel. But, dear friends, let us look and see what he meant when he wrote it, and not simply what we mean when we read it. In speaking at Miletus to the resident Ephesian elders, who had the oversight of that church, he said, "Ye should so labor, and be able to give rather than to receive." Elsewhere he wrote that Christ had made this arrangement, that they that proclaim the gospel as heralds shall live of the gospel, (for this is the force of the passage in the Greek). If the Lord calls a man away from his vocation and sends him here and there, and the church is sure that the Lord has so called him, why, by all means, let the church contribute to his support; because, as he travels from place to place, it is impossible for him to support himself. But while I believe we should lay down no hard and fast laws, I also believe that the ministry of the word will be greatly helped, if it is the regular plan for those ministers who are resident in any place to have their own vocations, so that they may be kept in absolute touch with the people day by day, and that they may speak to the people as one of themselves.

*See Hatch's "Organization of the Early Christian Church," Section 6.

But, then, you say, how is the pastoral work to be done? Don't you believe in pastoral work? Yes. God sets some in the church as apostles, some as prophets, some as evangelists, some as pastors, and some as teachers. Of course he does. No one believes in the pastoral work more than I do, and I believe the church has suffered from lack of it; but, dear friends, the minister is not necessarily the pastor. A Baptist minister in Baltimore, at the installation of a new minister in one of their congregations, said to the people, "If you find you have a good preacher, be satisfied; if you find you have in him a good pastor, be satisfied; because, in all probability you will not have both." As a rule, the two gifts are not in the same person. The pastoral gift is a far more universal gift than people generally think. More people are called into the pastoral work than we suppose, and what we need to do is to arouse our congregations, yes, even new congregations, to a sense of their privileges, so that when we bring people to the Lord they shall understand we have not brought them into a nursery or a hospital, but into a field of work, an army, and that as soon as they know the Lord Jesus as their Saviour, they are to set to work themselves, in order that his work may be carried on. We should lay the responsibilities even on those who are young in the Lord, so far as their age and experience permit, and this pastoral work is to be done by the combined forces of the church, and so the church will be built up. There is a tendency, we know, to parasitism in all animals. There are some creatures in the lower order of being which, when young, have the power of independent action, but after a while they get stuck where they can get all the food they want without working for it, and they lose their limbs of locomotion and become parasites and suckers all the rest of their lives. Now, it seems to me, without meaning anything invidious, we should be on our guard against parasitism in our Society, and seek to bring in members who fully understand that they have been called of the Lord by his spirit, to be his, and who recognize from the first that they are called into his service. We cannot do this in the most effectual way unless we lay a burden of responsibility upon them. If some one

else can do what they ought to do, better in their estimation than they can, they wont do it, and we must teach them to hear the voice of the Lord for themselves from the start, that they may, in the beginning of their Christian life, come to him because they hear his voice in their hearts, and not because of outward pressure, and that they may look to him for guidance from the first step in their Christian career. I firmly believe that if we introduce into our meetings anything like the pastoral system, so ably described by our friend, William Nicholson, this afternoon, we are going to have parasites as members in our denomination as we have never had them before. We may possibly increase more in numbers, but there is something besides this ; we want to influence the world ; and I would rather get one person who would stand strong and firm in the world when he goes out by himself, and be an independent power for good wherever he went, than ten people coming to be fed from time to time by somebody else, and looking for somebody else to do their work for them ; that one man would, in his life-time, do much more good than the other ten could possibly do.

Some one has said, no society can prosper except on the principles upon which it was founded, and, as we have heard from our friend James Wood, the Society of Friends is founded on this idea, that every soul is under the immediate guidance of the Lord. We do not need to teach people to receive their guidance from the minister, or to do what the minister says because he says it, nor should any of us say to the people, "Do what I say because I say it." but "If the Holy Ghost sends what I say home to your hearts, if he lays it on you, do it." We do not want parasites, but a working army. When there are any spiritually sick among us, let the concerned members look after them and each other in the name of the Lord.

You have been kindly bearing with me in this long address [Time was extended], and I do not wish to take undue time ; but I do feel this very deeply. Now, I do not want you to answer me, but I want each one of you solemnly to think of that which we have heard from Dr. Nicholson this afternoon. Do you really want that which he pictured to us as the meaning of the pastoral system

to be the normal condition of the Society of Friends? I have not the smallest hesitation in saying I do not, and I, for one, will be very sorry indeed if it should ever come about. I believe the Lord has called us into something better. You say some people are so afraid of doing wrong that they never do right. I have no doubt that that is the case. But let us guard against the dangers. There was once the danger of too much silence in our meetings, and we had too much silence. There was the danger of too much repression. But that is not a reason why we should have no silence in our meetings, or why we should encourage something which will, as it develops, lead to priestly assumption. It is because I believe that the Lord has a real work for the Society of Friends: that these principles are practicable and therefore to be practiced; that the Lord Jesus will bless us in maintaining our original principles with new life, but still on our original basis, that I am a Friend.

There is one other thing I want to say. It is asserted that the Society of Friends is a failure. I say it is not a failure. It was not a failure even in the time it decreased in membership. Take the Methodist church, which is an aggressive church. Suppose that church, through one hundred and fifty years, does its very best to get rid of all of the members it can, and makes it as difficult as possible for any new members to come in; do you think it would grow very much? Suppose it disowns every man or woman who does not marry a Methodist? Suppose it disowns people on the very slightest offense? Suppose it crowds down every appearance of life except in certain channels? Do you think it is going to grow? My opinion is that if the Methodist church would try that, it would not last fifty years. I believe that the fact that the Friends bore such a treatment for one hundred and fifty years is a constant evidence of the power in the Society of Friends. [Laughter.] The Society of Friends has always succeeded in what it set out to do. When it started out to be an evangelizing body, it was an evangelizing body with a vim, and brought souls to the Lord Jesus, and its numbers increased. When it started out to be an absolutely pure Society in itself, I think we will all admit that

it very largely succeeded. When it started out to be a philanthropic society, it succeeded ; and the fact that it did not grow in numbers is no argument against it, because it did not seek to grow in numbers. At the same time, please understand me, I think it should have wanted to increase. Now, what we need is not new principles, because they are the principles of the Lord Jesus Christ which he has laid down. They are the simplest and most natural. Every man who comes to Christ receives a gift, and every one must exercise that gift under his immediate direction. Our Society is formed on the idea that people are going to exercise their gifts. We have our overseers and our elders to look after the ministry, but no arrangement was made for the ministry, originally, for the reason that it was taken for granted that the Lord would supply it, and so he will, if we have life and power, and look to him for it. The arrangements were for the purpose of regulating the ministry. The Society was organized on the idea that the Lord would, of course, supply his gifts to the church. Now, let us expect him to do it, and go forward. It is the simplest thing in the world. Two or three who believe in the Lord Jesus Christ have a church at once. They do not have to wait for a minister or anybody. They start right off as a church, and they can build each other up. I have seen churches built up on that principle. I know it can be done ; and it is worth while putting it into practice and giving it a fair trial. The Society of Friends has not yet given it a fair trial. When new life came into it, it branched out on other lines. Now let us try, for a little while at least, the lines which originally belonged to us. Here is the true basis of the early church, the gifts divided, the ministers, the pastors, not necessarily the same and generally not the same, the teachers, the evangelists, all working in harmony, but not supported as a different class, as though one could say: I am holier than thou. No, each minister can say: "I speak on the same platform with thee. If the Lord has given me a gift in the ministry, that is no reason why I am not to work for my own living. I am to work for my own living unless the Lord says I must not, and calls me out to some other place." Where a minister is resident in a place, if

he has some means of livelihood he is going to do better work than if he has no way of making his own living. We do not want to teach the people to be led by us, but by the Lord, though we may help, by advice, to keep them in the right way. It is safe to trust a meeting to the Lord, if only the people will themselves trust it and themselves to him.

Now, dear friends, I do love you. Please understand me, I am not saying a word of intentional criticism. My heart goes out to you. I have met with nothing but the greatest kindness since I have been in this western country, nevertheless I must speak out. There is this real danger of priestly domination. We cannot shut our eyes to it, and if we do, the result will be that we shall become a third class ordinary evangelical denomination, like any other people. We shall not be able to hold our own half as well as we are doing now. If we put the ministry on a professional basis, other denominations have more money and better appliances, while we shall have lost our original position. Under these circumstances we cannot blame our most attractive ministers if they go off where they can get more money. We cannot compete with other denominations on their own lines. We cannot present as attractive a service from an external standpoint, and we have not the kind of ministry which is good to be paid for. [Laughter.] I mean it. But we have or can have the ministry which God wants. The gift of the Holy Spirit is not to be paid for, and when the ministry is put on a professional basis, you have got to have a professional article. Otherwise you cannot sustain it. There is no question about that. A paid ministry will mean a fullfledged theological seminary. It cannot be anything else. Now the Lord has his army in the world, the church. There is the Methodist, the Baptist, the Episcopalian, and there are others. We are a small people. Suppose we become exactly like the Methodists or the Baptists. Eighty thousand people, what is that in the great host of the Methodist, Presbyterian, or Baptist bodies? If we adopt their methods, we may still do much good, but nothing like so much good as if we hold the ground which the Lord gives us and

work in the way that the Lord wants us to work. We do not judge other people in the army. There are some fighting here, and some there ; but it may be God has a body guard in some citadel or other. Suppose that small guard in that citadel should say, O well, those people down there are doing a great deal more work than we are doing ; we will go down and fight where they are. Then that important position is left unguarded. The Lord needs the Society of Friends, not as a denomination, but as a body fighting in the way he has told us to fight. Dear friends, let no man take our crown.

L. L. HOBBS, of North Carolina : I expressed my wish this afternoon that we might have an entirely frank discussion of this question, and I must confess that I felt a litte bit disturbed for fear we might be going to rush from the subject too hastily ; but I am glad to see that there is no such disposition. The question with me all this afternoon has been, What is the truth with respect to this subject. If I can be shown that the truth is on the side which I think our friend William Nicholson held forth, then I want to be sufficiently honest with myself deliberately to take that position ; but if I cannot see it so, then I must, in honesty to my own convictions, maintain the position which does, to my own mind, seem to be the truth. One of the chief characteristics of the Society of Friends has been the development of the individual, and if we are to make a radical change with respect to the basis on which the ministry originally rested in the Society of Friends, it ought to be very frankly stated that we change our basis. That is a point with me, and I arose in order that I might feel clear with respect to myself, to state that I do not yet see, from the arguments that have been produced, that the time has come for us to change the original basis upon which the ministry rested. As soon as I do see it, if I ever see it, I think I shall have the frankness to admit it. As I stated in the outset, I very much desire to see the truth on this question, and it was on that account that I expressed a wish that we might give it due consideration, so that we might arrive at something that would be really useful to us when we got home.

NATHAN T. FRAME, of Wilmington: It seems to me that we need some means by which we may husband the work that is done by our earnest workers in the field where the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ is preached, and while I listened this afternoon to the papers that were read and to the discussion of the subject before us, I most heartily agreed, largely, with that which was uttered, and yet some points appeared to be so radical in some of the phases presented that, as liberal as some of us have been reckoned to be, I could hardly stretch myself up to the measure of it. I remember that the apostle Paul said, Not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called. We know that that which constitutes any one a minister of the divine Master is the message, and as messengers they have promulgated the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ, and have reached the minds and hearts and consciences of men. But a point that was brought out in one of the papers this afternoon seemed to indicate that no one but those who are evangelically trained and well cultivated could preach, that it had almost become a necessity for any one preaching the gospel in connection with our worshipping assemblies to be trained and educated in colleges and schools. Now, there are a great many common people, and I am one among them. There are a great many little valleys and little hills, and there are only a few broad ones and high mountains. God has adapted his ministers to the conditions of the people, and if we relegate to one person the attendance of all the funerals and the visiting of all the members when they are sick and the preaching of all the sermons because, perchance, they have felt called and are recognized as pastors of the flock, and those who may have been called of God just as much to serve him by exhortation or by preaching or by teaching, are to sit by and listen only, it seems to me we are getting away from the foundation principles upon which we started out in the beginning; and while I am fully in accord with the pastoral system in a right way, I believe we should, in our meetings for worship, have it clearly and distinctly understood that these pastors are set over the church by the proper authorities, and are there at the instigation of the people and the call of God,

and we should take care to see that they have the way open for the exercise of their gifts in the meetings.

JAMES CAREY THOMAS, of Baltimore: I shall not say a great deal. I am five years older than when I was at the last Conference, and I have not been an uninterested observer of the methods of Christian work that are going on about me. We have a very fraternal feeling in Baltimore, and I have been thrown in contact with a great many of my Christian brethren in all denominations except the Catholic and Unitarian. They are the two extremes. I believe that as a church thinks, so it is. Now, as an individual, I am anxious that this Conference should think forward into the future on the line of the Society of Friends. I am not going to discuss methods; I am going to discuss how we think, what is our ideal of a congregation. Is it an ideal of a congregation under the control of a pastor, or is it an ideal of a congregation in which each member is exerting his spiritual power as the Lord gives the command and the opportunity? Is that our ideal? Do we want to develop our congregations in that way? I believe that just as we want to develop them, as we desire to develop them, so we shall develop them. The preaching of the gospel, as I understand it, is this: The gospel itself has been committed to the church, to every member of the church, as we understand it, who knows the power of the Lord Jesus Christ in the pardon of his own sins, and knows the power and baptism of the Holy Spirit, which I believe confers a gift for service upon the individual so baptized. I believe it is for service every time when we receive the baptism of the Holy Ghost; it is for service for Christ and for men. Now, is it our ideal so to develop our church and those who claim to have received the baptism of the Holy Ghost, that they shall be in the work using the gifts which God gives them and developing those gifts? I do not care how you do it. The method I am not talking about, but is that the ideal in the minds of this Conference, the original ideal of this Society, that every man and woman has a gift from God which he or she is bound to exercise in the fear of the Lord, and that the church is the organization which

enables them to do it, which helps them in the exercise of their gift, and which promotes it in every possible way, and which does nothing to hinder or obstruct it? Is that the ideal which we have of a church gathered under the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ and by the commission of the church of which we are members and ministers? Is that our ideal? If so, we are going to work towards it. Now again, just one other thought, and I think I shall have concluded what I have to say. As I understand the order of our church, it is this: that God by his spirit lays upon the individual a special service; that the individual, the member of the church, says to the church, in some way or other, the Lord has given me this gift and laid this service upon me. Now, the church stands behind the individual with all the power of the church, to develop the gift, to promote its exercise, to send the individual out in the field into which the Lord has called that individual. Is that our ideal? If that is our ideal our methods will conform to it.

ISOM P. WOOTON, of Iowa: I will state to Friends that in my life it has been not so much my duty to be a public advocate as to publicly demonstrate; and I rise this evening for the purpose of setting before us a few facts that may not be known in connection with the subject that is before us. Take one yearly meeting, which, when I came on the arena of work, numbered eight thousand members and about half the number of ministers it has now. The body of the church, so far as religious work was concerned, was inactive. The ministry, so far as soul-saving efforts were concerned, was nine-tenths inactive. I think you who know the facts will bear me out in what I am stating. Some of us coming to the work at that time felt that it was a question of life and death to our church. Principles dear to us were at stake, on which, though we were birthright members, we were as thoroughly convinced as any person who ever came to the church from without through conviction. We have never in the history of our work wavered one jot or one tittle from the foundation principles, so far as we have known them, of the Society of Friends. Some of

us feel that we have been a little too arbitrary on that line. It was clear to us that as dear as these principles were, the time was coming when, in the West at least, we should almost be unknown as a society. We could but look around us and study the foundation principles from the standpoint of the possibility of practical work in which these principles might be maintained before a thinking world. The more we studied, the more we became convinced that we, as a church, were not acting up to our principles. The thought came to us that if we could reinstate the early methods, and by these carry forward and advocate the principles of the Society of Friends, it would be laudable and consistent with the highest interests of the church. This has been our search. The conviction of God has been right down to the very center of our hearts in this.

Another thing. A large number of our young ministers were constantly going from our church to fields where they could enter upon practical soul saving, and, with their hands untied from any other responsibility as much as might be, devote themselves wholly to God in the line of their calling. We were being depleted of the most intelligent young men of our church. They were becoming the standard bearers of other denominations. It is true, they carried with them in their hearts the principles which they had received, and they promulgated them abroad, but we, as a church, were simply preparing persons to take other fields and to bring the results of their labors to other centers, instead of concentrating the efforts of those who have been educated and prepared for the work of the church in our own church, and husbanding the work for which we had paid the cost. Now, it seemed to us that we must take a position in connection with the church in which we were born and which we loved, that might catch the tide of exit from our church and bring back those young men that were leaving us, and hold them, in connection with the doctrines that were precious to us, and by that means perhaps we might enlarge the boundaries of our church. That has been our effort, friends. We may have gone at this thing rather awkwardly. It would be strange if we did not go at it

awkwardly under our schooling. But we have done the best we could. We have done the best we knew. We have established plans. We have opened fields. We have saved our boys and our girls, I may say, to the ministry of the Friends' church in the West, and to-day we have doubled the ministry of Iowa Yearly Meeting. Iowa Yearly Meeting now has twelve thousand members, whereas it had about eight thousand at that time; and this increase has been largely on the line of husbanding the work. It may be true that we have got a lot of parasites. But let me say to-day that the activities of the Friends' church in connection with the yearly meeting of which I speak are ten to one in comparison to what they were at the time I speak of in the earlier history. The church rises up and takes the field, goes into the battle, uses the weapons, fires into the ranks of the enemy, and takes the gain to the Friends' church, and makes them members, active members, of the Friends' church. At the time of which I speak, I presume in connection with the ministerial work, and it is the great work of the church to preach the gospel to the people, there was possibly used in our yearly meeting, in traveling expenses of our ministers and in the home needs of the ministers, let me say, \$1,000 a year. Last year, on this very same line of evangelistic work and pastoral work of Iowa Yearly Meeting, there was pretty nearly \$18,000 used. Who furnished that? Where are the ministers, where are the workers that have come to the front and made their farms pay for the promulgation of the gospel, and made their merchandise pay for the promulgation of the gospel, and made their banks pay for the promulgation of the gospel, and in these different relations of business have carried the word of God to hundreds and thousands of people to whom it should have been carried before the inauguration of this later movement in the church?

Then again, take the \$18,000 and compare it with the number of ministers of Iowa Yearly Meeting at this time. Seventy-one pastors reported this year; seventy-nine pastors reported last year. Last year's report included a number of pastors who were not really and officially recognized as pastors, but who were doing decidedly pas-

toral work without pay and without an authorized decision of the monthly meeting. The seventy-one pastors are now men and women that are authorized by the church and placed in this relation, and reported up as official pastors in connection with the work of Iowa Yearly Meeting. Take these ministers and compare \$18,000 to their support, and you see it drives them, almost every one of them, to do work for their own support to supplement what they receive in their relation to the preaching of the gospel. I have been a preacher twenty-nine years. I tend my own patch at home, from which I get all the vegetables of our living, and if any of you will take hold of my hand you will feel almost the marks of the hoe handle at this time, after some months have passed. It may not be the hoe handle, but it is the result of gathering in my vegetables for our use. I do this kind of business, and yet I am the chore boy all over the West there. Now, if these men and women do what they can to support themselves outside, and then in the fullness of the fire that burns in their hearts they go steadily forward, preaching the gospel in the great field in which we are placed, I say to-night to call them parasites in connection with the church is wrong. We should be careful of such expressions. There is a large number of young men and young women in the western yearly meetings. You ought to see them in their fields of labor. You ought to see them bowing with the penitent, and giving them instruction. You ought to see them privately in the council, in connection with this great religious movement; and you would find that they were cut loose from any dependence upon the ministry, or upon anything else than the great Head of the church. They are independent, moving, acting, working men and women and girls and boys, in connection with this great movement that is before us. And there never was a time in our history when that could be said so truly as to-day. The question comes to you, how shall we develop these young people? We are not developing them, please God. They are developing themselves under the power of God, and the whole field is open for them to develop; and if, perchance, a minister is occupying some place in some church, there are plenty

of fields around, and they soon find it out, and they enter into the work as they never did before. The fire burns in the midst of the energies of a true pastor that brings down the truth of God upon the consciences of the people, and drives them out into the neglected fields, and they go as true missionaries, everywhere preaching the word. We have in the places where they have accepted the pastoral system as many that are not recognized in the ministry, in proportion to the number of our people who are in active work, as any other yearly meeting of the Society of Friends. I submit these facts, and they can be substantiated by others here, in connection with this great work, and may God bless the work of the Conference in relation to this subject.

FRANCIS W. THOMAS, of Indiana: It will take but a short time for me to say what I want to say, the oldest man in the field, with credentials dating back perhaps ten years longer than any other one present. This ministry we are talking about belongs, first of all, to God. He has called the ministers by his grace into this work. Secondly, it belongs to the church of our Lord Jesus Christ on earth. It was a question that agitated the minds of our forefathers at the close of the first half century of our existence. There grew up a class of men who had influence, who were opposed to the movement made by George Fox in sending out and controlling the ministry, evangelistic, itinerant, and pastorate of that day. They opposed that ministry and that arrangement on two grounds. The first was on the ground that each individual had the right to settle this question between himself and his God, and the church, as such, had no right to interfere. Secondly, that being called of God, God would provide the support without any church arrangement, and the church, consequently, had no right to send out or control that ministry. These were the positions taken by such men as Story, Wilkinson, and Rogers, and you can find, if you please to search, a written history of that debate and controversy which paralyzed the action of the church for all time until our day. You can find it in the answer of Thomas L. Wood to Rogers, wherein he claims the right of the church

to distribute and control that ministry and to support it. I wish I had time to go further into this side of the question than I possibly can do now. It is the question on which turns our life or death. I assert it without fear. It is the question upon the proper solution of which our life depends. I have no fear of the right outcome, however. I never had. I have expected to see this day, and I thank God that I have lived to see this day. Touch what line of procedure you may in the administration of the church of Christ relative to the ministry of the word, or relative to any other question, there is no line but what may be abused. There is danger on every side, but because there are dangers on every side shall we cease to act? I say no. The outline is given by the Lord Jesus and by the disciples following in the footsteps of Jesus Christ in the institution of his church on earth. They are safe and clear. Like men I hope we will face the responsibility that falls to us in this our day. I believe we are at just the final crisis of the settlement of this question, and by the patient movement on the part of all who have an interest in this great question I have no doubt we shall finally come out with glorious success. Why do I say that? The success of the past thirty years is the evidence. It is said that there is nothing succeeds like success. We went out of the pool of indolence, where the service, pastoral, evangelistic, and itinerant, was nearly all relegated to the background; we struck out to that which lay before, to occupy new fields, and as we have struck out with our eye on the star of Bethlehem, the line of guidance has been manifestly with the church, and I thank God that no very serious disaster, as I believe, has yet befallen it, and I do not apprehend that there will. In the providence of God I think we shall go on.

I would further say that seeing the divine law is laid down, the question of the pastor's office is already a settled question in that law; but that one question does not settle every other question of the ministry. Nor do I understand that any speaker has said by his allusion to this one simple picture of the subject, that this shall in the future in any wise interfere with the evangelistic work, or interfere with an itinerant ministry as God shall call into it. And that

is not all. It does not, and can not, interfere very successfully or materially with any live ministry in the cause of Jesus Christ. You can find a field anywhere that is commensurate with your gifts and calling of God. I have never been out of a field, and I believe that if there is room for such a man as I have been in the church and in the world, there certainly is room now under the present condition of affairs, for any man and anybody that is called of Jesus Christ; and I say, that while we are talking of the pastoral work and of this work of the ministry, we are not defining what shall be the grade of education or knowledge of philosophy, or of anything of the sort, but the first question is, Is he called of God and faithful to that call?

CHAIRMAN: I am sure there is not a member of the Conference whom I dislike more to interrupt than our friend Francis W. Thomas, but I have no choice. The time of the session has expired.

DAVID B. UPDEGRAFF, of Ohio: I propose that we continue the examination of this question for a reasonable time.

CHAIRMAN: Let us get the time fixed definitely then. This morning the Conference unanimously decided that we should be very careful in reference to the matter of time limits. I am only trying to serve the Conference.

MARY C. WOODY, of North Carolina: I want to add, let us also be careful about the time of beginning. We have wasted every session at least ten minutes that we might have used had we begun on time.

JOHN HENRY DOUGLAS, of Iowa: I like the proposition that we continue for another half hour.

(Others give the same expression.)

CHAIRMAN: The chair understands that the sentiment of the Conference is that we extend this discussion a half hour. Francis W. Thomas has the floor for six minutes.

FRANCIS W. THOMAS, of Indiana: I give way.

MARY M. HOBBS, of North Carolina: I don't think it is necessary at all for me to give any reasons for the belief that I hold in regard to this matter. What I have to say I will say by referring to what has already been brought before us. With the first paper that was read this morning I had entire unity so far as I understand the matter. The paper of William Nicholson, so far from impressing me with any joy or consolation over the state of our Society, seemed to me most pathetic; that any young man could allow himself to be put into a position that would hold an old, honored servant of the Lord Jesus in such a position as that described seemed to me most lamentable. I will add that with the expressions of Richard H. Thomas I have entire unity. We have heard Dr. Brooks referred to to-day in measures of approbation, and the very thing which gives Bishop Brooks the power which he wields in the Christian world to-day is the fact that he adopts principles which were originally maintained by us; that he has taken his stand upon the ground which the Lord gave to us. I do not say that he did not give it to other churches, but he gave it to us as a peculiar privilege. This very thing of getting all the members of a church to work is the point. The part of William Nicholson's paper which struck me as most impressive was that where he called for the consecration of the entire membership, that they should all become lay preachers. I don't like the words "lay preachers." I think that all ought to be on the same footing, if we think the Lord calls all to work for him. But it seemed to me that part where he wished to arouse us to our duty and to send us out to preach for the Lord Jesus to a dying world was the most earnest and touching, and really the thing that struck the heart of the Conference. I do think we need improvement in our methods, but I don't believe this pastorate system is the thing which will bring the desired result.

ANNA B. THOMAS, of Baltimore: The epoch-making points in the spiritual history of the world I believe have always been experiences by which some man's eyes were

opened to see the possibility of approaching God directly. That was the case in the lesson we studied only a week or two since of Cornelius. That was an epoch in the history of the church when they understood for the first time that the Gentiles could come direct to God without passing through the Mosaic rite of circumcision. It was a wonderful revelation; it brought the Gentiles to God direct. Then, in the time of the reformation, Luther had a revelation that the forms and ceremonies of the Roman Catholic church were not necessary for salvation; that "the just shall live by faith." That made a revolution in the religious life of his age. George Fox had his revelation: "There is one, even Jesus, that can speak to thy condition." That was the revelation that made an epoch in the religious life of England. Now, dear friends, it seems to me that what we want in our day is this individual experience for ourselves, and we want to preach that to the world. I believe that that doctrine is powerful now, just as it was in former days. We all believe that theoretically. I believe it practically. I believe that that one thing is going to produce a tremendous, wonderful work of grace all over this land of ours. I would trust the Lord that the Society of Friends, if they will be faithful to that one principle, have a living experience of it themselves and preach it, carry it everywhere in the strength and power of the Holy Ghost, will take America for God. I have that much faith. My faith has risen a great deal since I came to this Conference. I believe it could be done if we had faith in our own principles and were willing, in consecration to God, to carry them out practically. You all believe in the Holy Ghost, I know, and you experience it. Now, dear friends, I want to say, Do not limit the Holy Ghost by any possible method or means; do not limit the power, the leading or guidance, of the blessed Holy Ghost.

J. WALTER MALONE, of Ohio: My heart has been stirred as I have been listening to-day to these discussions by our fathers and mothers in Israel. But I love to speak a word or two for the boys and girls, the young men and women that we have left behind us at the old homes. I

am so glad that the spirit is stirring within us. I believe that all over our own land there is a sound of a going in the mulberry trees, and I believe we are just going out to the battle. Our dear father in Israel, who spoke so recently, touched my heart when he said he never found a time but that there was a place for him.

I believe in the pastoral system as we have it in these western yearly meetings. I believe it is creeping eastward as well as westward, however, and I believe it will make every man and woman having a gift of God find his place as under no other plan in the world. I am so glad I belong to a church that has no laymen. I am not trying to compete with Baptists, Methodists or Presbyterians. I am trying to keep step with God as he moves onward. There is our own little meeting. It had been getting smaller and smaller until at last the dear old elder, who sat at the head of the meeting, put his hand on my shoulder and wept and said: "O, my boy, if the day had only come sooner when my own children could have been saved to the church." He said, "We built this meeting house, but we were afraid to have any one come." I will never forget the time when I wrote for dear Nathan and Esther Frame to come up there. I did it in such a way as to get them to write back, and I read their letter to the people and they were a little afraid to have a minister come amongst us. I remember no place could be found for them to board. I got a home for them in a private boarding house, and made it as pleasant for them as I could. God was with us, and as the meeting house filled up I never can forget, before the week passed some dear old Friends took me in their arms like a child and kissed me in the meeting house and said, "Now we are ready to depart. We have seen the house filled for the first time in all our lives." A blessed meeting had begun. The dear old Friends there had lost every child they had to our meeting. Not a single birthright member of that meeting was left that was a birthright member twenty years ago. not one. And so, beloved, our meetings are growing and building up, and progress is being made when men and women are sent out to husband the fruits of the laborers. Why not keep right along this line? It is a

fact in our meetings, why not let it be a fact? I would dislike very much to see the state of things that has been spoken of, of pastors lording it over the heritage. Oh, no, that is not it. It is to care for the little ones that you and I have not time to look after. To illustrate again by our own little meeting — my knowledge is not as wide as that of these fathers and mothers who have spoken, but the practical side I have seen in the workings of our own meeting. Last First-day in our work, four or five or six were wonderfully converted, grandly saved, as I never have seen before, a wonderful demonstration of God's power it was. Men who had been in sin and drunkenness and wickedness all their lives, were transformed by the power of God. I have not time to look after them. We are all busy men, working from seven to six. I am glad God can send men and women who can give all their time and all their strength to the work, to meet these people at the street corner, or maybe drop around to their homes and give a little encouraging word. Ah, beloved, what means this sound of a going? It seems to me as though the young men and women had been reading the rest of the prophet Joel, where he says, "I will restore to you the years that the locust hath eaten." This is that. We are truly having the years restored unto us. God meant that we should be an army that should go out with our banners. Ah, the supper is ready and God has bidden thousands to go out into the streets and highways and compel them to come in, and that is what our men and women are doing. All cannot go, but we can give an encouraging hand to those who go. That is what is building up our meetings everywhere. It is that which Joel said: "I will restore unto you these years," and God is doing it. The fathers say he is doing it. Our sons and daughters at home are waiting for us to open more and more channels. May God enable us to put our arms around the sons and daughters upon whom God has laid his hand, and say, On, my children! God will give a place to every man and woman to use his gift. He will make room for it. Let us not be afraid of that. Let us go on and remember we are all priests of God. It is a priesthood of believers. That is what I believe in. There is no dic-

tation. Why, in our meeting sometimes a preacher gets no opportunity to speak. It is very fortunate for him if he gets a chance to preach. It is a meeting led by the Holy Ghost himself. I have gone there and sat at the head of the meeting each Sabbath for six weeks without a chance to preach, and if I got a chance once a month I thought I was fortunate. Down in the city we have a man here and another there. There are from eight to fifteen young Quakers preaching in that ungodly city every day, and we are going to keep the battle pressed to the gates.

(L. Maria Deane, of Iowa Yearly Meeting, being given an opportunity to speak, withdrew in favor of David B. Updegraff.)

DAVID B. UPDEGRAFF, of Ohio: I had a speech awhile ago, but there has been so much said, and so well said, that it seems to me that we are about ready to take some action. I have been greatly comforted in this thought concerning the fact of our intelligent appreciation of the fundamental truths of the religion we profess. Now, we may as well understand, dear friends, that that is about as true of one as it is of another. We can not institute any invidious comparisons in that respect. We have reached a point, however, a practical point, in the carrying out of our well-meant purposes. Now, it is not to be wondered at that we do not exactly see the details just alike. I, myself, have occupied a conservative position on this, as on most questions. I have weighed this matter very dispassionately. I believe I have been in a position not to be swerved in my judgment by any possibility of individual inclination. So far as I am individually concerned, it is nothing to me one way or the other, and never has been. I have judged of this question solely from the standpoint of the glory of God, the salvation of souls, and the welfare of the church, and as I have looked abroad throughout the land and seen these laborers who have borne the burden and heat of the day, toiled with their own hands, and endured this, that, and the other, my sympathies have been with those who

needed the helping hand and encouragement of the church. And I have felt that we have wronged ourselves as members of the church even more than the servants of the Lord in withholding it from them. There has been a pecuniary withholding upon the part of our church that has tended not only to poverty outwardly, but to poverty of spirit. We have robbed ourselves. Now, I greatly esteem all these dear friends who have spoken. I appreciate their zeal and earnestness, and yet we do look at this thing from these different standpoints. I have been interested to hear of all these lions of Brother Thomas'. Let me give you a little story. A little girl was taken by her older sister to a gallery of paintings, and she was shown there a picture of some lions that were being fed with missionaries. She came home and told her mother about it, and from her little sympathetic heart she said, "But, mamma, there was one poor lion that didn't have any missionary to eat." Now, nearly all of Brother Thomas' lions have been fed, but I think there were a few that did not have any victims. I think there were some of those distressing features for which there was no real ground at all. Men of straw they seem to me. We have, as has been already said, the practical experience of this thing in our midst. It is at work. It is at work where? It is at work in every successful department of our church wherever you may go, that practical outworking of the system that was detailed very beautifully and so blessedly by William Nicholson. Now, I have no hesitation in saying that I was greatly surprised at that address. I wondered, and I praised the Lord. I felt as if I was not listening to a polemical discussion of this question. I felt that God was speaking to us in a very peculiar way. I will declare to you I did not feel as if I was listening to a debate. I believe that our beloved brother was illuminated for the express purpose of writing that address. I can't help believing it. Why, I expected nothing but that he would drop postulates along the way, with which I could not concur. I did not find them. I found the difficulties fairly met, the dangers fairly stated, and to my mind, completely and fairly answered. They were disposed of. Now, I think that the time has come when

the throbbing heart of this Conference is ready to move on to action, not as a man, not as a unit; we can not quite do that, but I believe that the heart of this Conference throbs in unison upon the great principles that are involved in this matter. As to the details of them, as they may be individually brought out and made to apply by the yearly meetings, or quarterly meetings, or monthly meetings upon which rests the responsibility, I am not to judge for them. I am not to judge for brethren who think differently, but I do believe that if we are prepared, as I believe we are, to indorse the general principles introduced in the paper of William Nicholson, and have confidence in one another, and leave the matter with God, I believe all will be well. I believe the things we feared the most will be dispelled by the outworking of the church and in the blessing and providence of God. And so I propose at this juncture that we do adopt the address of William Nicholson, as sanctioned by this Conference, as a declaration of our views and our faith in this matter. I make that proposition at this time. I think that is the course we ought to pursue, and I leave it for the Conference to decide that question.

CHAIRMAN: The Conference has heard the proposition of David B. Updegraff that the paper read this afternoon by William Nicholson, of Kansas Yearly Meeting, be adopted as the sentiment of this Conference.

JOHN F. HANSON, of Iowa: I hope that before that document is adopted we shall, at least, have it read once more and considered by sections.

DAVID B. UPDEGRAFF, of Ohio: It was quite understood that I did not mean it to be adopted as an official document, but simply as an expression of our sentiment.

CALVIN W. PRITCHARD, of Western: As I understand the proposition of David B. Updegraff, I am in full sympathy and unity with it, and think that it is the sentiment of the Conference. I would like to have it so expressed, for that address in its general purpose speaks the sentiment that I have with reference to this whole question.

JAMES WOOD, of New York: The proposition of David Updegraff takes me somewhat by surprise. I am accustomed, and have long been accustomed, to hearing public discussion. Perhaps it was on account of excessive stupidity, but I failed to understand William Nicholson's paper. I certainly failed to understand it in the light in which it has been referred to by David B. Updegraff and others. I would be very much opposed to the adoption of any paper which is understood so differently by those who have spoken in regard to it, from my understanding of it in hearing it read once. If that paper is to receive the sanction which is proposed, I certainly hope that it will be read again, that those of us who are not quick enough of perception, perhaps, to see its point, maybe on the second reading may have an opportunity to do so.

WILLIAM L. PEARSON, of Iowa: I arise to a point of order in this matter. We have appointed a committee to draft the conclusions of this Conference, and for that reason I do not think it is right to adopt anybody's paper on a subject so important as this as the sentiment of the Conference. I do trust we shall have more deliberation about it, and not take it out of the hands of the committee.

CHAIRMAN: The chair would be obliged to decide upon that point of order, that the Conference has not delegated to this committee the function of making decisions for it, but only to express the decisions that are made to be handed down to the yearly meetings.

ROBERT W. DOUGLAS, of Indiana: I think we ought to be cautious in sanctioning anything that may come before us, however good it may seem, and however much it may appeal to our sentiments, without a good deal of very thoughtful consideration. I don't want us hastily to adopt something that evidently is like the Delphic oracles, capable of a double construction. The way I understood William Nicholson's address it was ironical and sarcastic, but it could be taken in good faith by some

of the Conference; and so in view of the double construction that may be put upon it, I doubt the practicality of taking one paper from among others that may be as good and adopting it.

ALLEN JAY, of Indiana: I feel like saying, without any reference whatever to the paper, that I have my doubts whether we will receive the benefits that we want to receive by adopting any paper on this question. I believe that the discussion that we have had to-night, and the impression that has been made upon the minds of Friends during the day, will do more good and will make Friends more thoughtful, and make them investigate this subject more, if we quietly pass from it when we get through discussing it, than to adopt any paper. I don't believe that William Nicholson himself wrote that paper to be adopted by this Conference.

WILLIAM NICHOLSON, of Kansas: I never thought of it.

ALLEN JAY, of Indiana: I don't think that we would be acting wisely or prudently to do so. I am glad this subject has been thoroughly discussed. I have listened with a great deal of interest. I think I see difficulties on both sides. I have had an opportunity to observe this matter. I don't feel that this Conference has yet entirely settled the matter. We have got to learn a good deal yet, and I think our Heavenly Father has led us forward, and will continue to lead us forward, and, as Walter Malone has said, I believe that the sound of the going is in the mulberry trees, and we are moving on, and I think we had better now just simply drop the question, if we are done discussing it, and pass from it.

(Many Friends express concurrence.)

CHAIRMAN: The chair understands that the sentiment of the Conference is adverse to adopting the paper of William Nicholson.

THOMAS C. BROWN, of Western: I shall be putting this matter quite modestly if I say that I have been ex-

ceedingly interested in the discussion of this question in all the different phases in which it has been discussed, and I think the proposition is opportune that the matter be dropped without urging any definite conclusion in the endorsement of any paper. I think, however, that the committee that has been appointed may possibly have some work to do in formulating the conclusion of the Conference. There is one thing I do want to say personally. First, I will acknowledge that I am not able to take all the sentences of William Nicholson's paper and analyze them and give an expression at this time as to whether I would indorse them all or not; but, fearlessly, I am ready to say from the observation that I have had, listening to the papers as I have listened, that I am quite ready to adopt the sentiments of that paper as I understood them.

DAVID HADLEY, of Western: There seems to be some modesty as to this Conference speaking out definitely on a system that has been so thoroughly tried, and that is resulting in the extension of our church and the building up of new congregations. It is a system yearly meetings have thoroughly employed and vitally incorporated with their work, and yet we are so modest as a Conference that we dare not speak out on it. I very much sympathize with David Updegraff's proposition, that we take some method of expression.

ELWOOD SCOTT, of Indiana: I think that on the general principles discussed in the paper of William Nicholson we are quite agreed. There may be expressions there that a good many can not indorse, but I think that the prevailing sentiment of this meeting is in favor of the pastoral system, and I believe it would be best for the people at home, whom we represent, to know something of what the feeling of this Conference of yearly meetings is on this question, that we give some expression in sympathy with the pastoral system in vogue in the yearly meetings of the West. I hope we will give some expression of the favor we feel toward it.

M. M. BINFORD, of Indiana: That which has commended the paper to me has not been the fact that I was able at one reading to judge of every sentence, but the general principles as they appeared in the paper, and which I believe commended themselves to most of us; and that in it, which we were not mistaken in calling the manifest presence of the Lord at that time. I think it would be the right thing for us in some way to express our conviction with reference to the pastoral system, the general principles embodied in the work as it is before us. With reference to the paper, I very much desire that we should have it entire. We should pass, in some way, a decision upon this question as a Conference.

EDMUND STANLEY, of Kansas: I do not arise to speak in reference, especially, to any particular paper, and yet, allow me to say that I think there were expressions perhaps in all the papers that have been read upon this subject that could be endorsed by this Conference. I am in hearty sympathy with the paper read by William Nicholson, so far as I understand it, but the point I wish to speak about is this: it seems to me that we are here for a purpose, and that that purpose is not merely to discuss questions and leave them at the end of the discussions and go home and say, we have considered some subjects and discussed them. Now, I may not understand the purpose and end of this Conference, but it does seem to me we ought to take these papers that have been read, bring them together, and get from them that which this Conference could indorse, and send it down to the yearly meetings as the sentiment of this Conference, as a recommendation with reference to the subject now before us. It seems to me if we fail to do this we fail to accomplish anything in the line of the work it was intended to accomplish at this Conference.

ELIZABETH LARKIN, of Wilmington: This subject is one that has always come before me in thinking of attending this Conference as the one all important subject. The church has been singing "Rescue the Perishing," and "Throw Out the Life Line," and we, as evangelists, took

you at your word, and went out ; and when we come bringing in those who were perishing and, with faces beaming with victory, place the trophies at your feet, we stand in wonder when we have to leave them to your care. What does it mean? for it is virtually turning them away, when we have no pastoral care for them. I believe I speak the sentiment of every evangelist that has gone out for the perishing ones, when I say that the cry of our hearts is, as we yearn over them as only those can who know what it is to be the instrument in God's hands of bringing precious souls to Christ, that they may be cared for.

J. WALTER MALONE, of Ohio : I was thinking whether it was not the duty of this committee appointed by our chairman to-night to make a little report of this meeting, to write up this question to put before us.

CHAIRMAN : The chair rendered the decision awhile ago with the expectation that the Conference would discuss it, that the committee was not appointed to make decisions for the Conference, but that the Conference would make its own decisions, and it was the business of this committee to put them into shape for transmission to the yearly meetings. If the chair is at fault in that matter we ought to have a discussion upon it.

DAVID B. UPDEGRAFF, of Ohio : I want to say that I asked William Nicholson about this matter of irony, and he disclaims any thought of anything of that kind. I think it is only fair that that be understood. Now, I fall into line myself with this discussion that the committee formulate something. What shall they formulate? In order to guide them I make this proposition, to which I can not think there will be any objection, that as many of the delegates be allowed to stand as approve of the general tenor, as they understand it, of this address of William Nicholson. This would be only for a guide for this committee.

CHAIRMAN : The chair in that matter is bound by a rule adopted by the Conference itself. If such a request

comes from any delegation it can be put before the Conference in that way, but only in that way.

FRANCIS A. WRIGHT, of Kansas: I would request that we might adjourn, and be given further time to discuss this subject. I would like to be given the privilege of speaking on this subject at some time, and I don't think I can at this late hour.

CHAIRMAN: Is the Conference willing to consent to this?

(Some voices in assent.)

ROBERT W. DOUGLAS, of Indiana: I would think it would be much better to suggest the idea of some action or some expression of this Conference upon the general question of a pastoral system, rather than endorsing any particular paper that has been introduced. I think we are pretty well agreed in regard to the question itself, though some might have some hesitancy about voting for the adoption of any specific paper that may have been read.

CHAIRMAN: Will the Conference consent to refer all this matter to the Business Committee, to be reported back to the Conference? (Consent.)

WILLIAM L. PEARSON, of Iowa: I wish then that the Conference might appoint a committee to take in this whole matter and consider it in the light of what seems to be the fundamental principles involved in the pastoral relations in the church. I have felt, and did for a long time before this Conference met, that unless some such thing was arrived at, as Edmund Stanley says, the Conference will not have accomplished anything like the real purpose for which it was called, and we shall be left very largely at sea in the matter. I wish that such a committee might be appointed.

CHAIRMAN: The only question before the Conference was upon the adoption of William Nicholson's paper. By

general consent the discussion upon that was postponed. Another proposition has been made since, that the Conference shall appoint a committee to draft a minute upon this subject of a pastoral system, irrespective of the language of any paper that has been read in the deliberations of the Conference.

DAVID B. UPDEGRAFF, of Ohio: I think we already have a committee appointed for this very purpose, and it is not contemplated in this suggestion of mine at all that this committee shall be confined to any language contained in this paper, but that this expression be had merely as a criterion for this committee.

AUGUSTUS TABER, of New York: I would propose that the whole subject be referred back to the Business Committee to take such action as to them may seem expedient and proper, and report to-morrow. (Consent.)

CHAIRMAN: It will be understood then that the Business Committee will bring this whole question concerning the pastorate before the Conference at some future time.

JOHN HENRY DOUGLAS, of Iowa: With fifty speakers here, fifty pastors, and a score or two of evangelists, it seems to me that we are moving away from this, as one of the leading questions coming before us, in an unsafe way.

CHAIRMAN: There has been nothing in the action of the Conference to prevent the continuance of this discussion to-morrow morning. It is now in the hands of the Business Committee.

WILLIAM NICHOLSON, of Kansas: If it were a mere personal matter I would not think of detaining the Conference for one moment, but I find that some of my friends seem to have misapprehended something about the paper I introduced, which I never thought would receive the consideration which it has. I simply want to say that so

far as I am concerned in my feelings and motives and intentions, that paper as I read it was sincere, honest, earnest and true to my heart. I never meant either to produce merriment or to use any terms of sarcasm, or anything that would be prejudicial to the feelings of any person. I simply wrote down what I felt to be my own personal status in regard to that matter, as it seemed to me to be the proper one for me to hold in the present condition of the church.

RICHARD H. THOMAS, of Baltimore: I want to make a little explanation which seems to be needed. I never meant to speak of any of the ministers as parasites. It was the danger of the congregation becoming parasites that I was thinking of.

ALLEN JAY, of Indiana: I would announce that at half-past 8 o'clock to-morrow morning a devotional meeting will be held under the charge of Robert W. Douglas.

After prayer by J. J. Mills, Conference adjourned until to-morrow morning.

FIFTH-DAY MORNING—9:30 O'CLOCK.

