

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

- Coloured covers/  
Couverture de couleur
- Covers damaged/  
Couverture endommagée
- Covers restored and/or laminated/  
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- Cover title missing/  
Le titre de couverture manque
- Coloured maps/  
Cartes géographiques en couleur
- Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/  
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- Coloured plates and/or illustrations/  
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- Bound with other material/  
Relié avec d'autres documents
- Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin/  
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la marge intérieure
- Blank leaves added during restoration may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming/  
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées.

- Coloured pages/  
Pages de couleur
- Pages damaged/  
Pages endommagées
- Pages restored and/or laminated/  
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
- Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/  
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
- Pages detached/  
Pages détachées
- Showthrough/  
Transparence
- Quality of print varies/  
Qualité inégale de l'impression
- Continuous pagination/  
Pagination continue
- Includes index(es)/  
Comprend un (des) index

Title on header taken from:/  
Le titre de l'en-tête provient:

- Title page of issue/  
Page de titre de la livraison
- Caption of issue/  
Titre de départ de la livraison
- Masthead/  
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

Additional comments:/  
Commentaires supplémentaires:

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below/  
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	12X	14X	16X	18X	20X	22X	24X	26X	28X	30X	32X
							✓				

# THE GOSPEL TRIBUNE,

FOR ALLIANCE AND INTERCOMMUNION

THROUGHOUT

## Evangelical Christendom.

VOLUME II.]

FEBRUARY, 1856.

[NUMBER 10.

"ONE IS YOUR MASTER, *even* CHRIST: AND ALL YE ARE BRETHREN."

### The Topic for the Month.

#### SLAVERY AND FREEDOM OF SPEECH.

When the Rev. Alexander Campbell, President of Bethany College, visited Canada last autumn, the bigoted opponents of his views called upon all the churches over which they had any influence, to shut their chapel doors against him, lest he should have an opportunity of disturbing the minds of the faithful, by what they were pleased to style his dangerous and pernicious sentiments. To render these appeals the more effective, certain Baptists accused this foreigner (the Rev. A. Campbell) of aiming at the overthrow and subversion of their peculiar church institutions. And in addition to all these things, charges direct and indirect, were so ruthlessly hurled at him that the *Tribune* was constrained to speak in his behalf, in the full belief that he, as a Christian brother, was entitled to a fair and candid hearing. That no obstacle should be thrown in the way of his proclaiming to us the doctrines of his reformation—but that he should have every facility of convicting us of sin and of error wherever he deemed it his duty to make the attempt.

While in Canada, the Rev. A. Campbell was an advocate of liberty of speech and of freedom of discussion, even where the interests of peculiar institutions were directly at stake; and, where his sentiments could not be uttered without awakening serious and determined opposition. In Bethany, however, it seems to be far otherwise. In Bethany,—Ay!—in Bethany College! there is *one subject* on which students must be dumb,—one subject, the discussion of which is proscribed by the Faculty and by the Rev. A. Campbell, their President!—Is the subject one, the discussion of which necessarily involves blasphemy? Not at all. Is it one so intimately connected with unnameable pollutions, that decency

forbids its discussion? O no! So far from this, the practices involved in this subject are held to be scriptural by four-fifths of the students of Bethany College. Surely, then, it must be one so visionary and puerile as to be obviously destitute of all practical issues!—Wrong still.—So much so, that it is perhaps impossible to name a subject in which the whole American Union is so deeply interested by reason of the number and magnitude of its issues.—The subject is rocking the whole nation, North and South, by the startling character of its marvellous developments. And in it are wrapt up the highest and dearest interests of more than *three millions* of the American people. To show the utter fallacy of proscribing such a subject, it is not necessary to view the recent disturbances in Bethany College through the statements of the parties whom the proscription has driven from its halls; the folly,—the utter folly of the attempt to place the subject under key and pad-lock, is painfully apparent in the following humiliating defence of the Rev. President. Alas! that this noble champion of the freedom of speech should have fallen asleep on the lap of slavery: for surely the following is a dream:—

#### DISTURBANCE IN BETHANY COLLEGE.

So many statements have appeared in different quarters concerning the recent disturbance in Bethany College, caused by the indiscreet zeal of a few inexperienced young men, in the agitation of the much vexed question of slavery, and so imperfect and unjust is the impression which these seem to have made upon the public mind, that it becomes our duty briefly to narrate the whole case, precisely as it occurred. This is due especially both to the Faculty of Bethany College and to our numerous friends, North and South, who have hitherto approved our policy on this subject. Our apology for not having done so at an earlier day, is—*first*, that we left home a few days after the occurrence and have just returned; and *second*, that we did not think it necessary to give, in advance, a public explanation for what was simply

wholesome and ordinary College discipline in like cases, in every College of any respectability known to us, either North or South. The perverted representations so gladly circulated by the common enemies of Bethany College and the cause we plead, render it now proper that we should say a few words for the consideration of the candid and unprejudiced reader.

The policy of Bethany College, from the commencement, has been to maintain a strictly literary, scientific and religious character. The discussion, by the Students, of difficult and exciting questions of social and public policy, especially those of a sectional peculiarity, has been uniformly discouraged by the Faculty, as not only without the pale of our collegiate course, but as unfit for the immature minds and undisciplined tempers of students, who come to learn and to be taught, and not to teach. Our views on all these subjects have been laid fully and fairly before the brethren. Especially on the subject of slavery and its introduction and discussion in the churches, have our views been fully elaborated and canvassed for now many years, and we are happy to know that they have not only withstood all factious opposition, but have also found a very general and almost universally harmonious concurrence among the well informed and enlarged minds of the entire brotherhood, both North and South. We stand on these subjects unchanged. Still, in the government and discipline of the College, the Faculty have preferred to let the matter rest rather upon its own evidences of propriety, and trusted rather to moral influence and the good sense of students, than to the arbitrary rule of a positive law. The students have known our views, and feelings, and principles on these subjects, and generally so far respected them as to render any formal interference, on the part of the Faculty, unnecessary. Occasionally, however, the subject of slavery, though never formally proposed for discussion, has been collaterally introduced, both by Northern and Southern students, in their Society debates. The sensitiveness of the opposing parties generally served to restrain its agitation, except in this allusive way, and it produced no trouble.

Recently, however, the College has had an accession of a few precocious youths, who seem to have come, rather in the spirit of patriots and social reformers, than that of students. Among the number was a Scotchman, Mr. Philip Burns, whose extreme principles of liberty are such, that though now a resident of the United States, he cannot conscientiously sign the American Declaration of Independence! Last session, his imprudent agitation of the subject of slavery in the Adelpian Society, produced some little discussion and unpleasant feeling amongst its members, but it was adjusted without coming before the Faculty. This session, some three or four kindred spirits combined with him in continuing the agitation. As usual in such cases, some students on each side became excited, and hard speeches passed freely between both parties. Still, the matter was confined to the performances of their respective Societies, and was controlled by their own laws of order and debate, till a Mr. Way, from Portage County, Ohio, introduced it into the pulpit, in a discourse delivered by him on Sunday evening.

The Adelpian Society is composed of young men who are preparing for the ministry, and it is a regulation among them, that one of their number, taken in alphabetical order, shall deliver a public discourse in the church in the village every Lord's day evening. Mr. Way's name was not the name in order, but by some means he was put forward to speak very soon after his arrival here. He was an entire stranger to the Faculty and three fourths of the students, and so

well known were our views, and so long established was the usage of the church here with respect to the discussion of slavery in the pulpit that no one dreamed that it was his object to introduce such a subject; but so he did, and in a manner very offensive to many of his hearers. Yet he was patiently and respectfully listened to, and no further notice was taken of the matter that we then heard of. It is now stated that he received, some days after, an anonymous communication threatening him with summary punishment, if he did not keep his offensive sentiments to himself. This communication was signed "80 Students," but with no name. It was regarded as an idle trick at the time, such as is common in all institutions where many young men are convened from different parts of the Union. Five or six weeks elapsed, and Mr. Way was treated with as much respect and confidence by his fellow-students as if nothing of the kind had happened.

Early in the month of November, the two Literary Societies held their Anniversary celebrations. These were held in the College Hall, and were public. The speaker on behalf of one of them was a Kentuckian, and he indulged in a good deal of very harsh language towards the abolitionists, especially the disunionists and those of the "underground railroad" order. This was warmly cheered by many, and slightly hissed by a few.

A few evenings after the American Society held its celebration, also in the College Hall, and public. Their speaker was from Illinois, and he, not with the purpose of discussing or introducing slavery, but as best illustrating his subject, recounted the merits of Uncle Tom's Cabin, as a literary production, and applied his characteristic tests of literary excellence to explain the extraordinary hold which "this work had taken, not only of the American mind, but mankind generally. This too, was a good deal applauded, and thus the matter passed, not, however, without the decided disapprobation of the Faculty, at this unwarranted introduction of the subject of slavery into performances of the Societies, on these purely literary occasions—especially at the purely political and sectional spirit of the address first alluded to.—The Faculty hoped that this would be sufficient, as it had been on former occasions, to prevent any further agitation of this subject, especially as the large majority of the more influential students from the South seemed satisfied that such a course could result in nothing but evil to the institution, and discord among themselves. But we had mistaken the purpose of some of these young social reformers.

On the following Lord's Day, just before the congregation was dismissed, a notice was handed to me, that Mr. Burns would "Lecture" that evening, "on the true principles of Liberty." Although it was altogether unprecedented, that a student should thus announce his subject, I did not suspect but that he meant the gospel. Other brethren, however, who were better acquainted with the spirit of Mr. Burns than I was, suggested to me that it was designed to be an anti-slavery lecture. I could not believe it, yet, as a matter of prudence, I requested a brother elder to call upon him and let him know that such a course could not be allowed. Notwithstanding this (whether from some misunderstanding of Mr. Burns or not, I cannot say) he did speak as appointed; and it was this "Lecture" which led to the disturbance; about which so much perversion and misrepresentation have been published in the columns of our enemies, to the mortification of the brethren and the delight of infidels, sceptics, sectarian bigots, all sorts of opposers and calumniators, both North and South. It was generally understood, as I afterwards

learned, that the Lecture was to be an anti-slavery Lecture; and though Mr. Burns was by no means popular, there was an unusual turn out to hear him. He approached the subject indirectly, by alluding to various kinds of slavery, and dwelt with his utmost severity upon the horrors of West India slavery. He described it just as American Abolitionists describe American slavery, and treated the whole matter in such a manner as to give offence to four-fifths of his audience. He spoke in very contemptuous language of the morality, &c., of the oldest and most favoured Church in the Reformation, and though in general terms, in such a style as to produce the almost universal impression that he was all the time referring, under this covert of generalities and remote cases, to American slavery and the church at Bethany, or to a certain class of its members. We pretend not to give even a synopsis of this Lecture. It was most ill-judged and unwarranted under all the circumstances, and the result was that twenty or thirty of the congregation rose, almost simultaneously, and went out—a few of them walking heavily, and making an unusual degree of noise, both with their feet and canes. Before this took place, some noise was made in the back part of the house by scraping the feet on the floor, and there was some hissing, but nothing was said. When those who left went out, Mr. Burns paused, but one of his friends cried out very loudly, "Go on! we will hear you through." This was the only thing said in the house during the Lecture, save by Mr. Burns himself. Soon after this a window on the side of the pulpit, some twenty feet off from the speaker, was pushed up with a stick. It slipped off and fell, breaking two panes of glass. This was supposed, by some, at the time, to be those without, throwing stones, but it was a mistake; nothing of the kind was done during the evening. At this juncture, one of the Professors, of whom two were present, went out to see if there was any probability of further disorder. There had been, also, some loud talking and some shouting out of doors, though not of such a nature as at all to interrupt the speaker. The night was dark, and the Professor saw some two or three persons retreat from the window, but could not identify them. The main body of the students who had withdrawn from the church, he found talking together, some distance in front of the door, and on speaking to them, they assured him of their purpose and desire to preserve and maintain order. There is a small excavation under the end of the church, remote from the pulpit, and some one entered it and struck up against the floor with a stick, so as to be heard by some of the audience in that part of the house. Some one also rapped several times on the windows at that end of the house, with something like a switch, but not hard enough to break the glass or disturb the speaker. The whole disorder consisted in some scraping of feet in the back part of the house, some hissing, a boisterous mode of leaving the house on the part of a few, some loud talking and shouting by a few out of doors, the hoisting of one window with a stick, tapping at another with a switch, and some thumping against the floor from the excavation at the back end of the house. All this was, of course, unwarranted, and justly deserving of the censure and reprobation of the Faculty, which they promptly and most decisively pronounced against it; but no one could be identified as guilty of the offensive conduct described as occurring out of doors, and all, at all acquainted with the discipline of colleges, know how almost impossible it is to discover anything relating to the conduct of a student, when it is known only to themselves.

Unjustifiable and rude as this conduct unquestionably was, it was not such as to interrupt the speaker. He went on to the end of an unusually long harangue, and was listened to patiently by a majority of the Southern students who remained. The meeting was closed with singing and praying, as usual, and in good order, and Mr. Burns and the congregation went quietly and peaceably home. There was no attempt to mob him—there is not the shadow of evidence that such a thing was at all seriously contemplated by any body, and though it is alleged that he was threatened with violence as he proceeded to his lodgings, several gentlemen, who walked along from the church close beside him, testify that there was not a syllable of reproach, insult, or threatening spoken to him. His martyrdom was all in his own imagination. He and his friends went quietly to their lodgings, and there was not the least manifestation of any design to annoy, much less to injure him or them. Mr. Burns did get an anonymous communication, threatening him, if he did not leave, with "consequences which it would be hard to escape and harder to bear," signed "30 students," but there was no name to it, and it was regarded as an irresponsible billet from some one who wished to frighten him. Mr. Burns and his friends did not leave for three or four days, and though their subsequent conduct was very provoking and refractory, there was no violence offered to one of them. On the contrary, they were treated with a great deal of kindness and fraternal confidence by many of their fellow-students of the South.

The next day the students met *en masse*, and passed resolutions commending "freedom of thought, of speech, of the press, and the right of individual interpretation upon all matters pertaining either to religion or politics, at the proper time and place," but condemning the course of Mr. Burns, (a foreigner,) in taking advantage of the sacred desk, and in the capacity of a minister of the gospel, to proclaim sentiments calculated to disturb the peace and quiet of the Institution, "and whilst acknowledging the right of any one to leave a religious assembly, when sentiments are uttered insulting to his feelings, yet heartily condemning all further disapprobation, by some of the students, especially as it was on Sunday evening, and about the house of God; and as mobocracy is, in its very element, inconsistent with liberty and morality:" further they say, "We most heartily condemn all discussions of said question, (slavery,) either for or against, believing that the agitation of said question will prove disadvantageous to the vital interests of Bethany College, and do, therefore, enter our most solemn protest against the delivery of any speech by any student, either from the North or South, upon the question of slavery;" closing with a recommendation to the students to disperse quietly and without any demonstrations of unkind feelings, and to abide faithfully by the spirit of the resolutions thus adopted.

Many of the Northern students, not being satisfied with these resolutions, held special meetings of their own, and dictated to the Faculty the following terms on which they "would remain:"—

That the past be fully rectified; that those who were connected with the mob be arraigned before the Faculty, and publicly reprimanded or expelled from College. "And especially demanding the right to discuss, in public debate or in the pulpit, the merits of American slavery."

While such resolutions as these were being passed, these Northern students (about 20 in number) absented themselves from their classes, and set the authority and laws of the Institution, which they had

pledged themselves to obey, at open defiance. Notwithstanding this, the Faculty were inclined to deal very gently with them, and it was not till all reasonable efforts had proved more than abortive, that they resolved to put an end to the excitement and insubordination by dismissing the ringleaders in the whole affair. This, after two or three days of most earnest and respectful, but fruitless counsel and admonition, was announced to them. They were told that the Faculty were determined to maintain order on all sides; that they would punish disorder and violence promptly, no matter by whom perpetrated, as soon as the guilty could be identified; but that, whilst all due allowance should be made for excited feelings and the rash judgment of youths, in matters that they were not qualified impartially to weigh or fully comprehend, that forbearance could extend no farther, and that they must return to their duty. The past we overlooked, and demanded only that they would resume their duties and abandon their efforts of faction and disturbance. This was all, but this was absolutely necessary.

Some continued obstinate, and the result was the formal dismissal of *five*. Five others left with them. So that in all, *ten* were carried off by this spirit of anarchy and discord, and, since then, all has been quiet and harmonious as before. Two-thirds of the students from Northern—i. e., free States—are still in attendance, and the College was never in a more healthy and prosperous condition than now. The best feelings seem to prevail among the students generally, and we have been often pleased to see that the highest honours which they can confer upon one another, are shared, if any thing, in a more than equal ratio by the Northern students, and that, too, where the preponderance of suffrage is three or four to one on the side of the South. Since this unfortunate affair has happened, we have noticed that two of the three existing Societies have been presided over, by the election of their members, by Northern students; and in the entire history of the College, there has ever been the same liberal and unsectional feeling of fraternity in these respects, by both North and South, towards one another. We have yet a few words farther on this subject; but so recently returned from our tour in Eastern Virginia, we can add nothing more at present.

We specially request the Editors, religious and political, who have taken any notice of this affair, to give to their readers this connected statement of the whole matter.

A. C.

This proscription of Slavery as a subject of comment in Bethany College and Bethany Church is proof that the spirit of slavery flaps its wings over both institutions—that Alexander Campbell should make himself the apologist and advocate of such a state of things is truly humiliating. If the advocates of slavery can plant their feet upon the Bible, and maintain their position, what do they fear? Let them challenge the world to displace them. That they shrink from such an issue is plain from the Resolutions of the Southern students, which are as follows:—

At 1 P. M., the Southern students met and passed the following resolutions, except two, however, which were not passed until Tuesday morning:—

WHEREAS, as it seems to be the object of some students of Bethany College to agitate the question of Slavery, and that in the present exigencies of affairs it is absolutely necessary to adopt some system of

arrangements to prevent any further discussion of the question, and, in the meantime, to disapprove of the course pursued by many of the students on yesterday: Therefore,

1. *Resolved*, That we approve of freedom of thought, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and the right of individual interpretation upon all matters, pertaining either to religion or politics, at the proper time and place. But, *resolved, further*, that we do most unequivocally condemn the course of Mr. Burns, who, being a foreigner, has taken advantage of the sacred desk, and in the capacity of a Minister of the Gospel, to proclaim sentiments which are calculated to disturb the peace and quiet of this Institution, and are inconsistent with the free and lawful institutions of the State in which he is at present residing.

