

The Convention Sermon

PREACHED BY REV. T. A. MOSELEY, D. D., OF HULLVILLE.

And now I am no more in the world, but these are in the world, and I come to them. Holy Father, keep them from sin, because those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one, as we are.

Dr. Higgins said: The custom of the past, and probably the expectation of the present, would seem to require that some subject should be presented on this occasion, the illustration and enforcement of which would tend further to strengthen our position as a denomination, or still better, perhaps, to fire our zeal in pushing the interests undertaken, to their grandest issue.

There therefore chose a subject no more vital to ourselves as a body than to all others who profess a union with the Lord Jesus Christ and cherish the hope that the time has come when its consideration may be fruitful of good, perhaps more so than would have been the case a few years ago.

The text may be found in several places in the 15th chapter of the Gospel by John, the 11th, 12th and 13th. In the 11th verse, "Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one as we are."

In the 13th verse, "I in them, and they in me, that they may be one as we are, that they may believe that thou hast sent me."

The term "church," however, we employ here not as representing any local or even denominational body. We shall avoid being too sectarian on the one hand and too broad on the other, by saying that, omitting definitions, we mean by "the church" that body which Christ referred to when he said, "On this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

The term "ideal" we use here not in the sense of imaginary, fanciful and therefore unreal, but rather as representing the perfected model of redeemed manhood, united for worship and work, as it existed in the divine purpose, and as it is to be in the consummation of all ages.

The Gospel of Christ is designed and fitted to produce this result. Sin, error, falsehood, hatred, all tend to divide, separate and scatter. Truth reconciles and unites, brings together. There is one Bible. It is the Book of the world. Oriental in its figures and poetry, Oriental in its imagery and composition. But divine in its origin for "holiness of God speaks as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."

It is the announcement of Christ is designed to accomplish this. It is as far reaching as the sun, and as wide as the earth. If he died for all, then were all dead. As in Adam all died, so in Christ all may be made alive. Quoting the great commission will establish this. "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature."

The bond of union is the Lord Jesus Christ. Of course it will be impossible in this connection entirely to separate Christ and the truth. For he said, "I am the way, the truth, and the life." Then union, concord, harmony, would seem to require agreement in the leading doctrines of the gospel. For how can two walk together

unless they be agreed? But there is it not well for us to remember that "great is the mystery of godliness." The truth is very deep, very broad, very high. Can we grasp it all? Can we measure it? Can we fathom it? If we cannot, how far can human wisdom form a correct estimate of another's conclusions? There can be no substantial union without some agreement in the fundamentals of our faith. But it is essential that each should believe the same truths in precisely the same way. "Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God." Take regeneration for instance. Suppose one regards regeneration as the first step in a religious life, and that neither repentance nor faith can precede it. Suppose that another believes that deep repentance must be wrought in the heart, and faith exercised in Christ before the work of regeneration can be effected. Does such a difference in views constitute a reason for a distinct church for each? They do not believe alike. They differ, and that too, on one of the fundamentals of the faith. They are not united, and their union is a mere name.

Suppose one is a hyper-Calvinist. He believes in fixed fate and eternal decrees. Same systems and worship men, angels, arch-angels all waving in harmony with the eternal purpose. Another is a low Arminian. While theoretically acknowledging the divine sovereignty, he believes that God, in the exercise of his divine right, has granted within certain limits, freedom of choice to intellectual and responsible beings. What then? Must there be two distinct churches in which these may worship? Are not all Calvinists and Arminians in turn? Are we not all brought occasionally, either in the study of the word or in daily life, where we are witnesses held fast in the meshes of an unchanging purpose, and powerless to go forward or backward, to the right or left, so far as a way is made for us? We are environed—have no election, and are compelled to be Calvinists. But again, there seems to be more liberty.—There are openings all round. And within certain limits we are conscious of the power to choose. So conscious that we can choose and must, and that such a choice depends upon the will, that we can almost wish that there was only one way. Almost wish that the responsibility of the choice could be thrown upon another. Then we are Arminians. Although, perhaps after the choice has been made, and comes up in after years for review, we may find that there was not so much difference in the two positions as we thought. There is a divinity after all, either within us or without, that shapes our ends, rough hew them as we may.