The Conference was called to order by vice-president Thomas C. Brown, who said: I know Friends will be sorry to hear that our chairman is absent from the city, and also that our secretary is absent for the morning, but we hope that the spirit of the Lord has such complete control that whatever need may be felt in the absence of these may be supplied by the blessed Holy Spirit. There is no work in which we engage upon which we ought not to ask the blessing of our Heavenly Father. A moment of devotion is in place. (Prayer.)

CHAIRMAN: I will ask if the Business Committee has any report for us this morning?

CHAIRMAN OF THE BUSINESS COMMITTEE: If the chair please, so many are asking the question when this Con-

ference will close, that the Business Committee are united in making this proposition: That the Conference close at the rise of the morning session on next Seventh-day, leaving it to the Conference to decide.

CHAIRMAN: You have heard the proposition. What is your pleasure?

CHAIRMAN OF THE BUSINESS COMMITTEE: Perhaps I ought to say that there is enough business before the Business Committee to keep us until next week, but many wish to close earlier, and we decided that we had better cut it off and stop next Seventh-day morning.

JOHN HENRY DOUGLAS, of Iowa: About what time Seventh-day morning will we close? Some of us must leave Seventh-day noon, unless we travel on the sabbath, which we do not wish to do.

CHAIRMAN OF THE BUSINESS COMMITTEE: The Friends in the yearly meetings have a way of beginning very early in the morning of the last session and closing before dinner, and I think the Conference may adopt the same rule.

CHAIRMAN: What is the pleasure of the Conference? I have sufficient confidence in the Business Committee to believe they have suggested what is best.

A FRIEND: I am satisfied to look toward that time.

(Consent.)

CHAIRMAN: The program made out by the Business Committee will now be read.

CHAIRMAN OF THE BUSINESS COMMITTEE: The Business Committee suggest: First, That the subject of pastoral care be open for further discussion.

Second, A communication from Western Yearly Meeting on historical records.

Third, That Francis W. Thomas be allowed to pre-

sent the subject of uniformity of discipline for all the yearly meetings of America.

Fourth, One foreign missionary board for all the American yearly meetings.

Fifth, The duty of our church toward our cities.

The committee recommend that these subjects be taken up in their order and discussed in the following sessions. The first subject now is the continuation of the subject that was before the Conference yesterday. The Business Committee, this morning, were unanimous in proposing that this Conference adopt what will now be read by the secretary as the words of this Conference on the subject, and then, as several Friends have expressed a desire to be heard, that the discussion be open for a little while. I think I might add that the Business Committee are desirous that the discussion may not continue long, but that only those who have really a live concern might speak, and in the same spirit and love that has been manifested thus far.

CHAIRMAN: I think first in order would be an action of this Conference with reference to receiving the report of the committee as far as it has been presented. What is the pleasure of the Conference with reference to receiving the subjects that have been presented for discussion? (Consent.)

The secretary then read the proposition of the Business Committee. (See Minutes, page 16.)

CHAIRMAN: This is a proposition, as I understand, that the Conference is asked to pass an opinion upon. Are you satisfied to enter into the discussion without a second and careful reading, or would you like a second reading?

ROBERT W. DOUGLAS, of Indiana: It is desired that it be read again.

TIMOTHY NICHOLSON, of Indiana: It does seem to me that the Business Committee has been remarkably favored

in bringing that as a statement before the Conference. I heartily accept it.

FRANCIS W. THOMAS, of Indiana: I like the statement, and hope we shall see our way clear to adopt the recommendation as representing the sentiment of the Conference. However, I should like it just as well, or a little better, to spare one word, the word "any" with reference to human agency. I would propose that we leave the word "any" out.

TRUMAN KENWORTHY, of Iowa: Will the secretary please read the closing part again with and without the word "any?" (Secretary reads.)

(Expressions of approval of the amendment.)

TRUMAN KENWORTHY, of Iowa: I understand the discussion we had yesterday touches a real, vital question that is before us to-day in our church; I don't know but I may say *the* vital question that is before us as to church policy and method of work. Time and again it has come to me, Who is responsible for this movement in our church? Some talk as if persons present were responsible for it; but can we pick out any one person, or any number of persons, as being responsible for this movement and this spirit that is abroad in our church to-day? I don't think we can. It is not only in our church, but you can go to any other church to-day and find it going through about the same change. Even the Catholic church is undergoing very much the same thing as far as it can with its methods of work. So that the question as to who is responsible for it certainly does not come here for discussion. God has certainly thrust it upon us. It is a general move in that direction. Now let us take this movement, which has been characteristic of God's work in all ages, for what it really is. It has come just as all movements have come in the church. Some think it has not come in the right way, and yet the fact that it is coming, and that it is here, and that it is doing the work that it is to-day, is its own recommendation. These ques-

tions come up time and time again. They came up with the Jews. They said, It won't do to acknowledge Christ as the Savior. It undoes all the work of the past. It goes against the prophets. But that did not hinder the work. I think we had better take the advice of Gamaliel. He said, If this thing is of man it will come to naught; but if it is of God we cannot hinder it, and we would better not try. Now, yesterday there was a great deal of discussion about the pastoral system. There is no such thing as *the* pastoral system in the world to-day in any church, especially in our church. It is not thought at all that in this Conference we shall dispose of the pastoral question as we look at it to-day. If we should hold a hundred conferences on this question, the hundredth conference would have the question more burningly before it than we have it now, because it is a question that goes out in its diversified relations to all the departments of our work. So the pastoral question in some form will always be before us. There is no one here who can say he has an inspired method of pastoral work. The Bible does not give it to us. Expediency is the great plan we must go on. In reasoning on this question a great many people stop at what Friends used to do and what Friends used to believe. Now, in some remarks yesterday there were words taken from the Bible, from Paul himself, and put into the mouths of some of our early fathers. Now, let us give Paul honor for what he said at the time, and the Bible honor for what was said at the time. We honor our church; we love it just as well as anybody. We stand by its principles, and some of us who are younger, so far as our record has gone, I don't believe oppose the church in any way in any great principle. It is not that; but in order to make our statement the strongest possible, and make it carry the most weight to the world and those we are trying to gain, we ought to base it on the Bible and the Spirit of God, and not on what we suppose Friends used to believe. What they believed was all right; but we should not make that the criterion for us. I believe we are in the line of what they used to be, and if we keep to that line our work will be fruitful. I believe these words express a sentiment which was abroad

in this Conference. Yesterday there was a little tendency on either side, I believe, to press the extremes, to show that certain phases of this work have objections, and then to fly to the other side and show that that has objections. I don't believe there is anybody who would recognize the difficulty of this work more than the pastor recognizes it. No doubt there are difficulties the pastors have to meet and which we must try our best to avoid; but that must not hinder us. We must discuss this question in a fair and candid way.

I must say I believe the document we have just heard read is quite Quakerly. It expresses very much, I believe, the sentiment of this Conference, and we ought to simply indorse a pastoral system and let the meetings in their various relations work it out.

ROBERT W. DOUGLAS, of Indiana: I want to know whether that proposition from the Business Committee is before the house, or whether we are now at liberty to discuss the general question.

CHAIRMAN: The proposition was that this matter come before the house. It was asked whether it would not be well to waive the matter a little and take the sense of the meeting after the discussion. What is the pleasure of the Conference? (Consent.)

NATHAN T. FRAME, of Wilmington: I would indorse the proposition brought before us, and coincide with what Francis W. Thomas said, but I thought of the word "merely" instead of cutting out "any." We must to some extent depend upon human agency for the propagation of the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ, and while our entire dependence is not upon the agencies, it seems to me that the word "merely" would be better than to cut out the word "any."

CHAIRMAN: You have heard the proposition that Nathan T. Frame has made with reference to this; is it your pleasure to reconsider this matter?

(Expressions of satisfaction with the former amendment.)

ESTHER G. FRAME, of Wilmington: The subject of the church is very dear to me. Last night something was said about the ministry as a profession. I don't know of any such thing in the Friends' church. There is a vast difference between speaking for Christ and being called of God to preach the gospel. To be filled with the Spirit is to testify for Christ, but that is very different from having a spiritual gift from God. Being filled with the Spirit does not confer of itself a spiritual gift. There are spiritual gifts born in a soul when regeneration takes place, and when a man or woman has this gift it comes directly from God. The gift of the ministry, the gift of teaching, the gift of the evangelist comes from God. Now, there are two sides to the question. There are responsibilities upon the church and responsibilities upon the minister. The minister's responsibility is to give himself or herself, and let the Lord have his way and prepare him or her for the work; and then the responsibility is upon the church to make a way for that minister, and the church cannot afford to do less.

Now, men and women who can preach the gospel, who can win souls to Christ, we know very well will not stop to preach the gospel in the Quaker church for the money they get, because if they have that ability there are other avenues of the profession open to them where they can make twice the amount of money. It has nothing to do with it. It takes a wonderful consecration and a wonderful sacrifice to the sensitive nature to do this thing.

Then another point: I don't want us to confound the gift of the Spirit and the gifts of the Spirit. They are two different things. The gifts of the Spirit are those that enable a man to preach the gospel, but the gift of the Spirit develops the gifts of the Spirit. We can develop from one thing to another; the gift comes from God. Again, some ministers are not called to spend all their time to preach the gospel, and they are not the ones to judge of the case. They can not understand it. We can only judge from our own standpoint. A physician may

be very wise in his science and yet be very ignorant in farming ; a farmer may be very wise in his business and ignorant in science, and so it is in reference to the call to the ministry. There are others who are called to spend all their time, and when they engage in any other profession they feel that God has not moved them to it, and it burns and consumes. For a minister to spend his time six days in the week in supporting his family, is burning his frame, is consuming his nervous system, and then when he comes with the last weak energies before his people, he is not prepared to dispense the gospel in the power of the Spirit as he ought to do. For we ought to give the very best we have to the Lord. If a man or woman is really called to preach the gospel, God intends every energy and mind-power to be used in that direction. When you see men or women engaged in business, a great many enterprises, and trying to preach the gospel, you will find they are not a success in anything. What we want is success. There is nothing so successful as success. When people are called to preach the gospel, the responsibility is on the church to see to it. But the minister who would preach for money is not worthy the name of minister, and the church that would not support a minister is not worthy the name of church. There are two sides to the question. Can't you trust God, one says. Yes, but it is just as well for the church to trust God as for the minister to trust God. I believe in this age of the world every minister ought to be a student every day. No difference how often he has graduated, he ought to have a line of study, not only of the Bible, but some other study, so that his mind shall be developed, refreshed, invigorated, and he should, at all times, be prepared to meet the congregation in the power of the Spirit and win souls to Christ. No minister can work six days in the week and then study to prepare himself when he comes before the people. They say, "that man seems dull ; his mind does not seem invigorated. He does not seem as though he could teach." I know this from experience, working eight hours a day and staying up until two o'clock at night trying to study to prepare myself for the work. If we want a glorious ministry we must open the way for it.

Another thing. Show me a meeting where they entirely dispense with the pastoral system and I will show you a weak meeting, a meeting that is not growing. The minister cannot save the church, but the ministry called of God is an essential part of the church, to build it up, and the time is upon us, and God has opened the way for us, and there might have been hundreds of Quaker churches to-day. I believe in primitive Quakerism. I believe it is apostolic. I am firmly grounded in it. I am not sectarian, but the more I work among all classes of people the more I know I am a thorough, old fashioned Quaker. We are coming back to the George Fox day. Why, if George Fox should come down upon us with his power, we would all get frightened and leave this meeting-house. I remember, years ago, as an evangelist, we had been called out among other people to preach. The people asked us, Why don't you build a Quaker church? We could but answer, What can we do? There is no pastoral system. How will we take care of the people? I remember one place in Ohio, in a town of several hundred inhabitants, where we went under the auspices of the Methodist and Presbyterian churches. There were men and women who wanted to be Quakers. One said, I will give you one thousand dollars to build a church; another said, I will give you land; another, one hundred dollars. I went to our quarterly meeting and presented the subject, and they said, "We don't know what to do with it. We can't do anything with it." When the time for the quarterly meeting arrived, I believe there were from fifty to one hundred young converts came down to the quarterly meeting, and I thought they were going to have a wonderful reception, and the people looked around on them and said: "Where did these people come from?" My heart ached. I presented it time and again to the quarterly meeting. They said they could not do anything. Now, dear friends, as God is opening the door wide, and this pastoral system is being presented to the church, we can have large Quaker meetings. I am glad the time is past when we don't care to build the Quaker meeting house in the center of a commercial city. I pray God we shall see the time when we shall go right into the com-

mercial cities and open the way for these large churches. So I pray the Lord we shall continue this work.

ELWOOD SCOTT, of Indiana : I suppose if we had permitted ourselves to go on in the old line of things of forty years ago, simply having our little meetings under the itinerant system of visiting here and there, the ministers all having a business of their own, we would hardly have felt the necessity of this pastoral system. But the time came when there was a new era of things upon us. There came an inspiration in the church, as was said by some one yesterday, when we believed the time would come when we might take this country for Christ. It was very apparent something must be done for those in the meetings that were being organized. Revivals went out everywhere ; there was a change from our old way of holding meetings ; revivals were had in new sections of country ; new meetings were organized. What to do with them was the question upon us. We could not induce friends to move into the city and buy new homes. They could not be prevailed upon to do that. These new persons just converted were babes. They must have some head over them. They must have some one to look after them. It was the only thing left, that the church should send some one to look after this work. It forced itself upon us. It was so all over the country. The work has been going on for a good many years in connection with school work. Persons have gone out Sabbath morning and evening and held meetings for these people, and stood by them. I have had a great many of these meetings for adults regularly organized in the Christian Associations. These meetings are headed by Friends, who meet the people and conduct the meetings. It seemed that this matter forced itself upon us. I can see no other way, and have no other thought but that God was in the whole matter, leading us on to take care of this work. We are just in the beginning of it. There is a grander work before us yet. So far as the pastoral system is concerned, I believe it to be right and God-ordained. The New Testament abounds in a great many expressions in the writings of the apostle Paul, with reference to this very

thing — men being set over congregations, staying there to take care of the work for a year, or two years, as pastor over those meetings. It is clearly enough brought out. We are just coming back to the old times that mean success. I am exceedingly thankful myself that there is a good time dawning upon us, and if we ever spread out and take the world for Christ, which is God's will, we have got to look after the work that has been done, husband the work, shepherd the flock and feed it, for it is the will of God that we feed the flock of God. I believe that God has had something to do with raising up ministers in the meeting. I can point to-day to meetings with a half dozen able ministers in them, and I don't apprehend it is God's will that these ministers shall all remain in that one meeting. There are inviting fields for them, but you tie these ministers down in their business, their shops and their stores, and on their farms, and they remain there, and their gifts are rusting out in idleness. They are in each other's way. There is nobody feels the responsibility. God raised them up, and he meant them to have certain fields of work, and I believe it is God's will that there shall be such a distribution of the work that the ministers can be of most service to the church. I am in most hearty sympathy with the pastoral system, and I indorse the recommendation of this committee, and think it should be adopted.

MICAJAH M. BINFORD, of Indiana: I am inclined to suggest, in view of the thoughts that have been brought before us, the possibility that if George Fox could appear in our midst incidentally, he would be about the most useless man that could appear in Quakerism to-day, for the ideas that are practical in our age have grown in our minds by contact with the age in which we live, just as those of his age made him the man he was in his time, not an infallible but a useful man, so that he was God's chosen instrument in his day. The principle must hold good, that only spiritual men who understand the mind and will of God are capable of discerning what is the will of God in the age and day in which they live. If we have not them to-day we had better get them. If we must

borrow all of our opinions from the preceding generation our case is hopeless indeed. It is interesting to trace the line of argument pursued in the Hicksite separation, and to see that the orthodox body had from the Bible the correct principle of Quakerism. The assertion was made again and again that we did not appeal to Fox and Penn and Barclay for our views, but to the Bible itself. I would suggest that the principle upon which that trial proceeded is a correct one, and must apply in this very case. I highly appreciate the remarks of our friend, Truman Kenworthy, with reference to the question of the appliance—I don't like to use the word system quite. I am not sure that I am a good hand to plan or suggest systems, or adopt systems as a whole. Somehow I think we are feeling our way into this thing which we can hardly call a system yet but in the development of that which evidently to us is the work of God along this line. Many of us have seen difficulties face to face which have been suggested perhaps by those who have not met them face to face, but looked at them theoretically. I don't think we are entirely unconcerned about them. I am free to confess this morning that I have not a great desire, I have not any desire unless the Lord shall plainly indicate it to us, to drift into that way of doing things, to see this sweet informality of our Friends' service entirely superseded by a set order and form of service. I don't care whether it is an evidence of weakness or not, not, there is something in our way of liberty of service that is very precious to me; and while there is a necessity for the suppression of the unreasonable and unseasonable exercise of the gift of talk, yet I cherish the liberty, as spoken of here last night, of having more than one sermon sometimes in a meeting. I believe the Lord will take care of us along that line.

I want to suggest another thought with reference to things that have been said here. I made a little examination of the matter, and I am inclined to think that a hod carrier is not so much inclined to have a hod carrier preach to him, or a blacksmith to have a blacksmith preach to him, or a farmer to have a farmer preach to him, as he is to have a man who, when he gets up to preach, shows

that he understands his business, if I may use almost an irreverent phrase about preaching. He wants a man to preach who is called of God and anointed, and who can speak to his heart, and I think he cares practically very little whether he follows his particular occupation or not. He wants a man who is in his place, as he, when he is carrying his hod of bricks, or making a horse shoe, is in his place and doing his work well. So I think that is hardly a practical difficulty in the way.

In reference to the development of gifts, I know there are several things connected with it. To sit down in one meeting and live by ourselves and be a great body of people, and just try to keep up our own meetings, never developed gifts under any system yet. The way to develop gifts is to have plenty of places to develop them, and to sit down in church with twenty-five people who think they are called to preach is not right. There is a field outside. When we move on in our work of evangelization, we shall find plenty of fields for the development of gifts. I think that is the question for many of us who are in the pastoral work more or less, to carefully study.

One more thing I wish to call your attention to, there has been a hint dropped that the pastor thinks it is his place to do all the visiting from house to house, and to exercise all the gifts that are exercised. As to that matter I have a little personal knowledge. How earnestly a congregation has been labored with to produce a disaffection in relation to the pastoral system, and when investigation was made it was found that under the pastoral system there had been four visits made by members where there had been one made before this system was adopted. If we undertake to sit still and balance ourselves on a bicycle, we shall have a hard time. In progress is the secret of being balanced, and I think that is the way this whole matter will balance itself.

CHAIRMAN: I feel quite sure that it is the pleasure of this Conference that we have that clear, frank and full discussion of this matter. I am sure it is the pleasure of the chair, and in order to give each one an opportunity

in the rotation in which he has claimed the floor, I will announce that at this time we have in rotation in this way, those who have asked privilege to speak : First, S. Adelbert Wood ; second, Jacob Baker ; third, Samuel R. Neave ; fourth, John Henry Douglas ; and fifth, Calvin W. Pritchard. Now we want to give all an opportunity.

ALLEN JAY, of Indiana : I hope we will not limit anybody, and yet I do hope friends will not put more time on this than is necessary, because there are other important matters coming up.

CHAIRMAN : I think that is well put. Pardon me if I say that if there is a point that has been well discussed, and a position that has been well taken, if you are satisfied with it, it is as well not to repeat it. Points that have not been discussed, or points with which you take issue, it is in place to take hold of.

S. ADELBERT WOOD, of Indiana : I think that during this discussion it would be profitable for us to see how near together we can get ; how near alike we see these things, and I believe that there are none here but what would recognize that in the church among the gifts of the Spirit there is the gift of government as well as the gift of ministry ; so that they that govern are to govern diligently. I might construe the remarks that I have heard on both sides of this question into two extremes. I might conclude, if I were not acquainted with the persons, that they believed in no church government, or government of services ; that they are ready to go to the extreme of an individual whom I heard say she believed the Lord had shown her that the one to close a meeting was any person anywhere in the house that the Lord impressed with the idea of shaking hands and closing the meeting ; but I know this is not the position of any one, or am satisfied that it is not, of any one in this Conference. I have myself visited, I will say, Baltimore meeting, and I know I never saw more arbitrary rules of government in any meeting than I saw in Baltimore meeting. So that we believe in church government. We believe

in a head to our meetings, and as one who has been in the pastoral work for nine years I have learned that the one important part of my work is to govern the service. It is important that we teach our congregations that they are to obey those who have the rule, or, as in the margin of the text, the "guide over you." This is important. It is essential to the success of the work.

I believe, on the other hand, that there are none in this Conference who desire what we might call a one man power ; that any should rule in the sense that there shall not be liberty for the exercise of any gift under the anointing and guidance of the Spirit. That there is a difference is evident, and I believe that our fears drive us farther apart than we really are. I think that the committee has been helped of the Master in preparing the paper that is before us for our adoption. I think that it covers really the belief of us all and will help us to stand in our places.

I want to say this much more : I am acquainted with meetings where there are, I will say, six ministers, and these meetings that have this number of ministers are headless. There are none who feel the responsibility. There are none that count they have the authority. I was called last winter by telegram to hold a series of meetings in a meeting of this kind. The Wesleyan Methodists had taken the revival meetings which were started out of the hands of the meeting, out of the hands of all its ministers, and were running it, because none of them felt they had the authority to take charge of the meeting, and the quarterly meeting superintendent said, when I got there, "We want thee to take this meeting and run it," and it was more needful than the teaching and preaching, if possible, that some one should run the meeting, some one should do the driving. We need heads to our meetings. I think we need to work that way.

JAMES WOOD, of New York : I want to ask the friends if, in consideration of this whole matter, we are not prepared to close it. We know these dear friends will make us excellent speeches. We know that, for we have heard them speak before : but, friends, we have found that we

are wonderfully near together on this subject. A proposition has come before this Conference from the Business Committee, that committee having in attendance a representative of every yearly meeting on this continent, and it unanimously agrees upon a proposition which it has brought before the Conference, which has not had a particle of objection expressed. What do we want to talk for? It is simply talk for talk. However good it is, it is not going to help the question in the slightest degree. I think we had better proceed.

JOHN HENRY DOUGLAS, of Iowa: It is very interesting for those who have had their papers on this subject and who have spoken, to call the house to order.

RICHARD H. THOMAS, of Baltimore: I want the friends to have time to speak. I have had my time, and I want the others to have theirs.

CHAIRMAN: If it please the house, those who have spoken on this question already might remain quiet until others in the house who have not spoken, have the opportunity. Shall we agree to that? (Agreed.)

ALLEN JAY, of Indiana: I wish to make one suggestion. I hope we shall have no personal allusions. I think they are out of place.

CHAIRMAN: I feel quite sure that I had no personal allusion in my heart. I don't think we had better allude to any meetings or any people. We had better just discuss the questions.

JAMES CAREY THOMAS, of Baltimore: A personal allusion requires an answer, and it is a privilege to answer any allusions. If friends make personal allusions they must expect to have them answered.

WILLIAM L. PEARSON, of Iowa: I agree with these remarks; but in reference to the matter of people speaking again, we have a conclusion brought here for adoption.

I think that certainly all ought to have a right to suggest anything with regard to the paper.

CHAIRMAN : It will be the wish of the chair to take the sense of the Conference on this paper when we reach it. There are a number who have not yet had an opportunity to speak on this subject, and the suggestion was made yesterday, that two or three days might be spent in discussing an important subject.

CALVIN W. PRITCHARD, of Western : I desire to say, in view of what has been presented, that I shall very cheerfully withhold from speaking, but there is a friend who is amongst those who are to speak, who, I think it is eminently proper, should be heard in this Conference to the full extent of what he may have to say, a man who has been engaged in this work from the beginning, our brother, John Henry Douglas.

CHAIRMAN : The thought I had was to give opportunity for those to speak who have not spoken at all since the question has been under discussion.

ROBERT W. DOUGLAS, of Indiana : I am the eldest professional pastor in the church, and I should like to have an opportunity.

CHAIRMAN : Jacob Baker is next in order.

JACOB BAKER, of Ohio : The subject matter introduced before us was in reference to the conduct of meetings for worship and the maintenance of the ministry. It is on that that I propose to speak. First, meetings for worship : Worship is the adoration of the heart toward God for the blessings of salvation that have come to us through the gospel. God gives the Holy Ghost as a helper in our worship, and our worship to God is because of the gift of his dear Son, our Saviour. Anything in any meeting of any congregation of people that promotes the love of God in the heart and the adoration of the mind toward God is worship. And this point I would like to make,

that worship is performed by the minister in his service in the ministry, and that at the same time it promotes worship in the hearts of the hearers and of the believers, as the Scriptures are opened and expanded. So that the functions of worship are going on at the same time through the ministry and through the hearing of the word. The functions of the priesthood of believers are the same. They have priestly service which is worship, preaching without the intervention of another, or help to approach God through the instrumentality of another. Now, in order to maintain the priesthood of believers, the ministry should be exercised continually, in opening to us the Scriptures, and that which made the disciples' hearts burn as they walked to Emmaus with the Lord Jesus Christ beside them, when he opened to them the Scriptures, and from their heart-burning love they worshipped God. So I see no danger at all in the exercise of the ministry and the hearing of the word at the same time. It is all worship.

Now, on the ministry : I believe it is in harmony with experience and in harmony with the truth of the word, that, in order to be a fruit-bearing ministry it must be a sanctified ministry, a ministry that comes from a sanctified experience, a ministry that has the second blessing of entire sanctification. We don't expect children, naturally born, to bear children. In fact they cannot. They have not the fruit-bearing power. No more can a justified ministry, a ministry in the experience of justification, be expected to be largely a fruit-bearing ministry, but a sanctified ministry, a ministry in the manhood of Christian experience, a ministry that can unveil the wondrous purpose of God in Jesus Christ and in the gospel will be a fruit-bearing ministry, and that person may be expected to have spiritual children. He is in the power of the Spirit and proclaims the gospel under that power. Now, this kind of ministry to-day needs support everywhere. It needs the united confirmation of the church, and the united prayers of the church, and the united moral support of the church behind it everywhere. This support of the ministry is a great deal more than the financial support. The moral support of the ministry in the church

of Jesus Christ is more needed to-day than the financial power that is behind it. Worship is going on from all true believing hearts during the preaching of the word, as much as it is under congregational song or united prayer, and I bless the Lord for the spiritual worship, not only in my ministry but in my devotion. Going through these United States of ours for the last twenty years, I have had experience in regard to the pastoral system, and I found everywhere, where behind the pastor was the moral support needed for the ministry of the word, that the people heard the gospel clearly, and maintained it in their moral support as well as in their financial support.

SAMUEL R. NEAVE, of Baltimore: I think I would like to say that as far as I am concerned I can accept that minute brought in by the committee with only one exception, which I think is perhaps the vital point of it, and that is the recommendation of the pastoral system. I conclude that that pastoral system is the one that we have heard so ably set before this Conference. My reasons for objecting to that are, that I think we cannot adopt it in its fullness without leaving our fundamental principles as Quakers. Now, if we do leave them we virtually admit that we have been a failure. I contend that point entirely. I don't think they are a failure or have been a failure. I think that the idea has been expressed in this Conference that the great ingathering of souls into our western meetings is in consequence of your pastoral system. I think that idea has been brought out more than once in this Conference. Now, that is a mistake, friends, I think. The pastoral system is, I believe, an outgrowth of your ingathering of souls.

I really know a little about this, although only in Oskaloosa meeting, where I was for two years an officer, an active member of their pastoral committee. It was long before any one in the Society of Friends dared suggest the pastoral system as we have had it brought before this Conference. In Iowa Yearly Meeting there was a great stirring of dry bones at that time, so much that it was a great trouble to know how to govern the church, and in the Oskaloosa meeting I remember that we had twenty-

six elders, and one Friend remarked that we had more than they had in heaven, but the reason was that we gathered in the people from all directions, thinking in different lines, and none of them thinking on Quaker lines. Now reference has been made to London, and reference has been made to Baltimore, and they both have tried a plan of receiving membership into mission meetings. Well, friends, I don't think that I can endorse that, personally. I have not seen the workings of it in my own mind quite clearly. I think that the pastoral system has risen from the fact that the people have demanded something that is not exactly in the Quaker line, and your thought has been forced into this thing without perhaps being able very well to help yourselves. I don't want us eastern people to get into this pastoral system, because the Quaker principles have not been a failure, I think, with us. Now friends, excuse me, but I think Iowa claimed fifty per cent. from the pastoral system. We can do better than that in Baltimore from Friends' lines. We can claim eighty per cent. in the same time. I believe that is a fact. We are very small, you remember, and additions count to our numbers; but it is a fact that in the last eighteen years eighty per cent. has been added to our membership and twenty-five per cent. to the number of our meetings for worship, and not one has been laid down during that time. Now I believe that if there is any failure in the system it is in this, that our church develops an individuality; that is the main difference I consider between our system and the systems of the other churches; that we build up the individual in just what God has made him. You give him the ability to work in the line of the gifts that God has given him. You develop him as a man, and if the individual will not be developed, of course to just that extent is the church a failure. That is conceded on that plan, and because of the individual unfaithfulness of many members, we have them in Baltimore, friends. We have got to have a stirring up there or else we cannot keep pace with the rest of you; we must have individual dedication, a sacrifice of self to the Lord, or else we cannot carry on our work on these lines. No meeting can. But if we

have that, there is no need to introduce a pastoral system into any meeting.

JOHN HENRY DOUGLAS, of Iowa: I am thankful for the privilege of saying a few words in this connection. I arise more particularly to say how thankful I feel at this time that in the progress of our work as a church we are so near together. I sympathize with the remark of brother Wood in connection with this document that is before us. It seems to me perfectly remarkable. It is one of the wonders of the age, that a people of so much independence and individualism as we are, considered as a people, should pass through the revolution, or reformation as I call it, through which we have come, with so little friction. To some minds it looks as though there had been a great deal, but it is more apparent than real. One thing delights me. Every speaker in this house, I believe, is from his heart intensely and most emphatically anxious for the salvation of our fellow men. I believe that we are recognizing that God had, and has to-day, a way of accomplishing this, and that it is through the preaching of the gospel of Jesus Christ. Another thing I have heard no controversy about is that the gospel is to be supported to the utmost extent of the need, and in the most conservative paper that we have had here it has been as emphatically declared and asserted as in the most liberal, if I may make any distinction on these lines. I see no divergence at all in the papers, nor in the speeches that have been made on this floor. Let us thank God at this moment with hearts united before him because of this state of things.

Now what has been the progress? No one man, as Brother Kenworthy has well said, and no set of men, has introduced, from the human standpoint, any system in connection with the work in its progress during the past years. I believe you believe, the most conservative and the most liberal, that God has been moving in the midst of our churches; that a revival was needed. There is nothing I remember more distinctly of my boyhood life than of hearing our fathers on their knees with a great deal of emotion, which characterized, you know, all our

preachers in those days, praying for a revival, on account of our going back, and of the formality in the church. I could name here a hundred men now in heaven, who used to pray and speak that way. How well some of us here remember that wonderful meeting in Richmond, held from seven in the evening until one o'clock in the morning, when it was counted up that one hundred and fifty souls had decided for Christ in a way they never knew him before. That was a characteristic meeting, ordained of God. Representatives from every yearly meeting were in that meeting. Sybil Jones was there, under whose ministry I was brought up. Lindley M. Hoag was there, and scores of others. They prayed, God pulled back the windows, and down came a manifestation of his presence and power that the church has never been able to gainsay or resist. That was a good many years ago, and it has moved on. Pretty soon evangelistic work came up. How did it come? It came from above. People say, How do you get up your systems, and how do you get up your revivals, and how do you get up this evangelistic work? We never got it up. It came down from above. I don't know, I only know I had a tender heart, and God for Christ's sake had saved me and I was open to conviction. I am ready to-day as much as then for any new move. It came upon us, and we fell in with God. God owned us. We made tremendous mistakes. At the first general meeting held in this country in modern times, quite a number of us here were present. We started in the city of Chicago. We lectured on our distinguishing views. That was the first general meeting held in this country. We lectured. We did. I begged for a place to preach in the evening. We had it and we preached some. We invited the people to come. Now the Lord was with us, but as we look upon it now, what a mixture! There was no power worthy the name we were born with. The Lord tolerated us. You know I like the word toleration. If heaven did not tolerate us, where would we be? We got into distress about it, before we got through. Is this the work of the church, we said. Here is a great Chicago, sinking; what are we doing to save it? We went to Back Creek, and it improved, didn't it? Oh, how it improved. We went

over to Martinsville, and we went around ; but to be brief, the Lord led us on until we struck a line of evangelistic power and efficiency that has never been excelled by any people since the beginning. I see a number in this house with whom I labored when we struck that line, for four years, day and night, summer and winter, and multiplied thousands of souls were converted to God ; and we are in touch here at this Conference, probably outwardly for the last time in this world, and it is good for us to be here. We have seen the travail of our souls and are wonderfully blessed in the remembrance of this. Others were in it. I see them here, fifty of them, or more, who were in this work in the beginning and up to the present time. Another generation has come up that knows nothing of those battles, nothing of those days, who are now taking the work and will carry it on much better than we did. Now the practical question is this : God has been with us ; God is with us ; he is in this Conference ; he has broken in sometimes in a very remarkable way. Is there anybody here ? is there any evangelist or pastor here to say we have reached our own ideal of perfection in this thing ? No, I believe those who have been in it the longest and know the most about it, have the deepest anxiety about it and the deepest jealousy. I believe those that are in it the most are thinking of it and weighing it more than anybody else in the world. They see the dangers. They were presented in the paper of William Nicholson most graphically. We see what professionalism means. I am glad that word has been introduced. It does not matter what branch of the Friends it came from at all. It is a good word, and I trust it will leave an emphasis that will never be forgotten. I don't know of a pastor or superintendent in this work, in this Conference or anywhere else, that for one moment would encourage professionalism in this matter. We have enough outside without bringing it into the church. The point is, God is leading us. God has empowered our ministry to a wonderful degree. Our ministry is sought in every church that has any life in it. I am called to a hundred places where I can not go to one, in every branch of the evangelical church in this land from one ocean to the

other, and called across the ocean. And talk about money and salaries! Had I, and others, yielded to that in other days we would not have been in this Conference of Quakers to-day, but we were under the leading of the Spirit of God that has been so emphasized here, and we were called to it. Those who know me and know about me, know the inducements and invitations and temptations and pressure that have been brought to bear from various quarters to lead us away from the humble, plain, simple place where God in his providence has placed us. And so I say to-day, our church stands before the Throne and before the world as an emphatic power.

I am not wedded to any system. God has led us on in Iowa and in that great Northwest which takes in two thousand miles square of this country. Some of you who come from the East feel as though you had got west. You are hardly on the edge. Next Fourth-day I start to take a trip of twenty-five hundred miles to my field of labor. Beloved, this is a great country and it is a great work. My prayer is, and I believe it is the general feeling of this Conference, that God will continue to own us and will continue to lay his hand upon us, and that his power may not be withheld from us. We will risk the system. We will take step by step in this matter. The system of Iowa Yearly Meeting to-day may not be its system next year. I know these pioneers in this work, and there is not one of them who is not ready to change at any moment when we can get illumination from headquarters, or help from the church, and can know better how to preach Christ, and how better to take care of those who are born into the kingdom.

And so, beloved, I want us to feel as we close up this discussion here, that from New England's rock-bound coast where I was born, to the Pacific coast where God in his providence is leading us into a wondrous work, we are one in spirit, one in prayer, one in motive, and we are here in conference not to accuse or to criticise one another or one another's work. You never heard me in one word criticise our beloved friends who may not see with us in this work. I bid you God speed, and is not that the feeling of every one in this Conference? God bless you, is cur

prayer, and we ask that this spirit be reciprocated, and I believe that it is largely, and I believe that it is growing every moment in this Conference, and that we shall leave this place with one prayer, that God's power may be upon us, and that we may know the leading of his blessed spirit, and that we may be led out into greater conquests and greater victories than we have ever known before. We believe in the immediate guidance of the Holy Spirit. We believe in the truth as revealed in the blessed Bible, and with the blessed Bible, and the Author of it accompanying it. I have no fear, if our people will keep humble, if they are filled with the Spirit, but that all the differences of our judgment can be harmonized with a loving heart. We of the West shall learn from the East, and the East shall learn from the West, and we will all learn from above, and we will bid one another God speed in all these lines that have the manifest owning of God. I think of those that have been raised up; I think of the multiplied thousands who have been converted; I think of the number of churches that have been built up within the past ten years, hundreds of meeting houses, hundreds of organizations, hundreds of ministers. Thus, beloved, we are able witnesses, able testimony bearers for our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. The only thing we are careful about and jealous about is that we keep the door open; that every school-house and private house in every town, and especially the great centres of population, to-day may have faithful representatives of those who know the power of God, who know the word of the Lord and are able to declare it. The Lord is opening the door wider and wider, and our prayer is for more laborers, and more are coming. The field is widening. The two things are coming hand in hand. I feel this from my heart at this time in my life, and as I leave this field, having gone over it from one ocean to the other, I believe in a sense as I have never felt before so deeply, that every brother and every sister in this Conference, and that takes in all that they represent, are in my very heart; they are in my very soul. I bid you God speed, and only pray that he may lead us and that we will follow. If it is a new path, let us follow it. How I

sympathized with William Nicholson as he opened up the leading of God in his life, and it is so with others here. Let the Lord lead us; let us keep to our fundamental principle of the guidance of the Holy Spirit and the teaching of his word, and when the crowning day shall come we shall have something to offer, something to lay down at the feet of him who has led us out, and we shall crown Jesus Lord of all.

CHAIRMAN: There are now recognized by the chair four friends. If each of these uses the allotted time it will carry us ten minutes past the hour of adjournment. I don't know their purpose in that regard.

JAMES CAREY THOMAS, of Baltimore: Are we to come to a decision in regard to these questions? Will not some time be necessary for that?

CHAIRMAN: It is at the option of the Conference whether we reach the decision this morning or not. It has been expected that it will be reached. It has not been expected by the chair that these friends will all want to take the full time. There have been a number of only five minute speeches.

CALVIN W. PRITCHARD, of Western: I withdraw my purpose to speak. I had a point or two that I would have made, but the subject has been so well discussed and so fully discussed that I am entirely satisfied to leave it.

ROBERT W. DOUGLAS, of Indiana: When I get started I know I shall probably want the full extent of the time, with the courtesy of the Conference, but I don't think we are going to get ahead any from now on. I sympathize with James Wood. The discussion is very largely on one side. We are going over and over the same old ground. I don't know but we had better come back to the old-fashioned Quaker way, that when a friend has pretty fully illustrated a subject, one friend says: I accept that, and another says: So do I. I think we will all say, So do I, this morning. I did have a speech in my mind. I

was looking over the speech I made five years ago, and I have pretty good unity with it yet. I saw my way pretty clearly then, how I could be a pastor on Quaker lines. Some people, when we say "Quaker lines," seem to pride themselves on getting just as far away from Quaker lines as they possibly can. Now, I believe Quaker lines are the best lines I have found, and if we can find a pastorate that will harmonize on Quaker lines, why not go on that line rather than seek other lines that we have never trod? It seems to me we are arguing the case after it has gone to the jury, after the testimony is all in; but there is this one idea here suggested, the moment we speak about pastors the minds of the people almost at once fly off, not considering the idea that we can have a pastorate that is in harmony with our recognized principles; they fly right off on the idea of the Methodist parson, or the Presbyterian clergyman, or the Church of England bishop, or something of that kind. Now, I should be opposed, my dear friends, to this, and I suppose I am the oldest professional pastor in the Society of Friends to-day. I think I was the first one in the field to give myself entirely to the work of the service of the Lord, separating myself from secular affairs and being supported by the voluntary contributions of the church. Some friends know how the thing worked when I was in Wilmington, and then, you know, for a year or two I was the "Kokomo hireling," up north here about fifty miles. So I feel I am a sort of high private, a sort of a self-supporting missionary society on my own account, and so I sympathize with these friends. I have been there and understand it. But don't think that because we may be pastors of the church we are either lords over God's heritage or over Cæsar's heritage. The trouble is oftentimes in the form of our expressions. We talk about having a pastor to be set over the church, to take charge of the church. Our dear friend, Adelbert Wood, had a very unfortunate expression about "running" a meeting, as though a minister could run a revival, or run a meeting. Now, some of these expressions are rather unfortunate. We know what he means. He knows what he means, but it is a little unfortunate that the minister should be spoken of as running anything in

that sense. The idea seems to me, that instead of a minister's taking charge of the church, the church should take charge of him and recognize that we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus, the Lord, and ourselves, your servants for Jesus' sake. Instead of the church being our servant, the fact is, my dear friends, we are the servants of the church, and we would not be the servants of the church if it were not for Jesus' sake. Now, I am frequently asked if I would preach the gospel without money, without being paid for it, and I remarked five years ago, and I was referring with a great deal of interest to what I said (the printer made me say exactly the opposite), I will preach the gospel without money, and rather than be deprived of the privilege of preaching the blessed gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ, I will pay a good round sum for the privilege of preaching it. Now, those of us who will pay for the opportunity of preaching the gospel just want it understood distinctly that the rich have no monopoly of preaching the gospel of God's dear Son; that the poorest minister in the church has just as much right to preach the gospel of the church of God as David Updegraff or anybody else who can preach the gospel for nothing and board himself. I think it would be a very unfortunate thing in the church if the rich should have any monopoly in this regard. I have a case in my mind now of a young man who went into one of the places in England where the old meeting-houses had been shut up and where there had been no meetings for fifty years, and opened up these meeting houses and built up the communities and built up churches, and there was a great deal of complaint because he was sent there by rich Friends of Darlington, to preach the gospel. Why, didn't he preach the gospel? Yes. Wasn't his ministry fruitful? Yes. What did they complain of? Simply because he was supported by the rich and he happened to be a poor man. Suppose that individual had been a rich man, and had gone there at his own charges and preached the same gospel and built up the same churches and converted the same souls, his name and fame would have been in all the churches. Now, my dear friends, I don't want this kind of discrimination. If the poor man

wants to preach the gospel, I want us to let him preach the gospel, and it is the bounden duty of the church to support him in preaching that gospel. So that rich and poor and learned and ignorant shall have the precious privilege of preaching the gospel of God's dear Son. And so I take the ground that there is such a position where we may keep in harmony with the principles of the Society to which we belong; where we can have a pastorate that will be in harmony with the Quaker ideas, and which has been presented in some of the papers for our consideration.

I think that we have said all that need be said, and we were, perhaps, just as well prepared two hours ago to arrive at a conclusion. It strikes me we can all unite on that paper.

JOHN F. HANSON, of Iowa: I am quite willing to withdraw my right to speak.

WILLIAM NICHOLSON, of Ohio: I think the ground has been pretty well covered, and like Brother Douglas I would have been a good while ago ready to give my sanction to the paper that is before us this morning. There are a few things that have been resting on my mind in regard to the discussion of yesterday that I feel like referring to, especially in regard to our own church and church work. We received the name we have adopted from a passage of Scripture that our blessed Master has left on record for our instruction: "Ye are my friends if ye do whatsoever I command you." And the Lord Jesus Christ has commanded the church to go out in the world and rescue the perishing, and wherever the church fails to do that, it fails to follow the commission that our Saviour has given us, and in that sense we have no right to be called the friends of God. We have lost the right to the name we have adopted if we fail to comply with the requirements that the Master has given us. Now, there is a thought that has seemed to present itself to our minds this morning, also yesterday, in regard to the duty of the church, of our church. Sometimes we get hold of the idea, from some remarks that have been made on this

floor, that our business is to build up the church, those who are already in the church. We have fallen into that idea from some circumstances that have always been in our church that we are not here to talk about so much this morning, but I do want to say that if the church accomplishes that which the Lord Jesus wants it to do, the first thing is to get sinners saved and build them up, to get them into the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ that they may there learn what is Christ's will concerning them. We want to get the thing right end foremost. The mission of the church is first to save sinners and then to build them up. Now I look upon the church of the Lord Jesus Christ as a co-laborer with the Lord Jesus for the gathering of these precious souls from the field of sin. Our Father in Heaven has made wonderful condescension, if I may be allowed to use the expression, in permitting us, the little band of whom we have so many here at this Conference, to be in partnership with the Lord Jesus, the Lamb of God, in rescuing the perishing. The world does not see the Lord Jesus Christ. They only have natural eyes to behold the natural things with which they are surrounded, but it has been declared in God's revealed will that it is the privilege of the church to have the eye of faith that pierces beyond the things that the natural eye can behold, and Jesus has left you and me as his followers in this world visibly to be seen by those who can not see Jesus by the spiritual eye. We can see him. He has left us here as his representatives, and he says to you and to me, that except we have the spirit in us that was in Jesus, we are none of his. The spirit that was in him brought him from the world of Glory to die in our stead. I am glad of this one thought, that the Lord Jesus Christ did not simply come from Heaven that my soul might be saved and I brought into the kingdom and have a hope that reaches beyond this vale of tears, an evidence of a home in glory, but that he has come to organize those washed in his blood, sanctified by his spirit, and bring them together as a church of the Lord Jesus Christ, to accomplish a work for Jesus while here in this world. As I say again, if we fail in doing that, we fail to accomplish that which the Lord wants us to do. The thought has

often risen in my mind, as I looked out over the history of our church, remembering our forefathers, of whom we have heard so much spoken here, who left to us eighty thousand members, and we have heard since this Conference commenced that we have had eighty thousand members through two hundred years. Talk about eighty thousand, and then think of the eighty thousand that our father, George Fox, numbered, who was the originator and organizer of the Friends' church! I tell us, dear friends, we ought to have had more members than any other evangelical church on God's green earth. Why is it we have not? George Fox's plan was to let the Lord Jesus Christ lead him. His plan was to answer the commands of God placed upon him. God did not tell George Fox how to save souls. He told him to go out into the highways and hedges and compel people to come in. He answered the demand that the Lord placed upon him in his day and we see what the result was. The great trouble with us, it seems to me, is withdrawing ourselves from the blessed Master and not allowing him to be a king to rule and reign in our hearts and direct us in all of our doings and actions, and following the injunctions that the apostle Paul has given to us in regard to these mortal bodies of ours being quickened into activity for the upbuilding of his Kingdom. So that I am not here this morning to say what the plan shall be, but, Is the end accomplished? Are sinners saved? Are they brought into the kingdom? Jesus knows just how to manage that work of his to accomplish the end. The church is a means to an end, and we want to be, as a church, so that our Master may lead us and we may do just what we profess to do as a church, and that is to let the Holy Spirit bring to our remembrance not only the words but the acts that shall most redound to God's glory; that he may bring to our remembrance the things that we may do and that we may say; that that same blessed Holy Spirit may be carried to the hearts and minds of those with whom we come in contact, that they may be won for Christ. That is the object that we ought to have, the salvation of precious souls. Then as a means to that end, we want to be so in the hands of God that we may understand the

“all” that is spoken of, to go into “all” the world, everywhere. I remember a few years ago, while being some thousand miles away from here, of hearing a remark made like this: that Quakerism was not suited to cities. I asked the question of the one who made the remark, if there were not sinners in cities. O, yes, the answer was, more than anywhere else. Well, then, said I, if there are sinners there, certainly if Quakerism is not suited to the cities we ought to get an ism that is. The Lord Jesus Christ came to save sinners wherever they may be, whether in the country or in cities, and we want to be so in Jesus’ hands that he can use us to gather in the sinners whether they be in one place or in the other.

