The Press and Banner.

ABBEVILLE, S. C.

Wednesday, May 18, 1887.

Man of Refined Taste.

Mr. Foster Hammond, foreman of the *Abbeville Medium*, is not only a good printer but is also a man of aesthetic taste. While discharging his duties as foreman, he has some spare moments which he has utilized for the establishment of an ornamental flower garden in the office window, and now the beauty of his geraniums is second only to the beauty of the flowers which ornament the piazza of the New Hotel. Mr. Hammond's fidelity to his employer's interest, his frugality, and his moral worth entitled him to the highest consideration of the young ladies. We have advised him to court one.

For Solicitor.

Since the announcement that Solicitor J. L. Orr would not be a candidate for re-election we have heard the name of W. C. McGowan, Esq., mentioned in connection with the office. His natural ability, his legal attainments, his eloquence as an orator, and his high character are such as to qualify him in an eminent degree to fill the office. His popular manners combined with his fitness for the office will commend him to the favorable consideration of the voters of this Judicial District as a suitable successor for even so able a man as James L. Orr.

The G., C. & N. R. R.

The work on this road progresses with entire satisfaction to its most earnest advocates.

The grading of the entire line from Chester to Monroe has been let.

The surveying corps from Chester to the Savannah are now near Abbeville Court House, having crossed Long Cane near Rapley's shoals coming this way.

Work will soon commence at Atlanta and Athens, working between these cities.

Under Lasting Obligations.

We are under obligations to the kindness of General Hemphill for the offer of the privilege of publishing a sermon by his grand-father which was delivered eighty years ago. He said it would be gratifying to his brothers, John and Calvin, to see it in the *Press and Banner*. Upon examination, it was found to contain 124 pages closely printed matter, with a codicil at the back of 36 pages. When it is remembered that the Governor's message was only 31 pages some idea of its length may be guessed.

JOE MUNDAY seems to have made a wonderful impression on the people at Williamston. A correspondent of the *Greenville News* says that he "pleads for the erring souls of men with all the impassioned boldness of Peter, the burning zeal of Paul, the tender rapture of John. * * * Sweetly, beautifully, he tells the story of the cross." Another correspondent of the same paper relates the circumstance of how a member of the base ball club went to whip him, and thought he would hear him preach first. The baseballist was the first man at the altar, and next night joined the church.

REV. R. N. PRATT, of Bennettsville was in town last Monday, looking as young as he did when he lived here and was one of us. He has a fine place at Bennettsville, and is held in high esteem there. Mr. Pratt met of his old friends while here on Monday. Mr. Pratt during his ministry with us built some seven or eight churches, and he may be justly termed a church-builder.

MR. RAMEY HUGHES has been promised a situation as fireman on the road. He likes the business and has long wanted a permanent place of this kind. He will, no doubt, make a faithful fireman, and finally become an expert engineer. Ramey Hughes has the energy, the ability, and the health, to become a most efficient railroad man, and his friends and acquaintances here will watch his course with interest and will rejoice at his success.

MISS ANNA JONES has returned from an extended trip to Greenville, where she has been receiving instructions in music. She is one of the finest performers on the piano to be found in this section of the country. Her excellent musical talent has been thoroughly cultivated.

MR. ROBERT PRATT of Due West was in town Monday with his son Rev. R. N. Pratt. Mr. Pratt is one of the successful farmers of this county, and he succeeds by giving his entire attention to the farm. This was the first time he had been to town this year.

NINE persons went from Abbeville last Friday on the excursion to Columbia. A majority of whom, we believe, had business down the road and managed to take advantage of the cheap rates. As far as we have heard no children went.

Every one wants a stylish hat, and if you will call on W. E. Bell and get Miss Marie Barcley to trim your summer hat or bonnet, you will be pleased in price and style, and better pleased with yourself.

THE millinery stores are doing a lively business. The ladies will wear pretty goods, and they are right too. Many a woman's fate has been decided by the sheen of a ribbon or the flutter of an apron string.

QUITE a number of persons were at Hill's medicine spring last Sunday. Mr. Hill is having the water analysed, and as soon as the result is known we may have more to say of its curative qualities.

MR. JOHN HOLCOMBE is having the Martin mill repaired. Among other work, new centre discharging waterwheels are being made to put in. The mill will be in good fix by wheat harvest.

REV. R. D. SMART, Presiding Elder, preached in the Methodist church last Sunday. No man is held in higher esteem by our people than Mr. Smart.

REV. S. J. BETHEA, Rev. Mr. Attaway, W. V. Clinkscales, Miss Magruder, and perhaps others, are off to the Holiness meeting in Newberry.

I have a lot of short pieces in dress goods and dress ginghams that I will sell for less than cost. Call at once and secure a bargain. W. E. Bell.

COLONEL WALLINGFORD, who has been spending the winter and spring with us for twelve years, says that our prospects for good crops is now better than he ever saw before.

THE Second Quarterly meeting for the Abbeville Circuit will be held at Zoar church (Mt. Carmel) next Saturday and Sunday.