2. *Resolved*, That Mr. Burns is hereby requested, for his own personal good and for the good of the College, to keep his alien and sedition views locked within his own bosom.

3. *Resolved*, That while we acknowledge the right of any individual member to leave a religious assembly, when sentiments are reiterated from the sacred desk which are insulting to his feelings of justice and propriety, yet we most heartily condemn any further manifestations of disapprobation, and therefore the actions of many students on last evening, as said actions were on Sunday evening the scene of said proceedings in the Church of God, and that mobocracy in its very element is inconsistent with liberty and morality.

4. *Resolved*, That although there can be no conceivable motive on the part of Northern students to discuss this question of slavery in our midst, other than to excite the feelings of Southern students upon a question, from the discussion of which nothing can be gained, pro or con; yet notwithstanding all this, we most heartily condemn all discussion of said question, either for or against, believing that the agitation of said question will prove disadvantageous to the vital interests of Bethany College; we do, therefore, enter our most solemn protest against the delivery of any speech by any student of Bethany College, either from the North or South, upon the question of slavery, now, henceforth, and forever.

5. *Resolved*, That however much to be regretted if the Northern students will not comply with the spirit of these resolutions, as far as relates to the agitation of this question hereafter, that the Southern students will be compelled to defend their rights.

6. *Resolved*, That we recommend to the students to disperse quietly and without any demonstration of unkind feelings, and to abide faithfully by the spirit of these resolutions.

7. *Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the Faculty of Bethany College.

In 1853, an Anti-Slavery Convention was mobbed in the City of Utica, N. Y., and the members for their own "personal good" and the peace and well-being of the city, were compelled to adjourn to Peterboro' in order to complete their business. Mobbing Anti-Slavery meetings continued to occur in the State of New York, down to the year 1840. In 1837, the President and Professors of Madison University, N. Y. suspended some twenty students for being members of an Anti-Slavery Society, which they had organized in the institution, all and each of them to remain suspended till they ceased to be members of the proscribed Society. The mobs and the suspensions and

all the other forms of proscription then in vogue in New York, were deemed wise and judicious by their authors; they being firmly persuaded, that no conceivable good could result from the movements which they proscribed; while vexatious excitements every where attended them. It is now 1856—all those proscriptionists are now ashamed of the blunders they committed. The *free discussion* of the sin of American Slavery, has rolled over the Free States with the force of an irresistible flood, and established a state of public sentiment which looks with pity on the efforts of the Southern Students and Faculty of Bethany College to Burk the free discussion of the sin of Slavery. Gentlemen, the first rippings of the rising tide have reached you in Bethany, you have, with uplifted chains, lashed and scourged them like the redoubtable hero of a former age, and as they died away around your feet you proudly tramped upon them and dreamed that you were conquerors! Your dream will be disturbed. The tide of free discussion on the question of slavery, is flowing in upon you. It will rise around you. Surge after surge it will rise. Whip and scourge it as you may. Scrape, thump, resolve, howl, and apologise as you may, it will still rise. Higher and higher it will rise, till bearing you aloft on its surface, or overwhelming you in its depths, you will recall with shame and humiliation the gross blunders everywhere apparent in your treatment of the case of Philip Burns. The sin which you have committed against liberty and the common sense of freemen, is not embodied in the scrapings, thumpings and howlings for which you apologise; these are simply its necessary fruits—they do not constitute the sin of which you are guilty—any more than labor extorted by the lash, concubinage and licentious amalgamation constitute the sin of slavery. This sin lieth not in these abominations, nor in these, combined with all their associate wrongs; but, in the heaven daring crime of reducing man to a *thing of traffic*—making it possible to place on him a monied valuation; on the payment of which, by any party, the man so paid for, becomes the *personal chattle* of the purchaser—this, apart from all its fruits, constitutes the sin *per se* of slavery. In like manner, gentlemen, your proscription of this sin, as a subject of comment and discussion in Bethany College and Church, constitutes the offence which you have committed against liberty and the common sense of freemen. Vain, gentlemen, utterly vain are all your apologies for the scrapings, howlings and breaking of windows, that took place in and around Bethany College; these are simply the fruits of your sin.—And for it you offer no apology. For it you know not how to blush. Henceforth let Bethany College and its President be dumb, in relation to the proscriptions of *Rome* and of the *Sects*.

Perhaps no man regrets any hardships he has endured, when he is once completely delivered from them.

### Moral and Religious Miscellany.

The following is inserted as found in the *Morning Star*. It is now about sixteen years since the Union spoken of by G. H. B., in his notes, was consummated. The *Free Baptists* occupied the center and eastern part of the State of New York, and were to a considerable extent Calvinistic in their theological views. The *Free-will Baptists* were more or less numerous in every one of the New England States; they were also found in Western New York, and in several of the Western States. In doctrine they were Armenian, as a Body. On the Union of these two denominations no compromise of cherished doctrines was required or conceded on either side; and both parties agreed that the names *Free* and *Free-will Baptist* should be at the choice of each member and church and exchangeable at pleasure. And thus without the slightest change of name or sentiments, the two denominations became one, and for sixteen years have lived as such in harmony.

From the London Patriot.

#### THE SANTALS.

"The Santal insurrection appears to be at an end. A large body of them are reported to have made an offer of submission. The Bombay correspondent of the *Times*, indeed, writes, under the date of Oct. 3, that the insurrection had not been so completely put down as seemed probable when he wrote last. The Grand Trunk road, however, is clear; and the deprecations of the insurgents are confined within very narrow limits. The adoption of decisive measures is anticipated, as soon as the weather becomes sufficiently dry to enable our troops to enter the jungles.

All the accounts that have hitherto appeared, of the origin, the extent, and the suppression of the insurrections, are so vague, extravagant, and even contradictory, that little reliance can be placed upon them. What appeared to be the best authenticated account of its actual leaders and true character, has already appeared in our columns; and we have nothing further to add upon that point. But we have now to call attention to the remarkable fact, that, among the same wild tribe, whose very name was unknown to the British public till this outbreak brought them into notice, the "American Free Baptist Mission" has for twenty years sustained an evangelical laborer, who has mastered their peculiar language, and commenced a translation of the Holy Scriptures. The stations of this mission are Balasore and Jelasore, in Orissa. Mr. Phillips, the missionary at the latter station, had labored there for twenty years, when, in February last, he left India for the United States, in pursuit of health. Besides preaching to the heathen, up to the time of his leaving for India, he had prepared and printed a Santal grammar and vocabulary of the language, the Gospel of Matthew, and some tracts. He had also, at the end of March last, finished a translation of the Gospel of Luke, of the book of Genesis, and of twenty chapters of Exodus. The report further states that these labors among the Santals of Orissa must be suspended till Mr. Phillips' return, as he is the only missionary acquainted with the language. Mr. Covil, however, was engaged in acquiring a knowledge of Oriya and Bengali, previously to their attempting to acquire

the Santal. The number of native Christians at the Jelasore station was thirty-one; and a native preacher was ordained in December last.

Thus, in Orissa, as in Burmah and other parts of our Indian Empire, Evangelists sent forth by the United States are going before and beyond our own missions, in making known to the outlying tribes of heathendom, in their own language, the words of Eternal Life. To these devoted Christian pioneers, our obligations are great, even in a political respect. They are supplying our lack of service, in fields which our missions had either not entered upon, or been compelled to abandon. It is the same case with the American missions in the Turkish dominions. These missions are preparing the way for the most beneficial political results, and they ought to be an additional bond of amity and fraternal alliance between the two nations."

#### LETTER TO THE EDITOR OF THE PATRIOT.

Sir:—In your Journal of November the 5th, credit is given to the "American Free Baptist Mission" for sustaining missions at Jelasore and Orissa. As, however, the above Society have no missions at either of the above places, I beg leave to correct the statement, and point out the features which distinguish this Society from the American Baptist Free-will Mission which sustains Mr. Phillips as missionary at Jelasore. This mission is the work of the Free-will Baptist denomination, which numbers 49,215 members and 823 ministers. Like the Methodists, it has a connectional form of government and an Arminian creed. Like the "Friends," it refuses membership to slaveholders, and like the Independents, it has but few members in the slave States. In regard to the slavery question, it does not fall under the strong censure which you so justly pronounce against those churches which connive at the fearful system. Hostility to slavery is its general characteristic, though some of its members are pro-slavery.

Its weekly organ, the *Morning Star*, has obtained marked success in diffusing the principles of an anti-slavery religion, thus presenting the noble, but, in America, the somewhat singular spectacle of a religious newspaper declaring it to be sinful to hold property in man. Many of the ministers and members have received a portion of the contumely which has been so unsparingly measured out to the abolitionists. Permit me to cite two instances. In the State of New Hampshire, where democracy is the name for a blind submission to partisan leaders, the Legislature refused a charter to the Free-will Baptist Book Concern, because it was hostile to slavery. Finally, however, in consequence of the able advocacy of John H. Hale, the Free Soil Senator, the charter was secured to the friends of the slave.

In Ohio, also, one of the educational societies of the denomination labored for some time under similar embarrassments, its hostility to slavery having provoked the hostility of the pro-slavery Legislature of that State.

The slaveholders, fearing the influence of the principles and members of this body, determined to employ the usual appliances to render it an auxiliary to the slave power. At one of its general meetings a slaveholder presented himself and desired admission as a member, expressing great interest in their prosperity, and stating that there were hundreds at the South who also desired to unite with them. They inquired, "Do you hold any slaves?" "Yes," he replied, "I have a few." "Will you," said they, "emancipate them?" "I would gladly do so," he responded, "but really I could not feel justified in

doing so, because they cannot take care of themselves." "Well," said they, "we will relieve you of your fears, we will give you a bond that we will take care of them, if you will set them free." "Gentlemen," said he, "I think I shall decline uniting with you." So he returned to his slaveholding brethren, a wiser but not a better man.

I am, sir, yours most respectfully,  
EDWARD MATHEWS.

#### NOTES TO THE ABOVE.

The foregoing letter of Bro. Mathews to the *Patriot* written to correct the *Patriot's* errors, is more in error itself.

The denomination of which Bro. Phillips was a member, were called Free Baptists, and are now so called in New York, and many parts of the west— When they united with the Free-will Baptists it was understood that they should retain their own name if they chose. The term Free-will, and Free Baptist is understood to mean the same people by those at all familiar with our denominational history. Some Y. M.'s, Q. M.'s and churches are reported as Free Baptists, while the majority add the—will. The communications of Bro. Phillips from Orissa have uniformly spoken of the churches, and mission as "Free Baptist," and none but the most inattentive have failed to understand that he referred to the same churches and mission that some of the other missionaries call Free-will Baptist. It is much more natural for even those ignorant of our history to understand "Free Baptist Mission" to refer to our denomination, rather than to the "Baptist Free Mission." There is quite a difference between "Free Baptist" and "Free Mission."

In another portion of his article Mr. Mathews indicates that by a "connectional form of government," he means some form of episcopacy. This is wholly a mistake. The Free Baptist churches are as absolutely independent in government as the Associate Baptist. Our plan of association differs from other Baptists, but there is no power in any of the associate bodies to meddle with the discipline, or government of the churches. The "connectional form" has none of the episcopal elements about it, and there is no power of appeal in cases of discipline from the church to any superior power ecclesiastical.—G. H. B.

From the *Missionary Herald*.

#### THE KARENS OF BURMAH.

We have been favoured, by the kindness of Mr. Marshman, with a paper on the Karens, drawn up and sent to him by Mr. Kincaid, of Prome. The greater part of it we insert below, and it will be read with more than usual interest on account of the extraordinary facts which it discloses. Our American brethren in Burmah are neighbours to us in the east. From Chittagong, some of our missionaries can almost shake hands with them. United with us in unity of doctrine and practice, intelligence of their success will be read with the same feelings as intelligence of our own. No apology, therefore, can be needed for the introduction of extracts from Mr. Kincaid's paper.

The first intimation of the Karen race in the annals of Europe is found in the travels of Marco Polo in the fourteenth century. In describing the races in the northern provinces of Burmah, he mentions the Karens as one of the most numerous; and in speaking of the country still farther north, he calls it the country of the Karens. I had an opportunity of

verifying the correctness of Marco Polo's information in 1837, during a trip up the Irrawaddy. After getting 200 miles north of the royal city, I found the interior of the country everywhere inhabited by Karens. Some Karen villages that I visited contained from thirty to eighty families, and invariably each village occupied but one house, built like barracks for soldiers, and sufficient in length to contain all the families. They had large herds of cattle for agricultural purposes. Colouring, weaving, and blacksmithing are brought to a very good degree of perfection. As far as opportunity offered, I inquired about the Karens, but could obtain but little more than that they regarded themselves the first and most extensive of all the races in the world. For the last 200 years, Europeans have been visiting this coast, and trading in all the ports along the Martaban Gulf, and for nearly the same length of time Jesuit missionaries have been in Burmah, and yet there was no intimation that such a race as the Karens inhabited the interior in such vast numbers; living remote from cities, and keeping at a distance from all the great rivers, and avoiding intercourse with strangers, they have been unnoticed. They are found in all the retired districts, and in mountain ranges, along the eastern shore of the Martaban Gulf, and still east of the mountains in Siam, and then to the north along the Salween river, and all its tributary waters, as far as they have been explored. The Sittang valley, situated between the Salween and Irrawaddy, is known to be inhabited by vast numbers of this people, and everywhere through the rich Delta of the Irrawaddy, even to the North of Prome, they form a large part of the agricultural population.

The conversion of one Karen to the Christian faith, about twenty-five years ago, awakened no interest, and induced no inquiry in reference to the peculiarities and extent of this race, but when *Ko tha byu*, prompted by the impulses of his faith in the Gospel of Christ, went amongst his countrymen and gained a goodly number to receive the *glad tidings*, the existence of such a people was first made known to the friends of Missions. Little, however, was known of their numbers, and for years they were regarded as a mere fragment of an almost extinct race. Without letters, without religion, having neither temples nor priests, they were despised by the Burmans. During the first five years after they became known, very little was done for them. It was found that they had in oral songs, some of the most singularly interesting traditions, relating to the creation of the world, the origin of the human race, the apostasy of man, the loss of Divine knowledge, and promises in reference to their future enlightenment. All these scattered rays of light are in harmony with the Mosaic record reaching back to the infancy of the human family.

When America was inhabited only by savages, and our ancestors in Britain and Germany were dwelling in the rudest tents, and clothed with the skins of beasts, and, in dark forests of oak, practicing the most cruel and revolting forms of heathenism, the Karens stood firm in the *great truth* of one eternal God, the creator of all things, and the only rightful object of adoration. From age to age, they chanted songs of praise to Jehovah, and looked, as their songs directed, towards the setting sun, from whence white men were to come with the *good book* and teach them the worship of the living God. Bhuddhism claiming to embody all science and literature, and all that pertains to the physical and moral worlds; propounding a system of morals admirably suited to carry the understanding, while it fosters the pride and arrogance and selfishness so deeply seated in humanity; reaching back in its revelations through illimitable

ages, and obscurely depicting other worlds and systems, and gods rising and passing away forever; surrounding itself with pagodas and shrines, and temples and priests, as imposing as pagan Rome, and a ritual as gorgeous as Rome papal,—has failed to gain an ascendancy over the Karen race. Arbitrary power, surrounded by imperial pomp and splendour, has neither awed nor seduced them from their simple faith. The preservation of this widely scattered people from the degrading heathenism, which darkens every part of this vast continent is a great and unfathomable mystery of God's providence. They have seen the proudest monuments of heathenism rise around them; they have seen dynasties rise and fall, age after age; and yet their faith has never failed them. Twenty-five years ago, the great fact was proclaimed on the mountains of Tavoy, by one of their own race, that the *white man* had come and brought them God's Book. *Ko tha byu*, the Karen apostle, did not preach in vain; some thirty followed him to the city, and there saw the tall, pale, emaciated form of Boardman. He opened God's Book, and expounded to them the things concerning Christ and his kingdom. In no long time they became the disciples of Christ; and when they were baptized, the dying Boardman, reclining on the margin of the stream, exclaimed, as he saw them rising from the baptismal waters, "Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, for mine eyes have seen thy salvation." Boardman died.

In 1832 and '33, an alphabet was adopted, and one or two small tracts written. In a short time, a few had learned to read in their own language the wonderful works of God. In 1836, a press was established in Tavoy, under the direction of Mr. Bennett. Messrs. Wade and Mason gave a large portion of their time to Karen work. Small portions of the Scriptures were translated, and books and tracts written, and schools established coeval with the preaching of the Gospel. The press, along with the preacher and translator, were incessantly at work. In 1835, Mr. Vinton commenced his labours in the Moulmein province, and as early as 1837 had travelled extensively in the Rangoon and Pegu provinces. Mr. Howard was the pioneer in Bassein, when the Gospel was first made known to the Karens in that region. Mr. Abbott and Mr. Brayton were in Karen work in 1837. Several years then passed before any new labourers entered the field, and there were no schools in existence beyond the mere *act* of teaching pupils to read, except as the few missionaries, in the depth of the rains, could give scraps of time to teaching amidst a multiplicity of labours. Early in 1844, Mr. Binney came out for the express purpose of giving to the rising ministry among the Karens a thorough biblical training. Few men ever entered upon a more important work—few ever had to contend with greater difficulties—and no one, perhaps, ever addressed himself more wisely or successfully to the great work he had in hand. He had to deal with untrained minds, and had few books to place in their hands, and even the art of reading was imperfectly known. The work, however, went forward, and a goodly number were so trained as to preach with great fullness, and expound the Scriptures with ability. The churches, as well as the pastors, began to feel the importance of education—a thirst for knowledge was awakened.—Mr. Binney took broad views of the wants and necessities of the Karen race, and projected a school, in which a select number of both sexes should be so trained as to become educators among their own people. The Karen missionaries warmly sympathized with him in his views, and hence arose the Karen Normal School in Moulmein. It was at first limited to thirty, and ultimately to fifty pupils, and was



taught by the ladies of the mission. To this school the churches and the ministry looked with the fondest hopes. The more enlightened and thoughtful among them had begun to inquire, "Why may we not have men raised up from among ourselves who shall be qualified to take the place of our teachers?"