CHAIRMAN: It is the purpose of the chair, with your consent, to take the sense of the meeting with reference to the paper that has been read this morning. We admire the full and perfect Christian spirit that has gone through the discussion. However, before we proceed there is simply a word of explanation that Charles E. Tebbetts desires to give.

CHARLES E. TEBBETTS, of Iowa: I was sorry to see in a portion of yesterday’s discussion that the impression seemed to have gone out from one part of William Nicholson’s paper, that those who were in the work, especially the younger workers, were trying to suppress some of the older ones. I wish to disabuse the minds of the Conference in reference to that. It has been my privilege to be associated with William Nicholson, in work in California, and there is nobody in that field I would so gladly put in the work, all the time, as my Brother Nicholson. We want to have all of our older workers in the work and hear them and give them full liberty in the work.

JAMES CAREY THOMAS, of Baltimore: I arise to a question of privilege. I merely want to say that attention has been called to the fact that this report was unanimous from the committee to which was entrusted the gathering up of the sense of the meeting. I wish it to be understood distinctly that that paper does not express the per-

sonal opinions or contain the words which would be used by me, personally, but I believe it was the conclusion of the majority of the Conference. I don't wish it to go with my personal indorsement as to its words.

WILLIAM NICHOLSON, of Kansas: Referring to what Charles E. Tebbetts has said, I did not mean in my paper to convey any impression that there had been an effort to suppress me. I think I conveyed the opposite impression.

DAVID B. UPDEGRAFF, of Ohio: I hope we may now have the question. I am glad to indorse what James Carey Thomas has said concerning the entire unanimity with which this was recommended by the committee.

LUKE WOODARD, of Indiana: I might suggest a little alteration in the phrasing, but I don't believe I will do so, but will express my unity and willingness to adopt the report of the committee. While on my feet I will say I have suppressed a good deal which is in my heart, to listen to others. I have not agreed with everything that has been said, but it has been a satisfaction to me to hear those speak who have not occupied the same standpoint I do myself. I am glad we have had this full and free expression.

JOHN NICHOLSON, of Baltimore: There is one expression about which I would like to ask a question. Is the expression "lambs of the flock" intended as a limitation?

DAVID B. UPDEGRAFF, of Ohio: I think it includes the sheep.

JOHN NICHOLSON, of Baltimore: That is the thought. It would convey the idea of a limitation to my own mind.

ALLEN JAY, of Indiana: Nobody thought of limiting it at all.

WILLIAM NICHOLSON, of Kansas: Perhaps the word "lambs" may be left out and say "flock."

CHAIRMAN: What is the pleasure of the Conference in reference to that one word?

(The secretary re-read the passage with the expression amended.)

TIMOTHY NICHOLSON, of Indiana: I was too hasty awhile ago. I spoke thinking that the paper was read with a view of at once having an expression upon it. It seems to me it would have been better not to read it until we were ready to adopt it. I say this as an apology. The discussion has only confirmed me in the thought that the paper is an expression of the feeling of the Conference.

WILLIAM L. PEARSON, of Iowa: I think we recognize in the form of our government that there is a distinction between the elders and the members. I don't believe that it is possible for us in this day, with the churches we have about us, most of which are not Friends, to speak of a pastoral system at all, without implying in some wording or other that these elders are not also in the pastoral body. I mention that as a thing that I wish might have been expressed. I would in no wise have interfered with the thought that is there, which I indorse and have for a number of years. In this particular I speak of, Iowa Yearly Meeting, I think, is more moderate than the yearly meetings in general.

ELIAS JESSUP, of Iowa: How is this question to be decided? Is it by expressing our unity, or in some other way? I am entirely in unity with the paper.

CHAIRMAN: This question will be decided according to the rules of the Conference adopted at the opening of the Conference. I think the suggestion of Elias Jessup is a good one. Without an explanation of your thought, give your views on the matter.

CALVIN W. PRITCHARD, of Western: Since that correction was made I don't feel quite satisfied. It seems to take away the individuality. If we would say members

of the flock, or individuals of the flock, it would be nearer the idea we would want.

ALLEN JAY, of Indiana: We here think that the word members should be put in. (Consent.)

ELIAS JESSUP, of Iowa: I was going to make one additional remark. It seems to me we need to cultivate the grace of forbearance in speaking as well as the grace of speaking.

FRANCIS A. WRIGHT, of Kansas: Our friend Neave referred to the minute as speaking of the pastoral system. When it was read I could not understand whether the word pastoral or pastorate was used.

SECRETARY: It was pastorate.

FRANCIS A. WRIGHT, of Kansas: I would have preferred that the word "system" had not been in it. I would like to say, as I never had an opportunity before, that there are a great many of us that have full sympathy with the remarks of Richard H. Thomas and our friend Hobbs from North Carolina.

WILLIAM L. PEARSON, of Iowa: I very much appreciate the caution in the latter part of it, and yet I should not feel easy without saying that we must take not only the wording but the understanding of it, and I think as the minute is now worded it will be understood as indorsing what is generally known as the pastorate system, and, therefore, I feel that I must dissent from the minute.

ANNA B. THOMAS, of Baltimore: I feel just the same.

JAMES CAREY THOMAS, of Baltimore: I feel the same though the voice of the Conference is in favor of it. I would like to have the word "pastorate" changed to pastoral, because pastoral system includes all systems of pastorate.

(A full expression of assent and dissent was given.)

CHAIRMAN: I think the mind of every delegate present would be that we should rule that we accept the report of the committee as the sense of this Conference, and yet we are all thankful to have each one give his explanation of his personal thought. That is right. Then we go on loving one another just the same.

A FRIEND: I would like to inquire whether it will be understood that we accept the report or whether we indorse the sentiment of it. To accept the report is one thing and indorsing it is another.

CHAIRMAN: Is there a point there of liability of misinterpretation that the Conference wishes to give expression to?

TIMOTHY NICHOLSON, of Indiana: The chair expressed it, and the words he used are complete, that we accept it as covering the sentiment of the Conference.

CHAIRMAN: If there are any others who wish to express their dissent, let it be done.

MARY M. HOBBS, of North Carolina: I should be willing to say that I accept it with my own interpretation, but not with the interpretation which some other friends here would give it. I think, however, that it is the expression of the majority of the Conference.

ANNA B. THOMAS, of Baltimore: I want to speak of it in the same way.

L. L. HOBBS, of North Carolina: I accept it with precisely the same explanation.

JOHN F. HANSON, of Iowa: I should like to ask if the word *pastorate* was changed to *pastoral*?

SECRETARY: Yes.

JOHN HENRY DOUGLAS, of Iowa: These dear friends just accepted it and now taking the course they do, they

would have each one go home and give such an interpretation as he sees fit. They say the minute can say that was the prevailing sentiment of the Conference, but we dissented.

JAMES CAREY THOMAS, of Baltimore: I don't so understand it. I was on the committee. I expressed a view that that was the sentiment of the Conference. We were appointed not to express our individual views but what appeared to be the judgment of the Conference. We may dissent from it, but that was the sentiment of the Conference. I take occasion to say that it was not expressed in the terms I would have put it in.

WILLIAM L. PEARSON, of Iowa: Unless the pastoral system there presented put a definite form upon it I don't think we ought to care about having a little difference of opinion about it now.

DAVID B. UPDEGRAFF, of Ohio: I think there is no question but what that word "accept" has been used in this Conference in the sense of adopt. I suggest, to avoid all question about it, that the word "adopt" be inserted instead of "accept." That certainly is what we have done. It is adopted. (Consent.)

(The secretary then read the minute.)

JANE E. WHITE, of Baltimore: I want to say I am willing to accept it as the views of the Conference, not as my personal views.

CHAIRMAN: Are you ready now to pass from this question? (Yes.)

JOHN NICHOLSON, of Baltimore: I have not yet spoken and I don't wish to speak now. I just wish to leave one little message with us all before we entirely pass from this. I came to this Conference with an earnest desire that I might not be in the way of any one getting good from it, and that I might myself receive good from it.

It is the desire which I have in my heart to-day, and as we are now about to pass from this subject, I just wish to say that I for one have listened with interest to all that has been said on this question on both sides, and I earnestly desire that I may enter into the rejoicing of all those who can rejoice in the work which has been done on this line, in the good which has been accomplished. I want to rejoice with you in it and then I want you to rejoice with us who have more quiet methods, if you can find anything in our work in which you can rejoice. And, if you can not find anything in our work in which you can rejoice, then I beg of you to pray for us that we may be led out into some consistent line of work, the result of which shall be such as that you can rejoice with us in the days to come. And finally, let me say, let us one and all pray for each other.

MAHALAH JAY, of Indiana: Some friends have asked that the program for the afternoon shall be read again, that friends may have their minds on the subjects.

The secretary read as follows: First, a communication from Western Yearly Meeting on Historical Records; second, that Francis W. Thomas be allowed to present the subject of uniformity of discipline for all the yearly meetings of America; third, a foreign missionary board for all the American yearly meetings; fourth, the duty of our church toward our cities.

CHAIRMAN: The subjects will be taken up in the order presented by the committee, and we shall proceed in the consideration of them as far as we may be able to proceed in the afternoon session.

TIMOTHY NICHOLSON, of Indiana: I think there might be some delegates here, who would like a copy of the proceedings of the conference held five years ago in Richmond. I have a few of them here, and they will be sold at cost, fifty cents per copy.

After a season of silent prayer, Conference adjourned until 2:30 P. M.

AFTERNOON SESSION — 2 : 30 O'CLOCK.

The sixth session of the Conference was called to order by the vice-president, and opened by prayer.

CHAIRMAN BROWN : I think it would be very profitable to our souls and to our work to have the same spirit of prayer and devotion remain with us for a time before we go further in the work. (A season of devotion.)

CHAIRMAN BROWN : I feel that I would but reflect the expression of every heart here when I say, Praise the Lord that the touch of his Spirit has been on our hearts in this opening moment. Allen Jay now has a little matter to mention.

ALLEN JAY, of Indiana : Our dear friend, Henry Stanley Newman, of London Yearly Meeting, wrote a letter to this Conference, but it was the decision of the Business Committee that it was not best for that letter to be introduced, for the reason that if we made a precedent of it somebody else might want to write, and we might get more letters on our hands than we would know how to manage. So it was decided not to have it read in the Conference, but I am informed that the letter has been printed and a number of copies of it are now present. When he sent it to the Conference he made the request that it not only be read in the Conference, but that it be printed at his expense, so that each member of the Conference might have a copy. The Business Committee having decided as it did, we are united in saying that we are willing that it should be circulated among the members. We thought it but right to say that much.

CHAIRMAN : The first subject this afternoon will be a matter referred to this Conference by Western Yearly Meeting, which the secretary will read.

(APPENDIX H.)

To the Conference :

The committee last year, in reference to our church history, submits its report as below. The report is ap-

proved. The suggestion contained in the report is referred to the Conference of yearly meetings as proposed. The clerk is directed to submit this information to said Conference.

REPORT.

To the Yearly Meeting: Your committee, appointed to take under consideration the needs of the church in reference to the presentation of its written history, etc., submits its report as below :

1st. The facts brought to light show that while we are *making* history we are not *writing* history. Sewel and Bowden have given us excellent histories of the past. The prayer of your committee has been that the Lord would somewhere raise up a historian of the present and past decade ; and,

2d. To the end that the necessary data may be at hand when required, we suggest that, if it meets the approbation of this meeting, the whole matter be, in such manner as is deemed proper, referred to the Conference of yearly meetings, which meets in Tenth Month of this year, at Indianapolis, Indiana, with the suggestion that a historic association be formed, constituted of representative men and women from each yearly meeting, whose function it shall be to collect and preserve such incidents, biography, etc., especially files of the minutes of the sessions of the yearly meetings, as may be of historic interest to Friends in the future, all of which, together with the desire that God's blessing may be upon the church in the development of writers as well as preachers, we respectfully submit.

(Signed.)

LEVI REES,
CALVIN W. PRITCHARD.

Taken from the minutes of Western Yearly Meeting of Friends, held by adjournments from Ninth Month 16th to Ninth Month 22d, inclusive, 1892.

THOMAS C. BROWN, }
LYDIA TAYLOR PAINTER, } *Clerks.*

CHAIRMAN: I presume Calvin W. Pritchard will be as well calculated to speak upon this matter and bring it before us in a concise way as any one. We will ask him to present the subject further.

CALVIN W. PRITCHARD, of Western: If the chair please, in order to get the subject before the Conference as briefly as possible, I have written what I want to say.

(APPENDIX I.)

HISTORY OF FRIENDS.

BY CALVIN W. PRITCHARD.

The time is probably not far off when some one qualified for the work will be called to write a history of Friends which shall be adapted to this age and generation. Is it not in the province of this Conference to take some active steps in preparing the way for the writing of such a history? It may not be able to lay hands on any one and set him to work as a historian. Historians, like poets, are born, not made. The Lord has, in the right time in past ages, provided men to record the doings of his people. A conference or committee in the last of the seventeenth century would hardly have chosen William Sewel as the historian of their time for Friends. He was obscure and of little note, but he proved to be a providential man, raised up by the Lord for a great work, and his history has proved invaluable to the church. Again, any attempt to write a history of modern Quakerism *now* might be premature. The time may not be ripe for it. Some questions are not yet settled, and a writer would be puzzled to present them so as to forecast correct conclusions. But the work ought not to be long postponed. A modern history of Friends is greatly needed. Friends are wanting it in their libraries, and many who inquire after us as a church should be supplied. Evangelists, as they go into their fields of labor, awaken inquiry, not only as to our doctrines, but as to our history as well, and they need a book to offer to such inquirers. Any one who mingles much amongst men as a Friend is often brought into embarrassment because of this need.

The concern which arose in Western Yearly Meeting, and led to the presentation of a minute here, was based upon a desire to provide for collecting historic facts, events, biographies, etc., for the use of the historian, and to stimulate the work of preparing a history as speedily as it can be properly done. After having it one year in the hands of a committee it was decided to refer it to this Conference with the suggestion that a committee be formed, or a historical society be organized, to gather historic material and keep it safely for future use. It is high time that something of this kind were done. The men and women who were active in the first years of the modern revolution amongst Friends are growing old. Many of them have already passed away, others will soon be gone. The past forty years are remarkable in the history of our church. In coming days the work of those who have been upon the stage will be sought after, as we seek after the words and deeds, the particulars concerning the life of Edward Burrough, Richard Hubberthorn, Anna Downer, and others who contributed to the rich heritage bequeathed to us by our fathers. Many scenes in the first revivals of our church were glorious. They were rich in spiritual fruitage, and the victories won for Christ were marvelous. They have never been fully set forth by pen. They ought to be. If it is not done soon it will never be done. Those who remember those scenes and can describe them will not be with us long. They should be asked to contribute what they know for the use of the historian. Biographies of evangelists, workers and teachers ought to be written and preserved. Should some provision be made by this Conference by which this service will be performed?

Another thing. The good name of the grievously persecuted Friends who first settled in Massachusetts ought to be rescued from the unjust aspersions cast upon their character by the historians whose works are now generally read and taught in many schools. Those Friends are made out to be *so* fanatical and even indelicate in their conduct as to deserve about what they received. Could not some one whose recognized ability, learning, and character would give him wide influence, be found

and employed to go to New England, press into the sources of knowledge concerning those Friends in Massachusetts and elsewhere, and get the facts as to their character, teaching, and conduct, and as to the outrages that were perpetrated upon them, and write the same in a history that will be accepted as authority. These noble men and women suffered in Christ's name for the sake of civil and religious liberty, and their heroism has doubtless had much to do in securing the freedom we enjoy in this land. It is a shame that their names should go down as evil to future generations through the neglect of their posterity. They ought to be honored along with William Penn. Would not our yearly meetings be willing to contribute a fund to employ some one suitable for this work to do it? May not this subject be referred to the historical organization, if one be formed by the Conference?

CHAIRMAN: In the minute that came from Western Yearly Meeting, and in this paper prepared by Calvin W. Pritchard, who was one of the members of the committee during the year, we have the matter before us. What is the pleasure of this Conference? What action will you take?

STEPHEN BREED, of Western: It seems to me the question is so well settled in our minds that we need to preserve our history and get it into shape, that we wont need to discuss that part to-day, but only the question as to how best to get at it. how to bring it into an effective form. I would suggest that there be a committee appointed, composed of one or two out of each yearly meeting, to take up this subject and present to a future sitting some plan of association as suggested.

DAVID HADLEY, of Western: There is no question as to the advisability of letting the unborn church know something of the history of the church in this age. While we do not want to create a church pride and grieve the Spirit, yet the Lord has seen proper to preserve the church, and I have no doubt that our church is to live on and on until the reappearing of Christ, and I have no question

but the unborn church will look back to this special epoch in our history very much as we look back to the days of George Fox. Therefore I feel anxious, for one, that we may take practical hold of this and leave a record behind us. I was thinking, in view of the existence of a Business Committee, unless we want to discuss this matter, we might put this work in the hands of that committee, and let them formulate something that this Conference can take hold of.

CHAIRMAN: The expressions which have been given have been by members of Western Yearly Meeting, perhaps because they have had this matter under consideration for more than a year. Perhaps members from other yearly meetings would like to give expression as to the desirability of taking hold of this matter.

ROBERT W. DOUGLAS, of Indiana: Writing history is rather new to us. Our dear friend, James Wood, of New York, is interested in some of the school history and otherwise, connected with New York. Perhaps he could give us a little light on writing history. I should be glad to hear from him. He is a historian himself.

JAMES WOOD, of New York: I most heartily approve of the proposition, so far as it refers to the collection and preservation of historical material. That is a duty that is incumbent upon the church, incumbent upon civil society, incumbent upon every one. It is something we owe to posterity, and it is a duty that we ought certainly not to neglect. Histories, successful histories, good histories, are never written to order. You can not find on all the library shelves a good history that was written to order. Calvin Pritchard has admirably covered that ground in what he has said about historians. It is our duty, just in the line of suggestion from Western Yearly Meeting, to preserve all matter that can be of historic value in the future, that it may be available when required. The labor of collecting the material for a history is generally about ten times the labor of writing the history. So that in doing this, friends, you are performing seventy-

five per cent. of the labor of preparing the history which you desire for the future.

Now, it may illustrate the subject in a practical way to tell what New York Yearly Meeting has done. Perhaps fifteen or twenty years ago I brought this subject before the yearly meeting, and it resulted in the yearly meeting's directing that all its subordinate meetings should furnish to a committee who were legally incorporated as trustees, all their books of record from the foundation of their meetings; and you will understand New York Yearly Meeting went back a great while ago. George Fox himself preached to organize meetings in New York Yearly Meeting, and we have nearly all the records of the meetings from that time down to the present. Those original records, the first records of any meetings held within our jurisdiction, that happened at the Hicksite separation to fall into the possession of any of the members of that body, we have gone to the expense of having copied in full, authoritative, certified copies, and we keep all these records of every quarterly meeting, monthly or preparative meeting in New York Yearly Meeting, preserved in a room which we hired in the largest safe deposit building in New York. We have boxes and trunks containing these records, not only the records of our meetings but the files of our religious periodicals for years and years. And thus we are doing what can be done, on similar lines, in all the yearly meetings. I think that is about all that can be done just at this time, have these things collected and put away where they will be preserved. Your garrets and mine are no place for the preservation of papers, and there is where they are, scattered about in private houses, and when a clerk is changed they are carted to his house, and they go up in the garret and the mice make use of them. If you take steps in this direction, you will have accomplished everything that can be done at this time, and it is an important work. It is a duty, and I am glad Western Yearly Meeting has taken the step that has brought this matter before this Conference, that it may go to all the yearly meetings.

NATHAN T. FRAME, of Wilmington: I am in full sympathy with the suggestions made in the paper prepared

by Calvin W. Pritchard, and also with what James Wood has said, as to the collection of matter so as to have it in reach of a future historian, whoever he or she may be. I am also in favor of this Conference taking some step to advise all the yearly meetings on the American continent to prepare a way for the collection of the facts relating to the history of Friends in the United States and in the American continent.

Incidentally, looking over the preface to a Bible that has been published recently in southern Alabama, I believe, under the auspices of the Southern Methodist church, I found copied from some historian of the United States, a part of the article that so misrepresents the early Friends in New England. As I read the lines I felt a burning desire that these things that are being sown in different directions might be corrected, and I believe that we cannot do a better thing than form a historic society.

LUKE WOODARD, of Indiana: It is a matter about which I have thought considerably for several years past. I found in traveling in New York and some other States that the records were a good deal disorganized; I found a fragment of a book of record of a monthly meeting in the central part of the State, in a very fragmentary condition, that is likely to be lost. I do not know how many such they have. I suggested this matter to Stanley Pumphrey when he was in this country, knowing he had traveled extensively through the country and acquainted himself with these matters to some extent. I am favorable to a move in this direction.

JOHN F. HANSON, of Iowa: I am glad and thankful that Friends in Western Yearly Meeting have looked into this matter and brought the subject before us. I think we do not need to discuss the question of the propriety of gathering up the material and saving it. I think it is fortunate for this meeting that the reference has been made to the character of our name in New England as to early Friends there. Not long ago I read in one of the prominent religious papers of our country a statement to the effect that the Congregational church, which was then

responsible for the outrageous conduct on Boston Common, must take steps to clear its name of the stigma. It was evident to the writer of this article that it was all a hoax, that there was nothing of it; it was something that was fabricated as early as 1720; that it was an outrage that such things as Cotton Mather's [imputations] were ever imputed to them. I hope some steps will be taken in this matter.

MARY M. HOBBS, of North Carolina: This is a very interesting subject to me. In North Carolina we have taken steps similar to those proposed here. While we have not our collection in a large fire-proof building, I cannot help thinking they are almost as safe as if they were. We have them in a vault out in the woods built by the yearly meeting on purpose to receive these matters, and we have been for some time collecting material. But something a great deal worse than the mice has gotten hold of some of our books. You know that previous to the war, and just after the war, there was a great exodus from North Carolina to the West, and our books were carried off, almost all of them, to the West. The Baltimore Friends, at the close of the war, interested themselves in our behalf, and collected a part of these and sent them home. The remainder are still somewhere in the West, and, dear friends, if you know anything about them, won't you send them home to us? [Laughter.]

CHARLES F. CHAPMAN, of Wilmington: I rise to say that not only for historical purposes, but for other purposes, I believe this is quite necessary. We should do it for the benefit of our own children. There are legal complications arising out of these records, or liable to be. There have been some already. You will bear in mind that in many places the manner of Friends' marriage ceremony has become almost obsolete, and the proof of our descent, as children of our fathers and mothers, lies in the records that we have. There have come to my knowledge two cases, one wherein there was involved the establishment of an estate, where they had gone to the county records and failed to find any record, and after-

ward they learned of the customs of Friends, and found their records and established the facts. I think these records should be carefully cared for, for the purpose of establishing our lineage. That committee might be appointed to look forward to taking steps that these records might be taken to the county records, and there put on record, or protected there.

JAMES WOOD, of New York: The Friend has called to my mind a very decided inconvenience resulting from the collection of these records in New York. I have received letters from all parts of the United States asking me to search these records of the Society of Friends, asking for peoples' ancestry, to an extent that would have required the employment of a clerk to meet all the demands. [Laughter.]

ROBERT W. DOUGLAS, of Indiana: I was thinking whether we would gain anything by continuing this discussion very much longer. The mind of the Conference is evidently in favor of gathering material. I do not think we can do better than refer these papers to the favorable consideration of the yearly meetings, and let them take action as they see proper.

CHAIRMAN: There seems to be but one voice with reference to the desirability of collecting these materials of record. The next question will be whether we will accept the proposition in the paper, or one of the others that have been indicated.

CALVIN W. PRITCHARD, of Western: I was about to arise to make a proposition a little different from that of Robert W. Douglas, but one which seems to me more practical, that is, that this Conference appoint two persons out of each delegation to take charge of the matter and carry it down to the yearly meetings, and work up, if they can, a historical society, something like they have in New York and North Carolina, in each yearly meeting. That would be my proposition, that each delegation choose out of its number two Friends, and report their

names to our next session, or to some future session, to constitute a committee from each yearly meeting.

ELWOOD SCOTT, of Indiana: I think this committee ought to prepare a statement in regard to the sense of the Conference, which should go along with the names of this committee. I think we ought to have something from this meeting as to the desirability of it.

JAMES H. TERRELL, of Wilmington: I heartily agree with the remarks of the last two speakers in regard to sending a copy of this paper to each one of the yearly meetings, and providing for the subject to be presented in those yearly meetings by some one appointed here, or in some way.

ROBERT W. DOUGLAS, of Indiana: I think my proposition is the best one, of course. I think a recommendation or suggestion from this Conference to the yearly meetings will have more weight. I have no objection to the committee, but I think it will have more weight to the yearly meetings to have it sent down as a recommendation or advice. I think they would act upon it more readily than they would to take it out of the Conference and give it into the hands of two Friends from each yearly meeting. I have no objection to a committee to formulate something more definite.

WILLIAM L. PEARSON, of Iowa: It seems to me we ought to appoint a committee here as a centralizing force. If it is simply referred to the yearly meetings, it may cause considerable correspondence and delay for two or three years. That delay might make the people lose interest.

NATHAN T. FRAME, of Wilmington: I am in favor of Robert W. Douglas's proposition, with the addition of appointing two Friends from each delegation to carry the matter to the yearly meetings.

JAMES H. TERRELL, of Wilmington: I agree to that.

CALVIN W. PRITCHARD, of Western: I accept the addition of Robert W. Douglas's proposition, that this Conference make a definite statement to go to the yearly meetings.

CHAIRMAN: Calvin W. Pritchard accepts the addition of Robert W. Douglas's proposition. Now will Robert W. Douglas accept the addition of Calvin W. Pritchard's proposition?

ROBERT W. DOUGLAS, of Indiana: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Then, as I understand it, the secretary will, by a minute, refer the matter to the different yearly meetings, and the delegates present appoint two persons in each yearly meeting to have charge of the presentation of the matter to the yearly meetings, and see that it is presented, by that means forming a union between the yearly meetings in this historical society.

JAMES WOOD, of New York: Does this proposition suppose the forming of a society?

CHAIRMAN: That is the understanding.

JAMES WOOD, of New York: I did not understand it so. If it does I am opposed to it. I think if you form a society, the yearly meetings will think it is all provided for, and will do nothing themselves. What we want is that each yearly meeting shall take action in the matter, because the yearly meetings can control the records of their subordinate meetings, and if you, in any way, release the yearly meetings of the responsibility in the matter, you frustrate the purpose you have in view.

CALVIN W. PRITCHARD, of Western: I think James Wood is correct. It was not my purpose that this committee should form a historical society, but that it be a committee to communicate to the yearly meetings what is done here, and labor for the same end.

CHAIRMAN: And that there would be no union between the different parts, each member appointed by the delegation from that yearly meeting?

NATHAN T. FRAME, of Wilmington: That is my understanding, leaving any union that might grow in the future entirely in the hands of the yearly meetings, if they choose to make any.

CHAIRMAN: The Conference has the suggestion, what is your pleasure?

JAMES CAREY THOMAS, of Baltimore: I think one member from each yearly meeting is quite enough. One is better able to present it than two.

CHAIRMAN: Will you modify the proposition and have one instead of two? (Consent.)

TIMOTHY NICHOLSON, of Indiana: I would suggest that the clerk, in making the minute, make very pointed the request that the yearly meetings take steps to preserve the records of all the subordinate meetings.

CALVIN W. PRITCHARD, of Western: I want to say it is not sufficient to have the records kept. We want especially to have something in regard to the early revival work and collecting the biographies of the men and women that have done this work. That ought to be a part of the work that is to be done by this committee.

FRANCIS A. WRIGHT, of Kansas: I was going to ask if there would not be a number of matters that would be referred from this Conference to the different yearly meetings, and if we appoint so many friends to have the care of this we are going to make it very cumbersome for our yearly meetings when the propositions come down. My idea is to make the suggestion as strong and pointed as it is desired, and then let it go for the delegations to carry back to their yearly meetings, and present to their meeting in the best way they know how.

CHAIRMAN: The original proposition, as it came from Western Yearly Meeting, covers the points that some have been speaking about, that is, not confining the data to the records of the meeting, especially, but extending them to the preservation of biographies and accounts of revival work, etc.

We are ready now to take action, I think, upon the question whether we accept the proposition of having one from each yearly meeting appointed by the delegates here, or whether we simply refer it by minute.

(Many expressed desire that it be referred by minute.)

CHAIRMAN: I think that is the sense of the meeting.

JAMES WOOD, of New York: Before leaving this subject I want to say one word. The important records to be preserved are the records of the Monthly Meetings. Those show admissions of members and marriages. Everything of historical importance comes in the records of the Monthly Meetings.

JAMES CAREY THOMAS, of Baltimore: I just have one thing to say. I think Friends are now seeing the value of our old custom of preserving the record of the work and services of the different prominent members as a memorial. Now we are looking for the records of the lives of Friends which have utterly passed away, no memorial being left of them.

DAVID B. UPDEGRAFF, of Ohio: I only desire to make a remark. I have been interested to see how this subject has taken hold of the Conference, and the anxiety we have to rescue the memory of our dead Friends from the misrepresentation of their characters, and as this subject is impressed upon the yearly meetings by the different delegations, I think it may give rise to a realization of the importance of paying a little attention and having a care against misrepresentations of the living saints.

JOHN HENRY DOUGLAS, of Iowa: The matter referred to by James Carey Thomas, I think, is one of the most

vital in connection with this subject. In the West, while, of course, we think we are advanced in most things, we are wonderfully behind in most of the details in connection with records. In Iowa Yearly Meeting we have never called a halt, since I have been a member of it, to consider the departure of our Friends who have built us up, taught us, and labored for us, except here and there. I think but once since I have been a member has there been such a thing as a memorial. I have advocated it, and I think we are going to reach it. We are progressing, and the thought is to have a time in the yearly meeting, a memorial hour or day, or half a day, or whatever it may be, in which a record may be made, and records may come up from every department of the yearly meeting. So that as our Friends die, who have been laborers in the work of the Lord, we shall have a record of them. Then the historian will have something official that he can get at. In our western country, in all our yearly meetings, we are wonderfully behind in this matter, and to catch up and make up the deficiency of the past will be a very difficult thing for want of records, and we will need a historian in every yearly meeting to catch up these broken links. One important thing hinted at here in the remarks of Calvin Pritchard and others is, that God has been dealing with us as a people. We have the record of our beginning, a glowing record to the glory of God. We have a record, brief, and I think it ought to be very brief, of the dark days of the separations and of the lapse that took place in our church, continuing for more than a hundred years. God has revived us; he has blessed us and united us; he has raised up eminent servants, as in the beginning, to carry forward the work that was so well carried forward in the early days, and we have no record of it. It belongs to all parts of America, from one ocean to the other, and I think it is a move in the right direction and to the glory of God, to record his dealings with us in great mercy and in carrying us forward as he has in the past thirty or forty years.

CALVIN W. PRITCHARD, of Western: There is one part of the subject that I presented in the paper that I did

hope the Friends would say something about, and something that might be referred down to the yearly meetings, and that is the subject of trying to bring to light more fully and more impressively, the truth with reference to the Friends who first settled and suffered in Massachusetts. When I was east, a year ago last summer, I talked with a number of prominent Friends there, and they all felt the same way about it. I talked with Thomas Chase, and he took a great interest in it, and I had my mind upon him as one who might do this work and give it the character that would make it authority and set it before the church; but he has gone home. I think if we could say to the yearly meetings that we thought this ought to be done, and there could be a movement started by which there would be raised \$1,000 or \$2,000 to employ some one to go to the bottom of this thing, somebody who is eminent, somebody who is scholarly, somebody who has position and place in the world, whose words would carry with them authority, I think we would have done a noble thing for our church.

RICHARD H. THOMAS, of Baltimore: There is a book, not very large, which, while it may not deal with the history of early Friends so much as it might, yet may do so as clearly as it can be gotten at. It is the "Quaker Invasion of Massachusetts." The author of it has cleared up a good many of the misrepresentations, while allowing certain things which were not for the best. We can not make our early Friends absolutely perfect.

WILLIAM NICHOLSON, of Ohio: As Calvin Pritchard has the thing at heart, and we have had an expression of the Conference as to what we want, I would suggest that Calvin Pritchard be appointed to assist the clerk in getting a proper minute to present to the Conference at a future sitting.

ROBERT W. DOUGLAS, of Indiana: I have just talked a little with my friend, James Wood. It may be interesting to know that he is president of the Westchester Historical Society and stands very high in historical cir-

cles, and he would be authority in anything he says, and, inasmuch as he frequently spends his summers at Newport, I think he might be encouraged to look after this matter of the history of the Friends in Massachusetts, and I think something might come of it.

J. WARREN HAWKES, of New England: I want to say that since this matter came before us I have felt a deeper regret, perhaps, than at any other time in the course of the Conference that the chairman of our delegation, Augustine Jones, is not with us. I think he would be the very man to take hold of this matter and bring it to a satisfactory solution on behalf of New England and this Conference. I am willing to say to this Conference that we who are here, when we return to our homes and this matter comes before our yearly meeting, will do what we can to have this put in the proper shape.

CHAIRMAN: New England Friends will do what they can, the North Carolina Friends will do what they can, especially in regard to the unwritten history in the time of the war, and other Friends will do what they can. Will the matter thus be attended to?

(Expressions of a desire that it be so left.)

CHAIRMAN: I think that is the voice of the Conference. We are through with this subject, and the regular president of the Conference has now arrived. Perhaps I ought to have given an opportunity for the Conference to have expressed itself as to whether it would appoint Calvin W. Pritchard to assist the secretary in making a minute. (Consent.)

CHAIRMAN: The ruling of the chair will be that Calvin W. Pritchard is appointed. He has prepared this paper and knows the different points, and also will have the communication that came from Western Yearly Meeting. He is appointed to assist the secretary.

(Joseph John Mills takes the chair.)

CHAIRMAN: I am informed that the next business to claim the attention of the Conference is the recommendation from the Business Committee that Francis Thomas be allowed to present the subject of "Uniformity of Discipline for all the Yearly Meetings of America."

(APPENDIX K.)

DISCIPLINE.

BY FRANCIS W. THOMAS.

"By this term is to be understood all those arrangements and regulations which are instituted for the civil and religious benefit of a Christian church."

"The first meetings for discipline under our name were settled in the North of England, about the year 1653." (George Fox's Journal.) The first in which there are any records extant was held at Balby, near Doncaster, in Yorkshire, in the year 1656 (see Friends' Library, Vol. I., p. 68), at which time there were directions and advices issued addressed to the brethren in the North; and we are informed that the document refers to most of the points which now form the chief subjects of our Discipline.

"It contained the gospel order" of proceeding with delinquents; "advice to husbands and wives, to parents and children, to masters and servants; strict justice in trade; a faithful performance of civil offices in the government," etc. To which was soon after added "the care and support of the poor; against drunkenness and gaming; to admonish the careless and the slothful to diligence in truth's service; to look after their suffering brethren; and to arrange a system for marriage, and in doing this to reject priestly intervention." "And it is very manifest that there was a loving care maintained over the membership at large for their preservation from evil, that they might build them up in the faith and at last be found a holy church, without spot and blameless."

Such were the general outlines of church rules under which we were organized, and under which, for about a half century, we made a record for success which was

second to none before us. And yet our progress was not so much the result of the rules and code of discipline as it was the outcome of a well defined Christian character as seen in the living representatives of the membership, such a life as made them "living epistles, known and read of all men." And furthermore, our history would certainly sustain us in the statement that both the success and the propriety of the rules adopted were from the soundness of the doctrine held and preached. I think that I have it correct when I say that it was a Baptist writer of that day who said the reason "the Quakers outstripped them was because we maintained an itinerant ministry." Discipline is, as I believe, only a help in keeping in harmony after we have come into the organization.

We were then one people under one code of rules, and it was claimed they were "an advantage in the work."* We were then one in profession, with one law. Why should we not be so now, if we are the same we were then? I can not see any reason why not, especially for the American yearly meetings which we represent. It would certainly tend to prevent some contentions and promote harmony. As we make the same profession and are united under one name, let us have the same law.

Now, let us see briefly how it is in this regard: Indiana Yearly Meeting Discipline for 1864, 76 sections, 146 pages; Ohio Discipline for 1859, 81 sections, 116 pages; Philadelphia Discipline, 254 sections, 191 pages; New York Discipline for 1859, 140 sections, 133 pages; Indiana Discipline for 1878, 119 sections, 122 pages; Indiana Discipline for 1892, 121 sections, 133 pages; Iowa Discipline for 1865, 40 sections, 91 pages; Western Discipline for 1891, 143 sections, 154 pages.

The special points of difference I need not enter upon here; but we can easily discover there has been a good deal of change; and furthermore, so many alterations are not calculated to give respect to the law. I need not pursue this subject further at present; but may I not ask what great good has grown out of so much diversity? To my mind, more has come from abridgment than from any other side. And I should not wonder if we could

* Friends' Library, Vol. I., p. 69.

harmoniously agree. There might yet be spared some things from the rules, and the church be equally as strong, and more successful. We do not want to run out into legalism. But the history of the church since the days of the apostles shows that as life and a zeal for God declined, rules and edicts were multiplied, and we have not been an exception.

Shall we not then like men meet the demand, not rashly, but with patience and in hope, strive to agree? In doing this I know some of us, perhaps all, will have to give up some favorite opinion.

I can not believe we ought to have a rule in one yearly meeting that would not only jeopardize membership, but disown from the church for things which in another yearly meeting would not do so; and yet in another there would be no law on the subject.

Let us remember in union there is strength. May our ranks be so concentrated that we shall be found in supporting distance of one another.

FRANCIS W. THOMAS, of Indiana: I don't presume, in offering these suggestions, to bring to the mind of any the thought that we shall make a discipline that shall be unalterable, but I do think that the church has come to a time when we should make less alteration, but ought to unify so that to be a member in harmony with the church in one yearly meeting should make one a member in harmony with the church in any other yearly meeting, unless his character be impeached by the infraction of law or for immorality, or for some cause. I need not pursue that subject here. If the question is entertained at all by the Conference, that will be a matter that will have to come before the committee that will make comparisons of the disciplines of all the yearly meetings. I do hope that we shall somehow do this, and in doing it remove some of the difficulties which have appeared in some monthly meetings, and sometimes in quarterly meetings, in the past. I know very well that under some of our yearly meetings' rulings a member may be in good standing, but if he were to go out of that yearly meeting into some other, his right of membership would be put in

jeopardy immediately. Now, if that yearly meeting has authority to take up and convict and disown a person who left another yearly meeting in good standing, it is an abridgment of the right of membership. To be a member in the Society of Friends, I think, according to the understanding of the rights of a member, means that if we are members anywhere we are members everywhere. And difficulties will continue to arise out of these diversities of law. I submit the whole subject to the Conference.

CHAIRMAN: The paper of Francis W. Thomas is open for discussion by the Conference.

JOHN F. HANSON, of Iowa: In order to get this matter before the house I make the proposition that this Conference set apart a committee, Francis W. Thomas to be the chairman of that committee, to take this matter into consideration, and if there is anything to be formulated between this and another conference, that they report to another conference in five years.

JOHN HENRY DOUGLAS, of Iowa: I unite with the proposition.

CHAIRMAN: The members of the Conference have heard the proposition that has been made by John F. Hanson, that the whole question involved in Francis W. Thomas' paper be referred to a committee to report at a conference in five years from now, if such conference should be held.

ELWOOD SCOTT, of Indiana: I have no speech on the question myself, but I think it is right that we should have a little discussion on this question before this committee is appointed, to give an opportunity to know what the ideas of the people are in regard to the proposition. There are some who would like to say something in regard to this matter before we turn it over from this Conference for five years.

ROBERT W. DOUGLAS, of Indiana: I think we all feel very much interested in the statement that our friend made in regard to the desirability of a uniform Discipline throughout the yearly meetings. There may not be so much in it as some suppose, whether it can be practically done or not, but I can see very readily that about as easy a way to kill it as any is to appoint a committee to report in five years. In the good providence of the Lord a good many of us will be over the river by that time. I would amend the proposition by proposing that the committee be appointed now to report to a future session of this Conference.

JOHN F. HANSON, of Iowa: I wish to say in support of my proposition that if so many of the yearly meetings have just got new Disciplines, it would hardly be a practical thing to carry it out before five years any way, and what changes may be made between now and then we would have the benefit of. I feel very grateful to our dear aged father in the church for bringing the subject before the meeting, and the points he has brought out are well taken; but I don't see how we, in this Conference, can do anything with it, either as to discussing it or for any practical outcome. So I think it the best way to leave it in the hands of a committee.

DAVID B. UPDEGRAFF, of Ohio: It seems to me that a very brief expression of sentiment upon the merits of the question will certainly be in order first of all. I cannot very well see how any committee can give the report at a future session without having at least a few minutes of brief expression of sentiment upon the point so that we can catch the drift of feeling.

CHAIRMAN: The course proposed by David B. Updegraff is perfectly in order.

DAVID B. UPDEGRAFF, of Ohio: I should be glad if the proposition of Robert W. Douglas should be decided upon.

JAMES WOOD, of New York: The subject which has been laid before us is one of general interest to our church at large, and I am sure that all feel thankful to our friend, Francis Thomas, for calling the attention of the Conference to it. He has stated some considerations in favor of the proposition, but he has not, by any means, stated them all, I think. Let us look at this from all of its sides. I don't wish to speak either for or against the proposition, but simply, so far as I can, to open the subject a little further. This question, as it is going to affect us as a church in practical work, is confined to two points: First, membership. To this Francis Thomas has referred. Second, the ministry; and there, I apprehend, is where the great point lies as it affects the ministry, the common ministry of the body at large. Now the present status is this: A minister of one yearly meeting goes into another yearly meeting with a minute of credentials, and by courtesy, and by courtesy alone, he is received and is accorded all the privileges that would apply to him if he were a member and minister of that yearly meeting. Well, it is not good practical ground to have this in our church, simply a position of courtesy. Perhaps some strict localist would like to have it that way, because it gives authority of control over ministers that come from without the border of a meeting within the limit. On the other hand it is to an extent an impairment of the free intercourse that might be considered profitable in a body constituted like ours. That is the thing of really greater practical importance, I apprehend, than any other, because a removal certificate certainly carries membership by legal recognition, and is accepted as a matter of course under Quaker laws, unless there be some personal objection to the individual. Then beyond that this subject reaches out into all branches of church work; foreign missions, home missions, educational, and every branch and ramification of work is affected indirectly to a greater or less degree by this proposition. According to my understanding, and it may be that my understanding is quite limited, there we have the whole of the favorable side of this question as it affects the membership, more important far as it affects the free intercourse of the min-

istry, and again, as it affects our missionary work. On the other hand there are some practical difficulties. First, in the minds of a great many people there is at once this thought, The situation in the different yearly meetings is so different that different disciplinary regulations are required! Some will meet you with that, and they will stand to it very strongly. Then again, there is a sentiment in different yearly meetings that their particular Discipline is the best possible one, as: "Now I know this might be all right if you will only adopt the New York Discipline. Ask us to give up our Discipline? We have had our own hands in it. We cannot give that up. We prize it." That is a practical difficulty that will be almost insurmountable. Those are the two practical difficulties, so far as I can see, that must be contended with. It is an excellent thing that it is brought before the Society. The Society must have time to consider it and digest it. It is a thing that cannot be hurried. I should like to amend the proposition: That if it is to be reported upon, it be at the next General Conference. It may be next year.

JOHN F. HANSON, of Iowa: That is the intention; that it be reported on at the next Conference.

JAMES WOOD, of New York: You cannot consider it and report upon it at once, except in a very general aspect.

DAVID HADLEY, of Western: There are, at least, three subjects before the Conference from the Business Committee that involve a principle. One of them, I believe, is the design of a united missionary board; another, the publishing association; another, the Discipline, and no one can doubt or question the desirability of the church in the United States expressing itself in a consolidated and concentrated way, so that it shall be bound together in these relations. But the whole question of yearly meeting sovereignty and the independence of the yearly meetings is so closely connected with this question that it seems to me as though, while we are upon the skirmish-

ing ground of these points, we are not touching the principle. If we are ready, if the churches in these different yearly meetings are ready to become so unified in these relations that there can be some kind of yearly meeting subordination, or something of that kind, by which we can be bound together, then I can conceive this high ideal. I think we have reached this peculiar crisis in our church in which we are to become wholly independent of one another or we are to drift together in unification. I would be glad of the latter. And if we do this, we will have to melt in the crucible of tenderness and love and gentleness. I think this whole thing is covered in these three propositions of unification. I can in-dorse and reach the visionary ideal of one Discipline, but I cannot see it in the very near future.

THOMAS C. BROWN, of Western: I desire simply to remark that this question of one Discipline for all Friends, especially in America, is not a new question to me. It is a question that, in certain channels, was brought to my thought some years ago, and, in the providence of God, I have been at the buzz saw for two years on the subject of a Discipline, and in the arrangement of our own Discipline, and, in the providence of God, for one year I had in my possession a copy of a Discipline from every yearly meeting in the world, and frequently examined them and compared them with each other, and while there are difficulties that I can see, especially in reaching the point that is proposed in this, I think, excellent proposition that has come before this Conference, I think, with Christian hearts knit together, as the Christian hearts of Friends are, the ideal may be reached. It will require time. It will require years to do it, but I think that this is the entering wedge that will eventually reach that point. I can conceive that one Discipline might reach all the churches in America. Let me make an illustration, please. In this city is a Friends' church planted. They meet from time to time in this room. There are persons of large culture brought up in the Friends' church, who associate and constitute the members of the church at this place. In the same quarterly meeting I am familiar with

a church of which, I think, not a single member was brought up a Friend. They are all new members. I think our friend, David Hadley, had much to do with preaching the gospel in that neighborhood that resulted in planting the church. They are a rural people who were not brought up in the Friends' church, but under entirely different circumstances. Not only the same Discipline, but the same quarterly meeting organization adapts itself and adjusts itself to both these. If they can be reached, why may not, then, in the East and West and North and South, the different conditions be met by one church Discipline? These are matters that are not new to me. They are matters that I have thought about. There is this thought that looks to be practical, it is, that we form one general Discipline, and there may be latitude given, however, to arrange for the details of the work in the local Discipline that may be arranged in the different yearly meetings, a little like the Constitution of the United States and the state constitutions, so arranged as not to conflict with each other. I only throw that point out, however, as a suggestion.

