







The Baptist.

MEMPHIS, TENN., JULY 30, 1870.

For Twelve Months, . . . \$3.00
For Six Months, . . . . . 2.00

BAPTIST FAITH.

There is no salvation but by the free mercy of God; no merit, but through the mediation of Christ; no interest in Christ except by a personal faith in him; no justifying faith but that which works by love and purifies the heart; no love to Christ which does not include love to his people, his example, his precepts and testify itself to the world by implicit and cheerful obedience to all his commands; no genuine love to his people that does not influence a man to do good to them, as he has ability and opportunity. J. K. GRAVES.

READ THIS, AND CHANGE THE NAME.

To ROMAN PROTESTANTS [BAPTISTS]. We wish that Protestants [Baptists] would adhere as closely to their declared position, with all its logical consequences, as do our brethren of the Roman faith. Fearless, complete acceptance of the principles of Protestantism [Baptists], would simplify many questions of public policy, would add immensely to the respectability of a church, and would sweep over those of an association, convention, or council, or presbytery—and no associations from or convention can impose a moral obligation upon the constituent parts without composing them.

1. No charge must be entertained against him unless supported by two or three unimpeachable witnesses.

2. He should have a fair and impartial trial, and should be allowed to face his accusers.

3. And unless it is a persecution instead of a fair trial, no church would object to calling an advisory council of ministers to aid her by their impartial advice. This we urge in all cases as a precautionary measure.

4. Our churches are wont to seek the advice of a presbytery of ministers before investing an applicant with ministerial authority, since he is ordained a minister of the churches of Christ at large, and their confidence is necessary to his usefulness. Let him be tried by the assistance of "a jury of his peers," and if innocent acquitted—if guilty, disciplined, and the churches at large will concur in an impartial verdict so obtained.

5. Of the guilt or innocence or name of the minister above "arrested" we are ignorant, but against the whole procedure we most emphatically record our protest, as unscriptural and unbaptistic, and as a bold effort on the part of J. S. Backus's christian profession is a profession of neutrality; especially is it a profession of friendship to the poor and needy.

6. The articles of the constitution were adopted after due consideration, and no one of them can be so construed as to admit a delegate from a church as such. If it will assume the name of a missionary society a delegate can be admitted; or, if a church will put money into the hands of one of her members, he may, in his own name, be admitted upon the money consideration, but the church per se cannot have a representation. To say that this happened without design, would be to charge the want of wisdom and thoughtfulness upon the framers of the constitution. It was purposely done.

7. It is also evident from the fact that all attempts to correct this have been resisted.

8. During the session in Macon, in 1869, a proposition was distinctly made by J. R. Graves so to amend the constitution as to admit church representation, and a large committee appointed to report upon the proposition—a large majority of whom reported favorably to the amendment; but a minority (I believe) of two protested. One of the protestants, Elder Boyce, of South Carolina, made a speech against the report. Among other things, he said to admit churches opened the way for ecclesiastical difficulties, for, in case of a division at home, two sets of delegates might come, each claiming to be sent from the church at a given place. At the close of his speech the proposition to amend was rejected by a very large majority. It appeared to me to be purposely done. If not, we have very thoughtless brethren.

9. If there had been any anxiety to admit churches Bro. Boyce's argument could have been easily set aside, by proposing a clause that the Convention would settle no ecclesiastical questions, so that delegates in such extreme cases would remain at home until all such difficulties were adjusted. The immodesty and injustice of such an argument were made palpable by what occurred soon after. Elder B. took the floor in behalf of Greenville Theological Seminary, and twelve thousand dollars or more were subscribed by pledging the very churches who were too dangerous to be worthy of representation. Those who were present will remember that certain brethren compared their churches to wives, who would always respond to the calls of benevolence. And these, forsooth, are unworthy of organic connection, because too dangerous to have representation! This is monstrous, and deserves reconsideration. Next week I propose to continue this subject.

10. We have drifted some ways from where we were 30 years ago, and WHERE ARE WE DRIFTING?

The above article I have clipped from the Examiner and Chronicle, and send for THE BAPTIST, because of the simple way of presenting a grave subject.

The alarming purpose here avowed was formed at least thirty years ago. The history of the last thirty years shows how faithfully the Catholics have kept their vows—how quietly and how successfully they have worked. As to changing our constitution and our laws, our own crazy, infatuated people have made that an easy task, by setting the example of regarding them with little respect. Our constitution and laws now and then are very unlike. The people seem inclined to submit to any changes the party in power may make. The heaven is at work, and unless God prevent, it will level the whole lump—each event Baptists may look out.