MR. W. S. COTHRAN has established a brick yard on the branch. He will make several hundred thousand bricks.

SEVENTEEN prisoners in the Abbeville jail are waiting trial at the June term. Judge Aldrich will be here then.

Now is the time for picnics, and you will need a picnic hat. I have the very thing for you. W. E. Bell.

MR. J. D. CHALMERS went to Columbia on the excursion train and got left in the city.

MISS NELLIE PRESSLY and Miss Emma Neel of Troy, were in town last Saturday.

For Harness, shoes, buggy tops, &c—Vaccuum Harness Oil, at Smith & Son's. 5-18.

THE pinnacles around the Episcopal spire have been replaced with brick.

Warrented not to gum—Vaccuum Harness Oil, at Smith & Son's. 5-18

THE farming prospects were never better at this season of the year.

DR. J. LOWRIE WILSON returned from Charlotte last Saturday.

The best in use—Vaccuum Harness Oil. Smith & Son. 5-18

WM. E. BELL has some special bargains in this week's issue.

MRS. SONDLEY is giving music lessons at the New Hotel.

ELIS G. GRAYDON, ESQ., was in Laurens last week.

MR. G. A. DOUGLASS has rented Mr. Lee's farm.

THERE is a demand for good milk cows.

Going to Washington.

The following named persons have signified their intention to join the excursion for Washington, which leaves Abbeville tomorrow, May 19, 1887, at two o'clock. The party will return together, leaving Washington June 1, 1887. Only one ticket will be issued for the whole party, and any one of the number who may get separated from the rest will be required to pay full fare. No single tickets will be issued at the extremely low rate of $9.45.

Mrs. W. H. Parker,
Miss Belle Guerard,
Miss —— Parker,
Frank Parker,
Mrs. S. W. Smith,
Miss Ellen Parker,
Miss Lillie Hanckel,
Miss Jennie Delph,
J. F. Lyon,
J. W. Sign,
H. H. Hill,
Mrs. H. H. Hill,
W. E. Hill,
J. S. Norwood,
M. M. Mattison,
McD. Cater,
Mrs. M. L. Bonham,
J. H. Latimer,
A. H. Watson,
M. H. Wilson,
G. W. Connor, 5 tickets.
Rev. E. P. Greenige, 3 tickets.
J. E. Bradley,
T. H. Walker,
Rev. H. D. Lindsay,
Mrs. H. D. Lindsay.

WE notice that the chamber of commerce in Charleston favors the enforcement of the long haul and short haul clause of the inter-State Railroad law. Upon general principles, the up-country should oppose it. As a rule whatever Charleston advocates we should oppose.

THE EPISCOPAL CONVENTION

THE BISHOP GIVES OFFENSE TO A MAJORITY OF THE LAY DELEGATES, AND THEY WITHDRAW.

The Bishop Takes up a Very Large Part of His Address in Counciling "Meekness and Gentleness" toward the Negro, While it Looks Like a Different Rule of Action Governed His Own Treatment to a Majority of the Lay Delegates.

In order that we give our readers a fair idea of the troubles in the Episcopal Convention we herewith give much in reference thereto

The following, except the headings, is as it appeard in the *News and Courier*:

Extract from the Bishop's Address.

Not having room for the entire paper, we are enable to copy only so much of it as relates to the negro:

THE WAY THE BISHOP ENGINEERED A NEGRO INTO THE CHURCH.

In the year 1884, after due inquiry as I thought, and on recommendation of persons who had long known him, and upon whose judgment I relied, I received J. S. Quarles as a postulant, under Canon D, Title I, of the Canons of the General Convention. A postulant is one who intends to become a candidate for holy orders upon canonical testimonials. In this case I did not think that the postulant had sufficient preliminary education to become a candidate, and so he entered St. Augustine School at Raleigh, N. C., where he maintained himself by his own labor. He did not expect to serve in the ministry of the Church except as a deacon. To go on to the priesthood would require a collegiate education, or its equivalent. Having completed his plain English studies, he was prepared to go before our standing committee, and ask them to recommend him to the Bishop as one qualified to enter on a course of preparation for the holy ministry. This they did, and in 1885, in accordance with their recommendation, I admitted Quarles as a candidate for the office of deacon only. He returned to Raleigh, and prepared for the diaconate under the Rev. Dr. Sutton, the head of the school. I will take this opportunity to say that in his letters to me Dr. Sutton spoke favorably of Quarles. In September last, 1886, he applied to the committee to be recommended by them to the Bishop for Deacons orders, and under the rules of the committee his application was received and laid over to a following meeting. The canon required that in the absence of a vestry to testify to the applicant's character such testimonial may be signed by "twelve respectable members of the Protestant Episcopal Church," and there being no organized parish or vestry the papers were accordingly signed at my suggestion by twelve whites, members of the Protestant Episcopal Church. Some of the names so signed were those of church-women. When the papers came up the committee ruled that the words "twelve respectable members" in the cannon meant twelve respectable male members. For the reason thus given by the committee the application of the candidate for recommendation to the diaconate failed. Accordingly, by my direction, the candidate prepared a second set of papers signed in accordance with the committee's construction of the canon. In due time the amended paper came before the standing committee and met refusal. Of this refusal the committee gave the Bishop no information whatever. He was left to learn it officially from the candidate who placed in his hands the letter of the secretary. This letter to the candidate bears date January 28, 1887, and is as follows: "Your application for admission to the sacred order of deacons was taken up for consideration at a meeting of the standing committee of South Carolina, which was held on the 26th inst. The testimonial of consent required by the canons to be signed by the committee failed to receive the necessary number of signatures." Signed, &c.