Again, let me say, I think it exceedingly opportune that our friend and father in the church has brought the subject to the front. I feel quite sure it is one that somewhere in the future will reach the ideal that the writer has in his mind and in his heart. I sanction some move in that direction.

WILLIAM L. PEARSON, of Iowa: I am very thankful that Francis W. Thomas has brought this before us, being very suggestive, and I approve of the proposition of John F. Hanson for the reason that a recommendation to the yearly meetings may be very indefinite and be forgotten; and then for the reason that I believe it is impossible for us to think of a uniform Discipline being arrived at at all until we are one yearly meeting, or bound together in a conference, or something of that kind. I don't think it is quite possible to reach it. I was not quite sure but the subject was presented five years ago in the general conference. I know J. H. Stewart, who was one of the clerks of that conference, stated about that time to me

that he was very anxious to have such a thing done, that is, the preparation of a digest of discipline. Now the point just mentioned by the last speaker in regard to a constitution which should fit all the yearly meetings, reminds me of the fact that there are two points in discipline that are very important: one is constitution, and the other is rules of discipline, and with reference to constitution, certainly we might arrive at something very practical before a great while. I wish a committee might be appointed, and that this proposition of John F. Hanson might be acceded to, and we suggest to them to prepare, if possible, a digest of discipline to bring before the next Conference, and let the committee be large enough so that if some of our fathers should not be alive at that time, there would be enough left to present it.

EDMUND STANLEY, of Kansas: I am sorry that our time seems to be so limited for considering this subject. It has been, to my mind, with the exception, perhaps, of the subject considered yesterday, the most important subject that was likely to come before this Conference. If I understand the proposition made by Brother Hanson, I can not agree to it. I want to say, too, that I am very sorry to hear our friends talk of this matter as a thing in the far distance. It does seem to me that we are in a condition to move in this matter at once. It is true that we have not the time to prepare a Discipline here to submit to the yearly meetings, but we certainly do realize that the time has come that if we, as a church, expect to exert any great influence in the world, there is great need for a unity of action and unity of purpose. And it seems to me that we are not likely to reach it until we are a unit in the matter of discipline, and become one church organization all over the country. I can say as an individual member of one yearly meeting that I would gladly to-day accept any Discipline extant on the American continent in preference to my choice rather than have the diversity of Disciplines that we find in our country. Any one of the Disciplines would be better for us as a whole than the different Disciplines we have in our different yearly meetings. Dear friends, if any of our members are so much attached

to the Discipline of their particular yearly meeting, let us have that Discipline for all yearly meetings, and be a unit on this subject, and have one Discipline for the direction of all the church organizations known as the Society of Friends in America. I do believe it is time for us to act in this matter. It is an important matter. It is a matter that, if taken hold of in the proper way, will unify the church and give us strength and character in the world and will do us much good. I see no way at the present time for us to move in this matter unless we have a committee appointed from this Conference to submit a copy of a Discipline to the next meeting of the Conference for ratification of the Conference, and to be submitted to all the yearly meetings. I think we ought to take that step, and I think the time is not far distant when that Conference will be called and the matter brought up.

JAMES CAREY THOMAS, of Baltimore: In reference to the way the discipline of the Society of Friends has been made, as I understand it, it has been received by us in its general features from the Discipline of London Yearly Meeting, but each yearly meeting has had power so to modify its rules according to any emergency or exigency, that from time to time Disciplines have been adopted to embody the prevailing sense and customs of the yearly meeting. Our Discipline has been modified in that way. It has been made to conform to the real needs and necessities of the church in its progress, and to the changes which must necessarily take place from the circumstances and surroundings affecting the church in its work. It does seem to me that a Discipline which prevents such change and modification according to the circumstances in the church, and at the time, would be a very great detriment to the progress of the church. We would have to alter our whole situation. I know there are some Friends whose opinion I value, who think there ought to be a delegative body like this, with authority over all the churches, to say what they should do and should not do. I never shared that view. I never expect to share it. And I believe there will be found practical difficulties in the adjustment of a Discipline which will suit all com-

munities and circumstances, unless the church itself has power of modification. Our view hitherto has been that the yearly meeting may change the discipline for the church in that place. I believe that has worked well, and I believe we have substantial agreement on the great general principles, but as to the discipline, the administration of those principles, that depends upon the local conditions, and must be within the power of the local church to modify according to the mind of the Spirit and not of the membership.

HANNAH E. SLEEPER, of Kansas: I don't think the yearly meetings of the central and eastern states have ever felt the need of this uniform Discipline that we of Kansas Yearly Meeting do, because Kansas Yearly Meeting is formed of members from every yearly meeting on the face of the globe, and of different nationalities, of Indians and all classes of people, and they come up there to our yearly meeting from among the diversities of Discipline that they have been brought up under. You see at once how it is and how much better it would be for Kansas Yearly Meeting, at least, if we had a uniform Discipline, especially for the United States.

NATHAN T. FRAME, of Wilmington: I am very glad to have here the subject presented by our dear friend, Francis W. Thomas, and I am in full sympathy with the proposition of referring the matter to the next general conference.

CHAIRMAN: There will not be time for further discussion of this proposition at this session of the Conference. Is it the will of the Conference to resume the discussion at the beginning of the evening session? (Expressions of dissent.)

CHAIRMAN: The chair understands that the feeling of the Conference is that this proposition shall be passed upon at the present time. The proposition is that a committee shall be appointed out of the Conference to which shall be referred this proposition, and it shall be their

duty to report to the next general conference upon the question of "Uniformity of Discipline in the different Yearly Meetings."

JAMES WOOD, of New York: I would offer a substitute to that, on reflection: that the subject be referred to the yearly meetings on the minutes of this Conference, simply for their consideration. You can not hurry this matter at all. (Expressions of approval.)

-LUKE WOODARD, of Indiana: I think I am in favor of the amendment. A future conference may be a contingency.

EDMUND STANLEY, of Kansas: I don't look upon a future conference as a contingency. We think it is provided for. I propose an amendment to the amendment, that this Conference set aside a committee to draft a copy of Discipline to be considered at the next Conference, and if accepted by the Conference, to be then submitted to the yearly meetings. (A voice in approval.)

ROBERT W. DOUGLAS, of Indiana: I think I offered an amendment awhile ago, that a committee be appointed to get together and consider this matter and report to a future session of this Conference. We can not discuss it any more. I think it would be very desirable to take it out of the general discussion of this Conference. Let us appoint a good judicious committee, and let that committee consider and report to a future session of this Conference what is best to do, and I think we can dispose of it in two minutes.

CHAIRMAN: The proposition of Robert W. Douglas takes precedence. He offered it very early. His proposition is to substitute in place of the original proposition this: That a committee be appointed in this Conference to consider Francis W. Thomas' paper and report upon it to a future session of this present Conference. (Consent.)

CHAIRMAN: The chair understands that the proposi-

tion of Robert W. Douglas has been accepted by the Conference.

(Several voices ask the chair to appoint this committee.)

CHAIRMAN: The chair will ask time until another session, and will report one from each delegation at the opening of the next session.

The chair would take the liberty to call the attention of the Conference to the fact that the hour of the evening meeting is inconveniently early for Friends stopping at the hotels.

ALLEN JAY, of Indiana: I propose that we adjourn to meet at half-past seven, and that hereafter the evening session begin at that hour. (Consent.)

CHAIRMAN: Then the evening session will begin at half-past seven o'clock, and promptly at that hour.

The Business Committee offer the following subjects for discussion at the evening session, or thereafter, in order: First, a foreign missionary board for all the American yearly meetings; second, the duty of the church toward our cities.

Both of these are topics of very great interest and importance. If there is no other business we will adjourn in the usual manner by waiting upon the Lord a few minutes for his blessing.

After prayer, Conference adjourned until 7:30 P.M.

EVENING SESSION — 7:30 O'CLOCK.

The seventh session of the Conference was called to order by the chairman, and opened with singing and prayer.

CHAIRMAN: The Conference will remember that at the afternoon session it was ordered that the chair should announce at this time the names of the committee to which should be referred Francis W. Thomas' paper upon

“Uniformity of Discipline for all the Yearly Meetings.” The chair is conscious of the fact that the right constitution of these committees is an exceedingly difficult matter. It is not worth while to discuss the difficulties that lie in the way of a single person making up committees out of a delegate body as this is. One of the embarrassments, however, under which I have labored, is that I have not known what delegates have been assigned duties. I offer this committee, which may be subject to amendment if the Conference so choose. I may say, however, that it was in the original proposition that Francis W. Thomas should be chairman of that committee. (For the names see minutes, page 19.)

LUKE WOODARD, of Indiana: I am satisfied with the nominations.

(Other expressions of satisfaction.)

CHAIRMAN: Is there any other miscellaneous business to claim the attention of the Conference before we proceed to the regular order of the evening?

If not, we will take up the first subject presented by the Business Committee, namely: One foreign missionary board for all the American yearly meetings. The Business Committee has arranged that Mahalah Jay, of Indiana, will open the discussion.

MAHALAH JAY, of Indiana: If the chairman please, I did not know until an hour or two ago that I would be depended upon to lead in this discussion; therefore, I come before the Conference with just a few notes hastily jotted down, instead of a paper.

It is the mission of the church on earth to spread the gospel. The commission was given us by Christ himself, “Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature.” He is the head of the church, and, therefore, the command is imperative and is authoritative; the command is brief and it is plain. He decides the place and he decides the message; to us it is only left to determine how we may best carry that message, carry out that com-

mand. That, as I understand, is the point we want to discuss to-night, whether we can best carry it out by means of a united American board or otherwise.

We all recognize the principle that "in union there is strength;" that we cannot, by dividing up and some doing one part and some doing another part without concert of action or specific end toward which we all are moving, do the same effective work and wield the same influence that we could if the parts of our work were not so detached. Now, the business given to the church by Christ is a great business, a great and important work, and we ought to put into it our best energies and our whole strength. We cannot do it, in my judgment, unless we work unitedly. It is impossible for us to take up that work with the greatest success in more independent divisions than there are yearly meetings, one doing a little here and another a little there without any definite or concentrated aim, except that we all want to carry out our Saviour's command. We all want to work in this field: I will assume there is no one here who does not believe it is our duty, as a branch of the church of Christ, to take up this work and to carry it on; and we are taking it up, we have taken it up. But we seem to me very much like children of a family with a great work before that family, in which each child chooses his own part and is going ahead and doing his little part just where he will, as fancy or accident may determine, yet doing it in earnest. I think we are, in all our separate divisions of foreign mission work, doing it in earnest and with the spirit of our Master, but not with the method that becomes the dignity and greatness of the work, a work for all the world, whose final mighty import is the eternal salvation of precious souls. Now, a family working in that way can never, I think, advance its work as a family should. The ideal family has a parental head. That head considers the whole work, and directs the children. That does not mean, necessarily, that it takes away from the children their choice. Often it is the parents' wish and the parents' skill in managing the work to give to each child just the part it has chosen, nevertheless to combine all their efforts into one grand whole. That is what I think

we ought to do, and can do, and must do, before we can do our work as a denomination, as a family among the denominations of protestant Christendom. We must do it by combined effort, by having a head to our family, and having the work of the children linked together in some way as a family work. I want that we may—for I will keep up the figure—be an ideal or typical family. The parental head shall not be of one nor of the other sex, but of both, a father and a mother. If we see a mother directing an important work alone and guiding her children alone, it suggests widowhood; it suggests nothing else to me but widowhood; and it is even a sadder sight to see the father of the family having to direct all the work of all his little children without a mother's help. We want a joint board of men and women.

As far as we have tried it in these American yearly meetings, the model of our associated executive committee on Indian affairs is the best we have, and we can improve upon that model, I think, in one way, by having both sexes more equally represented than on that committee. We may want to vary from that model in other ways, but that gives us the idea of what I want to see in our church, all the parts of our foreign mission work bound together as one whole. Here in this Conference of all the yearly meetings we might begin the work of forming a board that would in time result in giving this central or parental head to our mission work.

Without elaborating anything more of my plan, I want to answer one objection that has from time to time been brought to me, viz: that as we do not want to interfere with any work that is being done, to form such a board with nothing to do would be folly. Now I think there would be something for it to do very soon. We need direction in our work; we need stability in our work; we need to have some counseling head that has looked over all the ground to advise us where to take up a field, what to do, how to combine our efforts to the best advantage. This board might do that without usurping authority over the work now in progress.

Then there is another work, a work that lies near my heart, a work to which no yearly meeting, as far as I know,

has, to any extent, set its hand or engaged in in any way. The thought of it came to me very forcibly as I heard the cannons boom to-night. To-morrow is Columbus Day. Do you know what that means? It calls our memories back to the time when Columbus came here, when he brought his people and his religion, or, at least, opened the way for them to come. He brought the best religion he had. I am not faulting him for that, but that religion has become wonderfully mixed up with idolatry on this continent, and wonderfully degraded in itself. It has become mixed up with the pagan idolatry of the aboriginal inhabitants whom he found here, and now we have here a mixed race that may date their origin as a people to his coming, the Mexicans of our country. I am not speaking of Mexico. I am speaking of the Spanish-speaking Mexican people in the United States. We all agree we owe the Indians in our country a great debt of Christian care and teaching. We came here and dispossessed them of their lands. There is no people to whom we owe more of obligation to carry them the gospel as Christ commanded than we do to the North American Indians. Second to them only is the debt we owe to the Mexican people who inhabit our southwest border. There you find more Mexicans than Americans, a people with a mixture of superstitions as much pagan as Roman Catholic for their religion; a people mostly very degraded, ignorant and poor; a people not speaking our language insomuch that in some portions of the country our laws have to be translated into their language before they can understand them. These people stand here in relation to us almost as do the Indians. They are not under our government by choice, at least few of them are. As a people they are here because of our conquest or purchase, without their individual agreement to it, of their homes, the land that once belonged to their country, and I think our nation owes them an education, training them to our habits of thought, to our civilization, to a knowledge of our government, and whatever belongs to good citizenship under it, but the underlying stable foundation of all such training lies in the preaching of the gospel. We can have no permanent civilization, no permanent growth in any of these things

that make profitable children of the state without Christianity, without the gospel. This is a mission field in which we might at once work if we had our united missionary board. I am very anxious, as I look over the vast numbers of these people that throng our southwest border, that we should see our way out to them. We certainly have not seen it. We have let them stay there years on years in about the same condition. Really there has been very little church work done among them. The "New West" educational movement of the Congregational church has reached them, but it is not essentially a religious work, and it has only reached them in a few places. The field is open to us. I have had letter after letter from persons acquainted or residing in western Texas and New Mexico, asking that Friends take hold of that work, and saying the place was open and the people ready; that many of them, especially the men, were, as it were, disenchanted of their old forms of religion, and there was nothing brought to them that was any better. This is a field where I think Friends' new board, if they would form one right away, could, as in the Indian work, have a field for their united labor without touching any work now organized.

CHAIRMAN: This subject is open for further discussion by the Conference.

██████████

J. WALTER MALONE, of Ohio: I am so glad to-night to be able to speak on this subject. My dear wife and I have been feeling the pulse of our sons and daughters from the rock-bound coast of New England to the golden gate of the West on this very question. If there is one question above another that stirs our hearts it is this question of foreign missions. Beloved, He, who gave His only Son to be a foreign missionary for you and me—what should we do for Him? And so these days of the past weeks and months have been heart-searching days with us. We have been asking God how he could use us; our hearts have gone across the vast expanse of waters into those heathen countries where the people have never heard of our Christ. O, I love to preach the gos-

pel to those in this country who have heard it, but when I remember that there are in this world to-day one billion five hundred million people, most of whom know nothing about Jesus, my heart burns for them. We have little conception, perchance, of what that number means, but if the great procession should begin to-night and pass by us, one every second as the night goes on and the morning breaks, and the mornings go on one after another, and the fall and winter pass on and the springtime comes, and the summer, and the year rolls around and another Christmas comes, another summer, and still another, until the boy is grown into manhood and the man gray with years, that procession would still be passing by faster than one a second, till fifty years go by; and only just a few, comparatively, of all these hundreds of millions, have heard about Jesus Christ. My heart breaks for them as I think that since the Master gave us the commission: "Go ye," "Go ye over this whole globe of ours," death has swept it sixty times perhaps; and the years grow into centuries, a thousand years go by, and yet that procession is still passing, one every second, into death, with only one here and there ever having heard that there was such a person as Jesus Christ of Nazareth. O, it makes my heart ache as I think that we have not gone faster than we have been going; a thousand years, they have passed by, and we have been in our comfortable homes, some of us, and said: "O, yes, we will do something." But what are we going to do? I think it is time we were doing it. The signs of the ages are that we will have only a little while longer to be in the old battle. The signs are indicating the approach of the day when the Lord himself will come and take them unto himself, and we must be in haste about it. That is one great reason why I am in haste that our Friends' church somehow shall put on her armor and go to work as God intended her to do. Already it seems that from our eastern countries we can hear the rolling of the chariot wheels of the coming King, and he said: "Go ye." I don't wonder at the story told by that grand old man, Rev. Dr. Chamberlain. He went to Brazil and found an old veteran of eighty summers, and told him about Jesus, and that old patriarch accepted it

as a little child, and turned to the missionary with tears in his eyes and said: "O, sir, that is what I have been longing for all these years. But, O, tell me where was your father when my father lived, that no one ever came to tell him?" Beloved, you and I will have to answer that question one of these days. Where were we? We have, in some of our meetings, a half dozen preachers. Bishop Thoburn, as my wife and I sat with him with a little company that were already starting for India, said, "I can give you missionaries any amount of parishes with a million souls that have never heard of the lowly Nazarene that walked up and down your Palestine." Ah, there is a missionary field, a parish for our young men and women. It seems as if we were crowded in this day and generation when on every side they are building churches by the score. There is a little Friends' church in Cleveland, and on the next square they have built a Disciple's church, and on the next square but one a Congregational church, another two squares and there is a Presbyterian church, and on the other side of that a Methodist church, and across the street a little United Brethren church, and next to us, two or three doors, they have planted another kind of a church, and they are running a kind of a competition all the time, and I said, "I wish God would set some of these hearts on fire and send them off where they have not heard about Jesus, where the competition is not so great."

A friend the other day came into the office, his heart all bleeding for India, and he sat down on the desk and said: "Mr. Malone, can't you give us some missionaries for India? Why, there is a district up next to mine larger than the state of Ohio, with great towns and cities in it, two hundred villages and cities and towns, and they have not a single Bible reader in all their numbers;" and we are crowding ourselves, and I don't wonder the Master is waking us up and calling unto our sons and daughters, "Go ye." O, I thank God they are hearing the call. We have already in our little school in Cleveland more than seven yearly meetings represented by your sons and daughters, and their hearts are aching for a field, and many of them are going over yonder, I thank

God; and he is going to give us the privilege of sending them out yonder to where they will have a million souls to preach to without any fussing about it or competition at all. And so I thank God. I would just as soon have a church over there.

When that grand young man, Judson, came home from college, having finished his education and graduated with honors from the theological department, his father greeted him and said: "My son, we are so glad to see you back home, graduated as a minister. The South Park church, of Boston, has opened her doors, and you are to be made associate pastor of that great church." Judson turned to his father, perhaps a little disappointed that he received him so, and said: "Father, South Park church of Boston will never have your son for associate pastor!" The foreign field was Judson's. Years went by; perhaps thirty years after, the South Park church of Boston had a thousand members, but in grand old Judson's parish, in yonder field, he had thirty thousand members in his own little church. Ah, I say to the young men and women that they may have a parish of a million that never have heard of Jesus! The King's supper is ready. He has made a great feast, and he has bidden many on every hand who have said, I pray thee have me excused. my business is such that I cannot leave it, or my wife and family need me and I cannot go; but the Lord said: "None of these! Go out into the highways and hedges and compel them to come in." Their souls are just as precious as these.

I had a telegram from Bishop Thoburn saying, "Passage is engaged for all four of your missionaries." I thank God for the privilege of having four sail for India within the next month, and I tell you, beloved, there are thousands of men and women in our Friends' meetings who are waiting to go to some foreign shore to preach the gospel. We must be in haste about it in these days. We must arrange somehow to send them.

I believe it is not left with the mothers only. I believe in women's foreign missionary societies; but I would love to see us men also with our shoulders under the wheel, making ready for Christ's coming. He said, "Go

ye into all the world." He did not say, because it is easier to stay at home to preach, to stay there.

There is a little illustration that my wife uses, I know she will let me use it to-night, about building the great Atlantic and Pacific railroad. The contract was given out to build the road. One contract was given for a thousand miles, and the contractor struck a good rock up in Dakota. He found it nice and easy level building, and so he just built his thousand miles zigzag across Dakota because it was such easy building. When he came for his pay and said, "My thousand miles are built, sir," the owner said, "Where did you build it?" "O, I struck such easy rock, I built it all in Dakota." "But," the master said, "The purpose of the railroad was to connect the East with the West. Your railroad is useless." Christ wants the message proclaimed because he wants it announced that he is coming one of these days. He wants us to go and tell everybody, and be in haste about it; not only tell people here and there where it is easy going, but to go where he says and tell all the world.

I want us to go forward in this as we never have in anything. Let me illustrate how men will go when their hearts are stirred up, when God is talking with them. Last winter a man came into the theater where our work was going on, a beastly looking drunkard, one of the worst specimens. He wanted Jesus. The first thing we knew his heart was converted. He had given his heart to the Lord Jesus Christ. "Where do you suppose I found myself the other night?" he said; "I found myself—no, I didn't find myself there, but two policemen found me down on River street frozen in the ice, and they had to get an ax to cut me out, and they arrested me." "But," said he, "I have just been saved through and through to-night. I praise God. I have not been in a church for forty-seven years, and now I am going up to the little Quaker church next Sunday morning. O, I am glad God saved me." The other day he was in the foreign missionary society. It was the first time the poor fellow had had a new suit of clothes on in a good many years. They were taking up a collection, and he said: "Friends, I will tell you what I want to do. I am getting

seven dollars a week, the least money I have worked for in a good while. I have been around the world several times. I want to go to this little Quaker meeting, and I want to give three dollars and a half of my seven dollars for the preaching of the gospel to people who have never heard of Jesus." O, if some of our hearts would get stirred up like that! And God wants to stir them. I tell you there is a sound of a going in the mulberry trees, and it is the sound of the chariot and the train that is bearing your sons and daughters to some foreign field where they can preach the gospel to men and women who are accepting it so easily. God wants to see what you will do about it. What are you going to do about it? A few nights ago my wife and I told them in our meeting what the under-current was in their sons' and daughters' hearts. Some of them know pretty well. We told them how God had been talking to them about going to some foreign field, and when we asked them how many there were in that house, young men and women, whom God had called to go to the foreign field, whom God had been asking, to arise, over a dozen arose right there. And when we asked how many God had spoken to to-night, saying he wanted them in the foreign field, another dozen arose; and around the altars we knelt to pray because God had opened the way for them to go. So the sons and daughters are going. God has given us young ministers. The people are coming up by the scores, and they want you to make ready for their going, through a foreign missionary society of our yearly meetings.

We have started a little church over in China, and expect to have another in India, and expect to have another in Mexico. O, it is easy to get a Quaker church, and we would love to have them all over the plains of the West and Northwest. We would like to have them reach from the Golden Gate to the grand granite state, and if we get into line with God that is what he wants us to do. A word of prophecy, perchance you will say, but I tell you that in Friends' meetings to-day there are over a hundred young men and women waiting for you to open the doors for them to go to people who never heard of Jesus. Will we do it? Over a hundred of her sons and

daughters waiting! Over a hundred! Yes, there are twice that many waiting to go. Ah, the times of George Fox are upon us, when we are to go here and there and tell the story, but we can not do it with one little society here and another there, and another there. We want one that will cluster us together so that we may pull together; a society that will send all these young people out, and in the next ten years we will not only double our society here in the United States, but we will double it again in foreign fields if we just let God work. Let us do it. I wish to-night that somehow something could be done that would make us of one mind until every man and woman in our Friends' meetings everywhere would say, Here, Lord, I will do the best I can, and ask of God large things. I expect, in the next decade, if we tarry until that time, we shall see over one hundred of our sons and daughters in some foreign field. Let us do it. In some way I trust this Conference will be led in the right direction for a foreign board. Let us do it. God grant that we will do it.

MATILDA W. ATKINSON, of Iowa: Two years ago I found in Iowa Yearly Meeting that there were thirty student volunteers within the limits of the yearly meeting, and I found that there was very little expectation of power at that time for the yearly meeting to support two missionaries, and my heart was troubled. I talked it over with an old father in the church, and when I remarked to him that if those young people were faithful to the Lord in the pledge they had taken, and if they kept asking the Lord to open the way for them to go, he would open it and they would go, and it would not be through the Friends' church; if their fathers and mothers would not make the way for them and they minded the Lord, they would go through some other way, some other church would send them out, and pray for them, and reap the fruit of their labor and reward by and by; "Well," he said, "don't say anything about this so that the young people will get hold of it, for I am afraid they will." I did want to say it everywhere, so that the fathers and mothers would lay it to heart. I find the Friends are a

kind of jealous church. They don't like to lose any of their people, and they are so glad when somebody comes in from some place else. Well, friends, I hope that you will lose every one that God has called and you wont send, and I pray that it may be so, for I do love the Lord Jesus Christ better than the Friends' church, and now, to-day, this question comes right to you here. You look like the representatives of the Friends' church of America ; you look like you represented those at home, and there was a responsibility on your hearts and minds and in your hands. What are you going to do with the question of a Foreign Missionary Board that will take every student volunteer and every other volunteer who shall apply to you, saying, my heart burns for this work here, or there, or yonder? I have been thinking these last two days about what I have seen in five short years in the service of the Lord. I cannot tell you just how many thousands of souls I have seen come to Jesus Christ, nor how many of them I have heard testify to the saving grace of God and the assurances of it in their souls. I wish I had begun counting and keeping the name and date of every one who said to me personally, "I have felt God calling me to the ministry ; I have felt God calling me to the foreign missionary work." I am beginning to keep a little record of it now. That is what comes of our revival meetings in the West. God calls ministers and missionaries out. From our little meeting missionaries and ministers are going out, and I am praying God every day that he will make more missionaries and more ministers. We want to teach and train them. We want to say, This church is not an admiration society. We don't want you to sit down and look into each other's faces. You get restless under that. Just as soon as we start out of the central organization, and repeat ourselves, there is perfect harmony at home, perfect love for each other, and there is no trouble about quarrels and dissension. A church that will not repeat itself in a God-given time and God-given strength is a failure as a church. Did you know it? And unless the Friends' church to-day, within the time allotted by God, I don't know how long it is, shall repeat itself, multiply itself all over the wide world, where-

ever there are open doors, the Friends' church, that you and I are beginning to be so proud of, will have reason for shame instead of pride. If you cannot praise God in ten years from now for churches in other lands besides America, and not a few little stations here and there, you will have reason for shame instead of pride. I don't want you to have to go back to George Fox and compliment each other because you are descendants of the same religion he was. It wont do. Friends, you cannot live on that. You have got to have something else to compliment each other about. You have got to say we have multiplied ourselves, by the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, in every country where God made an open door for us.

But now my heart is more concerned for those young people who feel God's call, and have, upon their bended knees, prostrate before God, promised him that they would follow ; that they would serve him in the missionary work. I am concerned for them, and I want you to lose them if you wont take hold right now and send them out. And how better can you do it than by having a missionary board of all these yearly meetings? Did you know there was not a better thing in all the wide world, under God's shining sun and stars, in all the yearly meetings of America, than that very same missionary board, where we shall forget Disciplines and mooted questions between us, and all of us be striving to send out into the whole wide world those who will tell of the Lord Jesus Christ, his love and his salvation? Now, I sit down to-night to listen to the rest. Between every one of your sentences will be a prayer that God will lay it on the heart of this Conference in such a way that we cannot feel easy, cannot rest until we do this thing in the Master's name and the Master's strength, that by and by we may share the joy of our Lord.

CHAIRMAN: The Conference will pardon me for asking for a moment the sympathy of the Conference itself. This is an intensely interesting discussion and a great many friends are strongly moved, and I think not less than six people have appealed for the floor since the last

speaker sat down. It puts the chair in a very embarrassing position. I know of no better way than to recognize each in the order in which he claimed the floor.

A FRIEND: Might I suggest that the speakers confine themselves more closely to the subject in hand?

CHAIRMAN: It is very difficult to say in this case just where the limitations of the subject shall lie. Perhaps, it is as well that the speakers confine themselves to the question of the formation of a foreign missionary board, without any general discussion.

M. M. BINFORD, of Indiana: Of course any one would with a great deal of hesitancy break in upon the spell which the earnest exhortations have made in this meeting, but we may comfort our hearts with the feelings which they cause, and our hearts may be carried into fruit-bearing in whatever way the Lord may see to lead us in the matter before us. Of course the question for immediate discussion is that of the formation of this missionary board. It has been suggested to me to speak a little upon this matter, not because I am understood to favor one side or the other, I think. I should just like to drop a few suggestions upon the general question. I have, with a pardonable degree of church pride, been somewhat pained, as I have no doubt many of you have, to find that under our present system we have no way of finding out what we are doing. I received with great pleasure the Cyclopaedia of Foreign Missions some months ago, and I think, except as to the Madagascar work, you could put upon one page all that is said about Friends' missions throughout the world. One of the first things, then, that comes to us is that the scattered condition of our work makes it almost impossible for us to get an adequate idea of it ourselves, much less give others an idea of what we are doing. Then comes at once the question of the formation of a central board for the dissemination of missionary intelligence among ourselves in harmony with the thought of Dr. Pierson, that if we would have an acting people we must have a people in-

formed as to the work concerning which they are to act. I can certainly see at once great possibilities in this line. Whether or not it shall result at once in the publication of a missionary periodical, which is a somewhat hazardous enterprise when all the work of the church is considered, especially when only on the subject of missionary work, whether it shall result in that or not, if such a board shall be formed, certainly in some way we can inform our own people a little better of what has been done and what has been contemplated in the missionary field.

Perhaps I may name one more thing in reference to that, and that is that a central board, with careful study of the field, as suggested by Dr. Maybee in an address before the National Christian Association, ought to acquire an experience which will be very valuable in directing missionary movements in time to come.

On the other side there are some things I ought to say. In the first place, two of the most remarkable missionary men of our time, Dr. Pierson and Dr. Gordon, names I think familiar to all of us, especially the former, and to many of us the latter, have strongly-written arguments in the *Missionary Review* last year, urging what Dr. Gordon is pleased to call the decentralization of missionary boards, and making the recommendation that, in some way, instead of centralizing everything in a great board, and putting the management of the missionary work as far as possible from the churches, on the contrary it should be divided and subdivided until the people themselves will come in contact with the work more directly and feel their own responsibility because of missionaries in the field with whom they are in actual contact. So he is pleading, with all his experience and wisdom in the matter, for the very thing which we have in the yearly meeting boards to-day. Dr. Pierson has reached a similar conclusion, that the movements of God in our time seem to point toward the sending out of missionaries by smaller organizations, so that people are brought into contact personally with it, and their enthusiasm is not lost in great boards. I confess while I wait before God to know what shall be our duty in this matter, that up to this time I share in the views advanced by

these able men of God. There are other questions in connection with it. The expense is no small matter. Another thing, great flexibility of method seems to characterize this missionary work. We all know what trouble our Methodist missionary brethren have had in getting Bishop Taylor located where they could manage him. They never could do anything but to take him as he is. Those who have always looked at things from an Antioch standpoint cannot blame the Bishop for looking at them from a Jerusalem standpoint. So the flexibility seems to demand that there shall not be central boards. Let us leave the largest liberty for God to lead us on in this grandest question of our time. How hard it is for me to keep from saying something along the line of what Walter Malone said. May God bless those Christian Endeavorers who have said they are ready to go to this work.

HARRIETTE D. COLLINS, of New England: I feel thankful that I came from New England to hear what I have heard to-night. I feel paid for every step of the way. Perhaps there is no one theme in all the many interests we have in our church that comes so near my own heart as this. In the prime of my womanhood I came out of another denomination and joined the Society of Friends, came from principle, and after becoming a member of this church I looked upon the map to see where our missionary fields were. We had not started in New England, then, our Eli and Sybil Jones Mission. We had hardly heard that there was such a work over there, but when the very first sound of that mission came to us, when Eli Jones told in our yearly meeting what he thought could be done, I forgot I was a Quaker, and thought I was a Methodist, and I said, "Bless the Lord!" Now, to-night I feel such a deep abiding interest in this church, and I just feel that you can do it. I know you can do it. I feel such a confidence in Friends that we shall do the right thing. I have seen that wonderful mission go on day after day. I have felt a deep and constant interest in it. We have sent the best out of our hearts and our homes over on the other side to do that work, but God has wonder-

fully blessed the work. I do believe with our sister and brother that we need to be united together as one. Perhaps it may not be the best way to have one great center for all our work, but if there were one great center it need not in any way cripple the hands of those in every part of our heritage. Everybody might have a chance for this work. From the time of my earliest childhood, when I used to look into the fire and say, "When I am grown I will ask the church to send me as a missionary," I have had an interest in this work. God has had other ways for me, but I can say that there have been those of our own, those who have been taught beside me and in my own household, who have been called and willing to take their lives in their hands, and carry the gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ into the benighted lands of the world. I do so desire that we, as a people, may wake up to this. We can never be a people whose God is the Lord, and who have success in the world, no matter what our faith may be, unless we plant our feet firmly upon that one platform, For God and for humanity. Over on the other side they need us, our sisters; we of this land, where we have so much to be grateful for, need to send the gospel there. I know, perhaps, I am off the central point, but I do desire that we may unite together, and that God may direct us with great wisdom, and grace may be given to us that we may do this just right, and do it quickly. My brother has said we should be in haste. I am in haste, because the gray hairs are coming in my head, and I have only a little while to stay. I want to see this work while I live. May God give us great grace and wisdom in our deliberations to-night.

EMMA B. MALONE, of Ohio: Dear ones, my heart is on fire for those who have not heard of the Lord. There are very many of us here to-night who have been connected with the missionary work in our own yearly meetings, and for what have we been praying the last few years? For what have we had days set apart for prayer? Why have we asked and invited our pastors all over our yearly meetings to preach missionary sermons? For what have we been preparing? It has been to educate our

people to know that there is work beyond for them. We have been laying it upon the hearts of our young people, perhaps not in our own families, but upon the hearts of the young people outside, that there is a land beyond that knows not our Lord, and so we do need to be ready to carry out the answer to our prayer. We have asked God to raise up and send forth laborers into the vineyard, and now they come, young people from all over our country; and what are we going to do with them? Our boards are afraid to undertake it. They think they have not the means and know not whether they have the support of the church behind them or not. Dear friends, we want to make ready for them. It seems to me I can see the army coming all around, young people out of our own homes; and bless the Lord it is the highest honor he can lay upon any of your children, dear fathers and mothers, to send them to a foreign field. Was it not William Carey who said, "My son has descended from being a minister of the gospel to being a minister of the United Kingdom of Great Britain;" and so it is with one who can be a minister of Jesus Christ in foreign lands. What was St. Paul's ambition? It was that he might preach the gospel where the gospel was not preached. Let us go where we can have a parish that is uncontested, and have all that we can lead to the Lord Jesus. What is the undercurrent of thought among the heathen to-day? Bishop Thoburn said that the whole undercurrent of India was a belief that there was a great day just ahead of them. He said that at first they thought perhaps it was a local affair, they heard it in the districts around about them. But they went down to the southern part of India and they found the same thing there, the people just trembling, saying, there is a great day ahead of us. He thought, perhaps, it belonged to India, to some of the teaching they had there, but when he stepped over in China he found the same undercurrent there. Dear friends, when the supper was ready then the message was sent out to invite the guests. Do you know we are living in the last part of the sixth thousand years? The seventh thousand years is just ahead of us. What does it mean? Those people are looking forward to the

bringing in of Christianity generally, looking for better days, and what we speak of as the millennium. Are we ready to respond to it? We must make a way, whatever we deem most efficient, whether a united board or not. Let us be ready to carry forward the answer to our prayers.

FRANCIS W. THOMAS, of Indiana: This is one of the great questions that interest our people and out of which is to come in its reflex action an influence, I imagine, a mighty growth, a healthful, regenerating influence upon us at home. The fallow ground is being broken up. The preparation is being made for a grander ingathering under the banner of the Prince of Peace, under our name, I believe, than was ever yet known since we were a people. Some have thought that we were traveling slowly. I imagine that we are traveling just as fast as we are able to, taking all the conditions of society out of which we have so recently come, into consideration.

I am in favor of the formation of a central board for these reasons: the progress of civilization and the Christianization of the world, the making of railroads through heathen countries will carry the opportunity and make the demand, as I apprehend, for a larger and more comprehensive understanding of the management of this question than any local committee will be able to command and direct. For this reason I am in favor of centralization to a certain extent, at least, and the formation of this central board. I don't think that that necessarily will cut off those yearly meeting organizations, which would be subsidiary to the central one all the time. I hope that in view of the great demand, both for means and the directing effect in the appropriation of that means for the greatest good, we shall have such a supervisory board, whose business it will be to look over the whole field and not undertake more than we can fairly maintain, so that our forces will not be misdirected and scattered over too much ground; so that we may husband the work of our hands in this great enterprise of the missionary board.

CHAIRMAN: We have no very well defined parliamentary law here, and I feel that the chair has this evening

trespassed somewhat on what has been the general interest of the Conference, by recognizing members who have been in sight of the chair. The speaking has been very largely from those in front. I am only referring to the fact that many delegates sitting in the back of the room have been unable to attract attention.

HANNAH E. SLEEPER, of Kansas: This is a question that is very near my heart indeed, and I believe there is only one thought here to-night, and that is, that the gospel must be preached in foreign lands; that we as a church must obey the command of our Saviour and carry this gospel forth. And now the question is before us to-night to find out if possible the very best way to carry the gospel, whether it be by a central board or by boards in our separate yearly meetings. I think that we would find ourselves in a little the condition of our New York friends when they said they were willing for a common Discipline provided we would take their Discipline. I think we would all be willing for a central board provided we could all carry on our separate fields of work, but I for one am so anxious that we as a church shall do our part in carrying this gospel to the lost and perishing world that I am willing to accept any way that is God's way, and any way that we can determine to the best of our knowledge and ability and God-given wisdom to be the best way that we can command.

NATHAN T. FRAME, of Wilmington: It has been expressed, I believe, that all here have burning hearts in the direction of carrying the gospel into the foreign fields and to the people who have not had opportunity to hear this message. But so far as the formation of a great central board is concerned, that shall take the work of all the yearly meetings under its especial care, I have not yet been able to see that the work could be carried on with more efficiency and do more good in any other way than by the boards that are already formed in the different yearly meetings, which are in more direct contact with the people. I am not sure that I am right, but I have not been able to see further than that as yet. If,

in the course of the discussion, and with the things that are brought to our view, we shall see that this formation of a central missionary board is the best thing, we ought to have it. Can we get more money to send out these young men and these young women whose hearts have been made to burn as they have listened to the story of the degradation in those lands, and the fact that so many have never heard the name of the Lord Jesus Christ?—can we get more money by the organization of ourselves into a central missionary board to send these young men and women out, than we could by an appeal to our own people at home, by saying to them, “We have already a mission work in Mexico; we have already a mission work started in India and in Alaska, and we appeal to you directly, for some of our own young men and women are there—we appeal to you, for this work is especially and particularly under our direction?” I have not seen the point as yet to form a missionary board into whose hands the work shall be put.

TIMOTHY NICHOLSON, of Indiana: Friends will remember that five years ago, in the conference at Richmond, the conclusion was to recommend one board of foreign missions. I am of the same opinion still.

L. MARIA DEANE, of Iowa: I am in favor of a general board of foreign missions. I do not see why it need affect our responsibility or interest. I do believe we need something which will tend to centralization of interest and power to make this work effective.

ALLEN JAY, of Indiana: I propose that we now appoint a committee to take this matter under consideration and report to-morrow something definite. We might talk here all night and we would come out where we began. There are reasons why I think we ought to have one foreign missionary board, and at the same time have all the missionary boards we have in the yearly meetings besides, just as we have in the yearly meeting monthly meetings and quarterly meetings. I believe they will work together, as all other denominations have made a

success of it. It has been the means of doing the grand work that has been done. I do not see why it will not do for us. I am in favor of appointing a committee and letting that committee bring up some plan to-morrow.

LUKE WOODARD, of Indiana : I have come to the same conclusion.

CALVIN W. PRITCHARD, of Western : I unite with the proposition of Allen Jay, but I want to say that I am not satisfied at all that it would be the best thing for us to attempt to form a foreign missionary board. I do see that we need something like a secretary, who shall give some of his time to the matter of statistics, and, perhaps, a few other things. It seems to me that if there were somebody chosen to stand for the church who should receive the reports from the bodies that are in this work, and collate the statistics and report them once a year, and be able to answer questions from various people, that that would be about what we need. I have been in a situation for several years where I get a good many inquiries of that kind. Only a little while ago I had from Washington a request to give the statistics of our church with reference to the missionary cause. I said that I would try to do it, but it is such a large task, and requires so much work, that I have not been able to do it. Now, if there was somebody standing to represent the church, to answer such questions and do such work, it might be done with very little expense, and it seems to me that would be about the solution of the question.

DAVID B. UPDEGRAFF, of Ohio : I am sorry to dissent from the suggestion of Brother Allen Jay, but this occurs to me : comparatively little expression has been had upon the direct question before the house. Our hearts have been very much stirred upon the general question, and I think this committee might be somewhat in danger of confounding the general question with the special question at the present stage of the discussion. So it does seem to me that an intelligent committee would be greatly at a loss to know what to report until they should

hear a little further discussion upon the real question before the house. It would suit me better if the question were deferred for discussion until the morning, and have our committee appointed a little later. I believe it is an important subject, and it is lying heavily upon the hearts of a great many delegates here, and I think the discussion might profitably be prolonged a little while.

THOMAS C. BROWN, of Western: I favor Allen Jay's proposition. There are reasons that I would like to assign, but I think it is too late to assign reasons.

ISOM P. WOOTON, of Iowa: I favor the formation of a board of the yearly meetings, but I think, as David Updegraff does, that we have not arrived just now to the place where we should appoint such a committee. The whole question of the formation of boards is involved in the question that is before us this evening. If boards are going to be of practical benefit on one line, they will be of practical benefit on any other line, and if they are not of value on one line they will not be of value on another line. So that the great question that is involved in all the future discussion of this Conference is involved in this one question to-night.

STEPHEN BREED, of Western: I favor the appointment of a board representing all the yearly meetings, and to further the arrangements of this Conference I favor the appointing of a committee according to Allen Jay's suggestion.

ROBERT W. DOUGLAS, of Indiana: I would suggest that we hold this session a half hour longer and dispose of the question to-night. I am opposed to leaving it to a committee. The fact is, there are so many practical difficulties to contend with that we might just as well come to a conclusion, as we did five years ago, that we are in favor of it and just leave it there. I don't think anything will come of it at all.

CHAIRMAN: The question of the extension of time

takes precedence. The proposition is to extend this discussion thirty minutes. (Consent.)

RUTH MILLS, of Wilmington: I am in favor of a foreign missionary board, and I am in favor of appointing a committee composed of members from each yearly meeting.

ELWOOD SCOTT, of Indiana: I am certainly in favor of this board as proposed. I remember our dear Stanley Pumphrey worked so hard for this two or three years ago when he was here. I hope we can have a committee appointed.

ANNA B. THOMAS, of Baltimore: We, in Baltimore, are very deeply interested in this work. We don't know yet whether a central board is the best thing for the advancement of the work or not, but I do think we want a central bureau of information. I think that is a practical thing, and, perhaps, a thing we can get. It seems to me that would help the work.

ROBERT W. DOUGLAS, of Indiana: This country is a country of far distances, from the Atlantic to the Pacific and the lakes to the gulf (perhaps you have heard that before), in which we have missionary enterprises in which all the yearly meetings in America are especially united. Of course, we all have sympathy with the general remarks made at the opening of this discussion, and one rather regrets to say anything in opposition to a central board for fear his remarks will be construed into an opposition to the general subject itself. Let it, once for all, be set down as a fact that we are all in favor of foreign missions, whether we believe in a central board or not. Now, all the yearly meetings are practically engaged in some foreign field. They are straining themselves in every way. It is a case in which every yearly meeting is loaded down to the guards with its own work. Indiana Yearly Meeting is absorbing its strength and interest in Mexico. Our Western friends have another mission in Mexico and are doing all they can. Our friends in Iowa are interested

in a missionary enterprise in Jamaica, and doing a grand work there. Our New England friends are interested partially in Jamaica, but more especially in a missionary enterprise near Jerusalem. Our Kansas friends are very much interested in the missions in Alaska, and the new yearly meeting of Wilmington has decided to take Alaska for its field, and the other yearly meetings have divided their interest and means among all these missionary enterprises. Now, in view of the fact that our hands are all full, and we are doing everything we possibly can with organizations that are complete, committees that are selected with a great deal of care, on account of the special interest and skill that they have. I cannot see that there would be a willingness upon the part of any of these yearly meetings, with all these interests at stake, to yield up that which has been dear to their hearts, that for which they have been working so hard for years and years; to give up to a central board all that peculiar local interest that they have. I strikes me that instead of the idea of centralization, which is prevalent in the minds of some, the thought ought to be to disseminate, to diffuse, not to have too much blood around the head. If we do, we will die with a kind of missionary apoplexy, instead of keeping the blood in the extremities, so that every yearly meeting will have its proper influence and proper work.

DAVID B. UPDEGRAFF, of Ohio: It is not often that I am on both sides of the same question (laughter), but I am in favor in a very good sense of the proposition for a central board, yet it is not my judgment. My judgment, my conviction, is very much as has been expressed by Robert Douglas. I believe that on the present status more money will be secured, more enthusiasm and real earnest work will be brought to bear upon it, and the people will all get closer to the work to let the matter stand as it is. It is not the most welcome thing, perhaps, at a thought. I remember the disciples certainly thought, must have thought, when they were situated so comfortably and so centrally in Jerusalem, that the dispersion was a very unfortunate thing. But it was a very blessed thing. The agencies for promoting the work of

salvation of souls were multiplied, and they went everywhere preaching the gospel.

ALLEN JAY, of Indiana: They had their headquarters, though, at Jerusalem.

