MUCH OF THE DIFFICULTY which exists in the minds of these gentlemen has grown out of an absence of any clear and distinct statement of what was, or was not, taught at St. Clement's, or of what part of the teaching or ritual they, on their part, objected to. I may have been in part to blame for this, and hope it is now remedled by the following

Bowings, prostrations, and genuflexions to the altar have never been taught. Reverence for the places and things made sacred by holy use is taught and, I hope, practised.

I wish it distinctly to be understood that nei-ther of the clergy of St. Clement's Church has

ever taught one word on THE SUBJECT OF CONFESSION

other than that contemplated by the "Exhortatien to the Holy Communion," and as allowed by our standards. The whole system, as taught and practised by the Roman Church, has by long usage confined the term, "auricular con-fession," to a technical sense. If by this term these gentlemen mean the use of confession as taught and practised by the Church of Rome, I emphatically deny the teaching or practice of any such custom. The Roman Church says, "you must." The Anglican Church says, "you may." The clergy of St. Clement's Church hold and teach the Anglican practice, and no other. This, and this only, they are prepared to defend as primitive and scriptural.

Beseeching you, one and all, to avoid all un-charitable and harsh expressions, to keep in subjection that "unruly member," the tongue, and to "set forward, as much as lieth in you, peace and quietness among all men,"
I am, dear brethren, faithfully yours,
H. G. BATTERSON.

Clergy Rooms, St. Clement's Church, Philadelphia, March 20, 1871.

THE PAPER READ TO THE VESTRY OF ST. CLE-MENT'S, FEB. 16, 1871. Gentlemen:-I have read the letter of Bishop Stevens, directed to Mr. P. Pemberton Morris, and a copy of that letter has been placed in my

The Bishop writes under an entire misappre-hension of the character of the papers submitted to him by Mr. Morris. The paper aliuded to by the Bishop, as marked M," he seems to understand to be a report to

the vestry of St. Clement's Church from a committee appointed by the vestry at a meeting held on the 18th of January, 1871. The paper marked "B" he seems to understand to be an answer to that report by the rector, defending his teaching and practice, in opposition to the tenor of the report, and the ex-pressed wish of the vestry. I come to this conclusion from the words of the Bishop where he says:—"The decision of the report is evaded;" again, "not a point was conceded," etc. The course pursued by Mr. Morris in this matter, from the beginning to the end, has, to my mind, been unwise, injudicious, and, in this last act, injurious, not only to the vestry and himself, but to the Bishop and myself.

THE FACTS IN THE CASE

I may perhaps be allowed to rehearse. The whole subject of ritual, doctrine, and practice had been discussed in vestry meeting upon many occasions previous to the meeting of January 18, 1871. At that meeting, for a second time, I expressed my willingness to abandon any practices in matters of ritual which the vestry would say were detrimental to the interests of the parish, or which, in the opinion of the vestry, might be a cause of scandal to the Church at large.

All the points in the ritual in St. Clement's

Church were discussed or enumerated, and not one member of the vestry raised a word of objection to a single point. I then announced that in the future, should I

sire any change. I would before making it. (I add, by way of parenthesis, that on Tuesday evening of the week previous to the 13th of January, 1871, Mr. George N. Allen and Mr. John Lambert called at my house,

and expressed their satisfaction with my proposition, and their readiness to defend the services as at that time conducted.) I beg leave to call attention to the fact that,

at a meeting of the vestry previous to the one held on the 18th day of January, a resolution was offered to the effect that the whole matter be REFERRED TO THE BISHOP

and Standing Committee. This resolution was unanimously tabled, or postponed, the mover of come now to the meeting of January the

18th, 1871, At that meeting, after my statement, before alluded to, it was unanimously resolved that

"the whole matter be referred to the rector and the rector's warden," as a commit ee who were to investigate the whole subject and

REPORT TO THE VESTRY. This committee, of which I was chairman,

held a meeting. No conclusion was reached. The first drait of the paper spoken of by the Bishop, as marked "M," was read and discussed. I then prepared a paper, which was substantially the same as that spoken of by the Bishop

These papers were simply expressions of opinion by the two members of the committee, preparatory to a final report by that committee to the vestry.

These two papers passed into the hands of Mr. Morris. He then prepared a letter to the Bishop, which letter is aliuded to in the Bishop's Mr. Morris expressed an anxious desire to lay the whole matter before the Bishop. I was entirely opposed to it, as not authorized by the vestry, and for other reasons which he very well knew.