VERY MUCH OF THE BIG I IN THIS.

Now I could not but ask myself, in view of such action, why the committee, who had previously recommended the candidate and encouraged him to study for the diaconate, should now refuse their recommendation to ordination. Had anything arisen affecting the candidate's character since their former recommendation of him, whereby I admitted him to become a candidate? The canons make it the duty of a Bishop to supervise the conduct of his candidates for orders, and I received regular reports concerning him, and nothing to his disparagement came to me, but the reverse. The conclusion, therefore, to which I came, in the absence of any information from the committee, was to the following effect: That the candidate applying to our standing committee for the canonical recommendation to be ordained deacon, had been refused such recommendation because he was of African descent, or because, being of African descent and being ordained, he would acquire by canonical residence and under our constitution a seat in our Diocesan Convention. I say this is my inference, not the ground given by the committee, because they give no reason of their refusal. What now shall I do with my rejected candidate? Shall I drop him? or shall he give up the ministry? I could transfer him to the neighboring diocese, and have him ordained there, and then receive him back again, but I will not pursue such a course, which would be a species of ecclesiastical filibustering, and would widen and deepen already exiting differences. No; if a colored man is to be ordained in and for this diocese, it must be with the concurrence and consent of its standing committee. But in the meantime what becomes of the refused candidate?

THE BISHOP STILL DETERMINED TO FORCE THE NEGRO WHERE HE WAS NOT WANTED.

I answer, he must serve in another diocese under another Bishop, who has work for him to do. But when my brother Bishop to whose jurisdiction, I transfer the candidate asks me why Quarles could not be ordained in the Diocese of South Carolina, what must I say? What can I say but this: I believe the candidate was refused by the committee because of African descent. But lest something might have arisen which I knew nothing of, I addressed a note to the president of our standing committee, asking whether anything derogatory to the moral or religious character of the candidate had appeared in committee for which they had refused Quarles's recommendation, and for which I also ought to feel restrained from transferring him to another jurisdiction. The answer is quite distinct and emphatic. It says: "There was no objection to Quarles on the ground of character, moral or religious, nor has anything come to our knowledge which should prevent you from recommending him for orders to any other Bishop."

SCRIPTURE QUOTED TO GET HIS NEGRO IN.

In view of these facts thus simply related, and taken in connection with the burning question which has agitated the diocese for so many years, and Convention after Convention, and in view also of the conviction expressed by the protestants in the Diocean Convention assembled in Columbia in 1885, to the effect that only persons of the white race were entitled to sit in Diocesan Convention—in view, I say of all these things, I am constrained to believe that the candidate here spoken of failed to secure the approval of our standing committee, because he was a colored man. Now it becomes this Convention to look this matter squarely in the face—so doing in the spirit of meekness and gentleness. Is the action of our standing committee in the instance of Quarles to become the rule of action? My own conclusion is that it gives notice that no colored man, be his qualifications what they may, will be recommended by the standing committee to holy orders. Is this also the mind of the diocese in convention assembled? I cannot think it. But if it be, then to your bishop such a mind seems out of harmony with the new suffrage in the litany: "O, Lord of the harvest, send forth more laborers into Thy harvest."

A COMPROMISE SUGGESTED.

There is, I think, a fair compromise which, if adopted, might adjust differences. It was proposed by a venerable member from St. Paul's, Radcliffeboro', in 1881, and unanimously adopted by the Ninety-fourth Convention.

He proposed to amend Article III of the Constitution, so as to limit membership in convention within the celical order to the order of presbyters, by striking out the word "clergymen" and inserting "presbyters." The effect of this amendment would be to remove the diaconate altogether from Diocesan convention, and so dismiss the opprehension of a preponderance of the colored element in convention in case the permanent diaconate of colored men for work among colored people should largely increase. This amendment would apply, of course, to all in the order of deacons, whether white or black. Under this amendment, however, it must be understood, of course, that the colored presbyter who had come by ordination to the order of priesthood, with full canonical requirements as to literary and theological qualifications, would equally with the white presbyter under the constitution of the diocese, take his seat and cast his vote in convention.

I respectfully suggest, therefore, that such amendment as I have referred to be taken up and considered by you at your present session, and passed for a second time, if not unanimously, as in 1884, yet by the necessary two-thirds' majority in both orders, and thus furnish a partial solution at least to some of the race difficulties which have engaged our attention to the detriment of diocesan work for the past twelve years.

