Retiring Address of Pres. H. C. Creed at the Recent Baptist Convention.

The last meeting of this Convention, which will long be remembered as that of the Jubilee year of our beloved institutions at Wolfville, was the forty-third annual meeting, the body having been organized, in the city of St. John, in 1846. The third meeting, in 1848, was held in this little city of Fredericton, where the Convention has assembled on two later occasions, in 1870 and in 1878. The president at that third meeting forty-one years ago, was the Rev. Theodore S. Harding, and the secretaries were the Rev. I. E. Bill and Samuel Elder. Each of these three revered brethren had been in turn the pastor of the church where we are now convened, —Rev. T. S. Harding twenty-five years previously, Rev. I. E. Bill six years previously, and Rev. S. Elder at the time then present.

The total membership of the denomination in these Maritime Provinces in that year was reported as 14,152,—included in 173 churches,—a number which indicates a wonderfully rapid growth in the half-century which had elapsed since the formation of the first Baptist Association of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, composed as it was of only six churches—a feeble folk indeed. Twenty years earlier than that, in 1778, the first permanent Baptist church in these provinces was organized, at Horton, Nova Scotia. Preachers of our views were few in those days, and churches multiplied slowly. In this city of Fredericton, the earliest Baptist preaching, so far as is known, was that of David George, a colored man (formerly a slave) from Shelburne; who, in July, 1792, received a license from His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor of New Brunswick "to instruct the black people in the knowledge, and exhort them to the practice, of the Christian religion." On a certain Sunday in the same year, 1792, he baptized several converts, in presence of a great number of people—doubtless the first primitive baptism in this place. It was in January, 1814, that the church here was organized.

And how has the denomination progressed during the last forty years? Well, the number of churches has much more than doubled itself; the membership or number of communicants had more than trebled itself five years ago, reaching at the present time some 44,000; the ordained ministers number about 240; we have a well-established Mission in India,—an effective system of Home Missions,—a college and academies of whose record we may be justly proud. For all which blessings may the good Lord make us truly thankful! If we have in any degree failed to recognize the hand of God in all the way in which He has led us as a body of Christians,—if we have failed to render the glory and praise to Him, and have consciously or unconsciously said in our hearts, "See what we have accomplished,"—it becomes us to humble ourselves, and gratefully acknowledge our own utter unworthiness and our entire indebtedness to our blessed Lord, the great Head of the Church.

But is it really a cause of gratitude that the Baptist denomination in these provinces and in the world at large has thus grown and prospered? A man who has gotten to himself much wealth by hard work and shrewdness in a needless or hurtful craft, carried on only for his own enrichment, heedless of his neighbor's harm and loss, may think he has in his heart the grace of thankfulness to God for blessings vouchsafed to him; while in truth his life is a curse to the world, and his gains a seeming mockery of Heaven's righteous government. And unless we Baptists have a sufficient reason for existence as a separate body,—unless it is better for Christian people to be Baptists than to be Presbyterians or Methodists or Anglicans or Roma Catholics,—unless our gains are, in the broadest view of things, a true gain to the Christian world,—we must write "self-interest" or "sectional vanity" upon the complacency with which we view our history.

Let us ask then, Why are we Baptists? or rather, Why does our denomination maintain a separate existence? Have we distinctive principles that are both well founded and worth maintaing? And what have we done for the world that others have not done and are not doing as well as we.

To answer these questions fully and formally would occupy far more time than can properly be devoted to this address. A few brief statements must suffice, which may lead the inquirer to obtain fuller answers. And let us appeal mainly to eminent authorities of other communions, who may be presumed to speak without undue prejudice in our favor

It is very generally supposed, even among Baptists when they are not well instructed, that almost the only important difference between us and all other denominations, is in relation to the nature and subject of baptism. Our name gives color to this idea. There is, however,, a much more momentous and fundamental principle underlying all other differences, viz, our primitive and unalterable contention that "*the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the all-sufficient and only rule of faith and practice, and judge of controversies,*" —to quote from the eminent Presbyterian theologian, Dr. A. A. Hodge. We hold that, in regard to ordinances as in regard to doctrines, the Bible contains sufficient instructions for all time. We must neither add or take away. No doctrine and no ceremony must be changed. The Lord saw the end from the beginning, and ordered all things with infinite wisdom in view of all future times and conditions of men. The beliefs and the practices of the apostolic churches, so far as they were sanctioned by the Lord Himself, must continue to be the beliefs and practices of the churches in all ages.

