NATIONAL EPISCOPAL CONVENTION.

Sixth Day's Proceedings.

THE WIDOWS AND ORPHANS OF THE CLERGY—MISSIONARY BISHOPS FOR THE TERRITORIES—COURTESY TO GOVERNOR WISE—OPPOSITION BY MR. LITTLEJOHN—GREAT DEBATE AND CARRYING OF THE RESOLUTION.

RICHMOND, Va., Oct. 11, 1859.

The Convention met this morning at half-past nine o'clock.

The usual morning religious service was read by the Rev. Dr. Whipple, Bishop elect of Minnesota, and the Rev. Dr. Gregg, Bishop elect of Texas.

The PRESIDENT then called the Convention to order, and the minutes of yesterday's proceedings being read and approved, the President called for reports from standing committees, but none were made.

Gov. HUNT, of New York, said it would be recollected that a resolution was adopted by the House a few days ago in reference to the report of the Board of Trustees on the funds for the relief of the orphans and widows of deceased clergymen and of aged, infirm and disabled clergymen. That resolution was offered with a view to take the sense of the House on the adoption of the report as presented, or its reference to the Joint Committee of Canons of both houses. The resolution to adopt the report without its reference was carried. But it appears that the House of Bishops passed a resolution for the appointment of a joint committee to which that report shall be referred, and have appointed a committee to act with a committee of this House for the consideration of this report. It appeared to him to be proper that a committee should be appointed by this House to act with the committee of the House of Bishops, to consider this most important subject and to determine whether any further action is necessary in reference to it. No one will question the great and salutary purpose that will be accomplished by the aid of this fund, and it appeared to him that an appeal should be made to the members of this Convention and an active effort made on the part of the whole church in aid of this institution and of the accumulation of the fund created by it, for the support of such of the clergy who in the latter part of their career are reduced, perhaps, to the necessity of relying upon the charity and benevolence of their brethren. He would now propose the following resolution:—

Resolved, That a committee of three be appointed on the part of this House to unite with a committee of the House of Bishops as a joint committee on the report of the Board of Trustees and the fund for the widows and orphans of deceased clergymen and for aged, infirm and disabled clergymen.

Mr. HOFFMAN, of New York, said that the House of Bishops had not received a copy of the resolution which was adopted by this House, approving of the plan and scheme reported to this House for the management of the fund, and they passed a resolution appointing a joint committee to take into consideration the subject of that report, and also to appoint a joint committee for the purpose of nominating seven trustees of the fund. The House will recollect that he (Mr. H.) had said, when this subject was before the House, that under the charter it was not necessary a new appointment of trustees should take place; but the House of Bishops thought it was a matter of great importance, and that the appointment should take place. The resolution of his friend from New York (Gov. Hunt) was therefore proper; but it would be necessary, in the present situation of the case in this House and the House of Bishops, that something else should be done, especially for the nomination of a joint committee. He would, therefore, offer the following resolutions:—

Resolved, That this House concur in the appointment of a committee of seven to nominate a board of trustees of the fund for orphans and widows of deceased clergymen, and aged, infirm and disabled clergymen of the Protestant Episcopal church of the United States, and that —— be a committee on the part of this House.

Resolved, That a copy of the resolutions of this House adopted the third day of the session, respecting the report of the trustees, be sent to the House of Bishops; also a copy of these resolutions.

Gov. HUNT accepted these resolutions in lieu of his own.

The question on their adoption was then put and carried.

Dr. HILL, of California, said he had a resolution to offer, and he would not preface it by saying it would not lead to discussion, for it inevitably would; but he did not desire a discussion upon it now. He merely brought it before the House, and if the Convention would be kind enough to grant him a short interval, he would try to give his reasons for the change which it proposed to accomplish.

Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That it is expedient at this time to elect three missionary bishops—one for Nebraska and Utah, one for Arkansas and the Indian territory, and one for New Mexico and Arizona.

He moved that this be made the special order for Friday next.

Dr. LITTLEJOHN moved to amend by referring it to the Committee on Foreign and Domestic Missionary Society.

Dr. HILL hoped the gentleman would not press that motion, but allow the resolution to go before the House for immediate action.

Dr. L. refused to withdraw his amendment.

Dr. HILL inquired if the gentleman was a member of the committee to which he proposed to refer the subject. He (Dr. H.) had no voice on that committee; yet he, if it would report back to this House so that it could be discussed on Friday, would have no objection to its reference. If not he would desire that it should be acted on by the House without reference.

Dr. LITTLEJOHN expressed himself in favor of the resolution substantially as it was offered, but he was anxious to have it referred.

Mr. HUNTINGTON, of Connecticut, was in favor of referring the subject, and of an early report.

Dr. HILL having waived his objections to the reference, it was ordered to be committed.

COURTESY TO GOV. WISE.

Mr. HOFFMAN, of New York, offered the following resolutions:—

Resolved, That this House is desirous of presenting its respects as a body to his Excellency the Governor of the State of Virginia.

