WHAT THE MAJORITY SAY.

THE ASCENSION CHURCH TROUBLES AGAIN DISCUSSED.

An Interview With One of the Vestrymen Regarding the Defense of the Rector—Statements Corrected—The Rector's Election.

The rector and two of the vestry of the Ascension parish having promulgated a pamphlet in reply to the pamphlet issued last month by a majority of the vestry, a reporter of the REPUBLICAN yesterday saw a member of the majority, and inquired when the majority's replication might be expected. He was informed that no replication would be issued, the majority deeming the reply, when taken in connection with the statement, self-answering and utterly evasive of the questions presented to be answered.

The reporter called his attention to the fact that the *Star* of last Saturday contained what purported to be a summary of the reply of the rector and these two members of the vestry. In reply it was stated that this publication had been noticed on that day by the majority of the vestry, and that an effort was immediately made by some members of the majority to obtain a copy of the reply, but it was discovered that at that time it had not been sufficiently advanced in printing to enable anything except the proof to be seen, and that it was not ready for distribution, or at least a copy of it could not be obtained until Tuesday night. "As the election was to take place next Monday," said the member of the majority, "a gain of four days was probably considered valuable by the rector and minority in shortening the time that any analysis of this reply could be made, and at the same time they could obtain all publicity through the columns of the daily paper by furnishing it with a summary of the statement, which was not yet printed, and as to the accuracy of which the majority could only conjecture."

"I observe," said the reporter, "that it is claimed that the statement was in fact not the statement of the majority."

"As to that I can only say that of the vestrymen there were absent from the meeting at which the statement was adopted, only two, namely, Messrs. Corcoran and Falls. Any one in doubt as to the attitude of these two men respecting the statement, has but to inquire of them; and in addition to this the rector was well aware of the fact that this statement had been read over to Messrs. Corcoran and Falls, and was presented to the vestry for their approval and publication, with the express concurrence of one and without any objection whatever on the part of the other. Being aware of this fact, the fairness and honesty of the rector in allowing this part of the reply, under the names of two of the vestry, which, if not written by him, was certainly written under his supervision, and with his concurrence, is a matter as to which the public is left to judge for itself."

"Complaint seems also to be made that the statement of the majority was not signed," said the reporter.

"Yes, and it is also intimated that the failure to append the signatures was in violation of an alleged understanding on the subject. As to this, it is only necessary to say that no such understanding was had, or could be had in the matter. There was no two parties between whom such understanding could be had. In fact the statement was read in a regularly constituted meeting of the vestry, at which both of the minority members were present. They expressed no opinion as to the recitals of the statement, made no criticisms thereof, or objection thereto, and when the question of the adoption and promulgation of the statement was put to a vote, both remained silent. It was not promised or understood that the statement should be signed. It was the expectation of the majority at the time that their signatures would be appended, but upon reflection, the action on the statement having been the corporate action of the vestry, it was conceived irregular to publish such action as that of individuals. The perfect knowledge of the congregation and community as to responsibility for the statement would surely seem to have made any comment on the absence of signatures a waste of both time and place on the part of the minority and rector."

"Since the question of responsibility seems to have entered into the case, who is responsible for that reply? I notice that the reply is in two parts, one signed by two members of the vestry and the other signed by the rector."

"In view of the fact that for more than a month past the rector has been a most diligent caller at the office of the register, and has been engaged in examining and taking notes from the books and records of the church, and openly preparing to demonstrate the success of his ministry, and the further fact that the greater part of the alleged information contained in the reply could have been acquired by, through, or from the rector himself, and that neither of the gentlemen of the minority have been identified with the church sufficiently long to enable their knowledge in the premises to be personal, nor have they at any time applied for or examined the records of the church since this controversy commenced, it would be a natural expectation to find both portions of the reply signed, as they in fact evidently prepared and inspired, by the rector alone. The reason of this division is probably to be found in the highly flattering expressions used toward the rector in the first part of this paper, he doubtless remembering the Scriptural injunction, 'Let another man praise thee, and not thine own mouth.'"

"Was it the intention of the majority to pass either of the two resolutions set out on pages 6 and 7 of the reply, and characterized on page 29 as threats of dismissal?"

"No; on the contrary, each of those resolutions, as shown by the record, was introduced only for the purpose of raising for discussion the question of the legal relations between rector and vestry in this diocese, about which so much has been said. Each gentleman, seconding the resolutions distinctly, gave notice at the time that he would not vote for their adoption; but that his second was only for the purpose of bringing each resolution up for discussion. In addition, the author of one of those resolutions had beforehand assured one of the minority that he would under no circumstances vote for such resolutions. It ought to be conclusive of the want of candor on the part of the minority in publishing these resolutions, that the majority could, at any time, had it seen fit to do so, have passed either of them, yet forebore even to bring either to a vote."

"What does the majority anticipate as the determination of the issue presented by its statement?"