DAVID UPDEGRAFF, of Ohio: Not after Peter had his vision and went out after the Gentiles. Now, in our very earnest desire to carry out the objects that have been set before us, and to get the gospel preached everywhere, we are very prone to seize upon this or upon that which may seem to be a very good thing to facilitate and bring about the desire of our hearts, but we may do that very unwisely. We may not do it to the very best advantage, and it is my clear conviction that the present situation is the very best that can be devised. I think the argument that has been cited concerning the advice that was given five years ago, and the fact that the yearly meetings have given no attention to that advice, and have not acted upon it, is one evidence that in the judgment of the yearly meetings it were better let alone. So that while I would be willing to re-adopt that advice, I would expect them to do what they have done in the past, and believe that this is for the very best interest of the missionary work. I believe in a decentralization. I thought of the same argument brought forward by Micajah Binford in regard to these great boards and institutions that now exist. The question is now upon the hearts of the men most interested, how they can bring about the decentralization and untie the bonds that hold them in these great, compact, unwieldy bodies. That is the question before the greatest missionary workers to-day.

EDMUND STANLEY, of Kansas: I suppose I will have to go on record as being in favor of a concert of action in almost all points that affect the church. At the time this question was submitted to the yearly meetings, our yearly meeting appointed a committee to act with committees from other yearly meetings with reference to this question that is now before us. That committee was kept in existence for three or four years, and finally dropped because

the required number of other yearly meetings did not take hold of the work. I am still in favor of a concert of action in the yearly meetings upon this and other important questions that affect the extension and life of the church. I am in favor of it because of the very reasons³ which Brother Douglas gave a few moments ago in reference to the scattering of our work. I believe if we had had an advisory board on this work years ago a number of fields now occupied would have been left untouched by our societies and ten times the amount of work would have been done in the centralization of effort in other fruitful fields. For this reason I am particularly in favor of this concert of action. I have been studying all along the reason why some of our western or newer meetings are favorable to these propositions, while some of our older and larger and stronger meetings seem to oppose, and I am inclined to the opinion that you who live in the older meetings feel that you have the experience, you have the strength, and that you can stand alone. On the frontier you will find meetings that are as zealous to work as you are, as anxious to enter the field as you are, as willing to lend a helping hand as you are, but we feel, my dear brothers and sisters, that we need the advice and counsel of the older heads, those who have more experience, to help in the selection of fields and directing us in the extension of the work. I believe this is the reason we feel so anxious that you shall unite with us and allow us to unite with you, that we may join hands in settling these great questions of larger polity in order that the work may be advanced to the glory of God.

ABSALOM ROSENBERGER, of Iowa: The thought has been expressed at various times during the sessions of the day that we are entering upon a remarkable era in the Friends' church, and I believe it. It occurs to me that we need to have wisdom proportionate to the demands made upon us. If ever there was a time when we needed to be guided properly, when we needed to have the best thought and talent of the church brought forward in these lines, as we need to combine for our safety in these matters, it is now. So I sympathize with

the thought that in these great enterprises we need the wise direction, not of one meeting, but of the combination of all. I would by no means bind the free ends of the fingers, but I would have the other extremity united in one strong hand. So with the yearly meetings, I would have them free to act, if I may use the expression, as nimbly as the fingers, and yet, all combined in one harmonious body for the carrying on of these great enterprises. Now, I see no practical difficulties with reference to this matter. Just for a brief illustration, given in a moment, take that of the Swiss Republic, which is made up of three nationalities, by whom three languages are spoken, nationalities altogether different; and yet they have had no practical difficulty in transacting the affairs of the government. They are compelled to have an interpreter in their legislative bodies in order to understand each other. Their laws are put into three languages, and yet for three hundred years the Swiss Republic has stood, and her history is growing brighter as the days go by. So I would have the church united in one great federation in this missionary enterprise, and I would have the individual organizations carrying out the enterprises in which they are already engaged.

ESTHER PUGH, of Indiana: I can not conceive of anything more beautiful, theoretically, than a central board for our foreign missions, yet to me it is the least practical. I can not give in detail my reasons for that, time is too short; but I think of a great ponderous piece of machinery that I once looked at. Nothing was more magnificent than it was, and nothing more useless. I would follow out the figure my brother spoke of in reference to the hand, and instead of making a central board I would make a secretary, or central bureau of information. I think by tying ourselves so closely together we would lose power instead of gaining it, and, therefore, I do not favor a central board. I do favor a secretary or bureau of information.

JOHN F. HANSON, of Iowa: I will say that everything that I have heard to-night has confirmed me in the con-

viction I have had for a number of years, that we were too loosely organized and needed a good strong organization, not only on this point, but on a great many other points. I feel this especially to-night. I look back a good many years and I can see where we of Iowa Yearly Meeting made serious mistakes. We took the Jamaica field on our hands, and we carried it on, and we made some serious mistakes that I do not think we would have made if we had been better organized. I believe if we had a good strong central organization we would have wheels going that would give us control of much more money for missionary purposes where persons do not like to risk money in the hands of these small organizations.

Another thought that is an important one to me that will illustrate another feature: A few days ago, since coming to this Conference, in fact, the word came to me suddenly and surprisingly that my own daughter, at Kansas Yearly Meeting, had been taken up by the missionary board, which was going to send her to Alaska as a missionary. Well, I say, the will of the Lord be done. The child gave herself, long before she was grown, to the missionary work, and the family consecrated her to it on bended knees. That is all right. I don't have anything to say against the Lord's will. But when I read what such a man as Dr. Pierson, with all his great experience, has said on this point, that is, that of a hundred persons who present themselves for missionary work it is safe to say that finally you will only have five to send out, I think it is worth while for you not to lay hands suddenly on a person without knowing her, and knowing whether she is qualified for the field or not. It is not enough that the child has been under burden to go to the missionary field, but whether those who take her in hand know that she is fitted for that particular field, and whether she has the physical qualifications, and whether the time has fully come. I don't find fault with the dear Kansas Friends. They have told me kindly, and want me to think of it. I merely bring it up as an instance. We cannot just ride on a wave without thought and preparation. We have got to be calm and deliberate, and have a sober second thought in a great many things before we can act intelli-

gently and wisely. Now, when we have a good central board, composed of the best men and women in the church, those especially fitted for that work, who can take us over a second thought on a proposition, I believe our church will gain immensely, and will make fewer mistakes. Everything I have heard said is confirming me in the conviction that we, as a church, do need a stronger and better central organization.

RICHARD H. THOMAS, of Baltimore: We want the best thing done. We don't want to waste time in doing it. It seems to me that the yearly meetings would not accept a central board with authority; and, therefore, I would personally be very sorry for this Conference to make a recommendation which we are positive would amount to nothing. It seems to me we do need some means of information and advice between one another; and, therefore, I very strongly approve of what Esther Pugh and some others have said. As to the best means, I do not know, but I thoroughly approve of appointing a committee to see what is practicable in that line, and to allow them to report the result of their deliberations to a later session.

JOSEPHUS HOSKINS, of Wilmington: I am in favor of a board, such as has been indicated, from the very fact, as we will certainly agree, that in union there is strength, and in a multitude of counsel there is safety. I don't see that it need interfere in any wise with the different fields of labor that we have adopted and are so much interested in, but I can see, I think, very clearly where it will be very healthful in many respects, and, therefore, I am in favor of it.

JOHN HENRY DOUGLAS, of Iowa: I have listened with a great deal of interest to all this discussion. I was almost ready to say awhile ago that I united with everything that had been said. I do, I think, pretty much, but we must meet this question practically, and I think I can see the light in this matter in connection with the suggestion made by Calvin Pritchard, Dr. Thomas, Es-

ther Pugh and Brother Binford. I am glad to hear that Wilmington is going to Alaska. Oregon is going to Alaska; Kansas has gone to Alaska, just naturally working things out. I don't know where California is going, both ways, perhaps. But there is a spirit of union and fellowship in this matter according to the testimony of these first speakers, that is the best of all. And what startles me and has headed me off a good deal from the thought of a great central body, is the fact that the great central bodies themselves are beginning not to question centralization of interest and of information, but to advocate the disseminating and scattering of the fire brands all we can. I think this Conference is calculated to do that in the unity and fellowship of the gospel. That makes the strongest bond, it seems to me, that we can be bound with in this work. The work is going on blessedly, better than ever before, and everything is tending in the right direction. More money, a great deal, is coming in. Our Endeavorers are getting hold of it most practically. Iowa Yearly Meeting proposes to send out a foreign missionary besides the home missionary work which always comes up when the foreign missionary is started. So I shall throw my voice in on the side of going on as we are in the work with this central bureau or secretary, we all mean the same thing, so that we can be informed, and can keep in touch with one another during the interim of the general Conference.

JOSEPH POTTS, of North Carolina: Ever since I heard Stanley Pumphrey I have felt as though the missionary board was the right thing, but I have had a great deal of information on it generally, and feel that I know more about it than I did, and I am very much inclined to think that having the secretary or bureau of information is the best way to get at it. We, of North Carolina, appointed that committee according to the proposition made five years ago, but, I believe now, my idea would be that the secretary or bureau is the better plan. I was wondering whether it would not be best for this Conference to appoint such a secretary or board to remain in existence for conveying information all over the country.

WILLIAM L. PEARSON, of Iowa: I am heartily in favor of a central board, and I very earnestly pray that we should have just this thing.

CHAIRMAN: The Conference rule which applies to this decision is that it shall be arrived at by the usual method in use among Friends, unless a request for some other mode is made by some delegation. The question before the Conference is that of the formation of a general missionary board to take charge of, or in some way supervise, the work of foreign missions in all the yearly meetings. The Conference will please bear in mind that this discussion has extended over an hour and three-quarters. For the last twenty minutes the drift of the discussion has been very largely toward a secretary, but there was a full hour of discussion which was fully in the other direction, and there was a large number of speakers. So the chair is about to say that according to the usual method of decision by Friends it is not practicable to decide the question as yet. There has not been a clearly defined expression upon this subject. There has been a great deal of discussion, but the mind of the Conference, definitely expressed, has not been given to the chair for decision. Now, if the Conference will speak to the original question definitely: Shall we recommend the formation of a foreign missionary board? without any discussion whatever, the chair will endeavor to find what the opinion of the Conference is. Shall we, or shall we not recommend a foreign missionary board?

JAMES CAREY THOMAS, of Baltimore: I arise to a point of order. I suggest that Allen Jay made a definite proposition to leave this matter to a committee. At David Updegraff's suggestion it was stated that the committee would not have sufficient knowledge of the views of the Conference unless further discussion was had. I understood that this discussion was allowed, when the question as to whether it should be referred to a committee might be put before the house. That is my understanding of the continuation of the discussion.

CHAIRMAN: I am entirely willing that the Conference should speak to that question. The chair twice asked that a decision might be given three-quarters of an hour ago.

ISOM P. WOOTON, of Iowa: As chairman of this delegation, I will state that our committee agrees to call for a division on this question.

CHAIRMAN: The chair would rule that the proper way to decide this is to call upon the delegations. The chair would ask that the main question shall be settled definitely, and then if there are side issues to be raised the chair will entertain them.

JAMES WOOD, of New York: Until a vote is called for a motion is in order. I offer as a substitute for whatever may be before the house, That this subject be now referred to a committee, that the Conference may be relieved of all difficulties attending the case. That committee can readily report something to the Conference, which can be accepted or rejected.

CHAIRMAN: James Wood's proposition is, that the question of recommending the formation of a foreign missionary board be referred to a committee constituted by this Conference, to report to a future sitting of this Conference.

(Expressions of concurrence.)

CALVIN W. PRITCHARD, of Western: I unite with that proposition if it leaves that committee with power to report, if they think wise, in favor of a secretary.

ESTHER G. FRAME, of Wilmington: I would suggest that each delegation appoint its member of that committee.

CHAIRMAN: The chair understands that that proposition is accepted by the Conference.

(The committee was appointed; for the names see minutes, page 20.)

Adjourned until 9:30 to-morrow morning.

SIXTH-DAY MORNING — 9:30 O'CLOCK.

The eighth session of the Conference was called to order by President Mills, and opened by reading the ciii. Psalm, and prayer.

RICHARD H. THOMAS, of Baltimore, invited all the delegates to attend the Peace Conference which should follow this. He also requested, on account of the amount of work he had to do in connection with the Peace Conference, that some other Friend should be put in his place on the committee on conclusions, naming John Nicholson, of his delegation, who was, by consent, appointed to fill the place.

JOHN HENRY DOUGLAS, of Iowa: This is a day of wonderful demonstration [Columbus day], such as this nation has never known. We have nothing to do with that, except in our individual feeling about it, but there is a matter that comes home to us. At the capitol of our nation the wife of our beloved president lies in great suffering, and, by the accounts this morning, is, probably, very near death. I feel, and in consultation with a good many others find that they feel the same way, that we, as a Conference, ought to call a halt a moment and invoke the blessing of God upon the family, and furthermore, send, on behalf of this national Conference, a message of sympathy to the President of the United States. (Amen, Amen.)

CHAIRMAN: I think that can be accepted without discussion, friends. It is not even necessary to ask for an expression.

ALLEN JAY, of Indiana: I will say the Business Committee has directed that we ask the president and sec-

retary of this Conference to send a telegram of sympathy.
(Consent.)

CHAIRMAN: The proposition coming from the Business Committee, and also in this way, shows how very spontaneous is this feeling in the Conference. (Prayer.)

CHAIRMAN: The officers to whom this matter was referred will give attention to it as promptly as possible and report later to the Conference. (Expressions of sympathy.)

CHAIRMAN: I think the sympathy which this Conference feels with the beloved President of the United States is simply beyond expression. I feel that it is not the part of earnest, active, Christian people to recount the reasons why we should have this sympathy. It is so deep that it does not need extended expression.

NATHAN T. FRAME, of Wilmington: I bless the Lord for those who love Christ at the head of the nation.

CHAIRMAN: There is likely to be a large amount of unfinished business come before this Conference in these closing hours. Delegates will bear in mind the fact that a number of committees have been appointed on subjects of the greatest importance that have occupied our attention. The reports of these committees may require as careful consideration as the subjects of discussion themselves. They have to be adopted by the Conference. For that reason I think we ought to begin to look to the reception of reports from committees before we get too near the closing hour. If you will pardon me for doing so, I will suggest to these committees, to whom matters of this kind have been referred, that their reports ought to be presented to the Conference at the earliest possible hour. I am informed that the committee to which was referred the question of a publishing house is ready to report. Would the Conference be willing to entertain their report at this time before entering upon the special order of the forenoon? (Consent.)

CHAIRMAN: Before this report is given, we will hear the minutes of the Conference read up to this time.

The minutes were approved as read.

CHAIRMAN: We will now hear the report of the Committee on Friends' Publishing House.

SETH MILLS, of Western: The committee on the subject of a publishing house has held two meetings and given the matter such consideration as seemed to be possible. It, of course, is clear that the first thing that can be done is to have a general interest in the subject on the part of the various yearly meetings, and all that this Conference can do, as we think, is simply to take measures to secure this. We have the following written report. (See Minutes, page 21.)

CHAIRMAN: You have heard the report of this committee, what action will be taken?

At the request of Robert W. Douglas the report was re-read.

AUGUSTUS TABER, of New York: As an individual I would ask the Conference to notice that there are two questions involved here. There is, in the first place, a question that is taken for granted, that there is a general sentiment of the Conference in favor of establishing an official periodical. Has the Conference come to that conclusion? Perhaps it has, but I ask the Conference to pause a moment. Then, in the second place, will be the plan of that organization.

JAMES WOOD, of New York: I think there is some mis-statement on the part of Augustus Taber. The real fact of the case is that there is only one question, and that is the reference of this whole question to the yearly meetings. I think that is all there is in it.

JAMES CAREY THOMAS, of Baltimore: I think the preamble might state that a consideration of the subject is

recommended, rather than the establishment of the periodical.

DAVID B. UPDEGRAFF, of Ohio: I do think, as has been stated by the clerk, that it appears upon its face that the Conference takes it for granted that these things are advisable. I do think it bears that impress. I think that has not been passed upon by the Conference. For myself I do not think it advisable, or feasible, or practical that we have an official organ of the whole society, or that we take affirmative action upon the other question, but I should like to have it go to the yearly meetings, if it goes to them perfectly untrammelled in that respect. If that is the judgment of the Conference let us have it clearly understood.

NATHAN T. FRAME, of Wilmington: I am ready to unite with the report of the committee, with a little change there to "very large sentiment."

JAMES WOOD, of New York: I think the facts of the case are these: The subject was brought before the Conference by the paper of Seth Mills. I think there was a unanimous expression, so far as any expression was made, in favor of the proposition contained in this paper, and under the fact of that general expression a committee was appointed, and this is the logical conclusion of the matter, as the sense of the Conference was expressed in that discussion, and as the reference was made to this committee.

JAMES CAREY THOMAS, of Baltimore: I would propose a modification of the first clause of this by saying, "Your committee, in view of the very general sentiment of the present Conference in favor of considering the subject of establishing a Friends' publishing house, with an official periodical for the whole Society, do not approve of the establishment, but of considering the subject."

CHAIRMAN: Will you accept James Carey Thomas' proposed amendment?

(Some voices in approval.)

WILLIAM NICHOLSON, of Ohio: I object. If you would leave out the word "considering" I would like it, but I believe the sentiment of this Conference was in harmony, as James Wood has said, with the paper of Seth Mills, that we have an organ, an official organ for the whole church. We want a fish big enough to swallow all the little fish.

JAMES CAREY THOMAS, of Baltimore: I thought that in referring the subject to the committee the Conference did not make a decision. If we had decided, what would have been the object of referring it to a committee? Now, this is a preamble to resolutions introduced by the committee, and they undertake to declare the decision of the Conference. We did not refer to them the formulation of the decision of the Conference; it was to consider the subject of establishing, not to state that the Conference was in favor of establishing.

JAMES WOOD, of New York: Perhaps the sense of the Conference might be taken on the preamble. (The preamble is re-read.)

CHAIRMAN: Will you accept this amendment?

(Expressions of preference for the original preamble.)

CHAIRMAN: The chair understands it is not accepted. The question, then, is upon the preamble as originally offered.

(Voices, both in approval and disapproval.)

CHAIRMAN: The chair understands that the preamble is accepted, with four voices in the negative. What is the mind of the Conference upon the whole report of the committee?

WILLIAM L. PYLE, of Western: I notice in one place there it speaks in regard to a suitable locality. I should

prefer that the word "central" be used instead of "suitable." As the expanse of our church is so great, I think it will be productive of more good and have greater force and influence for good if we have a view to rather a central location.

CHAIRMAN: Does the Conference desire to go into the details of this matter, or is it the sentiment that the yearly meetings' committees will settle those questions?

ELWOOD SCOTT, of Indiana: I think it would go before the yearly meetings with greater force if left as it is; and the matter of location will be decided later on.

CHAIRMAN: The Conference will remember that a call was made for the preamble alone. The further report has not been adopted by the Conference at all. Will you adopt the report as it stands as a whole? (Consent.)

CHAIRMAN: The report is adopted.

JOHN HENRY DOUGLAS, of Iowa: With one dissenting voice. I do not accept it in that way, but I am loyal to the majority.

AUGUSTUS TABER, of New York: I do not accept.

DAVID B. UPDEGRAFF, of Ohio: I do not accept.

TIMOTHY NICHOLSON, of Indiana: It is entirely safe. You refer it to the yearly meetings. There must be seven yearly meetings agree before anything can be done, and I think you need not be alarmed.

JOHN HENRY DOUGLAS, of Iowa: We are sending it out with full force with the favor of this Conference.

A FRIEND: This discussion is subsequent to the action of the Conference, and is hardly proper.

CHAIRMAN: Unless somebody dissents from the decision of the chair, that report is adopted and this discussion is not in order.

(Voices sustaining the decision of the chair.)

CHAIRMAN: I am informed that the Committee on Discipline is ready to report. Will you hear that report now? (Consent.)

FRANCIS A. WRIGHT, of Kansas: We just adopted the report of the publishing committee, which requires the appointment of a committee; had we not better decide how that committee shall be appointed?

CHAIRMAN: The point is well taken, but it is likely that this report will require a like action, and the chair purposely delayed it, so that we might reach a uniform action in regard to them to save time.

(The secretary reads the report of the committee. See Minutes, page 22.)

CHAIRMAN: What will you do with the report of this committee?

NATHAN T. FRAME, of Wilmington: I am willing to adopt it with the words "desirable, but not feasible."

(Voices in approval of the report.)

DAVID UPDEGRAFF, of Ohio: I shall not attempt to make any speech upon this question that shall exhaust myself or the people, but I do think that as a Conference we shall lose a great deal by sending things to yearly meetings to consider, that are, in their very nature, impracticable, and that antagonize not only the prejudices of our people, but their settled convictions; convictions which ought reasonably to obtain and be retained, one of which is this, I think: I believe in the autonomy, in the individuality of the meetings. I remember very well this remark, coming from Joseph Bevan Braithwaite a number of years ago, making a deep impression upon my mind at that time, and after considering it a little I gave it the full sanction of my judgment: "The autonomy of

the yearly meetings must be maintained." I believe that is true. It is practically true. There is an individuality, a homogeneous character in every yearly meeting that we can not very well, in certain aspects, at least, spread over every other yearly meeting. Hence, I believe that it is legitimate and proper for the different yearly meetings to exercise their own individual judgment concerning the character of their Discipline, and I believe that that will be done. However, going down from this Conference with the force of advice and deliberate judgment of this body, it will have this effect: Every yearly meeting will make an endeavor to adjust itself in some sense to this advice and to this request. This will involve the appointment of committees and examinations of Disciplines, and it will result as I have suggested. It will involve a consideration and discussion of the question, and a great deal of time will be given to the subject, and possibly two, three, or four different yearly meetings may conclude upon a Discipline that will suit them. Then, if others do not fall into line, it throws upon them the onus of being unfraternal.

These are my objections. I have nothing to fear from it. It is not that. I should be glad to know that there was enough homogeneousness in the church, enough of similarity of view and feeling so that we could have one Discipline. I would have no objection to that in the world, although I believe we are better off the way we are.

CHARLES E. TEBBETTS, of Iowa: I hope we shall not decide a thing that seems so desirable in so many minds to be "not feasible" until we try it. We can not say what can be done until the matter is taken under consideration and something tried. It seems to me that in view of the fact that new yearly meetings are being established, we need especially to turn our attention to this matter at this time. It is none too soon. It will require years, at the very shortest, to accomplish the result, and I am in favor of this action in order that we may, if possible, discover the way of bringing something to the church that shall be a blessing to it.

FRANCIS A. WRIGHT, of Kansas: I am very sorry to hear this report. We have come together from great distances here to consider matters of vital interest to the church. Some of us have come at much inconvenience, and when an important question comes up, to simply refer it back to the yearly meetings without practically taking any action or giving any advice, it seems to me we had better leave it alone. I think the proposition that was made to refer it to a committee of the Conference, and go further if the way was open, would not stir up the question, as our friend David Updegraff has said, unless there was a possibility of doing it, and it would be much more desirable. I think that we forget that this is now, as I understand from the clerk, an established body. There will be another conference in five years. We have the right to consider the matter under our own committee for that time, and if we do not consider it feasible, we need not go to the yearly meetings with it; if it is, we can do so. These yearly meetings will have to appoint committees and get together as we have done, and do a great deal of work by correspondence, and will not achieve much. We are here; we can discuss matters fraternally together, with ten yearly meetings represented, and we could appoint a committee and consider the matter, and report to a future conference.

EMMA F. COFFIN, of Iowa: When this is reported to the yearly meetings, if some should see fit to unite and go forward in the work of preparing a uniform Discipline for all, and if some of the yearly meetings should think best not to do so, what then would be done? If there were a majority in favor of preparing and having a uniform Discipline, would it be done anyhow, or would one or two yearly meetings, which might not feel disposed to unite in this, stop the work?

FRANCIS W. THOMAS, of Indiana: I should like to say this in regard to this question. In the first place, each yearly meeting, being a co-ordinate body, has the right to make its own Discipline, but has there ever been any attempt to unify the yearly meetings since we have had

multiplied bodies of this character? Has there ever been any attempt to unify the church on the question of Discipline and of law throughout? I think never. It seems to me that the remarks made in opposition to this report are in the line of preferring to see our neighbors different from ourselves, rather than to see them like ourselves; a preference for diversity rather than unity. I think that this question can go to these yearly meetings without any bar and without suspicion. If a yearly meeting has a right to make its own Discipline, any two yearly meetings have a right to agree upon one Discipline; if they have that right, any three have it, or any number. It is not a bar to any right which any yearly meeting now has. It can not be put up as a bar to the right which they now exercise, and it certainly would not be undesirable to have greater union in judgment in matters of law and right and privilege, as well as in the general constitution, and to see them coming nearer together instead of getting further apart. I hope we shall consider the subject in this light, and not as endangering or putting in jeopardy any part of the ordinary constitution of the church.

CHAIRMAN: May the chairman suggest that it will facilitate the discussion somewhat if we divide the question a little. This discussion is turning wholly upon the simple question as to whether it is the judgment of this Conference that a uniform Discipline is desirable. If that can not be adopted by this Conference the remainder of the report logically fails. If Friends will confine themselves to that part of the report until we have an expression upon it, it will help us very much.

CALVIN W. PRITCHARD, of Western: My objection to the matter, as it appears to me at present, is that it would be very possible, I think, that some of the yearly meetings would unite in a uniform Discipline; for instance, three or four of the western yearly meetings, and three or four of the eastern yearly meetings might do the same, and the result of it would be that the bar, or whatever there may be, that separates different sections of our church would be increased rather than diminished.

WILLIAM L. PEARSON, of Iowa: I think that the fact that two or three of the yearly meetings might agree together on a common Discipline is one thing in favor of our adopting this proposition. I should like to see two yearly meetings, at least, try to be a little nearer alike, if all the other ten tried to be as different as they could. I think it would be a good wholesome example, and helpful, and since it is only along the line of advice and not along the line of control at all, there is no possibility of danger arising from such arbitration and peaceful methods that the Society of Friends has had as a characteristic throughout its history. I should be exceedingly glad if, in two, three or four yearly meetings, they could in some way by friendly intercourse decide to have uniformity in practice.

LUKE WOODARD, of Indiana: I understand the question is whether it is desirable to have such a Discipline.

CHAIRMAN: This report expressly states that it is the judgment of the committee that a uniform Discipline is desirable, and the remainder of the report hinges upon that, and so the chair took the liberty of suggesting that the discussion be confined to that until we could clear up a little ground.

LUKE WOODARD, of Indiana: I have thought for some time that a uniform Discipline in all matters of doctrine, and in all matters affecting the rights and privileges of members, is desirable. As to some of the details, I do not think it is very desirable, and perhaps not practicable.

J. WALTER MALONE, of Ohio: There is a thought in regard to this that I wish to express. I think it is very desirable that we should be one. When I came to the great iron bridge that spans our Ohio river I saw a notice there that all processions must break step before they go across this bridge. They are afraid of one solid company of men marching across there in step. So it seems to me that the great enemy of our souls wants to get us to break step somehow. I tell you if all Christians were one there

would be no trouble. We should be a solid army of God, moving as one. I do not know how our men and women who want to have our Society called a church think about this. I think we are a Society of Friends in one sense, and let us be one. I would be willing if only two or three yearly meetings would unite in a Discipline. We need not put everything we know into a Discipline. But let us get something we can all agree on, and let us be united before the world as a people.

JOSEPHUS HOSKINS, of Wilmington: I am glad to say that there are two yearly meetings that have the same Discipline now.

TIMOTHY NICHOLSON, of Indiana: There are three.

JOSEPHUS HOSKINS, of Wilmington: I am glad to know that. I think it would be better to have the same Discipline.

TIMOTHY NICHOLSON, of Indiana: I think we are very much afraid, apparently, to trust the yearly meetings. If, when this matter comes before a yearly meeting, that yearly meeting decides that it is not desirable that we all have the same Discipline, all it has to do is not to appoint a committee, and let those who do think it is desirable appoint a committee and come together and see what can be done. There is no risk in the matter.

S. ADELBERT WOOD, of Indiana: It seems to me that the present discussion is out of order. We had this question before us, and discussed it in such a way that the committee has come to the conclusion that it is the mind of this Conference, and has made a report on that basis.

CHAIRMAN: I beg pardon of the friend. The report says it is the judgment of the committee. Now, to adopt that statement in this report of the committee is to commit this Conference to that question.

S. ADELBERT WOOD, of Indiana: We have, on all other questions, sought to give the mind of the Conference, that these committees might have a basis to work on and report accordingly.

CHAIRMAN: I understood this committee was to come to a judgment of its own and recommend something to the Conference.

S. ADELBERT WOOD, of Indiana: I want, then, to unite with the report they make.

EDMUND STANLEY, of Kansas: I want to unite with the first part of the report, that a uniform Discipline is desirable. I believe I am a member of this committee, but I have heard no notice of a meeting of the committee, and, therefore, had no opportunity to meet with the committee. So you will allow me to make this remark. I am emphatically in favor of a uniform Discipline for the Friends' church or Society, for the Friends of America. I have looked forward to this Conference with the desire, if I had any one desire above another, that this thing should be accomplished. I long to see the day when we can join hands and say we are one, and not stand in a relation to each other that places us in a position that we may drift apart and drift apart until we sever our connection and weaken our influence. This has been the tendency, and it seems to me that it will be, so long as we stand as ten or twelve separate yearly meetings. Dear friends, can we not agree upon something that shall make a Discipline for us, so that we may be a united people?

RICHARD H. THOMAS, of Baltimore: It seems to me there is an ambiguity in the word "desirable." I suppose we would all say it was desirable if we were going to start the Society of Friends from the beginning. As a matter of fact, we are not doing that, and if we say it is desirable now, we are not simply stating a theoretical fact, but that in the present condition of affairs we consider it desirable. Now, dear friends, it seems to me, if we want to make this Conference as strong a power in the

various yearly meetings as we possibly can, we should be very careful how we send down recommendations to which we are morally sure a large proportion of the yearly meetings will say no. Every recommendation which this Conference makes, which is rejected by the yearly meetings, is going to lessen the dignity and influence of this Conference; and it seems to me that under the present circumstances David Updegraff's remarks are eminently in place, and I thoroughly approve of them.

L. MARIA DEANE, of Iowa: I approve of the remarks of the last speaker. I think it is better to break step and live than keep step and go down.

ABSALOM ROSENBERGER, of Iowa: I never was more convinced of the fact that we need uniformity and a general commingling than I have been since I have been here. We need that the East, West, North, and South come into a relation of this kind, and, as I said this morning, thinking over the points of common interest, it seems to me no organization could possibly have more common points than we have, as a Society; that no government could be organized on a basis of unity that is as capable of including so many important points as can we. "One Lord, one faith, one baptism," one common interest throughout all our ranks. It does seem to me if we could be brought into a relation of that kind that the different traits of character that exist in the different yearly meetings would have a modifying influence, one upon another, and we would receive good all around.

WASHINGTON HADLEY, of Kansas: I do feel it is exceedingly desirable that this should be accomplished so that we may have a general uniform Discipline for all our denomination. It is one of the most desirable things that has come up before this Conference. We are surely not so diversified a people in interests, or principle, or doctrine, that we might not have a Discipline in its general features, particularly as to doctrine and personal rights, that would be adaptable and acceptable to our whole people. Of course some of the details might be left to the discretion of the different yearly meetings.

ELWOOD SCOTT, of Indiana: I am quite in harmony with the idea of uniformity of Discipline, so far as it can be made practical. I think that on the details of local matters in the yearly meetings there will have to be a diversity, but on the important points of Discipline I see nothing whatever to hinder the yearly meetings from having one Discipline. It has already been stated here that three of the yearly meetings have a common Discipline, and get along splendidly and work nicely, and I can not see why we should not have it. I do not think all the yearly meetings are prepared now to adopt this, but there is ample opportunity for them to fall in line; there is ample opportunity for them to change their opinion, and I think when they see the binding influence that this would have upon the yearly meetings they will be likely to drop in. I have full sympathy with that report.

MARY M. HOBBS, of North Carolina: I am not in favor of the Conference sending any recommendation to the yearly meetings on this subject for this reason: While the thing may be desirable ultimately, it seems to be for the present impracticable, and I think it is very undesirable to throw any yearly meeting in opposition to another yearly meeting, or to the general Conference. We go along in unity. We are keeping step largely, and, if we begin to think about it and throw ourselves into opposition, I think we shall be less likely to work in unity than as we are doing now.

THOMAS C. BROWN, of Western: I was delighted a few weeks ago, in being present at the opening of Wilmington Yearly Meeting. As they took the step of adopting the Discipline of Indiana Yearly Meeting, it filled my heart with gratitude to know that there were two yearly meetings now that had a like Discipline. I would be pleased if, in the organization of the yearly meeting in Oregon, they might adopt the Discipline of some other yearly meeting. There certainly is strength in the matter of uniformity of Discipline. It is a question that I have thought about a good deal in the consideration of the matter of organization. I think there is a possibility

of persons reaching a conclusion earlier than they ought to and earlier than the facts would justify, with reference to a matter being impracticable. I remember a friend came to me at our yearly meeting a year ago, and said : "I am sorry there is an attempt to adopt a new Discipline. There certainly are things that ought to be in that Discipline that we cannot reach for five years." In twelve hours from that time the very points that he said could not be reached in five years, were adopted in the Discipline of our yearly meeting. We may be nearer together as yearly meetings than we anticipate. It seems to me that Luke Woodard and Washington Hadley have made practical suggestions on that idea, unity in certain things. I believe we need a concert of action, and, therefore, I favor the report.

AUGUSTUS TABER, of New York : Following the line of the remarks just made, I find in the minutes of the Conference of 1887 a declaration of some fundamental principles of truth held by the religious Society of Friends, which were adopted by that Conference and which have since been adopted, I believe, by nearly all the yearly meetings of this continent. "In essentials unity ; in non-essentials liberty ; in all things charity." Is not that the bond which unites us together, and would we not lose in spirituality if we insisted upon an outward uniformity of practice? I recall only a short time ago when in such a Conference as this, I would not have been permitted, nor would our president himself have been permitted to stand upon this platform because our coats fell over perhaps a quarter of an inch. We have done away with that. We have laid that aside because we perceived that under that apparently trifling matter was concealed a solemn truth. We need, friends, the individuality of our lives. We need the universal priesthood of believers. We need individuality in all our life, and we must not shut ourselves down too much to iron forms laid upon us by others at a distance.

I. WARREN HAWKES, of New England : I simply rise to give my individual sentiments upon this question. I am

entirely in harmony with what has just been read by our brother: "In essentials unity; in non-essentials liberty; in all things charity." I think it is desirable for us as a church to endeavor to unite and come into harmony in all points we can. I was cradled in this society, and it has been the desire of my life ever since I came into the Lord's service to see this body, east, west, north and south, more closely united, and with this feeling in my heart, which is based upon the teachings of my blessed Saviour, which are especially dear to me: "That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me and I in thee, that they also may be one in us;" "that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast loved me." Now, dear friends, with reference to this matter of uniformity, it does seem to me that it is desirable to bring us as a body more closely together in fellowship and in labor. I realize very well what the result of this may be. In my own yearly meeting of New England if this subject is brought before them, they will decide at once and with a great deal of unanimity that the time has not yet fully come for this step. But, in other yearly meetings it gives them an opportunity, as the matter is brought before them to unite so far as they can; and if union in these yearly meetings works satisfactorily, others, and even old New England, may fall into line.

ISOM P. WOOTON, of Iowa: I want to say in connection with this subject that the action of this Conference does not rest upon the way in which this report shall be received in the different yearly meetings. The fact is clearly before us that people are getting awake on this question of Discipline. We cannot disguise that. It comes up here. It comes up in our yearly meetings. It is in the East; it is in the West. Now the subject has come before this Conference to-day whether this Conference feels enough interested in this subject to heartily recommend it back to the yearly meetings in a way that may cause action to be taken immediately, or may cause the subject to be brought before the yearly meetings for immediate discussion. In my own conviction there is nothing clearer than that we are not half organized. Others may say that

organization suppresses the life. It does not make any difference with me what they say about that, I have been thinking independently on this subject and I do not know anybody here who has a brain that is active at all or spiritual powers in his being that is not organized, and I do not know that hands and feet and the different members of the body have anything to do with the spiritual relation of an individual, except in so far as he is capable of spiritual development. He is spiritual or unspiritual from the fact that he gives himself over to God or withholds himself from God. So, organization is a necessity for the carrying on of the real, spiritual interests of the church. There is no question about that, and to be afraid of organization is a great detriment to the real growth and stability of the church, and that we enter heartily into the study of the organization is an important thing in connection with the growth of the church. So, I stand before you this morning an advocate of organization and an advocate of proper Discipline. We may be able locally to get along with our affairs by the local Disciplines which we now have; but there is a constitutional relation of the church, and at the present time the constitutional force of the Society of Friends is much lost because we have not entered into the constitutional needs of the church. The strength of the church will depend on uniformity in connection with the great principles of organization and church government. It is altogether proper for us as a Conference to stand in relation to our yearly meetings with a deep conviction that the church wants to enter into the study of all its interests, both constitutional and local. So, I am here this morning to indorse this report, only [zealous] that it be fully and deeply the really needed report that shall go to our yearly meetings. It needs to be brought before us in such an emphatic way that people must think of this even though they reject it.

JAMES CAREY THOMAS, of Baltimore: I feel very deeply on this subject, because, like a great many friends here, I have had experience for a number of years in the changing and changes of Disciplines which have occurred in my own yearly meeting. I see a number here who have

had the same experience. I fully agree with my friends that there are certainly great principles upon which we unite, but I do not believe that in the different yearly meetings we can so form the statements of disciplinary matters that we shall all be agreed. Friends talk about its being a very long period. I think it will take a very long period for the representatives of the yearly meetings to come together practically. I am not talking theoretically. I believe the theory is all right, but I believe the practical difficulties are very great, because we have local peculiarities and local needs. Friends must admit that, and, as I said when I spoke before, our Disciplines are the outgrowth of our special needs. If they have any life in them at all they will be the outgrowth of the needs of the church in the locality in which they are. Now, there are certain things we can agree upon that do not interfere with the moulding of the church according to the way God has been leading the church in the different places, and we are not always having a Discipline that we are not living under. Now, friends, there are a good many Disciplines we do not live under, a good many things in our present Discipline we do not live under at present. We are forming the views, and the practices, etc., that will hereafter be crystallized in the Disciplines in our different locations. There is no question about that, if the Discipline is to meet the needs of the church. Now, I wish we could agree upon certain general principles, but to place it as it is placed here, that a uniform Discipline is desirable—that means everything in the Discipline. I cannot give it my consent. I do not believe it is desirable in the form in which it is placed. I think this Conference, as has already been said, is injuring its cause in the Society of Friends if it recommends certain things when it refers a subject to the yearly meetings. I think it is well to refer the subject, but not with the statement that we consider it desirable, when there has been so much said against it as has been expressed here. Let us refer it without this, because it is not a united judgment. If the question is a good one, and is to be considered, there can be no objection. I thoroughly approve referring the subject to the yearly meetings, but I

do think we injure ourselves when we express a strong sentiment in referring the subject to the yearly meetings. The yearly meetings are supreme in this matter. This Conference has no supremacy over the yearly meetings, and ought not to attempt to claim it. We are an advisory body, and can advise on the subject, with the understanding that if a certain basis of agreement can be reached by the yearly meetings we shall be glad, but to express our sentiment in the full terms in which it is stated, that a uniform Discipline is desirable, and then refer the subject to the yearly meetings, is not, it seems to me, the wisest course for this Conference to take. I should be much better pleased with the latter part of that report if the judgment of the committee goes in without being adopted. I propose that the latter part of the report be adopted, with the omission of the preamble. A preamble is universally dangerous because it decides a question in advance. A preamble is the judgment of the committee, and then following that the committee offers results. Let us have it without the preamble.

CHAIRMAN: The chair will entertain that proposition and amendment, and I think the Conference will pardon the chair for interrupting the proceedings to make the report of the officers in reference to the telegram to the President of the United States. (Consent.)

(The telegram [see Minutes, page 21] is read, and approved after a second reading, and put into the hands of Timothy Nicholson to transmit.)

CHAIRMAN: There is before the Conference a definite proposition. Three friends have claimed the floor who have not had an opportunity to speak, and the chair bears that fact in mind, but there is a definite proposition made by James Carey Thomas, of Baltimore, that the latter part of this report be adopted, omitting the preamble entirely, and that the Conference recommend that the subject of a uniform book of Discipline be taken up by the yearly meetings, and that as many as can unite in the work may proceed therein, as far as they may be able to

do, by appointing committees to co-operate in attaining so desirable an end. The amendment is offered as a substitute for the report of the committee.

JOHN HENRY DOUGLAS, of Iowa: We are all most emphatically united in one declaration as to the Bible. In all our Disciplines we are alike about that; also in our declarations of faith, I do not think there is one here that can mention any essential difference. Some of them are longer and some shorter. A large number of yearly meetings have adopted the same one. When it comes to vital points in church government the similarity is very interesting and remarkable. We are wonderfully united and we want to maintain that ground. It seems to me we are coming nearer together instead of diverging. It has been hinted here that we are getting apart. I do not believe it. The very fact that we have united throughout this country in a conference as we have is evidence to me that we are coming together, and the character of this Conference, the spirituality of it, and the kind feeling is another evidence of it. My thought is to go on in this same good old way. Now, if it had been desirable that all the yearly meetings should have the same Discipline, each yearly meeting, when it was formed, should have adopted the Discipline of the yearly meetings already in existence. Western Yearly Meeting adopted the Indiana Yearly Meeting's Discipline. In some phases of it we have changed it, but it is essentially the same. I cannot see that any good is to come of putting this matter before our yearly meetings and turn the old church from ocean to ocean to making discipline, with an effort to come together on some little, minor thing, while we are already essentially one in the great matter of church government and church order. So, I would not even accept James Carey Thomas's suggestion; I would accept Richard Thomas's suggestion. I believe in uniformity, and I believe we are on the way to uniformity practically.

ROBERT W. DOUGLAS, of Indiana: I make the proposition that we dismiss the whole subject.

WILLIAM L. PYLE, of Western : I should like to second the proposition.

(Expressions of approval and dissent being made, the chair decides that the proposition to lay on the table is lost.)

LUKE WOODARD, of Indiana : I unite with the proposition of Robert W. Douglas on the ground that I do not think we could accomplish it, and, therefore, it is not desirable to make the attempt, although in itself it is desirable.

WILLIAM L. PYLE, of Western : I rise to a point of order. I understood the chairman to say the motion to lay on the table is lost:

CHAIRMAN : The chair so decides, and unless there is a dissent from the decision, it so stands. There is only one way in which dissent becomes forcible, and that is expressed in the rules of the Conference.

DAVID B. UPDEGRAFF, of Ohio : I would ask that we have the voice taken again, and that the chair call for all that are favorable to Robert W. Douglas's proposition to lay it upon the table to speak in succession at once and deliberately, and then that the same opportunity be afforded to the negative, and then the chair decide.

JAMES WOOD, of New York : It is evident that there is considerable opposition to the proposition. It will carry no weight to make any recommendation under this state of the case. I think all Friends will agree with me on that point, and, therefore, in the good old Quaker way of expressing it, way does not open to go forward.

A FRIEND : I like those remarks.

CHAIRMAN : The chair has regarded it as the will of the Conference as expressed last evening at the close of a long discussion, and repeatedly referred to to day, that

parliamentary usage shall take precedence if there be any conflict between that and the usual method of Friends, and, certainly, if we should follow the parliamentary method of procedure, this suggestion of James Wood is entirely out of order.

JAMES WOOD, of New York: It is, unless it meets with unanimous consent, as I believe it does.

CHAIRMAN: Then will James Wood please make his proposition again?

JAMES WOOD, of New York: That in view of the evident opposition in this Conference to the proposition that is now before it, we withdraw the subject and proceed to other business.

(Voices in approval.)

CHAIRMAN: The chair accepts that as a reconsideration of the voice on Robert W. Douglas's proposition.

FRANCIS W. THOMAS, of Indiana: I think it is but just to myself and just to the Conference for me to say that under the divided sentiment with reference to the recommendation of the question so as to have it in a moving condition, we have arrived at the best conclusion, the best thing to be done. I am heartily satisfied with the discussion on the subject. I believe it will never die until we reach the end aimed at.

JOHN F. HANSON, of Iowa: I want to make this statement. I am in favor of the report as brought in by the committee. I was a member of the committee myself. I wish the Conference might appoint a committee to have that matter under consideration until the next conference. I believe the subject worthy of such action, and I believe it becomes the dignity of this Conference to take such action.

CHAIRMAN: Action in regard to the matter has been taken by the Conference, and any further discussion is clearly out of order.

JOHN F. HANSON, of Iowa: I make it as a new motion.

CHAIRMAN: I think the only way that this matter can come up before the Conference is by motion to reconsider the last vote.

JAMES WOOD, of New York: I rise to a question of privilege. In speaking on this subject yesterday morning I endeavored to illustrate one phase of that which I was about to bring before the Conference by saying that perhaps if each yearly meeting thought their book of Discipline was about the right thing, and if the body at large would adopt that, it would be all right, and then with a little attempt at pleasantry, I said: "Of course it would be all right if you would only adopt the New York Discipline." I may be mistaken, but I thought I heard from some part of the house, that I recommended the adoption of the New York Discipline, and I am told that the press has it so this morning. It simply illustrates the fact that it is exceedingly dangerous for a dull man to attempt pleasantry.

EDMUND STANLEY, of Kansas: It seems to me there was no opportunity given to protest against laying the proposition on the table.

RUTH MILLS, of Wilmington: I believe that it was decided that the yeas were to have the first vote and the nays were to vote afterwards. We who opposed the proposition were courteous enough to wait until the yeas had their chance, and then the decision of the chair was given.

CHAIRMAN: If some friend who voted in the affirmative will call for a reconsideration of this vote, the chair will put it again.

DAVID B. UPDEGRAFF, of Ohio: Under the apprehension that our dear friends feel that they have not been treated quite fairly, I, voting in the affirmative, am willing to call for a re-decision without any discussion. I sustain the chair most heartily because I think he con-

ceived that the expression was so overwhelming that he, perhaps, overlooked calling for the negative, and I believe the negative was not called for.

CHAIRMAN: It is quite possible that the chair was at fault in not calling for the negative vote specially. The proposition now before the Conference is this: that the whole question of a uniform book of Discipline be laid upon the table, including the report of the committee, and the friends who support this proposition to lay upon the table will please express themselves.

(Opportunity being given for expressions on both sides the chair decides that the number of votes in favor of laying upon the table is much larger than the number who are opposed, and that the subject is laid upon the table.)

ELIAS JESSUP, of Iowa: Is it understood that the advice or decision reached by this vote is to go down to the yearly meetings that it is not a practical thing that a uniform Discipline be had?

SECRETARY: I would suggest that the minute be not recorded in order to avoid that effect.

WILLIAM L. PEARSON, of Iowa: I do not agree to that. I think these speeches ought to go on record.