Resolved, That a committee of three be appointed to communicate this resolution to his Excellency, and ascertain if it is agreeable to him to state what time and place it may be suitable for him to receive them.

Dr. LITTLEJOHN doubted the propriety of the adoption of that resolution. A similar resolution was offered in the House of Bishops, and they declined to adopt it, because it made it obligatory upon them to visit the Governor in their official capacity as the House of Bishops; meanwhile, they declared their purpose to visit him informally, and, as he understood, they did so. He (Dr. L.) would be very happy himself to pay his respects to his Excellency; but, as he said, he questioned the wisdom or propriety of visiting him in an official capacity. Such a course is without precedent in this body, and he could see no special reason, beyond the demands of courtesy, why this body should take the course indicated by the resolution.

Mr. CONRAD, of Virginia, advocated the resolution, and went on to say that it having been once offered, it had better be passed. While he had no political affinities with the Governor of this commonwealth, he had a high personal regard for him, and it was in this connection alone and the respect which this compliment would indicate in reference to the State of which he was the representative, that he advocated the adoption of the resolution. He submitted that it was but an act of courtesy, and he thought that the resolution being offered should be adopted, lest its rejection or withdrawal be construed into an act of discourtesy. He did not think that the action of the House of Bishops should be regarded as a precedent in this matter, because, that body being composed of comparatively few, might, with all propriety, dispense with formal visit and act as they have done; this body being greater in point of numbers, it could hardly be supposed that all would pay their respects to his Excellency in an informal manner. He would repeat, that this resolution being presented by a respectable member of this body, it would look like an act of repudiation or discourtesy were they to decline acting upon it.

Mr. LITTLEJOHN said, in view of the reasons presented by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Conrad), he would beg leave to withdraw his opposition to the resolution.

Mr. CHAMBERS, of Maryland, was not in favor of binding this body to the action which the resolution presented. Long since, by the advice of one of the wisest heads that ever took part in the councils of this church, they were admonished against bestowing attention upon any matter that did not strictly belong to the interests of the church. That wise man said that the Convention ought never to engage in any measure outside of its own business. And now he would suggest to the gentleman from Virginia that the proper action would be not to offer this resolution, but to make a motion to adjourn at an early hour to enable any individual members, who may desire to do so, to wait on the Governor and pay him their respects, and have the object of the adjournment entered upon the record. This precedent, if once established, would be followed up at all future Conventions, else it would be deemed an insult to the Governors of other States to omit such a mark of respect to them. He would therefore suggest that the best course to pursue would be for the gentleman from New York to withdraw his resolution, and take the course which he had just indicated. Whenever members shall have suggested their desire to pay their respects to the Governor, why, of course, it will be understood as a very satisfactory reason why the house should adjourn. For his own part he would take the very first occasion to pay his personal respect to Governor Wise. Such a compliment will be quite as acceptable to the Governor as if a formal visit was paid him as proposed by the resolution. He hoped, therefore, his friend from New York (Mr. Hoffman) would withdraw his resolution, and allow it to be spread upon the journal that when this body shall adjourn it shall do so for the purpose of enabling the members of the house to pay their personal respects to Gov. Wise.

Mr. HOFFMAN said he most cordially acceded to the suggestion of the gentleman. He arose to make this proposition, under the influence of two considerations:—First, because he was under the impression that the House of Bishops had adopted a similar course; and, secondly, because he felt that he was treading upon ground so sacred and illustrious from the memory of the great dead of the nation, that it was but proper that some mark of respect should be paid to the representative of the State of Virginia in the person of her representative head, the Governor of the State. And where we never before have met in the capital of any State in the Union, the exception made in this instance might be deemed justifiable; while, moreover, such a mark of respect would be regarded as a natural tribute from the feelings of the heart to the great State of Virginia. A suggestion, however, having been made that this would be a deviation from that wise rule prescribed by the high authority referred to by the gentleman, he (Mr. H.) would abandon his motion, feeling deeply that the distinguished individual referred to (Gov. Wise) cannot but see the wisdom of this course, and cannot but feel that no disrespect is intended to him. He would, therefore, unite cordially in withdrawing the motion which he made, and adopting the suggestion which his friend from Maryland (Mr. Chambers) had offered. If he had not reduced that suggestion to form he would ask him to do so.

Mr. CHAMBERS evinced an evident unwillingness to comply with this request, and seemed as if he would prefer it should be done by somebody else. He so expressed himself in a low tone of voice.

Mr. HOFFMAN said, before any vote was taken on the suggestion he thought it would be well to appoint a committee to ascertain the pleasure of the Governor as to where he should be found.