But if the truth of mind or training of one has been such as to lead him to wander from the high line of the fixed and eternal, while that of another leads him to the more busy and practical of free will and personal choice, is this any reason why the two may not work together and worship together? There is much about these two views that neither can explain. And they may discuss it till they are weary, without being much nearer the solution. If both have been renewed by divine grace, hearts changed by the power of the spirit; if both have felt the need of Christ, and have accepted him as their life it doesn't so much matter whether each of them knows just how or why it was brought about. Probably they were both led by a way that they knew not, the eternal purpose and the personal choice working together to save a soul from death, according to the eternal plan. If one sees the divine purpose the most clearly and the other sees human responsibility the most clearly it may mean that the same church needs the experience, the gifts, the graces of the two, so that all the phases of the truth which the living God, the Father and the church of the truth. This is the body. It is not ours now to enquire where it is to be found, or who belong to it. It must be in existence, or otherwise, the promise of Christ, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world," would seem to have failed.

So we return to our original statement. "The great bond of union is Christ. He is the way, the truth, and the life, who pleased the Father that all fulness should dwell in Him. He is to become to the intellectual, the social, the moral, the spiritual world what the natural sun is to the natural world, the centre of light and warmth, and the power toward which all shall be drawn. And when all are drawn toward Christ they cannot help being drawn toward each other. The benefits of union in the service of God are too manifold to need statement. "Union is strength" in many ways. (1) More powerful in its action, and more extensive in its interests in the same village, such with an empty treasury, a dilapidated building, a handful of people and perhaps a very religious inefficient instructor; that to the outgrowth of divided views. Not to mention the petty jealousies and the ill-will which spring up when what is barely sufficient for one must be divided among two. And we are not now speaking of thinking even of the financial needs only of public worship. But of the need of members, of intellectual and spiritual gifts, the comfort of all, and of the Bible, the instructor of all, will ultimately bring Gentile and Jew, Barbarian and Scythian, bond and free, into one common brotherhood.

(2) The announcement of Christ is designed to accomplish this. It is as far reaching as the sun, and as wide as the earth. If he died for all, then were all dead. As in Adam all died, so in Christ all may be made alive. Quoting the great commission will establish this. "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." His morality, education, refinement, will not place him above the level of gospel grace. His ignorance and degradation and sin will not place him beyond redemption, since the blood of Christ cleanses from all sin.

(3) The bond of union is the Lord Jesus Christ. Of course it will be impossible in this connection entirely to separate Christ and the truth. For he said, "I am the way, the truth, and the life." Then union, concord, harmony, would seem to require agreement in the leading doctrines of the gospel. For how can two walk together

unless they be agreed? But there is it not well for us to remember that "great is the mystery of godliness." The truth is very deep, very broad, very high. Can we grasp it all? Can we measure it? Can we fathom it? If we cannot, how far can human wisdom form a correct estimate of another's conclusions? There can be no substantial union without some agreement in the fundamentals of our faith. But it is essential that each should believe the same truths in precisely the same way. "Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God." Take regeneration for instance. Suppose one regards regeneration as the first step in a religious life, and that neither repentance nor faith can precede it. Suppose that another believes that deep repentance must be wrought in the heart, and faith exercised in Christ before the work of regeneration can be effected. Does such a difference in views constitute a reason for a distinct church for each? They do not believe alike. They differ, and that too, on one of the fundamentals of the faith. They are not united, and their union is a mere name.

Suppose one is a hyper-Calvinist. He believes in fixed fate and eternal decrees. Same systems and worship men, angels, arch-angels all waving in harmony with the eternal purpose. Another is a low Arminian. While theoretically acknowledging the divine sovereignty, he believes that God, in the exercise of his divine right, has granted within certain limits, freedom of choice to intellectual and responsible beings. What then? Must there be two distinct churches in which these may worship? Are not all Calvinists and Arminians in turn? Are we not all brought occasionally, either in the study of the word or in daily life, where we are witnesses held fast in the meshes of an unchanging purpose, and powerless to go forward or backward, to the right or left, so far as a way is made for us? We are environed—have no election, and are compelled to be Calvinists. But again, there seems to be more liberty.—There are openings all round. And within certain limits we are conscious of the power to choose. So conscious that we can choose and must, and that such a choice depends upon the will, that we can almost wish that there was only one way. Almost wish that the responsibility of the choice could be thrown upon another. Then we are Arminians. Although, perhaps after the choice has been made, and comes up in after years for review, we may find that there was not so much difference in the two positions as we thought. There is a divinity after all, either within us or without, that shapes our ends, rough hew them as we may.