I proposed that he should submit them to the Rev. T. F. Davies, the rector of St. Peter's Church. To this proposition Mr. Morris assented. I consented (seeing his determination) that they might also be laid before the Bishop. This decision I reconsidered, and said to Mr. Morris, "Rerd both papers to Mr. George N. Allen and Mr. Walter H. Tilden, and if they say send them to the Bishop, then you may lay them before him.

I am aware that MR. MORRIS CLAIMS

that no such declaration was made on my part. I simply ask, Why should I have requested that these papers be read to these two gentlemen if their counsel and advice were not to be asked in the matter?

I will pursue this matter no further, save only to say that it was my wish that the papers should not go before the Bishop without the concent of both Messrs. Allen and Tilden. Mr. Allen I have not seen. Mr. Tilden has told me that he advised Mr. Morris not to present them to the Bishop, and that Mr. Morris gave him to understand that he would not send them.

But the papers did go. And they went with-out the knowledge or consent of the vestry. THEY WEST IN SPITE of the unanimous vote of the vestry against such reference. They went before the commit-

tee had made a report to the vestry, as they were directed to do. They went with no authority from anybody.

Let me here ask why, at a meeting of the vestry, at which I was unable to be present, Mr.

Morris presented and read both papers as the report of this committee? I was not consulted in the matter, nor had I any intimation that such was his intention. As chairman of that committee, the report

should have been presented first by me; Mr. Morris would afterwards have been entitled to present his paper, but not until then. The whole proceeding has been

UNPARLIAMENTARY and irregular. I come now to

THE BISHOP'S PAPER. The Bishop discusses, first, the subject of au-

ricular confession. In response to my statement that "the teaching of the American Courch upon this anviect is contained in 'Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity:'" that "this book is one of the list pre-scribed by the House of Bishops, and by the

General Convention, for the study of every man previous to his ordination to the priesthood;" and that "having received the sanction and authority of the Honse of Bishops and General Convention, without any proviso or qualification, may be said fairly to speak the mind of the American Church

the American Church."
The Bishop says: - "I need not point out the fallacy of the argument of Dr. Batterson, that because an author is mentioned in the list of books prescribed by the House of Bishops, to be read and studied by candidates for holy orders, that therefore, suck author or work has the sanction and authority of the House of Bishops, and may be said fairly to represent the mind of the American Church for it is too evident to escape notice."

So, then, the House of Bishops deliberately sets forth a list of books which they, in union with the General Convention, by canon require to be studied by candidates for hely orders; and yet 'cannot thereby be said to give to such books their sanction and authority!"

THE "FALLACY" of this argument is "too evident to escape notice." The Bishop apparently proceeds upon the supposition that the compulsory confession of the Church of Rome is that which is spoken of. He is mistaken. To no man is compulsory confession more abhorrent than to myself.

But, to the "troubled minds contemplated by the exhortation to the communion;" those with an "oppressed conscience, bona fide, seeking re-lief in that way," the Church has always coun-selled and encouraged confession as a means to "quiet the grief," and for the "removal of all scruple and doubtfulness."

The Bishop says in effect that the "whole drift" of Hooker's teaching is

AGAINST PRIVATE CONFESSION. What, then, is Hooker's meaning, when he says in Book vi, chap. iv, 7:—"Our Lord Jesus Christ bath left in His Church * * spiritual and ghostly physicians, guides and pastors of redeemed souls, whose office doth not consist in general persuasions unto amendment of life, but also in the private particular cure of diseased minds.

The quotation from Bishop Jewel's "Apology is entirely foreign to the subject. Bishop Jewel is speaking of the subject as taught and practised in the Church of Rome. When he speaks of the practice of the Church of England we get at his teaching on the subject under discussion.

IN THE HOMILY ON REPENTANCE. in arguing against the compulsory confession of the Church of Rome, Bishop Jewel says, "that every man should be bound to their (i. e. the Roman) auricular confession, it is no command-ment or ordinance of God." So say I. This same Bishop Jewel, in his defense of

The Apology, says:—"Touching the third" (private confessions made unto our brother), "if it be discreetly used, to the greater comfort and better satisfaction of the penitent, without superstition or other ill, it is not in any wise by us reproved. The abuses and errors set apart, we do no more mislike a pri-vate confession than a private sermon." The quotation from Bishop Jewel, used by

Bishop Stevens, is foreign to the question under discussion. Used as he uses it, he makes Bishop Jewel say what he never did say. In the Homily on Repentance, Bishop Jewel discusses both questions.