"The majority have presented, and intended to present, no 'issue to be determined by the parishioners.' The rectitude of its own intentions and reasonable ground for its action being in seeming question, the majority sought only to acquaint the congregation with its attitude and motive in the premises. This alone was the object of the statement. No issue was intended to be raised, and in the nature of the case such intention would have been absurd; the majority were well aware at the time of making the statement, that by means of personal solicitation on the part of the rector and his friends, by appeals based upon his domestic afflictions, by statements that he would resign immediately after the Easter elections, even if he was sustained, and by direct representations that the supposed issue between the rector and the vestry rested solely upon his recent action toward the superintendent of the Sunday school, the rector and his friends had succeeded in obtaining practical pledges from enough persons qualified to vote to render more than certain the election of such persons, at the coming Easter meeting, as he saw fit to designate for the new vestry. As, on the other hand, the majority of the vestry considering that it was doing merely its duty in demanding that a person unqualified to be at the head of the institution should withdraw, they thought it not only undignified, but unworthy of their position as vestrymen, to solicit votes and make appeals for re-election. It would have been worse than useless for them to expect re-election. The statement was, therefore, put out, not to present an issue, the result of which was already foregone, but simply to set forth the reasons and motives which had actuated them in making the request for the resignation of the rector. The immediate action of the parish does not concern the majority, they await the judgment of time, by which they are more than ready to stand or fall."

"I see, also, that the figures of the statement are impugned by the reply. How came the majority to err in so material a matter?"

"The majority has not erred. The figures of the statement are taken from official sources, and are to the last degree accurate and authentic. They are neither imaginary, nor the estimates of the figures taken from a report 'not accepted;' and, by the way, speaking of finances, the exhibit of the reply, on pages 8 and 9, cannot be otherwise characterized than as astounding. The architect of this exhibit divides the financial history of the parish into two periods, one embracing the thirteen years prior to 1873, and the other the thirteen years from that date to the present time. Not only does this make, with becoming modesty, a direct contrast between the administration of the present rector and that of Bishop Pinkney while rector, before the advent of the present incumbent, but also it would seem to have been expected that the congregation could forget its history and fortunes in the earlier period. During a great part of those thirteen years the congregation was driven from its church by the exigencies of civil war, the building being taken and occupied by the United States government for army hospital purposes; the services of the congregation being held in a private edifice, generously appropriated to the purpose by our steady benefactor; all the financial resources of the congregation and parish being drawn upon to the very utmost by burdensome taxation in the very face of the threatened capture of the city; and the energies of the parish being paralyzed by the scattering of its members and absorption in the ever present necessity of financial self-preservation. The second period thus delimited embraces two separate and distinct sources of income, which would be apparent at a glance to any one reading the statement; one being for a specific object, to wit: The erection of a new building, and not contributions to the revenues of the church in the ordinary sense of the term. The determination to erect this building had already been taken before the advent of the present incumbent, and from that time until the present the whole energies of the parish had been directed to the object. The sum total of contributions, so-called, for this second period is stated in the reply at $247,490.56. Of this sum, as is stated on page 12 of the reply, about $171,000 were for prime cost of the new church, lot, and furniture, specially contributed to the purpose. Taking this sum from the total reported in the reply, the hollowness of the comparison between the two periods designated is apparent. This subtraction leaves the sum of a little over $103,000 as the revenues of the church for the last thirteen years, the average being in round numbers $8,000, as against $8,000 in each of the preceding thirteen years. It is further to be observed that not only was the early period, as above suggested, one of great financial depression and stress, but also no allowance is made for the growth and increase in the population of the city during the latter period. The impulse under which the increase in the latter period was brought about was pointed out in the statement, and surely needs no restatement. To claim that the specific donations made for the particular object mentioned are in any sense to be regarded as contributions toward the general revenues of the church is manifestly unfair and purposely misleading. Moreover, of the large amount claimed to have been realized during the last period, over $100,000 were the donation of one member of the vestry, and the greater part of the rest the donations of the remaining members of the vestry, and the sum realized by the sale of the old property. As to the continuation of the present administration of the parish, the vestry is entirely willing to abide by the judgment of those who have thus contributed much the greater part of the boasted revenues during the past thirteen years, of whose support and sympathy in their action the majority of the vestry have direct assurance."

"But is not the increase of receipts in the past quarter evidence of the financial growth of the parish since the extinguishment of the debt, as is claimed in the reply?"