Here some persons will exclaim, "But are not the Presbyterians, the Methodists and others equally sound with ourselves as regards the sole authority of the Scriptures?" Let us listen to authorities.

Martin Luther, leader of the Protestant Reformation and founder of the Lutheran church, wrote: "I condemn no ceremonies unless they are opposed to the gospel; all others I preserve unchanged in our church."

John Calvin, succeeding Zwingle at the head of the Protestants of Switzerland and France, and one of the founders of Presbyterianism, said: "The church did grant herself liberty, since the beginning, to change the rite (baptism) somewhat, excepting the substance"; and again, "It is not of the least consequence whether the person baptized is totally immersed, and that once or thrice, or whether he is merely sprinkled by an affusion of water. This should be a matter of choice to the churches in different regions, though the word *baptize* means to immerse, and it is certain that immersion was the practice of the ancient church."

The Church of England, in her 34th Article, declares: "It is not necessary that traditions and ceremonies be in all places one, or utterly like; for all times they have been divers, and may be changed according to the diversities of countries, times, and men's manners, so that (*i. e.*, provided that) nothing be ordained *against* God's Word. Who, soever, through his private judgment willingly and purposely, doth openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the church, which be not repugnant to the Word of God, and be ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked," etc.

The striking language of Dean Stanley is quite consistent with this Article. After strongly stating the historical and exegetical truth, as we hold it, regarding baptism, he goes on to say:

"The practice of immersion, apostolic and primitive as it was, was peculiarly suitable to the Southern and Eastern countries, for which it was designed, and peculiarly unsuitable to the tastes, the convenience and the feelings of the countries of the North and West. Not by any decree of council or parliament, but by the general sentiment of Christian liberty, this great change was effected. . . . There is no one who would now wish to go back to the old practice. It had no doubt the sanction of the Apostles and of their Master. It had the sanction of the venerable churches of the early ages, and of the sacred countries of the East. Baptism by sprinkling (what a contradiction of terms) was rejected by the whole ancient church as no baptism at all. . . . But speaking generally, the Christian civilized world has decided against immersion. . . . Perhaps no greater change has ever taken place in the outward form of Christian ceremony with such general agreement. . . . The substitution of sprinkling for immersion must, to many at the time, as to the Baptists now, have seemed the greatest and most dangerous innovation. Now, by most Catholics, and by most Protestants, it is regarded almost as a second nature."

The Reformed Church of France may be heard through Dr. de Pressense, saying: "To comprehend the value of this august symbol (baptism) we must consider it under its primitive form (immersion). I declare at the outset that I admit the right of the church to modify a form and rite according to times and places."

The Methodists adopt the 34th Article of their mother Church of England, just quoted, and carry out the principle by refusing to immerse converts; although John Wesley, their founder and lawgiver, held that "the ancient manner of baptizing" was "by immersion," and that the Apostle Paul referred to this in the expression, "buried with Him in baptism."

The references here made to one particular ceremonial observance are introduced, it should be observed, merely by way of illustrating the fact that the teachings and example of Christ and His Apostles are not taken as the sole authority. The church may, it is held, lawfully prescribe new ceremonies or change old ones. Many Christians of other bodies than ours now attempt to prove from Scripture the correctness of their belief in regard to the rite called baptism; but the majority of pædobaptist scholars are too wise to attempt this, contending rather that the form is not important, or that the form has been properly and legitimately changed, to suit altered conditions. It is refreshing for us Baptists to listen to an eminent Roman Catholic authority upon this point. Bossuet, Bishop of Meaux in France, wrote in the 17th century:

"We do not inquire carefully whether we were plunged in water, according to the example of our Lord Jesus Christ and the Apostles, according to the practice of all the church for thirteen centuries, according to the force of the word *baptize*, which constantly means plunge, and according to the mystery noticed by the Apostle himself, namely, 'buried with Christ.' We receive baptism as the church gives it to us, persuaded that there is eternal power in the command, 'Go teach and baptize, and lo, I am with you alway (as you teach and baptize').. We do not carefully inquire, either, if instruction is separated from baptism, contrary to that order which seems to appear in the institution of Christ,—teaching them and baptizing them. Baptized as little infants, without testimony of Scripture, we are not troubled about our baptism. It suffices us that we are baptized as *she* (the church) teaches us, to whom Jesus Christ said, 'I am with you.' You (he addresses pædobaptist Protestants)—you respond: 'We receive it in the same way you do, and we are no more troubled on account of our baptism than you are with yours.' That is what surprises us (Catholics) that you have the same assurance, without having the same foundation. Either follow the command with rigor, or cease your boasting of a baptism which you do not find there. Why do you measure with two measures? Why do you walk in uncertain steps in the ways of God."

It is evident then that the Baptists before the Reformation (for our forefathers came not out with the Reformers, nor out of the Reformation, but traced their descent back, outside of the Roman and Greek churches, to the Apostolic age),—it is evident, I say, that the Baptists, not only before the Reformation, but also for some centuries later, were the only people who maintained the sole and sufficient authority of the sacred Scriptures in matters both of faith and practice. There are scholars ready to claim that this people alone (including the various smaller bodies which have arisen out of the Baptist family) "maintain this position firmly and consistently to-day."

Here let me adduce testimony in support of the historical statement made just now, which some persons present may think unfounded. Dr. Cramp's History of the Baptists quotes Drs. Ypeig and Dermont, of the Dutch Reformed church, as saying: "We have now seen that the Baptists, who were formerly called Anabaptists, and in later times Mennonites, were the original Waldenses, and have long in the history of the church received the honor of that origin. On this account the Baptists may be considered as the only Christian community which has stood since the days of the Apostles, and as a Christian society which has preserved pure the doctrines of the gospel through all the ages." This is the way some others see us.

It would be apart from my present purpose to dwell at length upon the particular applications of this foundation principle of scriptural authority, but a few thoughts may not be out of place.

And first as regards doctrine. I venture to affirm that the bulk of our denomination in this nineteenth century has, not so much in its recognized statements of belief as in the general sentiment of individuals, departed from its historical position in regard to one at least of the most prominent doctrines of the ancient church. From time to time we see quoted with approval, in our Baptist periodicals, such passages as the following, which was copied from the New York *Independent*, noticing a work on "The Act of Baptism in the History of the Christian Church": "He (the author) holds that the practice of immersion has come down from the apostles. He fortifies this opinion by the authority of exegetical scholars like Elicott, Lightfoot Howson, Alford, Plumptre, Meyer, Lange, Thotolook, Olshausen, DeWette, and historical scholars like Schaff, Stanley, Pressensé, Dollinger, Kurtz, Guericke, Bunsen and Mosheim. Indeed, on this question, there is no difference of opinion among scholars."

Now let the same weight be accorded to such authority on other points. There is a doctrine which is clearly taught in the Bible, in the opinion of a host of eminent exegetical scholars of all ages, which was apparently uppermost in the minds of the early Christians, which is believed to have been the unquestioned faith of the church until near the close of the third century, which was clearly a part of the faith of the predessors of our modern Baptist churches, and has continued to be held and taught by multitudes of enlightened Christians down to the present time. I refer to the doctrine of the literal and personal second coming of Christ, antecedent and causative to the millennium—known as the premillenial doctrine. All eminent authorities, so far as I know, agree that this was "the general belief of all orthodox Christians in the age immediately following the Apostles" down to the fourth century. It has been held as taught in the Scriptures by such men as Bengel, Lange, Dorner, Schlegel, Baumgarten, Krummacher, Delitzsch, Ebrard, Meyer, Koch, Olshausen, DeWette, Theurer, and other German scholars; such Presbyterians as Chalmers, Irving, Candlish, Hugh Miller, McCheyne, Gilfillan, Cummings, Faussett, and Eddy; such Episcopalians as Sir Isaac Newton, Birks, Bickersteth, Heber, Elliott, Horne, Ryle, Ellicott, Alford, Gresswell and the Tyngs; and passing over other denominations, such Baptists as John Bunyan, John Milton, John Gill, Robert Hall, George Muller, and Charles Spurgeon. In this list I have not myself verified all the references, but accept all upon good authority.