Mr. HUNTINGTON, of Connecticut, said he felt compelled very reluctantly to interpose in this matter. He had no doubt himself but that Governor Wise would prefer that they would take no formal action upon the subject. He (Mr. H.) knew something of his sentiments in this regard, and he presumed that there was no gentleman present who would not pay his respects to his Excellency before leaving. He saw no difference between the resolution of the gentleman from New York (Mr Hoffman) and the suggestion of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Chambers). Both would be the same in effect. They would be committing this Convention to what will be termed by many a political move. Now, he did think that they should pursue a course which would not even involve a suspicion of this character, and keep the church from all political connections. He (Mr. H.) had great respect for Governor Wise and the State of Virginia, and in obedience to that feeling he would take occasion to pay to him his respects. He had been at his house already, as had other gentlemen here, and the time there spent was peculiarly agreeable to him, as it was, he had no doubt, to the other gentlemen who visited him. He regarded it as impolitic to put upon the records one word that would in any way officially connect them with the distinguished public men of the country. He thought the whole matter should stop here, and that every gentleman should be permitted to wait upon the Governor or not, at his discretion.

Mr. WELSH, of Pennsylvania, desired to know if this Convention did not meet at Philadelphia, when the head of the nation resided there, and whether it then waited on that individual.

Mr. MEMMINGER, of South Carolina, inquired of the gentleman from New York (Mr. Hoffman) whether he withdrew his resolution.

Mr. H. answered in the affirmative.

Mr. MEMMINGER—This he regarded as the best course that could be adopted. The proper plan was to take no action whatever upon the subject, but to leave all to take whatever course they deemed the most appropriate. This was the course of wisdom, and he trusted that the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Chambers) would also withdraw his suggestion, and leave the members to act in their individual capacities as seemed to them best. He deemed it exceedingly impolitic to make any entry upon the record associating this body, in any remote form, with political movements. Any marks of courtesy extended to Governor Wise would be as much appreciated without this formality as with it.

Mr. CHAMBERS said he could tell the gentleman that his experience in the house is that it has frequently adjourned for purposes not connected with their official duties. For instance, they adjourned at Cincinnati in conformity with an invitation to go on an excursion; and they accepted at several other places and they adjourned to attend these invitations. But this was done, not by any resolution, but as the result of a general understanding by which all seemed to be governed. At all events, since he (Mr. Chambers) had discharged himself from the odium which might attach to a disregard of this matter, he would withdraw the suggestion which he had offered.

With this withdrawal the whole subject was dropped.

The CHAIR appointed the following gentlemen as a committee to consider certain reports submitted to the house:—Dr. Vinton, of N. Y.; Dr. Clarkson, of Ill; and Mr. F. B. Fogg, of Tenn.

Also the following committee on the report of the Board of Trustees of the fund for the relief of orphans and widows of deceased clergymen:—Dr. Wyatt, Dr. Hanckel and Gov. Hunt, of N. Y.

Mr. HUGH DAVY EVANS, of Maryland, offered the following resolution:—

Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the proposed canon entitled "The Council of Conciliation," which was in the Convention of 1856 postponed till the next general Convention, and which is printed on page 331 of the journal of that Convention, be referred to a joint committee appointed to revise the proposed digest of the canons.

Mr. CONRAD, of Va., proposed an amendment by moving its reference to a special joint committee. He made that motion because he believed the Committee on Canons of both houses had already enough of business before them.

Mr. EVANS said it struck him the wiser course would be to allow it to go before the joint committee, for it would almost certainly have to be referred to that committee at last.

Mr. CONRAD withdrew his amendment, and the resolution was referred as indicated by its mover.

Mr. EVANS then offered the following resolution:—

Resolved (the House of Bishops concurring), That the proposed canon A, entitled, "Of the definition of terms," printed on pages 306 and 307 of the Journal of 1856, and the proposed canon which is entitled, "Of amenability and residence," printed on pages 307-8 of the same journal; also the two proposed canons sent herewith in manuscript and severally entitled, "Of difficulties between ministers and their congregations," and "Of the officiating of ministers within the cures of others," shall be referred to the joint committee appointed to consider the report on the digest of the canons.

The following are the last two canons referred to as appearing in manuscript:—

TITLE 2, CANON 5—"OF DIFFICULTIES BETWEEN MINISTERS AND THEIR CONGREGATIONS."

In case of controversy between ministers who now hold or may hereafter hold a rectorship or assistant ministership of any church or parish, and the vestry or congregation of any church or parish, which cannot be settled by themselves, the parties, or either of them, may make application to the bishop of the diocess, who shall thereupon summon a meeting of the twelve senior presbyters of the diocess, or all of them if there are not more than twelve. If it shall appear to the bishop and a majority of the presbyters present at such meeting, that there is no hope of a favorable termination of such controversy, and that a dissolution of the connection which exists between such minister and his congregation is necessary to restore the peace of the church and promote its prosperity, the bishop and the said presbyters shall recommend to such minister to relinquish his connection with such church or parish on such conditions as may appear proper and reasonable to the said bishop and presbyters.

2. If there be no bishop, a similar application may be made to the Convention of the diocess, whereupon such Convention may either act upon the case itself or delegate power to do so to the Standing Committees or the Committee of Presbyters of the Convention; the Standing Committee acting under such delegated powers, or the Committee of Presbyters, as the case may be, to have the same power and authority as the bishop and presbyters mentioned in the first clause of this section.