Of compulsory confession as used in the Roman Church, he says:—"It hath not the war-rant of God's Word." Of voluntary confession, he says:-"I do not say but that if any do find themselves troubled in conscience, they may repair to their learned curate or pastor, or to some other godly, learned man, and show the trouble and doubt of their conscience to them, that they may receive at their hand the com-fortable salve of God's Word." The whole drift and teaching of Bishop

Jewel's works on this subject ARE AT UTTER VARIANCE

with the statement of Bishop Stevens. Dr. John Donne, Dean of St. Paul's, London, n the time of James I, says: - "Men come not willingly to this manifestation of themselves, nor are they to be brought in chains, as they do in the Roman Church, by a necessity, Again he says:-"We enjoin private and particular confession if the conscience be op-pressed: and if any man do think that that which is necessary for him on his death-bed is necessary every time he comes to the Communion, and so come to such a confession, if anything lie upon him, as often as he comes to the Communion: we blame not, we dissuade not, we discounsel not that tenderness of conscience and that safe proceeding in the soul.

Wheatly on the Book of Common Prayer is very clear on this subject. His book is one of the list authorized by

THE HOUSE OF BISHOPS and the General Convention. He says: - "No argument sure can be drawn, that because a practice has been abused, it should therefore cease to be used. The abuses of it should be reformed, but not the practice discontinued.' "And therefore the Church of England at the Reformation freed it from all the encroach-ments with which the Church of Rome had em-

barrassed it, and reduced confession to its pri-"Every one is left to his own discretion; all that was absolutely enjoined, was only a mutual forbearance and peace; for the security of which, a clause was added in the first book of King Edward, requiring such as shall be satisfied with a general confession not to be offended with them that do use, to their farther satisfying, the auricular and secret confession to the priest; and those also which think it needful and convenient, for the quietness of their own consciences, particularly to open their sins to the priest, to be offended with them that are satisfied with their confessions to God, and the general confession to the Church. But in all things to follow and keep the rule of charity, and every man to be satisfied with his own con-

sciences; whereas he hath no warrant of God's word to the same.' "What could have been added more judiciously than this, to temper, on the one hand, the rigors of those who were too apt at that time to insist upon confession as always absolutely to salvation; and to prevent, on the other hand, a carelessness in those who, being prejudiced against the abuse, were apt indiscriminately to reject the thing, as at no time needful or useful to a penitent."

science, not judging other men's minds or con-

"So that we may still, I presume, wish, very consistently with the determination of our Church, that our people would apply themselves, oftener than they do, to their spiritual physicians, even in the time of their health since it it much to be feared, they are wounded oftener than they complain, and yet, through aversion to disclosing their sore, suffer it to gangrene for want of their help who should work

"The E xposition of the Thirty-nine Articles" by the Rt. Rev. Harold Browne, D. D., the present Bishop of Ely, is another of the books authorized by the House of Bishops and by the General Convention. The Bishop of Connecticut has edited an edition of this book for use in the American Church, and it is used in all our Divinity Schools. Bishop Browne says: -"The Church of England provides for all troubled consciences the power of relieving themselves, by making confession of guilt to their pastor, or any other discreet and learned minister, and so gives them comfort and counsel; but does not bind every one of necessity to rehearse all his private sins to man, nor elevate such useful confession into a sacrament essential to salvation.

Martin Luther says of private confession: -"It is useful, yea, necessary; neither would I desire that it had no existence, nay rather, I rejoice that it exists in the Church of Christ.' he says: - "I would rather lose a thousand worlds than suffer private confession to be thrust out

af the Church.

tary confession.

I am unable to find a single word in the writings of Luther, Calvin, Ridley, Cranmer, Hooker, or any of the Reformers against voluntary confession. They are almost unanimous on the subject of COMPULSORY CONFESSION.

and equally unanimous on the subject of volun-

I have examined with patient care the writ-

ings of the great and good of the Anglican com-

munion, from the days of Ridley and Craumer to the present time, and at every step I flud a condemnation of compulsory confession, and an equally strong commendation of voluntary

confession. The present Bishop of London—(Bishop Jackson) who cannot be said by anybody to be favorable to what is called the "Advanced School"—says, "As ministers should be, by their profession, usually the best advisers in cases of conscience, and are or ought to be every penitent's ready and sympathizing friend: them the stricken or perplexed soul will often have recourse. Thus, there is a sense in which those dreaded words "Confession to the Priest"

tice, and even at times a duty."