WILLIAM NICHOLSON, of Kansas: Whether we put it upon the records or not, we are upon the records of our church and upon the records of the public press of Indianapolis, and leaving it off of our minutes does not make one bit of difference. Every body all through the Friends' church will know about this proceeding, and we might just as well put it down.

(At the request of a friend the secretary reads the minute as prepared by him, and it is accepted by the Conference.) (See Minutes, page 23.)

FRANCIS A. WRIGHT, of Kansas: I do not know whether we are working under parliamentary rules or

Friends' order, but I would like to know whether John Henry Douglas' motion is not in order?

CHAIRMAN: The chair decided that a new motion precisely like the original one is not in order and reconsideration of the vote upon the other question might be brought about by some member who spoke in the affirmative. Parliamentary proceedings would be interminable if a proposition could be sprung a second or third time after it is first brought up.

WILLIAM L. PEARSON, of Iowa: I rise to a point of order, to express a dissent from the decision of the chair. John F. Hanson's proposition was to appoint a committee who should go over this question, and that is a wholly different question from the one we have had before us.

CHAIRMAN: The Conference has heard the dissent from the decision of the chair. What will the Conference say in regard to it?

ISOM P. WOOTON, of Iowa: The case stands here as having been settled. This proposition involves a reconsideration of the whole subject. When the subject is settled and departed from there is no way of bringing it up except by reconsideration.

CHAIRMAN: The motion was to table the whole question. There is no ground to make a new proposition.

(The Conference sustains the chair in his decision.)

CHAIRMAN: The chair would like to remind the Conference that there is a committee to be appointed on Friends' Publishing House. How shall that appointment be made? The chair would very much prefer that it shall be made by delegations reporting at the beginning of the afternoon session.

ALLEN JAY, of Indiana: I propose that the delegations get together during the recess and choose one member

from each delegation, and they can propose their names at the opening of the afternoon session, and I think it important that those selected should be persons adapted to that work. (Consent to Allen Jay's proposition.)

WILLIAM P. PINKHAM, of New England: One matter ought to be made clear before we adjourn, and that is, whether the selection of these individuals for the committee on publication should be made from the delegations or from the yearly meetings to which the delegation belongs.

CHAIRMAN: The chair understood the report of the committee to imply that the committee should be made out of the membership of this Conference.

FRANCIS A. WRIGHT, of Kansas: It seems to me we have taken a cumbersome way to appoint that committee. There is nothing whatever for this committee to do, as I understand it, except to refer the matter to the yearly meetings, which will be done any way.

JAMES WOOD, of New York: There is an exceedingly important thing for the committee to do, and that is to give the yearly meetings a proper understanding of the subject.

CHAIRMAN: The friends appointed this afternoon will be placed under obligation to see that the whole subject is presented to the yearly meetings. Each friend in this committee will make whatever verbal report is necessary, in addition to the statement of our Minutes.

RICHARD H. THOMAS, of Baltimore: One of the duties of that committee would be to see that the matter is laid before the Canada Yearly Meeting also.

CHAIRMAN: According to the report of the Business Committee which lies upon the table, the regular order for this afternoon will be the discussion of the subject of

the Duty of the Church toward our Cities. Does the Business Committee have any further report to make?

ALLEN JAY, of Indiana: We have several other things under consideration, and are waiting to see how the Conference will discuss this question. I feel like saying, as chairman of the Business Committee, that if we get anywhere near through the questions that have been presented we shall have to talk less and more to the point.

ANNA B. THOMAS, of Baltimore: I am sorry to see us departing from the Friends' order of doing things. I am afraid we are forgetting how to do it in the Friends' way, and I think it is a very great loss to us. If we could keep to the old way more, I believe we would get through more business and in a more satisfactory way.

LAWRIE TATUM, of Iowa: I have been wanting for an hour, nearly, to say almost the same words that my sister said, but I happened to be in a corner and behind the chairman, and he did not see me. I think it is a great pity, and it has hurt my feelings to see Friends get up and talk as we have heard some do this morning. I do wish we, as Friends, could realize the dignity that we ought to have, and say what we do say to the point and in a way that becomes us to speak in a Friends' meeting.

CHAIRMAN: The Conference will allow the chair to make this remark upon the subject which has been introduced. Last evening the attempt was made to have the deliberations of the Conference proceed as nearly as might be under the usual order generally understood by Friends. At some points in the deliberations the chair was asked to exercise his authority in keeping speakers to the subject before the Conference, and repeated calls were made for the application of parliamentary usages. The chair said, in reply to this, that there was but one means of conducting the discussion at that point, and that was to follow the order of the Society of Friends. We have had long rambling discussions, which certainly were not quite satisfactory to the Conference. The chair-

man was prayerful over the subject during the night, and came to this conclusion, believing it was his duty, as constituted official authority of this Conference in this particular respect, to adhere to-day as strictly to parliamentary usage as possible. My conviction is that the attempt to manage the deliberations of a body like this on a hybrid plan between parliamentary usage and the practice in vogue in Friends' meetings for some years past, is a failure. Either the Friends must be subject one to another and proceed in the manner that Lawrie Tatum has suggested, and not be impatient with rambling speeches, and in the unity of the spirit, bear with one another and go on for half-day after half-day in a discussion of this kind, or else we must draw the line upon parliamentary usage and hold Friends to the conditions of a deliberative body assembled under those rules. That is the only explanation the chair has to make with reference to the action in presiding to-day.

RICHARD H. THOMAS, of Baltimore: It seems to me that it is exceedingly important for us, at least it will be very helpful to us, if we could hold our meetings under the sense of the presence of the Lord, and try to come to united decisions. I may be entirely mistaken in my idea of Friends' usage, but my idea is that the body does not reach any decision by a majority vote at all, but that we reach a united decision, and that, where in a meeting there is a decided opposition to any point, it is not considered the united judgment of the meeting, and the meeting passes over it, as it would have done to-day, without further discussion. It seems to me that exactly the conclusion which we have arrived at would have been arrived at very much sooner if we could simply have said there was not sufficient unity to do anything, and so stopped it. But it does seem to me that going on the majority rule we are going to lack weight when we get home.

JAMES CAREY THOMAS, of Baltimore: The decisions of this Conference are advisory. They must carry the weight of this Conference with them. They are not decisive, but advisory. Let us keep that in mind.

DAVID B. UPDEGRAFF, of Ohio: I want to say a word, and ask that the remaining moments of this Conference may be spent in cementing love, and waiting upon the Lord a moment or two for his blessing. Premising that, I desire to say this: I exceedingly sympathize with the chair in his very difficult task of conducting this Conference under the rules. We have not appealed to any parliamentary usage. It has been a struggle to carry forward the deliberations of this Conference on the old line, and this very fact, as has been said by the chair, has led to our difficulty, which would not have occurred if we had gone distinctively on the one line or the other.

One other thing I want to say, just as a thought. I have been impressed with this idea, that many of our friends look toward this measure as promotive of unity. Surely we have a much better hope for unity than law, a much better hope for it than in a uniform Discipline, and as was remarked awhile ago, we have been keeping step very blessedly in this Conference. There has been a substantial advance in the unity of the spirit. I do not want any of us to feel discouraged about that, but praise God, thank God, and take courage and wait upon him for the unity of the spirit which is a thousand fold more easily obtained and worth a thousand times more when obtained than any unity of mere uniformity. We do ourselves injustice sometimes in the exercise of our minds as to the manifestation in others of undue excitement, or a wrong spirit, when there is really nothing of the kind. I believe there has been no bad feeling here to-day or anything that disturbed the unity of the church. I believe the Conference has been tested on the line of bearing and forbearing, and I praise the Lord for it. I think we ought to thank the Lord; and I think we ought to thank our chairman. I believe he is not amenable to a single reflection. He has honestly and faithfully done the best he could. I do not think anybody thinks he has not.

CHAIRMAN: If there is no further business to come before the Conference, we will close in the usual way by waiting for a little time in prayer.

Adjourned until 2:30 P.M.

AFTERNOON SESSION — 2 : 30 O'CLOCK.

The Conference was called to order by President Mills. The session was opened with singing and prayer.

CHAIRMAN : The first order of business for the afternoon session is the reading of the minutes of the Conference up to the present time.

(The minutes of the preceding sessions were read by the secretary, amended in a few points, and approved.)

CHAIRMAN : The next order of business is the appointment of the committee on the Friends' publishing house. The secretary will please call the roll of the yearly meetings for the appointment of this committee. (For names of this committee see Minutes, page 23.) (It was decided that the first person named on the committee should act as chairman in calling the committee together, and that the committee should then choose its own chairman.)

CHAIRMAN : We will now hear a communication which the Business Committee has to make to the Conference.

ALLEN JAY, of Indiana : The Business Committee has been again and again requested to present to this Conference a resolution on the subject of intemperance. After weighing the matter carefully, they have agreed on a resolution that they are willing to present to this Conference, to be adopted or rejected, without debate or without any substitute being offered. If a debate is entered into or a substitute is offered, the committee expects to withdraw the resolution. The committee was unanimous in that decision. The resolution will be read by our secretary, if the Conference desires it.

(The secretary of the Business Committee, by request of the Conference, read the resolution.) (See Minutes, page 24.)

(The resolution was unanimously approved by the Conference.)

CHAIRMAN : The report of the committee on Congress of Religions, or participation of Friends in that congress, is upon the table, and if no objection be offered, we will introduce it at this stage of the business. (See Minutes, page 24.)

THOMAS C. BROWN, of Western : I think it was the united thought of the committee that a word of explanation should be given by Elias Jessup on that.

ELIAS JESSUP, of Iowa : The only point I think the committee thought it necessary to mention in addition to the report is that we are to be represented in that congress whether we take any action here or not. That is, the Friends' church will be represented in that congress anyhow. It was thought, after discussing the matter to some extent, that it would be better for us to appoint a committee to confer with the Friends of our Friends' church who live in Chicago, and have the matter in hand to give us as complete a showing as possible, under the circumstances, so that we may defend and protect ourselves against a false position before the world. This congress, as we understand, is to make history. That history is to be recorded, and will go down to generations to come; and it was thought best, under the circumstances, to appoint a committee to confer with Calvin W. Pritchard and others who live in Chicago, to enable us to be as fairly and properly represented before that Congress of Religions as possible, under the circumstances.

(A second reading of the report of the committee was called for and given.)

ESTHER G. FRAME, of Wilmington : I unite with the report of the committee. I do not think we can have a committee appointed that is of more interest and value to our church than this. We have so many times been misrepresented in so many places, and now I understand a man of influence, and perhaps capability, is going to represent the Society of Friends, who is a Hicksite. A

friend of ours knows him, and knows that he is a thorough Hicksite, and he is to represent Friends in that congress as a people, and he is to represent us as merely an offshoot or kind of annex of the Friends' Society to which he belongs. I see in the Encyclopedia, and in many places, so many misrepresentations of Friends that I think it is very necessary that we have in this Conference a committee appointed that shall confer with the Friends in Chicago concerning this subject. It is of vast importance. I am extremely anxious that we hoist our flag to the breeze. I am anxious that we let our light shine. I am anxious that we be represented truthfully in that congress as we stand as a church to-day.

JAMES CAREY THOMAS, of Baltimore: I am very glad of the action of this Conference for one reason. As Calvin W. Pritchard remarked, invitations have been sent to Friends in different parts of the country, and it was a very great embarrassment to know just how far Friends would be justified in accepting by the general opinion and consensus of the members of the Society who knew anything of this offer. This certainly makes the way clearer to accept. The only question would be, what value would a committee of this Conference be when a number of Friends have been asked in different parts of the country, and what would be the duties of a committee in addition to those who have been already invited?

CHAIRMAN: It would seem as if, from the report of the committee, they contemplated an interview with the authorities at Chicago, to see whether it would be possible for us to participate under these conditions or not. I suppose it is intended that there shall be only a few Friends appointed.

ELIAS JESSUP, of Iowa: I should like to emphasize what I said a moment ago. I think, in a discussion of this kind, it need not take us long to decide whether we are in a position now to defend ourselves, if I may use that expression, in the World's Congress of Religions. I want to emphasize the fact, as I understand it, that we

are to be represented there, either falsely or truly. Now, the only question is whether we are to do the very best we can, under the circumstances, to have a truthful representation of the Friends' church or not. I understand it is possible that the committee that may be appointed here, one or more or all of the committee, may get a place on that Board of Control that has charge of the matter ; but at any rate, we need to do something to assist the Friends that have the matter in hand, and are earnest about it, to defend ourselves to the utmost extent, so that when the history is made and recorded it may be made and recorded properly.

CALVIN W. PRITCHARD, of Western : I think, as to the question that has been brought up in the report as to our being able to do this independently of any other organization of our name, that is already settled in one way. We had it clearly understood between ourselves and the Hicksite Friends, and with the president, Mr. Barrows, and also with the president of the congress, Mr. Bonney, that we are to act with just as much independence as if we were not associated with them in the committee ; but that is not all that we would like to have. It is not all that this Conference would like to have. It is not all that the committee would like to have. It is not all that we have sought to have ; but possibly it is all that we shall be able to get. Now, we would like to have a place on the executive committee, of which Mr. Barrows is the chairman, but we have no place on that committee. Jonathan W. Plummer is the man that represents the Friends on that committee, with one each from all other denominations. It is possible that we may not be able to get a place on that committee and to have a representation there ; but we have a place so that we can do our work just as well, for aught I see, as if we did have a place there. If we had a place there, we would be a distinct denomination, and would have a committee at Chicago by ourselves, with our own president and secretary, instead of being on a committee with the Hicksites, as we are, with Jonathan Plummer as our chairman. Now, I do not know whether we can get that or not, but

I apprehend that we already have enough so that we fill the conditions of that report that is made by the committee.

AUGUSTUS TABER, of New York: I have in my pocket a letter from some one in Chicago, requesting me to act as a member of that advisory committee on the Congress of Religions. I have given the subject very careful attention, but, with my present light. I do not see how it would be possible for a member of the Society of Friends to accept such a position. Our religion is a positive religion. We acknowledge one God; we acknowledge one Saviour; we acknowledge one plan of redemption, and we have nothing second to it. We cannot deny all love and charity and tenderness toward all others of every other religious denomination, and, indeed, to all men; but we cannot compromise the dignity of the Lord our God, or of his Son Jesus Christ, our Lord and Saviour. It may be that I do not fully understand the plan of the Congress of Religions. I have sought to understand it as far as possible; but, on the same platform with the Mohammedans, Buddhists and Pagans, and the various varieties of belief and unbelief in what is called the Christian world, I fear we should be so seriously compromised, and, as has been intimated just now by the chairman of this committee, without the power of protecting ourselves, that we should be placed in a very equivocal position by our connection with it. Possibly, we may be misrepresented by not being on the committee. It may be that people will speak ill of me in the theater, or in any other place, but it is not necessary for me to go to defend myself, in such positions, and I seriously think that the wisest plan, and the most consistent plan for us, as members of the religious Society of Friends, is to abstain from all connection with this, and to let our character be cared for by Him who has us in His keeping.

TIMOTHY NICHOLSON, of Indiana: I do not see how it is possible for Calvin W. Pritchard to expect that we can have a member on the executive committee. The entire branches of the Methodist church have but one, the en-

tire branches of the Baptist church have but one, the same with the Presbyterian, and I do not see how it is possible to look forward toward a member on the executive committee for this branch of the Friends' church. I know Jonathan W. Plummer personally, and unless he has changed since he has been at Chicago, he is an honorable, upright, splendid man to get along with, and will do nothing but what is right. Is it so still?

CALVIN W. PRITCHARD, of Western: It is so still.

TIMOTHY NICHOLSON, of Indiana: Now, dear friends, it is just this: just so sure as we do not take any hand in that matter, the Society of Friends is going out before the whole world as represented by the Hicksites. Do you want it that way? (No.) When I received an invitation to act as a member of that advisory committee, President Mills and Dougan Clark of our city and I, conferred together and decided that we ought to let our light shine, and that we had nothing to fear when we had the chance there to present Quakerism as we hold it, and that it was the safest thing, and the only safe thing, for us to do.

CHARLES F. CHAPMAN, of Wilmington: I should like to add to these remarks one thought. I know Jonathan Plummer also. He is a beautiful character, an honest man; but nevertheless if it is left to him to represent us, it will not be orthodox Friends, it will not be vicarious atonement. It seems to me we are forced to be represented there.

CHAIRMAN: I am sorry to be obliged to rise to a question of personal privilege, and interrupt the discussion on this subject. My obligations at Earlham College are such as to make it imperative that I shall take the train at a very early hour for my work, and so leave the conduct of the business in the hands of the vice-president. I am very reluctant, however, to withdraw from the Conference, without saying just a word of parting. In the first place, permit me to express my own very great personal gratification at the work this Conference has already accom-

plished. It has been a source of exceeding encouragement to me. Something has been said at one or two times in the discussions about our differences of sentiment. I do not believe there is any greater difference of sentiment amongst the members of this Conference than can be found in almost any quarterly meeting of the Society of Friends on this continent. I have been unable to discover any signs of serious difference amongst us that can in any way mar the harmony of our future progress. I leave this Conference with that kind of a conviction on my heart, that we are closer together, we are better cemented in the unity of the Spirit, and in the fellowship of the service of Christ, than we have been since I have had any knowledge of this branch of the church. The only remaining thing for me to say is that I have had a very hearty appreciation of the uniform courtesy that has been extended to me by the members of this Conference in the transaction of business, and I thank you very sincerely for the expression of your appreciation as it has come from time to time in our deliberations.

TIMOTHY NICHOLSON, of Indiana: Will the president give us the result of his thought before he leaves us?

CHAIRMAN: Very briefly. It has seemed to me all the while, since receiving a letter of invitation to act upon the advisory board, that it was the one opportunity of the century for the orthodox Society of Friends. I have been unable to see any reason why, as Christian soldiers of the cross, we should do anything else except measure up to the responsibility that in God's providence has come to us in this case. I think if Paul, after a disputation in the school of Tyrannus, had had opened before him such an opportunity as this, to meet all the great religions of the world by their very best representatives, in a discussion as to the merits of the religion of our Lord Jesus Christ, he would have thanked God, and taken courage that the door was now wide open to the whole world. I think that is the whole amount of my conviction upon that subject.

JAMES CAREY THOMAS, of Baltimore: I should like just to say that I am sure I voice the sentiment of the Conference when I say we are sorry our president is obliged to leave us, and that we thank him for his uniform courtesy and kindness, and the ability with which he has conducted the affairs of this Conference.

(Vice-President Brown takes the chair.)

CALVIN W. PRITCHARD, of Western: I meant to make a little further explanation when I was on my feet awhile ago, but forgot it, with reference to the proposition to appoint a committee. I think the committee at Chicago will be very much gratified and strengthened if this Conference will appoint a committee to co-operate with them, notwithstanding there is already a great number of Friends that are eminent in our church that are appointed as an advisory board. There were sent out, I think, thirty-five invitations, and about twenty of them have been answered. I desire to say that those who have been invited, and who have not answered directly, I hope will do so, if you are willing to serve in that capacity, because it ought to go forward. After they are appointed I think it will be eminently right and proper for this Conference to have a committee. This committee may not be able to have an official connection with this work as the advisory board have; it may not be known to the officers that appointed us, but still it may meet there and be very useful in the work. I am sorry to say it is a men's convention. There are no women at all appointed by the authorities in connection with this. The women have a connection with the Missionary Association, but that is nothing that we have anything to do with. We are only sorry that it is so, but there are no women appointed. Women, however, may be appointed on this committee, and be able to act with us in that way.

CHARLES F. CHAPMAN, of Wilmington: If we appoint a committee I favor their all being women.

CHAIRMAN: In the first place, let us decide whether we shall appoint a committee, and as to how many.

JAMES WOOD, of New York: I desire to say that up to my coming to this Conference, I had been very strongly opposed to the Society of Friends taking any part whatever in this Congress of Religions, partly on grounds suggested by our friend Augustus Taber, and partly on the ground that I have no sympathy with the primary object of this movement, of this Congress of Religions, in connection with the World's Columbian Exposition, and from other considerations which it is not necessary to state. I therefore had not accepted my invitation to act as one of the advisory committee. But it appears, much more forcibly than I supposed the situation warranted, that we are compelled to take part. The situation is such that whether we want to take part or not, we have got to do it. We are going before the world as taking part in it whether we do or not; and if we do not, as has been already said, we are simply represented to the world by a committee of Hicksites. We, therefore, in truth to our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, must take part for his sake and ours. That is all there is of it, and by taking part in this we in no way compromise his name and our true allegiance and testimony to him, because he permits us and these other people to live in the same world together, and this is a World's Fair. They have just as much right to the exhibition of their faith as we have. I have eaten and traveled and slept with Mohammedans and Buddhists, and all these people, and I could not help it, and we have got to be with them here on this earth so long as the Lord pleases; and it is our duty, as we live with them here upon the earth, to raise aloft and keep aloft the banner of our Lord; and this is simply the concentration of the world focused at Chicago for next year, and we have got to be there, therefore, on higher grounds than interest. I have been converted since I came here. I believe, instead of compromising our Lord and Master, our duty to him requires that we shall go.

Now, in regard to the appointment of this committee — I wish I could take back all I have said against this; but I am being taught every day of my life that it is better to keep my mouth shut instead of talking against anything except sin — sin is the only thing to talk against. In re-

gard to the appointment of this committee it may be that the Friends in Chicago are the best persons in America to represent Friends, but that has nothing to do with it. We represent Friends in America, and I think there should be some connecting link with our representative body other than mere membership. Now, if this Conference sees fit to indorse the names already given, or any number of those names, or appoint any one in addition, I think it is eminently proper it should do it in order that there may be a proper connecting link between this body and that body at the World's Fair.

EMMA F. COFFIN, of Iowa: When Augustus Taber expressed his views concerning this, it occurred to me that the very fact that the religions without Christ are to be represented there is evidence sufficient that the truth of the Lord Jesus Christ ought to be held up, and I remember this text of the Psalmist: "Thou hast given a banner to them that fear thee that it may be displayed," not hid away under a bushel, but displayed, "because of the truth." I think it ought to be displayed there.

DAVID B. UPDEGRAFF, of Ohio: I looked upon this question a good deal as has been expressed by Augustus Taber and James Wood, and yet I was impelled to reply affirmatively. I thought that was the only safe course for me at the present time, so I replied affirmatively, scarcely knowing why, but I think the way is clear. It does not seem to me that there is any other course for us to take at present than the one that has been suggested. Not that I grant that the opportunity will be so good or great to hold up the religion of Jesus Christ and promulgate it amongst those Mohammedans as some might hope, but I think there is no course left to us but the one that has been suggested. If there is a committee appointed, doubtless this connection may be made; doubtless some, at least, of those who have been invited to take part in the advisory board may be officially appointed in this Conference, and so the connection be made.

NATHAN T. FRAME, of Wilmington: I want to unite with the report of the committee because it has been so

clearly and fully brought before us that we shall be represented there in some form, as Friends, at that congress, and I think we are more capable of representing ourselves than anybody else is of representing us. I am glad that there is so united a sentiment upon this question of appointing a committee to take our share, whatever that share may be.

ALLEN JAY, of Indiana: I have always made it a rule in meeting, when I see a thing going the way I want it to go, not to make a speech about it.

LUKE WOODARD, of Indiana: I stand just where my friend James Wood does, as a convert. I had objections to the movement, but listening calmly to the various views, I am ready to accept the proposition.

FRANCIS W. THOMAS, of Indiana: I am in favor of the report of the committee, and while in favor of the report of the committee I am also in favor of confining ourselves to the regular status which has been laid down for the management of the affairs in the conduct of that concern. The women have a department, the men have a department, and it seems to me that it will not be any advantage to our interests to endeavor at this time to force any complications by putting women on this committee.

ESTHER PUGH, of Indiana: It would not be dignified to put women on the committee. I know enough about the management there to know that. The women would find themselves rather alone.

DRUSILLA WILSON, of Western: That is my mind. It would be better not to appoint women.

WILLIAM L. PEARSON, of Iowa: I propose that we follow the suggestion of James Wood.

CHAIRMAN: Will James Wood please state his suggestion again?

JAMES WOOD, of New York: I simply made the suggestion that this Conference might appoint those who had been invited by the Chicago Friends representing different parts of the country, or they might appoint somebody else. All I wanted was an official appointment of this committee. I do not remember just the wording of the minute in regard to appointing this committee, but I think it must be kept advisory. We have no authority to appoint anybody here but to advise.

ROBERT W. DOUGLAS, of Indiana: Quite a number of representative men have received invitations as members of the advisory board; why could we not take their names as that committee inasmuch as they have been invited in that regard? I would be willing to trust the case in their hands, in connection with the local committee of Chicago.

ELIAS JESSUP, of Iowa: I suggest that a committee of five be appointed to co-operate with the Friends at Chicago, who are already on that board, in some sense, and that the chair take time to think about it and appoint them this evening.

WILLIAM NICHOLSON, of Kansas: I should like to approve the remarks of my brother, Elias Jessup. One of the best things for a new convert is to set him to work, and I want to suggest that we could not do a better thing for ourselves than to put our friend, James Wood, on that committee.

CALVIN W. PRITCHARD, of Western: I want to express my dissent from the remarks of Esther Pugh and others with reference to women on this committee. I apprehend this committee will not be the advisory board. They may be on the advisory board and on this committee also, and as we have no opportunity of having official connection with the women through the other channel we can have through this, and I think the committee at Chicago that have this matter in hand would feel it a very great strength to them if they had some of our representative

women appointed by this Conference, with whom they could confer as helpers in this work.

CHAIRMAN: Are you satisfied with the proposition to appoint five?

ESTHER G. FRAME, of Wilmington: I am compelled to dissent from our sisters. I think it is of the very highest importance that we uphold the privilege of women in Christ Jesus. This is no time, no place to remove our standard, and I believe the darker the time, the darker the place, the greater the need of the light. It is just as much a great necessity that this subject be presented as any other subject in our church, so I do not believe I want us to withdraw from it, for in Christ Jesus there is neither male nor female. There has been a distinction made, and I hope it will not be done again.

CHAIRMAN: How will you have that committee appointed? (By the chair.)

WILLIAM L. PYLE, of Western: I want to make the proposition that we increase the number on the committee to five of each sex. There will be communications through the mails, and they can reach each other and consider far apart. (Consent.)

WILLIAM NICHOLSON, of Ohio: I was about to make the same proposition, to have five of each. That congress will be composed of religions from all the world. We must come in contact with that which ignores women and holds them as slaves. We want to show our colors there and show what the religion of Jesus Christ has done not only for man but for woman. I think we ought to appoint women on that committee.

(The Conference decides to appoint five men and five women on the committee.)

NATHAN T. FRAME, of Wilmington: I believe there was a suggestion made that this committee be appointed

from among those who are already invited to take part on the advisory board.

CHAIRMAN: That was only a suggestion. The chair will use its pleasure about complying with that unless the Conference orders it.

(The Conference desires to leave it to the chair.)

(The names of the advisory board were read at the suggestion of Calvin W. Pritchard.)

CHAIRMAN: The chair will, at the opening of the evening session, propose a committee as suggested, composed of five men and five women.

We are now ready to go to the regular program.

ALLEN JAY, of Indiana: We will have to have less discussion or we will not get through. Some of the propositions that have been put into the hands of the Business Committee cannot be brought up unless we proceed more rapidly. I think when we know a thing is settled that we would better stop the discussion and take up new business.

The committee propose that the devotional meeting meet to-morrow morning at eight o'clock and be conducted by Emma F. Coffin; that the Conference meet at nine o'clock; that the business of the Conference close at ten o'clock to-morrow, and that we then have devotional exercises for one hour, reading the adjourning minute at eleven o'clock.

DAVID B. UPDEGRAFF, of Ohio: I hesitate very much to say it, but there is a question in my mind whether we would not better dispense with the devotional meeting to-morrow morning entirely and meet early, if we are going to close the business of the Conference at ten o'clock so as to have an hour of devotion from ten to eleven.

ALLEN JAY, of Indiana: It will be entirely proper for this Conference to make this change. If the Conference

prefers to meet at half past eight o'clock and adjourn the business meeting at ten, that would give an hour and a half for business.

WILLIAM L. PYLE, of Western : I like that proposition.

(Other voices in approval.)

CHAIRMAN : The understanding, then, is that the Conference proper meet at 8:30 and close at 10 ; that the devotional meeting be held from 10 to 11, closing at 11 o'clock sharp.

SECRETARY : The subject is now, The Duty of our Church toward our Cities.

ALLEN JAY, of Indiana : David Hadley is proposed to open the discussion.

DAVID HADLEY, of Western : (After a short prayer he spoke as follows :) I feel that in the limited time we have for this discussion of our duty toward cities what I shall say must be very imperfect and indefinite. It is recognized on the part of our advancing civilization that our cities are becoming the centers not only of the management of commercial and financial matters, and all interests of that character, but they are also becoming the centers of intellectual life, and ought to be made the centers of spiritual power and blessing. It is also a known fact that the Friends' church has been satisfied with its development in the rural districts, and that situation has given to the church a great deal of stalwart Christian character ; has given the fibre of character that has stood the test of the surging difficulties connected with the experiences of the human family. But in these modern times, recognizing the advance of the enterprise of the age, it seems quite evident that if our church meets its highest expectation and reaches the summit of its influence it must not be satisfied with a merely rural influence, but that it must touch the cities. There are some

reasons for this that are exceedingly potent, a few of which only I shall speak of. One is, that our colleges and academies are educating our young people until they are choosing professional and clerical life and commercial enterprises, and we are becoming a commercial people rather more than a rural people in many respects. In order to carry out that development our people are moving into cities and towns, and we have had an unusual shrinkage in our membership by the absorption of that exceedingly desirable element of the church into other churches, and to-day it is not uncommon to find in our cities some of the most prominent characters in the other churches that ought to be in our church, and hence we owe it to our membership to seek the citizenship in our cities; we owe them the establishment of our church in our cities. It is, perhaps, a known fact that it is a great deal better to commence at the top and reach down than to commence at the bottom and reach up. For that reason we must enter the cities if our light shines as it ought to shine.

Perhaps I might speak a little of the methods by which we should enter the cities. There is no question that the methods employed will have to be absolutely spiritual, absolutely of that character that shall be marked in a spiritual sense. They will have to be not mere forms and theories of spiritual life, not a mere externally correct movement, with nothing behind which is absolutely and positively spiritual in its development. We are not economical of our strength when we allow our evangelists to be called by other churches and supported by other churches, when we ourselves ought to have the benefit of their influence and their work. I insist upon it that in our duty to our cities, instead of allowing these evangelists to go out into other churches we ought to take them up and put them into these cities as members of the Friends' church, and whatever comes as a result of the work of these evangelists ought to come as a membership into the Friends' church. However much we are glad to see men and women saved, I feel that I am especially interested in building up the Friends' church, and I think we have a right to the numerical results of those

who are converted under our instrumentality. Some may say that this is utopian; that it cannot be done. I believe, my dear friends, that it is not utopian. I believe that it is within the reach of the Friends' church. I speak more directly of the West. I know not so much of the East. There is not a village or city in this central country in which there is not a certain amount of hungering and thirsting for that which is absolutely spiritual in its nature, and I believe that God, in his providence, intends that we shall strike this current, and let the people know that we stand in such a relation that these may be brought into connection with us.

I want to say something practical, if I can. We are entirely done with impracticable things and impracticable systems and breezy poetry. We want to get down to something that is absolutely solid and specific in its nature, and that will come to our relief; hence I would like to say something practical. I think we ought to send these evangelists, who are well adapted to meet a city citizenship, out into the cities. We ought to rent a hall in a suitable part of the city that would commend itself to the intelligent. If we, as a church, do the work that we ought to, we must meet not only those who are consigned by hardships to an uneducated life, but we must necessarily reach those who have intellectual culture, men and women who command large capital and large resources, and if we do that we must plant our instrumentalities in such a way that they will commend themselves to men and women of enterprise and men and women of culture and intellectual grasp. I am tired of letting the world be more enterprising than we are.

After having sent out these evangelists, it seems to me the next thing to be done is for the yearly meetings' committees, or general superintendents, or the yearly meetings in coöperation with each other, to bring these individuals into the church fellowship. Their names ought to be brought into the church. There ought to be pastors appointed over all these persons recently awakened and brought into the church. I hope to see the day, and I shall be like good old Simeon if I can see the day, when the Society of Friends, or the Friends'

church, gathers up all its latent energies, and with sanctified judgment moves into these centers, where the surging masses of our people are meeting, to plant the standard of the cross of Christ in the midst of them, and show to intelligent people that we are equal to the emergencies that are before us, and that we have nothing to be ashamed of. I am full of enthusiasm on this question, and I am a rural man, living on a farm, and do not claim the qualifications that I have outlined as necessary to meet this point. I could say more, but this is enough, simply to open the discussion on this point.

CHAIRMAN: The question is now open for discussion by any member of this Conference. I think possibly it may not be out of place to call attention to the fact that according to the rules for discussion adopted at the opening of this Conference, no one is entitled to speak on the same question the second time without the permission of the chair, and the chair would not grant it without the permission of the house.

CHARLES E. TEBBETTS, of Iowa: I wish to say a few words on this question. I would not so exceedingly regret the attitude our church has taken if it simply resulted in the loss of a large number of our members who have moved to cities and connected themselves with other churches. It has been my work during this year to be connected with an effort to bring together some of our members in the city of Los Angeles, California, a city of fifty or sixty thousand inhabitants, and I find perhaps a hundred persons who had been in former times connected with our church, but who have drifted away from any church association, or connected themselves with other churches, the majority with the Unitarian church for some reason. So that the result of past experience has been that because we have not had churches in these centers where these persons could be collected together, many of our own members have dropped out of religious life, and are now in a condition where it is almost impossible to reach them, and those who have gone to other churches have gone to churches where we would not wish

them to go. So it seems to me important that in these cities, these centers, there should be churches established so that we may hold our own membership and reach others. It certainly is not practical for us to locate our houses of worship far away from the center of a city, out where there are no lines of street-car accommodations, and where we cannot hold evening service. My experience in the past has been that Friends have seemed to take a delight in doing this.

Another thing, if we are going to go into the centers where we can have this central location to reach out from into the suburbs, it will require a large expenditure of means. The practical way is to have some means like other churches have of fostering these influences in the earlier stages. I suppose there is no place where a church can so soon become self-sustaining, perhaps, as in these cities, if a vigorous effort is put into it in the incipiency. But to let it drag on poorly sustained, left almost to itself, is almost worse than to do nothing at all. If we are to do this work we must have some one who will take hold of it and devote his entire time to the work. It must be done first through some home mission board that shall have funds that it can devote to fostering the work in its earlier stages and press it with all the force possible, and bring it as soon as possible to a self-supporting basis. I believe it is practical and necessary and we ought to take hold of this work in such a way as to put the force of the church behind these churches in the cities where we wish to build up our church.

J. WALTER MALONE, of Ohio: I do not want to discourage the thought of taking our work into our cities, but, beloved, I will whisper you one secret. The Quaker church will not be popular in our cities. It is because religion is not popular. Formal religion that will let them go to the theater and play cards is popular, and that is all. Unless we have a church like that, we will not have great, large, strong churches that the rich will join. They wont do it. The rich people will not join a Quaker church in a city. I represent to-day possibly the largest growing Friends' church in a large city, and I will tell you one

secret. It is built out of those that are discontented, that feel like those discontented men who followed David, but to-day they are men and women filled with God and growing. Our church is growing. We have nearly three hundred members to-day, whereas ten years ago dear old James Farmer said he often went to church by himself, and when he was not there he had good reason to know the doors opened and shut without any one entering in. I would be delighted to have the rich people come to help us, but it takes constant work.

I would say one thing more: the backbone of our churches in our cities is the Quakers, those who were born Quakers in the country, most of them; sons and daughters of Quaker parentage are carrying on the largest Baptist, Presbyterian and Methodist churches there are. To keep successful, our church must have converted men and women alone in it. We do not admit any one in our congregation that has not been born of the Spirit of God. We do not grow very fast. It is not popular to join our church. One of the pastors of our city told me that there was not a church in our city of Cleveland in which some of the members had not been converted in our church. I do not know how true that is, but the young people will not join our church very much when these others say they may go to the theater and go out to parties and have a good time. The Quakers say that they must not go to a dance or play cards, and that is why it is not popular. We are not going to have a big popular church of Quakers in our cities, and yet, I believe as our brother said this afternoon, that we should let our light shine in those darkened places. I thank God for the privilege of holding a light in a city where men and women point to our young people and recognize them as acceptable helpers in the work. They know the Quakers. If a revival comes up they send over and ask for some of the young people to come over from our church, and if they are going to have a fair or show, they do not invite us. Thank the Lord for it. It is pretty hard for us to come down to take in the poor people and go out after the outcasts, but to build up our city meeting I believe we will have to begin at the bottom and go up. We want

get the rich to come in. I have seen it tried. It is fatal. The devil is after the people, and he will repeat himself always. When God called the children of Israel the devil tried to kill them, and when he could not kill them he tried to tempt them in the wilderness, and then he tried to make them compromise. First, Satan tried to kill Christ, and then he tried to tempt him, and then he tried to make him king, anything to compromise. So in the church; the devil tried to kill the early church, and when he could not do it, by and by he got to patting them on the back, and that is worse. It is the same in our Christian experience. If the devil cannot kill us, the next thing he will be patting us on the back and saying we are very nice fellows. It will be the same in the city churches if we want to get the rich people in. We cannot do it, because it is pretty hard for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God. I believe if Quakers had kept their right position where they began, where the Salvation Army began, where the Methodist church began, they would have done better, but now they are getting top-heavy. God has called the Salvation Army to commence the work over again, and I believe the same old story will be repeated. It will be the same with the Salvation Army. The devil is patting them on the back now. They can get a larger crowd of people than any other church can in our city. It is the same old story. They are going the same way unless God wonderfully intervenes. So we must begin in our cities, at the bottom. The king's supper is ready. We must go out into the highways and hedges and compel them to come in. Let us go at it with the expectation that we will be a poor, despised people. We will be like our Master, of whom it was said there was no beauty about him, that he should be desired. But, we will save men along the way. I wish we could save our young men. Mothers write letters to us, asking us to find their boys, and fathers write, asking us to find their children. We get letters from all over the country. I had a letter from a dear Philadelphia Quaker, one of the strongest, straightest men, who would not like to take very much part in our meeting in Cleveland, I suspect, because we sing, but the dear man wrote to us that his boy was coming out there,

and he said, "Wont you get your arms around him and get him into your meeting?" Beloved, let us have a soul-saving station in our cities. I trust dear David Hadley will be able to plant them within his limits, and that every yearly meeting will do work in that direction. We can do it, if we are willing to take in the poor and despised. We can make our meetings grow if we will keep on the line of conversion or no membership. We will not get those in the higher walks of life. One has married a wife and cannot come, another has bought a farm and must see it, another must attend to his business and cannot come. So, beloved, do not spend your means laboring where there will be no result. Bishop Thoburn told us that they tried to get the upper class in India, and labored years and years with no result, but when they went to the outcasts they got them and they are getting them now. They are glad to come. That is the way the Methodist church is building up in foreign lands. That is the only thing we can do, put a little house there where men and women can be converted. I am glad of the privilege of having men say, "I am going to bring a man into your little Quaker meeting, and we want you to see that he is converted before he gets out." O, beloved, let us begin and let our light shine in our cities, and let the work grow there.

LUKE WOODARD, of Indiana: I am in full accord with what has already been said. There is a great deal more in what Walter Malone has said than perhaps many of us are ready to assent to. We go into the cities, and what we have to meet is not the old established meetings where Friends for comfort and convenience have congregated. We talk about starting meetings where there are none, and in doing it we have to meet manifold difficulties of which our fathers knew nothing, because they did not then exist. We have difficulties before us on all sides. The first thing to consider is not the holding of revival meetings. Evangelistic work is much more easily accomplished than the after work of building up and holding the meeting. We have to consider how we will get pastors who are gifted to take hold and hold this work. The

money question comes in. Have we the means by which we will be able to support these pastors and build the churches and carry on the work? I confess, as I look over our church, that we may truthfully say, The harvest indeed is plenteous, and for this demand the laborers are comparatively few. I am not saying this to discourage us from going forward and doing all we can do, but that we may see the difficulties that are before us. There is an intensity of business and pleasure, and many things that did not exist before the days of railroads and telegraphs and telephones. There is a competition, I may say, among the churches. We are not the only people who have the gospel. We are not the only people who have spiritual men qualified of God. Now, we have to come in competition with these, and we have to come in competition with all the influences that are operating against us, mistaken ideas, against which I utter my protest, or, at least, would correct the statement which is often made, that if we only get the power of God upon us, and are full of the Holy Ghost, people will be flocking to us. Now that depends. The more spiritual a man is, the more he really represents Jesus Christ and his truth, the more he will be avoided by a man who does not want to make the acquaintance of God. Such a man will want a place where he can have his worldly entertainments and pleasures. He will not seek a very spiritual church until the Spirit of God gets hold of him and he begins to hunger and thirst after righteousness. I believe it is really true that if we make a success in these great centers we will have to content ourselves with doing as our Master did, build up a church of the common people, and if we get too proud to take the very common people in, the Lord will spew us out of his mouth. We are not the church he wants.

JAMES CAREY THOMAS, of Baltimore: I think this question divides itself into two parts: what is to be done with the small city, and what is to be done with the large city. What is to be done with our towns first, and then what is to be done with our large cities. I want to emphasize what our friend David Hadley said about Friends'

meetings in towns of any size not growing if situated far away from the center of a town. I think it is practical to put a meeting-house in the center of the town and go on with the work there. Then you will get the people. It is practical.

There is one other point that I want to speak of. You wont get the people to come a half mile or a quarter of a mile. We made a mistake in Baltimore. We have put a meeting-house about twenty feet from the street, and that twenty feet keeps lots of people out of the meeting-house. If we put it in the highway, in the most prominent place that it can be placed, and then, if we have somebody to build a church up, it can be done.

I want to say another thing, that is, in regard to the influence of the Society of Friends upon the community in which they live. I do not care whether it is a small town or a large town, we want to influence that community; and I tell you, friends, we may talk a great deal about one way of doing things, but there is more than one way. There are more influences in a church than evangelism. There are more methods of reaching communities than by revivals. There is the influence of a man whom God has touched in the community though he may never be called publicly to preach the gospel. I have an example in my own mind, a friend of mine whom I knew and honored and loved. Early in his life by the power of God's Spirit he determined to give his life to his Saviour and to mankind in connection with his church in which God had placed him. It was the church of the Society of Friends. He went away by himself for six months to ask the Lord what his call was,— whether to the ministry of the word. He definitely decided it was not to the ministry of the word, but that it was to the dedication of his life to that service, and that man entered into almost every avenue of the life of that city of which he was a member. When he died, he was, probably, one of the most influential of men, not in politics, but in the moral support, in the power of the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ in that city. Now, I tell you, dear friends, we will lose that hold upon the community which we have had by the lives of men who are universal in their spirit. I think it was

William Penn or George Fox who said: "Friends, be universal in your spirit. Don't look only at one aspect of the truth." Here we are placed in a community, it is our business as Friends to take hold of the moral influences of that community and control them, and we can do it if we will. There is no society in the world, I venture to say, from my experience, that affords such a vantage ground as ours for a man who is willing to dedicate himself and take hold of the community in which he lives in order that he may promote its welfare in every possible way. I will yield to no man in my estimate of the power of the preaching of the Lord Jesus Christ. It is his way of converting men; it is the way in which men are brought to Christ. The preaching of the gospel is a means of salvation, and men, when they have received the gospel and become members, are to build up the community and let the gospel flow from them in every way in which it is possible. They are to take hold of the community and be powers in the community. I tell you, dear friends, that is what our cities want.

We talk about rich people. Rich people have souls as well as poor, and the gospel can reach rich people and convert them. I heard the other day of a man who was converted under the power of the gospel and in less than a year he had so given up his means and used his power, that he had made a revolution in his community. He was converted and his pocket-book was converted. Rich people can get into the kingdom of Heaven. With God, all things are possible. Let us not forget the rich or cultivated people. If you want to keep the cultivated people in the churches you have got to give them methods that do not offend them. Their taste must not be offended. If you give the conduct of a meeting into the hands of a man who does not understand the feelings of the cultivated people, he treads upon them. If he occupies all the time with discussion which cannot reach the cultivated man and gives him no opportunity for silent approach to God, united worship for which he came there, you drive that man out of the meeting, and it has been done in many instances, dear friends. It has been done over and over again. If we undertake to give an individual control

over a meeting, we must see that he is spiritually equal to that control. In our methods we must remember that we are not only to reach the poor and ignorant and uneducated, and those who are willing to accept anything and everything just to keep out of the way. I believe it is our duty to stand in the way sometimes in the power of the Lord Jesus Christ.

If our church is to grow, it is to grow by sanctified application of our principles to our needs, and it is not to grow by our putting meetings under the direction of one who will scatter the meeting. I say, dear friends, if we are going to take these communities and cities we have got to take hold of the community, being ourselves sanctified to the work, not only having sanctified ministers; then we can build up a strong Quaker church so that it may be a power wherever it is.

A missionary had a large number of converts and he wanted workers. He said he was going to appoint deacons over the church, and he told them what the duty of a deacon was, how much service he would have to give; that he would have to go if the Lord called, even if it took him where there was a contagious disease. He said to them, "Now come next week and I will appoint those who are willing to volunteer." Every single member of that congregation arose as volunteers. I believe that is the spirit the Quaker church should have. When we all get to work we will take not only small villages and towns but we will have power in cities because we have a gospel that reaches intellectual people as well as people who are not intellectual, a gospel that reaches rich as well as poor, a gospel which is the power of God unto salvation. It is the power of the gospel, it is Christ himself, who reaches the people by the power of his Spirit. We are bound to go somewhere and I believe we can take a city as well as we can take a country place.

NATHAN T. FRAME, of Wilmington: The very fact that there is such a manifest desire for the planting of churches in our centers of commerce, in our cities, shows us plainly that the demand is upon us, and whether we commence one time or another, I believe that our dear

friend, Brother Hadley, struck the key note when he said that those who had in charge the evangelistic and pastoral work must take this matter in hand and go out and rent a hall and employ the very best talent that God has called, to go there and stay there until the church is built up. That demand is upon us. Our dear friend, Walter Malone, said that the backbone of the different churches in the cities was composed of those who had once been Friends. What we need to do is so to plan and arrange that we shall lay hold of those persons before they go to supporting these other churches, and make them the backbone for the churches in the cities and build up the Friends' churches in the cities in that way. It has been on my heart and on my wife's heart, and we have traveled over this country, when we have seen the inflow into other churches of these young men and women, educated and cultivated, who might have been standard bearers for the Society of Friends, and who might have been staunch men and women to stand by the church in all its relationships; we have seen that the demand is upon us, and we shall have to begin to plan and make arrangements to establish churches in these centers.