3. If any rector or assistant minister shall refuse to comply with the recommendation of the bishop and presbyters mentioned in the first clause of this section, or the Convention, Standing Committees, or Committee of Presbyters mentioned in the last clause of this section, the ecclesiastical authority, taking the bishop to its aid, if the diocess shall be vacant, may at their discretion proceed according to the canons of the church to suspend such rector or assistant minister from the exercise of ministerial duties within the diocess, until he shall retract his refusal; or if a vestry or congregation shall refuse to comply with such recommendation, they shall not be allowed any representation in the Diocesan Convention until they shall have retracted their refusal.

TITLE 2—CANON 12.—OFFICIATING OF MINISTERS WITHIN THE CURES OF OTHERS.

1. No minister belonging to this church shall officiate either by preaching, reading prayers, or otherwise, except in visiting the sick, administering baptism, or the Holy Communion to the sick, solemnizing matrimony between persons, one or both of whom shall belong to his own cure, or burying the dead, within the parish or parochial cure of another, unless with the express permission of the minister of the parish or parochial cure in which he shall so officiate, or if such cure be vacant, or the minister thereof be absent, of the church wardens and vestrymen of the congregation, or the majority of them.

2. The ascertainment and defining of the boundaries of existing as well as the establishment of new churches and congregations, the forming of new churches is left to the action of the several diocesan conventions of the dioceses respectively.

3. Until a canon or other regulation of a diocesan convention shall have been adopted, the formation of new parishes, or establishment of new churches or congregations within the limits of other parishes, shall be vested in the Bishop of the Diocess acting and with the advice and consent of the standing committees thereof; and, in case of there being no Bishop in ecclesiastical authority, provided that no church building shall be erected or occupied for the purpose of worship, if such church be within one mile of any church building owned or occupied by any organized congregation in convention with this church, without permission of the minister and vestry of such congregation.

4. Until action is had by the dioceses respectively no parish or parochial cure shall be taken in any city, town or borough, or village having more than 2,000 inhabitants, to extend half a mile in every direction from the church building with which it is connected; in either case the limits of the parochial cure shall be coextensive with this, and the district within which the church building with which it is connected, such district being one established by law for election purposes, the voters residing within which are to vote at one place.

There are two other sections in this canon which are of little importance to the reader, inasmuch as they relate chiefly to the same subject contained in the preceding section, and the right of ministers to officiate within the new limits prescribed by the foregoing sections.

Dr. VINTON, of Pennsylvania, offered an amendment to these canons, as follows:—

Section 1. Parish boundaries in each diocess of this church may be established by the Convention thereof.

Sec. 2. Canon 9 of 1853 is hereby repealed.

After some debate as to the reference of this whole subject and the printing of these canons, it was finally disposed of by the following resolution, offered by Dr. STEVENS, of Pennsylvania:—

Resolved, That the Committee on Canons be requested to report to this house upon the subject of the above canons on Saturday next, and that the consideration thereof be made the order of the day for Saturday, at one o'clock.

The order of the day next came up, which was an amendment to the third article of the constitution.

Dr. LITTLEJOHN moved that the vote upon it be taken at one o'clock P. M.

Mr. MCCRADY, of South Carolina, opposed this motion, on the ground that the subject was of too much importance to be passed by so abruptly. It was, moreover, unjust to exclude from a participation in the debate those gentlemen who sat patiently listening to the arguments of those who had spoken upon the question.

On motion of Dr. VINTON, of New York, the motion fixing one o'clock as the time for taking the vote was laid upon the table.

Dr. WILMER, of Pennsylvania, who was entitled to the floor, proceeded to address the house briefly in opposition to the amendment; and he was followed by

Mr. GEORGE S. YERGER, of Miss., who discussed the question at great length—a large portion of his address being devoted to a vindication of the bishops from a charge made against them yesterday by a member, of a disposition to tyrannize and override the clerical and lay members of the church.

Gov. HUNT offered a few remarks in support of the amendment; after which Mr. H. D. EVANS, the mover of the amendment, seeing, as he said, a probability of its defeat, submitted a motion to lay the whole subject on the table, which was agreed to.

Dr. R. M. MASON, of North Carolina, submitted the following report from the Committee on the Consecration of Bishops:—

The Committee on the Consecration of Bishops, to whom was referred the message of the House of Bishops on the subject of the consecration of the four Bishops elect report to the house and recommend the adoption of the following resolutions:—

Resolved, That the testimonials from their respective dioceses, of Rev. Alexander Gregg, Bishop elect of Texas; of W. H. Odenheimer, D. D., Bishop elect of New Jersey; of G. T. Bedell, D.D., Assistant Bishop elect of Ohio; of Rev. H. B. Whipple, Bishop elect of Minnesota, having been approved by this house, and the testimonials from this house having been signed by a constitutional majority of the clerical and lay members of the House of Deputies, this house do now hereby assent to the consecration of the said four bishops elect.