"These increased receipts are probably taken from the already mentioned report of the finance committee 'not accepted.' In fact, much of this claimed increase is due to the open colonization of the parish in the interest of the rector in the coming election, and the payment of arrears stimulated by the resolution of the vestry declaring all pews vacant, the holders of which should be in arrears on the 31st of March. Besides which, as pointed out in the statement of the majority, the revenues of the first quarter are in no wise to be considered as indicative of the prospects for the year, for not only is the attendance larger and the contributions greater during that time than at any other period of the year, but also many pews and seats held at that time are given up later in the year and not again resumed, if at all, until its close. As to any indication that the alleged increase was due to the payment of the debt, the existence of which, as is repeated on page 13 of the reply, 'warned away new pewholders and impeded the growth of income.' The complete exposure of this pretense has already been made on pages 14 and 15 of the statement of the majority. The value of the reply, as to the truth of its figures, may be estimated when attention is called to the fact that the contributions for the year 1885 are stated at $30,033.35. This is an exact repetition of the statement made in the *Parish Record* some months since. Upon the appearance of the statement, the attention of the vestry and rector was called to the fact that the statement in itself was misleading and incorrect, in that over $8,000 of the amount was not a contribution, but was money received from the sale of the parsonage and site, long the property of the parish, which sale had been forced from the reluctant rector. Notwithstanding the exposure at the time of this inaccuracy, we find it repeated in the reply.

"The reply seems to show, on page 16, a steady addition to the number of pewholders from Sept. 1, 1876. With this addition constantly going on, how does it happen that, as set forth in the statement of the majority, the number has been increased in the aggregate only to the extent of three over the number of the pewholders at the time of quitting the old church?

"The statement in the reply is far more ingenious than ingenuous. It will be noticed that all the additions to the number of pewholders are stated as between the dates, Sept. 1 and Jan. 26 following. Everyone knows that this is the period of the year in which those who have given up their pews or sittings for the summer resume them, and these figures in reality only represent in great part the number of those thus resuming their pews and sittings. Furthermore, this statement wholly excludes all account of those giving up their pews and sittings within the same period for the several years mentioned. The total of apparent gain, as intimated in the reply, when contrasted with the total of actual losses, ingeniously omitted from the reply, will put a very different face on the figures. As already stated, this is the most flourishing period of the year, and is no criterion by which to judge actual gains and losses, notwithstanding which the valuation of the apparent gain is disingenuously set forth, as though the pews and sittings represented thereby were taken or resumed to be held throughout the year, contrary to the uniform experience of the parish."

"How is this affected by the statement in the reply that there seems to be some confusion in the statement of the majority of the number of pews with the number of pewholders?"

"Any confusion in the matter arises wholly from the careless or unintelligent reading of the statement; by reference to which, on page 15, it will be seen that the majority deals with those holding pews, or but one seat in the church.' The number of pews does not figure at all in the case, nor does the number of persons holding full pews. The statement of the majority deals exclusively with the number of holders of either the whole or any part of a pew, and is in all respects exact and accurate. No attempt is made in the reply to impugn its exactness and accuracy. It makes no sort of difference how many pews may or may not be rented. The question is solely one of the number of persons holding either pews or seats, and of the revenue derived therefrom accordingly."

"How about the number of communicants?"

"The number of communicants is a matters as to which the vestry has no means of judging or verifying the figures of the rector. But it is enough to say that the statement of the majority being intended as a business exposition of the financial condition and prospects of the parish, the communicants played no part in enlightening that question. If the church were intended as a philanthropic venture, to afford a place of worship for all comers, and nothing else, the number of communicants might well be cited to measure the philanthropy of the contributing body of the parish; but, while not seeking to belittle the spiritual value of the church, to all alike, whether pewholders or not, it must be borne in mind that that is a subject with which neither the vestry nor the majority in its statement has assumed to deal."

"In connection with this matter of the spiritual value of the parish work, the reply seems to show a great vitality in the number of organizations claimed to be in successful operation in the parish. Does not that evidence the energy and vitality of the parish, as is claimed?"

"Any one familiar with the history of the parish knows that the only really valuable association now existing, namely, the Ladies' Association, was in full and vigorous operation before the accession of the present rector. The various committees and clubs enumerated in the reply are in reality nothing more than subdivisions of the association, created for specialization of work, formerly the object of the association's joint care. The only individual organizations outside of the Ladies' Association and its subdivisions seems to be St. Mark's Friendly League, the Parish Guild and the Ascension Debating Society; of which of the guild, as is admitted by the reply, there now exist only 'remnants,' and as to the debating society, it is also truly said: 'It has never been large, and its exercises are now, for a time at least, suspended.'"

"Judging from the quotations from the diocesan journals, set out in the reply, there seems to be a wide difference in the estimate of the rector by the majority of the vestry and by Bishop Pinkney?"

"It is one of the significant features of the rector's defense that he flies for protection and vindication to the ample and generous unselfishness of the bishop. To take the tributes of the bishop, never known to be wanting in fullness of generosity, enunciated at various times, prior to the manifestations by the rector, which have invited the criticism of the majority, and in ignorance of those manifestations, strikes the majority as a queer method of proving character. Had those testimonials to the merits and worth of the present rector, over-generous as they are, been made by the bishop in the full knowledge of the later workings of the parish, which his absorption in labors elsewhere rendered impossible, they would be justly entitled to the highest consideration. But given as they were, at periods either ante-dating the indications of the rector's real disposition in his administration or under circumstances forbidding real knowledge on the bishop's part of what was going on within the parish, their projection into the existing controversy can scarcely be deemed judicious."