ESTHER G. FRAME, of Wilmington: I do feel that we ought to continue this discussion. The subject is of great importance. A great many hearts are overflowing with thoughts and interest in this subject. I want that we as Quakers may consider this subject, and at the evening session I believe we ought to have an opportunity of continuing this discussion.

JAMES WOOD, of New York: It is an extremely important subject, and one in which we all feel a great interest, and one in which we all feel exactly alike. It is, therefore, quite unnecessary to take the time of this Conference to discuss this question. All we can do, I think, is to make a minute to the effect that the duty of the church toward our large cities is a very urgent one, and that Friends are advised to watch such openings as the Lord may make for them for service in those cities.

I think a minute of that kind, expressing the conclusion of the Conference on this subject, is all that remains for us to do.

FRANCIS W. THOMAS, of Indiana: I would accept that with the amendment that we do not confine it to the large cities, but extend it to all centers of population, cities and towns.

DAVID B. UPDEGRAFF, of Ohio: I agree, and hope that Friends who see how it ought to be done will go ahead and do it, and furnish us an example by the time the Conference meets next, as to what can be done.

WILLIAM NICHOLSON, of Kansas: To my brethren in the ministry I would say, let us make this a subject of prayer and meditation, and when we come before our congregations, let there be occasions in which we shall put it upon their consciences with all the power that God gives us.

ESTHER G. FRAME, of Wilmington: We have made one mistake as a church: we have spent our forces and energies upon the poor people. I love the poor people, but the Lord intends us to go after the rich. I do not really agree with our friend from Cleveland that the rich are not easily reached. My experience is that the rich man is just as easily reached as a sinner who is not rich. We have had experience among southern people, among refined people, among sinners who were slave-holders, and I have seen the altar crowded with those people, seeking to come to Christ. We believe the demand is upon us to go after the rich, and if we get the rich saved we can reach all the way down to save others.

JUDITH C. JOHNSON, of Ohio: Greatly to my regret I must leave the Conference, and I want to say, before I leave, how much I have enjoyed being here and looking into your faces, and now I want to say, "Finally, brethren, farewell. Be perfect, be of good comfort, be of one mind, live in peace; and the God of love and peace shall be with you."

ROBERT W. DOUGLAS, of Indiana: We are getting at something very practical now. Our large towns and cities are not only consuming our pork and wheat and corn, but are taking our young men and women, and unless we can do something more than we have done to build up our own interests, our days are numbered. I think we ought to discuss this question, because it is of vital importance to the welfare of the church. I propose that this discussion, which is vastly better and more practical than our disciplinary arrangements, be continued to-night. I have some remarks that I should like to make for the relief of my own mind. I propose that we adjourn now and continue the discussion this evening.

(A proposition being made to extend the time to quarter of five, and at that time close the discussion, it was not agreed to, and the Conference decided to continue the discussion to-night.)

ALLEN JAY, of Indiana: I will make the announcement that I have spoken to one or two friends who have introduced subjects, and one, at least, is willing to withdraw his subject, and, therefore, this topic might occupy half the evening session, and the next subject can be finished before the close of the evening session.

The subject we propose to bring before the Conference is a proposition to change the name of the Society of Friends to that of Friends' Church, limiting every speech to five minutes; then the printing committee will be appointed, and then the question of the indorsement of the Christian Endeavor will come up; then our friend, William P. Pinkham, has a speech he wants to make of fifteen minutes length, on the recognition of the gifts of the ministry.

I want to say, myself, that this subject of our duty toward our cities is one that some of us feel the importance of more than any other that has been brought before this Conference. Indiana Yearly Meeting is suffering on that account, and if we can get anything definite and practical, I think we had better get it. That is my opinion, as a member of the committee.

CHARLES E. TEBBETTS, of Iowa: I was going to suggest that the Business Committee bring forward some plan, perhaps similar to a home mission board, or something of that nature, so that this work may have the support of the church behind it.

CHARLES F. CHAPMAN, of Wilmington: It occurred to me that we might be willing to ask the Business Committee to withdraw that question as to the name of the church or society, and devote ourselves to other matters that are more important.

DAVID B. UPDEGRAFF, of Ohio: I think the committee would be glad to have it withdrawn.

(The committee consent to withdraw the subject.)

JOHN F. HANSON, of Iowa: I think our friends at home would be very much disappointed if we just avoid that question. It has come up here in one way or the other more than once.

FRANCIS A. WRIGHT, of Kansas: Our yearly meeting desires to have it considered. I do not like to see that question entirely withdrawn.

JAMES WOOD, of New York: I think matters referred to this Conference by any yearly meeting cannot be withdrawn without consideration.

JAMES CAREY THOMAS, of Baltimore: I propose that we let the report of the committee stand, and let the speeches be five minutes in length.

WILLIAM L. PEARSON, of Iowa: I wish the Business Committee would follow the suggestion of Charles E. Tebbetts and bring to us to-night something definite about this city work, if we are going to continue the discussion.

FRANCIS A. WRIGHT, of Kansas: A year ago we had the subject of change of name on our minutes, but we

did not consider it because we wished to wait for the judgment of this Conference. We have not brought it forward before the meeting because we supposed it would come before it, but we shall be disappointed if some action is not taken on it.

CHAIRMAN : The ruling of the chair is that the subject cannot be withdrawn inasmuch as it is referred to this Conference by a yearly meeting.

DAVID B. UPDEGRAFF, of Ohio : I think the action of Brother Wood has misled the chair. I would dissent from it. I know of no rule requiring this Conference to consider anything.

RICHARD H. THOMAS, of Baltimore : Although this Conference is not bound to consider the question proposed by Kansas Yearly Meeting, it certainly would be a mark of good feeling and kindness for this Conference to pay some attention to the very moderate action of that yearly meeting in the matter ; I think we ought to consider the feelings of the people at home, and I very much hope we shall discuss this subject.

(Others express the same desire.)

TIMOTHY NICHOLSON, of Indiana : If it is to be considered, let us give an expression on it without discussion.

ELWOOD SCOTT, of Indiana : I do not think we shall have time for a lengthy discussion.

ROBERT W. DOUGLAS, of Indiana : I think we can express our opinion in regard to that matter in a very few minutes. The Conference can express its opinion either for or against.

CHAIRMAN : The sentiment is very nearly evenly divided. Would we be satisfied to give an opportunity during the evening session for an expression on this subject, cutting off absolutely every word of discussion, sim-

ply taking the sense of this Conference in the matter of the name of the church?

(Conference consents.)

CHAIRMAN: It will be the understanding then that at the opening of the evening session the matter of our duty to cities will be open for discussion.

After a season of prayer the Conference adjourned until 7:30 P.M.

EVENING SESSION—7:30 O'CLOCK.

The Conference was called to order by the chairman, and opened by singing and prayer.

CHAIRMAN: I will announce as a committee on the Columbian Exposition Congress of Religions the following Friends: (For names see Minutes, page 26, where, however, Elias Jessup, of Oregon, is wrongly ascribed to Western Yearly Meeting.)

(The nominations were approved by the Conference. The Secretary then read the minutes of the last meeting, which were approved.)

CHAIRMAN: I think I will take the liberty now, as we enter into the discussion of the question with reference to our duty toward the cities, to call attention to one rule that is to control our discussions in this Conference; that is, that no one friend is to speak the second time on the same subject without the consent of the chair, and the chair wishes to place the responsibility back on the Conference; so the chair will not entertain a second speech from any one, without the consent of the Conference. That, we will bear in mind, has reference to the discussion of this subject. Therefore, those parties who spoke this afternoon will not expect to speak again on this subject this evening, without the consent of the Conference. The rules of the Conference allow fifteen minutes to any

one speaker, but it is expected that speeches of this length will be the exception; that persons who speak fifteen minutes are persons who are not well calculated, perhaps, to concentrate their thought. Those who can concentrate their thought well, and are the best speakers, get through in less time. I think "A word to the wise is sufficient."

DAVID B. UPDEGRAFF, of Ohio: I am sure it will be understood that it is not designed for anything personal.

CHAIRMAN: Not by any means. It is for that which is to come, and does not apply to that which is past. We are ready now for the further discussion of the question we were discussing this afternoon: The duty of the Friends' church to the cities.

A FRIEND: If I mistake not, the Conference, in allowing this discussion to be continued, decided there should be only five-minute speeches this evening.

CHAIRMAN: That is so; the Conference does so rule.

DAVID B. UPDEGRAFF, of Ohio: I believe this whole question is so absolutely dependent upon the leading of the Spirit and providential openings, that we cannot determine anything beyond the general truth, "Go preach the gospel to every creature." We shall find in the fulfillment of this commission that some people are led in one direction and they succeed. It may be the Lord will raise up a special man, a providential man for a city, and there may be a great success given to that man, or to that congregation there, and to others elsewhere. I think each of us had better just mind his calling, and I believe the Lord will do the best he can for us if we are ready to go here or there or anywhere, as God may call. I have been interested in all that has been said about it. Our attention has been called to it, but we cannot determine as to just what is practical or the very best for any one congregation or yearly meeting, or any one person; and I believe we shall have to end right at this place, to recommend people to mind their calling and mind the Lord.

TIMOTHY NICHOLSON, of Indiana : I hope the time will soon come when we can be so unified that we can as a whole church have a general board and a large church-extension fund, which can be used in this special field. I think that at present the only thing we can do is to make a minute, commending this matter to the yearly meetings, that they be instant in season, to look out for opportunities to do this work in our towns and cities, as the yearly meetings are the only bodies that can now act upon this subject. But I do hope the time will come when we can have a fund which will be supplemented by endowments, given for the special purpose of general church extension.

CALVIN W. PRITCHARD, of Western : I think this a very proper question for us to consider, because, unfortunately, our churches in great cities are not very strong and mighty, and will not accomplish any very great amount of work. I can speak this the more freely because I belong to a city meeting, and have lived and labored in a city. Now, it is a little remarkable that in our large cities our churches are not flourishing. This is true, I think, of nearly all, if not all, that is, in large cities like Chicago, New York, etc. Our city of Chicago is divided into three divisions ; in the south division there is a Friends' church, but there is none in the west division nor in the north division. There are a great many Friends in Chicago ; that is, there are a great many people there, that if they were at home where they came from, would be Friends. They would delight to be Friends ; they are connected with Friends' families ; they love their church ; but in Chicago they are absolutely separate from Friends ; there is nobody looking after them ; they are going into other churches, and we shall lose them. There ought to be some means provided by which these people can be gathered together ; we realize in Chicago that it can not be done without a great deal of money. We can not have anything over on the west side without a house ; if we rent a house it costs a great deal ; if we undertake to buy property and build, you know that it costs a vast amount of money. How this is to be overcome, how we are to do it without having means, how these people are to be

gathered up and brought in, I do not know. I have been thinking, while we have been discussing this subject, about an Italian that came to Chicago. There are a great many Italians in Chicago. He came to this country a converted Catholic. He came to this country and was connected with business largely in New York on the Board of Trade, and was prospering in that line. He was converted to God, and he was well converted, and when converted he was ready to go to work and qualified to go to work, and he understood the call of the Lord to him for his own people. He came to Chicago to look after the Italians, and went to work, and has been working only about two or three years amongst his people. It was not very long before he had a mission, and then he was able to find a man with the money to help him; a church was built, and after a little while they sent over to Italy and had an Italian brought to this country as a pastor for the church; and now they have a strong church, and another mission is being built up out of that in the city. Now, he has gone to St. Louis, and is doing the same work there. I wonder, if we would concentrate our prayers upon it, and give our attention to it, if there could not be found a man to go to our cities and do a similar work amongst, not Italians, but Quakers? There are hundreds and thousands of people, I am sure, who would be glad to be led by some such means as this, and have such a work done, if the man could be found and the money could be found to sustain it.

ELWOOD SCOTT, of Indiana: It takes off the edge of our zeal to press out into the work in cities as long as we harbor the idea that a Quaker meeting will never flourish in the city. We have not much heart to go. We have not much spirit to press out nor to spend much money. I thought while Timothy Nicholson was speaking about these meetings and raising money to press this work, that if Quaker meetings are not calculated to flourish and prosper in a city, why incur the expense? But I believe just the contrary. It has only been during the last few years that we have tried to adapt our principles to the needs of the people of the cities. If I thought the prin-

ciples that we hold as a church were not such principles as were adapted to the needs of the world everywhere, I should conclude there is something wrong in the principles; that we are holding something that is not the gospel of Jesus; but I believe the Quaker principles are meant to apply to the needs of the world in every locality under the shining sun, to all men and to all nations, in cities and in rural districts. I think what we need is to have good, earnest, Holy Ghost preachers, full of life and full of power, to send out, and to have the church stand by them. But we must overcome a good deal of prejudice. It is a fact that there is a prejudice against the Society of Friends. Some think we are the same as the Shakers and the same as the Dunkards. There are places where we have to undo a great deal that has been done before a certain class of people will feel like putting themselves among us. There has been an idea for a good many years that the Quaker church is on the down grade, dwindling out. There is no man who will take passage on a ship that he thinks will sink before it crosses the sea. He will take another ship. But when it is understood that the Quaker church is going to live and grow and prosper, people take heart. As far as I understand it, they have about as good meetings in Richmond as anywhere, as prosperous meetings as in any other church in that city, meetings that have the respect of everybody, meetings that have as wealthy people in them, meetings that have as much backbone and grace in them, and spiritual life as any churches in the city of Richmond; and I do not know but it is so over in Des Moines city, from what I have heard about that place. I believe Quaker principles and Quaker meetings will prosper anywhere where truth is rightly preached and backed up by a live minister and a living church.

We can organize churches. There is nothing in the way of it and it ought to be done. I hope we will press out into this work. In Anderson they have been calling for a meeting for three or four years. The call has been going out: "We want a Quaker meeting here." There are no less than fifty Friends there already wanting a meeting there. There is nothing to hinder us from build-

ing up a large meeting there, if we have got the worker to send there and can sustain him. I do not believe any Quaker meeting will flourish in any city in the old fashioned way of sitting down in silence for an hour, having a few words of exhortation, shaking hands, and going home. They will die. We have got to do something more if we gather in men and save them. I hope we will not conclude that the principles of the Friends' church are not adapted to the city as well as to the country. If we have not the gospel God wants us to preach, let us get rid of what we have and get hold of what we ought to have. Look at Moody's plain sermons. Thousands of people gather to hear those plain sermons.

ROBERT W. DOUGLAS, of Indiana: It is evident, dear friends, that we cannot do very much in five minutes. I think this question is of sufficient importance to take some of our best thought and our best words. It takes some time to review the reasons why meetings of the Society of Friends do not flourish in our large cities and to find the remedy to be applied. The fact is, that there are only about four cities in the United States, so far as I know, where the Society of Friends is increasing and those cities are Baltimore, Cleveland, Des Moines and Indianapolis. Take Portland, Boston, Providence, New York, Washington, and we might come west and mention nearly all, Cincinnati, Chicago, Minneapolis and San Francisco, each of these has a meeting of the Society of Friends in some form or other. It would be interesting to look at these cities individually where these churches exist and see that they are not growing and the reason why, and then study what we can apply in order to bring about a state of affairs so that they can grow and flourish. Now, the trouble in regard to Elwood Scott's remark is, he takes the idea that is in the minds of a great many, that principle and practice are identical, that when you talk about Friends' principles it is equivalent to talking about their practices. The fact is, the principles of the Society of Friends will never change as a Society, but the practical application of those principles may very properly change from year to year and age to age. Of course, we will fail

if we deal with past issues. Now, in some of these places, the meetings are held in a sort of a rigid, formal way, and, permit me to say, that a formal Quaker meeting is about as dead a thing as we can imagine, and a lively Quaker meeting is the most lively service that we can have. In some of these places people come up from the rural districts where they have been converted to God, where they have lively meetings, and they go on with a good deal of religious zeal and religious activity applying the spiritual idea of a priesthood of believers and they exercise it, and in some of our large cities where there is constraint in a certain direction and a greater degree of restraint in some other direction, it does not take very many meetings to freeze them out, and you will find them in some of the other churches where they can have more liberty and more attention and more pastoral care.

MARY E. CARTLAND, of North Carolina : I am intensely interested in this subject. I believe Friends' principles are adapted to people in the towns as well as in the country. It has been my fortune, or privilege, or providence, that my lot has been cast entirely away from Friends in the last few months, which is an entirely new thing to me. We are the only Friends in the place. I am often questioned about my doctrine and what Friends believe. I think we could go to almost any town and build up a church of women, if we could not of men, for I find so many women who are just hungering for the opportunities of individual development that we get in our church, that they do not get in most others. So often they say, "Your opportunities have been so much better than ours, you have so much to be thankful for." One old lady, whom I met a few weeks since, said to me, "I wish I could live near your church"; and to another she said, "I am going to go out of the church to which I belong, I cannot stand the oppression. I wish I could be near the Friends so that I might know more about them." To extend our church, as has been stated, we must have larger extension boards and we must have money. We never can do it without. A few families cannot go into a place and build up a church alone. It takes these helps; they will have

to come. We must have a live ministry if we would draw the people, the people who have not been brought up as Friends. Those of us who have been educated as Friends understand these things and can come together, but we cannot draw others in who have been educated differently.

ELIAS JESSUP, of Iowa : I would like to inquire whether the question has really been discussed in the last ten or fifteen minutes. The question is our duty to the cities. We have been listening to a very able discussion upon the thought that our church must of necessity be a failure in the city. We have been discussing that. Now, have we as a church any duty? That is what I want to call attention to. Have we as a church any duty to perform in the cities of this country? It will be remembered that there are living in the cities of eight thousand inhabitants and over, one-fifth of the population of this country, and it will also be remembered that, perhaps, eight-tenths of the wickedness and crime of this country has its center in the large cities. It is also a fact that the Evangelical Alliance, when it meets to discuss these great questions that pertain to our churches, takes a great deal of time and exerts a great deal of energy in trying to determine what we ought to do in regard to the people in the large cities, the submerged tenth, it has been called. Whether we can establish churches in the cities or not, I feel exceedingly anxious that we take our place among the churches in this country in doing what we can to arrest the progress of crime and wickedness in the cities. I am impressed more and more, as I travel and go up and down the streets of the cities, that there is a duty that the Christian church, to say nothing of our own at this moment, a duty that the Christian church owes to the cities and certain classes of the population in the cities, that we as a church are absolutely neglecting. I am exceedingly anxious that we should expend a great deal of money in sending missionaries to foreign countries, but I do believe that we would gain a rich harvest of souls if we would spend a little money and exert a little energy in the city missionary work in this land in which we live. So I am anxious, whether our church can flourish there

or not, that we send workers, and a great many of them, from our churches into the cities, into the great maelstroms of sin, that they may be benefited by the leaven that I believe our churches can introduce for good into the cities. I am of the opinion that if we shall take this view of the subject and enter into the field that is spread out before us in all the cities and larger towns in this country, that the Lord will open the way for the establishment of flourishing churches. It is because we do not commence in the right way and exert our energies in the proper direction that we are a failure in the cities. Our effort and anxiety, as it would seem from the discussion thus far, is more that we shall establish flourishing and popular churches than that we shall go into the cities and mingle with the lost and see that they are reclaimed and brought to Christ. If we do that the church may take care of itself.

WILLIAM NICHOLSON, of Kansas: I do not rise to discuss this question. I believe we are all of one mind about it. We do not need any argument. The place for us to talk about this matter is when we return to our people at home; but I rise with some degree of diffidence, I admit, not as to the propriety of what I am about to propose, but as to whether the right time has come for it. I think it has. I want to make this definite proposition: that this Conference recognize the formation by voluntary association of a Friends' Board of Home Missions, with a secretary, treasurer, and board of directors; that this board proceed to solicit subscriptions to establish auxiliaries throughout our church, and that it enter as far as practicable into the work of church extension, with an especial but not exclusive regard to the needs of our towns and cities. Now, brethren, if we can recommend that to the church at large, and that can be taken hold of—it must be done, of course, by individuals in a sort of private capacity; it will be outside of the church, but, nevertheless, that is just the way some of the great missionary boards of this country are constituted—it would be a nucleus, a start. Let it be an organization that is properly chartered, so that it will be thoroughly

legal ; so that it will be a body to which men who have money to give, either while they are living or when they are about to die, can leave it by will and feel that it will go into a safe channel for the purposes that rest upon their hearts. Then there will be something in this work which will gather force and volume as the years pass on, and be the beginning of a work that shall do what we have been talking about here, and reflect honor upon the name of Him who died to redeem the world.

JOHN HENRY DOUGLAS, of Iowa : I hope this will be borne in mind, that while we continue the discussion we will not turn aside from this suggestion of William Nicholson. Anything that is worth reading or speaking here is worth attention. I am interested beyond anything I can tell as from day to day these subjects of vital and legitimate interest come before this Conference. We are one. We are united. When we take up the missionary question we are all alike in all the delegations in the spirit of the thing ; we are full of the missionary spirit. Now we come to the subject of carrying the gospel to the cities, and the spirit of the thing is, I believe, the same in all the delegations, in all hearts. We are speaking about practical things. My brother, Robert Douglas, has spoken of the cities. I do not think we need to confine ourselves to large cities, but we should take in small cities. There is no difference between a large city and a small city where there are people. The circumstances may be different, but this gospel of ours is to be taken to everybody in the largest city and in the smallest city, and in the country. But we are speaking about cities now. I regret very much that our churches now in our larger cities are so unfortunate, as has been spoken of here to-night. In Chicago, the condition is such, and is spoken of by Chicago Friends plainly. It is a terrible thing. It is a sad thing that within a few hours ride of this Conference, in the great metropolis of the West, and there is no question in my mind but it will be the metropolis of America in a few years, instead of gaining we are weakening every day, and unless a change comes very soon it is only a matter of a short time when all

worthy the name of the church will be extinct in Chicago. Quite a number have moved away; many do not attend the Sabbath school; it has run down to a couple of dozen; there is no mid-week meeting, day or night. So it is in other cities. Now, beloved, I believe that our friends and our churches in these cities alluded to, and those that have not been named, ought to have our special attention and prayers and counsel, so far as they will take it. It is discouraging, as Elwood Scott has said, to go into these cities without anything like efficient appliances, without support and encouragement, with the churches already organized there, and attempt to do anything on a large scale with no probability of its continuance. The question is, Is there another side? Cleveland is a sample of success, as has been spoken here by Walter Malone to-day. The number of people converted in that meeting during the year I cannot tell, but there are a great many. The question is whether the church is a live church, doing good work and saving souls and carrying the gospel out. In Richmond, Indiana, I know they are flourishing in Friends' meeting there, and sending out workers and gathering a great many in. Take the city of Des Moines, that has been alluded to; ten or eleven years ago a man and his wife were sent there. They had some means, and the man said, "I will build a house if you will furnish the lot." He took four thousand dollars out of his pocket and built the house. Isom Wooton went in there as pastor with a handful of people. He sent for me as evangelist. I went there. He stood on the edge of the platform and watched with eagle eye every soul that came in, and as he saw the power of God reach a soul, he was after that soul before he left, and got the name and address, and was in his house in less than twenty-four hours. What was the result? Hundreds of people were converted and joined the church. There was no trouble about it. The power of God was there. In every city and every town there are people who can be reached by the power of God. They will not all be saved. A great many people in the city as well as in the country are going down in spite of everything, and I believe there ought to be planted in every city and in every

town a Friends' church that is filled with the power of God. More than a thousand members have been taken into that church since that time. They have gone out and other meetings have been organized. Every year a greater or less number of ministers have been recorded, men and women. Three meetings have been organized in that city in that length of time.

MATILDA W. ATKINSON, of Iowa: Our duty toward the great cities is not to sit down or stand back and wait until some great plan can be developed and carried out in our minds, but to go to work right away to do all the little things that come to hand. It is possible for Friends with spiritual lives, who have time and ability, to take up the work and visit from house to house. That is the deaconess work, as you know it by another name. It is our duty to see that that is done, or to do it ourselves, in the cities where any of us may live or where God may send any of us. Remember that the work of the Lord can be accomplished as well by his devoted servant in the city as in the country. As proof of that, I want to refer you to the life of John Vassar. He started out as a colporteur and worked in the country for years. He was a wonderful personal worker. They called him to the city. He said, "No, my work is among a different class of people." The church pressed him hard. He did not want to be stubborn, and he went into the city. After calling at doors a few steps apart and finding the same kind of hearts and the same kind of troubles, he said to the people, "Why, I am surprised. Humankind in the cities is just like it is in the country." And so it is, dear friends. Our duty is to take up the work, not making a distinction between the country and the city, as we, after awhile, are going to take up mission work, not making a distinction between home and foreign, but regarding it all as the work of the Lord, and children of God being sent by the Lord Jesus Christ to a human soul in the city or in the country. Now, don't you forget while deliberating on some great plan, to do these little things. Send some one to work up a mission; be willing to begin at some central point and to add to the work; like drops in

a bucket, you will have it full after awhile. Be faithful over a few things and He will make you ruler over many.

FRANCIS W. THOMAS, of Indiana: The interests which gather around this question are so great and so multitudinous that we shall not be able to solve them all here to-night. The only solution for this question is to begin the work now with just what means we have to spare. I have one or two suggestions on this line.

In the first place, if we have any judgment in the propriety and nature of things, it is consistent with the will of God to look out the man or woman who is suited to a certain field. It is the province of the church to lay hands on such a character, and put him into that field. To make the work successful afterward he must have the support of all the means that are necessary. These are two points. Then there is another, and it is one of the main things in making the first two points a success: that when we have found a place where a minister of the gospel can enter and settle a church, or anything approaching a settled church, it becomes the membership everywhere to sustain the character of that ministry that we have settled in that place. If the minister should be successful we ought not to undertake to bring him down because he has been successful. We ought not to slight the opportunity of holding up his reputation and success. The success of the successful men of all the other churches has risen out of this material and this individual support, which comes after they have found the field. You can put the best man you can find into a field, and there may be an opening, but you may let an insinuation go out against him of inefficiency, or of human pride, or of something, there are a thousand ways in which his character may be attacked, and the work may be destroyed. You cannot build against all the odds of a fault-finding people. So we have got to select the man and rally around the character of our ministry. We lack the sense of adaptation. We see this everywhere we go. At some of our gatherings we set a minister to occupy the lead on that occasion who cannot address half his audience and be understood, can not be heard, when we know before-

hand that there will be a thousand or two thousand people there. You cannot expect to make that a success. It is intended that men in the religion of Jesus Christ should use their senses, sanctified. We must regard these three points as essential points in the work that lies before us in the cities and towns. To that end it is important that we set somebody on the throne of judgment, or some class of men, who will undertake to divide the ministry, and put the ministry in the place where it is adapted to the work. There is no need of contention, or competition, or jealousy on this line. There is room for all. And I praise God for making any man more successful than I have been. I do not care how much success a man has on the right line.

Then just one more point, the point of discouragement. We can not expect to be alike successful in all the cities of the world. It never was so since the foundation of the world. The Lord Jesus said to the disciples that if they went into a city and the people would not receive them they should shake off the dust of their feet against them. We get into that kind of places now, and will do so until the end of the world. We have to look out for our calling, and make the best of it.

ISOM P. WOOTON, of Iowa: Our duty in anything is what we can do; and one of the things we can do in the city, which is not done, is to give the people a more spiritual gospel than they now have. That was the thought when I went into Des Moines and it was one of the objective points in all the work there. Another thing we can do in the city is to form a society of people, rich and poor alike, that will feel perfectly at home with each other, the rich feeling in common with the poor and the poor feeling in common with the rich. That is a thing we can do, which under ordinary circumstances other churches cannot do, because they do not get spiritual enough. Another thing we can do in connection with the cities and ought, therefore, to do, and that is to plant churches in places where other people will not plant them. I do not believe we can do that if we put a wall around our meeting house, as they do in some places, or if we set it in some 'odd

place, a little out of the city in the most remote place we can find. We can put a church or a meeting house in a place where people will feel it a privilege to have a meeting house put. I do not believe in entering into competition in the city work on a basis of competition, but I believe in providing the gospel for those who have not the gospel,—providing such a gospel as they would not have from any other source. Therefore, I say the Society of Friends can go into a city. They can go into Chicago; they can go into any city in the country and be as successful, and I would emphasize that and say they can be more successful than any other church I know of, because of these advantages which I mentioned. One of the things we need in this work to make it possible for us to do what we can do, is to have persons who do not care what people say about them. They go about their business as my mother always went about her cooking in her kitchen, feeling perfectly at home with her apron on or her apron off, or with her sleeves rolled up or her sleeves rolled down. That is what we want in a city. Whenever an individual goes into a city and undertakes to put himself into a kind of fashion to please the higher society of the city, he is losing his real relation as an earnest, honest, faithful, Christian man. Everywhere, when we undertake such miserable dignity as this, the world will give the credit to the enemy of the church instead of giving it to the great higher Power. We need to go as simple and trustful in the Lord.

L. L. HOBBS, of North Carolina: I only wish to say that according to my judgment the best thing the Conference can do on this important subject is to adopt the proposition of William Nicholson.

ALLEN JAY, of Indiana: Before that proposition or any other one is introduced I hope that we may decide what we want, without discussion. There is a very important report upon the foreign missionary work that everybody wants to hear and a good many friends are going home to-night, and if we do not get it in pretty soon they will not get to hear it.

(Secretary reads William Nicholson's proposition again.)

CHAIRMAN: What is your pleasure with reference to this proposition?

(At the request of Walter Malone the minute in regard to this discussion was read by the secretary.) (See Minutes, page 27.)

ALLEN JAY, of Indiana: I propose that we adopt both.

ROBERT W. DOUGLAS, of Indiana: I do not think that I like the proposition. I think it would be adding more complicated machinery to what we have at present. I think what we want is more means to strengthen the meetings in our cities, as they exist, and then put forth endeavors for new ones.

DAVID B. UPDEGRAFF, of Ohio: I would much prefer the minute as it is, without the proposition.

(Several friends express the same preference.)

CHAIRMAN: I believe it is the sense of the meeting to have only the minute. That is the ruling of the chair.

WILLIAM L. PYLE, of Western: I want to impress strongly upon the minds of Friends who live in the country the importance of immediately following with a letter of recommendation members who move to the city, or calling attention of the pastor of the church, if there is one, to them, or of some Friend who will take notice of them or hunt them up, that they may be gathered into the church before they are gathered into some other denomination.

J. WALTER MALONE, of Ohio: I have always had the difficulty of having to write under a picture I draw the name of it, to tell what it was, and so what I said this afternoon was greatly misunderstood. Some seem to have

thought that I said Friends' principles are not adapted to cities. I think just the contrary exactly. And what I said in regard to rich Friends' meetings came from the thought that rich Friends' meetings do not want revivals and do not want the poor gathered in, and our Friends in the West have always said that is what we will have to do. I just wanted to explain that. I think Friends' principles are adapted to the masses. It is proved by the Salvation Army that is coming right along in our tracks! They have Friends' principles in all their meetings, in regard to the ordinances, etc.

CHAIRMAN: Shall we reach the sense of the meeting on the subject we spoke of this afternoon?

ELWOOD SCOTT, of Indiana: There is one point I would just like to refer to. If the suggestions of William Nicholson could in some way find their way into the minute I think it would be helpful, letting the minute stand as the clerk has made it, but if we could embody the suggestions in the minute in some way I think it would do good.

SECRETARY: The secretaries can do that by adding this minute: The following proposition, presented by William Nicholson, was directed to be placed upon record, without further action by the Conference.

WILLIAM NICHOLSON, of Kansas: I think that it ought to state that the Conference declined to accept it. That was just what was done. If we make a record, let us make it according to truth.

(Several friends express a desire that the minute stand as it is, and it is so decided.)

ALLEN JAY, of Indiana: This afternoon we suggested that we would bring up the question of the change in the name of the church, but there are so many going home who are anxious to hear this foreign mission report that we propose to introduce that at once.

JAMES WOOD, of New York : I think the chairman of the committee has not followed the instructions of the committee in this matter. I think the instructions of the committee were very positive that this subject, as to the question of change of name, should be laid before the meeting, and that no one would be allowed to speak over two minutes, and that we get through with it in twenty minutes.

TIMOTHY NICHOLSON, of Indiana : I think the understanding was that we would get through the whole thing in two minutes, because we would not have any speeches at all.

CHAIRMAN : The proposition was, as I understood this afternoon, to take the sense of the meeting without discussion.

(The secretary of the Business Committee read the recommendation of the committee as follows : The Business Committee recommend as the judgment of the Conference that it is not desirable that any change should be made in our name from that of the Religious Society of Friends, by which it has hitherto been known.)

JOHN HENRY DOUGLAS, of Iowa : I want to know from any source whether that has been the name by which we have been known as a people from the days of George Fox to this day. I undertake to say that George Fox never said it, nor any Friend during his life time, and I do not know whether there is any yearly meeting that is incorporated under that name at all. I only speak in relation to the verbiage. We do not call ourselves by that name in any Discipline.

(The recommendation of the committee is re-read.)

CHAIRMAN : Would the committee be willing to change the wording of it a little?

DAVID B. UPDEGRAFF, of Ohio : I think we ought to adhere to our conclusion so far as discussion is concerned, but doubtless a proposition to amend would be in order.

WILLIAM NICHOLSON, of Kansas : I have a proposition to offer in place of that : It is the sense of this Conference that the use or the disuse of the term "The Friends' Church," should be left to each yearly meeting, according to its own sense of propriety.

DAVID HADLEY, of Western : I second that proposition.

RICHARD H. THOMAS, of Baltimore : I would be glad if the Conference would allow each person a minute or a half minute to speak on this. We have time to spend two minutes. I think it would be better for the Conference to allow each to express his opinion very briefly, not more than two minutes at the outside, so that he may give his reasons.

ROBERT W. DOUGLAS, of Indiana : I think we can decide it in about a minute, by an expression for or against.

CHAIRMAN : The objection to the presentation of this was, that the way it has come from the Business Committee it assumes to say that the name has been known as Society instead of Church, from the organization of our church.

ELIAS JESSUP, of Iowa : There is now a proposition to introduce a substitute, and it seems to me the first thing to do is to act upon that. I want to say I am in favor of the substitute.

WILLIAM L. PYLE, of Western : I approve the substitute on the ground of our being congregational in our make-up and constitution. I do not think it is proper to undertake to bind the rights and privileges of yearly meetings in regard to their constituted name.

(The substitute of William Nicholson is re-read, and several speak in favor of it, and several speak in disapproval. The chair decides it impossible to determine the sense of the Conference.)

CALVIN W. PRITCHARD, of Western: I think, for the reason that we do not want to pass any censure upon any yearly meeting, that we ought to drop the matter in this divided condition.

JAMES WOOD, of New York: I propose that the whole subject be laid upon the table. (Several friends approve.)

CHAIRMAN: The matter is simply laid upon the table. We leave it in that way.

ELIAS JESSUP, of Iowa: I propose we leave it to the good judgment of the secretary to make the minute of this action and read it at a future sitting. (Consent.)

JAMES WOOD, of New York: Laying on the table is a parliamentary phrase. It means in a Friends' meeting that the body is not prepared to take any action. Laying on the table does not kill a measure. It can be called up at any time and acted upon. It is still before the body. Now, it is a singular thing, but Friends' use of the word "table" is based upon its parliamentary use. The clerks always say that certain things are on the table. It has come from the same use, and when a thing is laid on the table in a Friends' meeting it means it is on the table, and the meeting takes it off the table whenever it pleases. It is the practice of Friends' meetings, and it is precisely the practice of the British Parliament, of the Congress of the United States, and of every legislature of the United States.

I thought this statement might be advisable, because a number of things have been laid on the table, and we ought to understand what it means. They can be called up to-morrow before we adjourn, and acted upon. Of course, it will not be judicious to do a thing of that kind, but it is legitimate to do it.

ELIAS JESSUP, of Iowa: Laying on the table always kills in the legislature.

CHAIRMAN: Are we ready now to pass from this and take up the matter as proposed by the Business Committee? (Consent.)

CHAIRMAN: The report of the committee on a Foreign Mission Board will now be made.

MAHALAH JAY, of Indiana: Your committee has endeavored to combine the different ideas that were brought out here of a statistical bureau, a bureau of information, and also that of an organized advisory board. We also have endeavored so to form our plan that it should not in any way even intimate that the work or the treasury of any organization that is now engaged in the foreign mission work should at all be made subservient to this board. We want to cherish the work that is now going on. We want to foster it and respect its autonomy, and we have endeavored to frame our report in accordance with that thought. I wished to call your attention to these points before I commenced reading. (For report see Minutes, page 28.)

JAMES CAREY THOMAS, of Baltimore: Do the committee mean to limit the secretary to a man by using the word "he" instead of "secretary?"

MAHALAH JAY, of Indiana: We meant to use the term generically, and let either a man or a woman be chosen, as may be found suitable.

CALVIN W. PRITCHARD, of Western: This board will especially be a convenience in cases where a missionary in one yearly meeting wishes to go into a mission of another yearly meeting. This board will form a channel through which the missionary can be transferred from the one to the other.

CHAIRMAN: You have heard the report of the committee. What is your pleasure?

(Some voices in approval.)

CALVIN W. PRITCHARD, of Western: I think William P. Pinkham, of our committee, could give a point or two on this subject that he gave in the committee that may be of interest to the Conference.

WILLIAM P. PINKHAM, of New England: As a member of the committee I may say that I noticed last night in the discussions that there seemed to be a prevalent desire for some means of union and yet a great fear about having a board of missions. It seemed evident that friends labored under the great disadvantage during the discussion of not having any common conception of a "board of missions," and seeming to judge that matter entirely by what they knew of such boards in other denominations. There was the fear on the part of a great many that the organization of such a board would in some way fetter the independence of the different yearly meetings. The committee had these points before them and desired to present something which would guarantee an efficient bureau of information and advice, just what is felt to be needed and at the same time not confer upon it undue authority or power. The committee have labored to that end, and, so far as they know, have succeeded in accomplishing the purpose.

(Many friends speak in approval of the report.)

DAVID B. UPDEGRAFF, of Ohio: I am sure I highly appreciate the efforts of the committee and I confess my inability to discover what is really to be accomplished. There are so many disclaimers in it, not to do this, and not to do that, and not to do the other, and yet no positive end to be gained that I can see, that I am constrained to say for myself, I would prefer that it be laid on the table. I am quite willing for any complication that is really necessary and useful, but every time we lay our hand to any sort of complication of this kind, unless it does promise to be something valuable, I think we are doing what is unwise. Now all the information that can be found on the face of the earth is accessible to the various boards of the various yearly meetings. They understand it so well that they will not be willing to take anybody's help to get at it. All the yearly meetings are engaged in their missionary work and they are perfectly competent to find out all they need to find out, and to establish this board would lay upon the yearly meetings

the responsibility of either giving a decided assent to this, to which no further attention will be given, or of rejecting it and laying it aside. I do not think we ought to lay that kind of a burden upon the yearly meetings unless something is really to be attained. This may look to some people like it is something, but examining it closely, I can really find nothing in it. There will be no authority over any missionary association. The board is going to give advice but will not be at all offended if it is not taken. I would prefer that it be laid upon the table.

HANNAH E. SLEEPER, of Kansas: I think I can answer some of these questions, although not so able as the last speaker. It will be the business of this bureau to have persons in view on whom they can lay their hands at any time. If any of our yearly meetings' boards wish a missionary for a certain place they will write to this board as headquarters and be referred by it to such a person. Not very far from this place last spring there was a young man who had gone to a missionary training school and been fitted for missionary work, who wrote away down to Kansas, asking if they did not have any place for him to go. He said he wanted to be a missionary at a certain place and was begging for us to take him. If there had been a bureau of information where he could have put in his request, that board could have taken charge of him and had him ready and had a place ready. That is one of the reasons why we need this bureau of information.

W. F. BANGHAM, of Wilmington: I merely rise to ask a question for information. I understood from one of the speakers that a transfer of a missionary from one yearly meeting to another must come through this board. Did I understand the remark correctly?

CALVIN W. PRITCHARD, of Western: Not that it would be required, but that it might be a convenience.

CHAIRMAN: A number of persons have given expression in favor of adopting the report. Some have given expression in the other direction. Now, I will give an

opportunity for those to give expression in the other direction who desire to do so.

ISOM P. WOOTON, of Iowa: I do not think we ought to get into a decision on this matter until David Updegraff's points are explained, and they are easy of explanation. He makes out to the Conference that there is nothing in this. The first point is that the prospective board is not designed to interfere in any way whatever with boards already organized, therefore, when questions are asked as to what effect this board would have on this or that organization, the answer is negative. That is the natural consequence in such a question. This is a positive board, designed for a positive purpose. The purpose is to meet the needs of the great missionary field, the needs that cannot be met in our disconnected boards, both in the investigation of the nature of the fields that are before us and in the choice of a large field into which we can enter more fully and unitedly in the missionary work. That would be one point in connection with the organization of this board. Again, it would prevent us from dropping here and there, at haphazard, into mission work, as we have done because of ignorance in times past. The board would be expected to be good authority on any relation of the missionary field or missionary needs. Then, on the other hand, it will answer as no present board can possibly answer in the relation of definite creation and successful examination of applicants for the field, and inasmuch as this board will be acquainted with all the fields, when applications are made and persons are examined, this board will be good authority in the placing of these persons according to their ability and according to the needs of the field. While it does not propose to absorb the Woman's Board, or the boards of the yearly meetings, or any of them, yet in all these relations and many others it would be positively needed and has been needed through the history of our work.

LAWRIE TATUM, of Iowa: For a number of years I have been chairman of the missionary committee on Indian affairs, that is, of the Friends' missionary committee.

I have had to hunt up missionaries occasionally. We wanted but very few, but I found it very difficult to get my fingers on a missionary who was qualified for that work and felt drawn of God to go into that work, and I do not want anybody, and the committee does not want anybody, in the work who does not really believe himself that he is qualified of God to go into it. There are a good many people who are good judges in a good many things, who are not good judges in regard to the qualifications of a missionary. There are a good many features that would be good in a rural district, or in a city, that would not be good at all in an Indian missionary. I believe that God has some one for the place somewhere, and it would be a great convenience to me if there was some place to which I could apply when a missionary is needed, a committee in whom I have confidence to examine the qualifications of a missionary, and knowing somewhat of the field where he is to be placed. If we could come together without so much work as I have had on some occasions, it would be a great convenience to me, and it is quite probable that it would be a great convenience to some others.

WILLIAM P. PINKHAM, of New England: I am very much surprised that the argument should have been opposed to this report, that the information in all the world is accessible to all the boards as they now stand. I believe those who have endeavored over and over to find information and failed know very well that that is not true. A board of this kind can gather information from sources entirely without our own organization; so can other people do it. And we can gather information from sources within our organization, and other people can do that. There is no question about it, but the fact is that nobody does it. It is not anywhere collected, arranged, and tabulated and made accessible to those who want to find out all about it. Such an arrangement as that which is proposed provides for this provisionally.

Then again, if a missionary is wanted for any field as has been suggested, the secretary being kept informed by the corresponding members of the yearly meetings

respecting all the applicants who may be seeking for service, respecting their qualifications and their preferences, and this being kept on record in the office of the secretary, he has something he can always appeal to. I fail to see myself what disclaimers there are in the report. The only disclaimer I detect in connection with it at all is that we have disclaimed going counter to the opposing ideas as they were presented in the meeting last night, and I believe we have met the wants without confronting the dislikes or disapproval of the members of the Conference.

CHAIRMAN: Are we ready to either adopt or reject the report without further discussion?

ROBERT W. DOUGLAS, of Indiana: Who appoints the board?

MAHALAH JAY, of Indiana: We ask the Conference to appoint a committee here, consisting of one from each delegation, to present the matter to the yearly meetings. We ask the yearly meetings to appoint two corresponding members from each yearly meeting, and that they empower those corresponding members to employ a secretary and choose the advisory committee.

NATHAN T. FRAME, of Wilmington: I would ask that that be laid before the yearly meetings for the yearly meetings to deal with, and that we do nothing.

(Expressions of assent being given, the chair decides that the Conference accepts the report.)

CHAIRMAN: We will hear from the Business Committee with reference to the morning session.

ALLEN JAY, of Indiana: The Business Committee proposes to-morrow morning to take up the subject of whether we shall have the proceedings printed or not, and if we do we have the names of a committee to propose.

We also propose a resolution in regard to the indorsement of the Christian Endeavor work, which will be very brief, friends merely to express themselves as to its indorsement.

We also have a report of names for a committee in regard to another conference five years hence.

Then the committee in regard to conclusions is to report to-morrow morning.

CALVIN W. PRITCHARD, of Western: How is that committee about a future conference to be appointed?

ALLEN JAY, of Indiana: The Business Committee has been trying to get the delegations from the different yearly meetings to propose names, and we will have them ready; also this committee which has just been provided for is to be appointed to-morrow morning.

ELIAS JESSUP, of Iowa: It seems to me we ought to determine whether the delegations are to name the members of the missionary committee, because that ought to be done before we adjourn.

MAHALAH JAY, of Indiana: It was expected that each delegation would choose its own member, having the name ready to announce at the beginning of the morning session.

After prayer the Conference adjourned until 8:30 to-morrow morning.

SEVENTH-DAY MORNING—8:30 O'CLOCK.

The Conference was called to order by the chairman, and opened by singing.

CHAIRMAN: There is a pleasant thought that has been in my mind and on my heart from day to day, that as this Conference has advanced from session to session, there seems to have been, in the discussion of the matters that have come before us, and especially during the devotional

moments that we have had together, a constant approach to each other, cementing together the Christian heart. I feel that it has been very sweet to me, and I want that, in the very few moments this morning that we shall spend in our devotional exercises, the climax may be reached in that spirit. Let the Holy Spirit have his way with us.

Prayer was offered by several members, after which the minutes of the former session were read by the secretary.

CALVIN W. PRITCHARD, of Western: I would ask the clerk to read that part of the minutes referring to the change of the name of the church. (Secretary reads.)

CALVIN W. PRITCHARD, of Western: I did not myself understand the decision last night to be just that way. I thought the amendment proposed by William Nicholson was to go in the minutes also, that the whole matter was to go in the minutes.

ROBERT W. DOUGLAS, of Indiana: My understanding was just as the secretary has read.

DAVID B. UPDEGRAFF, of Ohio: That was my understanding, but I thought that the precise thing, just as it came from the committee, would be quoted.

SECRETARY: I have the precise minute of the Business Committee, in its exact words.

RICHARD H. THOMAS, of Baltimore: I think William Nicholson's point last night was well taken, and that we should have the minutes to represent what was done, and his motion was before the house, and both were technically laid on the table, as the expression was used. It seems to me it would be more accurate and more satisfactory to have it so.

CHAIRMAN: The chair understood that William Nicholson's proposition was to appear on the minutes, but I

see that some others did not understand it so, and I suppose I was wrong.