A recent Baptist writer, speaking of the so-called Anabaptists in Germany, says:

"They united the worldly principles of Luther as to civil power, with *the millennarian views* and rejection of infant baptism of the true Baptists."

Through the Waldenses of the middle ages, and the Donatists or Puritans of the fourth century, we trace back our Baptist history to the apostolic age, and these are said to have been pre-millennialists. In 1660, twenty thousand Baptists in England presented to King Charles II. a declaration of faith, signed by many leading ministers and laymen, including John Bunyan, in which the same doctrine is clearly set forth. Dr. Duffield, of Princeton, with whom other writers on this point agree, wrote thus a few years ago:

"The common doctrine respecting the millennium is a novelty in the history of the church. It is not to be found in the standards of any of the churches of the Reformation—by several it is impliedly repudiated. The doctrine was first proposed by Whitby but little more than 150 years ago, and avowedly as 'a new hypothesis.'"

Yet, in the face of all this mass of expository and historical authority, many of our Baptist ministers and people today refuse even to investigate the subject, and treat as erratic and heretical those who maintain that our Lord is to return before and not after the predicted "times of refreshing."

I might speak further, in the second place, concerning the attitude of our denomination as to the ceremonies of the church; but on this point probably enough has been said already.

Thirdly. Then, we come to the polity or constitution and mode of government of Baptist churches. Our denomination has ever adhered strictly to the entire independence of each church or local association of baptized believers,—and to the congregational form of government; as being most nearly in accord with the apostolic model. In this, of course, we are not alone. It was my purpose to dwell more at length upon this part of the subject, and less than I have done upon the question of doctrine; but having learned that church polity was to be discussed before the Ministers' Institute by one far more competent, I have changed my plan. Permit me, however, to say that I have often thought—and in this I am far from being alone—that possibly there is a tendency among us to carry the idea of church independence somewhat too far. Do not the New Testament epistles warrant us in believing that not only the Apostles but their successors exercised more authority among the brethren than our people would now consider lawful? Is it not at least worthy of consideration whether it would not be both scriptural and expedient to have a ministerial conference or council, with duties and powers somewhat similar to the "Elders' Conference" of our Free Baptist brethren, as an addition to our present denominational arrangements. Might it not be desirable also, in view of the manifest objections to our present system in the matter of ordination of candidates for the ministry, to return to the practice of our fathers previous to 1827, when ordinations took place at the meetings of the Association? In the apostolic age, the elders, bishops or pastors were ordained by the Apostles and their successors, not by the churches. Paul and Barnabas "ordained them elders in every church," and Titus was empowered to ordain elders in every city. Among us at the present time, the function of the church in ordinations is merely nominal. Virtually the council desides the question *pro* or *con*, and the council directs the ordination. When once the candidate is ordained, there is no recognized mode of removing him from the ministry if he prove unworthy. The church to which he belongs may exclude him from membership and thus accomplish the result; but a man may be a fairly good church-member yet not a very worthy minister of the denomination. In some cases an Association has withdrawn fellowship from a minister as such, but it would be no more illogical for them to withdraw fellowship from a lay member, since in neither case did the Association confer what it afterwards undertook to withdraw. Possibly there may be a more excellent way.

In conclusion, let me, in a few words, call to your minds what the Baptists have done for the world in forwarding the cause of religious liberty, of civil liberty, of evangelical truth, and of Christian civilization. Bancroft, the historian, says: "Freedom of conscience, unlimited freedom of mind was, from the first, a trophy of the Baptists." And John Locke is quoted as saying, "The Baptists were the first and only propounders of absolute liberty, just and true liberty, equal and impartial liberty." These are outside witnesses. They are in accord with the Confession of Faith of the Baptists in 1611, where it is declared: "We believe the magistrate is not to meddle with religion or matters of conscience, nor compel men to this or that form of religion, because Christ is the King and law-giver of the church and the conscience." The hardships and persecutions our forefathers endured in support of this conviction cannot here be detailed.

Again, in Germany, in England, in America, the Baptists have striven and fought successfully for civil liberty. Dr. W. R. Williams wrote: "The share of the Baptists in shoring up the falling liberties of England and infusing new vigor and liberality into the constitution of that country, is not yet generally acknowledged." And George Washington wrote: "The Baptists, throughout America, were uniformly the preserving promoters of the glorious American Revolution in behalf of civil liberty."