"The question is asked in the reply, 'Why did the majority, knowing the rector to be what they describe him to be, elect him less than three years ago to the rectorship made vacant by the death of Bishop Pinkney?'"

"The answer to this is very simple. The vestry had either to seek at that time a severance of his relations to the parish, or else go through the mere form of giving him the promotion to the vacancy which had been promised him when he was called. This latter action was taken as a matter of course, without any consideration of the question one way or the other. Besides, it is to be observed that two of the most objectionable of his acts, namely, his absolute refusal to part with the parsonage, and his action in setting aside the regular election of the vestry last chosen, had not then occurred; nor had he given in so pronounced a form many of the minor exhibitions of autocracy now taken exception to. Indeed, it has been the subject of common remark, both within and outside the vestry, that since his elevation to the rectorship, his disposition to arbitrary dominance in the affairs of the parish has been more frequent and more marked; and one of the very minority signing the reply has himself, within that time, declared in the presence of two of the majority that the rector's transfer from the parish would be to its great advantage."

"But the rector has evidently been prominent in the affairs of the church both here and elsewhere; the enumeration of his various official positions on page 28 of the reply would seem clearly to indicate this?"

"As to this, I can only congratulate the minority of the vestry upon their very intimate and extensive acquaintance with the rector's history. Of course, we all know that both of those gentlemen were members of his parish in the state of Ohio, and I also assume that they know the circumstances of his severance from his church in that state. Under these circumstances this is peculiarly fortunate, as all who have spoken to me on the subject seem not to have received the same complimentary accounts of his administration in that charge, and I have heard it said that this is not the first, nor the second, controversy that he has had with his several flocks in the course of his ministrations. It is, further, a subject of congratulation to the vestry that they so carefully preserved the files of the New York *Herald* as to have at ready command the issue of October 21, 1883, characterizing the great speech of Dr. Elliott, of Maryland. The well known modesty of the rector forbids the supposition that he could have furnished to the minority this brief, but adequately complimentary resume of his official life. Indeed, this very statement show the justness of the complaint of the vestry that the rector is wedded to the politics rather than to the doctrines of the church, and that having been in early life a member of the bar before taking holy orders, he even yet consistently observes the analogy of his life by making the order of his attention first the law and then the gospel."

"What was the vestry's object in having any secrecy about their proceedings?"

"Simply this, that the subject of a possible severance of the relations of the rector and the parish might be introduced and considered both by the rector and vestry, without any undue publicity or injury to either the rector or the parish. The vestry understands it to be an unwritten law of the church that a request by the vestry of the rector's resignation is such an indication it at his further usefulness to the parish is out of the question; that his retirement sooner or later is thereby made a mere question of time. If the expectations of the vestry in this respect had been realized, there would have been afforded the rector an opportunity to change his charge in seeming harmony on all sides, and without danger to himself, in securing another field for his labors, or possible impairment of his usefulness therein. If the vestry erred in this conception it was a mistake of judgment, but as is conclusively evidenced by its adoption of the resolutions notwithstanding their publicity, any canvassing of the question in the congregation would have made no change in the conviction of the vestry as to the advisability of its intended action. And it is not to be forgotten that the rector's friends in the vestry themselves urged this secrecy, in presumably the same disposition entertained by the majority, namely, the desire to avoid controversy and impairment of the rector's usefulness elsewhere. It was one of them, and not one of the majority, who moved the postponement of the question for a time, in order to give the rector an opportunity to prepare himself for what evidently was to be the action of the vestry on the resolutions."

"What do you say as to that part of the 'reply' dealing with 'the three typical events?'"

"That is the one part of the reply of which the rector acknowledges the paternity, and it proposes to meet three distinct charges or complaints presented against him by the majority of the vestry. To notice these in their order, the first relates to his conduct touching the building and occupation of the parsonage.