DAVID B. UPDEGRAFF, of Ohio: It has been suggested that possibly the stenographic report may not be printed. In that case the explanation of the clerk would fail, and, I think, in view of that possibility we might consent to the incorporation of William Nicholson's proposition.

WILLIAM L. PYLE, of Western: I decidedly prefer it. I think that was the understanding of it.

(Several delegates express the same preference.)

JOHN NICHOLSON, of Baltimore: For our member of the committee on the publishing house, we would like to name Richard H. Thomas instead of Anna B. Thomas. (Conference consents.)

(The minutes of the secretary were adopted as amended.)

CHAIRMAN: We will have the report from the delegations of names proposed for the committee on Foreign Missions. (For names see Minutes, page 30.)

CHAIRMAN: The report of the Business Committee on the printing committee will now be introduced. (For report see Minutes, page 31.)

WILLIAM L. PYLE, of Western: It seems to me it would be more proper to decide the manner of publication after we have considered whether we will print all or a part of the transactions.

DAVID B. UPDEGRAFF, of Ohio: That is one of the questions involved in this proposition. It is my judgment that this minute should stand. I suppose this committee would like the judgment of the Conference concerning the extent of publication. I would propose that the committee print the transactions, the minutes and the con-

clusions of this meeting as in yearly meeting form, and that the mere stenographic report of the remarks made by different ones should be left out and not printed at all. I think it would make a simple, plain statement of all that is valuable and save a great deal of expense and be more profitable and better than to publish the whole.

JAMES CAREY THOMAS, of Baltimore: Will you divide the question, appoint the committee, and then consider what we shall entrust to it?

CHAIRMAN: Are you satisfied with the committee? (Conference approves.)

CHAIRMAN: Now, the question is open as to whether you will give your instructions with reference to the extent of printing, or whether you will relegate the whole matter to the committee.

JAMES CAREY THOMAS, of Baltimore: I hope the whole matter will be relegated to the committee; and yet I believe the value of the Conference will be greatly impaired without the stenographic report, and I think the committee should have liberty to publish it as was done in the former conference. Friends paid for it when it was published, and thus friends who wished copies had them. If David Updegraff does not care to read it again, it is quite within his province not to purchase a copy, but I hope he will not prevent the rest of us from having the opportunity of reading it as we desire.

L. MARIA DEANE, of Iowa: Our delegation instructs its secretary to report that we are in favor of having the whole report printed.

ESTHER G. FRAME, of Wilmington: I favor it as a matter of education. It is extremely necessary that the people at home should have the opportunity of reading the proceedings of this Conference. We do not presume it implies perfection, but a mere report of the minutes of this meeting will not convey the ideas. Therefore, I be-

lieve it will be right to give the privilege to our committee to search and see what is best.

FRANCIS W. THOMAS, of Indiana: The Indiana delegation is in favor of printing the report.

ROBERT W. DOUGLAS, of Indiana: No, I would be opposed to it.

LUKE WOODARD, of Indiana: I do not know who authorized him to speak for me.

ROBERT W. DOUGLAS, of Indiana: I would be opposed to the printing of the stenographic report of off-hand speeches in which a speaker commences a subject and goes on for four or five minutes, and is stopped right in the midst of it, so that no definite thought and no argument is completed, no conclusion arrived at. I think it would be very injudicious and incomplete passing out in that way. I, for one, would be decidedly opposed to the printing of the stenographic report unless the speakers could have the opportunity of completing their arguments. I do not think such a report would be edifying.

TIMOTHY NICHOLSON, of Indiana: We have to consider somebody else besides the members of this Conference. We have to look at the body of Friends in this country that are looking to see the thought and sentiments of the different members of this Conference. We know with what intense interest the report was received five years ago. I remember with a great deal of pleasure that some of our Iowa delegates did not think they wanted the proceedings printed. Our departed friend, Charles Hutchinson, was one who was very decided against it; but after they were printed, and we had sent Iowa its share, he wrote back asking if more of them could be spared. He said, "We want more of them for our people." But I would say this, friends, that the delegations of the different yearly meetings ought to get together and decide how many copies will be wanted in each yearly meeting, because the printing committee will not know

otherwise how many copies to have printed. Now, my thought is that the minutes and the conclusions should be printed together, as David Updegraff suggested, in pamphlet form, just as was done five years ago, and that a large number of them should be printed, so that the membership generally can have them, and then that enough of the full reports should be printed, including the minutes and the conclusions, to supply the different yearly meetings with the number they have instructed their delegations to take, and no more; and then I would sell them at cost. I would not run an expense to the yearly meetings. I do think it will be very unsatisfactory to the rank and file of the church if we merely send down a skeleton report, such as the minutes and conclusions would be, without the full stenographic report.

CHAIRMAN: There are three propositions before the Conference. One is to print the entire proceedings, including the stenographic report; another proposition, made by David Updegraff, is to print the minutes and conclusions and the thought that was given in the speeches; another proposition, made by Robert W. Douglas, is to omit the discussions, and simply print the minutes and the conclusions. Are we ready now to take the sense of the meeting without further discussion?

A FRIEND: I am very anxious to have the full proceedings of this Conference printed, every word of it. I was instructed when I left home to take an itemized account of everything that was said, and I have been busy listening. I want my friends at home to know everything that has been done.

AUGUSTUS TABER, of New York: The remarks of Robert W. Douglas should have consideration. It is impossible for us to give that finish to our remarks that we all want. Remarks have been very imperfect; many speakers have been shut down just before the climax of their speech, and I think it is very unjust toward them. I think the committee that has charge of the preparation of this report can make the proper elimination of superfluous

matter. You will trust your committee very greatly, but the proper preparation of such a stenographic report might easily be made, and one that would be satisfactory, if you have confidence in your committee.

JAMES CAREY THOMAS, of Baltimore: Was there not a third proposition before the meeting — Timothy Nicholson's?

CHAIRMAN: I understood that to be the first one I named. I intended my statement of it to cover his proposition.

WILLIAM L. PEARSON, of Iowa: I very much wish that we may publish the full report. I know that it has been pretty hard, and that in some cases there was no conclusion reached in regard to questions we have discussed. But take the home mission work, if you will, the work of our duty to cities; I think that that is one of the most valuable discussions that we have had, and I should be very sorry to see all of those good speeches suppressed. Some of them were very important; and I wish to say, while some of us regret very seriously, that there was not a conclusion in the line of the formation of a home mission board, nevertheless there is such good material in the speeches that it would be very helpful for our people to know what we think about city work.

ALLEN JAY, of Indiana: I apprehend we will certainly print the proceedings of this Conference. I think our friends at home would never send us back again if we deprived them of the benefit of our wisdom. I just want to say that the printing committee before had charge of this work; and in reply to Robert Douglas's proposition, I would say that they were very careful to review every speech. It was written out on the typewriter, so that the committee could go over the whole thing and review every speech and cut out the expressions that they knew the speaker did not intend, and give him the benefit of their judgment, and in a few places, I think, where they could not make out what the speaker meant, they sent to him

and had him to state what he meant. In that case they took the liberty to leave out anything that was not clear. One member of that committee spent about twenty days hard work getting it in shape, eliminating, and trying to rewrite some of the speeches, and in some cases, that there might be no misunderstanding, the manuscript was sent to the speaker himself before it was printed, and I think everybody was satisfied with what they had said.

(The Conference decides to leave the whole matter to the committee, with expressions from several of a desire that the whole be published.)

TIMOTHY NICHOLSON, of Indiana: Will the delegations now, please, before they separate, try to decide, approximately at least, how many copies of the full report will be wanted. Do you not think that the proposition is a good one that the printing committee print quite a large number of the mere minutes and conclusions in pamphlet form, so that everybody can have a copy, and then print just enough of the full reports to supply the yearly meetings with the number decided upon by the delegations? (The proposition of Timothy Nicholson is agreed to.)

The recommendation of the Business Committee, in regard to the indorsement of the Christian Endeavor movement, is read by the secretary as follows:

“The Business Committee recommend that the Conference give its indorsement to the movement of the Christian Endeavor, and urge upon young Friends an active participation in its work.”

ALLEN JAY, of Indiana: The Business Committee, at the request of some friends, propose to give M. M. Binford two minutes and Truman C. Kenworthy two minutes on this subject, and then take the sense of the meeting on the subject.

M. M. BINFORD, of Indiana: It is not necessary to look over the movement at length. The present status, I think, is that there are somewhere near nine thousand

members of the Christian Endeavor societies in the United States among Friends, and at the New York convention we organized the International Friends' Union of Christian Endeavor, into which nine yearly meetings have now been admitted, their presidents being vice-presidents of this Union. The attempt, throughout all our organization, I think, is to make the Christian Endeavor movement helpful to the church with which it is connected. For its inter-denominationalism is equaled by its denominational features in building up the work of the church. It would be pleasant to our Christian Endeavorers, although indorsed by our yearly meetings, to receive the sanction in general of this Conference also, if you see fit to give it.

(Truman C. Kenworthy not being present, Matilda W. Atkinson spoke in his stead.)

MATILDA W. ATKINSON, of Iowa: When our International Friends' Christian Endeavor Union was organized in New York last summer, the call was made that there should be a Christian Endeavor meeting in connection with this Conference at this time. We have waited until this Conference should recognize us, and it is probable, and I think very likely, that should another Conference convene in five years or one year from this time, having been recognized and supported by you, the young people of the Friends' church in America will come to the Conference and have a meeting, not to take the time or attention of the Conference, but to meet with it. We mean to make the Christian Endeavor profitable and to make it serve the glory of God. It is doing in the churches at home for the Friends as it has for other denominations something that has never been done otherwise. The Lord is blessing it, to draw and fill the hearts of the young people with loyalty and fidelity to their church.

FRANCIS W. THOMAS, of Indiana: I am in favor of the Conference recognizing the Christian Endeavor organization, and I would like that our clerks be instructed to formulate a minute giving them a word of cheer with that recognition. (Several voices in approval.)

RICHARD H. THOMAS, of Baltimore: I approve with the single exception of expressing approval of their requiring each member to speak in every meeting.

M. M. BINFORD, of Indiana: Our pledge simply asks that they shall speak, except when they have a conscientious reason for not doing so. I do not think anybody could ask more than that, and it simply puts us in the position that we are ready to obey the Lord unless we are commanded to keep still.

FRANCIS A. WRIGHT, of Kansas: I think it is not hardly the right thing to say that the negatives on this question shall have no opportunity to speak. The committee says it will allow those in favor to speak and gives no opportunity to those not in favor.

CHAIRMAN: The chair was not instructed whether one of those two minute speeches should be on one side and the other on the other side or not. The two persons were simply named and the chair could not admit further discussion without the Conference permits it.

WILLIAM L. PYLE, of Western: I would be in favor of giving two minutes more to two speakers on the other side. (The Conference unites with that suggestion.)

FRANCIS A. WRIGHT, of Kansas: I would be willing to see this Conference give a minute of sympathy to the Christian Endeavor. I think it would be very wrong for this Conference to do anything that could be construed into indorsing the Christian Endeavor. The Christian Endeavor works great good, but it is controlled outside of the Society of Friends. (A friend says that is a mistake.)

FRANCIS A. WRIGHT, of Kansas: It is absolutely controlled outside the Society of Friends. I know whereof I speak. The Christian Endeavorers of Kansas Yearly Meeting said they could not do what they wanted to do because they were controlled outside. I have lived where

they have had a Christian Endeavor for three years and I have failed to see the wonders talked about. I know that members of the Christian Endeavor absent themselves from our meetings for worship. They must attend the Christian Endeavor and they leave our meetings for worship. It is not our place to indorse it but to give it our sympathy.

(The secretary reads the minute on this subject.)
(See Minutes, page 30.)

CHAIRMAN: Are you satisfied with the minute? (Voices in approval.)

RICHARD H. THOMAS, of Baltimore: I am not at all satisfied with that minute. I do not think it has been unanimously indorsed. Certainly it has not been by Francis A. Wright. I think for the Society of Friends to take a position that is generally understood to indorse a movement which makes people promise to speak in every meeting — and I have heard it urged — is a mistake. I am perfectly willing to have a general word of encouragement given, but I do not approve of the word “indorsement.”

JAMES CAREY THOMAS, of Baltimore: The word “indorsement” might be changed. I do not approve of the word “indorsement.”

ISOM P. WOOTON, of Iowa: The word “indorsement,” I do not think that we need to have it unanimous, but the word “indorsement” is the only thing that will do these young people the service that they ought to receive from this Conference.

JOHN HENRY DOUGLAS, of Iowa: I can not see why it can not be unanimous. In nearly all of our yearly meetings, involving five-sixths of our membership, this is as much a part of our church work as the meeting of ministers and elders. The Christian Endeavor Society reports to the church; it is under the care of the church;

it is responsible to the church and loyal to the church. Exceptional places may be found such as Brother Wright has spoken of, but it is emphatically false as to the society everywhere.

(The secretary re-read the minute, inserting the words, "expresses its approval," and omitting the word "unanimous.")

WILLIAM NICHOLSON, of Kansas: Kansas Yearly Meeting is unanimous if Brother Wright is not.

(The Conference accepts the minute as read.)

JAMES CAREY THOMAS, of Baltimore: I think that minute would be improved if we could have in it "in loyalty to our church."

CHAIRMAN: The pledge of the Christian Endeavor binds each member to be loyal to his own church.

FRANCIS A. WRIGHT, of Kansas: Some societies do not use that pledge.

A FRIEND: They are not Christian Endeavor societies unless they do.

FRANCIS W. THOMAS, of Indiana: I do not think we can improve the minute which has been adopted. I propose that we leave the subject.

CHAIRMAN: We will now take up the subject of the next Conference.

(The Business Committee's minute is read by the secretary. See Minutes, page 31.)

FRANCIS W. THOMAS, of Indiana: I approve of the names, and propose that they be constituted that committee. (Consent.)

CHAIRMAN: I understand the Conference approves the report.

(The proposition being made to add John Henry Douglas for Oregon Yearly Meeting, Conference consents.)

DAVID B. UPDEGRAFF, of Ohio: We have made a provisional appointment for Oregon. Inasmuch as Canada may want to send delegates to the next conference, I think we might leave the way open for Canada to be associated.

ALLEN JAY, of Indiana: I make the proposition that if during the next five years any other American yearly meeting should wish to join this Conference, it shall be admitted.

CALVIN W. PRITCHARD, of Western: I should like that, with the understanding that the matter of Oregon be left as proposed.

WILLIAM L. PEARSON, of Iowa: It seems to me we are going unusually out of our way to accommodate yearly meetings that may come in. It is a great deal like providing for people in the church before they are converted. It seems to me it would be perfectly safe to leave this until they come in.

FRANCIS W. THOMAS, of Indiana: I think that matter is settled.

CALVIN W. PRITCHARD, of Western: There is a matter that I do not feel quite satisfied about. We left it with the delegations to confer together and decide how many of the bound copies of the report of the Conference they want printed. Some of the friends who were appointed on the printing committee were on the committee five years ago. They know how many were printed then, and I suppose the records will enable them to tell about how many were sent to the yearly meetings. So, I think they will know more about that than we will. It would

be mere guess work with us as to how many we want, and I think we should leave the matter with the committee. (The Conference is satisfied with that.)

CHAIRMAN: We will now introduce the subject that remains on the table. It is the report of the committee on Conclusions of the Conference. Will you consider it subject by subject, or have the entire report read before you stop to consider it?

(The Conference prefers to have the whole report read.)

ROBERT W. DOUGLAS, of Indiana: I think that report is very carefully prepared, but I would suggest, inasmuch as the names of the committees are in the minutes, they might be omitted from the conclusions.

JOHN NICHOLSON, of Baltimore: If these conclusions were prepared as a document to be sent to the yearly meetings, upon which they would base their action, it would seem important that they know who our committeemen and committee-women are. If, however, this Conference proposes to have all these matters submitted to the yearly meetings through some other channel, of course the names of the committees can be taken out. (Conference decides to leave them as they are.)

WILLIAM L. PEARSON, of Iowa: There has been objection in the minds of some friends to just one word in the minute that was adopted in reference to pastoral care and work, not as opposed to the substance of the paper in itself but where it speaks of the proper pastoral system. The objection has been raised, and some friends have asked me to speak of it, and I speak of it in their name as well as my own. There is no generally accepted pastoral system represented among us, and the thought was, the word pastoral care or pastoral work would more nearly represent what was the real status of our work.

CHAIRMAN: The thought is presented here by our friend and backed by a few other friends to remove the

word system and place in its stead the word work, from the fact that, as they think, we have not reached a complete system. Would you like to have that change?

DAVID B. UPDEGRAFF, of Ohio: I hope the chair will not entertain that proposition, as it is entirely out of order.

WILLIAM L. PEARSON, of Iowa: I object to such a peremptory movement as that. It is in order for us to have in charge our own affairs. It may not be desirable. That is a different thing, but that we have not the right to discuss a matter when the subject is up seems to me strange.

FRANCIS W. THOMAS, of Indiana: I would consider it in order so far as parliamentary action is concerned, but I do deem the question as having been settled. It was called up the second or third time, and the Conference fairly settled that question, and I hope we will not open it again.

ROBERT W. DOUGLAS, of Indiana: It is simply a change of a word, and I think the point is well taken as far as it is based on the fact that the work has hardly arrived at that completeness which would justify its being called a system.

RICHARD H. THOMAS, of Baltimore: It might be well to change the word. It would make Friends' minds easy, I think.

JOHN HENRY DOUGLAS, of Iowa: I am sorry to have this discussion come up here. It is a system, though it is open to improvement. To change that word now, at this time, I think would be very unfortunate. Many of our friends have gone home.

WILLIAM NICHOLSON, of Kansas: I think it would be better to leave it as it is for various reasons. It seems to me the word *proper* qualifies it enough for any one—a "proper pastoral system."

(Conference decides to leave the matter without change.)

JOHN NICHOLSON, of Baltimore: My attention has been called to the fact that in the committee on Publishing House we omitted to make provision for members from Philadelphia Yearly Meeting in case they desired to come in. That was in the hurry, perhaps, overlooked. The minutes can show it. I would think it might be left out of the conclusions very properly. The committee would have authority from the Conference to get an appointment for Philadelphia. (The matter was left with the committee.)

ALLEN JAY, of Indiana: I have a matter to report from the Business Committee. No doubt everybody is aware that there have been some expenses in regard to conducting this Conference. We are having to pay for minutes of our proceedings and other matters, and five years ago, at the close of the conference, we adopted a minute authorizing the treasurer of the Conference to borrow the money and pay the necessary bills, and then when the printing committee had got all the expenses collected together, they sent out to the different yearly meetings and collected the money. I think we ought to authorize our treasurer to borrow the money necessary to meet the expenses, and let him report to the printing committee, and when they get all the other expenses, the amount may be divided up among the yearly meetings, according to the rule we have adopted. (Consent.)

ISOM P. WOOTON, of Iowa: I just wish to state that while we have been here these days, and we have been engaged in hard work, there is something due each one who has gone to the trouble of coming here. We have enjoyed being together; we have enjoyed the work; we have enjoyed the Conference; but there have been persons in connection with this work who have peculiarly served us, and I think it is due these persons, not in so formal a way as might be done under other circumstances, but really from our hearts to express to them our thanks

for their care. I would include in this the chairman, the secretaries of this Conference, and the persons who have opened so pleasantly the way of entertainment here, and also our reporters and those who have served this Conference in a special way, whether I am able just to mention them or not. I feel that there is due them an expression of thanks.

WILLIAM NICHOLSON, of Kansas : I rise to express my approval of these remarks and to say that I consider it an especial favor that this Conference has had the advantage of the ability and the experience and devotion of our Brother Augustus Taber here at the table.

ISOM P. WOOTON, of Iowa : I would include our Business Committee.

TIMOTHY NICHOLSON, of Indiana : I like the sentiment, and I hope the clerk will make a minute covering the idea and let us pass on. (The Conference thoroughly approves.)

CALVIN W. PRITCHARD, of Western : I would like to include in that the committee of the Friends here at Indianapolis, some of whom are not members of this Conference, who have been very kind and labored incessantly and carefully and lovingly to do the best they could to provide for our comfort.

ISOM P. WOOTON, of Iowa : I would have my proposition take them in.

WILLIAM L. PYLE, of Western : I want to say that our esteemed father and brother in our Western Yearly Meeting proposed in the first place that we should open this house to accommodate this Conference. He had labored and expected so much from it. I refer to Barnabas C. Hobbs, whom we are not favored to have with us. We have missed him from the start ; we missed him at our yearly meeting ; we still miss him. When the subject came to us, as I presented it to our monthly

meeting here, I did not think they would take any action on it, but the monthly meeting took it up, saying it was a matter worthy of our minds, and they appointed a committee and opened the way and labored faithfully. The committee appointed Henry C. Wright as our chairman, to be made responsible for assigning accommodations, and he has devoted his time to it, I think, faithfully.

ESTHER G. FRAME, of Wilmington: I hope we shall not forget the wives who have been so faithful and who have not been here because they wanted to make all pleasant in their homes.

WILLIAM L. PYLE, of Western: Our house, we knew, was not large enough, but our hearts were large enough to offer accommodation to this Conference, and we were only sorry our house was not larger. This house was built thirty-six years ago to accommodate a membership of seventy-five individuals, two or three of whom remain here and that is all. Our membership has grown to about six hundred. They could not all get in the building if they came at once. We hope soon to have a new meeting house that will accommodate all of them.

HENRY C. WRIGHT, as chairman of the local committee: I had not expected to say anything to this Conference, but as this subject is up, I wish to say for Indianapolis Monthly Meeting, I think for every member of it, that when we heard of the Conference coming here we thought that it would be a treat to us, and if our Friends had had their homes as close together as I think their hearts are, and their homes had been as commodious as they wished, we would have given you an old-fashioned Quaker entertainment. As it was, as has been expressed here, some of our women have done the best they could. We have all tried to give you the best we had under the circumstances.

LEVI REES speaks by invitation: At the time I entered into the ministry I asked a Friend and elder in the church how I should know when I should speak in meeting and

he told me that when I felt a kind of fluttering about my heart here, that it was about time to get up. I have had a good deal of that fluttering during this meeting and have had but very little opportunity of speaking. I thank the Conference now for this opportunity for the mere expression of my own feeling in reference to the benefit that has come to me personally through the attendance as far as I have been able to do so upon these means of grace. I think I have learned a great many things that I did not know before. It has been a sort of schooling to me. I have discovered some things in reference to geographical localities that I had not known, and geographic boundaries of certain phases of thought within the church called the Society of Friends. I want to thank God and take courage. While there have been many things that in my own thought have occupied time that might profitably have been given to other things, I think the discussions that have taken place will result in good not only to those who have been permitted to attend the sessions of this Conference, but in the line of the unification of the church. I trust such may be the case. I believe if the East knew us better they would love us more. I believe they would fear us less. I believe that possibly if the West knew the East better they would be less suspicious of the conservatism, as they have thought, that exists in some of the eastern yearly meetings. I am not sure but this Conference has tended largely to develop some of these thoughts and bring to the surface some of these things and relieve both the East and the West of some of the suspicions that they may have had of each other in reference to these things. May God grant to strengthen every resolve and every effort for the unification of the body of Christ as represented in the Friends' church, that we may all be one as the Father is in the Son and He in Him; that we may all be one in Them. I think that we are on the border of a very hopeful day. I think instead of the Quaker church having failed in its mission and reached the point where it is to be relegated to the things of the past, we are just on the border of entering upon a broad campaign of service that shall result gloriously in the uplifting of the cross of Christ, in

the enlargement of our borders, and the reclamation of the unsaved.

CHAIRMAN: We are six minutes past the time. We have the minutes to read.

TIMOTHY NICHOLSON, of Indiana: There is one thing we have overlooked. In consideration of the death of two of the most prominent Friends in America, who were appointed delegates to this Conference, deceased since, there ought to have been a statement of our feeling in relation to them entered on our minutes.

ALLEN JAY, of Indiana: Such an expression has been prepared, but is not at present in the house.

TIMOTHY NICHOLSON, of Indiana: Would the meeting be willing to leave it with our chairman and secretaries to insert in the minutes such an expression? (Consent.)

MARY C. WOODY, of North Carolina: I am afraid you will rule me out of order, but there is just an observation I want to make and have wanted to make through the Conference, that we must go home from this Conference remembering that no methods are perfect and that all methods are liable to abuse, but that we must not cease to use methods. Because machinery is dangerous we must not fail to use it.

Another observation I want to make is, that as Friends, let us allow that the people who are working in a place and trying to meet the needs of that place, know more about it than those who are off at a distance looking on and hearing from it from the other side of the continent.

(The secretary reads the minutes of the present session, which are approved.)

CHAIRMAN: The Business Committee recommends that the direction of the devotional meeting at the close of the Conference be placed in the hands of John Henry Douglas.

JAMES CAREY THOMAS, of Baltimore: I know of no appointment of John Henry Douglas or anybody else to lead the concluding exercises of this Conference. It did not come from the Business Committee and it has not come from this Conference. I hoped the Conference would allow its presiding officer, in the dignity of his office, to conduct whatever closing exercises might need conduct.

(Expressions in approval.)

CHAIRMAN: The hour has been reached for the precious moments of the conclusion of this session, and it is the earnest prayer of the chair as well as of every friend here present, that in these precious moments the Holy Spirit may fall upon our hearts.

The clerk reads the concluding minute as follows:

The work brought before us having been accomplished, we would reverently acknowledge the gracious presence of the Master in our midst, as from session to session we have endeavored to follow the leadings of the Holy Spirit. With a lively sense of the brotherly kindness and courtesy which have marked the deliberations of the Conference, and with heartfelt prayers for the blessing of the Lord our God upon our beloved Society, and upon all the members of its widely extended organization, and for the extension of his kingdom throughout all the world, the Conference adjourned.

NAMES AND ADDRESSES

Of the Delegates present at the Conference of Friends of America,
held in Indianapolis, Indiana, beginning 18th of Tenth
Month, 1892.

FROM NEW ENGLAND YEARLY MEETING.

William P. Pinkham, Woodford's, Maine.
Harriette D. Collins, Hopkinton, Rhode Island.
I. Warren Hawkes, Manchester, Maine.
Olney T. Meader, Boston, Massachusetts.
Deborah P. Atherton, Uxbridge, Massachusetts.

FROM NEW YORK YEARLY MEETING.

James Wood, Mount Kisco, New York.
Augustus Taber, West Chester, New York.
Anna F. Taber, West Chester, New York.
Ann M. Haines, Buffalo, New York.

FROM BALTIMORE YEARLY MEETING.

James Carey Thomas, 1228 Madison avenue, Baltimore,
Maryland.
John Nicholson, 1305 McCulloh street, Baltimore, Mary-
land.
Richard H. Thomas, 236 West Lanvale street, Baltimore,
Maryland.
Anna B. Thomas, 236 West Lanvale street, Baltimore,
Maryland.
Jane E. White, 1114 St. Paul street, Baltimore, Maryland.
Samuel R. Neave, Hughesville, Charles County, Mary-
land.

FROM NORTH CAROLINA YEARLY MEETING.

L. L. Hobbs, Guilford College, North Carolina.
 Mary M. Hobbs, Guilford College, North Carolina.
 Mary W. C. Woody, Guilford College, North Carolina.
 Josiah Nicholson, Belvidere, North Carolina.
 Elizabeth W. Nicholson, Belvidere, North Carolina.
 Joseph Potts, High Point, North Carolina.
 Albert Peelle, Guilford College, North Carolina.
 Abigail N. Mendenhall, Deep River, North Carolina.
 Mary E. Cartland, Concord, North Carolina.

FROM OHIO YEARLY MEETING.

David B. Updegraff, Mt. Pleasant, Ohio.
 J. Walter Malone, 275 East Prospect, Cleveland, Ohio.
 Emma B. Malone, 275 East Prospect, Cleveland, Ohio.
 Jacob Baker, Damascus, Ohio.
 Henry Johnson, Pickereltown, Ohio.
 Judith C. Johnson, Short Creek, Ohio.
 William Nicholson, Ashley, Ohio.

FROM INDIANA YEARLY MEETING.

Allen Jay, Richmond, Indiana.
 Mahalah Jay, Richmond, Indiana.
 Timothy Nicholson, Richmond, Indiana.
 Joseph John Mills, Richmond, Indiana.
 Anna M. Votaw, Richmond, Indiana.
 Rhoda M. Hare, Carthage, Indiana.
 Elwood Scott, Carthage, Indiana.
 Joseph O. Binford, Carthage, Indiana.
 Micajah M. Binford, Carthage, Indiana.
 Luke Woodard, Muncie, Indiana.
 Esther Pugh, Chicago, Illinois.
 Emma Hedges, New Castle, Indiana.
 Robert W. Douglas, Versailles, Ohio.
 Francis W. Thomas, Dunreith, Indiana.
 Mahlon Harvey, Fairmount, Indiana.
 S. Adelbert Wood, Amboy, Indiana.

Mary E. Baldwin, Marion, Indiana.
 Thomas N. White, Lewisville, Indiana.

FROM WESTERN YEARLY MEETING.

Drusilla Wilson, Indianapolis, Indiana.
 William L. Pyle, Indianapolis, Indiana.
 Thomas C. Brown, Kokomo, Indiana.
 David Hadley, Hadley, Indiana.
 Dinah T. Henderson, Quaker Hill, Indiana.
 Samuel Trueblood, Salem, Indiana.
 Seth Mills, Monrovia, Indiana.
 Andrew F. Mitchell, Bloomingdale, Indiana.
 Martha J. Binford, Thorntown, Ind.
 Sylvester Newlin, New London, Indiana.
 Phebe A. Cox, Azalia, Indiana.
 William Furnas, Cramby, Indiana.
 Calvin W. Pritchard, Kokomo, Indiana.
 Jesse Mills, Bakers Corners, Indiana.
 Mary Emily Ellis, Kokomo, Indiana.
 Lydia A. Perisho, Carmel, Indiana.
 Stephen Breed, Carrier Mills, Illinois.
 Enos Kendall, Thorntown, Indiana.

FROM IOWA YEARLY MEETING.

Charles E. Tebbetts, Pasadena, California.
 Elias Jessup, Newberg, Oregon.
 John F. Hanson, Mount Vernon, Dakota.
 Absalom Rosenberger, Oskaloosa, Iowa.
 Isom P. Wooton, Legrand, Iowa.
 L. Maria Deane, Muscatine, Iowa.
 Abbie G. Mendenhall, Minneapolis, Minn.
 Emma F. Coffin, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
 Matilda W. Atkinson, Iowa Falls, Iowa.
 William L. Pearson, Oskaloosa, Iowa.
 Truman C. Kenworthy, East Des Moines, Iowa.
 Mary T. Thomas, Oskaloosa, Iowa.
 Lawrie Tatum, Springdale, Iowa.
 Abigail M. Fry, Springdale, Iowa.
 John Henry Douglas, Salem, Oregon.

FROM KANSAS YEARLY MEETING.

Lydia M. Henshaw, Lawrence, Kansas.
 Caleb Johnson, Tonganoxie, Kansas.
 Penelope Gardner, Hesper, Kansas.
 Edmund Stanley, Lawrence, Kansas.
 Miriam A. Maxwell, Sterling, Kansas.
 Josiah Binford, Haviland, Kansas.
 James Pitts, Glen Elder, Kansas.
 William Nicholson, Pasadena, California.
 Sarah H. Morgan, Lowell, Kansas.
 Hannah E. Sleeper, Baldwin City, Kansas.
 Francis A. Wright, 1612 Belleview avenue, Kansas City,
 Missouri.
 Washington Hadley, Lawrence, Kansas.
 Naomi Hadley, Lawrence, Kansas.
 Lindley M. Jackson, Washington, Kansas.

FROM WILMINGTON YEARLY MEETING.

Charles F. Chapman, Wilmington, Ohio.
 Esther G. Frame, Jamestown, Ohio.
 James H. Terrell, New Vienna, Ohio.
 Elizabeth Larkin, Samantha, Ohio.
 Ruth W. Mills, Wilmington, Ohio.
 Amy Fulghum, Oregona, Ohio.
 Josephus Hoskins, Wilmington, Ohio.
 Nathan T. Frame, Jamestown, Ohio.
 W. F. Bangham, Wilmington, Ohio.
 Edward Walton, New Burlington, Ohio.

CONTENTS.

| | Pages. |
|---|---------|
| Minutes of Conference..... | 3-32. |
| Conclusions of Conference..... | 33-38. |
| Stenographic Report of Proceedings of Conference..... | 39-389 |
| Names and Addresses of Delegates to Conference..... | 390-393 |

STENOGRAPHIC REPORT OF DISCUSSIONS — PAPERS, ETC.

| | |
|--|---------|
| Temporary organization of Conference..... | 39-43 |
| <i>First paper, A</i> — Society of Friends and Maintenance of its Doctrines..... | 43-58 |
| Permanent organization, and remarks of chairman..... | 59-60 |
| Devotional opening of sessions.— Admission of visitors..... | 60-69 |
| Discussion of report of Business Committee..... | 69-75 |
| <i>Second paper, B</i> — World's Congress of Religions, and dis- cussion..... | 76-82 |
| <i>Third paper, C</i> — Friends' Literature, and discussion..... | 82-99 |
| <i>Fourth paper, D</i> — Meetings for Worship and Maintenance of Ministry..... | 103-110 |
| <i>Fifth paper, E</i> — Our Ministry — Demand, Supply, and Con- necting Link..... | 110-119 |
| <i>Sixth paper, F</i> — The Pastorate System..... | 119-128 |
| <i>Seventh paper, G</i> — Church Government — Its relations to the Pastoral Question..... | 135-146 |
| Discussion of the subject: Conduct of Meetings for Worship and Maintenance of the Ministry..... | 146-217 |
| <i>Eighth paper, H</i> — Historic Material — Minute of Western Yearly Meeting..... | 218-219 |
| <i>Ninth paper, I</i> — History of Friends — Discussion..... | 220-234 |
| <i>Tenth paper, K</i> — One Discipline for all the Yearly Meetings — Discussion..... | 235-248 |
| "One Board of Foreign Missions" — Discussion..... | 249-281 |
| Report of committee on Friends' Publishing House — Dis- cussion..... | 284-287 |
| Report of committee on Uniformity of Discipline — Discussion | 288-308 |

| | Pages.. |
|---|---------|
| Report of committee on Congress of Religions — Discussion | 313-325 |
| “Duty of the Church toward our Cities”—Discussion..... | 326-359 |
| “Denominational Name—Society or Church?”—Discussion | 359-362 |
| Report of committee on Board of Foreign Missions — Dis- cussion | 363-368 |
| Committee on printing Proceedings of Conference appointed and instructed. (See also page 381.)..... | 371-376 |
| Minute approving Christian Endeavor movement—Discussion | 376-380 |
| Committee to arrange for next conference appointed..... | 380-381 |
| “Conclusions of the Conference” discussed and adopted... | 382-384 |
| Expenses provided for — Thanks tendered to all who have served the Conference — Death of B. C. Hobbs and F. T. King noticed | 384-388 |
| Concluding Minute | 389 |
| Names and Addresses of Delegates..... | 390-393 |

INDEX.

| | Pages. |
|---|-------------|
| Appointment of Committees — | |
| On permanent organization | 10 |
| On business | 10 |
| On World's Congress of Religions..... | 13, 26, 102 |
| On Publishing House..... | 14, 23, 102 |
| On formulating conclusions of Conference..... | 15, 129 |
| On Uniformity of Discipline..... | 19, 249 |
| On One Board of Foreign Missions..... | 20, 30, 281 |
| On Printing Proceedings of Conference..... | 31, 371 |
| On arranging for Conference in 1897..... | 31, 371 |
| Call of Conference — from Oskaloosa, 1891..... | 3 |
| Christian Endeavor approved..... | 376 |
| Close of Conference, Time of..... | 16, 389 |
| Conclusions of Conference..... | 33, 382 |
| Congress of Religions, Officers of,— Report..... | 76 |
| Delegates to Conference, Names of..... | 6 |
| Delegates to Conference, alternate | 8 |
| Delegates to Conference, Addresses of..... | 390 |
| Discipline — One for American Yearly Meetings..... | 235 |
| Devotional opening of sessions arranged for..... | 61 |
| Duty of our church to our cities..... | 326 |
| Expense of Conference provided for..... | 384 |
| Foreign Missions — One American Board..... | 249 |
| Friends' order of deciding, or parliamentary usage..... | 309 |
| Historic material to be preserved | 218 |
| Letter of Henry S. Newman, for distribution..... | 17, 218 |
| Method of deciding questions..... | 70 |
| Minutes — On pastoral question..... | 16 |
| On liquor traffic..... | 24 |
| On our duty to cities and towns..... | 27 |
| On changing name from Society to Church..... | 27 |
| On Christian Endeavor movement..... | 30 |
| On death of B. C. Hobbs and F. T. King..... | 32 |
| At close of Conference..... | 32, 389 |
| Opening of Conference, Temporary..... | 39 |

| | Pages. |
|---|---------|
| Papers — "Society of Friends," by James Wood..... | 43 |
| "Friends' Literature," by Seth Mills..... | 82 |
| "Meetings and Ministers," by James Wood..... | 103 |
| "History of Friends," by C. W. Pritchard..... | 220 |
| "Our Ministry," by Joseph Potts..... | 110 |
| "The Pastorate System," by William Nicholson..... | 119 |
| "Church Government," by William L. Pearson..... | 135 |
| "Uniformity of Discipline," by F. W. Thomas..... | 235 |
| Papers — How presented to Conference..... | 13 |
| Pastoral question, Discussion of..... | 146 |
| Permanent organization of the Conference..... | 59 |
| Printing Committee, Instructions to..... | 371 |
| Program prepared by Committee of Arrangements..... | 9 |
| Reports of Committees — one at Oskaloosa, 1891..... | 3 |
| On arrangements for Conference..... | 8 |
| On permanent organization..... | 11 |
| On publishing house.... | 21, 284 |
| On uniform Discipline..... | 22, 228 |
| On World's Congress of Religions..... | 25, 313 |
| On Board of Foreign Missions..... | 28, 363 |
| On formulating Conclusions..... | 32, 382 |
| Rules of procedure for Conference..... | 11 |
| Stenographic report of Conference..... | 39 |
| Stenographer appointed..... | 8 |
| Telegram sent to President Harrison..... | 21, 283 |
| Thanks rendered to various persons..... | 384 |

INDEX OF SPEAKERS.

| | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Atkinson, Matilda W..... | 259, 354, 377 |
| Baker, Jacob..... | 196 |
| Bangham, W. F..... | 365 |
| Binford, Micajah M..... | 71, 176, 190, 262, 376, 378 |
| Breed, Stephen..... | 222, 271 |
| Brown, Thos. C., vice-chairman... } | 98, 174, 180, 182, 185, 192, 193 215, 218, 229, 231, 234, 242, 271 296, 313, 343, 369, 389 |
| Cartland, Mary E..... | 349 |
| Chapman, Charles F..... | 132, 226, 317, 319, 341 |
| Coffin, Emma F..... | 290, 321 |

| | Pages. |
|--|---|
| Collins, Harriette D..... | 264 |
| Deane, L. Maria..... | 170, 269, 295, 372 |
| Douglas, John Henry..... | 40, 65, 98, 132, 165, 179, 181 195, 200, 215, 231, 238, 278, 287 302, 352, 360, 379, 383 |
| Douglas, Robert W..... | 60, 62, 75, 81, 134, 173, 178, 182 185, 196, 205, 223, 227, 228, 233, 239 247, 271, 272, 302, 323, 340, 342, 348 358, 361, 368, 370, 373, 382, 383 |
| Frame, Esther G..... | 65, 91, 99, 186, 281, 313, 324, 338, 339, 372, 386 |
| Frame, Nathan T..... | 66, 80, 94, 99, 157, 185, 224, 228, 230 246, 268, 283, 285, 288, 321, 324, 337, 368 |
| Friend, A (Names not under- stood by the stenographer)..... | 69, 73, 75, 215, 262, 287, 303, 344, 374 |
| Hadley, David..... | 60, 62, 64, 68, 70, 175, 222, 241, 326, 361 |
| Hadley, Washington..... | 61, 295 |
| Hanson, John F..... | 100, 172, 208, 215, 225, 238, 239, 241, 276, 304, 341 |
| Hartshorne, Henry..... | 66 |
| Hawkes, I. Warren..... | 234, 297 |
| Hobbs, L. L..... | 61, 131, 156, 215, 357 |
| Hobbs, Mary M..... | 166, 215, 226, 296 |
| Hoskins, Josephus..... | 278, 293 |
| Jay, Allen, Chairman of Busi- ness Committee..... | 61, 67, 97, 100, 130, 131, 174, 180 181, 193, 195, 212, 214, 218, 248, 269 274, 282, 307, 309, 312, 322, 325, 326 340, 357, 359, 375, 381, 384 |
| Jay, Mahalah..... | 217, 249, 363, 368, 369 |
| Jessup, Elias..... | 67, 99, 213, 214, 306, 313, 314, 323, 350, 361, 362, 369 |
| Johnson, Judith C..... | 339 |
| Kenworthy, Truman C..... | 183 |
| Larkin, Elizabeth..... | 176 |
| Malone, Emma B..... | 265 |
| Malone, J. Walter..... | 167, 177, 253, 292, 330, 358 |
| Mills, Joseph John, the Chairman..... | 43, 59, 61, 62, 66, 67, 74, 75, 79 95, 100, 102, 119, 129, 131, 146 165, 172, 178, 235, 248, 261, 267 280, 283, 291, 301, 309, 318, 319 |
| Mills, Ruth W..... | 272, 305 |
| Mills, Seth..... | 82, 284 |
| Neave, Samuel R..... | 198 |
| Nicholson, John..... | 212, 216, 371, 382, 384 |

| | Pages. |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Nicholson, Timothy..... | 39, 61, 63, 72, 74, 81, 92, 99, 182, 213 215, 217, 230, 269, 287, 293, 316, 318 342, 345, 360, 373, 376, 385, 388 |
| Nicholson, William, of Kansas | 67, 74, 100, 101, 119, 174, 179, 212, 306 323, 339, 351, 359, 361, 380, 383, 385 |
| Nicholson, William, of Ohio..... | 132, 208, 233, 286, 324 |
| Pearson, William L..... | 62, 101, 130, 135, 147, 173, 178, 195 213, 214, 216, 228, 243, 280, 292, 306 307, 322, 341, 375, 381, 382, 383 |
| Pinkham, William P..... | 70, 308, 364, 367 |
| Potts, Joseph..... | 110, 279 |
| Pritchard, Calvin W..... | 75, 80, 81, 96, 172, 196, 205, 213, 220 227, 229, 230, 232, 270, 281, 291, 315, 319 323, 345, 362, 363, 365, 370, 381, 385 |
| Pugh, Esther..... | 276, 322 |
| Pyle, William L..... | 61, 67, 68, 73, 98, 132, 147, 286, 303 324, 326, 358, 361, 371, 378, 385, 386 |
| Rees, Levi..... | 386 |
| Rosenberger, Absalom..... | 275, 295 |
| Scott, Elwood..... | 63, 69, 73, 97, 175, 189, 228 238, 272, 287, 296, 342, 346, 359 |
| Sleeper, Hannah E..... | 246, 268, 365 |
| Stanley, Edmund..... | 98, 176, 244, 247, 274, 294, 305 |
| Taber, Augustus, the Secretary..... | 72, 129, 133, 179, 217, 284, 287 297, 306, 316, 359, 370, 374, 389 |
| Tatum, Lawrie..... | 64, 309, 366 |
| Tebbetts, Charles E..... | 97, 211, 289, 329, 341 |
| Terrell, James H..... | 228 |
| Thomas, Anna B..... | 166, 214, 215, 272, 309 |
| Thomas, Francis W..... | 62, 75, 80, 100, 132, 147, 163, 183, 237, 267 290, 304, 322, 339, 355, 373, 377, 380, 383 |
| Thomas, James Carey | 66, 70, 92, 131, 158, 195, 205, 211, 214, 216 230, 231, 245, 280, 284, 285, 286, 299, 310 314, 319, 334, 341, 363, 372, 379, 380, 389 |
| Thomas, Richard Henry..... | 65, 134, 147, 180, 195, 233, 278, 282, 294 308, 310, 342, 361, 370, 378, 379, 383 |
| Updegraff, David B..... | 63, 73, 74, 101, 128, 131, 134, 165, 170 172, 177, 179, 212, 216, 231, 239, 270, 273 285, 287, 303, 305, 321, 325, 339, 341, 342 344, 358, 360, 364, 370, 371, 381, 383 |
| White, Jane E..... | 216 |

| | Pages. |
|--------------------------|---|
| Wilson, Drusilla | 322 |
| Wood, James... { | 40, 43, 59, 61, 71, 72, 89, 101, 102, 173, 194 |
| | 223, 227, 229, 231, 240, 241, 247, 281, 284, 285, 286 |
| | 303, 304, 305, 308, 320, 323, 338, 341, 360, 362 |
| Wood, S. Adelbert..... | 193, 293, 294 |
| Woodard, Luke..... { | 62, 80, 94, 129, 212, 225, 247 |
| | 249, 270, 292, 303, 322, 333, 373 |
| Woody, Mary C..... | 165, 388 |
| Wooton, Isom P.. | 73, 81, 99, 159, 271, 281, 298, 307, 356, 366, 379, 384 |
| Wright, Francis A..... { | 68, 70, 178, 214, 230, 288 |
| | 290, 306, 308, 341, 378, 380 |
| Wright, Henry C..... | 386 |

SESSIONS.

| | | | | |
|---|-------------------|---------------|---------------------|-----|
| * | 1st, Third-day, | 7:30 P.M., | Tenth mo. 18th..... | 39 |
| | 2nd, Fourth-day, | 9:30 A.M., | Tenth mo. 19th..... | 59 |
| | 3rd, " " | 2:30 P.M. " " | | 102 |
| | 4th, " " | 7:15 P.M. " " | | 133 |
| | 5th, Fifth-day, | 9:30 A.M., | Tenth mo. 20th..... | 180 |
| | 6th, " " | 2:30 P.M. " " | | 218 |
| | 7th, " " | 7:30 P.M. " " | | 248 |
| | 8th, Sixth-day, | 9:30 A.M., | Tenth mo. 21st..... | 282 |
| | 9th, " " | 2:30 P.M. " " | | 312 |
| | 10th, " " | 7:30 P.M. " " | | 343 |
| | 11th, Seventh-day | 8:30 A.M., | Tenth mo. 22d..... | 369 |

Sch.R. 289.6 F911 ~~AM~~ 391499
1892
Friends, Society of

Proceedings

| DATE | ISSUED TO |
|------|-------------|
| | <i>S.P.</i> |

Sch.R. 289.6 F911 AM 391499
1892

School of Religion

**FOR LIBRARY
USE ONLY**

D046876682



Duke University Libraries