I may add, that in all the recent trials and troubles in the Church of England, in no instance has the subject of confession been touched, while it is well known that Pusey, Keble, Bennett, Carter, Sadler, and hundreds of others of the English priesthood have been, or are, in the constant habit of hearing these voluntary confessions. The same statement is true in the case of many priests in the American

The Bishop proceeds: "Where the English Prayer Book in the first of the exhortations to the holy communion has the words, 'that by the ministry of God's Holy Word, he mey receive

THE BENEFIT OF ABSOLUTION, together with ghostly counsel and advice,' in the American Prayer Book the reference to absolution is left out, and the passage reads, that he may receive such godly counsel and

Does the Bishop mean by this paragraph to say that the American Church repudiates absolution? It so, I call your attention to the preface in her Prayer Book, where she says:— This Church is far from intending to depart from the Church of England, in any essential point of doctrine, discipline, or worship; or other than local circumstances require."

I CALL ATTENTION

to the declaration which she puts in the mouth of every priest on all occasions of matins or even-song, viz.: that "God hath given power? and commandment to His ministers, to declare and pronounce to His people, being penitent, the absolution and remission of their sins. The Bishop goes on to say: -"Where the Eng-lish rubric before the confession in the holy communion reads:-"Then shall the general confession be made in the name of all those that

are minded to receive," the American rubric tays, 'Then shall this general confession be made by the priest and all those that are minded to receive, 'i.e., that the priest is to confess as well as the people." I am at a loss to understand THE BISHOP'S MEANING.

for it is obvious that in either case the priest is to confess. For is not the priest to receive as well as the people? So then, in both cases, the "confession" is by priest and people. The Bishop's allusion to this rubric is to my mind UTTERLY MEANINGLESS

in this discussion. Again the Bishop says:-"Where the English rubric directs after this general confession, Then shall the priest (or the bishop being present,) stand up, and turning himself to the people, pronounce this absolution:' the American rubric leaves out the words, 'pronounce this absolution, and substitutes the single word

Is there, then, no absolution? Are not the words which the priest is to "say" the very same as those in the English Prayer Book? DOES THE BISHOP INTEND

here to say that the American Church conveys

to her priesthood no power to "pronounce absalution" in the communion office? What means she, then, when she uses the words which were used by the Bishop at my own ordination, viz.:—"Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by

the imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven, and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained. And be thou a faithful dispenser of the Word of God, and of His Holy Sacraments: In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen. ARE THESE WORDS A MOCKERY?

Do they convey no power? No authority? Or are they merely a high sounding phrase, repeated over the kneeling man, at the most solemn hour of his life?

The Bishop alludes to the omission in the American office for the visitation of the sick, of the particular and special confession, and abso-

Why this was done, when we remember the Preface to the Prayer Book, heretefore mentioned, it is hard to explain, unless it be for the reason that the English office compels a confession, and commands the priest to give absolution, if the penitent desires it. Still, in the visitation sick, when the holy communion is celebrated, the very words of confession and absolution, contained in the office for the public celebration, are directed to be used. Again: -THE AMERICAN PRAYER BOOK

has a rubric which reads as follows: -"Here the minister may use any part of the service of this book, which, in his discretion, he shall think convenient to the occasion," etc. By this rubric, the priest is no longer a machine, but a man, and supposed to have some "discretion." In the performance of his duty in visiting the sick, he may (by this rubric) move the sick person to confession; and by the same rubric, he may, "in his discretion," use the form of absolution contained in the communion office.

The Bishop proceeds to the office for the visitation of prisoners, and admits that

THE FORM OF ABSOLUTION in the communion office may be used "when a prisoner is confined for some great and capital

crime. The Bishop goes on to say that "the only confession which the minister is to exhort the prisoner to make, is a particular confession of the sin for which he is condemned." The Bishop must have overlooked a previous rabric in the same office, which says:-"Then shall the minister examine whether he repent him truly of his sins, and be in charity with all the world; and further admonish him, particularly concerning the crimes wherewith he is charged," etc. Again, in the exhortation to the prisoner, the minister is directed to say: -"I require you to strictly examine yourself and your estate, both towards God and towards man; and let no worldly consideration hinder you from making a full confession of your sins," etc. After this is done, then the minister is to exhort him to that "particular confession of the sin for which he is condemned.

THE BISHOP'S INTERPRETATION of this office may fairly be paraphrased thus: -"The man who outrages law, who commits murder, robbery, or, in the pursuit of his lust, outrages the purity of woman-this man, upon confessior, may receive the absolution given to all penitents in the communion office;" but the humble penitent soul, who is battling with his sins, and who comes in his sorrow for guidance and consolation, shall be turned away with no word of peace from the Church which our blessed Lord has placed on the earth to that

IT IS MONSTROUS! Does not the greater include the less? If the great criminal may receive absolution upon making a confession, why may not the peatent sinner, whose sins may not be an outrage upon society, and yet are an outrage upon the law of God, and his own conscience; why may he not receive the same blessing and the same "wholesome salve of God's Word?"