"It was distinctly charged that at the time it was determined to build the new church it was also determined and fully understood by both the rector and vestry that the property then occupied in part by the old church was to be sold, and its proceeds applied toward paying for the new. This much the reply admits. It was further charged that it being essential to obtain title to this property, that the building of a parsonage was necessary, it was resolved to erect a parsonage for this purpose, which resolution was known and acquiesced in by the rector. This also the reply admits. The charge then proceeds: That in pursuance of this resolution and understanding a contract was entered into for the erection of the parsonage for the purpose named, and for such purpose only; that the vestry being without means the builders generously agreed to build the proposed parsonage without any cash payment, relying upon receiving their pay out of the proceeds of the property after the title should have been acquired; that in pursuance of their agreement, the builders did proceed to the erection of the parsonage; that upon the completion by them of the building, it was, in strict compliance with and pursuance of the determination, understanding, and contract based thereon, (all of which was known to, acquiesced and participated in by the rector, in full knowledge of all the circumstances), tendered to him for his use as a parsonage; that in order fully to carry out the undertaking and understanding in the premises, it was absolutely essential that the building should be accepted, and inhabited by him as such; that the offer of the building to him was made at a vestry meeting, admitted by the 'reply' to have been on the 24th of March, 1880, the offer being in terms that the rector 'be tendered the use of the parsonage;' that in utter violation of good faith, the rector refused to accept the offer as made, but imposed as a requisite to his acceptance certain conditions, assent to which would place it in the power of the rector to delay or, if he should see fit, absolutely to defeat the very object of erecting the building, and to add largely to his own salary and the burdens of the parish, at the expense of its credit and good faith, so long as he might choose to insist upon enforcement of those conditions; that in the end he did insist upon their enforcement for several years, and until the united vestry demanded that the intended sale should be carried out without further delay, and one member thereof threatened to withdraw a proffered subscription of $10,000 unless the rector would permit the original understanding to be carried out in full, and that the result of the rector's action was to require payment for the parsonage out of the proceeds of the rest of the old church site, thus reducing the expected proceeds of sale of the old site by both the cost of the parsonage and its sale value. The charge is thus seen to be, in effect, the display of bad faith by the rector, to his own personal advantage. No one of the several specifications of this charge is denied by the 'reply,' the whole charge thus standing admitted. Indeed, the case is worse than this, for in the 'reply' the rector declares that he had heard of intended 'sharp practice' to obtain the title, and 'resolved that he would be no party to such proceeding.' Now, on which side was the 'sharp practice?' With this noble resolution in his heart, unexpressed to any one in the world and uninted at in any of the many conferences of the vestry on the subject, he actually stood silently by in seeming concurrence of all that was going on, and allowed the building to grow up under his very eyes without one word of dissent, criticism, doubt, or suggestion to the contrary of the oft-expressed intentions in the premises. If he had this high resolve, was he not clearly by this silence guilty of a gross dereliction in not warning the vestry, and was not his conduct purposely false and misleading? He must have known that a suggestion of his conditions in advance would have put an end to the whole matter, for the vestry would not have moved hand or foot merely to build a house which he might or might not see fit to allow to be utilized for the only purpose in the world entertained in building it. As already pointed out in the 'statement,' the 'conditions' were imposed under such circumstances and at such a time that the vestry had no alternative but to accept them; and the rector's letter of April 27, 1880, *a month and three days after the offer of the parsonage*, in which 'conditions' were for the first time heard of, is itself conclusive confirmation of what is claimed in his behalf in the 'statement;' for as that letter requested consent to his conditions '*as a record against the public should any need for it arise*,' a refusal of such assent would have been simply fatal to any demand of the transfer of the title.

"The second 'typical event' being, as charged in the 'statement,' the rector's appeal to the congregation from the refusal of the vestry to give him an assistant, is also admitted by the 'reply.' It is denied that he applied to the vestry for an assistant. This is not denied. It is further charged that the vestry 'discredited the proposition,' and that it was thereupon withdrawn, with the statement by the rector that he would renew it at a subsequent time. This is not denied, the only pretense at denial being the uncandid statement that 'there is no record to show that in the latter part of the year 1879 the vestry discredited the proposition.' The application of the rector having been only in the nature of a proposition, it would not, as so good a parliamentarian as the rector must know, appear of record. Why does not the reply deny that the proposition was discredited by the vestry, instead of making the other statement, intended to mislead, that *there is no record* of the fact? And the real point of the charge is, that having thus been refused by the vestry, in disregard of his promise to bring the matter again to its attention, he appealed directly to the congregation. Of this there is even no pretense at denial.

"The third typical event is the action of the rector at the last Easter election. The charge is, that after a regularly constituted and organized meeting of the parishioners had elected a certain gentleman as vestryman, and had some twenty-five or thirty minutes after the hour designated for the meeting adjourned and dispersed, the rector learning and openly expressing disapproval of the choice made by the meeting, procured the attendance of certain of the parishioners, organized a new meeting, nominated a gentleman whom he desired for vestryman, procured his choice by that meeting, caused immediate public announcement to be made of the 'election' of the gentleman so chosen as vestryman, and endeavored to induce the secretary of the first meeting to suppress its minutes. Of all this what does he deny? Absolutely nothing. The expression in the 'reply,' that he 'had requested several of the parishioners to be present,' is intended to convey the idea that this was before the meeting or hour of meeting; whereas, as the majority is prepared to prove by the mouths of two witnesses, he sent out and procured the attendance off two of the parishioners, after he had learned of the result of the first meeting, thereby making the vote for his candidate *one* greater than that cast for the candidate of the first meeting. The statement that 'the rector has never ascertained that there were more than three parishioners present at the first meeting,' is simply amazing; for not only did the secretary of that meeting so inform him on the spot; but also the statement that four were in attendance at that meeting was repeatedly made, *and the names given*, at the subsequent organization of the present vestry when the question of the election was under consideration. Finally, in this connection, the 'reply' states that the notice of election was 'from 6 to 7 p. m.' It was on this assumption that one of the present majority, as is claimed in the 'reply,' contended for the election of the nominee at the second meeting, upon the ground, as he stated, that if the polls were announced to be open from 6 to 7 o'clock all votes cast within that period should be counted. But the closest inquiry since has failed to sustain the pretense that the notice was 'from 6 to 7 p. m.,' and it is accordingly said in the 'statement' of the majority that, beyond the designation of the hour of 6 o'clock, 'no other time for balloting was mentioned.' This is not denied by the 'reply,' except inferentially, and shortly after the last election, when specially inquired if the rector would not say that the designation of time was other than at 6 p. m. But no matter what may or may not have been the views or contentions of any member of the vestry on the subject, the law is too plain to admit any room to question that the vestrymen at the parish meeting, and they alone, were the judges of election. It was in defiance of their judgment that the rector acted."