I think, also, I am aware equally with any one of the inexpediency of injecting into his council of the Church a large number of permanent deacons who, however fitted they may be to do their office and work on plantations, are yet not fitted by education and otherwise to legislate for the Church. But this is guarded against by the proposed amendment, which confines the function to the order of presbyters, who must necessarily, before attaining that order, have discharged all canonical requirements, and the sole objection to whom, as members of convention, is that of race.

A PLEA FOR THE OTHER SIDE TO YIELD EVERYTHING.

I fear my brethren of the laity do not fully enter into the position of the Bishop and of a majority of the clergy to the diocese. Why should we be arrayed on opposite side? Have we not suffered together? When you, the laity, were in the field, were not we, the clergy, in the hospitals and in evacuated towns, and some of us refused protection?

Have not the clergy as much at stake as the laity? And are they not equally, with my brethren of the laity, solicitous for the future welfare of the diocese? Or is it that you distrust our intelligence in these matters, and think that because we bear no part in political and party conventions, that therefore, as citizens, we must necessarily be short-sighted? Let me, then, claim your indulgence only a few moments longer in consideration of our painful divergence. Come to the Bishop's side for a moment and see if you cannot see what he sees. But if this is too much to expect, that one who is free from the "care of all the churches" should see what the Bishop sees, at all events possibly you may see enough to make you grant that from his standpoint he could do no less than what he has done.

THE CHURCH NOT A Y. M. C. A—BUT A NEGRO IS AS GOOD AS A WHITE MAN.

The Bishop then believes this Church to be not a social organization like the Young Men's Christian Association, but a branch, and it may be a feeble branch, of the Church of Christ. The Church of Christ, like the gospel of Christ, is for all people and for all sorts and conditions of men." When commissioned to go to his work at the time of his consecration the Bishop believes he was sent not to any one class, but to all classes who desired a part in his ministrations. If his Episcopate was to teach the rich only, or the refined only, or the whites only, then he would wish to lay it down, being in his esteem an Episcopate which lagged too far behind the footsteps of his Lord. He must address himself, therefore, if true to duty, to the colored people of the diocese as well as to the whites. But to do this effectively there must be a colored ministry. But if a colored ministry, then a colored ministry on the same plane ecclesiastically with the white ministry. For if ordination means anything it means that its gifts go to men without regard to race or color. Here then begins the difficulty in our diocese, and by the way, we are the only church South, I believe, which is wrestling with this difficulty. When the colored clergyman becomes canonically connected with this diocese he equally with the white clergyman becomes thereby under the provisions of the constitution (vid. Article III) *ipso facto* a member of the Diocesan Convention. What shall be the *extent* of the privileges of his membership will depend upon two further considerations. *To be a vote* in convention he must have been actually and canonically resident in the diocese "for the space of twelve calendar months" next before convention, and, moreover, he must have discharged his duties as a rector or missionary for the same period of time—twelve calendar months next before convention. When these conditions have been fulfilled then, in my judgments, which nothing I have seen or heard has shaken for a moment, the clergyman in question is here under the constitution, which was adopted finally and unanimously in Columbia in 1876, and in full view of this question. But I will not argue the point further. What I have said is simply to show that while the present constitution is the constitution, as a conscientious interpreter of the same I can do no otherwise than I have done. If you wish the interpretation changed you must change the constitution, and I have made a suggestion to this end, which you unanimously approved of three years ago. You will pardon me, I trust, if I speak with entire frankness, but at the same time in great consideration of my brethren of the laity, when I say that it is my belief that they are not keeping step with the laity of other Southern dioceses in this question. You are alone in your position. This, indeed, matters not if you are right, but if you are wrong it matters a great deal that you should array the diocese *contra mundum*.

[*News and Courier, Friday* 13, 1887.]

The Diocesan Convention met at half-past 10 o'clock yesterday, pursuant to adjournment.

The galleries and most of the pews in the body of the church were filled with ladies, who were interested listeners to the rather warm discussion that occupied the entire morning session.

The "bone of contention" was present in the person of the Rev. J. H. M. Pollard, of St. Mark's.

Immediately upon the calling of the roll the color question, which by this time had assumed a somewhat canonical and constitutional aspect, and which before adjournment had developed into a perplexing parliamentary puzzle, was resumed. Mr. Pollard's name was on the roll of clerical delegates prepared by the Bisop as being entitled to a seat but not a vote in the Convention, a twelve months' residence in his parish being the qualification for a vote.

A motion had been made to accept the roll, and Mr. Haskell had moved to amend it by striking the name of Mr. Pollard from the roll.

Mr. Benet then moved that the debate be closed, which motion was adopted with but one dissenting voice, and a vote by orders was taken—the question being on Mr. Haskell's motion to strike from the Bishop's roll of the clergy the name of Rev. J. H. M. Pollard. The vote resulted as follows:

Clergy—Yeas 3, nays 28.
Laymen—Yeas 22, nays 12.