Since the fall of Rangoon, in April, 1852, the long pent-up fires in the Karen heart have burst forth.—The last gun from the ships of war had not been fired on *Sway da gong*, when a deputation of three Karens was hanging about the outskirts of the town, ready, as soon as the Burman army had fled, to rush in and find the teacher. They did rush in, and, amidst wide ruins and amidst ten thousand foreigners, sought for the teacher and found him. Why this urgency? The churches had sent them, and, night and day, followed them with their prayers. Among their first inquiries was, "Will teacher Vinton come now?"—They returned; and in three days more forty Karens came in. They said, "All are praying for their teachers, and also praying for the English." They had even taught their little children to pray that the teachers might come. Heathen Karens had joined them in this prayer. Such faith moves mountains from their base. Though the waves of anarchy were rolling over them, and the sword and famine wasting their numbers, there was hope in God, and earnest longing for the coming of Christ's kingdom. "Let us arise and build," was the cry and the prayer of this long oppressed and enslaved, but now emancipated, people. The records of every month, from the 1st of May, 1852, up to the present time, are enough to awaken songs of praise to the God of missions, in the bosom of the most slumbering church. Within this time about 4,000 have received the Gospel, so as to give evidence that their faith rests not in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God; and not less than two thirds of this number have been gathered in districts where Christ was unknown before. This is not all, multitudes in other districts where only a feeble sound had reached them, are asking to be taught the worship of God. It is beautiful to see a great people rising up from long ages of ignorance and degradation, to see them pressing forward to the attainment of moral truth. This has been the case with the Karens from the day when the glad tidings of redemption were first announced to them on the mountains of Tavoy. During the last three years, the indications of rapid reform bear a striking analogy to the early days of Christianity, when province after province, in rapid succession, turned away from their lying vanities and gave heed to the word of God. All the older churches, to the number of about one hundred, have built themselves chapels, and the larger half of these support their own pastors and their own village schools. Many of the pastors and school teachers are poorly qualified for their work. This is felt and deeply deplored by themselves and the churches.—And this is not all; churches are rising in new localities, and no one to teach them to read God's Book. Hundreds and thousands are asking to be taught how to read the good book, and there are no men qualified to go among them!

Had we a few such men now, they could go among the thousands north of *Toung-oo*, in the provinces of *Moona* and *Legore*, and still north along the Salween to the borders of China. They could go a little north of Ava, and in all the upper provinces, amidst thousands, tens of thousands; or proclaim the blessed Gospel and plant churches in all those vast regions bordering upon China and Thibet. There is nothing visionary in this, nothing impracticable; and the providence and promises of God are urging us to un-

dertake this great and glorious work. We must have a school in which men can be trained to read and reason, to speak and write. This is one of the necessities of the Karen race; there can be no solid progress without it. An enlightened ministry and a well-qualified class of instructors are needed to carry forward and perfect the great work now begun. In a few years this school will subsist and grow without foreign aid. Even now the churches will support forty or fifty well-qualified assistants to go into as many districts to preach Christ, and teach the people to read the Holy Scriptures, and probably the same number will be needed every succeeding year, to supply new fields so rapidly opening on every side.—Evangelists, pastors, and school-teachers are needed, and they can only be qualified for their work by such a school as we propose. Can this work be longer delayed? Can we shut our eyes to the obvious indications of Divine providence in reference to this great people; Can we satisfy ourselves that we are acting up to the *letter* and the *spirit* of the great commission, when we preach the Gospel and baptize those who believe, and then have no men to set over them as pastors, and so leave them on the confines of heathenism, untaught in the things of the kingdom? Are we not bound "to set in order the things that are wanting?"—"to ordain elders in every church?" But where can pastors be obtained among a people without letters? Before they can teach they must be taught; they must learn to read, and have some Biblical knowledge. The conversion of souls is our great work, but not our only work. Baptized believers must be instructed in the "all things" which Christ commanded. The first must be done, and the other must not be left undone. The expense of training one hundred Karens will not much exceed the expense of two mission families for the same time. Allow an average of four years for such students, and we have a body of men qualified to labour as evangelists, and a goodly number of these will be more efficient by far than the average of missionaries, and in some respects will be in advance of the best missionaries that have ever entered the fields.

A question has been raised in reference to the singleness of purpose and steadfastness of well-educated Karens—"Will not a thorough training furnish a strong temptation to leave the ministry for government service?" The past history of the Karen ministry furnishes no evidence against them, but, on the contrary, every page of their history gives evidence of a pure, noble, self-sacrificing spirit. The temptations to wealth and honour, and high position have been resisted by not a few of the Karen preachers. Salaries varying from forty to one hundred rupees a month have been within their reach, and yet not one of them has been seduced by the dazzling prize. From six to twelve rupees a month is the salary of a Karen preacher, whether paid by the mission or the church when he labours. Can we have stronger evidence of earnest views and loftiness of purpose? Conscientiousness and deep religious feeling have ever been prominent traits in the Karen Christian churches. Where shall we look in the history of modern Christianity for fairer, brighter examples of faith and steadfastness? It is marvellous that a people so numerous, so remarkable in their past history, and in their rapid evangelization, so steadfast in Christian principle, and so earnest in winning their benighted fellow-men to the knowledge of Christ, should awaken so little interest among the friends of missions. Some *twelve thousand* church members, and a Christian population little short of a hundred thousand, gathered within twenty years after an alphabet was formed, and yet not one school in existence where a

few of the rising ministry can obtain that mental discipline and that sound Biblical training which alone can fit them to become "able ministers of the New Testament." We appeal to all thoughtful, serious Christians, is it not tempting God to leave this people without a native ministry? Unlettered men or men only able to read, with difficulty, cannot feed the flock of God. Neither can they go forth among the dark and superstitious masses, and explain intelligibly the way of life through Christ. Let all who read this paper ponder well the subject. The moral and mental regeneration of a great and widely extended people is a work compared with which all other achievements sink into littleness.

#### "I HAVE LIVED TOO FAST."

Such was the exclamation of the young man Caldwell, who was convicted of embezzling money while acting as a Conductor on the Burlington Railroad, when he was arrested and told that he had been detected. There are volumes in that sentence, and it reveals the secret of his fall. He is a man of fine address, was one of the most popular of Conductors, had once a good character and good habits and was readily trusted, and had occupied positions of considerable responsibility. But he indulged his appetites and passions too freely, he was extravagant, associated with worthless and dissipated companions, and if he did not gamble, was compelled to exceed his income in his expenditure, to preserve appearances and to defray his share of the expenses of the company he kept; and, alas! in an evil hour, to meet these drafts upon his purse, he ventured on the experiment of appropriating to himself a portion of the funds of the company which were entrusted to him, and as the result was discovered, arrested, tried, convicted and sentenced to the penitentiary. Disgrace and ruin followed hard upon his sin. His case is but another illustration of the text of Scripture, "The way of transgressors is hard."

Alluding to the phrase we have quoted, the eloquent counsel for the prosecution, in his concluding plea, said to the Jury:

"Ah, gentlemen, the pivot on which all this sad drama turns is condensed into that single expression, '*I have lived too fast!*' Pregnant words! they should fall from this Court Room like a tocsin, on the giddy whirl of young men below: the multitude that has watched, with varied emotions, but all with intense interest, the progress of this trial, should carry it forth and spread it in the saloons and in all the popular resorts of youth, *I have lived too fast!* It is the most forcible, as it is the most graphic expression of the unhealthy life that characterizes—I shall be allowed to say—a multitude of young men in this beautiful city. In no town in the world do the centres of allurements and temptation bear such a proportion to the population. Extravagance in dress, extravagance in living, dangerous extravagance everywhere, is apparent to the observer, nor need that observer wear Puritanaical glasses to see what I allude to. Perhaps it is the inseparable incident of the marvelous growth of this great city; and that when things become settled, and the more conservative institutions of society become established, their superior moral force will cause all other elements and tendencies to revolve around the true central influences of society."

Will not young men take warning from this melancholy case, and avoid the rock on which Caldwell made shipwreck? They should realize that character is worth more than money, and that pleasures purchased at the sacrifice of morals and honor, are

bought too dear. Let those who would escape the danger of dishonesty, avoid saloons and gambling-houses, and the company of those whose ways take hold on hell. Let clerks and others who are entrusted with money, never yield for a moment to the temptation to fraud; for one dishonest act paves the way for another, and no one, who takes the first step, knows where his career will end; what disgrace and suffering he will bring on himself, and what anguish he will cause to friends who are deeply interested in his welfare. "He," and he only, "who walketh uprightly, walketh surely." The dangers of a city life for young men are appalling; but he who acknowledges God in all his ways will find the promise fulfilled, that He will direct his paths.—*Congregational Herald—Chicago.*

#### CONVERSIONS IN IRELAND.

From a Speech of Archbishop Whately.

At a provincial meeting in England on behalf of the Society for protecting the Rights of Conscience in Ireland, Archbishop Whately bore a very distinct and valuable testimony to the reality of the religious changes going forward there, and to the persecutions which the converts have to endure:—

"The best friends of the Protestant cause were those who had been lately burning Bibles. Those Bible-burners were proclaiming what he had long known and believed—that the Scriptures were contrary to the principles of the Church of Rome. He would not welcome converts with open arms till he had examined their professions with the utmost caution. He had been assured that the large conversions from Romanism which had lately occurred, were the result of the distributing of food to the converts during the famine. From inquiries made, his grace considered that he was authorised in concluding that relief during the famine was afforded by those almost on the verge of famine themselves, the Protestant clergy and the Protestant gentry, to the poor of all denominations, and without imposing any conditions. He could not but suppose that this indiscriminate, impartial charity would have the effect of removing prejudices formerly entertained, and cherished by interested parties, against Protestants by the poor Roman Catholics. From that or other causes—partly, no doubt, from the wide diffusion of education—a great movement had been commenced among the Roman Catholics of Ireland. Although it might savour of egotism, yet he would state that he had taken a step which had been blessed with considerable success, in removing one of the great obstacles to the fair hearing of the Gospel truth.—This proceeding required all the ministers whom he instituted to livings containing an Irish-speaking population, to be able to speak the native language. If that system had been adopted from the time of the Reformation's first establishment, Ireland would have contained very little Romanism at this day.—Archbishop Whately then referred to the fierce persecution which Irish Protestant converts suffered, such as having their crops destroyed, being refused the purchase of the necessaries of life, and the unmerciful treatment which they met with in the work-house; and afterwards recommended the society as a machinery calculated to stop the evil. As an example of the usefulness of the society, he said, that in one district in Ireland, where Romanists threatened to give no work to those laborers who had abjured the Papal errors, the Protestant clergyman informed the employers, that he would seek the aid of this Association to provide employment for those who

had been in this way deprived of their daily bread; when the employers, seeing that it would not do to lose their best laborers, relinquished the persecution."

#### UNHONORED HEROES.

When I see a man holding faster his uprightness in proportion as it is assailed; fortifying his religious trust in proportion as Providence is obscure; hoping in the ultimate triumphs of virtue more surely in proportion to its present afflictions; cherishing philanthropy amidst the discouraging experience of men's unkindness and unthankfulness; extending to others a sympathy which his own sufferings need, but cannot obtain; growing milder and gentler amidst what tends to exasperate and harden; and, through inward principle, converting the very incitements to evil into the occasions of a meritorious virtue; I see an explanation, and a noble explanation, of the present state. I see a good produced, so transcendent in its nature as to justify all the evil and suffering under which it grows up. I should think the formation of a few such minds worth all the apparatus of the present world. I should say that this earth, with its continents and oceans, its seasons and harvests, and its successive generations, was a work worthy of God, even were it to accomplish no other end than the training and manifestations of the illustrious characters which are scattered through history. And when I consider how small a portion of human virtue is recorded by history, how superior in dignity, as well as in number, are the unnoticed, unhonored saints and heroes of domestic and humble life, I see a light thrown over the present state which more than reconciles me to all its evils.—*Channing.*

From the Morning Star.

#### CONTRADICTIONS OF UNIVERSALISM.

It is an axiom that whatever affirms and denies the same thing, cannot be true. This is equally true of a principle or a system. It appears to me that Universalism is a fallacy under this rule. Look at some of the contradictions of this system:

1. It affirms that man is a sinner in admitting he needs salvation. It denies that he is a sinner; for it denies that he is a moral agent; he being necessitated in all his actions. No man is a sinner, without free-will and free-agency; therefore man, if he needs to be saved, is a free moral agent.

2. Universalism affirms and denies the vicarious suffering of Christ. It affirms that Christ suffered the full claim of the law against every transgressor; or that he paid the debt due the law from the sinner, who will be saved without condition on his part required. It denies it when it asserts that men themselves suffer for their sins in this world, and that this is their retribution, or as some say, they suffer a limited time in another world, and then, being purified by the fires of hell, ascend to heaven. It affirms and denies the infinite love of God.

3. It affirms it, in saying that God will unconditionally save all men. It denies it, when it asserts that He has decreed the acts of every man, and all that results from them; and is, therefore, the author of all the misery of man in this present world. A very unsafe precedent, I think, from which to infer the unconditional happiness of all men in another world.

4. They affirm and deny the doctrine of retribution. They affirm it when they say that the sinner suffers for his sins every day; and that the judgment is in this world, and not in the future. They deny it in making man irresponsible, and therefore not a creature of judgment.

The absurdity of Universalism must therefore appear self-evident to every candid mind; still there are multitudes that embrace it, doubtless, to bolster themselves up in sin, and quiet the reproaches of a guilty conscience; and, as might be expected, little else than evil is the result. J. D.

From the Morning Star.

#### WHAT DO MINISTERS PREACH FOR?

[Concluded from page 243.]

SCENE. Discussion in one of the aristocratic circles in New York city: abridged from a work recently issued, entitled, "Which; the Right or the Left?"

Mr. Griscom. Do you mean to say that all our clergymen are faithful?

Mr. Leland. As a body, yes; in every individual case, no; here and there a false one, like an occasional traitor in an army; but the instances are rare—rarer than you dream; and so rare, that even you, sir, upon a candid examination of the subject, would be amazed at the exceeding smallness of their number.

G. If that be so, why don't they accomplish more good?

L. They do accomplish great good; more than you think.

G. I'd like to see the evidence of it.

L. The evidence is all around us, sir. In the advancement of men in general uprightness; in the markedly improved tone of our country and the age; in the rapid march of morality in literature,—which has of late years turned a complete somerset, the better now taking the lead of harmful books, which formerly swept the field; in the public Press—which, with rare exceptions, are on the side of Truth and Right—few or no journals gaining ground in circulation save those whose columns bear witness of the progressive spirit of their conductors; in Legislation, which no longer laughs with impunity at the moral measures demanded by the moral voice of the people; in Politics, whose day for obtaining vast majorities, by pandering to the mere passions of the multitude, is over—those politicians only ascending high in the atmosphere of public sentiment and support, who are enlisted, professedly, at least, under the elevating banner of reform; in society, which is no longer openly arrayed on the side of vice—the card-table having disappeared from the drawing-room, the rum-bottle from the side-board, slang, infidelity, impure song, and ribald music, from social gatherings—those only finding admission into refined circles who display at least an appearance of religiousness, those openly against religion being excluded, and confined to intercourse with their own kind. These are the broad results of the labors of that noble army of energetic, self-sacrificing men, whom you so ungenerously reproach!

G. Self-sacrificing! Let me see; Mr. Engold obtains four thousand a year and the perquisites; Mr. Gadsden four thousand a year and the perquisites; Mr. Fenton four thousand a year and the perquisites. Very self-sacrificing—indeed!

L. A single word, sir, and let it be a frank one as you are a gentleman! You are a merchant, that is to say, a business man with a fair yearly income which is derived wholly from your commercial knowledge and labors. You earn over four thousand per annum—do you not?

G. I should hope so, Mr. Leland. [Mr. G., it was well known, had an establishment which netted him from twenty to thirty thousand a year.]

L. You will not deny that the clergyman just named are your equals in intelligence?

G. Of course not.

*Le.* You will admit that their respective changes in trade would be as favourable, at least, as your own?

*G.* Certainly.

*Le.* That with their mental abilities, they could clear from ten to twelve thousand a year?

*G.* I admit that too, sir.

*Le.* And yet you think there is no self-renunciation in these men when they voluntarily relinquish all hope of fortune, and take up a profession whose highest earthly reward is scarcely equal to one-third of what they might earn in commerce.

[Mr. G. looked down thoughtfully.]

*Le.* Mere, sir. A merchant can garner up some portion of his income. But what can a clergyman save? You expect him to live in a style corresponding with his position as the pastor of a wealthy congregation. To have influence with them he must live so. How far will his paltry income enable him to do that and accumulate anything? What, then, remains to him after five, ten or twenty years of labor—his position not permitting him to husband aught while in service? *Poverty!*

[Mr. G. was dumb.]

*Le.* Let us not be uncharitable. Where one clergyman of high talents, learning, and piety receives four thousand per annum, a thousand others, equally as devoted, learned, talented, and pious, do not obtain eight hundred. Nay, the average income of clergymen throughout the Union is but a fraction over three hundred dollars. Why, sir, our poorest laborers are paid better than they? And yet you brand them, in effect, as mere fortune hunters? What would you say, if I should tell you that large numbers of clergymen are compelled to preach and earn their living, in other ways, into the bargain!

*G.* A rare case I apprehend.

*Le.* On the contrary, sir, it is the case with thousands! Look you, Mr. Griscom. While a small proportion of that noble profession receive a thousand dollars per year, the generality of them scarcely obtain a bare living. A clergyman's ability to pay for a suit of clothes without feeling it for months afterwards is the exception—the reverse the rule. After a long life of faithful service, that one is fortunate who can leave behind him enough of his own savings—let him have pinched ever so hard—to pay for his own funeral. And yet you impugn the motives of men who devote the best twenty, thirty or forty years of their lives to the great cause of their Redeemer! Mr. Griscom I blush for you!

*G.* Nay, Mr. Leland, you are too hasty. I was not aware of all this.

*Le.* And yet you—a business man!—have formed and expressed an unflattering opinion upon the highest of all humane professions, without making the slightest examination of its details; have borne oracular testimony against it and its members; have vilified it and them, without knowing so much of either as the merest tyro in the world's affairs could tell you in half an hour!

*G.* I yield, I yield, Mr. Leland, and thank you for the lesson which you have read me. There is my hand, sir; and I give you my word as a man and a gentleman, that I have uttered my last slander against the pulpit.