The Bishop proceeds to say: "I repeat, therefore, that the American Church has spoken for herself, the recognizes no inherent right in the minister to hear confession and grant absolution outside of the forms and way specially provided; and by her legislation, direct and indirect, has protested against private confessionals and private absolution. I BEG LEAVE TO DISSENT IN TOTO

from the Bishep's statement. The American Church, so far as I can learn, has never "legis-lated" upon this subject, "directly or indirectly The American Church has given to her priest-

this very thing.

She restricts the newly-commissiond priest by no word or hint, in the use of the Divinely de-scended powers. If the "power and command-ment" of God to "His ministers" to "declare and pronounce to His people, being penitent, the absolution and remission of their sins," be not a part of the "office and work of a priest in the

Church of God," what is it?
Beyond this the Bishop's whole argument is directed against the compulsory system of the Church of Rome, which system I abhor as deeply as it is possible for him to do.

THE BISHOP CONCLUDES

this discussion by saying:—
"I require the officiating ministers in St.
Clement's parish to discontinue all teaching and practice which leads to or countenances such private confession or private absolution."

Are we to suppose the Bishop here to say that
he will forbid the clergy of St. Clement's parish to hear a private confession, or to give absolu-tion in such a case? If so, I am bold to say that he will do that which the Church nowners gives him authority to do.

The American Church has given me authority without restriction in this matter, and until she by her legislation shall take away that authority. I MUST USE MY LIBERTY.

This whole question touches the private duties of the priesthood. No subject can be more sacred. It is a matter outside the direction of a vestry! and one with which as a vestry, they have no right to interfere. Were this conceded every action of the ministry would be subject to the direction of a vestry. The same will apply o a Bishop. The exhortation of the Communion bids the

troubled penitent to go to the priest and "open How that is to be done it is not in the province of Bishop or layman to decide. No men in the American Church have a higher reverence for authority" than the clergy of St. Clement's parish. No men more deeply

and abhor an autocracy.' Whatever the Bishop may command, counsel, or advise, within the limits of his rightful authority, shall, "with a glad mind, be reverently followed and obeyed" to the letter and in the spirit.

The question of "prayers for the dead" need not be discussed in this paper The vestry having unanimously declared that not one of them has ever heard me say one word, in the pulpit or in the chancel, which they could not heartily endorse, it needs no words to prove that we are heartily in accord so far.

I DECLINE TO ACCEPT THE BISHOP'S DICTUM. that I am responsible for the sentiments expressed in the sermons of those who preach tor me, and who are my peers, responsible not to me but the diocesan authority under which

A more careful reading of the Bishop's paper seems to call for some examination. "The opinion that prayers for the dead are efficacious" has never been "taught or preached" in St. Clement's Church by anybody. To my knowledge the subject has never been alluded to more than once or twice. The Bishop says:— The two passages in the Prayer Book that are usually relied on by the advocates of this doc-trine are found in the Prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church Militant, and in one of

(What follows was not in the original paper).

the prayers of the Burial Service. The first sentence is, "And we also bless Thy Holy Name for Thy servants departed this life in Thy faith and fear," etc., etc.

The Bisbop knows (or perhaps I should say, he ought to know) that this passage is not the one "relled on by the advocates of this doctrine." This passage is referred to, but the strong part of their argument is in the prayer which follows the Canon of Consecration, viz .: -'And we earnestly desire Thy Fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; most humbly beseeching Thee to grant that by the merits and death of Thy Son Jesus Christ and through faith in His Blood, We, and all Thy Whole Church, may obtain remission of our sins and all other benefits of His Passion.

The argument is, that "Thy Whole Church" comprises three parts: The Church Milicant the Church Expectant, and the Church Triumphant. Therefore say they, the prayer reaches beyond those still in the flesh. The Bisho, then alludes to the

PRAYER IN THE BURIAL OFFICE. and gives a quotation as follows: -"And we beseech Thee that we, with all those who are departed in the true faith of Thy Holy Name, may have our perfect consummation and bliss in Thy eternal and heavenly kingdom. Let us now have the quotation just as it reads in the Burial Office.

"And we beseech Thee that we, with all those who are departed in the true faith of Thy Holy Name, may have our perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul, in Thy eternal and everlasting glory." Why is it that the words "Both in body and soul" are omitted? These are the very words upon which the "advocates of this doctrine" hang their whole argument. They say that the "perfect consummation and bliss" can not be until the soul is reunited to the body, and that this is a supplication that the "bliss" of that day may be granted to those souls now separated from the body.