Of the clergymen, the Rev. Messrs. Guerry, Hanckel and Trapier voted in the affirmative. The minority of the lay delegates who voted with the clergy was increased this year to twelve against five last year. Those who so voted are Ex-Governor John L. Manning and Messrs. R. J. LaRoche, R. W. Shand, P. T. Villipigue, D. B. Egleston, E. M. Rucker, F. A. Mitchell, H. W. Frost, E. M. Seabrook, J. W. Meacher, I. Rutledge Smith and J. R. London.

The amendment, not having received a majority of the votes of both orders, was declared lost.

Col. McCrady, moved to reconsider the Benet motion, and this having been agreed to on a division—yeas 34, nays 27, debate was declared in order, Mr. Benet stating that in the interest of the economy of time he would ask leave to withdraw the motion.

Col. McCrady then moved to table Mr. Benet's motion.

The Bishop, (with an almost audible sigh of relief:) "I am happy to say, brethren, that this motion, at least, is not debatable."

The motion to table Mr. Benet's motion was then carried, and Col. McCrady then moved to divide the vote on the acceptance of the Bishop's roll of the clerical delegate.

Mr. Haskell could not see what good was to be effected by this movement. He had been with the laymen in this question, but he recognized defeat when he met it. If the Convention refused to accept the Bishop's roll it could not affect the organization. The Convention had been already organized when his amendment was defeated. While he was opposed to one name on the list, he was unwilling to make that the pretext for obstructing or delaying the business of the Convention. The question had been fairly put and lost. The clergyman referred to (Mr. Pollard) had a clear, presumptive right to a seat here, and is entitled to it until he has been ousted by a majority of the Convention. He could not be ejected by a negative vote. He, for one, had had enough of this, and he hoped the matter would be set at rest. There was but one way in which the views of the laity, as expressed by their action here, could be carried out; they must amend the law, and if the consciences of the clergy would not allow them to meet the views of the laymen, the latter must simply go home and elect other clergymen who would agree with them. He, for one, however, was not prepared to take that step. There had been a fair test of strength. The clergy had said that their consciences would not allow them to go with the laymen, and he, for one, was prepared therefore to vote for the whole report, from top to bottom.

Mr. Jervey explained that his side wanted to get the organization of the Convention completed. It was not denied that the call for a vote by orders on the second part of the Bishop's roll was because the "bone of contention," which had destroyed the unanimity of the Convention was in that part. Suppose a vote was taken, the result would be the same. "We will not," he continued, desert our position. We feel our responsibility, but if we are driven to vote against the whole body of the clergy, we will do it and let the responsibility rest where it belongs. Very grave doubts have been expressed as to the legality of the proceedings unless the Convention is properly organized.

Col. McCrady: "We only ask that this body shall be organized at once before going into that other question.

The Bishop: "This body has been declared duly organized."

Col. McCrady: "But there is a difference of opinion on that subject. What we want is to seat those about whose right to be seated there is no difference of opinion. After having done this we will introduce resolutions referring this matter to a commission."

Dr. Porter: "How will that settle it? At the end of the year we will find ourselves exactly in the same position, except that Mr. Pollard, if he lives, will be on the list of the clergy who are entitled to vote."

At this point the discussion branched off on the subject of the organization, the Rev. Mr. Bellinger delivering a lengthy and earnest speech, showing that the Convention was organized as soon as a quorum was present.

Mr. T. M. Hanckel followed on the other side, and a half dozen delegates were on their feet to speak when Mr. Mr. Benet obtained the floor. "There is no use," he said, "to stay here chopping logic and constructing syllogisms. There is absolutely nothing new to be said on this question, if we stay here a week, or a month, or a year. If this thing is allowed to go on it will cease to become a burning question—it will become a festering sore in the side of a dying diocese. It can't be settled this way, and I am implore the members of this Convention to allow a division of the question, so as to allow the reference of the matter to a commission which will harmonize matters. The Convention this year by some strange accident had been called together on Thursday, instead of Wednesday, as on former occasions, and the time was too limited to allow of a settlement at this meeting."

Rev. Mr. Tillinghast: "If no more light can be thrown upon the subject what is to be accomplished by putting it off for another year? Has it not been sat upon for twelve years already? This is simply filibustering. The question has been settled already; it is *res adjudicata*. The very fact that Mr. Pollard's name is on the Bishop's roll of clergymen constitutes him a member of this Convention."

Dr. Porter: "I appeal to the brethren to shorten their speeches and let us come to a vote."

Mr. Shand, of Union, moved that the debate be closed and a vote taken.

Mr. Edward McCrady, Sr.: "Before the vote is taken just let me say a few words. The clergymen, it seems, are forcing us to take somebody in we don't want."

The Bishop: "The clergymen think you want to put some one out who is already in and entitled to be in."

Mr. McCrady: "Well that's the difference between us. The constitution as it now stands is in our favor, for when it was framed the term 'clergyman' meant 'white man,' and it can't mean 'black man' now."