*Le.* O sir, you make me happy to hear that. For of all the toilers along life's pathway, none more deserve our confidence, our respect, and our affection, than the workman of the cross; for they come to us as no others come—in our Redeemer's name; they labor as none others labor—fighting the battles of their Master as never fought soldiers in any lesser cause. Their work, to save men, not destroy them;

to bring them happiness, not woe; content, whether carrying the Message to the civilized hordes of cities, to the untutored red men of the American forest, the savages of Patagonia, the bushmen of New Zealand, the mountaineers in the frosty Caucasus, the wild idolators of Eastern India, or the dark sons of burning Africa, with the simplest pittance, struggling manfully and bravely for men and their Redeemer, all the way—and when they come to lay them down at last, thank God, with grateful hearts, for kindly having permitted them to do battle a few years for their dear Prince, and to die with their harness on in his service!

*G.* Enough, sir, I see my error and freely acknowledge it. Had I been aware of those facts before, I should have avoided many very silly blunders. Meanwhile, Mr. Leland, set me down among your friends.

*Le.* All men who are friends to my Prince, are friends to me.

### WHAT WOULD I BE?

BY W. H. C. HOSMER.

What would I be? Not rich in gold,  
And with a narrow heart,  
Or mi-anthropic, stern and cold,  
I dwell from my kind apart;  
I would not be a man of war,  
Who look on death unmoved.  
Give me a life's dearer far:  
"The well-beloved!"

I would not wear a laurel crown,  
Its leaves conceal the thorn;  
Too oft the children of renown,  
Are friendless and forlorn.  
O let me lead a blameless life,  
By young and old approved;  
Called, in a world of sin and strife,  
"The well-beloved!"

God grant me power to guard the weak,  
And sorrow's moaning—hush,  
And never feel upon my cheek  
Dark shame's betraying blush;  
And when, at my Creator's call,  
From earth I am removed,  
Let friend-ship "bolder on my pall,  
"The well-beloved!"

### PROFANE SWEARING.

When Sir Christopher Wren was building St. Paul's cathedral, he caused the following notice to be affixed to several parts of the structure:—Whereas among labourers and others that ungodly custom of swearing is too frequently found, to the dishonour of God and contempt of his authority; and to the end that such impiety may be utterly banished from these walks, which are intended for the service of God and the honour of religion, it is ordered that profane swearing shall be sufficient crime to dismiss any labourer who comes to the call; and the clerk of the works, upon sufficient proof, shall dismiss him accordingly; and that if any master, working by task, shall not, upon admonition, reform the profanation among his apprentices, servants, and labourers, it shall be construed his fault, and he shall be censured by the commissioners.

### BEAUTIFUL SAYINGS OF A DYING MAN.

The late Professor Caldwell, of Dickinson College, a short time before his death, addressed his wife as follows: You will not, I am sure, lie down upon your bed and weep when I am gone. You will not mourn for me, when God has been so good to me. And when you visit the spot where I lie, do not choose a sad and mournful time: do not go in the shades of the evening, or in the dark night. These are no times to visit the grave of a Christian: but go in the bright sunshine, when the birds are singing."

## Vices and Doings of Individuals.

For the Gospel Tribune

### THOUGHTS OF THE MIDNIGHT HOUR.

A POEM, BY THE FOREST HARD.

To W. . . . L. . . . Esq.

Most respectfully inscribed as a token of friendship and devoted affection.

(Concluded from page 246.)

Not so the good man who reveres his Lord,  
Religion leads him with her silver cord;  
A cause he finds for every thing he sees,  
The creature-God, and God the creature please.  
No chilling doubt his quiet conscience draws,  
He knows all's God-made, yet seeks not His cause;  
He seeks a heaven, devoid of doubt or fear,  
Where virtue's vot'ries crowns of glory wear;  
And when his summon's calls from earth away,  
He feels no fears, no trembling to obey;  
His soul is conscious of no coward fear,  
And trembles not death's signal trump to hear.  
Firm in integrity his soul is found,  
And smiles to hear death's signal trumpet sound:  
He knows in heaven his Advocate will prove,  
A Christ of pity, and a Christ of love;  
A God of mercy, knows he'll meet in heaven,  
Repented, past, unwitting sins forgiven;  
This why impatient is he to away,  
This why he chafes his humble bonds of clay,  
He feels impatient of his thraldom here,  
And heaven's last trump is music in his ear;  
His eager soul, fain, fain would soar away,  
To tread the confines of eternal day:  
In heaven's bright court he fain would take his seat  
Where kindred spirits he is sure to meet;  
Too long, he thinks, his flight has been delayed,  
He thinks too long through life's rough paths he's stray'd;  
He waits death's passports, which he gladly greets,  
Then goes to tread Jerusalem's golden streets—  
God's praise to sing upon a sweet-toned lyre,  
In concert rich with the celestial choir;  
No humbling power attracts him still to earth,  
No plodding scheme he labours to give birth,  
Tho' standing on that brink where we may find  
Eternity's dread ocean roll behind:  
Her waves in gentlest murmurs lave his feet,  
No scowling tempest on its breast he'll meet;  
The mists of doubt and unbelief dispel,  
And faith's bright beacon on his view shall swell;  
Truth's lighthouse gleams where Christians oft resort,  
And guides his vessel to her destined port;  
The rocks and shoals of unbelief are pass'd,  
And death's bleak headlands come the worst, and last;  
But his tight vessel o'er the bar hath stood,  
And gained the bay, rides o'er a tranquil flood;  
No towering wave he fears will now o'erwhelm,  
He knows he's safe—religion's at the helm.  
Though in eternity's deep ocean should  
Oblivious rivers disembogue their flood,  
To sink beneath their waves he has no fears.  
For fame shall name him to succeeding years;  
To after ages shall his name descend,  
Bright in the mem'ry of a faithful friend,  
He whom RELIGION did by wisdom guide,  
In heaven will find her still his bosom's bride;  
This earth to lose, counts not the good man loss,  
To him are riches, equipages, dross;  
The friends he leaves, he gives an embrace sweet,  
Assured in heaven, the loved ones he will meet;  
Where each employ'd join with a sweet accord,  
As min'string angels on a gracious Lord,  
Oh! 'tis a glorious aim for heav'n to live,

For such a home life's toilsome years to give;  
The babes we cherish'd, and the long lov'd wife,  
All are transplanted from this land of strife—  
All met in heav'n, where faith her anthem sings,  
All happy subjects of the King of kings;  
No painful change, no chilling grief or woe,  
But blessings glorious which from glory flow;  
In vain the human eye would contemplate  
The radiant glories of this heavenly state.  
Vain is the mocking luxury of art,  
The fading splendor of a canker'd heart,  
Or regal grandeur, which a throne may wear,  
With heaven's least tithes of glory can't compare;  
The sweetest hymns that to earth's sons belong,  
Or softest notes of instrumental song;  
May not compare, tho' joy each oft inspires  
With the rich strains which thrill from angels lyres.  
Nor yet is this a fading changing scene,  
That time might tell of what it once hath been;  
Oh, no! the pride of art may fast decay,  
And earthly splendour, too, may fade away;  
Proud architectures crumble into dust,  
Or grandeur waste before devouring rust;  
The moth may, not o'er some gorgeo scene,  
The worm may sport where beauty once hath been,  
And e'en satiety may weary grow,  
For newness wish, or sigh for change of show;  
And riot stall'd, at last the feast refuse,  
Though still perplex'd what new-born vice to choose,  
And pleasure loathe, aye, loathe e'en to decay,  
The scenes once loved, but long since pass'd away:  
But 'tis not so with those bright heavenly joys,  
Which time ne'er surfeits, nor which years destroys;  
All heaven's joys are sure, they are not few,  
Tho' ages formed, yet still are ever new;  
Those eyes may weary that earth's pageant sees,  
Here still behold some newborn scene to please;  
Still some new scenes before our optics roll,  
The mind to cheer, and to delight the soul;  
Scene joined to scene of grand magnificence,  
Outvies earth's splendour or its vast expense;  
The Omnicient's throne, whose pearly robes enfold  
Resplendent pillars of the purest gold,  
There milk and honey from each stream distils,  
And flow'rs with fragrance every arcade fills;  
Each breath that blows o'er the celestial plain  
Seems clothed in music of the softest strain;  
A balmy odour o'er the landscape moves,  
That is distilling from ten thousand groves;  
Transparent fruits, rich, clust'ring, woo to eat,  
Bright dropping gems lie limped at the feet;  
A resting couch invites the weary there,  
Which Ganges' eyenet down could not compare;  
These are unbought by those by whom unpriced,  
But are the blessings of the heirs with Christ;  
Nor these alone vain would my pen essay  
The Christian's rest, the Christian's home pourtray;  
The scene surpasses far the creatures thought  
That science gives us, or that earth has taught;  
One moment there repays for years of pain,  
Makes earth no loss, but, heav'n acquired, a gain.  
But where's this heaven which Christians so much prize?  
Is it located in yon azure skies?  
No. Where then? where? in yon bright orb of gold  
Where glittering epics the morning's birth unfold?  
Is it yon bright, yon silver lamp of night  
That gilds the landscape with her mellow light?  
Is it those gems yon azure vault that deck,  
Like living pearls the broad expanse that speck?  
No: none of these are heaven—they too must waste;  
When earth consumes they too shall be displaced;  
When final judgment its dire mandate hurls,  
They too must perish in the wreck of worlds.  
Is it where lightnings flash, or thunders growl?  
Whence tempests spring, or where the whirlwinds howl?

No! these can but his majesty record,  
Whose pow'r they own as universal Lord.  
Then where is heaven? must echo answer where?  
Where God and Christ is—there 'tis—Heaven there;  
Where endless day, where endless beauty reigns;  
And purchas'd pilgrims swell a Saviour's trains;  
Where angels' hymns their great Creator laud,  
In loud hosannas to the Son of God;  
Where endless life to all the guests is given,  
This is the place where Christians make their heav'n.  
Then why refuse this home, thou weary soul,  
That's hust'ning forward to destruction's goal?  
Say, what's the charm that earth holds forth to thee,  
That you dislike so from her courts to flee?  
Hast thou sought treasure? hast thou gather'd gold?  
Or dost thou fame within thine arms enfold?  
Hast thou built castles in thy pride of heart?  
Hast thou rear'd fabrics to display thy art?  
Doth pleasure court thee with her syren voice,  
Or was ambition thy unbiassed choice?  
Wast thou by vice with phantoms led astray;  
Or didst thou yield to vanity's display?  
Has Moloch been thy god, or at his shrine  
Hast thou paid honours, human or divine?  
At folly's altar didst thou sacrifice,  
Or woo false pleasure in the courts of vice?  
Say, hast thou been by vanity betrayed,  
Or sought you fortune that deceitful jade?  
Hast thou seen Time, that fleet-foot monarch pass,  
Or pour the sand from his eternal glass?  
Or dost thou see with what untiring speed,  
With his long scythe he mows the human mead?  
Aged porter at the charnel house of death,  
How oft he warns us ere he stops our breath;  
But, ah! how little is his chide revered,  
How oft his warnings are by man unheard?  
First, on bright beauty his chill breath he blows,  
She pines, and dies, like summer's fading rose,  
Next on full manhood's wanly blooming face,  
His warning wrinkles, legibly we trace,  
More full maturity his warning shares,  
His frost breath whitens on old age's hairs,  
Sure type is this to tell the life earned name,  
A crown of honor or a brand of shame;  
Pain and infirmity their pinions wave,  
He bends, he stoops, he totters round the grave.  
Yet fain he'd wait, tho' frailty marks his way,  
He seeks a staff his trembling limbs to stay,  
And full as feeble as when life began,  
He now beholds the waning years of man;  
Yet how tenacious will he grasp at life,  
And battle death in the momentous strife;  
All pleasures fled, all joys to which he clung,  
Yet now he cries—death—still! oh still! I'm young;  
I still must live, I've many things to do,  
My will to make all my affairs to view;  
My soul to save, my peace with God to make,  
My debts to pay, my friends' farewell to take;  
But death replies, this hour must be thy last,  
God's edict's seal'd, the changeless fiat's pass'd;  
Thou the dark slumber in the tomb must sleep,  
Corruption's worms for thee a vigil keep;  
Thou sought'st not heav'n, while life for thee was star'd,  
But now thou seek'st when at my frown afraid;  
Its purchase (slighted whilst thou'lt store of breath)  
Would not be valued in the hour of death;  
That heav'n neglected, ere death interposed,  
Is lost forever, and forever closed;  
And less the loss, if from eternity,  
Thou man who lost it wast forever free;  
Or that a haven g'en oblivion gave  
To save thy soul from torment's burning wave;  
Oh, wretch! thou victim of thy passions' lust,

Well, as thy body, had thy soul been dust;  
Each vice that lured thee to its yawning hell,  
With fiendish laughter sounds thy sinking knell;  
Those lusts whose puppets thou at first was made,  
Now spurn the victim that they have betray'd;  
Where's now those visions thy blind fancy raised,  
Those phantom pleasures that too long thou prais'd;  
Where's folly now, ambition, pride, or vice?  
False pleasure? wealth? all vanish'd in a trice;  
Or, if not vanish'd, on life's brink they brood,  
To mock thy misery on death's gloomy flood;  
And now too late, thou thinkest and would tell,  
They're but the demons of an earthly hell;  
The source whence springs each blight, each curse of life,  
Revenge, pride, envy, wrath, deceit, and strife;  
They are the Alpha where our woes begin,  
For they are agents in the courts of sin;  
Imperceptibly their pow'r o'er man is gain'd,  
Till he awakes a victim by them chain'd;  
Awak'd, perhaps not till it be too late,  
And death's shrill voice has told the wretches' fate;  
Awak'd not, tho' truth's warning voice he hears,  
Till hell's loud shrieks are ringing in his ears;  
But, oh! too late, his blinded senses tell  
The dreadful depth to which his soul has fell;  
Now fell despair her tort'ring rack would stretch,  
To pour more misery on the writhing wretch;  
And, too, remorse would heap the measure up,  
With misery swell the overflowing cup;  
And retrospection all her wrongs will urge,  
And conscience lash him with her fiery scourge;  
Oh! for some place where he might now retreat,  
Where horror's frown he would not fear to meet;  
Where fell despair her robes would lay aside,  
Where he'd escape the sneering taunts of pride;  
For him no more will dawn the smiling day,  
No more for him will cheerful sunbeams play;  
No more for him eve's fanning breeze shall blow,  
No more for him the crystal waters flow;  
Each breath in horror, now he thinks he hears  
A demon's voice loud ringing in his ears;  
And since mortality has claimed her debt,  
His star of hope is now forever set;—  
But cast a veil o'er this distressful scene,  
'Tis painful o'er the grave of vice to lean;  
Not so with virtue, for around her tomb  
Remembrance hovers like a sweet perfume;  
Thought may transport us to youth's by-gone day,  
Then hope and mirth make childhood's moments gay;  
It may remind us of some friend beloved,  
Whom pale death's summons long ago removed;  
Or one recall, whom we may say, forsooth,  
Was cheerful comrade on the sports of youth;  
Or should our partner of each joy and woe,  
On death's damp breast be pillow'd cold and low,  
And oh! should man to sorrow be exposed,  
Beside her tomb in whom his hopes reposed;  
Yet still if virtue holds the sable pall,  
He blushes not their memories to recall;  
Whom she entombs he need not blush indeed,  
The motto on their modest slab to read;  
Pomp here shall tell not what was once their pride,  
Nor splendour strive their weaknesses to hide;  
No gold shall glitter round their humble bed,  
To change to *saint* the *sinner*, until dead:  
Tho' labor'd lines the hypocrite may *paint*,  
Tell after years he lived a very saint;  
Not such, shall to posterity disclose,  
The grave where christians' sacred bones repose,  
But one short line to all his tomb shall serve,  
His deeds, his mem'ry, and his name preserve;  
Sacred to virtue, and religion too,  
This humble stone a christian's grave doth show;  
And should rude strangers read, and dare to laugh,

They'll find rebuke in this short epitaph,  
 Impiety, where folly's from her torn,  
 Shall reverence virtue, she affects to scorn,  
 With awe her name to all her train she'll tell,  
 Nor dare upon her weaknesses to dwell;  
 Sweet is the name the good man leaves behind,  
 'Tis heaven's breath, with sweetest incense twined,  
 Oh, then religion, guide me in the way,  
 Till I to thee and virtue homage pay;  
 Oh condescend, my mistress to be,  
 Till heav'n bestows the dazzling noon on me.

For the Gospel Tribune.

A LETTER TO THE REV. WILLIAM FRASER  
 IN REPLY TO HIS REMARKS ON COMMUNION IN THE  
 "CHRISTIAN MESSENGER."

Dear Brother,—I have just received your late communication in the *Christian Messenger*, on the Communion question; from which I learn that your mind, like my own, has been a good deal exercised on that contested subject; and also, that our cogitations have terminated in very different conclusions respecting it. I propose here briefly to inform you wherein I differ from you.

"For the last thirty years" (you say) your "mind has been exercised most carefully on the subject". It is therefore reasonable to expect you to exhibit a thorough acquaintance with it. Permit me, however, to say, "I think you sadly misapprehend the very question at issue. This, it appears to me, is manifest from your choice of an aphorism wherewith to head your article: viz. "true Christian unity is practicable in a visible diversity." Assuredly, brother, this maxim is altogether in favour of open, or Christian communion; the amount of which is that true Christians may, and ought to unite in those religious exercises and observances about which they are agreed; while they forbear with one another as to those in regard to which they differ. This is "unity in visible diversity"; it is surely therefore unsuitable as a heading to an article the object of which is to demonstrate the impracticability of open communion. It surely gives no countenance to the close principle. the amount of which is that it is unlawful for Baptists to commune with Christians who hold not the same views on baptism with themselves. I am aware you will say you are favourable to the most intimate communion with genuine Christians, even those who differ from you on baptism *except in the church*. To this I would merely express my firm conviction that you can shew no better warrant for communion with them *out of the church* than we can shew for it *in the church*. Your choice of a maxim, then, only shews that you really misapprehend the question at issue.

I now proceed to notice your declaration, which you call "the conclusion of all your investigations, viz,—*let alone the theory, mixed communion, as understood by Baptists, is an impracticability.*"

In proceeding to demonstrate the impracticability of mixed communion, you refer to certain Missionary Societies whose leading men had framed rules to enable them to pursue their holy course above the influence

of party feeling.—these you say, have all failed on that point,—that is, they have broken their own rules, and have irresistibly fallen under the influence of party feeling, and become sectarian institutions;—and you wind up your argument by saying,—*no wonder then that the difficulty is so great where we believe the rules to be of divine authority.*" Here your argument seems to be, that as those societies have become sectarian whose rules to prevent it were merely of human framing, much more may it be expected that Christian churches, whose rules to prevent falling under the influence of party feeling are of *Divine authority* will still more certainly succumb to that baneful influence, and become sectarian. I cannot see the cogency of this as an argument that open communion is impracticable. We do firmly believe that the rules given the church to prevent falling under the influence of party feeling and sectarianism, are of divine authority, and that it would be a great wonder if human rules proved to be more efficient than divine. Surely you do not mean to say that the rules to which you refer as of divine authority, bind the church to cherish party feeling and sectarianism: for you evidently admit these to be of a pernicious character when you say, "Our Bible and Tract Societies have a great deal to do to save themselves from utter extinction from their influence." Yet, Brother, I confess I cannot view close communion but as a system assuming that there are rules in the New Testament enforcing the rankest sectarianism. I will not say I can demonstrate that this is its character; though to me it appears very obvious.