Resolved, That the foregoing resolution, with the testimonials from this house, be transmitted by the Secretary to the House of Bishops.

Both these resolutions were adopted.

The resolution of the House of Bishops, fixing Philadelphia as the next place of meeting for the Convention, instead of Chicago, as determined by the house some days ago, was called up by Dr. Talbot, and a motion being made by Mr Chambers, of Md., that the house concur in the resolution of the House of Bishops, it was decided in the negative.

A motion was then made that the house adhere to its resolution fixing Chicago, and that the Committee on Conference be asked.

This question was being discussed up to the hour of three o'clock, the time fixed for adjournment.

Before the adjournment the Chair read a letter from the Lord Bishop of Nova Scotia returning thanks to the house for the honor conferred upon him in allotting him a seat by the side of the President, and regretting that he could not again avail himself of the courtesy, as he would have to leave Richmond to-morrow.

The Convention then adjourned.

The case of Bishop Onderdonk was before the House of Bishops to-day, but what transpired is still a secret. All the papers in the case were presented by S. A. McCoskry, Bishop of Michigan. I will be able to give you some of the particulars which transpired in this case in my next report.

Seventh Day's Proceedings.

LONG SPEECHES COMPLAINED OF—THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER—PERMANENT GENERAL CONVENTION—CONSECRATION OF BISHOPS.

RICHMOND, Va., Oct. 12, 1859.

The Convention met this morning at the usual hour, half-past nine o'clock.

The morning religious service was read by the Rev. ALEX. H. VINTON, of Pa., and the Rev. F. VINTON of New York.

The President then called the Convention to order, and the minutes being read and approved

The PRESIDENT called for reports from standing committees, when

Dr. GARDNER, from the Committee on Expenses, submitted the following report:—

The Committee on Expenses, to whom was referred the report of the Treasurer, respectfully report that they have examined the same, and find it correctly cast and duly vouched, and that there is now due the Treasurer, for money advanced by him, $863 51, of which sum $228 will be received when the assessment for the dioceses for 1858 are fully paid.

There will then remain a deficiency unprovided for of $635 51. This deficiency is due to arrearages which have been carried forward from one Convention to another. The Treasurer's account shows $4,300 51 paid out, while the total resources paid in or expected to be paid, are $3,665. With the rate of assessment adopted by the last Convention, the increase in the number of the clergy may be expected to raise the increase sufficiently to meet an economical expenditure by the present Convention. To meet the arrears, long since advanced by the Treasurer from his private funds, your committee recommend the following resolution:—

Resolved, That the Secretary and Treasurer be authorized to draw upon the several dioceses for their proportionate part of the indebtedness of this committee.

Dr. CUMMING, of Michigan, from the Committee on Unfinished Business, submitted the following report:—

The Committee on Unfinished Business report that they have given the journal of the last General Convention as careful an examination as their time would admit, and think they have discovered the following to be the unfinished business left on its pages:—

Pages 55 and 147—A resolution respecting a committee to open a friendly intercourse with the church in Sweden.

Pages 74 and 175—A resolution respecting a committee to prepare a digest of the canons of the church.

Pages 77, 147 and 151—A resolution for the appointment of a person to correct typographical errors in the authorized version of the Holy Scriptures.

Page 124—The report of the Rev. Dr. Stevens upon the foreign missionary work of the church.

Page 129—A resolution by Rev. P. Trapier, respecting the appointment of a committee upon a stereotype edition of the journals of this Convention.

Page 135—On the subject of the translation of the prayer book into the Spanish language.

Pages 137, 140 and 331—A message from the House of Bishops in reference to a canon entitled "On Councils of Conciliation."

Pages 29 and 306—The report of the special committee on the judicial system of the church.

Page 332—The correspondence in reference to the Episcopal missionary jurisdiction in China and Africa.

Pages 101, 139, 137 and 331—The consideration of certain articles of the constitution, viz:—3 and 6, which have already engaged in part the attention of the Convention.

Pages 40 and 177—The subject of the music of the church.

On motion of Mr. CHURCHILL, of Ky., the report of the Committee on Expenses, as given above, was adopted.

The SECRETARY read the following message received from the House of Bishops:—

The Presiding Bishop, upon whom devolves the arrangement for the consecration of the bishops elect, has obtained leave to use any part of the Capitol square which seems most convenient for the purpose, and, with the approbation of the House of Bishops, has determined to select the ground immediately to the south of the monument. The steps around the monument will be reserved for members of the Convention.

Should the weather be unfavorable, the consecration will take place in St. Paul's church—morning prayer to commence at nine o'clock and the consecration at ten.

Mr. HENRY A. TAYLOR, of Ala., offered the following resolution:—

Resolved, That the speeches of this house shall be restricted to fifteen minutes in duration, unless by the unanimous leave of the house the period be extended.