11. I think the proposition will be for the mission to gather them in first, but to go on tributing the Bible, French language, gospel by the way individuals. Any who speaks the French

by vote, can call a council into being. It is then powerless only to advise a church—give its opinion and advice upon questions and facts submitted to it by the church or churches calling it. The church is not bound to accept its advice. The creator is superior to, and not bound by the opinion of the creature. If it is to advise a church as to the qualifications of an applicant for the ministry, the church may accept or decline acting upon the advice of the presbytery. If she accepts, the presbytery does not ordain, does not confer its authority—for it has none—but formally confers the authority of the church upon the candidate, and the church should commission, i. e., issue his credentials. If the church, after hearing the examination, should decline to accept the advice of the council or presbytery, the presbytery could not go on to ordain, because it has not in its own right a particle of power or authority to either induct into, or depose from, the ministry.

The scriptural law for the trial of a minister is,

1. No charge must be entertained against him unless supported by two or three unimpeachable witnesses.

2. He should have a fair and impartial trial, and should be allowed to face his accusers.

3. And unless it is a persecution instead of a fair trial, no church would object to calling an advisory council of ministers to aid her by their impartial advice. This we urge in all cases as a precautionary measure.

4. Our churches are wont to seek the advice of a presbytery of ministers before investing an applicant with ministerial authority, since he is ordained a minister of the churches of Christ at large, and their confidence is necessary to his usefulness. Let him be tried by the assistance of "a jury of his peers," and if innocent acquitted—if guilty, disciplined, and the churches at large will concur in an impartial verdict so obtained.

5. Of the guilt or innocence or name of the minister above "arrested" we are ignorant, but against the whole procedure we most emphatically record our protest, as unscriptural and unbaptistic, and as a bold effort on the part of J. S. Backus's christian profession is a profession of neutrality; especially is it a profession of friendship to the poor and needy.

6. The articles of the constitution were adopted after due consideration, and no one of them can be so construed as to admit a delegate from a church as such. If it will assume the name of a missionary society a delegate can be admitted; or, if a church will put money into the hands of one of her members, he may, in his own name, be admitted upon the money consideration, but the church per se cannot have a representation. To say that this happened without design, would be to charge the want of wisdom and thoughtfulness upon the framers of the constitution. It was purposely done.

7. It is also evident from the fact that all attempts to correct this have been resisted.

8. During the session in Macon, in 1869, a proposition was distinctly made by J. R. Graves so to amend the constitution as to admit church representation, and a large committee appointed to report upon the proposition—a large majority of whom reported favorably to the amendment; but a minority (I believe) of two protested. One of the protestants, Elder Boyce, of South Carolina, made a speech against the report. Among other things, he said to admit churches opened the way for ecclesiastical difficulties, for, in case of a division at home, two sets of delegates might come, each claiming to be sent from the church at a given place. At the close of his speech the proposition to amend was rejected by a very large majority. It appeared to me to be purposely done. If not, we have very thoughtless brethren.

9. If there had been any anxiety to admit churches Bro. Boyce's argument could have been easily set aside, by proposing a clause that the Convention would settle no ecclesiastical questions, so that delegates in such extreme cases would remain at home until all such difficulties were adjusted. The immodesty and injustice of such an argument were made palpable by what occurred soon after. Elder B. took the floor in behalf of Greenville Theological Seminary, and twelve thousand dollars or more were subscribed by pledging the very churches who were too dangerous to be worthy of representation. Those who were present will remember that certain brethren compared their churches to wives, who would always respond to the calls of benevolence. And these, forsooth, are unworthy of organic connection, because too dangerous to have representation! This is monstrous, and deserves reconsideration. Next week I propose to continue this subject.

10. We have drifted some ways from where we were 30 years ago, and WHERE ARE WE DRIFTING?

The above article I have clipped from the Examiner and Chronicle, and send for THE BAPTIST, because of the simple way of presenting a grave subject.

The alarming purpose here avowed was formed at least thirty years ago. The history of the last thirty years shows how faithfully the Catholics have kept their vows—how quietly and how successfully they have worked. As to changing our constitution and our laws, our own crazy, infatuated people have made that an easy task, by setting the example of regarding them with little respect. Our constitution and laws now and then are very unlike. The people seem inclined to submit to any changes the party in power may make. The heaven is at work, and unless God prevent, it will level the whole lump—each event Baptists may look out.

11. I think the proposition will be for the mission to gather them in first, but to go on tributing the Bible, French language, gospel by the way individuals. Any who speaks the French

be a fatal error. We believe that every member of the Association will give a dollar if allowed to meet in it. The Beaver Creek church will build at Gallo-way's Switch this year, and we have agreed to preach the opening sermon. Bro. Canada is building committee, and he will build the house.

ROANOKE COLLEGE, VA.—As often as we have passed the beautiful little town of Salem, Va., in the fertile valley of the Roanoke, on the Va. and Tenn. railroad, we have noticed a pile of buildings and, always thought, what a splendid place for a college!—without knowing that it was the seat of a prosperous college patronized by nearly every Southern State, and offering board and tuition cheaper, by almost half, than any college in the South. See advertisement in another column, and send for a catalogue if you are about to send your son to Virginia to school.