You adduce three instances which in your estimation demonstrate the impracticability of open communion. But suppose three instance might be such as to decide it, the three you adduce in my view fall far short of deciding it: and suppose that in your three instances open communion were admitted to be as complete a failure as you suppose, yet if it could be clearly shewn that in three times three instances it had been found to be perfectly practicable, your three instances would of course go for nothing. But I must not lose sight of your qualifying clause, viz: "as understood by Baptists." If you had said *Close* Baptists, the assertion might be admitted to be true, or it is but too evident that many of them at least labour under sad misapprehension as to what open communion really is. If you, brother, had had clear conceptions of it you would not have adduced the three instances you have adduced to demonstrate it to be a failure. You are aware that the gospel professes to be a system fitted to renovate and save the world,—what would you think then, of the logician who should pretend to demonstrate that the gospel is a failure, having in three instances failed to renovate and save where the experiment had been tried?

You are certainly wrong when you say, "it matters not whether the impracticability is from the theory or from the spirit of the age." Suppose one should point to three instances wherein the gospel

had failed to convert sinners to whom it had been faithfully preached, and say 'it matters not whether the failure is from the gospel, or from the depravity and wickedness of those who rejected it,—the result is the same; a fact is a fact, &c.'" Does it not matter whether the blame be charged on the right or the wrong subject? You say the fact that open communion is impracticable can hardly be denied. Be assured, brother, it is positively denied, and the contrary affirmed, viz., that open communion has been demonstrated to be practicable in more than *three times ten instances*. An instance in your own experience, to which you refer, is surely not to be viewed as any decided evidence that open communion is a failure. Having been only a few months "pastor of an open communion church, you "baptized," you say, "all the Pedobaptist party, and then shut the door." What was their number you do not say; but the phraseology implies there were several. Let me ask, brother, are you sure you would have been equally successful with the same individuals had they not happened to be in the church on the open principle; or if you had dealt with them on the close principle, that is, excluded them till they should do their duty? I think it is very questionable. It may be, some of them, or even all of them, had they not been admitted to the church on the open principle, would have remained to this day Pedobaptist. But you "baptized them all and then shut the door"; and it may almost be inferred from the context that you were at the same time "half way" open. You shut the door. Then sure enough, you had unity as far as baptism was concerned, but where was your "visible diversity"? You shut the door. It may be there were no Pedobaptists without worthy, or wishing to come in, but suppose there had been standing without, suing for admittance, some standing as high in the favour of their Lord as yourself, or any within, or even higher,—and you aware that such was the fact.—This is possible:—but for my part, were it not that I know it has been done, I should think it impossible to find one possessed of a moderate share of Christian modesty that could shut the door against certain Pedobaptists that could be named, and then boast of the deed. A voice from heaven would be necessary as a warrant; and that would be barely satisfactory; as it would necessarily have somewhat the appearance of being contradictory of the voice eighteen centuries ago enjoined "what God hath cleansed that call not thou common."

I now proceed to notice your three "notable instances adduced to illustrate and demonstrate the impracticability of the open theory:—The first is Bunyan and his church. It is somewhat remarkable, that Bunyan's is the only open church that is instanced as having become Pedobaptist, but so it is, as far as my information goes; and it is urged as evidence that the open theory cannot be acted upon but with the great risk of Baptist churches becoming Pedobaptist. It appears to me, however, this case

can be accounted for without attributing the least influence to open communion. Bunyan was highly popular in the best sense; he was followed by crowds; and very many of them were converted: and there is no doubt that he laboured harder to convince them of their sins, than to persuade them to submit to immersion. He was successful in gathering a numerous church on the open principle; and there is no doubt that a great proportion of the members, whether baptized or not, were genuine converts. It is not improbable that a majority of the church gathered by Bunyan remained Pedobaptists; and if so, though he himself was a Baptist, his church could not be properly so designated. On Bunyan's death, the church chose a Pedobaptist pastor, from which it may be inferred that the majority was then Pedobaptist: but this proves nothing against the practicability of the open theory; for all that appears, it continued to be acted on under the Pedobaptist pastor; for it is not alledged that he made Pedobaptists of all the Baptist party "and then shut the door"; and how can it be proved that its operation was not upon the whole more for the glory of God and the good of souls than the operation of close communion would have been in the circumstances? And how can it be proved that a single convert would have submitted to be immersed that was not immersed, though Bunyan had acted on the close principle? I think, brother, I may appeal to yourself if it be not probable that, had Bunyan shut the door as you did, many converts, who became members of his church, and were edified by his ministry, would have remained without, and might have, in consequence, fallen back to the world. What you mean by the insinuation that baptism *was put half way to the door*, unless, perhaps, that the ordinance was treated by the church with only half that regard that it claims;—admitting there was ground for the allegation, it is not so bad as it would be to treat an ordinance of Christ of still greater importance with total disregard; and we hold the injunction, "Him that is weak in the faith receive ye", to be a positive ordinance of Jesus Christ; and that ordinance is by close communion *put to the back of the door*, or to the outside entirely.

Your second notable instance is that of the celebrated Hall and his church: after passing a glowing eulogy on whom, you refer to the singularly divided state of his church,—that being such that it was necessary to administer the Supper to one division in the morning, and to the other in the evening. This it must be confessed was a rather singular mode of proceeding; but where was the blame? Surely, brother, you cannot but see if there was blame, it must be charged solely to the close communion theory. The Pedobaptists and open brethren would have cheerfully sat at the same table with the close, but the close would not sup with them! And this demonstrates the impracticability of the open theory!—Instead of that, it demonstrates it to be practicable; and that too in peculiarly adverse circumstances;



and if it demonstrates anything else, it is *the impracticability of overcoming close communion prejudices*. "All Hall could do (you say) was to crowd together a singularly divided church—a church separate at the Lord's table, [that was owing to close communion] but forming one body in every thing else": that was owing to open communion; and which is the more meritorious? Open communion united the Pedobaptists and open Baptists into one body in every thing, except of course in baptism; and it formed the whole, close Baptists and all, into one body in every thing except at the Table of the Lord. This shows that there was a singularity about the close Baptists in Mr. Hall's church, else they would not have suffered Pedobaptists to be members of the same church; many close Baptists holding baptism to be "the only door of admission into the church of Christ", do not, of course, view Pedobaptists as in the church.

Your third notable instance is that of Dr. Innes, the Haldanes and their churches. After eulogizing these worthies very highly, you state that "by their instrumentality thousands were converted to God", and "in the midst of these gracious movements these illustrious men adopted Baptist views, "and what will be thought peculiarly natural, (you say) they practised the open principle." Here I would observe, if what they did was peculiarly natural, it would have been peculiarly unnatural to have acted otherwise in their circumstances; but I ask, brother, does the word or ordinances of God lead to a course of conduct which can with any propriety be termed *unnatural*? Verily I think not. You say "for a short time during the excitement the open principle was made to work." That is, while the minds of the people were deeply impressed with the importance of eternal realities, they could love and forbear with one another, and for all that appears, the open principle worked well. You proceed to say "but the Pedobaptist party never could get above their Pedobaptist notions, and consequently the church melted down"; and thus you lay the blame on the open principles that the Pedobaptists never could get above their Pedobaptist notions; perhaps though close communion had been adopted *that* would not have helped them above their notions; but merely excluded them. This, Brother, is mere misconception; you assume that as open communion failed in certain instances to raise the Pedobaptists above their Pedobaptist notions, it is therefore demonstrated to be impracticable. This is passing strange from one who professes to have carefully studied the subject for thirty years, "and read with deep interest Hall" and others. If incontestible instances can be adduced wherein Baptists and Pedobaptists have walked in peace and love in the same church, these are just so many proofs that the open principle is practicable. When the Pedobaptists get above their Pedobaptist notions, the open theory, as far as they are concerned, is not needed. Be assured, Brother, to open the door of the church,—to admit a few Pedobaptists,—bap-

tize them, *and then shut the door*, as you did, is not open communion. You remark farther, "The above three specimens may satisfy any man that the present age will not work out the mixed plan, whatever may be said of the theory, and whatever may be done by ages to come, when less prejudice and more light shall prevail."

To me this appears tantamount to saying, "the open principle may be right, and the time may come when it will be practicable, and practised among Christians in general; but that cannot be in the present age, because of the prevalence of prejudice and ignorance"!

If the open theory be right it is our duty *now* to use our utmost endeavour to dispel the darkness which is the cause of the prejudice which is the sole hinderance to its prevalence.

We do not say, brother, as you assume that we do, that it would have been the duty of the Baptists in the days of Cranmer, to commune with him while he felt towards them as he did; nor do we say that Richard Baxter and John Bunyan ought to have been put at the same communion table while Baxter was in that state of mind that led him to say "that burning was too good for John and his people": but it was the duty of both Cranmer and Baxter to inform themselves better as to the character and claims of the Baptists, and thus get rid of their prejudice and ignorance.

"The very worst church state (you say) is a body huddled together to bite and devour one another." Here, again, is gross misconception, for who ever contended that a Church should not separate, whose members were in the state supposed. It is quite possible that any church, whether open or close, may get into such a state; but the sooner they separate the better, if due efforts for adjustment have been tried in vain; but separation ought to be the *dernier* resort.

You say, "Should I see on my death-bed that my own family could not agree together, my dying advice to them would be to build each a shanty for himself, &c." This advice, as a last resort, might be very good; but there is a previous duty incumbent on a parent, viz.: to use all possible means to bring about a reconciliation by urging, as motives, the unseemliness and baneful consequences of strife in a family, solemnly assuring them that if they kept up their feuds and animosities, they sinned against the Lord; and that even though they should each build a shanty for himself, their sin would certainly find them out.

Again, you say, "Have all the visible unity possible." Brother, let me assure you *this is all we contend for*: and believing as we do, that union at the table of the Lord is quite possible, we contend for unity there between those agreed about that ordinance, though differing about other things; and why should it be supposed impossible for Christians, recognizing each other as such, to live in love and peace in the same church, observing those ordinances about which

they are agreed, and forbearing one another in love in regard to those about which they differ, observing sacredly the divine injunction, "Let every one be fully persuaded in his own mind." Nothing but sectarian prejudice could urge a reason.

You exhort all men, especially ministers, to lend their aid to secure unity in diversity—the *unity of the spirit of love*." Should one acquainted with the controversy happen to read this, and several other similar passages, without reading the rest of your article, he would necessarily suppose it to be a defence of open communion. As a proof of this, I quote two or three sentences from brother Gilmour's preface to a pamphlet, which he lately republished, advocating the open theory. You say, "A visible union is most desirable, but hardly possible amongst imperfect beings." Br. Gilmour says, "However desirable unanimity of sentiment and practice is, it has hitherto fallen to the lot of very limited groups of even the followers of Christ." Your heading declares, "True Christian unity is practicable in a visible diversity." This does appear to me to clash with the sentence already quoted. But, passing that, I observe, Christian unity in diversity is declared in your maxim to be practicable, and you repeatedly exhort all Christian men to strive to secure it; but you do not tell us whether the Head of the Church has made provision for the securing or preservation of this unity. Brother Gilmour furnishes this all important information. He says, "He that knew the end from the beginning provided for the preservation of the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace amidst the diversity which would obtain." And in answer to the question,— "What is that principle, the energetic operation of which will preserve unity of spirit amidst diversity?" he observed, "We hesitate not to say, it is forbearance, Christian forbearance, forbearance in love." And again he says, "The law of Christian forbearance is that which Christ has given for the purpose of preserving harmony of spirit amidst the diversity which prevails." Here then is the principle that will infallibly secure the great desideratum; but, alas! brother, Close Communion leaves no room for its operation. You therefore rightly conclude that "a visible union, though most desirable, is hardly possible;" you might have said *perfectly impossible*. You say "It was lost on the death of the apostles, and without a return of inspiration you do not see how it can possibly be restored." It is then a hopeless case with you, for unless we adopt the Mormon or Irvingite theory, we can hardly expect a renewal of inspiration. Indeed we Baptists in general profess to believe that inspiration is no more needed, holding the inspired code, which we already have, to be all-sufficient for our direction. Unless, then, we attain this desideratum by the operation of Christian forbearance, we may set it down as impossible of attainment; and it is vain for us to call on either Christian men or ministers to lend their aid to secure it. The truth

is, close communion has nothing whatever to do with *unity in diversity*. "Christian unity in visible diversity is practicable," you say; but how and where? Not in the church by the exercise of forbearance. Such unity is ignored by close communion. But though you carefully keep Pedobaptists out of the church, yet you will "love them truly and tenderly," and you will manifest this love by "saluting them in the street;" "by paying kindly visits." And you will even go so far as to invite them to assist you at the formation of churches, and employ them in leading the devotions on such solemn occasions, and in exhorting the members of the newly-formed church to their duties. One would think those who may lawfully go thus far, might lawfully go a step farther, and even have the privilege of sitting down at the table of the Lord with the church whose devotions they have been leading, and whom they have been exhorting to their duties in their new capacity. Is it indeed possible that there are to be found intelligent Christians who are really persuaded that Pedobaptists may be allowed to go just so far, but no farther? Yes, it cannot be denied. I will say, however, it will be impossible to believe this when the age shall have arrived when, as you say, "less prejudice and more light shall prevail." I feel constrained to say, brother, you speak very incoherently about *unity* or *union*; it is difficult to ascertain the precise meaning you attach to these terms, and it would indeed be impossible to comprehend your meaning, were we not assisted by your known practice. Your aphorism speaks of "*Christian unity being practicable in a visible diversity*." If we inquire where, you do not tell us; but we know from your practice it cannot be in the church; for there you contend for *unity without diversity*; it can only be outside the church, then, that your true *Christian unity in diversity is practicable*. Again, you speak of "*a visible union being desirable, but hardly possible*." Are we to understand that this *visible union* is the same as the *Christian unity* in your aphorism? No; by the one you evidently mean a *unity in the church*, and by the other a *unity out of the church*.

*Visible union in the church* is in your view desirable, but hardly possible. Yet it is that for which close communion contends. Open communion is satisfied with a *visible union amidst prevailing diversity*. "Rivers of blood," you say, "have been shed for the *visible unity*." Well, that is precisely what the close theory demands; that is what it will have at whatever cost. To shed blood for it is now out of the question; but the theory has the blood of thousands in its skirts. If does not now say, you must be burned, or imprisoned, or fined, if you dare to think differently from the church; but if you dare to do so, rejection or exclusion must be your portion; you must be *shut out*. Open communion, on the other hand, though it views unanimity of sentiment to be desirable, yet believing it to be hardly possible in

this imperfect state, and "convinced," as brother Gilmore says, "that the law of Christian forbearance is that which Christ has given for the purpose of preserving harmony of spirit amidst the diversity which prevails, can attain all the visible unity necessary without fire or fagot, rejection or exclusion." We deny that the pursuit of the unity for which we contend, ever shed a single drop of human blood.

Finally, dear brother, instead of "demonstrating clearly" the impracticability of the open theory, you have sadly failed to show that it was impracticable even in the three instances which you adduce as demonstrative proof. In Bunyan's Church it was practiced during his life-time, and for aught that appears, long after his death, and if it was ever abandoned, how can it be proved that close communion intolerance was not the sole-cause of it? In Hall's Church it was, as you allow, practicable, and practised, and that, too, in very unfavourable circumstances; it was indeed in spite of close communion intolerance. In the Churches of Jones' and the Haldanes' you admit it was practiced "in the midst of the gracious movements, in which the people were converted to God by thousands." This speaks volumes, and says open communion is quite practicable while the minds of Christians are deeply impressed with divine and eternal realities; but when Christians begin to leave their first love—when the love of many waxes cold—it may then become impracticable; for then Christians begin to judge and set at naught their brethren; one will say to another, brother, it is time for you to be getting above these Pedobaptist notions; and, unless you do, I cannot commune with you; you or I must leave the Church. This, brother, or something like this, may have been the cause why Mrs. Haldane was the only Pedobaptist in Haldane's Church; but the question still remains, were the others excluded by close communion intolerance; or were they all baptised as in your own case? or did they retire of their own accord? and if so, why? Possibly some of them may have seen clearly enough they were viewed with suspicion and treated with coldness by their Baptist brethren on account of their Pedobaptist "notions," and they rightly concluded it was better to separate. Shall we say whether this was from the theory of open communion, or from the spirit indulged by the Baptist brethren, it matters not, the result was the same. Nay, brother, it is of great consequence to know which was to blame. If the open theory was the cause of the separation, let it bear the blame; but, if the intolerant spirit of the Baptists, let the blame be charged to that, and let open communion be exculpated.

For the Gospel Tribune.

#### EXCLUSIVENESS AND FORBEARANCE.

"2 Thes. iii. 6. Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly,

and not after the tradition which he received of us. .... 14. And if any man obey not our word by this epistle, note that man and have no company with him that he may be ashamed.—15. Yet count him not as an enemy, but admonish him as a brother."

To be zealously affected always in a good thing is an apostolic injunction of great importance. But seeing that even good men are ever liable to run into extremes, not only from the imperfection of their knowledge, but also from defects of mind and temperament, it is highly necessary that all should be constantly on the watch, and ever fervent in prayer, if they would appear under all circumstances to be controlled by the spirit of love and guided by a sound or judicious mind.

The passages of Scripture quoted at the head of these observations, are often urged in justification of two extremes in church polity.

*First*, that a misapprehension of the law of Christ, in relation to one ordinance of the Church, disqualifies the individual Christian for celebrating the other ordinance in fellowship with his brethren.

*Second*. That so long as a particular Church entertains the faintest hope of the genuineness of the Christian character of a member, that Church must continue him a member of their body, however disorderly he may be in his walk or deportment.

Having called attention to these extremes—their cause and supposed scriptural basis—I wait for the comments of others.