"Some comment has been occasioned by the statement that more than a year's salary is due the rector. Is such the fact?"

"It is true that among the arrears now due by the parish is a sum due the rector equivalent in amount to his salary for one year. But this arrearage has not arisen within the past year, or any one year, but is the sum of various shortages in payment to the rector since the year 1879. Nobody can regret more than the vestry that such sum is due; but if the money with which to pay the rector is not to be found in the parish revenues, how can he be paid? In point of fact, what seems to have been persistently overlooked, the members constituting the present majority have, time and again, by individual indorsement of the notes of the vestry, obtained from bank hundreds of dollars with which to pay the rector, trusting to future receipts to meet the obligations so incurred."

"Do you not think that the minority of the vestry would have done more wisely to take notice of the protests of the congregation?"

"That question sounds the keynote of the 'reply,' the main object of which is to array the congregation in antagonism to the vestry, because of the alleged ignoring of the protests. It is, in effect, an appeal to the petty instincts of wounded pride and self-opinion. What value is to be attached to protests obtained in the manner exposed in our 'statement?' I am not aware that the vestry which called the present rector to the parish consulted the congregation on the subject, nor have I as yet learned that he desired to be informed whether the congregation wished or approved of the call extended to him by the vestry before he accepted the same. This thing of vestry powers is about as broad as it is long. In accepting the call of the vestry, without such inquiry, the rector recognized its right under the law to make choice of and contract with a minister, and the same law giving the vestry that right gives it also the other much deprecated right of terminating his incumbency, by declaring its desire to make a new choice."

"What will be the outcome of Monday's meeting?"

"Considering how prone the average man is to be persuaded to do a pleasant rather than an unpleasant thing, and in view of the extensive appeals and solicitations already mentioned on the part of the rector and his friends, and the persistent determination of the majority of the vestry to rest in the assurance of having done their duty, and not to solicit support, it is quite certain that changes in the vestry, as desired by the rector, will be made at the coming meeting. It is, however, probable that the vote to the contrary will be sufficiently large to indicate that the further incumbency of the present rector will be utterly inconsistent with the harmony of the parish. I can only add that such change in the vestry as now seems probable, while it will not prove wholly unacceptable to myself, should I be of the number to be retired, will yet be not altogether without its regretful features, in that it will mark a breaking of the parish with its past, and the relegation to the background of the steady financial supporters, and old adherents and friends, of our late bishop and the former harmonious administration of what was once a united and zealous band of fellow-workers in the cause of the church."

ITEMS ON THE WING.

Gathered and Compiled Exclusively for the Saturday Edition of the "National Republican."

The organization of the people under the leadership of men of acknowledged fitness, with no other motive than their general improvement and protection, is a question that appeals directly to every colored man. We are between the two great powers—wealth and labor. In our disorganized condition we are unable to procure any benefits from either. We are poor, divided, and unskilled, consuming the pittance we receive for our labor to maintain life. We occupy tenement and pay the most exorbitant rents, which impoverishes us and retards our advancement. These facts are known to our enemies, who take advantage of them, and with the exception of cities and towns our people are very little better off than they were in 1869; murdered, disfranchised, and robbed of their wages by a system known as the contract system and corner groceries, with no protection; sentenced to prisons, worse than those of Siberia, for years for the most trifling offense; hired out by the state authorities to their former owners and drivers, wearing the livery of a contractor, instead of that of a slave owner; pursued by the progeny of the bloodhounds that run them down in the dark days of slavery, and with every door of the nation's citadel of justice closed, the same cry arises from Carrollton, Miss., as went up on the auction block in the slave market. We are free in theory, but in practice the form of slavery and intimidation of the southern states to-day is the cruelest to be found in the world. And the only solution of this problem is organization. The prejudice that exists has existed for centuries, and until the 7,000,000 of colored people of America are thoroughly organized under the leadership of men in whose ability and honesty they have faith, there will never be any material progress made by the masses. All the avenues that tend to the progression of other people are closed by prejudice, the roads leading in the direction of our advancement direct to an organization. The signs of the times demand a halt upon our part. We are now engaged in one of the greatest revolutions known to modern times. No man knows what moment labor and capital may pool their issues, and the colored race being between the two great and powerful millstones will be ground to atoms.