I now return to the original paper. The remainder of the discussion is upon mat-

ters of ritual. THIS WHOLE SUBJECT having been settled by the vestry, requires but little consideration. The vestry know full well that the rector is not strenuous upon these minor points, as (for the most part) they involve no principle.

He would probably differ from both Bishop and vestry in some points, but a man may do that without loss of confidence, trust, or affection. The question of

MIXING WATER WITH THE WINE, at the time of placing the oblations upon the altar, I had promised to abandon if it was an offense to anybody, and it was unfair to take that question before the Bishop, especially as no person (in the vestry or out of it) had ever raised one word of objection to the practice. In speaking of vestments, the Bishop says: There is no authority for the use of colored

vestments in our Church," etc. It is pretty generally known, libelieve, that there is no authority for the use of any vestments in our Church, except that of common ecclesiastical law. There is not one word of law in our canons, nor has the American Church legislated upon the subject in any way, "directly

or indirectly.' A BISHOP'S OPINION, however wise, learned, or plous he may be. surely cannot be elevated to the position of

The Bishop of New York, in his recent action. took good care to recommend, not to command; nor did he touch the question of colored stoles. He simply requested the clergy who had used the colored chasuble to substitute white in place The use of the colored stoles the rector and

the action of the next General Convention. Not one member of the vestry raised a word of objection, per se, to the use of them.

The Bishop concludes his paper by saving:—
"It would certainly be a mockery of Episcopal authority, and bad faith towards the vestry of St. Clement's Church, after agreeing to submit

vestry agreed should be continued, and await

the controversy to the ordinary," etc.

The rector and the vest y have never agreed to "submit the controversy to the ordinary." the contrary, the rector has steadily protested against it; and the vestry by an unanimous vote, on the 11th of January, decided not to do it. IT HAS BEEN THE AIM

of the majority of the vestry to settle the matter among themselves without such a reference. This was the reason for the appointment of a committee to report upon the subject. But Mr. Morris, in his haste, has rushed the question before the ordinary, with no authority what-ever; and has placed the ordinary in a false position by giving him to understand that the matter was referred to him for adjudication, which was not the case. Had Mr. Morris come to me before the introduction of his first resolution, all the painful discussions which have fol-

hood an absolute, unqualified commission to do | lowed might have been avoided. The clergy of | St. Clement's

STAKED THEIR REPUTATION upon their work there, believing in the truth and good faith of the vestry. The work has been a triumphant success, but this action may result in defeat and disaster, if not in dishonor The whole congregation, with not more than balf a dozen exceptions outside of the vestry, are heartly in accord with the rector, If they were not I would resign at once; but knowing as I do that they are, I shall hold my position as rector of the parish.

I hope and pray that the vestry may have the grace and the wisdom to stop before they bring St. Clement's into disrepute and dishonor, if not into atter ruin.

It will be very plainly seen that in the above paper I have not discussed the wisdom, the desirability, nor the necessity of private coufession; of prayers for the dead, nor of any matter of ritual. As neither of the clergy of St. Clement's has ever asked anybody to come to confession, as they have never said it was a duty to pray for the dead; as they have never insisted on any matter of ritual under discussion; it has not been necessary to defend, or even explain, their teaching or practice. The only question in the matter is this:—Does the American Church permit private confession? I give here no opinion in the matter, but simply state facts

give no opinion on this subject, nor is such my There has been no teaching in St. Clement's Church on the subject of confession, other than the plain statement of the fact that "the troubled minds contemplated by the exhortation to the communion-those with an oppressed conscience, bona fide seeking relief in that way,

Again, do the prayers of the Church extend

in any sense beyond the Church militant? I

were entitled to the privilege.
H. G. BATTERSON, Rector of St. Clement's Church. Philadelphia, March 20, 1871.

SPECIAL NOTICES.

REDEMPTION OF STATE BONDS. STATE OF CALIFORNIA, TREASURY DEPARTMENT, SACRAMENTO, Feb. 1, 1871.

Whereas, there is on this day in the State Treasury the sum of two hundred and fifty thousand (\$250,000) dollars, which, under the provisions of an act of the Legislature of said State, entitled "An Act to provide for paying certain equitable claims against the State of California, and to contract a funded debt for that purpose," approved April 28, 1867; and also under the provisions of an act amendatory of said act, approved April 27, 1860, is set apart for the redemption of Civil Bonds of said State, issued under the provisions of said first mentioned act, notice is hereby given that

SEALED PROPOSALS for the surrender of said Bonds will be received at this Department for the amount above specified, 10TF DAY OF APRIL, A. D. 1871,

at 11 o'clock A. M. No bids will be entertained at more than par

value, and a responsible guarantee must accompany each proposal, which must be marked "Sealed Proposals for the Redemption of Civil Bonds of 1857." Said bonds must be surrendered within ten days after the acceptance of the proposals for their re A. F. CORONEL, State Treasurer. 2 14 eod t 4 10

REDEMPTION OF CIVIL BONDS OF STATE OF CALIFORNIA, TREASURY DEPATMENT, SACRAMENTO, February 1, 1871.