He said that too much time was occupied by long speeches, and there were members present who had come three thousand miles, who were precluded from the transaction of their business in the Convention by this practice of long speaking. Many of the speeches delivered he had listened to with great pleasure; but while that was so, he would candidly say that others of these speeches had grieved him. At all events, he deemed it necessary, in order to secure the transaction of all the business which the Convention had in charge, to curtail the speeches. He did not look upon this body as a political body, who had an extended time to listen to lengthy speeches, and he had a strong hope that the house would take that view of the subject and adopt the resolution.

Dr. HIGBEE, of New York, asked whether there was any precedent for translating from political assemblies a resolution of this character.

The CHAIR answered in the negative. He said a similar resolution was adopted at almost every session of the Convention.

Dr. HIGBEE—It might have been adopted at a late stage of the session, but in the present instance he deemed it quite unnecessary to adopt such a resolution as this. There are necessities, such as arise at the close of the sessions, where such a resolution might be introduced without reproach to this body, but this was not the time for its introduction. He was sure they were not in the habit of making long speeches, and there were many members he knew who made no speeches at all, and who were, notwithstanding, willing, so far as he could ascertain, to listen to the sentiments of those who may choose to speak. They should wait till a later period of the session before they applied this restriction, when it was probable such a course would be rendered necessary by the limited period alloted for the discharge of business. He had not the pleasure of being here at the opening of the session, but since he took his seat in the house he could say that there were but few speeches which could be deemed too long. He hoped the resolution would not be adopted.

Dr. WILMER said that in the midst of some remarks that he had been making on yesterday, on the special order, he heard a report around him that the special order, which was an amendment to article 3 of the constitution, was to be withdrawn; whereupon he promptly took his seat, deeming any further remarks unnecessary upon a subject which was soon after to be removed from the consideration of the House by its originator. After that, however, he observed, to his surprise, that a gentleman had actually spoken one hour and fifteen minutes upon the same subject, and while he had listened to it, he would say that his patience was somewhat taxed, and that his experience led him to the conclusion that short speeches were more consistent with the proper despatch of business. He thought the longevity of that House would be too much increased if they were to occupy its time in eloquent expressions of kindness and courtesy to their bishops. He was therefore in favor of the resolution.

Dr. HILL, of California, said that there was one subject only in which he had a direct interest, and after that was disposed of he pledged himself he would unite with pleasure in promoting any measure that would best tend to expedite the business of the house. He had a speech to make upon one subject, and he would assure the house that he would not utter an unnecessary word, or prolong it to any extent that would be deemed unreasonable. He could not, however, confine his remarks to fifteen minutes, for the subject was of too much importance to be dealt with within so short a period. It related, as the house would remember from the resolution which he proposed on yesterday, to the election of missionary bishops for Nebraska, Utah, Arkansas, New Mexico and Arizona. It was a subject which involved the progress of the Church. He agreed with his brother from New York (Dr. Higbee) that the resolution was premature. If his friend (Mr. Taylor) would allow it to slumber until Monday he would cheerfully vote for it, but, believing it was unnecessary at this stage of the session, he would move to lay it on the table.

Mr. CONRAD, of Virginia, said if the gentleman withdrew his motion to lay on the table, he would move to amend the resolution by substituting Monday as the period after which only fifteen minutes speeches could be made.

Dr. HILL withdrew his motion, and Mr. Taylor having accepted the amendment, the resolution was adopted.

Mr. MEMMINGER, of South Carolina, offered the following preamble and resolutions:—

Whereas, the preamble and resolutions adopted by the House of Bishops on the eighteenth day of the last session of the General Convention in relation to the Book of Common Prayer, and published in the journal of said Convention, have disturbed the uniformity of worship which should prevail throughout our church, and have been received in various parishes as lawful authority for deviating from the rubrics; and whereas, in the opinion of this House, no such change can lawfully be made except by the joint action of both houses in General Convention, made known to the several dioceses and adopted in the manner prescribed by the constitution of the church; therefore,

Resolved, That the House of Bishops is hereby respectfully requested to reconsider the said preamble and resolutions, and instead of any separate action upon the subject matter, to send down to this House such proposals for any change of worship as it may deem expedient, to be acted upon in the manner required by the constitution of the church for making alterations in the Book of Common Prayer.

Mr. H. D. EVANS, of Maryland, offered the following:—

Resolved, (the House of Bishops concurring,) That it be made known to the several Diocesan Conventions that it is proposed to alter the constitution as follows:—

1. Strike out the three first articles.

2. Insert the following three articles:—

Art. 1. There shall be a General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal church in the United States of America, consisting of a House of Bishops and a House of Clerical and Lay Deputies. The two houses shall be co-ordinate, and each shall have a right to originate and propose any acts or resolutions which it may think proper, and to concur in or reject any act or resolution proposed by the other house.