CENTRAL CHURCH, NASHVILLE, TENN. Bro. A. B. Shankland writes:

"Three accessions to Central church yesterday by letter and two by baptism. One of the latter a daughter of a Roman Catholic."

We can but rejoice in the prosper of our old church in Nashville, as well hundreds of Baptists who contributed secure for them a house of worship. With that money, not having built before the war, they have purchased a fine edifice built by the Second church, which had been sold for debt and placed into the hands of the Presbyterians, who were now worshipping in it.

On Christians to make all necessary arrangements for the preaching of the gospel, both at home and abroad; and every sacrifice made for that purpose is an act of Christ-like benevolence. The holding of houses of worship, and all necessary preparations for the advancement and comfort of congregations of worshippers, are acts of Christian benevolence. So are sacrifices for Sabbath-schools, or any other Christian work.

The suffering poor of earth are the minister above "arrested" we are ignorant, but against the whole procedure we most emphatically record our protest, as unscriptural and unbaptistic, and as a bold effort on the part of J. S. Backus's christian profession is a profession of neutrality; especially is it a profession of friendship to the poor and needy.

6. The articles of the constitution were adopted after due consideration, and no one of them can be so construed as to admit a delegate from a church as such. If it will assume the name of a missionary society a delegate can be admitted; or, if a church will put money into the hands of one of her members, he may, in his own name, be admitted upon the money consideration, but the church per se cannot have a representation. To say that this happened without design, would be to charge the want of wisdom and thoughtfulness upon the framers of the constitution. It was purposely done.

7. It is also evident from the fact that all attempts to correct this have been resisted.

8. During the session in Macon, in 1869, a proposition was distinctly made by J. R. Graves so to amend the constitution as to admit church representation, and a large committee appointed to report upon the proposition—a large majority of whom reported favorably to the amendment; but a minority (I believe) of two protested. One of the protestants, Elder Boyce, of South Carolina, made a speech against the report. Among other things, he said to admit churches opened the way for ecclesiastical difficulties, for, in case of a division at home, two sets of delegates might come, each claiming to be sent from the church at a given place. At the close of his speech the proposition to amend was rejected by a very large majority. It appeared to me to be purposely done. If not, we have very thoughtless brethren.

9. If there had been any anxiety to admit churches Bro. Boyce's argument could have been easily set aside, by proposing a clause that the Convention would settle no ecclesiastical questions, so that delegates in such extreme cases would remain at home until all such difficulties were adjusted. The immodesty and injustice of such an argument were made palpable by what occurred soon after. Elder B. took the floor in behalf of Greenville Theological Seminary, and twelve thousand dollars or more were subscribed by pledging the very churches who were too dangerous to be worthy of representation. Those who were present will remember that certain brethren compared their churches to wives, who would always respond to the calls of benevolence. And these, forsooth, are unworthy of organic connection, because too dangerous to have representation! This is monstrous, and deserves reconsideration. Next week I propose to continue this subject.

10. We have drifted some ways from where we were 30 years ago, and WHERE ARE WE DRIFTING?

The above article I have clipped from the Examiner and Chronicle, and send for THE BAPTIST, because of the simple way of presenting a grave subject.

The alarming purpose here avowed was formed at least thirty years ago. The history of the last thirty years shows how faithfully the Catholics have kept their vows—how quietly and how successfully they have worked. As to changing our constitution and our laws, our own crazy, infatuated people have made that an easy task, by setting the example of regarding them with little respect. Our constitution and laws now and then are very unlike. The people seem inclined to submit to any changes the party in power may make. The heaven is at work, and unless God prevent, it will level the whole lump—each event Baptists may look out.

11. I think the proposition will be for the mission to gather them in first, but to go on tributing the Bible, French language, gospel by the way individuals. Any who speaks the French

periodicals, they have worked against them and have labored most assiduously to introduce among the members of their churches the papers published in the States from whence they came. Thus, they have kept up a continual confusion touching the circulation of newspapers, and greatly hindered our efforts in sustaining our own organs. They plainly show, by such a course, that they do not feel identified with us and our institutions. Their bodies are with us, claiming from us support and protection; but their hearts and their sympathies are back in the land from whence they came.

I deem it the duty of every pastor, and of every Baptist, male and female, to sustain, first of all, their own paper, and strive to introduce it into every Baptist family, and influence every one they possibly can to read it.

But our Tennessee pastor says: "The ante bellum discussions about Old Landmarkism, etc., had well nigh ruined the Baptist interests in this region."