Whereas, There is on this day in the State Trea sury the sum of twenty-eight thousand (\$28,000) dollars which, under the provisions of an act of the l egislature of said State entitled "An act to provide for the paying certain equitable claims against debt for that purpose," approved April 30, 1860, is set apart for the redemption of Civil Bonds of said State, issued under the provisions of said act, notice is hereby given that

SEALED PROPOSALS for the surrender of said Bonds will be received at this Department for the amount above specified until the 10TH DAY OF APRIL, 1871.

at 11 o'clock A. M. No bid will be entertained at more than par value and a responsible guarantee must accompany each proposal, which must be indersed "sealed Proposals for the surrender of Civil Bonds of 1860," Said bonds will be redeemed and interest paid in gold and silver coin of the United States, and must

of the proposal for their redemption. A. F. CORONEL. State Treasurer. 2 14eod t4 10 OFFICE FIRE COMMISSIONERS, S. E. corner FIFTH and CHE-NU C.

be surrendered within ten days after the acceptance

PHILADELPHIA, March 15, 1870. THE VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARCMENT having been retired from service and the NEW DEPARTMENT placed in operation at 6 o'CLOCK THIS EVENING,

the Beard respectfully asks the co-operation of the public to assist them in their endeavors to make the Department a success. The Board would return their sincere thanks to the Volunteer Department for their assistance and

uniform good conduct while they were engaged in JACOB LAUDENSLAGER,

Attest-John R. Cantlin. OFFICE OF THE LOGAN IRON AND STEEL COMPANY,
PHILADELPHIA, March 13, 1871.
The annual meeting of the Stockholders of this company will be held at the office, No. 230 SOUTH THISD street, on TUESDAY, March 23, at 12 o'clock M. when an election will be held for Five Directors.

M., when an election will be held for Five Directors, and such other business transacted as may then be presented. By order. CHARLES WESTON, JR.,

OFFICE OF THE NATIONAL RAILWAY COMPANY, No. 218 S. FOURTH Street.

PHILADALPHIA, March S, 1371.

An instalment of Five Dollars per share on the subscriptions to the preferred stock of the National Railway Company will be due and payable at the office of the Company, No. 218 S. FOURTH Street, Philadelphia, on or before the 24th of March, 1871.

By order of the Board of Directors.

382w JACOB RIEGEL, Treasurer.

BATCHELOR'S HAIR DYE.—THIS SPLEN-did Hair Dve is the best in the world, the only true and perfect Dye. Harmless—Reliable—Instantrue and perfect Dye. Harmless—Reinble—Instantaneous—no disappointment—no ridiculous tints—"Does no contain Lead nor any Vitalic Poison to injurets: Hair or System." Invigorates the Hair and leaves it soft and beautiful; Black or Brown.

Sold by all Druggists and dealers. Applied at the Factory, No. 16 BOND Street, New York. [4 27 mwft] THE UNION FIRE EXTINGUISHER

COMPANY OF PHILADELPHIA Manufacture and sell the Improved, Portable Fire Extinguisher. Always Reliable. # 80 M No. 118 MARKET St., General Agent

DR. F. R. THOMAS, No. 911 WALNUT ST. formerly operator at the Colton Dental Room devotes his entire practice to extracting teeth wit out pain, with fresh nitrous oxide gas. 11 17: JOUVIN'S KID GLOVE CLEANER restores soiled gloves equal to new, by all druggists and fancy goods dealers, cents per bottle.

DISPENSARY FOR SKIN DISEASES, NO. 216 S. ELEVENTH Street. Patients treated gratuitously at this institution daily at 11 o'clock.

FURNITURE.

JOSEPH H CAMPION (late Moore & Campion),

WILLIAM SMITH, SMITH & CAMPION Manniacturers of PINE FURNITURE, UPHOLSTERINGS, AND IN-

TERIOR HOUSE DECORATIONS, No. 249 SOUTH THIRD Street, Manufactory, Nos. 215 and 217 LEVANT Street, 215 FINANCIAL.

THE PENNSYLVANIA COMPAN FOR INSURANCES ON LIVES AN GRANTING

ANNUITIES. Office No. 304 WALNUT Street.

INCORPORATED MARCH 10, 1812. CHARTER PERPETUAL.