Q. Q., PICKERING.

#### REMARKS.

In relation to the *first* of these extremes little need here be said, as common sense would seem to teach very clearly, that all who regard each other as genuine Christians, should make manifest their Christian unity, by acting in concert and fellowship in every instance in which diversity of opinion does not render it impossible. It being difficult to conceive of anything more preposterous and unreasonable, than for them to repel each other, where their agreement and unanimity is complete, because they differ in judgment as to the manner in which something else should be done.

Concerning the *second* extreme mentioned, all should know that no one has a right to claim the privileges and immunities of Christian fellowship, save such as furnish ample and satisfactory proof to the brethren "that God has received" them. An AMPLE and SATISFACTORY amount of this evidence God demands of every one who names the name of Christ. The world demands the same; and the Church that ACCEPTS of less from its members, is recreant to its trusts—as it thereby dishonours God and the holy religion of Jesus, and does great violence to the common sense of mankind. The Lord of glory has declared it necessary to blot out the existence of the Church that abandons its first love—

the lukewarm, he says, he will spew out of his mouth. This should convince every church of the necessity of rejecting from its bosom the "lukewarm" who have left their first love, unless they repent and do their first works. If such leaven is allowed to remain, it will leaven the whole Church, and subject it to the removal of its candlestick. The evidences of an active living Christian faith, should be demanded by every Church of all its members, and that in continuance. The withholding of such evidence by any member, demands the immediate action of the Church, which should labour in the spirit of meekness to restore such an one; if not successful therein it should reject him, for "the destruction of the flesh" that has eclipsed his Christian character, that his spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord, through the faithfulness of the Church, in not allowing him to sleep in their midst, while in a state that would subject the Church itself to be pronounced "lukewarm," and fit only to be cast out as a thing to be loathed and utterly rejected. Eternity will reveal the immense injury Churches have entailed upon themselves, and upon the Christian name, by tolerating the membership of individuals, the evidences of whose genuine piety, instead of commanding the belief and confidence of the brethren as it should—falls so far short of it as, in reality, not even to warrant such a belief at all—being barely sufficient to enable charity to indulge a faint hope, that the apparently dead member is, perhaps, not really dead but lukewarm and asleep. If nothing else will awaken such sleepers, let them be rejected by the Church on the authority of Christ's declaration, who says he will reject them. But, alas! this faithfulness on the part of the Church is seldom witnessed. The many divisions of the Church rendering it almost necessary that each should retain all the members it has, even the spiritually lukewarm and asleep, as they often very materially increase the numerical and monied strength of the body, and are generally the most loud and the most earnest in giving utterance and adhesion to party peculiarities.

The conductor of the *Gospel Tribune* took an active part in securing the union of all the liberally constituted Baptist churches in the United States; and having seen nothing to induce him to regret the part he then acted, he must be expected to coöperate with all who would promote a similar work in Canada; and hence the following letter is received; as indicating a move in the right direction.

#### LETTER ON UNION.

To the Editor of the *Gospel Tribune* :—

Sir,—At a quarterly meeting of the Free Baptist Delegates from their respective churches, held in the Township of Townsend on the 9th inst., the principles and aims of the *Canada Baptist Union* were brought fully before them by one of the brethren, and discus-

sed at considerable length. The subscriber, being present, endeavoured to give what light he possessed on the subject; when the following resolutions were passed with only one dissenting voice :—

1. *Resolved*, That in the opinion of this meeting, the principles of Christian Union as held by the C. B. U., are such as should characterize all evangelical Christian Associations.

2. *Resolved*, That we recommend the churches represented at this quarterly meeting to consider the propriety of connecting themselves with the C. B. U.

Yours, &c.

A. MILLER.

Woodstock.

#### THE HOUSEHOLD "GOOD NIGHT."

"Good night?" A loud, clear voice from the stairs said that it was Tommy's. "Dood night!" murmurs a little something from the trundle-bed—a little something that we call Jenny, that filled a large place in the centre of one or two pretty large hearts. "Good night!" lisps a little fellow in a plaid rifle dress, who was named Willie about six years ago.

"Now I lay me down to sleep  
I pray the Lord my soul to keep;  
If I should die before I w-a-k-e"—

and the small bundle in the trundle-bed has dropped off to sleep, but the broken prayer may go up sooner than many long petitions that set out a great while before it.

And so it was "good night" all around the homestead; and very sweet music it made, too, in the twilight, and very pleasant melody it makes now, as we think of it, for it was not yesterday, nor the day before, but a long time ago—so long that Tommy is Thomas Somebody, Esq., and has forgotten that he ever was a boy, and wore what the bravest and richest of us can never wear but once—the first pair of boots.

And so it was good night all around the house; and the children had gone through the ivory gate, always left a little ajar for them—through into the land of dreams.

TIME AND ETERNITY.—Time, like a river, carries all things away with a rapid course; they swim above the stream for a while, but are quickly swallowed up, and seen no more. The very monuments men raise to perpetuate their names, consume and moulder away themselves, and proclaim their own mortality, as well as testify that of others. But now, on the other side, the enjoyments above and the treasures proposed to us by our Saviour, are indefeasible in their nature and endless in their duration. They are still full, fresh, and entire, like the stars and orbs above, which shine with the same undiminished lustre, and move with the same unwearied motion with which they did from the first date of their creation. Nay, the joys of heaven will abide when these lights of heaven will be put out, and when sun & moon, and nature itself, shall be discharged their stations, and be employed by Providence no more. The righteous shall then appear in their glory, and being fixed in the Divine presence, enjoy one perpetual and everlasting day—a day commensurate to the unlimited eternity of God himself, the great Sun of Righteousness, who is always rising and never sets.—*Dr. South.*

## Political and General Miscellany.

LETTER OF FRANCIS P. BLAIR, ESQ.

TO THE REPUBLICAN ASSOCIATION OF WASHINGTON.

SILVER SPRINGS, (Md.) Dec. 1, 1855.

GENTLEMEN: Having relinquished political employment, and, to avoid encountering again its anxieties, addicted myself to country life, I am constrained to decline your invitation to join the Republican Association of Washington City, although tempted by the honor of becoming its presiding officer. Yet I feel it my duty to say, that in the main, I concur in the aims of the Association. To exclude slavery from the Territories of the United States, and to rebuke the violation of the Compromises, which were made to stand as covenants between the Slave and Free States to effect that exclusion, are, in my opinion, the most important movements which have engaged the public mind since the Revolution.

The extension of slavery over the new territories would prove fatal to their prosperity; but the greatest calamity to be apprehended from it is the destruction of the Confederacy, on which the welfare of the whole country reposes. Every conquest of this element of discord, which has so often threatened the dissolution of the Union, increases the danger. Every surrender of the Free States invites invasion.

The cause which your organization is intended to promote may well draw to its support men of all parties. Differences on questions of policy, of constitutional construction, of modes of administration, may well be merged, to unite men who believe that nothing but concert of action on the part of those who would arrest the spread of slavery, can resist the power of the combination now embodied to make it embrace the Continent from ocean to ocean.

The repealing clause in the Kansas Bill is predicted on the nullity of the clause in the Constitution which gives Congress the power to make regulations respecting the Territories of the United States. Yet nothing is clearer in the history of our Government than that this phrase, giving power to congress 'to make regulations respecting the Territories,' was meant to give it the power to exclude slavery from them.

Mr. Jefferson's resolution of 1785, declaring that 'there shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in any of the States laid off in the Western Territory, was subsequently renewed in the Congress of 1785, which added, that 'this regulation shall be an article of compact'; and it was so voted unanimously by the delegates of eight States out of twelve.

It was passed by the unanimous votes of all the States by the Congress of 1787, which sat contemporaneously with the Convention forming the Constitution, and that Constitution gave Congress the power 'to make regulations respecting the Territories,' and, moreover, affirmed the validity of 'the engagements entered into before the adoption of the Constitution' by the Confederation—one of which engagements was that made by the regulation excluding slavery from the Territories. Thus the Congress of the Confederation and the Convention framing the Constitution united in giving a double sanction to the exclusion.

The first exerted the power of enacting Mr. Jefferson's interdict of slavery in the Territories then held by the United States, to which it had previously given an impressive sanction by adding, 'this regulation shall be an article of compact,' &c.; and the Convention guaranteed this 'engagement,' entered into

under the Confederation, by declaring it 'void,' and employed the same terms, 'regulation of the Territories,' to transmit the power here exerted to future Congresses. In the face of this history, and the letter of the Constitution granting the power to make whatever regulations it deemed fit respecting the Territories of the United States, the authors of the Kansas and Nebraska bill deny the constitutionality of the regulations which exclude slavery from the Territories, and set at nought all the precedents that confirm them, which have followed in uninterrupted succession, from the foundation of the government.

The other clause in the Constitution, empowering Congress to pass laws to prevent the 'migration or importation' of slaves after 1808, shows the fixed purpose of the founders of our Union to limit the increase of this evil. The consequence was an inhibition, which prevents a South Carolina planter, who has slaves in Cuba, from bringing them to his home plantation; and to remove this obstruction to the increase of slavery within the Union, and open Africa to supply the demand made by the new act, the Northern nullifiers are already called on by their Southern allies to lend their aid; and certainly those who embrace Mr. Calhoun's doctrine, as stated by Mr. Douglass, that 'every citizen has an inalienable right to move into any of the Territories with his property, of whatever kind or description,' the Constitution and Compromises notwithstanding, can hardly refuse it. It was on the annexation of the Mexican Territories that Mr. Calhoun asserted this principle, to unsettle the fixed policy of the nation, beginning with the era of the Declaration of Independence; and he applied it alike to the Compromises of 1820 and 1850. Mr. Douglas thus sums up the position taken, and the result:—

'Under this section, as in the case of the Mexican law in New Mexico and Utah, it is a disputed point whether slavery is prohibited in the Nebraska country by valid enactment. The decision of this question involves the constitutional power of Congress to pass laws prescribing and regulating the domestic institutions of the various Territories of the Union. In the opinion of those eminent statesmen who hold that Congress is invested with no rightful authority to legislate upon the subject of slavery in the Territories, the eighth section of the act preparatory to the admission of Missouri is null and void, while the prevailing sentiment in a large portion of the Union sustains the doctrine that the Constitution of the United States secures to every citizen an inalienable right to move into any of the Territories with his property, of whatever kind or description, and to hold and enjoy the same under the sanction of law. Your Committee do not feel themselves called upon to enter into discussion of these controverted questions. They involve the same grave issues which produced the agitation, the sectional strife, and the fearful struggle of 1850.

From this it appears that the Compromises of 1820 and 1850 involved the question of the validity of the law of Mexico excluding slavery from the newly-ceded Mexican Territory, and the law of our own Congress excluding it from that north of the line of 36 deg. 30'. Mr. Douglas's Committee Report recommended that, as

'Congress deemed it wise and prudent to refrain from deciding the matter in controversy then either by affirming or repealing the Mexican laws, or by an act declaratory of the true intent of the Constitution, and the extent of the protection afforded by it to slave property in the Territories, so your Committee are not prepared now to recommend a departure from the course pursued on that memorable occasion, either

by affirming or repealing the eighth section of the Missouri act, or by any act declaratory of the meaning of the Constitution in respect to the legal points in dispute.'

These passages are quoted to show that the issues made by Mr. Calhoun, as to the constitutionality of the two compromises of 1820 and 1850, were expressly left open for judicial decision, by the committee, who nevertheless swept away, by a clause subsequently added to their bill, not only the Missouri Compromise of 1820, but also the Compromise of 1850, which left untouched the Mexican laws, prohibiting slavery in the ceded Territories, which Webster, Clay, Benton, and all the leading lights in the Senate, (with the exception of Mr. Calhoun,) pronounced valid, and an effectual restriction.

The repeal was the adoption of Mr. Calhoun's nullifying doctrine in extenso. The power of Congress to make laws excluding slavery for ever from its Territories, as such, was denied, and all the Territories were open to slavery, on the ground of the 'inalienable right' of every citizen 'to move into any of the Territories with his property, of whatever kind and description;' and the law of squatter sovereignty was superadded, and substituted for the sovereignty of the United States over the public domain. Thus fell, at a dictation of Mr. Atchison, supported by the coalition effected between the Whigs and Democrats of the South, under the pressure and through the intrigues of the Nullifiers, Mr. Jefferson's noble principle, endeared to the country both for its moral grandeur and political wisdom. It is the first thought uttered in the Declaration of Independence; and to the denunciation of the King of Great Britain for the crime of bringing slavery to our shores, the original draft adds as the deepest aggravation, that 'he has prostituted his negative for suppressing every legislative attempt to prohibit or to restrain this execrable commerce.'

The first legislative attempt to restrain the progress of the mischief which the King of Great Britain visited upon this country, was Mr. Jefferson's resolution excluding slavery from the Territory of the United States in 1784—the next was that introduced by Rufus King in 1785—the third that of Nathan Dane, in 1787—all receiving the votes of two-thirds of the States of the Confederacy, and the last the unanimous vote.

The fourth movement was that of the Convention, in the Constitution itself, providing against the importation of slaves after 1808, declaring the binding validity of the engagements entered by the Congress on the Government of the United States, to exclude it from the Territory, and securing to the new Government the power of making similar provision for future acquisitions of Territory. The fifth regulation to restrain the progress of slavery was that of the Compromise of 1820—the sixth, that of 1850. It is remarkable, that although these great measures, had their origin with Democratic leaders, Federal and Whig leaders of great renown united in their support. The constitutional provisions on the subject had the unanimous suffrage of all the illustrious men in the Convention who framed the Constitution of the United States; and from the silence on the subject in the State Conventions, called to ratify the Constitution, it may well be presumed that these also were unanimous in their approval of what had been done under the Confederacy and in the new Constitution to restrain the introduction and limit the extension of slavery. And may not men of all parties now unite to restore, what the patriots of all parties, during the first seventy years of our Government, contributed to establish?

The work of restoration is simple and easy, if the

men who abhor the late innovation on the long-settled policy of the nation can be induced to relinquish petty differences on transitory topics, and give their united voice in the next Presidential election, for some man, whose capacity, fidelity and courage can be relied upon to oppose the issue which the present Administration has made to control it. The contest has grown out of Presidential aspirations.—The decision of the people at the polls, in choosing a Chief Magistrate, will end it. Senators will easily comply, when the nation's demand is backed by the existing Presidential power and patronage, and hopes of the future succession, which always animates the leading members of that body.

The Administration has staked itself on the support of the party of privilege—of class interest—which makes it a unit. It confides in the success which has crowned the oligarchy everywhere in the Old World, and secured its triumphs on the maxim, 'Divide and Conquer.' The Whigs and Democrats of the South are a combination, to carry into the next Presidency some candidate absolute in maintaining the repealing clause of the Kansas Bill which nullifies the principles of the Ordinance, the provisions of the Constitution, made to give them effect, and all the Compromises which have been made in pursuance of them, with the sanctions of all sections of the Union. If the majority favorable to the policy built up with our Government will unite, accept the issue tendered by the Administration, and make the repeal of the repealing clause of the Kansas act paramount in the impending contest for the Presidency, all will be restored that has been lost to free institutions, by opening the Territories North and South, to slavery. The Compromises of 1820 and 1850 being restored, there will not be an inch of the territory of the United States, once exempted from slavery, on which it can legally intrude: and Mr. Atchison's attempt by an armed force to carry out the nullification plotted of the caucus which gave birth to the Kansas Bill, will, like the attempt of his prototype, Mr. Calhoun, to give effect to South Carolina nullification, be paralysed by the frown of an indignant nation, made potent by an honest and firm Executive.

And there will end the career of those gentlemen who arrogate to themselves the exclusive tutelage of the Democracy of the country, as ended that of Mr. Calhoun and his proselytes, who took the peculiar charge of the 'State Rights' party. They sunk under the universal conviction that their zeal for State Rights was an ardent passion to reach political power, at the hazard of extinguishing in the blood of the people the wise and free institutions it had cost so much to establish.

Our innovating Democrats, who put under foot the representative principles; who violate the known will of their constituents; who scorn their instructions to redress the wrong they have committed; who reply to the suffrages that condemn their conduct, that they are not. Democratic suffrages; who, in the plenitude of their infallibility, read out of the Democratic party, Maine, New Hampshire, Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania. Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Iowa, because they will not submit to the will of these, their Representatives: who have set up a test which must forever exclude Massachusetts, Rhode Island and Vermont; who have bartered away the rights secured to them all by compacts—will soon learn that Democracy does not reside in the organization of intriguers, but in the mass of the people.

It is the glory of our great Republic, that its Democracy springs up from the soil and flourishes in the fresh air of our wide spread country; and its rich

harvest, imparting health strength and spirit, to our whole system, is gathered annually at the polls. The Democracy which is bred in caucuses and cabinets is a sort of hot-bed species—a delicacy suited to the taste of epicurean politicians, whose appetites are their principles. Incumbents and expectants of offices and dignities claim a sort of patent right in the machine of government to create a Democracy adapted to their purposes. Their innovations in the machinery are contrivances to renew their privileges for new terms, and the people are the subjects who are to be used up in it—to pay tribute for this privilege, and take pride in the skill of the operators.

The telegraph wires and the Cincinnati Convention are to bring all the masterly combinations of the Administration in contact with the masses at the appointed time. But, will the wires work? Undoubtedly the people, far and wide, will have their instructions from the operators; but the responses will probably be a thunderbolt to those who have violated their rights, spurned their remonstrances, and, as a consequence, have arrayed brothers from the different sections of the Union to shed each others' blood, in civil war on the plains of Kansas.

F. P. BLAIR.

To Messrs. Daniel R. Goodloe and Lewis Clephane,  
Corresponding Committee of the Republican Association of Washington City, D. C.

#### PREPARING FIRE-WOOD.

Great diversity of opinion exists as to the best and most proper season for cutting and preparing fire-wood; but we apprehend that the season most convenient for the farmer, and the one during which this branch of labor will least interfere with the ordinary business of the farm, is the one when fire-wood will be cut, whether or not it is intrinsically the best for the wood or for the timber.

That season, every one will say, is during the winter, and it is at that time most of our fire-wood is cut and hauled throughout the country. There are very many reasons why this is the best season, aside from its being a time of leisure, among which may be mentioned the following. The snow, which usually fills the forest, enables the farmer to use a sled for hauling the wood, and the greater ease and rapidity with which it can be loaded and unloaded, and the larger burthen which a team can haul upon it, are of great advantage. The simple construction of a sled renders it cheaper, much less liable to break, and more easily repaired than any other vehicle—and the lowness of the load, compared with the size of the base, brings the centre of gravity so near the ground that it is not easily overturned. Upon uneven and hilly ground therefore, a cord of wood can be loaded upon a sled and drawn off in perfect security, where a wagon or cart would inevitably be upset.