Prof. Gregory's address on the evening of the 16th was a masterly production.

Hon. J. Milton Turner was tendered another banquet by his many admirers of this city.

Col. Kelly commanded the finest body of colored soldiers on the 16th ever seen in Washington.

Magnus L. Robinson will be a candidate for magistrate of the fourth ward in Alexandria, Va. He will be the only colored candidate at the May election.

Senator Bruce and lady are often seen promenading the avenue.

Bethel literary and Historical Society are making great preparations for the opening of the Metropolitan Church.

The collection on Sabbath last at Plymouth Congregational Church amounted to $1,029.05.

The T. N. C. P. A. met at Richmond July 8, 1884, and will convene at Atlantic City, N. J., on the 3d of August.

Lena Miller McKinney, the noted prima donna of Washington, D. C., has been engaged by J. G. Bergen, manager for the Star Concert Company, to sing in the opera house at York, Pa., May 18, 1886.

T. Thomas Fortune is favorably spoken of for president of the Colored Press Association.

Dr. Watts is hard at work arranging for the industrial exhibition.

J. E. Bruce, as Washington correspondent, will no doubt make the *Maryland Directory* a lively paper.

All the churches are making extensive preparations for Easter. The flower display will, no doubt, be very profuse and very beautiful.

Mrs. Sarah A. Robinson is one of the graduates of the Training School for Nurses. H. PRICE WILLIAMS.

NO EXTERNAL remedy has the pain-relieving qualities of St. Jacobs Oil.

SPECIAL REDUCTION in prices for Easter Cards for Sunday schools, at Whitaker's.

Don't fail to attend the ball game.

DIED.

TAYLOR.—On Thursday, April 22, 1886, HENRY TAYLOR, beloved son of Wellington and Martha C. Taylor, aged 19 years, eleven months and twenty-four days.

Funeral will take place from the residence of his parents, No. 1509 Sixteenth st. N. W., Saturday, April 24, at 3 p. m.

MOTTE.—In this city, April 23, MARIANNE MOTTE, widow of Rev. M. I. Motte, of Boston.

CLAYTON.—ADDISON CLAYTON, at 5 o'clock a. m., April 22.

Funeral from Israel Church Sunday, April 25, at 2 p. m.

BAYNE.—On April 22, at 11:20 a. m., WILLIAM HARMON BAYNE, in the 4th year of his age.

The funeral will take place from St. Patrick's Church on Sunday at 3 p. m. Interment at Mt. Olivet.

UNDERTAKERS.

W. R. SPEARE,
UNDERTAKER,
940 F STREET NORTHWEST.
Everything strictly first-class and on the most reasonable terms.
[Camp Chairs to hire for all occasions.]
TETEPHONE CALL—349.

JOSEPH C. LEE,
Formerly of Henry Lee's Sons, Undertakers,
NEW AND COMMODIOUS WAREROOMS,
No. 995 Pennsylvania avenue N. W.
Residence on the premises.

The Sunday Post.

An Unusually Bright Number.

Besides the general features of THE SUNDAY POST, with its full General and Special Telegraphic News, it will print—

Two Original Articles, especially interesting to Lady Readers, by **Marian Harland.**

An Original Article on Ranch Life in the West, by Theodore Roosevelt.

A very interesting article, entitled **"Four New York Twenty Millionaires and How They Do Business."**

An exceedingly lively New York Club Letter from Amos J. Cummings, Nym Crinkle, and others.

WOODWARD & LOTHROP.

Sixth Annual Sale of Linens

And Housekeeping Goods and White Goods at the Boston Dry Goods House.

After ample and thorough preparation we beg to announce the inauguration of our Sixth Annual Sale of Linens and Housekeeping Goods and White Goods. We propose to distribute the best intrinsic values ever offered by us at any corresponding time since we have been in business.

Our large outlet commands for us the lowest possible prices from the makers, and buying in such large quantities we can name prices which would otherwise be impossible, hence the benefits accruing from our large purchases are shared by every individual buyer.

We pay especial attention to the supplying of institutions, boarding houses, hotels, restaurants, steamboats, and summer cottages, and are always ready to bid upon the largest of contracts.

It would be impossible to put a fifth of our inducements in this space; hence, have confined ourselves to those most noteworthy.

Damasks.

64-inch Cream German Table Damasks, 89c per yard.

64-inch Turkey Red Table Damasks (oil-boiled colors), 50c per yard.

60-inch Bleached German Linen Table Damasks, with and without colored borders, 62½c per yard.

64-inch Bleached German Linen Table Damasks, 75c per yard.

68-inch Cream Barnsley Linen Table Damasks, 70c per yard.

Doylies and Napkins.

All-linen Doylies, plain and plaid centers, with fancy borders, only 50c per dozen—the best ever offered at the price.