I have frequently heard it intimated that the discussions about non-affiliation with errorists had had an evil influence on Baptist interests in our State. Particular pains has been taken, for several years past, to impress this on the minds of the people. But I must confess that I am not prepared to indorse such a tenth of all their income for purposes of Christian benevolence. God is the author of this rule. He prescribed it to his people in ancient times, and abundantly blessed those who observed it strictly; but cursed those who failed to do it, and charged them with robbing him. We are only stewards, and what we have belongs to the Lord. David said of the willing offerings made by the Lord's people in his day, "All things come of thee, and of thine own we have given thee." And to those who withheld their tithes the Lord said, "Will a man rob God? Yet ye have robbed me. But ye say, Wherein have we robbed thee? In tithes and offerings. Ye are cursed with a curse, for ye have robbed me, even though ye say, we have not robbed thee, yet better it will be for the church and the world."

We clip the following from the Biblical Recorder, N. C., a sterling Baptist newspaper, whose editor dares to speak out his own sentiments. Will the Herald deign to apologize for the ridicule it indulged in toward the Biblical Recorder? and its tender of the feelings of others? Will it answer the pertinent question, "Does it raise the cry of persecution to divert attention from the stabs it inflicts upon other papers?" Let a paper disagree with the Herald, if it would experience what this editor means by its "stabs."

"We are at peace with all the world, and might make an exception to one or two of our editorial confederates, who seem to feel that their mission is to keep the Herald on the right track, to counteract the evil influence of its supposed errors, to make an occasional insinuation in disparagement of its merits, and to avoid carefully the correction of any misstatements that may happen to get in their columns concerning it—such for example as that the Herald is repudiated by some of the Baptist Associations of Virginia, and that it is conspiring for the destruction of the Southern Baptist Convention and its Boards."—Sen. Ed. Religious Herald.

If the foregoing is intended for this paper, it is "the most unkindest cut" we have ever known Dr. Jeter to inflict. Just as soon as we suspected that the Editors desired it, we published what the Herald had said in regard to "some of the Baptist associations of Virginia." This Dr. Jeter has not seen, or ignores. We believed and had a right to believe, we said and had a right to say, that the agitation of the co-operation question would injure the Southern Baptist Convention; but we have not accused the Herald of "conspiring for the destruction of the Southern Baptist Convention." We are not conscious of ever designing any injury to the Religious Herald, though that paper has sometimes appeared to seek the injury of the Recorder. Since the meeting in Louisville, we have taken special pains to avoid allusions to the Herald. We are trying to discharge our duties in peace with that paper. No consideration could have induced us to publish such personal ridicule of any apprentice in the Herald office (and much less of any editor of that paper) as the Herald recently published of the editor of this paper. Does the Herald raise the cry of persecution to divert attention from the stabs it inflicts on other papers? Verily, if we desired to make a martyr, the Herald would not suit our purpose.

We now state distinctly,

1. If we have wronged any man, or any paper, it is our heart's desire to make honorable and complete reparation.

2. With all obedient believers we are trying to cultivate the things that make for peace.

3. So far from being "at peace with all the world," we are waging a relentless war against the world, the flesh and the Devil."—Biblical Recorder.

BAPTIST ESTIMATE OF ELD. EARLE. I enjoyed Elder Earle's visit to Mobile very much. He does not appeal to the emotions, but to the judgment, and hence never had more excitement than would be desirable in all our weekly prayer-meetings. I would be delighted to have him come again and often, if he would hold Baptist—not Union meetings. Think if he should come again our pastors would have only Baptist meetings. The St. Francis street brethren are cramped in their present building, and speak of enlarging, or selling and building anew.

BAPTIST PAPERS. No. 6. MISSIONARY OPERATIONS.

The great body of the denomination are missionaries, at least in contradistinction to anti-missionaries. We recognize the world as the field of gospel proclamation—of missionary labor. This, of course, looks at human beings as we find them—of all colors, races and climes. "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature," is recognized as of binding force upon all Christians. It is but too true that comparatively few feel this in all its force. The zeal of the church is not a burning flame. While, however, there are differences of opinion regarding the plans of operations, it is but the truth of history to say that the objects to be accomplished, in the minds of our brethren, are in the main the same. So that there is a wonderful agreement in diversity. Whoever has felt a burning love for Jesus can but desire that the same gracious influences which he has felt should be realized by the subjects of the gospel in all lands. This desire, this inward prompting, constitutes the unity of Christians in missionary labor. That any and all plans are equally scriptural and equally acceptable to God, I cannot for a moment believe, and hence I propose to put upon record my own solemn convictions.

MISSIONARY ORGANIZATIONS. That the church of Jesus Christ is the ground and pillar of the truth no sound, thoughtful Baptist will deny. That the church is commissioned to give to the world a pure gospel is, to my mind, equally obvious; that the order of God's house, including ordinances, is part and parcel of a pure gospel, and is committed to the safe-keeping of his church. This necessarily commits his Word to the same, for it is this which is to guide us through all time. If these propositions be true, it follows that any plan for spreading the gospel, administering ordinances, organizing churches, or anything else ecclesiastical, which does not recognize churches as the basis of operations, is irregular and defective, if not God-defiant. That some of our organizations cannot stand the ordeal of scrutiny in this regard, but few will deny. The Southern Baptist Convention, in its constitutional, its organic construction, purposely ignores the churches as a basis of operations. That it ignores them in point of fact is patent from the constitution itself, and from the uniform precedents of its actions. That it purposely ignores them is manifest from the following considerations:

1. The articles of the constitution were adopted after due consideration, and no one of them can be so construed as to admit a delegate from a church as such. If it will assume the name of a missionary society a delegate can be admitted; or, if a church will put money into the hands of one of her members, he may, in his own name, be admitted upon the money consideration, but the church per se cannot have a representation. To say that this happened without design, would be to charge the want of wisdom and thoughtfulness upon the framers of the constitution. It was purposely done.