Wood lands are not unfrequently so wet and miry as to forbid the passage of a heavy load unless the ground is frozen, and there is in such cases no alternative but to take advantage of the winter season.—A better market, and in many places the only market, for wood, is afforded at this time. The notorious propensity of men to put off the purchase of any article, even of prime necessity, until the time it must be had at all events, is a sufficient explanation of the cause.

Wood ought to be well seasoned before it is burned, and in many instances before it is hauled also. The great amount of water contained in green wood renders it uneconomical as fuel, for the following reason. In the conversion of water into steam, one hundred and forty degrees of heat are absorbed, and become

latent, so as to be utterly unappreciable. This, of course, is abstracted from the burning fuel, and is entirely lost as a means of warmth. The idea that green wood is much the best for making a warm and cheerful fire in cold weather, is a common and popular error which ought to be exploded as soon as possible. It is also, as a general rule, uneconomical to haul green wood to market, both on account of the unnecessary weight to be carried, and because of the less price usually obtained. A well seasoned, bright load of hard wood, that shows no rot in the sap, will generally command twenty per cent. more in the market than the same kind of wood freshly cut. It is therefore profitable for the farmer who sells wood to have it cut one year in advance, by which he makes a double saving, viz. in price and in labor of hauling.

Wood should never be piled upon wet ground. If it grows in such a situation, let it be hauled off and piled upon a dry spot, moderately snug, but so as to admit of a free circulation of the air around and through it, and sticks should be placed beneath so as to elevate the pile a few inches above the ground.—Special care ought to be observed that every stick of size sufficient to admit it should be split; for it seasons much more readily and perfectly by so doing. Beach wood in particular will rot in the sap and greatly deteriorate unless this course is adopted, and other kinds are greatly improved by the process of splitting when green. A covering of boards or slabs over the pile while undergoing the process of seasoning, will be found of great advantage, and attended with very little trouble or cost.

From experiments made upon various kinds of wood, it is ascertained that on an average, about forty per cent of its weight when first cut is water. One hundred parts of green walnut wood, when dried at 212°. Fahrenheit, lost 37.5 per cent., white oak 41, and white maple 49 per cent. A cord of green beech wood weighs about three tons, and the ordinary seasoning of a year will reduce its weight nearly one ton. Under these circumstances it is easily seen that every facility ought to be given for the evaporation of a constituent which, although of vital importance to the growth of wood, is worse than useless after the tree is cut. It adds to the weight, facilitates decay, and absorbs the caloric during the process of combustion.—*Rural New Yorker.*

#### THE HOUSES OF HANOVER AND SARDINIA— GENEALOGY OF THE STUARTS.

[To the Editor of the Edinburgh Witness.]

EDINBURGH, Dec. 7, 1855.

MY DEAR SIR,—So far back as December, 1827, I gave to the public a brief genealogy of the house of Stuart, showing the descent of the house of Savoy or Royal family of Sardinia, from Charles the I., King of Great Britain, and that since the death of Cardinal Henry of York, in 1807, who was the younger brother of Prince Charles Edward, the house of Savoy had become the lineal representatives of the royal family of Stuarts, and but for the special settlement of the British crown on the Protestant house of Hanover, would have succeeded to the throne of these kingdoms.—The following is the table of descent of the house of Savoy from the house of Stuart:

1. James VI. of Scotland and I. of Britain, born 1556, died 1625.
2. Charles born 1600, and beheaded 1619.
3. His daughter Henrietta, born 1641, married 1651 Philip, Duke of Anjou and Orleans, (brother of Louis XIV.)

4. Their daughter, Anne, born 1669, married 1684 Victor Amadeus I., King of Sardinia. She died 1748. He died 1772.

5. Their son, Charles Emanuel, King of Sardinia, born 1701; died 1782.

6. His son Victor Amadeus II. King of Sardinia, born 1726; married Maria Antoinette, of Spain.

7. His son Charles Emanuel IV., King of Sardinia, born 1751; married Clotilda, sister of Louis XVI., abdicated the throne 1802; died 1824.

His brother, Victor Emanuel I., born 1759, succeeded King of Sardinia 1802; abdicated 1821; and was succeeded by his nephew.

8. Charles Albert, King of Sardinia, born 1798, married 1817 Theresa of Saxony, abdicated 23rd March, and died 28th March, 1849; and he was succeeded by his son the Duke of Savoy.

9. Victor Emanuel II., the present King of Sardinia, born 14th March, 1820, married 1842 Archduchess Adelaide of Austria, who died, 1855.

Then again, after giving the connection of the Sardinian family with the present royal family of Great Britain, which the recent visit of the King of Sardinia invests with greater interest, it may be curious to your readers to lay before them also, the descent of our present popular and beloved Sovereign from James I.

The following is the table:—

1. James VI. of Scotland, I. of Great Britain, died 1625.

2. His daughter Elizabeth, Queen of Bohemia, born 1596—married 1612, died 1661.

3. Her daughter Sophia, born 1630, married 1658 Ernest Augustus, Duke of Hanover, Elector of Brunswick, died 8th June, 1714.

4. George I. King of Great Britain and Ireland, born 1600, married 1682 his cousin Dorothea, died 11th June, 1727.

5. George II., born 30th October, 1683, married 1705 Caroline of Bradenburgh, died 25th Oct. 1760.

6. Frederick, Prince of Wales, born in 1700, married 1736 Augusta of Saxe Gotha, died 1751.

7. George III., born 4th June, 1738, married 1761 Charlotte of Mecklenburgh Strelitz, died 1820.

8. George IV., born 1752, married 1796 his cousin Caroline of Brunswick, died 1830.

His brother William IV succeeded to the British throne 1830, died June, 1837.

9. Victoria, Queen of Great Britain, born 1819, succeeded to the throne in 1837, and married in 1840 her cousin Prince Albert of Saxe Cobourg.

Thus Queen Victoria, the reigning Sovereign of Great Britain, and King Victor Emanuel, the present monarch of Sardinia, are both direct descendants, in the 9th degree, from James VI. of Scotland, as shown in these genealogical tables.

I am yours, &c., J. A.

### SMART CHILDREN.

A writer in *Blackwood's Magazine* thus discourses on the practice of trying to stick "book learning" in the heads of children while they are yet "babies:" How I have heard you, Eusebius, pity the poor children! I remember your looking at a group of them, and reflecting, "For of such is the kingdom of heaven," and turning away thoughtfully and saying, "Of such is the kingdom of trade!" A child of three years of age, with a book in its infant hands is a fearful sight! It is too often the death-warrant, such as the condemned stupidly look at—fatal, yet beyond his comprehension. What should a child three years old—nay, five or six years old—be taught? Strong means for weak digestions make not bodily strength.

Let there be nursery tales and nursery rhymes. I would say to every parent, especially every mother, sing to your children; tell them pleasant stories; if in the country, be not too careful lest they get a little dirt on their hands and clothes; earth is very much akin to us all, and, in children's out-of-door play, soils them not inwardly. There is in it a kind of consanguinity between all creatures; by it we touch upon the common sympathy of our first substance, and beget a kindness of our poor relations, the brutes. Let children have a free, open-air sport and fear not though they make acquaintance with the pigs, the donkeys, and the chickens—they may form worse friendships with wiser-looking ones: encourage familiarity with all that love to court them—dumb animals love children, and children love them. There is a language among them which the world's language obliterates in the elders. It is of more importance that you should make your children loving, than that you should make them wise—that is, bookwise. Above all things, make them loving; then will they be gentle and obedient; and then, also, parents, if you become old and poor, these will be better than friends that will never neglect you. Children brought up lovingly at your knees will never shut their doors upon you, and point where they would have you go.

From the Prohibitionist

### PROHIBITION SANCTIONED BY THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT.

When a half-and-half Prohibitory law was passed by the Legislature of the British Province of New Brunswick, in the year 1852, the *New York Herald* propagated the falsehood, that the Queen of England had disallowed the Bill, saying that "she could not consent to have the liberties of her subjects so adridged." Like all falsehoods against the Prohibitory Reform, this obtained the utmost publicity; we are continually meeting men in the United States who still suppose that her Britannic Majesty did and said what the *Herald* reported of her. The fact is, however, and Earl Grenville reaffirmed it in the House of Lords on the 5th of August last, that "An act prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors was passed by the Legislature of New Brunswick in 1852, and received the usual assent of the crown, and in 1854, a law amending that act was passed and received the Royal assent." But the question was, would her Majesty assent to the improved act passed by the same Legislature in April, 1855? To this question Earl Grenville replied: "As to this act receiving the Royal assent, would depend upon whether the act contained a clause reserving the action of the measure until her Majesty's assent had been given to it." Now the Prohibitory Law of the 12th of April, 1855, contained no suspending clause to this effect. It was signed unconditionally by her Majesty's Representative, the Lieutenant Governor of the Province. Still the Liquor Dealers of the Province hoped every English mail would bring the joyful tidings that the Queen had disallowed the Bill. They had petitioned her Majesty to this effect. They had petitioned a late Court of General Sessions, held in King's County, to "license taverns as heretofore," upon the presumption that the Queen would disallow the Prohibitory Law. Respecting this solemn enactment of the Lieutenant Governor, the Legislative Council and the Assembly of the Province, these "law-abiding citizens" held the following very choice and respectful language:—

"That said law is, in the opinion of your petitioners, no more than a *Yankee abortion*, and is law on no British ground.



"That your petitioners believe that *her Majesty will not impose such a law on this Colony*, when in no other part of her dominions is *this arbitrary and tyrannical law* in force—that she will veto *this act of a few visionaries*; and that is another reason for your Honors not to allow the County to be at any loss, but to grant licenses as above requested, and your petitioners, as in duty bound *will ever pray*."

"Will ever pray!" After this specimen of the language of a *Kunseller's petition*, what a precious gem in the way of sacred rhetoric must be their form of *prayer*! The *Royal Gazette Extra* of the 21st of December, contained an Order in Council dated at the Court at Windsor, which crushed out the last hope of the outlaws. It announced that the New Brunswick Prohibitory Liquor Law had received the sanction of the Crown, and the Imperial Government of Great Britain; and directed "all persons whom it may concern, to take notice and govern themselves accordingly." We are indebted to our friends in that Province for an early copy, the substance of which we telegraphed immediately to the Associate Press of New York City. We now put it on record *verbatim*, as a memorial of general and enduring interest. Queen Victoria was the Royal Patroness of the old Temperance movement in England; let no paper or person after this, presume to cite her as hostile to the Prohibition of the Traffic:—



ROYAL GAZETTE EXTRA.

FREDERICTON, N. B., DECEMBER 21, 1855.

BY AUTHORITY

AT THE COURT AT WINDSOR, THE 21ST DAY OF DECEMBER, 1855.

PRESENT :

The Queen's Most Excellent Majesty,  
His Royal Highness Prince ALBERT.

Lord President,	Lord Panmure,
Lord Privy Seal,	Mr. Labouchere,
Lord Steward,	Sir George Grey, Bart.
Viscount Palmerston,	Mr. Vernon Smith,
Viscount Canning,	Sir Charles Wood, Bart.

WHEREAS the Lieutenant Governor of Her Majesty's Province of New Brunswick, with the Council and Assembly of the said Province, did in the month of April, 1855, pass an Act, which has been transmitted, entitled as follows, viz:—

No. 2409. An Act to prevent the importation, and traffic in Intoxicating Liquors.

And whereas the said Act has been referred to the Committee of the Lords of her Majesty's Most Honorable Privy Council appointed for the consideration of matters relating to Traffic and Foreign Plantations, and the said Committee have reported as their opinion to her Majesty, that the said Act should be left to its operation: her Majesty, was thereupon this day pleased, by and with the advice of her Privy Council, to approve the said Report: Whereof the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, or Commander in Chief for the time being of her Majesty's Province of New Brunswick, and all other persons whom it may concern, are to take notice and govern themselves accordingly.

WM. L. BATHURST.

READING.

Of all the amusements that can possibly be imagined for a hard working man after his daily toil, or in its intervals, there is nothing like reading an interesting newspaper or book. It calls for no bodily exertion, of which he has had already enough or perhaps too much. It relieves his home of its dullness and sameness. It transports him into a livelier and gayer, and more diversified and interesting scene, and while he enjoys himself there, he may forget the evils of the present moment fully as much as if he were ever so drunk, with the great advantage of finding himself the next day with the money in his pocket, or at least laid out in real necessities and comforts for himself and family—and without a headache. Nay, it accompanies him to his next day's work; and if what he had been reading be any thing above the *idlest and lightest*, gives him something to think of besides the mechanical drudgery of his everyday occupation, something he can enjoy while absent and look forward to with pleasure. If I were to apply for a taste which should stand me instead under every variety of circumstances, and be a source of happiness and cheerfulness to me though life, and a shield against its ills, however things might go amiss and the world frown upon me, it would be a taste for reading.—*Sir J. Herschell*.

LIFE.

"Life," says the late John Foster, "is expenditure. We have it, but are as continually losing it; we have the use of it, but are as continually wasting it. Suppose a man confined in some fortress, under the doom to stay there till death; and suppose there is there for his use a dark reservoir of water, to which it is certain none can ever be added. I know, suppose, that the quantity is not very great, he cannot penetrate to ascertain how much, but it may be very little. He has drawn from it, by means of a fountain, a good while already,—and draws from it every day. But how would he feel each time of drawing, and each time of thinking of it? Not as if he had a perennial spring to go to. Not 'I have a reservoir—I may be at ease.' No: but 'I had water yesterday,—I have water to-day, but having had it, and my having it to-day, is the same cause that I shall not have it on some day that is approaching. And, at the same time, I am compelled to this fatal expenditure!' So of our mortal, transient life! And yet, men are very indisposed to admit the plain truth, that life is a thing which they are in no other way possessing than as necessarily consuming; and that even in this imperfect sense of possession, it becomes every day a less possession!"

HAVE SOMETHING TO DO.

The secret of all success in life, of all greatness, nay of all happiness, is to live for a purpose. There are many persons always busy, who yet have no great purpose in view. They fritter away their energies on a hundred things, never accomplishing anything, because never giving their undivided attention to any one thing. They are like butterflies, that flit from spot to spot, never gaining wealth; while the ant, who strictly keeps to a certain circuit around her hole, gradually lays up stores for winter comfort. Such persons are doomed to be dissatisfied in the end, if they are not sooner; for they will find in the race of life they have been passed by all who have a purpose. It is not only the positive drones, therefore, but the busy idler, that makes a blunder of life for want of purpose.

The following is from a correspondent of the *Morning Star*, and is highly interesting as a delineation of some important features of life in the United States.

## PRIVATE MEMBERS—MANNERS, &amp;c.

ELEPHANTS—LION—MULE—WHAT WE MIGHT DO IF WE HAD HIM!

Washington, D. C., Jan. 7, 1856.

MR. EDITOR.—We have perhaps said enough about "Speaker" and "no Speaker" in our former letters—suppose we talk a little about the "private members" of the House.

Taken together as a whole they are a noble looking set of men—all sizes, of course, from a *three-Hundreder*, as Luke, of Mississippi, down to a "hundred-and-a-quarter," as ——— no, no, it won't do to call names here, as men do not like to have their weight made light of. Their "fixings" are as diverse as their States, or even their district. They wear all sorts of outgarments, from a "Texan blanket," "Pop's shawl," "circular cloak," N. Y. "Carpette," to the neat "suitout." Some shave from ear to ear and from nose to neck—some shave nowhere and never, wearing beard, whiskers and mustache all blended together. Some come out every morning as "prim" as a doll, some looking as if ——— no, no, we'll turn on our heel again—as if "the mind makes the man."

Some look good-natured when they feel cross—some look cross when they feel good-natured—some are quick as lightning (almost)—some are as slow as snails, never getting up *till the next day*. The richest man in the House is Mr. Aiken, of S. C.—the poorest man is—(further this deponent saith not.)—The handsomest man is Gov. Chase of Ohio, (pardon us for getting 'outside the bar,' in the 'third branch.') The oldest man is probably "father Knight," a noble and venerable Quaker, from Pa. Among the eloquent men who have spoken, are Dunn of Ind., Etheridge, of Tenn., and Keitt, of S. C. Among the powerful men, are Giddings, of Ohio, H. Marshall, of Ky., and Howell Cobb, of Ga. Among the direct, pointed men, are Stephens, of Ga., Campbell, of Ohio, and Galloway, of Ohio. Among the noisy, gassy men, are McMullen, of Va., (No. 1.) Cadwallader, of Penn., and Wheeler, of N. Y. As to the political strength of the House, that is not yet well defined. One thing we think the country may rely upon, there will be no positive pro-slavery legislation during this Congress.

As to parties in the House, the Democrats are the best united and most thoroughly disciplined, and as between them and the Republicans it may with propriety be said, "The children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light." We may say that some of the strong anti-Nebraska men have the backbone of an elephant, the heart of a lion, and (we mourn to say it) to these they add most unfortunately the temper of a mule. Declaiming over the "personal preference" of the 107 who vote for Mr. Banks, some three or four men allow their "personal preference" to keep their votes from him, when *three votes* would elect him. The Democrats chuckle over this—the whole mass of the Free States mourn over it, and while we admire the elephant and lion more than ever, we utterly detest the proverbial peculiarity of the mule. There is an unknown amount of responsibility resting upon these few impracticable anti-Nebraska men. We will however call them no hard names, nor impugn their motives, but leave each one to settle his own case, with his conscience, his country, and his God.

Did time and our engagements, permit, we might give you a bird's eye view of a New Year's day

among slaves, *black and white*, in a neighbouring city—might tell you of the desolate appearance of the country on the way there—that nothing looked beautiful but the trees—nothing seemed pure but the air of heaven—might describe the motley multitude assembled at and about the hotel, or all sorts, ages and colors—men, women and children, and black being bleached towards white, and the white turning red, especially their eyes and noses.