All-linen German Damask Doylies, in cream and white, with cardinal borders, extra quality, $1 per dozen.

⅝ Bleached German Linen Damask Napkins, $1.25 per dozen; extra, $1.75 and $2.

¾ Bleached German Linen Damask Napkins, fine quality, $2.25 per dozen.

⅞ Bleached German Linen Damask Napkins, extra heavy quality, $3 per doz.

Damask Sets.

Bleached German Linen Damask Table Cloths, fringed, excellent quality, handsome patterns, with ⅝ Doylies to match:

Eight by four-quarters, $4 per set.
Eight by ten-quarters, $4.50 per set.
Eight by twelve-quarters, $5.50 per set.
Eight by fourteen-quarters, $6.25 per set.
Eight by sixteen-quarters, $7 per set.

Bleached German Linen Damask Table Cloths, extra fine quality, assorted patterns, with ⅝ Damask Napkins to match:

Eight by four-quarters, $5.50 per set.
Eight by ten-quarters, $7.50 per set.
Eight by twelve-quarters, $8.50 per set.
Eight by fourteen-quarters, $9.50 per set.

Towels.

Large variety of Huck and Damask Towels, all linen colored borders, only $1.50 per dozen.

21 by 38 All-linen Huck Towels, splendid quality, with and without colored borders, $2 per dozen.

26 by 40 All-linen Huck Towels, extra quality, fancy borders, $2.50 per dozen.

At $3 per dozen we have the following excellent bargains, best value yet seen:

24 by 48 Bleached Huck Towels.
24 by 46 Bleached Huck Towels.
22 by 42 Cream Huck Towels.
22 by 42 Bleached Double Huck Towels.
20 by 42 Bleached Barnsley Huck Towels.
22 by 45 Cream Honeycomb Towels (all linen).

The above come with and without colored borders, also plain and knotted fringe.

Crash and Toweling.

18-inch All-linen Plaid Glass Toweling, fast colors, 10c per yard.

14 and 16 inch Russia Crashes, fine and coarse qualities, extra good values, only 12½c per yard.

All-linen Brown Russia Twilled Crash, extra heavy, 10 inch, 11c; 18-inch, 12½c per yard.

Bleached Barnsley All-linen Crash, 17-inch, 10c; 19-inch, 12½c per yard.

Brown Crashes, 6 and 8c per yard.

White Dress Goods.

In summer every lady looks better when dressed in white, which fact is being recognized and accounts for the increased number of white dresses worn each succeeding season.

We might say we have everything wanted in White Goods, either plain or figured, and we know our prices cannot be beaten.

Some Things We Have:

Nainsooks,	Tuckings,
Cambrics,	Egyptian Dimity,
Mulls,	Zappet Muslins,
Victoria Lawns,	Organdies,
Persian Lawns,	Tarletans,
Simon de Decos,	Organdie Checks,
Ecru Batiste,	Lawn Satin Plaids,
India Mulls,	Dotted Swisses,
Swiss Mulls,	Plain Swisses,
Figured Swisses,	Piques,
Welts,	Lace Lawns,
Striped Lawns,	Marseilles,
	Colored Mulls, &c.

White India Linens.

Six years ago we introduced this fabric to the Washington public, and each succeeding season they have become more popular, as evidenced by their increased sale.

They are made from a fine grade of Egyptian yarns, which are by far the best obtainable, and bleach better, have a more perfect color, superior finish, and launder more beautifully than any other makes. We take pleasure in recommending them to our customers. Prices, 10, 12½, 15, 18, 20, 22, 25, 29, 31, 37½, 42, and 46c per yd.

48-inch Swiss Lawns.

This is a fabric introduced by us 3 years ago, and which grew so rapidly in public favor that we were hardly able to supply the demand last season.

This year we imported more largely, and they are, if possible, superior in both color and finish, and at the prices quoted (same as before) they are the best intrinsic value we can possibly offer the trade, taking in consideration their width (48 inches), quality, and the fact that they wear as well and launder as handsomely as our India Linens. Three numbers, 25, 29, and 35c per yard.

33-inch Persian Lawns.

The most important feature of this fabric is its pure color and beautiful finish. We have made comparisons, and know the standing of every other made, and assert that we believe that this fabric as shown by us has no superior at the prices named, being absolutely the best in the market. Prices, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, 29, 33, 37½, 44, and 50c per yard. Each number a bargain. This fabric is particularly suitable for graduating and commencement dresses.

We pay special attention to orders by mail, and guarantee entire satisfaction.

WOODWARD & LOTHROP,
ONE PRICE ONLY.
WASHINGTON, D. C.

The Golden Eagle
CLOTHING CO.,
N. W. CORNER 7TH AND D STS.
****

In presenting our compliments to the men of the future—by which, of course, we mean the boys of to-day—we wish to remind them we are still presenting every purchaser of a Boy's Suit with a pair of fine roller skates. And as every recurring Eastertide marks a large increase in the sales of Boys'