But if the truth of mind or training of one has been such as to lead him to wander from the high line of the fixed and eternal, while that of another leads him to the more busy and practical of free will and personal choice, is this any reason why the two may not work together and worship together? There is much about these two views that neither can explain. And they may discuss it till they are weary, without being much nearer the solution. If both have been renewed by divine grace, hearts changed by the power of the spirit; if both have felt the need of Christ, and have accepted him as their life it doesn't so much matter whether each of them knows just how or why it was brought about. Probably they were both led by a way that they knew not, the eternal purpose and the personal choice working together to save a soul from death, according to the eternal plan. If one sees the divine purpose the most clearly and the other sees human responsibility the most clearly it may mean that the same church needs the experience, the gifts, the graces of the two, so that all the phases of the truth which the living God, the Father and the church of the truth. This is the body. It is not ours now to enquire where it is to be found, or who belong to it. It must be in existence, or otherwise, the promise of Christ, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world," would seem to have failed.

So we return to our original statement. "The great bond of union is Christ. He is the way, the truth, and the life, who pleased the Father that all fulness should dwell in Him. He is to become to the intellectual, the social, the moral, the spiritual world what the natural sun is to the natural world, the centre of light and warmth, and the power toward which all shall be drawn. And when all are drawn toward Christ they cannot help being drawn toward each other. The benefits of union in the service of God are too manifold to need statement. "Union is strength" in many ways. (1) More powerful in its action, and more extensive in its interests in the same village, such with an empty treasury, a dilapidated building, a handful of people and perhaps a very religious inefficient instructor; that to the outgrowth of divided views. Not to mention the petty jealousies and the ill-will which spring up when what is barely sufficient for one must be divided among two. And we are not now speaking of thinking even of the financial needs only of public worship. But of the need of members, of intellectual and spiritual gifts, the comfort of all, and of the Bible, the instructor of all, will ultimately bring Gentile and Jew, Barbarian and Scythian, bond and free, into one common brotherhood.

(2) The announcement of Christ is designed to accomplish this. It is as far reaching as the sun, and as wide as the earth. If he died for all, then were all dead. As in Adam all died, so in Christ all may be made alive. Quoting the great commission will establish this. "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." His morality, education, refinement, will not place him above the level of gospel grace. His ignorance and degradation and sin will not place him beyond redemption, since the blood of Christ cleanses from all sin.

(3) The bond of union is the Lord Jesus Christ. Of course it will be impossible in this connection entirely to separate Christ and the truth. For he said, "I am the way, the truth, and the life." Then union, concord, harmony, would seem to require agreement in the leading doctrines of the gospel. For how can two walk together

unless they be agreed? But there is it not well for us to remember that "great is the mystery of godliness." The truth is very deep, very broad, very high. Can we grasp it all? Can we measure it? Can we fathom it? If we cannot, how far can human wisdom form a correct estimate of another's conclusions? There can be no substantial union without some agreement in the fundamentals of our faith. But it is essential that each should believe the same truths in precisely the same way. "Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God." Take regeneration for instance. Suppose one regards regeneration as the first step in a religious life, and that neither repentance nor faith can precede it. Suppose that another believes that deep repentance must be wrought in the heart, and faith exercised in Christ before the work of regeneration can be effected. Does such a difference in views constitute a reason for a distinct church for each? They do not believe alike. They differ, and that too, on one of the fundamentals of the faith. They are not united, and their union is a mere name.

Suppose one is a hyper-Calvinist. He believes in fixed fate and eternal decrees. Same systems and worship men, angels, arch-angels all waving in harmony with the eternal purpose. Another is a low Arminian. While theoretically acknowledging the divine sovereignty, he believes that God, in the exercise of his divine right, has granted within certain limits, freedom of choice to intellectual and responsible beings. What then? Must there be two distinct churches in which these may worship? Are not all Calvinists and Arminians in turn? Are we not all brought occasionally, either in the study of the word or in daily life, where we are witnesses held fast in the meshes of an unchanging purpose, and powerless to go forward or backward, to the right or left, so far as a way is made for us? We are environed—have no election, and are compelled to be Calvinists. But again, there seems to be more liberty.—There are openings all round. And within certain limits we are conscious of the power to choose. So conscious that we can choose and must, and that such a choice depends upon the will, that we can almost wish that there was only one way. Almost wish that the responsibility of the choice could be thrown upon another. Then we are Arminians. Although, perhaps after the choice has been made, and comes up in after years for review, we may find that there was not so much difference in the two positions as we thought. There is a divinity after all, either within us or without, that shapes our ends, rough hew them as we may.