2. It is also evident from the fact that all attempts to correct this have been resisted.

3. During the session in Macon, in 1869, a proposition was distinctly made by J. R. Graves so to amend the constitution as to admit church representation, and a large committee appointed to report upon the proposition—a large majority of whom reported favorably to the amendment; but a minority (I believe) of two protested. One of the protestants, Elder Boyce, of South Carolina, made a speech against the report. Among other things, he said to admit churches opened the way for ecclesiastical difficulties, for, in case of a division at home, two sets of delegates might come, each claiming to be sent from the church at a given place. At the close of his speech the proposition to amend was rejected by a very large majority. It appeared to me to be purposely done. If not, we have very thoughtless brethren.

4. If there had been any anxiety to admit churches Bro. Boyce's argument could have been easily set aside, by proposing a clause that the Convention would settle no ecclesiastical questions, so that delegates in such extreme cases would remain at home until all such difficulties were adjusted. The immodesty and injustice of such an argument were made palpable by what occurred soon after. Elder B. took the floor in behalf of Greenville Theological Seminary, and twelve thousand dollars or more were subscribed by pledging the very churches who were too dangerous to be worthy of representation. Those who were present will remember that certain brethren compared their churches to wives, who would always respond to the calls of benevolence. And these, forsooth, are unworthy of organic connection, because too dangerous to have representation! This is monstrous, and deserves reconsideration. Next week I propose to continue this subject.

5. I think the proposition will be for the mission to gather them in first, but to go on tributing the Bible, French language, gospel by the way individuals. Any who speaks the French

by vote, can call a council into being. It is then powerless only to advise a church—give its opinion and advice upon questions and facts submitted to it by the church or churches calling it. The church is not bound to accept its advice. The creator is superior to, and not bound by the opinion of the creature. If it is to advise a church as to the qualifications of an applicant for the ministry, the church may accept or decline acting upon the advice of the presbytery. If she accepts, the presbytery does not ordain, does not confer its authority—for it has none—but formally confers the authority of the church upon the candidate, and the church should commission, i. e., issue his credentials. If the church, after hearing the examination, should decline to accept the advice of the council or presbytery, the presbytery could not go on to ordain, because it has not in its own right a particle of power or authority to either induct into, or depose from, the ministry.

The scriptural law for the trial of a minister is,

1. No charge must be entertained against him unless supported by two or three unimpeachable witnesses.

2. He should have a fair and impartial trial, and should be allowed to face his accusers.

3. And unless it is a persecution instead of a fair trial, no church would object to calling an advisory council of ministers to aid her by their impartial advice. This we urge in all cases as a precautionary measure.

4. Our churches are wont to seek the advice of a presbytery of ministers before investing an applicant with ministerial authority, since he is ordained a minister of the churches of Christ at large, and their confidence is necessary to his usefulness. Let him be tried by the assistance of "a jury of his peers," and if innocent acquitted—if guilty, disciplined, and the churches at large will concur in an impartial verdict so obtained.

5. Of the guilt or innocence or name of the minister above "arrested" we are ignorant, but against the whole procedure we most emphatically record our protest, as unscriptural and unbaptistic, and as a bold effort on the part of J. S. Backus's christian profession is a profession of neutrality; especially is it a profession of friendship to the poor and needy.

6. The articles of the constitution were adopted after due consideration, and no one of them can be so construed as to admit a delegate from a church as such. If it will assume the name of a missionary society a delegate can be admitted; or, if a church will put money into the hands of one of her members, he may, in his own name, be admitted upon the money consideration, but the church per se cannot have a representation. To say that this happened without design, would be to charge the want of wisdom and thoughtfulness upon the framers of the constitution. It was purposely done.

7. It is also evident from the fact that all attempts to correct this have been resisted.

8. During the session in Macon, in 1869, a proposition was distinctly made by J. R. Graves so to amend the constitution as to admit church representation, and a large committee appointed to report upon the proposition—a large majority of whom reported favorably to the amendment; but a minority (I believe) of two protested. One of the protestants, Elder Boyce, of South Carolina, made a speech against the report. Among other things, he said to admit churches opened the way for ecclesiastical difficulties, for, in case of a division at home, two sets of delegates might come, each claiming to be sent from the church at a given place. At the close of his speech the proposition to amend was rejected by a very large majority. It appeared to me to be purposely done. If not, we have very thoughtless brethren.