As to their share in promoting evangelical religion and extending true enlightenment in the world, let me quote from Dr. George B. Taylor:

"To-day, in the United States, the different evangelical denominations agree that a credible profession of personal piety is a perquisite to church membership and to the communion table. One hundred years ago this was a Baptist peculiarity. One hundred years ago the baptism of one's infancy was regarded as all-sufficient to make him a Christian and a church member. . . . The error is to a great extent abandoned, . . and the rite itself is also falling into comparative disuse. . . . Modern missions to the East were originated by Baptists. The first modern society for sending the gospel to the heathen was organised by Baptists. The first modern missionaries to the heathen—Carey and Thomas—were Baptists. Joseph Hughes, who conceived the idea of giving the Bible to all nations, and who founded, nourished and sustained the British and Foreign Bible Society, was a Baptist. A Baptist deacon divides with Robert Raikes the honor of originating the great Sunday-school movement. The earliest translations of the Bible into heathen tongues were made by Baptists; and they have rendered it into more tongues than any other people. The first Christian churches in India, Burmah and China were Baptist churches."

Dr. Chalmers, the great Scotch Presbyterian, paid the following tribute to the English Baptists:

"Let it never be forgotten of the Particular Baptists of England, that they form the denomination of Fuller and Carey and Ryland and Hall and Foster; that they have originated among the greatest of all missionary enterprises; that they have enriched the Christian literature of our country with authorship of the most exalted piety, as well as of the first talent and the first eloquence; that perhaps there is not a more intellectual community of ministers in our island, or who have put forth, for their number, a greater amount of mental power and activity in the defence and illustration of our common faith; and, what is better than all, the triumphs of genius or understanding, who by their zeal and fidelity and pastoral labor have done more to swell the lists of genuine discipleship in the walks of private society—and thus both to uphold and to extend the living Christianity of our nation."

We may conclude, then, that our denomination has distinctive principles worth living for, and that the world is the better for its existence. In our history we Baptists of to-day have a goodly heritage. Let us live worthy of it.

Palace Car Piety.

BY THEODORE L. CUYLER, D. D.

Good John Bunyan lived before the days of railroads, and he sent his pilgrim to the Celestial City on foot. Some pretty rough walking and hard climbing did Christian find before he had traversed the straight road from the City of God, His convictions of guilt were deep and pungent, his conversion was thorough, and when he reaches a dark and dangerous defile on the way, he bravely says, "I see not but that this is the way to the desired haven," and on he goes without flinching. The piety of the pilgrim was stalwart, selfdenying, sinhating and uncompromising; the man relished the severities of duty and never coddled himself with confectionery. Is there not a strong tendency in our day to make a Christian life a great deal easier and more selfindulgent—and instead of a sturdy walk with God, to make it a comfortable ride to the heavens in a palace car.

1. This tendency shows itself in quite too much of the preaching to the unconverted. The Apostle Peter's first discourse after Pentecost was not a bid for popularity; he did not seek to bribe those Jerusalem sinners by telling them how easy it was for them to become Christians and what a "good time" they would have if they embraced the new gospel. He knew that the very best thing for them was to convict them of their sins and a prompt acceptance and confession of Jesus Christ. Thorough conviction brought thorough conversion; then came gladness of heart and steadfast continuance in the apostle's doctrine and fellowship. This same kind of subsoil plowing down to the roots was the characteristic of Whitfield, Finney Edwards, Nettleton and Lyman Beecher; it is the characteristic of Spurgeon's preaching to-day. The best service that can be rendered to a sinner is first to convince him of his sinfulness and then lead to Jesus' blood; the more thoroughly sick of sin he becomes, the more he gets the bad stuff out of him by deep repentance, the healthier, holier, Christian he will be afterwards. But to preach to an unconverted man that "it is just the easiest thing in the world to be a Christian" and to urge him to come on board the church-train just as he is, and be transported safely and comfortably to paradise, is pretty sure to either hoax him into self-deception or to make him a crude, half-converted, self-indulgent professor to the last. When the deadly hurt of sin is salved over, or "healed slightly," it breaks out again. To endeavour to bribe sinners with the offer of "happiness" before the heart is right toward God is a cruel deception; it is the surest way to rob them of that solid soul-health, and purity and holiness, which alone can give enduring peace.