But if the truth of mind or training of one has been such as to lead him to wander from the high line of the fixed and eternal, while that of another leads him to the more busy and practical of free will and personal choice, is this any reason why the two may not work together and worship together? There is much about these two views that neither can explain. And they may discuss it till they are weary, without being much nearer the solution. If both have been renewed by divine grace, hearts changed by the power of the spirit; if both have felt the need of Christ, and have accepted him as their life it doesn't so much matter whether each of them knows just how or why it was brought about. Probably they were both led by a way that they knew not, the eternal purpose and the personal choice working together to save a soul from death, according to the eternal plan. If one sees the divine purpose the most clearly and the other sees human responsibility the most clearly it may mean that the same church needs the experience, the gifts, the graces of the two, so that all the phases of the truth which the living God, the Father and the church of the truth. This is the body. It is not ours now to enquire where it is to be found, or who belong to it. It must be in existence, or otherwise, the promise of Christ, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world," would seem to have failed.

So we return to our original statement. "The great bond of union is Christ. He is the way, the truth, and the life, who pleased the Father that all fulness should dwell in Him. He is to become to the intellectual, the social, the moral, the spiritual world what the natural sun is to the natural world, the centre of light and warmth, and the power toward which all shall be drawn. And when all are drawn toward Christ they cannot help being drawn toward each other. The benefits of union in the service of God are too manifold to need statement. "Union is strength" in many ways. (1) More powerful in its action, and more extensive in its interests in the same village, such with an empty treasury, a dilapidated building, a handful of people and perhaps a very religious inefficient instructor; that to the outgrowth of divided views. Not to mention the petty jealousies and the ill-will which spring up when what is barely sufficient for one must be divided among two. And we are not now speaking of thinking even of the financial needs only of public worship. But of the need of members, of intellectual and spiritual gifts, the comfort of all, and of the Bible, the instructor of all, will ultimately bring Gentile and Jew, Barbarian and Scythian, bond and free, into one common brotherhood.

(2) The announcement of Christ is designed to accomplish this. It is as far reaching as the sun, and as wide as the earth. If he died for all, then were all dead. As in Adam all died, so in Christ all may be made alive. Quoting the great commission will establish this. "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." His morality, education, refinement, will not place him above the level of gospel grace. His ignorance and degradation and sin will not place him beyond redemption, since the blood of Christ cleanses from all sin.

(3) The bond of union is the Lord Jesus Christ. Of course it will be impossible in this connection entirely to separate Christ and the truth. For he said, "I am the way, the truth, and the life." Then union, concord, harmony, would seem to require agreement in the leading doctrines of the gospel. For how can two walk together

unless they be agreed? But there is it not well for us to remember that "great is the mystery of godliness." The truth is very deep, very broad, very high. Can we grasp it all? Can we measure it? Can we fathom it? If we cannot, how far can human wisdom form a correct estimate of another's conclusions? There can be no substantial union without some agreement in the fundamentals of our faith. But it is essential that each should believe the same truths in precisely the same way. "Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God." Take regeneration for instance. Suppose one regards regeneration as the first step in a religious life, and that neither repentance nor faith can precede it. Suppose that another believes that deep repentance must be wrought in the heart, and faith exercised in Christ before the work of regeneration can be effected. Does such a difference in views constitute a reason for a distinct church for each? They do not believe alike. They differ, and that too, on one of the fundamentals of the faith. They are not united, and their union is a mere name.

unless they be agreed? But there is it not well for us to remember that "great is the mystery of godliness." The truth is very deep, very broad, very high. Can we grasp it all? Can we measure it? Can we fathom it? If we cannot, how far can human wisdom form a correct estimate of another's conclusions? There can be no substantial union without some agreement in the fundamentals of our faith. But it is essential that each should believe the same truths in precisely the same way. "Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God." Take regeneration for instance. Suppose one regards regeneration as the first step in a religious life, and that neither repentance nor faith can precede it. Suppose that another believes that deep repentance must be wrought in the heart, and faith exercised in Christ before the work of regeneration can be effected. Does such a difference in views constitute a reason for a distinct church for each? They do not believe alike. They differ, and that too, on one of the fundamentals of the faith. They are not united, and their union is a mere name.