9. If there had been any anxiety to admit churches Bro. Boyce's argument could have been easily set aside, by proposing a clause that the Convention would settle no ecclesiastical questions, so that delegates in such extreme cases would remain at home until all such difficulties were adjusted. The immodesty and injustice of such an argument were made palpable by what occurred soon after. Elder B. took the floor in behalf of Greenville Theological Seminary, and twelve thousand dollars or more were subscribed by pledging the very churches who were too dangerous to be worthy of representation. Those who were present will remember that certain brethren compared their churches to wives, who would always respond to the calls of benevolence. And these, forsooth, are unworthy of organic connection, because too dangerous to have representation! This is monstrous, and deserves reconsideration. Next week I propose to continue this subject.

10. We have drifted some ways from where we were 30 years ago, and WHERE ARE WE DRIFTING?

The above article I have clipped from the Examiner and Chronicle, and send for THE BAPTIST, because of the simple way of presenting a grave subject.

The alarming purpose here avowed was formed at least thirty years ago. The history of the last thirty years shows how faithfully the Catholics have kept their vows—how quietly and how successfully they have worked. As to changing our constitution and our laws, our own crazy, infatuated people have made that an easy task, by setting the example of regarding them with little respect. Our constitution and laws now and then are very unlike. The people seem inclined to submit to any changes the party in power may make. The heaven is at work, and unless God prevent, it will level the whole lump—each event Baptists may look out.

11. I think the proposition will be for the mission to gather them in first, but to go on tributing the Bible, French language, gospel by the way individuals. Any who speaks the French

You promised yourself that you would take THE BAPTIST "next year." Now that next year begins next September, and if you will subscribe now you will receive the paper two months gratis. Fulfill your promise—bless yourself, bless your family, and encourage your editor and aid in sustaining a first-class paper in the Southwest.

WHITHER ARE WE DRIFTING? "I wish to relate to you a few facts, the faithful consideration of which is pertinent to the present time," so began a speaker in the Fulton Street Meeting. He is an old clergyman who once labored long and earnestly as a pastor in the West.

"It is just 30 years ago that I was walking down Main street in Cincinnati, Ohio, in company with a Roman Catholic priest with whom I was acquainted. He was a scholar and gentleman, in the usual acceptance of the word. Our conversation turned upon the aspirations and designs of the Roman Catholic church. He confessed that it was his great desire to see the day when their religion would have universal sway in these United States, and the Roman Catholic faith has its place as the religious faith of the country. The time must come when it must be supreme, and to its authority all hearts must bow.

"You know," said he, "you Protestants have no religion. You have sectarisms, but you have no common faith." This he said good-humoredly, smiling all the time, but having a grim meaning.

"Do you think," said I, "that yours will ever be the established religion in this country?"

"Certainly I do. It must be so."

"Never," said I.

"No, never," said I, with vehemence.

"Now, now," said he, playfully, "not so fast. Don't be so positive. Why do you think ours may not one day be the established religion?"

"Because our Constitution and our laws are against it."

"But we will change your Constitution and your laws."

"Change them?"

"Yes, change them—amend them."

"But the people will see that you shall not do that."

"We will change the people, too."

"Not in your day, or mine," said I, resolutely.

"Perhaps not," he answered, very coolly. "Perhaps not. But we have purposed it, and it will be done—if not in your day or mine, then in the days of those who shall come after us."

"I looked at his face with astonishment, as if I could not believe my own senses. He saw, and added quickly:

"O, do not be alarmed. It will be done very quietly. It may be a long time coming—but it will come, when the Catholics will rule the nation, and the Catholic religion will be the ruling faith of the country."

"Oh! you cannot believe it."

"Yes, I do believe it. We are at it now. And you know what we Catholics are. When we take hold, we hold on, and never let go." This was said with a very solemn and determined look, and he then added: "We will wrest your institutions and establish our own."

"We parted company at the foot of the street, I scarcely realizing the amount of meaning there was in the priest's threats; for in that day we had no such apprehensions as now.

"We come down thirty years. Whether this priest is alive or dead, we know not. But the work, which he said was begun, of supplanting our institutions, is not dead. Quietly, persistently, encroaching, the Catholics have gone on in their work, proselyting where they could, buying up votes where they could, till at last they fill our places of trust and office with creatures of their own. Our judges, our lawyers, our military leaders, our senators and representatives are fast becoming Roman Catholics, and the profession of this faith, which was never 'delivered to the saints,' is a sure passport to office or preferment. The politician has found it to his advantage to confess his sins and get absolution from a priest, and he accounted a good Catholic. We stepped into a police station for a moment, the other day.

"Ting-a-ling!—ting-a-ling!" went a little bell. And then a message came from another station.

"And this answer was returned: 'Tell him that he is a good Catholic and a good Democrat.'