CAPITAL \$1,000,000.

SURPLUS UPWARDS OF \$750,00 Receive money on deposit, returnable on demi-for which interest is allowed. And under appointment by individuals, corputions, and courts, act as EXECUTORS, ADMINISTRATORS, TRUSTE

GUARDIANS, ASSIGNERS, COMMITTEES RECEIVERS, AGENTS, COLLECTORS, ETC.

And for the faithful performance of its di such all its assets are liable. CHARLES DUTILH, Paesident WILLIAM B. HILL, Actuary. DIRECTORS. Joshus B. Lippincott, Charles H. Hutchinson Lindley Smyth, George A. Wood, Anthony J. Antelo, Charles S. Lewis,

Henry J. Williams, William S. Vanx, John R. Wucherer, Adoiph E. Borte, Alexander Biddle, Henry Lewis.

Bowles Brothers & Co

PARIS, LONDON, BOSTON.

19 WILLIAM Stree

New York,

ISSUE

for Traveller Credits IN EUROPE.

Excharge on Paris and the Uni Bank of London,

IN SUMS TO SUIT.

CITY OF BALTIMOR \$1,200,000 six per cent, Bonds of the Weste Maryland Railroad Company, endorsed by the C of Baltimore. The undersigned Finance Commit of the Western Maryland Railroad Company of through the American Exchange National Ba \$1,200,000 of the Bonds of the Western Maryla Railroad Company, having 30 years to run, princip and interest guaranteed by the city of Baltimo This endorsement having been authorized by act of the Legislature, and by ordinance of t City Council, was submitted to and ratifled by almost unanimous vote of the people. As an ad tional security the city has provided a sinking fund \$200,000 for the liquidation of this debt at matur An exhibit of the financial condition of shows that she has available and convertible asse more than sufficient to pay her entire indebtedne To investors looking for absolute security no lo

These tonds are offered at 87% and accrued in rest, coupons payable January and July. WILLIAM KEYSER, JOHN K. LONGWELL, MOSES WIESENFELD. Finance Committee

EDUCATIONAL. HARVARD UNIVERSIT

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.,

offered in this market presents greater inducemen

Comprises the following Departments:-Harvard College, the University Lectures, Divini School, Law School, Medical School, Dental Scho Lawrence Scientific School, School of Mining a Practical Geology, Bussey Institution (a School Agriculture and Horticulture), Botanic Garden, tronomical Observatory, Museum of Comparate Zoology, Peabody Museum of Archæology, Episcop Theological School.

The next academic year begins on September ? The first examination for admission to Harva College will begin June 19, at 8 A. M. The seco examination for admission to Harvard College, a the examinations for admission to the Scienti and Mining Schools," will begin September 28. T requisites for admission to the College have be changed this year. There is now a mathematic

describing the new requisites and recent examin tion papers will be mailed on application. UNIVERSITY LECTURES.—Thirty-three cours in 1870-71, of which twenty begin in the week Fe ruary 12-19. These lectures are intended for grad ates of colleges, teachers, and other compet adults (men or women). A circular describing the

a'ternative for a portion of the classics. A circu

will be mailed on application. THE LAW SCHOOL has been reorganized th year. It has seven instructors, and a library 16, 06 volumes. A circular explains the new cour of study, the requisites for the degree, and the co of attending the school. The second half of t year begins February 13. For catalogues, circulars, or information, J. W. HARRIS. dress

E DeBHILL BCHOO, MERCHANTVILLE, N. J., Four Miles from Philadelphia

Secretary

2 6 3m

The session commenced MONDAY, April 1871. For circulars apply to Rev. T. W. CATTELL

A UGUSTUS KINKELIN, TEACHER OF PIAN can be engaged for Dancing, Parties, Ente talaments, etc. Orders by mail from suburban res dences punctually attended to. Residence, No. 1 S. ELEVEN'I II Street, below Chesnut. 3 13 lm WHISKY, WINE, ETQ.

CARRIATAIRS & MCCALL

No. 126 Wainut and 21 Granite 2t IMPORTERS OF Brandies, Wines, Gin, Olive Oil, Etc

WHOLESALE DEALERS IN IN BOND AND TAX PAID.

SHIPPING AND COMMISSION MERCHANTS,
No. 2 COENTISS SLIP, New York,
No. 15 SOUTH WHARVES, Philadelphia,
No. 45 W. PRATT STREET, Baltimore.
We are prepared to ship avery description of Freight to Philadelphia, New York, Wilmington, an intermediate points with promptness and despated Canal Boats and Steam-togg farnished at the shorts actice.

PURE RYE WHISKIES ASTON & MCMAHON,