The Rev. Mr. McCullough: "If you vote to take the name of this man from the list you will be striking at the rights of the clerical order."

Mr. Benet here interposed a point of order, which resulted in a vote on the motion to divide the question which resulted as follows:

Clerical—Yeas 5, nays 21.
Laymen—Yeas 19, nays 9, divided 3.

So the motion to divide the question not having received the majority of both orders, was declared lost.

The question now recurred on the original Seabrook motion to accept the Bishop's roll and, a vote by orders being demanded, resulted as follows:

Clerical—Yeas 22, nays 3.
Laymen—Yeas 6, nays 18, divided 6.

So this motion was also lost, and for a moment there was a pause as if the debatants were anxious for a truce. The pause was broken by the Bishop, however, who arose and said: "A majority of the two orders having failed to concur the motion is lost. The Chair is happy to state, however, that the Convention is duly organized and is ready for any business that may come before it."

This announcement for a moment seemed to stagger the laymen, and a clerical delegate had already arisen and obtained the floor and was about to make a motion, when Mr. Jervey arose and fired this shot before the clerical delegate could finish his motion: "I desire to state," said he, "that the Parish of St. Michael's appeals from the decision of the Chair."

The Bishop, (quickly and decisively,): "The Chair has made no decision. It has only stated the canon which affirms that the house is duly organized. If any appeal is made, it must be an appeal from the constitution and canons, not from the Bishop, for he has made no decision."

Mr. Jervey: "A delegate arose to make a motion. I say he is out of order. He says he is in order. Is not that a decision?"

The Bishop: "Under the constitution and canons, I say he is in order."

Mr. Jervey: "Well, I appeal from that ruling."

At this time a dozen or more delegates were on their feet with points of order, motions, &c. One delegate wanted to know how the motion proposed by the clerical delegate could be out of order when he had not made it.

Mr. Jervey replied that his point of order was that the delegate was out of order, no matter what motion he made.

Dr. Porter: "Well, if he can't make a motion how can you make a point of order?"

It was finally decided to hear the proposed motion, and the Rev. Mr. Joyner, who had first obtained the floor, said that the motion he intended to propose was that a portion of the Bishop's address be referred to a special committee, to report to the Convention at a night session.

Mr. Jervey: "I make the point of order that the gentleman's motion is out of order."

The Bishop: "On what grounds."

Mr. Jersey: "On the grounds that the Convention is not organized."

The Bishop: "If the Convention is not organized how can the appeal be considered?"

The discussion now took a parliamentary turn in which the question of organization of parliamentary, deliberative and representative bodies was discussed freely and at great length. Finally, about half-past 2 o'clock, when the Bishop was about to put the question on the appeal from the decision of the Chair, Col. E. M Rucker moved an adjournment until 6 P. M., and the delegates by this time having become somewhat exhausted, the motion was adopted and an ajournment had.

A Wholesale Secession.

At 6 o'clock the delegates were all in their seats and the galleries were also full, the ladies being out in full force. The "bone of contention," that had almost been lost sight of in the parliamentary discussion which had taken place during the morning session, was also in his pew. It had been thought that the recess would have afforded time and opportunity for a compromise, which would at least have enabled the Convention to go on with the diocesan business; but it was evident, as soon as the Convention was called to order, that there would be no compromise. Taking his seat, the Bishop, after calling the meeting to order, stated that the question was upon the appeal of St. Michael's church from the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. J. J. Pringle Smith first obtained the floor and restated the views he had expressed during the morning session.

The Rev. Mr. Bellinger made a short speech on the organization of the Convention, at the close of which there were cries of "Question! Question!"

The Bishop, before putting the question, said that after thinking the matter over he had come to the conclusion that he might have made a mistake in entertaining the appeal. Two days had been spent in the fruitless discussion of this matter, and he would take occasion to announce now that, after taking the vote on this appeal, he would receive no further appeals in reference to the organization of the Convention, but would go on with the regular business. "The question," he continued, "is: Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the sense of the house?"

A vote was then taken by orders and resulted:

Clergy—Yeas 23, nays 2.
Laymen—Yeas 9, nays 13, divided 2.

Of course there was a non concurrence, and the laymen had gained another victory, as they thought.

The Bishop, however, after announcing that, there being a non-concurrence, the decision of the Chair had not been sustained, immediately turned to the secretary, and instructed him to go on and read the "rules of order," this being the first business under the order of business.

THE BISHOP'S ACT OF CONTEMPT FOR GENERAL M'CRADY.

For a moment there was an ominous silence. The secretary had proceeded with the reading. But this was soon broken by Gen. McCrady, who, jumping up on his feet, said:

"Mr. President, I rise to a point of order."

The Bishop, (very calmly:) "What is your point of order?"

Gen. McCrady: "The Convention is not organized, and any business"—

The Bishop, (still very calmly:) "Go on with the rules, Mr. Secretary."

Gen. McCrady: "I appeal from the decision of the Chair."

The Bishop: "The Chair has already stated that the Convention is duly organized, and that it will entertain no other motions or appeals that tend to question its organization."