Art. II. The House of Bishops shall consist of all bishops of this church exercising jurisdiction within the United States, and of all assistant bishops canonically elected and consecrated for any dioceses in connection with the Convention. In the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies each diocess shall be entitled to a representation of both clergy and laity. Such representation shall consist of not more than four clergymen and four laymen, communicants in this church, residents in the diocess, and chosen in the manner prescribed by the Convention thereof; and in all questions when required by the clerical and lay representation from any diocess, each order shall have one vote; and the majority of suffrages by dioceses shall be conclusive in each order, provided such majority comprehend a majority of the dioceses represented in that order. The concurrence of both orders shall be necessary to constitute a vote of the house. If the Convention of any diocess should neglect or decline to appoint clerical deputies, or if they should neglect or decline to appoint lay deputies, or if any of those of either order appointed should neglect to attend or be prevented by sickness or any other accident, such diocess shall nevertheless be considered as duly represented by such deputy or deputies as may attend, whether lay or clerical. And if, through the neglect of the Convention or any of the churches which shall have adopted, or may hereafter adopt this constitution, no deputies, either lay or clerical, should attend at any General Convention, the church in such diocess shall nevertheless be bound by the acts of such Convention.

The third article is only amended by substituting "sixty-two" for "forty-one" in the following clause:—The general convention shall meet on the first Wednesday in October, in every third year from the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and "forty-one." "Sixty-two" is substituted for the two former words.

These propositions were submitted to the Committee on Canons.

Dr. VINTON, of N. Y., said he stood there to represent Dr. Tuttle, of California, who, he deeply regretted to say, was suddenly called away by a telegraphic despatch, informing him of the dangerous illness of his wife, from Panama fever, contracted on her way from California. He has been very assiduous in his examination of the canons of the church, and as the result of that assiduity he has drawn up some resolutions which he committed to me for presentation to this House. They are as follows:—

Resolved, That the Secretary of this House be directed to prefix to the college list published in the appendix to the journal of the Convention, a list of the leading bishops of this church in the order of their consecration.

Resolved, That the Secretary of this House be directed to append to the clergy list published in the appendix to the journal of the Convention, under their proper apostolic jurisdiction, a list of the foreign and domestic clergy in these jurisdictions.

These resolutions were adopted.

Dr. VINTON said he would also move the following resolutions in behalf of Dr. Thrall:—

Whereas, part of section two, canon one, of 1850, is in conflict with article three of the constitution of this church,

Resolved, That section two, canon one, of 1850, be amended by striking out the words "be entitled to a seat in the House of Bishops; nor shall he."

This canon relates to foreign missionary bishops consecrated to exercise Episcopal functions in places designated. The second section goes on to say that he shall not be entitled to a seat in the House of Bishops, nor shall he become a diocesan bishop in any organized diocess within the United States, unless with the consent of three-fourths of all the bishops entitled to seats in the House of Bishops, and also of three-fourths of the clerical and lay deputies present at the session of the General Convention

Dr. V. then offered the following resolutions in the same behalf:—

Whereas, part of section 5, canon 1, of 1850, conflicts with the discretion granted to bishops by the ordinal,

Resolved, That section 5, canon 1, of 1850, be amended by striking out the words "nor shall any deacon so ordained be advanced to the order of presbyter who has not been in diocesan orders for at least one year."

Whereas, part of section 4, canon 2, of 1850, is in conflict with article 3 of the constitution,

Resolved, That section 4, canon 2, of 1850, be amended by striking out the words "nor shall he have a seat in the House of Bishops."

These several amendments were referred to the Committee on Canons.

He also moved in the same behalf that the Secretary be directed to republish in the appendix to the journal the letter of consecration of the Right Rev. Bishop Wainright, heretofore published in 1853, and to correct a typographical error, by which he is represented to be a deacon, instead of an oxon. He would move to strike out "deacon" and insert the latter word.

The Secretary observed that all the letters of consecration were published under the supervision of the Secretary of the House of Bishops, and he had therefore no responsibility in the matter.

Dr. VINTON disclaimed any purpose to cast the least odium upon the Secretary. He was merely acting in behalf of another, and could have no such intent. Moreover, he was unaware where the responsibility of the error lay before hearing the remarks of the Secretary.

The question on the adoption of the resolution was then put and carried.

Mr. HOFFMAN, of N. Y., submitted the following:—

Resolved, That it be referred to the Committee on Canons to consider and report upon the following proposed canons:—

Whenever a church or congregation shall have been organized in any foreign country, not within the limits and jurisdiction of any foreign missionary bishop, and shall by its constitution, or plan or articles of organization, have acceded to and recognized the constitution, canons, doctrine, discipline and worship of the Protestant Episcopal church in the United States of America, and shall have declared its desire to be under the direction of the general Convention thereof, the same shall be subject to the Episcopal government and jurisdiction of the presiding bishop for the time being of the House of Bishops.

2. Such presiding bishop may select an assistant from the bishops or assistant bishops of the church, and may assign to him such Episcopal duties, and the exercise of such Episcopal powers, as he may think proper in relation to such church or congregation.