2. Our blessed Master—who loved sinners infinitely more than we can—never bribed men into discipleship. He invited them to come to him, but he frankly told them that unless they were willing to deny themselves and take up a cross and follow him, they could not be his disciples. There was a magnificent reward waiting for them at the terminus, but no palace cars to carry them there. The young ruler who fancied he might find one, and ride to heaven "like a gentleman" went away disgusted and disappointed. Brethren, we are always safe when we copy our blessed Master. So in dealing with the unconverted and with the awakened inquirer, let us be honest with them and tell them that if their "right hand" be a favorite sin, the hand must come off. The biggest devil in a sinner's heart is self, and unless that greedy devil is cast out, Christ can not and will not come in and flood the soul with peace and joy and power. What is it but the subtle spirit of self that would seek to bargain with Christ for a safe and "genteel" journey to heaven in a palace car.

3. The spirit of indulgence eats like a canker into the life of too many members of our churches. It leads them to choose as their place of worship—not the one in which they are the most needed—but the prosperous one, in which they have the lightest load and the most luxuries. The wealth that ought to feed a dozen feeble churches into independence, runs right down into the pool of one aristocratic church and stagnates there. Self-indulgence inquires—"Who preaches there? Is he eloquent? Is the music fine? And do the best society go there?" In plain English this means—bribe me with a seat in the drawing-room car and I will go with you. Self-indulgence always goes to its store through a storm, and hires a carriage on the bitterest nights to reach a pleasure party; but it leaves Christ's ambassadors to preach to empty pews on an unpleasant Sabbath. The conduct of a vast portion of Christ's professed followers (I fear a majority of them) on every wet or inclement Lord's day, is a severer reproach and works a severer damage to our Christianity than the ribald assaults of an hundred Ingersoll's. It practically means—"My religion will be worth heaven to me in eternity; but in this world it is not worth a little exposure and discomfort."

Brethren and sisters, we have but one journey to make through this world. Let us make it on foot, helping up other poor fellow-travellers as we go along. Jesus will walk with us over the ruggedest paths of self-denial and sweeten every step. We shall have the best of company—home missionaries who wear old coats to teach men new hearts—poor needle-women who give hard-earned dollars to their Master—and rich men also who give Christ the key to their iron safes and check books. Let us be in no hurry to get to heaven, for "Our Beloved" is with us on the road and we are needed in this sin-cursed world. When we get to the celestial "station" we will not find many who came there in a palace car.—*Interior.*

"Just My Luck!"

The *Watchman* gives its readers this week a few sentences regarding "luck," which are well worth repeating.

If the boy who exclaims "Just my luck," was truthful, he would say, "Just my laziness!" or "Just my inattention!" Mr. Cobden wrote proverbs about "Luck and Labor." It would be well for boys to memorise them:

Luck is waiting for something to turn up

Labor, with keen eyes and strong will, will turn up something.

Luck lies in bed and wishes the postman would bring him news of a legacy.

Labor turns out at six o'clock, and with busy pen or ringng hammer lays the foundation of a competence.

Luck whines.
Labor whistles.
Luck relies on chances.
Labor, on character.
Luck slips down to indigence.
Labor strides upward to independence.

Shall Women be Allowed to Vote?

The question of female suffrage has agitated the tongues and pens of reformers for many years, and good arguments have been adduced for and against it. Many of the softer sex could vote intelligently, and many would vote as their husbands did, and give no thought to the merits of a political issue. They would all vote for Dr. Pierce's Favorite Prescription, for they know it is a boon to their sex. It is unequalled for the cure of leucorrhea, abnormal discharges, morning sickness, and the countless ills to which women are subject. It is the only remedy for woman's peculiar weaknesses and ailments, sold by druggists, under a positive guarantee from the manufacturers, that it will give satisfaction in every case, or money will be refunded. See guarantee on wrapper around bottle.

5 TRIPS PER WEEK, 5
FROM
ST. JOHN, N. B.,
ANNAPOLIS
AND
Digby, N. S.
By the Superior Side-Wheel Steamers of the
International S. S. Co.
TO
BOSTON.