"What is that?" said I to a friend at the 'machine.'

"Oh," said my friend, "we are only keeping up a little conversation with one of the primaries."

"What is the object?" said I.

"Oh! only to have a little voice in the matter. We know on which side our bread is buttered."

"And how to get the butter?"

"Exactly so," said he, with a chuckle.

"We came out, saying to ourselves, We have drifted some ways from where we were 30 years ago, and WHERE ARE WE DRIFTING?"

The above article I have clipped from the Examiner and Chronicle, and send for THE BAPTIST, because of the simple way of presenting a grave subject.

The alarming purpose here avowed was formed at least thirty years ago. The history of the last thirty years shows how faithfully the Catholics have kept their vows—how quietly and how successfully they have worked. As to changing our constitution and our laws, our own crazy, infatuated people have made that an easy task, by setting the example of regarding them with little respect. Our constitution and laws now and then are very unlike. The people seem inclined to submit to any changes the party in power may make. The heaven is at work, and unless God prevent, it will level the whole lump—each event Baptists may look out.

11. I think the proposition will be for the mission to gather them in first, but to go on tributing the Bible, French language, gospel by the way individuals. Any who speaks the French

by vote, can call a council into being. It is then powerless only to advise a church—give its opinion and advice upon questions and facts submitted to it by the church or churches calling it. The church is not bound to accept its advice. The creator is superior







PREMIUM LIST. Twenty-Five Thousand Dollars Offered. We are willing to give away this spring twenty-five thousand dollars worth of the most valuable premiums ever offered for new subscribers...

NEW ADVERTISEMENTS. THE NEW FOOD SOURCE. SEA MOSS FARINE—This new and elegant preparation, made from Irish Moss, or Carrageen, is conceded to be the cheapest, healthiest and most delicious food in the world...

WATCHES AND JEWELRY. ESTABLISHED IN 1841. WILLIAM C. BYRD, SUCCESSOR TO MERRIMAN, BYRD & CO., 275 MAIN STREET, MEMPHIS.

BUSINESS CARDS. A. LOEHMEYER, W. LOEHMEYER, LOEHMEYER & BRO., Gun and Locksmiths, BELL HANGERS, Railing and Safe Makers, and Practical Machinists...

PUBLICATIONS. Agents Wanted To sell the only Complete Unabridged People's Edition of Dr. Wm. Smith's Bible Dictionary.

THE BAPTIST DOCTRINE, PRINCIPLES AND HISTORY. A. C. DAYTON, BY HIS DAUGHTER, MISS LUCIE DAYTON.

WAKE FOREST COLLEGE. FALL TERM begins September 15, and continues twenty weeks. Tuition (in advance) \$25 00 Board per week (table fare) \$2 75 to \$3 00 Board per week (lodging) \$3 00 to \$3 75

WAKE FOREST COLLEGE. FALL TERM begins September 15, and continues twenty weeks. Tuition (in advance) \$25 00 Board per week (table fare) \$2 75 to \$3 00 Board per week (lodging) \$3 00 to \$3 75

WAKE FOREST COLLEGE. FALL TERM begins September 15, and continues twenty weeks. Tuition (in advance) \$25 00 Board per week (table fare) \$2 75 to \$3 00 Board per week (lodging) \$3 00 to \$3 75

WAKE FOREST COLLEGE. FALL TERM begins September 15, and continues twenty weeks. Tuition (in advance) \$25 00 Board per week (table fare) \$2 75 to \$3 00 Board per week (lodging) \$3 00 to \$3 75

WAKE FOREST COLLEGE. FALL TERM begins September 15, and continues twenty weeks. Tuition (in advance) \$25 00 Board per week (table fare) \$2 75 to \$3 00 Board per week (lodging) \$3 00 to \$3 75

WAKE FOREST COLLEGE. FALL TERM begins September 15, and continues twenty weeks. Tuition (in advance) \$25 00 Board per week (table fare) \$2 75 to \$3 00 Board per week (lodging) \$3 00 to \$3 75

WAKE FOREST COLLEGE. FALL TERM begins September 15, and continues twenty weeks. Tuition (in advance) \$25 00 Board per week (table fare) \$2 75 to \$3 00 Board per week (lodging) \$3 00 to \$3 75

WAKE FOREST COLLEGE. FALL TERM begins September 15, and continues twenty weeks. Tuition (in advance) \$25 00 Board per week (table fare) \$2 75 to \$3 00 Board per week (lodging) \$3 00 to \$3 75

WAKE FOREST COLLEGE. FALL TERM begins September 15, and continues twenty weeks. Tuition (in advance) \$25 00 Board per week (table fare) \$2 75 to \$3 00 Board per week (lodging) \$3 00 to \$3 75

WAKE FOREST COLLEGE. FALL TERM begins September 15, and continues twenty weeks. Tuition (in advance) \$25 00 Board per week (table fare) \$2 75 to \$3 00 Board per week (lodging) \$3 00 to \$3 75