Gen. McCrady, (excitedly:) "But, Mr. President, let me tell you, sir, that the right of appeal is an inherent one, and no delegate to this Convention can be deprived of it by anybody. If this is attempted it will simply break up this Convention."

The Bishop, (still very calmly:) "Go on with the rules, Mr. Secretary."

At this point Gen. McCrady resumed his seat, and once more the voice of the secretary was heard reading the rules of order.

HON. C. G. MEMMINGER GIVES NOTICE THAT GRACE CHURCH WITHDRAWS.

A delegate moved that the reading of the rules be dispensed with, and the motion was at once adopted. While the Bishop was about referring to his order of business the Hon. C. G. Memminger, who occupied a seat in the pew with the lay delegates from Grace church arose in his seat and amid a deathlike silence sent up the following paper, which re requested should be read by the secretary:

"The lay delegates of St. Paul's church, Radcliffeboro, finding it impracticable to organize the Convention according to the constitution and the canons of the Church, deem it wise to withdraw, and hereby notify their colleagues of their intention."

A PROFOUND SENSATION—MANY DELEGATES WITHDRAW.

To say that a profound sensation was created by this announcement scarcely describes the situation. Something of the kind had evidently been expected, and when the secretary had finished reading the paper there was a pause for a moment. The St. Paul's delegation had kept their seats while their ordinance of secession was being read, but before they could arise and make a start a dozen delegates were on their feet announcing their withdrawal.

Gen. McCrady first got up and stated that St. Philip's delegation withdrew for the same reason.

Then a delegate announced that St. Andrew's withdrew.

Next in order, Mr. Jervey stated that St. Michael's would withdraw, and the rector, the Rev. R. S. Trapier, stated that he would follow the delegates from his parish.

THE BISHOP'S ALLEGED BLESSING, WHICH SOUNDED MORE LIKE SOMETHING ELSE.

Then there was a move of the seceding delegates towards the aisle, and as the seceding delegates gathered up their books and papers and started to leave, the Bishop exclaimed: "Well, good-bye, brethren. God bless you."

Mr. Desportes, of Columbia, got the floor when there was a lull, and stated that a part of the delegation from Trinity church, Columbia, would withdraw, because they felt that they represented the views of from seven to nine-tenths of the members of the parish.

While the seceders were retiring Mr. W. C. Benet, of Abbeville, who had previously withdrawn, returned to his seat, and asked to be allowed to say one word.

Several voices: "He has withdrawn; he is not a delegate now."

Mr. Benet: "I just desire to say a word."

The Bishop: "Certainly, Mr. Benet, as a seceding brother."

Mr. Benet then went on to say that himself and Mr. W. H. Parker had been elected delegates to the Convention; that Mr. Parker had failed to attend the Convention because having voted with the clergymen at the last Convention, he felt that he did not represent the views of the congregation of Trinity Church, Abbeville.

THE BISHOP AFTER TAKING A COLUMN IN WHICH TO URGE THE RECEPTION OF THE NEGRO, DISMISSES A MAJORITY OF THE CONVENTION IN SIX LINES.

The Bishop: "The Chair regrets, of course, the withdrawal of the brethren. It can do no more than simply express its regrets. Of course, the withdrawal of the delegates does not withdraw the parishes."

Then there were other withdrawals, but these were announced so rapidly that it was impossible for even a stenographer to take them down. And the secretary so announced. After the last delegate had left, however, the Bishop announced that the ten clergymen and ten parishes constituted a quorum, and directed the secretary to call the roll of the parishes with a view of ascertaining who had withdrawn and what parishes were represented.

The roll was called, and it was then ascertained that fourteen delegations had seceded, as follows: St. Philips, Charleston; St. John's, Berkeley; St. Andrews; Prince Frederick, Pee-Dee; St. Michael's, Charleston; All Saints, Waccamaw; St. Paul's, Charleston; Christ Church, Greenville; Trinity, Abbeville; St. Thaddeus, Aiken; Grace Church, Charleston; St. Luke's, Newberry; Trinity, Black Oak; St. Paul's, Summerville.

The roll was subsequently called and it was found that thirteen parishes remained, represented as follows: St. Marks, Clarendon; Grace Church, Camden; St. John's, Fairfield; Church on Edisto; Claremont, Stateburg; Trinity, Columbia; Grace Church, Anderson; Church of the Holy Communion, Charleston; Church of the Advent, Spartanburg; St. Luke's, Charleston; Church of the Saviour, Rock Hill; Church on John's Island; Christ Church, Charleston.

The Rev. R. S. Trapier, of St. Michael's, and the Rev. W. H. Hanckel, of Abbeville, were the only clergymen who withdrew.

After it had been ascertained that a quorum was present the Convention went on with its regular business. The Rev. John McCullough was elected secretary, and Mr. F. A. Mitchell, treasurer.

NEXT CONVENTION AT ANDERSON.

The reports of the standing committee, the trustees and the treasurer were read, and on motion of Col. E. M. Rucker the meeting of the next Convention was fixed for the second Wednesday in May, 1888, at Grace Church, Anderson.

