



ill-timed. They thought Bro. Sledge rudely

in having the gas turned off. I suppose

no person who appreciates civilization

thinks otherwise. It should be remembered

that the Convention, without taking much

time for reflection, appointed the Committee,

but when the Report was made and discussed,

the oldest man in the body suggested that

the Convention had no jurisdiction of the case.

This view was acquiesced in, and the matter

dismissed, with the understanding that certain

brethren would take the thing in hand, and go

with Bro. Sledge to Mr. Stedman, and seek an

honorable settlement of the unfortunate affair.

Bro. Sledge had publicly expressed his readiness

to do whatever a gentleman or Christian

could do. Brothers Greese, Freeman and

James sought, through Bro. Drake, an inter-

view with Mr. S. who declined it, on the

ground, as they supposed, that it was unnecessary,

he being satisfied, &c. It seems, how-

ever, that Mr. S. was only satisfied with Bro.

Drake. He has since published a letter giv-

ing, as he says, "a plain statement of the facts,

as they actually occurred." Among these

facts he represents Bro. Sledge as saying

"there was but one Bible method of ad-

justing for our Church, the Old Landmark

Church, the Church of the living God, out of

whose pale there was and could be no alter-

ation."

Now, let it be borne in mind that Dr. Sted-

man represents Bro. Sledge as saying these

things after he [Mr. S.] had left the house.

Very well, Mr. S., then, did not bear them.

They were reported to him by others. But

did Bro. Sledge make these remarks? I do

not believe he did. I accuse no one of in-

terfering in matters, but there must have

been a misunderstanding. Look at this fact:

Baptists say that none are entitled to Church

membership who are not in a sacred state.

How then is salvation restricted to the Church

membership? Is it not clearly prerequisite to

it? The Lord added to the Church the saved.

But according to Mr. Stedman's representa-

tion, Bro. Sledge asserted that out of the

Old Landmark Baptist Church there could

be no salvation. Very few of the Baptists of

the North are Landmarkers, and a large mi-

nority in the South, I suppose, are not. Did

Bro. Sledge say at Memphis, on the night

of November 28th, that no Baptist can be

saved who is not a Landmarker? Where is

the witness who will so testify? I would like

to cross-examine him. My own opinion is that

Mr. Stedman's letter as published in the Mem-

phis papers, said nothing in the Presbyterian

Herald and Nashville Advocate, does Brother

Sledge gross injustice.

How often we say it, but do we ever pray?

Prayer is not mere submission, it is de-

mand. We pride ourselves sometimes when

under circumstances of affliction, we have

ceased to complain, and since we can't do

better, have concluded to bear what we can't

avoid. We say they will be done with a sort

of sullen resignation. We are barely willing

to be done, since so it must be. But who

prays? They will be done? Who desires and

longs for it? Who sets God's will so far above

his own, as to rejoice in disappointments and

tribulations?

God's will will be done. No power on earth

or hell can hinder it. Men and devils can

but work it out whether they will or no. Happy

trials happy to me so far as in desire with

God, that he finds his highest happiness in

the fact that he doeth all his pleasure, and

not only says, but prays, "Thy will be done."

SUNDAY MORNING THOUGHTS

"-It doth yet appear what we shall be."

This is true of our bodies as well as our

souls. What our bodies are now we know;

what they shall be we cannot tell. We may

form conjectures—there may be something sub-

lime in them—but still they are conjectures.

How little do we know!

The bodies of the saints are to be raised

from the dead in incorruption. They are

committed to the grave in corruption. There

is a tendency in the body to decay. In the

grave there are no influences to counteract

this tendency. Were we to personify the dead

body of the saint as it is laid in its narrow

resting-place, we might represent it as saying

MISSIONS.

Thoughts on the Missionary Organization of the

Foreign Missions.

BY FRANK W. WALKER.

THE same complication of interference exists in

our efforts to extend the Kingdom of Christ among

foreign nations.

The tentative agency among us for the work of

Foreign Missions, the American Baptist Missionary

Union, is constituted for the most part, by

those who believe in the "restricted field." But

both the "restricted" and the "unrestricted" have

entered into the same field. The Publication

Board has some co-workers in the North of Europe,

the very same agencies as those who carry on the

work in the South. It appears to the public for

the most part, as if it were a single body, with

ground of its labor in Foreign Missions. The Bible

teaches us that the very same field from which

the "restricted" draws its strength, is the

source of the "unrestricted." The "restricted" is

not a separate organization, but a part of the

whole. The "unrestricted" is not a separate

organization, but a part of the whole. The

two are not separate, but united. The

work of the "restricted" is not a part of the

work of the "unrestricted," but a part of the

work of the whole. The "restricted" is not a

separate organization, but a part of the whole.

The "unrestricted" is not a separate organiza-

tion, but a part of the whole. The work of the

"restricted" is not a part of the work of the

"unrestricted," but a part of the work of the

whole. The "restricted" is not a separate

organization, but a part of the whole. The

"unrestricted" is not a separate organiza-

tion, but a part of the whole. The work of the

"restricted" is not a part of the work of the

"unrestricted," but a part of the work of the

whole. The "restricted" is not a separate

organization, but a part of the whole. The

"unrestricted" is not a separate organiza-

tion, but a part of the whole. The work of the

"restricted" is not a part of the work of the

"unrestricted," but a part of the work of the

whole. The "restricted" is not a separate

organization, but a part of the whole. The

"unrestricted" is not a separate organiza-

tion, but a part of the whole. The work of the

"restricted" is not a part of the work of the

"unrestricted," but a part of the work of the

whole. The "restricted" is not a separate

organization, but a part of the whole. The

"unrestricted" is not a separate organiza-

tion, but a part of the whole. The work of the

"restricted" is not a part of the work of the

"unrestricted," but a part of the work of the

whole. The "restricted" is not a separate

organization, but a part of the whole. The

"unrestricted" is not a separate organiza-

tion, but a part of the whole. The work of the

"restricted" is not a part of the work of the

"unrestricted," but a part of the work of the

whole. The "restricted" is not a separate

organization, but a part of the whole. The

"unrestricted" is not a separate organiza-

tion, but a part of the whole. The work of the

"restricted" is not a part of the work of the

"unrestricted," but a part of the work of the

whole. The "restricted" is not a separate

organization, but a part of the whole. The

"unrestricted" is not a separate organiza-

tion, but a part of the whole. The work of the

"restricted" is not a part of the work of the

"unrestricted," but a part of the work of the

whole. The "restricted" is not a separate