WAKE FOREST COLLEGE. FALL TERM begins September 15, and continues twenty weeks. Tuition (in advance) \$25 00 Board per week (table fare) \$2 75 to \$3 00 Board per week (lodging) \$3 00 to \$3 75

WAKE FOREST COLLEGE. FALL TERM begins September 15, and continues twenty weeks. Tuition (in advance) \$25 00 Board per week (table fare) \$2 75 to \$3 00 Board per week (lodging) \$3 00 to \$3 75

WAKE FOREST COLLEGE. FALL TERM begins September 15, and continues twenty weeks. Tuition (in advance) \$25 00 Board per week (table fare) \$2 75 to \$3 00 Board per week (lodging) \$3 00 to \$3 75

WAKE FOREST COLLEGE. FALL TERM begins September 15, and continues twenty weeks. Tuition (in advance) \$25 00 Board per week (table fare) \$2 75 to \$3 00 Board per week (lodging) \$3 00 to \$3 75

WAKE FOREST COLLEGE. FALL TERM begins September 15, and continues twenty weeks. Tuition (in advance) \$25 00 Board per week (table fare) \$2 75 to \$3 00 Board per week (lodging) \$3 00 to \$3 75

WAKE FOREST COLLEGE. FALL TERM begins September 15, and continues twenty weeks. Tuition (in advance) \$25 00 Board per week (table fare) \$2 75 to \$3 00 Board per week (lodging) \$3 00 to \$3 75

WAKE FOREST COLLEGE. FALL TERM begins September 15, and continues twenty weeks. Tuition (in advance) \$25 00 Board per week (table fare) \$2 75 to \$3 00 Board per week (lodging) \$3 00 to \$3 75

WAKE FOREST COLLEGE. FALL TERM begins September 15, and continues twenty weeks. Tuition (in advance) \$25 00 Board per week (table fare) \$2 75 to \$3 00 Board per week (lodging) \$3 00 to \$3 75

WAKE FOREST COLLEGE. FALL TERM begins September 15, and continues twenty weeks. Tuition (in advance) \$25 00 Board per week (table fare) \$2 75 to \$3 00 Board per week (lodging) \$3 00 to \$3 75

WAKE FOREST COLLEGE. FALL TERM begins September 15, and continues twenty weeks. Tuition (in advance) \$25 00 Board per week (table fare) \$2 75 to \$3 00 Board per week (lodging) \$3 00 to \$3 75

WAKE FOREST COLLEGE. FALL TERM begins September 15, and continues twenty weeks. Tuition (in advance) \$25 00 Board per week (table fare) \$2 75 to \$3 00 Board per week (lodging) \$3 00 to \$3 75

WAKE FOREST COLLEGE. FALL TERM begins September 15, and continues twenty weeks. Tuition (in advance) \$25 00 Board per week (table fare) \$2 75 to \$3 00 Board per week (lodging) \$3 00 to \$3 75

WAKE FOREST COLLEGE. FALL TERM begins September 15, and continues twenty weeks. Tuition (in advance) \$25 00 Board per week (table fare) \$2 75 to \$3 00 Board per week (lodging) \$3 00 to \$3 75

WAKE FOREST COLLEGE. FALL TERM begins September 15, and continues twenty weeks. Tuition (in advance) \$25 00 Board per week (table fare) \$2 75 to \$3 00 Board per week (lodging) \$3 00 to \$3 75

WAKE FOREST COLLEGE. FALL TERM begins September 15, and continues twenty weeks. Tuition (in advance) \$25 00 Board per week (table fare) \$2 75 to \$3 00 Board per week (lodging) \$3 00 to \$3 75

WAKE FOREST COLLEGE. FALL TERM begins September 15, and continues twenty weeks. Tuition (in advance) \$25 00 Board per week (table fare) \$2 75 to \$3 00 Board per week (lodging) \$3 00 to \$3 75

WAKE FOREST COLLEGE. FALL TERM begins September 15, and continues twenty weeks. Tuition (in advance) \$25 00 Board per week (table fare) \$2 75 to \$3 00 Board per week (lodging) \$3 00 to \$3 75

WAKE FOREST COLLEGE. FALL TERM begins September 15, and continues twenty weeks. Tuition (in advance) \$25 00 Board per week (table fare) \$2 75 to \$3 00 Board per week (lodging) \$3 00 to \$3 75

WAKE FOREST COLLEGE. FALL TERM begins September 15, and continues twenty weeks. Tuition (in advance) \$25 00 Board per week (table fare) \$2 75 to \$3 00 Board per week (lodging) \$3 00 to \$3 75

WAKE FOREST COLLEGE. FALL TERM begins September 15, and continues twenty weeks. Tuition (in advance) \$25 00 Board per week (table fare) \$2 75 to \$3 00 Board per week (lodging) \$3 00 to \$3 75