3. Such presiding bishop, or such assistant (if thereto authorized) as may from time to time assign to any other bishop or assistant bishop of this church the performance of any Episcopal duties, and the exercise of any Episcopal power, in relation to such church or congregation, and for such period of times as he may deem expedient.

4. The clergyman settled in any such church or congregation shall, for the time being, and for all acts and matters done in such foreign country, or in discharge of duties in relation to such church or congregation, be subject to the jurisdiction of the presiding bishop or of such assistant named by him as above provided, without reference to the canonical residences within the United States.

Dr. STEVENS, of Pa., said he deemed it important that this matter should be referred to a special committee. It was a subject which concerned the progress of the church abroad, and when it was ascertained that the condition of things on the Continent was such as to justify the proposed plans, then would be the proper time to take steps for carrying it out. The question first to be ascertained was, whether the time was come to legislate upon the subject. If the special committee would say that this was the proper occasion for action, why it could at once be referred to the Committee on Canons. He moved its reference to a special committee.

Dr. F. HAWKS, of New York, said he seconded that motion because of the importance of this matter, which he regarded as an initiatory step in a system which may become a very extensive one. Our relations with foreign countries in this connection are somewhat complicated; and we don't know enough of the facts relative to the state of affairs abroad to enable us at this time to determine on the expediency of any legislation. And when, if legislation be necessary, we come to act upon the matter, it will require all the wisdom and experience of this House so to shape the course of that legislation as not to bring us into ecclesiastical or political conflict with other governments. Let this matter, therefore, go before a special committee first, and then should that committee, after duly examining the subject, recommend further action, the whole matter may be referred to the Committee on Canons. He would further move, that in order to afford the House a full opportunity of understanding the matter, the document be ordered to be printed.

Mr. HOFFMAN said he had no objection to its reference to a special committee. His object was to have it examined by the Committee on Canons: first, to consider the propriety of passing any measure at all upon the subject; and, second, to consider and report what legislation was necessary in order to carry out the object proposed to be accomplished. The difficulty which seemed to him most likely to arise, from its reference to two committees, was that it would inevitably delay the consideration of the subject until the session had closed. However, if it was the pleasure of the House to refer it to a special committee, he would cordially assent.

Dr. HIGBEE presumed the chief desire to refer it to a special committee grew out of the fact that the Committee on Canons had already before it as much business as it could well attend to.

The question on referring the subject to a special committee was then put and carried. The question then recurring on the motion to print—

Dr. STEVENS, of Pa., remarked that he deemed it better to defer printing the document until the special committee sent in its report.

Dr. HAWKS withdrew his motion to print.

On motion, it was ordered that the committee consist of five.

THE PLACE FOR THE CONSECRATION OF THE BISHOP ELECT.

Dr. MARAN, of N. J., offered a resolution that a joint committee of conference be appointed to ascertain whether any alteration could be made in the arrangement made by the presiding bishop for the consecration to-morrow.

Mr. CONRAD, of Va., said, as he understood the message sent down from the presiding bishop, it was peculiarly within his discretion to name a place for the consecration. He presumed, therefore, that this was not a subject for a committee of conference, and he would ask the gentleman so to form his resolution as merely to ask the presiding bishop to reconsider his arrangement.

Dr. F. J. CLERC, of Mo., offered a resolution to the effect that a committee of three be appointed to express to the right reverend bishops their disapprobation of the arrangement made, and to suggest the propriety of holding the consecration in different churches. Dr. C. said he had understood that the presiding bishop, by way merely of testing the sense of the House upon his view of the arrangement, took an informal vote on yesterday, and it was probable that he was influenced by the result of that vote to make the arrangement which he has reported to this House. He thought that some such plan as he proposed would be satisfactory.

Dr. W. T. D. DALZELL said it was an essential part of the consecration service that the Lord's Supper should be administered. He desired to know whether adequate preparations could be made for this purpose at the place designated by the presiding bishop. He trusted that all personal considerations in connection with this matter would be laid aside, and that the House would act with due regard to the consecration service alone. He would always bow to the authority of his right reverend fathers; but his information in respect to the place designated for the consecration led him to the conclusion that the services could not be conducted there in a manner becoming so solemn an occasion. He hoped that some better arrangement would be made, and that the presiding bishop would be induced to reconsider his action, to afford an opportunity of doing so. He would concur in any measure for causing the consecration to be held in a church, for none could form a conception of the character of the congregation which would be likely to assemble around the scene if the square is chosen.

Dr. MEAD, of Conn., said that while he had a high respect for the action of the House of Bishops, he held they were sometimes fallible. They had neglected in this instance, he thought, to look at the Rubric, in which it is stated before the consecration service commences, and when all things are duly prepared in the church, after the morning prayers, the presiding bishop shall begin the communion service. Now, this evidently contemplates that the consecration service shall take place in a church, and the Capitol square is not essentially a church in the conception of this Rubric. And then it goes on to say that after the Gospel, the bishop to be consecrated shall be presented to the presiding bishop, sitting in his chair near the holy table. Capitol square would be rather a dis