The Bishop stated that the announcement of the standing committee would be made today, and at half-past 7 o'clock the Convention adjourned until 10 o'clock this morning.

The announcement in the *News and Courier* yesterday morning that a large number of the delegates to the South Carolina Episcopal Diocesan Convention had severed their connection with that body was a subject of much comment and surprise all over the city. No such action had been anticipated, even by those who understood the almost impossible chance of reconciling the two great parties in the Convention on the color line. Ostensibly the now fatal division in the Convention was a point of parliamentary proceeding, but it is now very generally agreed that the settlement of the disputed process of organizing the Convention, either in accordance with or against the Bishop's construction of the canons of the Church, would not have precluded a warm debate on the color question. The fair inference from the proceedings is that it was the apparent impossibility of the two parties meeting on common ground, which was the virtual ground of separation.

HOW THE TROUBLE CAME UP.

Up to the time of the withdrawal of twenty parishes and four clergymen from the Convention the proceedings had gone no further than a debate on the organization of the body. Bishop Howe maintained that the Convention had been duly organized by his declaration to that effect, accordidg to the third section of Canon VIII, which is as follows:

"When the Convention shall have been called to order, the secretary shall proceed to call the names of the clergy, and then of parishes and deputies; after which, if a quorum be found present, the president shall declare the Convention duly organized; provided, that no deputy whose seat may be contested shall have place on his list."

In accordance with Section 4 of the same canon a committee on credentials of the clergy was then appointed to examine and report on the list of the clergy as given to the secretary by the Bishop. When this committee had reported it was moved that it be adopted.

Col. John C. Haskell moved, thereupon, that the report be adopted with the omission of the Rev. J. H. M. Pollard, of St. Mark's Church, upon which motion arose the dicussion which ended in the seceding of many members from the body.

Under the Bishop's construction of the section of the canon above quoted, after his declaration had been made as to the organization, that organization could not be questioned, a ruling which practically denied the right of either laity or clergy to revise the Bishop's list of the clergy, or in any way to question its authoritative make-up. As a consequence, it was impossible for the laity and the few ministers in opposition to make successful use of the laws of ordinary parliamentary bodies for the removal of Mr. Pollard, and they, therefore, "seceded." as their recent action is now generally termed.

THE SECEDERS STAND FIRM.

It was expected on Friday night that the seceding members of the Convention would have returned yesterday morning. The result, however, showed that they were fixed in their determination to remain outside of the Convention until the latter should yield. The lay deputies from the parishes and five ministers who had withdrawn assembled at the church yesterday morning and organized themselves into a separate body, and held a long session in the Sunday School building of St. Philip's Church. According to the statement of the secretary of this new Convention there were present deputies from twenty parishes and four ministers. The meeting was organized with Mr. J. J. Pringle Smith as chairman and Mr. W. A. Gammell, deputy from St. Paul's Church, Summerville, as secretary. This meeting was a secret session. The officers of the body declined to admit a representative of the press, and there was no communication between this body and the outside world except in one instance when it returned a message to the Diocesan Convention in session in the church.

After the adjournment of the seceding delegates, the chairman of the meeting said to a Reporter that the meeting was altogether an informal one, and that it was rather in the nature of conference. He said that he desired that no publication of its proceedings should be made at this time, for reasons that appeared best to the body. It was contemplated, however, to prepare, at a very early date, a circular, in which the position of the seceding delegates would be clearly set forth, and that that statement would be furnished to the *News and Courier*. What this body did, however, can be surmised from its communication with the Convention during the day.

As stated yesterday morning, the defection, if it may be so termed, of a part of the body still left the Convention with a quorum. The proceedings were, therefore, opened with the usual devotional exercises, which were conducted by the Rev. John Johnston and the Revs. Messrs. Joiner and Kershaw. On motion of Mr. J. R. London the roll was called in order to have the presence of a quorum made a matter of record. The roll was accordingly called, and thirteen out of thirty-three parishes were found to be present, and all the ministers with the exception of the five already named.

THE CONVENTION AT WORK.

The business of the Convention then proceeded with as much order and dignity as if it had been determined to ignore the presence of the body assembled in the Sunday School building.

THE CONSTITTTION AMENDED IN THE ABSENCE OF THE SECEDERS.

Dr. A. T. Porter called up the question referred to in the Biscop's address relative to the amendment of Article III of the Constition.

The article, as it was amended and passed the Convention, is as follows:

"Section 1. The Convention shall be composed of presbyters and laymen."

"Section 2. The Bishop, the Assistant Bishop, where there is one, and every other presbyter, who has been actually, as well as canonically, resident within the diocese for the space of twelve calendar months next before the meeting of the Convention, and has for the same period been performing the duties of his station as rector, minister, or assistant minister of a parish; or as a missionary, acting under the ecclesiastical authority of the diocese; or as a chaplain in any public or benevolent institution; or as a professor in the theological seminary of the diocese, or who, after continued service of