We might describe, or attempt to, the slave carts, coming into the city with a family of a dozen negroes—it may be a father, mother, and eight or ten children, riding together for the last time, it may be, on earth; getting out of that cart and being sold or hired—father to one, mother to another, son, daughter, brother, sister, each to another. We might tell you of the first private sale we witnessed—a sister and brother, about seventeen and nineteen years old—sold, one to one man, and another to another, living twenty miles apart—might allude to the *agony* of that sister bleached almost to whiteness. We might speak of the noble manliness and brotherly affection of that *true* brother, with a *brother's* heart in him, although blacker, far blacker, than the sister who stood by his side, and whose father was probably a demon with a *white* skin. We might refer to (we could not describe) the earnest, affectionate manner in which we overheard him say to that heart-broken sister, "Eliza, don't cry so, I will come and see you; if it is twenty miles, and if it takes me till night every day to do my task, I will come in the night and see you, and get back to my work before morning—I can do it—I will do it, so don't cry so, Eliza." Ah! and we might wish that those who think, "niggers have no souls," could have seen that earnest, thankful, intelligent, but utterly indescribable *look of love*, which that pale but true sister give in return for those priceless words that fell from the thick lips, but warm heart, of that noble brother.

We might tell you of a blue-eyed boy, thirteen years old, white and beautiful, whom we took to be a boy instead of a "*chattel*," until he told us that his mother was a slave, and that "*he never had any father*"—we might speak of a little bit of a black boy, whom he pointed out as his brother, who was sold "*last New Year's*," and whom he or his mother had not seen before for a whole year, and the sorrowful tone in which he added, "I spect mistress will sell me to-day, she said she would sell me"—how he implored us to buy him, because he thought he should like us for a master, and how he added, "I should rather die though than be sold from my mother, but you know I cannot die, but I can be sold."

We might speak of a noble, lady-like appearing woman, about fifty years old, who said she was only a "spectator," being neither "for sale nor for hire," as her master could not spare her—might tell you how she turned her face to hide the falling tears as she told us that "her husband was torn from her and sold to go south—twelve years ago, and that she herself had been *dead* ever since; that they had sold all her children except this (putting her hand upon the head of a girl about fourteen years old,) and that she was nearly old enough for market"—might speak of a young man only twenty-two years old, having a wife and three children, *mourning* because he was so *strong* and so *well*, (as he would have to pay more for himself than if he were weak and sickly,) and begging to be let or sold to some one who would let him work for *himself* after his daily task was done for his master—might speak of a spirited fellow, who swore point blank that he would not go to live with the man who had hired him, saying, "I know you, sir! You are a *tyrant*, sir! I wont work with you,

sir! Then came the expostulation of the man-monger, and the threat, accompanied with oaths, declaring that his master would "sell him South," if he did not go with him—then this keen retort, "Let him send me to h— if he can: I am sure I could not fall into worse hands than yours". Possibly, if we had not little children of our own, we might describe to you three little boys, (if we were going into this description in detail) about four, five and a half, and seven years old, brothers, and beautiful, notwithstanding their blackness, whom the man-monger wanted to hire out, declaring he would not sell them, (though several wanted to buy the three together,) as they would bring him more money to raise them; and when some one expostulated with him for separating such little fellows from their mother and from each other, and it only caused him to say "away with your blarney," I'll have \$1500 a piece for them in a few years," we wout attempt to describe the struggle it cost us to prevent telling him if he did not repent he would have a seat in the lowest hell "in a few years," and compound interest in the mean time.

We might speak of an aged and venerable woman, probably ninety, who said she could remember Washington distinctly—that her first husband held his horse—that they sold him (the husband not the horse) and carried him South, "away back yonder"—that they sold her second husband "a little farther on," and her third "many years ago," and they had sold all her thirteen children, so that she had not one to lean her dying head upon—that she had nothing but massa Jesus left.

We might speak of the living horror and burning agony with which we heard for the first (and we pray it may be the last) time the grating hellish sound (no, not *hellish*, for there is no such work in hell) of the auctioneer, crying (with the voice of a man, but with the heart of a fiend and the conscience of an ostrich,) "Only eight hundred dollars for this sound, healthy boy, seventeen years old, warranted sound, and a good disposition to boot—only eight hundred dollars, who says nine?"

We might refer to the encounter we had as we left this "den" with one of the "lions"—the impertinence with which he demanded to know what we were there for, and ordered us to give him up our notes; and our reply that we had further use for them ourself—his charge that we were a d—d abolitionist, having come there to take notes and report lies to the North—and our reply and *promise*, that if we reported anything we would report the *truth*, and his impudence among the rest (which promise we will fulfil at some future time, if we do not lose our notes)—his blustering assurance that we were "in a dangerous place"—and our reply that no doubt that poor, sobbing girl, who had just been sold to one man, and her brother to another, would agree with him that it was "a dangerous place"—our assuring him that if he expected to *frighten* or *sell* a full-blooded white man, he had waked the wrong customer—his inquiry for our name—our reply, giving real name, residence, present business, &c.—his "Ah, indeed"—"Happy to see you, sir"—"Why had you not got some Southern gentleman to introduce you"—our reply that we were not accustomed to follow the lead of Southern gentlemen—his begging us to pardon his impertinence—our reply that we would certainly do so,—these and a host of other incidents, we say, if we had time to develop, and you had space, and your readers had patience, might fill two or three columns of your paper; but as you and we are *hard up* for time and space, (don't know how it is with the patience of your readers,) we will close by saying that we were filled unutterably full of indignation by the scenes we wit-

nessed, and we thanked God that there are some men who will stand up in the present Congress and give their voices and their votes against the extension of this "sum of villanies."  
"DANIEL."

P. S. We ought to add as news (seeing sleighing can't go by telegraph) that we had eight to ten inches of snow on Saturday and Saturday night, making excellent sleighing, which might last a month if the thermometer keeps down to two degrees below zero, as it was this morning at sunrise. D.

From Correspondence of the Morning Star.

#### AFFAIRS IN WASHINGTON.

WASHINGTON, D. C., Jan. 29, 1856.

Mr. Editor:—During the past two weeks the struggle for the Speakership has been unabated and unsuccessful. Week before last the plurality rule was moved several times by the Anti-Nebraska men, and as often voted down by the votes of the very same men who voted for it and were benefited by it in 1849. Here is a specimen of the language and disinterested patriotism of Howell Cobb, of Georgia, who was then elected Speaker by the plurality rule. He said:

"In reference to the plurality rule, if necessary, I would go into a discussion of it. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Giddings] says that while, at one time, I was the recipient of the benefit of that plurality rule, I have during this session uniformly voted against it. I will tell him that it never will receive the sanction of my vote when its creation is inevitably to place in the Speaker's chair the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Banks]."

Here also is what was said by Mr. Fuller, of Maine, then as now a member of the House:

"I voted for it on the ground that I believed the effect of the rule, if adopted, would be to elect the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cobb.] That was the reason I voted for it then; and I will not vote for it now, because I believe the effect of it would be to elect the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Banks]."

The country will judge *who* are keeping the House unorganized, and *why* they are doing so, from these and many similar declarations.

On Saturday week, a resolution was adopted entirely prohibiting debate, or personal explanation, so that for the past week there has been nominally no speech-making, but many members have evaded the rule by presenting their views in the form of resolutions, and moving the previous question, so as to cut off amendment and bring the House to a direct vote upon their proposition.

Mr. Dunn, of Indiana, one of the shrewdest, as well as one of the most stubborn members, introduced three resolutions at once, and demanded the previous question, and that the vote be taken on each resolution separately. The first declared that "the political complexion of the House is such that none but an Anti-Nebraska man should be elected Speaker." Disagreed to—102 to 103. The second declared that the Missouri compromise line ought to be restored, in terms or in substance. Agreed to—101 to 100. The third declared the agitation of the slavery question justifiable until the said compromise restricting slavery shall have been restored. Disagreed to—100 to 103. So it is exceedingly doubtful whether there is a working Anti-Nebraska majority in the House—that is, a majority who have nerve and backbone enough to meet the present emergency. The people have been deceived and betrayed to some extent at least. Next time let them scrutinize more closely, and elect men whose sympathies are not only right as to past action, but who will dare to take present responsibility. To

show your readers that this is not a distinction without a difference, we give them the following resolution offered by Mr. Meachum, of Vermont:

*Resolved*, That in the opinion of this House the repeal of the Missouri compromise of 1820, prohibiting slavery north of latitude 36 degs. 30 min., was an example of useless and factious agitation of the slavery question, both in and out of Congress, which was unwise and unjust to the American people.

This was agreed to—108 to 93. So it seems there are at least seven or eight men who say that an act was "unwise and unjust," and yet dare not say they will vote to repeal that act. The timidity of such men increases the insolence of the slave power in Congress.

Mr. Fuller, of Maine, voted against the Nebraska bill, otherwise he could not have been elected, and still he voted against the above resolution, and some other members from the free States are in the same category, while Mr. Ethridge, although from the slave State of Tenn., voted against the Nebraska bill and voted for Meachum's resolution.

On the vote of Saturday Mr. Banks stood within four votes of an election—Dunn and Scott, of Indiana, and Harrison and Moore, of Ohio, voting against him. These gentlemen give no reason for their course, but seem immovably fixed in their hostility to Banks. What the result will be, time only can tell. We see no prospect of an organization without the plurality rule; it is for the Democrats and Know Nothings to say whether that rule shall be adopted or not.

The President has thrust another message upon the House in its unorganized State, the whole drift of which is to justify and sustain the border-ruffian Missouri legislature of Kansas—to condemn and reject Reeder, and justify and uphold Whitfield—to charge the Free State men of Kansas with treason, and to shake the whole Executive and military power of the Government over their heads, so as to bring them into acquiescence.

The spirit, tone, and time of this message all indicate that it is a sheer electioneering document, and the only fear we have is, that it may deter some true men in the Free States from going to Kansas. We wish those who are hesitating about emigrating there on account of slavery, could know how nearly universal the opinion is here, among intelligent men of all parties and from all sections, that Kansas *will, in the end, be a free State*. The indomitable business energy and enterprise of men from the free States, together with a plentiful supply of Sharp's rifles, is putting a decided damper upon Missouri cut-throats; and, while they will continue to howl and bluster over their "peculiar institution," like a cross and hungry dog over a bleached bone, the gnawing of which is starving him to death, they will see and feel that they are engaged in an unequal as well as unjust warfare upon freedom and free territory.

If the freemen of this nation do their duty like men, Kansas is as sure to be free as the sun is to rise—if they cower and cringe and bow down to the slave oligarchy, freedom will soon be crushed out throughout the whole length and breadth of this fair land, and one may as well then be in Kansas as in New Hampshire, in South Carolina as in Maine. The experiment of a free government has not *been* tried—it is *being* tried. The world has yet to see and learn whether freedom or slavery is to rule in this boasted land of liberty.

Last Wednesday a resolution was passed, calling on the several clergymen of this city to offer prayer in the House each day at the opening of the session; so there have been since then most fervent supplica-

tions for "a spirit of harmony and concession," for deliverance from "faction," for "a disposition to organize the House on a patriotic basis," and for "the preservation of our cherished institutions;" but not a breath of prayer that "we might repent and come back to God as a people," or that "we might have that righteousness which exalteth a nation"—not a word of confession of our national sins—not a single sigh for our worldliness, our oppression, our forgetfulness of God. An aged and venerable member, after listening to one of these *velvet* prayers, turned to a friend and said, "Does the minister think he is going to blind the eye of the God of the Bible, and turn his wrath away from our sins, by studiously avoiding any allusion to our guilt, and politely asking the Almighty to enable us to organize this House upon a patriotic basis?"

A week ago last Sabbath we attended the dedication service of the C. Baptist church on Thirteenth Street. The first sermon was by Rev. Dr. Fuller, now of Baltimore, formerly of South Carolina. He is a man of the Calhoun and Webster grade, intellectually, and the clerical pro-slavery war-horse with whom Rev. Dr. Wayland had the battle upon the subject of slavery some years ago. Aside from his subserviency to slavery, he is a strong man armed—a giant of manhood—and that subserviency is at once a living testimony, both of the paralyzing power of American slavery, and the utter inability of the loftiest human intellect in its own strength to stem a moral whirlpool.

His style of preaching we liked—that is, there was an entire absence of that stiffness and mock dignity and reserve, which some small men court to screen their intellectual leanness. He spoke like a man, talking to men, like a messenger with a message, seeking to deliver it in the plainest and most forcible way. His whole manner, gesture, pronunciation, action—everything that constitutes delivery—was a merited rebuke to that studied, lifeless, school-boy-recitation-style of preaching, which finds its way into too many popular pulpits. Dr. Burrows, of Richmond, Virginia, preached in the P. M., and Dr. Teesdale, the pastor, in the evening. Of the latter and his sermon and his ———, no, we will not at present go into this matter, hoping that another and an abler pen will save us the trouble. We cannot refrain from saying, however, that when we retired from the services of that entire day, this conviction settled down into our very soul, viz: that pro-slavery ministers, or slavery-apologizing ministers, or slavery fellowshipping ministers, are, after all, doing more to uphold and strengthen that accursed institution, than all the pro-slavery politicians in the land; and while they attempt to hold up the gospel of Christ in one hand, and the institution of American slavery in the other, they are doing more, indirectly at least, towards filling our world with infidels and atheists, than can be done by all the open, blaspheming skeptics in Christendom.

Snow is still abundant here, this being the twenty-second successive day of as good sleighing as is common in New England. "DANIEL."

#### CHILI.

"In Chili religious fanaticism has always predominated. sustained by an archbishop, by a numerous clergy, and by many convents of friars and nuns; yet still, in Valparaiso, the principal seaport of the Republic, there exists a Protestant congregation, composed of many hundreds of English, German, and American citizens. They have a chapel, as also a chaplain, whose stipend is borne, in equal moieties,

by the congregation and the government of her Britannic Majesty. Many Spaniards attend the divine services performed therein, and we have good grounds for believing that some of those attendants, particularly that portion of them composed of the fair sex, have abjured the errors of the Roman Catholic communion. The rising generation is impregnated with ideas of religious reform, and we have seen works of some of the young writers of that country, in which the prejudices of former times are openly attacked, and principles of independence and religious liberty proclaimed,—a course of action which in other epochs, would have provoked the scandal and indignation of the authorities and of the nation at large."

#### NEW GRANADA.

"In New Granada this reformation has proceeded from the government itself. The archbishop and the Jesuits have been banished from the territory of the republic, the legislative power has sanctioned the liberty of worship, and the public writers employ themselves in enlightening the people upon the falsity of the Roman doctrines, and the necessity of undoing the work which, ever since the discovery of the new world, has been set up and perfected in it by the enemies of the true faith of Jesus Christ."

#### EARTHQUAKE.

On Friday last, about five minutes before midnight, a shock of an earthquake was felt by many persons in town. It commenced suddenly with a report like thunder, and continued rumbling for the space of thirty seconds, dying away in the distance. The tremulous motion of the earth was not very sensibly felt; but sufficiently so to indicate the character of the phenomenon. The atmosphere was perfectly calm at the time, and the stars shone brightly. In February, (if we are not mistaken,) 1832, a similar shock was experienced over the country between Montreal and Niagara.—*Prescott Telegraph.*

#### BOHEMIA.

Among all the kingdoms of Europe, this was the first earnestly to protest against the sins of Rome; it is computed to have supplied more than two millions of victims to the spirit of Popish persecution; in the single year, 1627, more than 30,000 families left it on account of their faith; and at the present day, thousands are sighing for release from the bondage of Rome. The land of Jerome and Huss, those early martyrs for the sake of the truth as it is in Jesus, is the seed-plot prepared in Providence for a future harvest of precious grain. Since 1848, not less than 3,000 persons have renounced Popery, a third Protestant Church of 1,200 souls has been formed in Prague, of 4,600 Roman Catholic priests in their father land, it is asserted that not half of them are properly Popish—many of them are sighing for reform, and not a few of them are subjected to violent treatment, as Hussites and Revolutionists; several have renounced Popery openly, and joined Protestant communions, at the cost of excommunication and all its bitter consequences. By these facts the Popish hierarchy has been greatly enraged, and has resorted to the basest expedients to prevent the progress of reform, incarcerating and tormenting for long periods those who have ventured to look for emancipation from their chains, and who were taking the legal steps to reach that result. Some are still imprisoned,

and others have been driven to expatriation. The spirit of inquiry however is advancing, and the interests of the Papacy are waning, the exercise of private judgment is maintained, and the rights of conscience are vindicated in despite of all maltreatment by these "Powers of darkness." Among the good effects of this spirit of persecution, is the bringing of such misused servants of the Lord to our own country, for the spiritual benefit of the Roman Catholic population, who need more enlightenment than they can ever receive from our home born ministry. "Out of the eater comes forth meat."—*Congregationalist.*

#### STATISTICS OF MORMONISM.

The Mormons have about 95 Missionaries in Europe, and as many in Asia, Africa, and the Pacific Islands, also, a number in the United States and British America. They have a paper in Salt Lake City that issues 40,000 copies per week; another in Liverpool, issuing 22,000; and others in South Wales, Copenhagen, Australia, India, and Switzerland; their Bible has been translated into the Welsh, Danish, French, German, and Italian languages, and has made considerable progress in Sweden and Norway.—*Desert News.*

#### REWARD FOR LABOR.

Many worldly people imagine that the Christian life is made up only of crosses and sacrifices, which are borne with patience in expectation of future reward. They cannot comprehend how the good man is satisfied from himself, and finds an unfailing fountain of happiness in the consciousness of God's approval. Mr. Bixby, of the Mulmain mission writes: "Our work is hard, taxing both body and mind. What the reward will be, we do not know. But one thing we do know. If we receive no other reward than what is given to us daily, there is no other service upon earth that pays so well. In all the pursuits of this world, even in my choicest amusements, I have never found such exquisite pleasure, as in preaching Christ, the way, the truth, and the life, to these perishing idolaters. It is a work perfectly congenial to my feelings, and satisfying to my craving soul; and with such sweet contentment and that 'favor which is life,' how can I be unhappy?"

"Go, then, earthly fame and treasure,  
Come, disaster, scorn and pain,  
In Christ's service pain is pleasure,  
With his favor loss is gain."

At a late anniversary of Yale College, Professor Silliman was called out by a complimentary toast. In the course of his remarks, the professor proceeded, for the benefit of the younger brothers present, to say how it was that at his age (76 years) he enjoyed such excellent health and spirits. He said at 30 he was dyspeptic and feeble. He cut off determinedly all stimulants, and had used none since. He dieted one year, and then returned to his labour. He ate always plain nutritious food, and drank nothing but plain, diluent drinks. He eschewed tobacco in every form. Every morning he used the sponge and cold water, and felt now no less power of endurance than when he was a young man, and no abatement of intellectual power.

#### UNIVERSITY COLLEGE COMMISSION CASE.

The article on the subject referred to in the contents of this number, will be found on the second and third pages of the cover.