Leave St. John for Boston, via Eastport and Portland, every Monday, Wednesday and Friday, at 7.25 a. m., and until September 14th every Saturday evening at 6.30, for Boston direct.

Leave Annapolis, calling at Digby, for Boston direct, every Tuesday and Friday after arrival of W. & A. Railway express from Halifax.

On Saturday, the steamer "City of Monticello," from Annapolis and Digby, makes close connection at St. John, and passengers are due in Boston at 4 p. m. next day, thus making equal to three direct trips from Nova Scotia.

Always travel by the Palace Steamers of this Company.

All Ticket Agents sell by these Popular Lines. For State Rooms and further information, apply to

H. B. SHORT, Agent, Digby. R. A. CARDER, Agent, Annapolis. H. W. CHISHOLM, Agent, St. John.

ALBION HOUSE,
22 Sackville St.,
HALIFAX, N. S.
Conducted on strictly Temperance principles.
P. P. ARCHIBALD, Proprietor.
Jan 1

CENTRAL HOUSE,
73 Granville St.,
HALIFAX, N. S.
Conducted on strictly Temperance principles
MISS A. M. PAYSON.
Jan 1

ELLIOTT'S HOTEL,
28 to 32 Germain St.,
SAINT JOHN, N.
Modern Improvements.
Terms $1 per day. Tea, Bed & Breakfast 75c.
E. W. ELLIOTT, Proprietor.

YARMOUTH HOTEL,
MAIN STREET,
YARMOUTH, N. S.
W. H. S. DAHLGREN, PROPRIETOR. Jan 1

OXFORD HOUSE!
TRURO.
A TEMPERANCE HOTEL.
Jan 1 A. N. COX, Proprietor.

HOTEL OTTAWA,
North Side King Square,
SAINT JOHN, N. B.
E. COSMAN, Proprietor.
Terms: $1.00 per day. This Hotel is conducted on strictly Temperance principles. Every attention paid to Guests' comfort.

NOBLE CRANDALL,
Custom Tailor,
Doris Building, Gerrish Street,
WINDSOR, N. S.,
A few doors above Post Office.
All orders promptly attended to. Jan 1

LEATHER, HIDES, OIL, &c.
WILLIAM PETERS,
Dealer in Hides, Leather, Cod and Finishing Oils, Curriers' Tools and Findings.
Manufacturer of Oil Tanned Lace and Larragan Leather.
240 UNION STREET, ST. JOHN.

J. McC. SNOW,
— GENERAL —
Fire, Life and Accident
INSURANCE AGENCY.
MAIN STREET, MONCTON, N. B. Jan 1

BOOKS AND STATIONERY.
W. H. MURRAY,
MAIN ST., MONCTON, N. B.
School Books and School Stationery.
Bibles, Hymn Books, Sunday School Books, &c
Orders by mail promptly attended to.

JOHN M. CURRIE,
Manufacturers of and Dealer in
FURNITURE AND BEDDING,
Wholesale and Retail.
Fine Upholstered Work a Specialty.
Photos and prices on application.
Jan 1 AMHERST, N. S

SHAND & BURNS,
(Successors to CURRY & SHAND,)
WHOLESALE AND RETAIL DEALERS IN
FLOUR, MEAL and GROCERIES.
Also, Blasting Powder and Fuse.
Horse and Cattle Feed a specialty. Vessels supplied at lowest rates.
WINDSOR, N. S.

JAMES S. MAY. W. ROBERT MAY.
JAMES S. MAY & SON,
MERCHANT TAILORS,
Domville Building, Prince Wm. Street,
ST JOHN, N. B.
P. O. Box 303. Jan9

EVERY BAPTIST
SHOULD HAVE THEM.
A BEAUTIFUL SOUVENIR containing PHOTOS of ACADIA COLLEGE and FACULTY, ACADIA SEMINARY, CHIPMAN HALL, and HORTON ACADEMY, in two sizes at 60c. and 35 cts; a Fine View of Acadia College and grounds, 5 by 8 inches, 40c.; a Fine Photo of the late Dr. Crawley, 35c. Sent post paid to any address on receipt of price by BOCKWELL & CO., Wolfville, N. S