Suppose one is a hyper-Calvinist. He believes in fixed fate and eternal decrees. Same systems and worship men, angels, arch-angels all waving in harmony with the eternal purpose. Another is a low Arminian. While theoretically acknowledging the divine sovereignty, he believes that God, in the exercise of his divine right, has granted within certain limits, freedom of choice to intellectual and responsible beings. What then? Must there be two distinct churches in which these may worship? Are not all Calvinists and Arminians in turn? Are we not all brought occasionally, either in the study of the word or in daily life, where we are witnesses held fast in the meshes of an unchanging purpose, and powerless to go forward or backward, to the right or left, so far as a way is made for us? We are environed—have no election, and are compelled to be Calvinists. But again, there seems to be more liberty.—There are openings all round. And within certain limits we are conscious of the power to choose. So conscious that we can choose and must, and that such a choice depends upon the will, that we can almost wish that there was only one way. Almost wish that the responsibility of the choice could be thrown upon another. Then we are Arminians. Although, perhaps after the choice has been made, and comes up in after years for review, we may find that there was not so much difference in the two positions as we thought. There is a divinity after all, either within us or without, that shapes our ends, rough hew them as we may.

But if the truth of mind or training of one has been such as to lead him to wander from the high line of the fixed and eternal, while that of another leads him to the more busy and practical of free will and personal choice, is this any reason why the two may not work together and worship together? There is much about these two views that neither can explain. And they may discuss it till they are weary, without being much nearer the solution. If both have been renewed by divine grace, hearts changed by the power of the spirit; if both have felt the need of Christ, and have accepted him as their life it doesn't so much matter whether each of them knows just how or why it was brought about. Probably they were both led by a way that they knew not, the eternal purpose and the personal choice working together to save a soul from death, according to the eternal plan. If one sees the divine purpose the most clearly and the other sees human responsibility the most clearly it may mean that the same church needs the experience, the gifts, the graces of the two, so that all the phases of the truth which the living God, the Father and the church of the truth. This is the body. It is not ours now to enquire where it is to be found, or who belong to it. It must be in existence, or otherwise, the promise of Christ, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world," would seem to have failed.

So we return to our original statement. "The great bond of union is Christ. He is the way, the truth, and the life, who pleased the Father that all fulness should dwell in Him. He is to become to the intellectual, the social, the moral, the spiritual world what the natural sun is to the natural world, the centre of light and warmth, and the power toward which all shall be drawn. And when all are drawn toward Christ they cannot help being drawn toward each other. The benefits of union in the service of God are too manifold to need statement. "Union is strength" in many ways. (1) More powerful in its action, and more extensive in its interests in the same village, such with an empty treasury, a dilapidated building, a handful of people and perhaps a very religious inefficient instructor; that to the outgrowth of divided views. Not to mention the petty jealousies and the ill-will which spring up when what is barely sufficient for one must be divided among two. And we are not now speaking of thinking even of the financial needs only of public worship. But of the need of members, of intellectual and spiritual gifts, the comfort of all, and of the Bible, the instructor of all, will ultimately bring Gentile and Jew, Barbarian and Scythian, bond and free, into one common brotherhood.

(2) The announcement of Christ is designed to accomplish this. It is as far reaching as the sun, and as wide as the earth. If he died for all, then were all dead. As in Adam all died, so in Christ all may be made alive. Quoting the great commission will establish this. "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." His morality, education, refinement, will not place him above the level of gospel grace. His ignorance and degradation and sin will not place him beyond redemption, since the blood of Christ cleanses from all sin.

(3) The bond of union is the Lord Jesus Christ. Of course it will be impossible in this connection entirely to separate Christ and the truth. For he said, "I am the way, the truth, and the life." Then union, concord, harmony, would seem to require agreement in the leading doctrines of the gospel. For how can two walk together

unless they be agreed? But there is it not well for us to remember that "great is the mystery of godliness." The truth is very deep, very broad, very high. Can we grasp it all? Can we measure it? Can we fathom it? If we cannot, how far can human wisdom form a correct estimate of another's conclusions? There can be no substantial union without some agreement in the fundamentals of our faith. But it is essential that each should believe the same truths in precisely the same way. "Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God." Take regeneration for instance. Suppose one regards regeneration as the first step in a religious life, and that neither repentance nor faith can precede it. Suppose that another believes that deep repentance must be wrought in the heart, and faith exercised in Christ before the work of regeneration can be effected. Does such a difference in views constitute a reason for a distinct church for each? They do not believe alike. They differ, and that too, on one of the fundamentals of the faith. They are not united, and their union is a mere name.

Suppose one is a hyper-Calvinist. He believes in fixed fate and eternal decrees. Same systems and worship men, angels, arch-angels all waving in harmony with the eternal purpose. Another is a low Arminian. While theoretically acknowledging the divine sovereignty, he believes that God, in the exercise of his divine right, has granted within certain limits, freedom of choice to intellectual and responsible beings. What then? Must there be two distinct churches in which these may worship? Are not all Calvinists and Arminians in turn? Are we not all brought occasionally, either in the study of the word or in daily life, where we are witnesses held fast in the meshes of an unchanging purpose, and powerless to go forward or backward, to the right or left, so far as a way is made for us? We are environed—have no election, and are compelled to be Calvinists. But again, there seems to be more liberty.—There are openings all round. And within certain limits we are conscious of the power to choose. So conscious that we can choose and must, and that such a choice depends upon the will, that we can almost wish that there was only one way. Almost wish that the responsibility of the choice could be thrown upon another. Then we are Arminians. Although, perhaps after the choice has been made, and comes up in after years for review, we may find that there was not so much difference in the two positions as we thought. There is a divinity after all, either within us or without, that shapes our ends, rough hew them as we may.

To Sunday-School Workers!

ONE of the most valuable helps for the study of John's Gospel is

"CHRIST IN THE GOSPELS, or the Life of Our Lord" in exactly the words of the evangelists, without repetition, and chronologically arranged, with all interesting scriptures and maps of Jesus' travels, by J. E. DUNDAS, A. M. Introduction by F. S. HENSON, D. D.

Opinions regarding this new Bible help: "This harmony has a completeness not hitherto attained in any work." "Helpful and labor-saving."—Examiner, (Boston), N. Y.

"A rare help to Sunday-school teachers and pastors."—Rev. F. S. MOXOM, Boston.

It has gained a prominent place in the literature of church study.—Standard, Chicago.

Send for club rates for Sunday-schools and for terms for agents. Price \$1.50. Address AMERICAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY OF NEW-YORK, 230 NASSAU ST., N. Y. City.

Please mention this paper when you order the book.

Advertisement for Dr. Williams' Pink Pills for Pale People, describing its benefits for various ailments like weakness, nervousness, and general debility.

Advertisement for Campbell's Tonic Elixir, highlighting its effectiveness for improving blood and overall health.

Advertisement for St. John Building Society, Odd Fellows' Hall, incorporated in 1861, listing directors and financial details.

Advertisement for Port Elgin Woolen Mills, The Largest and Best Equipped Mill in the Province, listing directors and contact information.

Advertisement for Cooking Stoves, Ranges, & Co., Own Manufacture, listing products and contact information.

Advertisement for Union Baptist Seminary, Saint John, N. B., listing faculty and course details.

Advertisement for St. John Building Society, Odd Fellows' Hall, incorporated in 1861, listing directors and financial details.

Advertisement for Herbert Attorney, Notary Public, Room No. 7, 117 William St.

Advertisement for C. C. Richards, Tailor, 117 William St., offering various tailoring services.

Advertisement for Dr. Williams' Pink Pills for Pale People, describing its benefits for various ailments.

Advertisement for Campbell's Tonic Elixir, highlighting its effectiveness for improving blood and overall health.

Advertisement for St. John Building Society, Odd Fellows' Hall, incorporated in 1861, listing directors and financial details.

Advertisement for Port Elgin Woolen Mills, The Largest and Best Equipped Mill in the Province, listing directors and contact information.

Advertisement for Cooking Stoves, Ranges, & Co., Own Manufacture, listing products and contact information.

Advertisement for Union Baptist Seminary, Saint John, N. B., listing faculty and course details.