



The Sabbath Recorder.

Alfred Centre, N. Y., Fifth-day, May 9.

REV. N. Y. HULL, D. D. - - - EDITOR.

For all communications, whether on business or for publication, address the Editor, The Sabbath Recorder, Alfred Centre, N. Y.

AN OBT NEGLECTED PRECEPT.

Every word of the Lord is good—his word is a lamp unto the believer's feet and a light unto his path. He who does not know the blessedness of having such a lamp and such a light has yet many important lessons to learn in the school of Christ. And so with him who can not say with the Psalmist, "I esteem all his precepts concerning all things to be right."

The New Testament has one precept which would do well to be studied carefully until they understand the letter and spirit of the injunction, and to pray earnestly until they no longer sorrow for sins from it, but obey it with cheerful willingness and true Christian joy. It will be found in 1 Cor. 16: 2: "On the first day of the week, let every one of you lay by him in store, as God has prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come."

It was for the purpose of making known their liberality that this precept was given. And their liberality was to secure the good of the honor of Christ the Lord, and the promotion of his work. It applies to the entire Christian brotherhood—"every one of you."

Who will ask exemption? Who is there that does not care to share in the service, and in the blessing which attends it? It claims a fair proportion—"as God hath prospered," specifying no particular amount, but leaving it to the Christian conscience, and to the grateful believing heart to determine how much to give. One day, the history of every one of these seasons of giving will be reviewed to the believer's joy to his shame. Very few in that day will think that they gave too much. How many will regret that they gave but at all, or gave far less than the proportion which the precept points out. It is to be a part of devotion—"on the first day of the week."

It is to be a part of devotion—"on the first day of the week." The day when Christ rose from the dead, and when believers rejoice before him who died for their offenses and rose again for their justification. How fitting the act for such a day! How acceptable, too, as a part of the sacred worship to which the day is appropriated. There is to be a "fair proportion" laid by him in store, that there may be no gatherings when I come."

Let this ordinance, which is now too often neglected, be cheerfully observed everywhere and by all believers, and what a change will come over the churches, and what an enlargement of their work of Christian love! It will seem as though the reddening light of the millennial day were falling in gladness upon them and the world.

The article above is from the National Baptist and contains thoughts worthy the consideration of every Christian. Among the powers for good in this world is the benevolent use of wealth. Waste and supply is a law of humanity in all ages and places, and will be while this world continues. Nor is there a greater blessing bestowed upon us than that in the use of our goods we can do untold good to our fellows. As for the gospel, its nature is benevolence, and in all departments of its operations its work is benevolence. In all this we agree with the article above, and yet we deny that the "order" or "commandment" quoted by the National Baptist in form ever applied to other than a fragment of the church, the Galatians and Corinthians. No other event of the New Testament church received it. How could it apply to those churches in Judea in whose behalf the collection was taken? The National Baptist is in error where it says this precept, 1 Cor. 16: 2: "On the first day of the week, let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come," applies to the entire Christian brotherhood." Its proof passage is "every one of you." But those referred to in the phrase "every one of you" were the Christians at Corinth, and not the "entire Christian brotherhood." Let us quote the whole passage and see what it teaches: "Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, so do ye. Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come. And when I come, whosoever ye shall approve by your letters, them will I send to bring your liberality unto Jerusalem."

It is here taught that the Galatian churches had been directed to make collections for the poor at Jerusalem. The method of doing this was that on the first day of each week each one of the Corinthians was to lay by himself in store, as God had prospered him, that the collections might be in readiness when the apostle came to them. Now nothing can be plainer than that this command came to an end when the collection taken was carried to Jerusalem. Are the Galatians and Corinthians still making collections for the poor saints at Je-

rusalem? But further. Are Christians everywhere and for all time required by this passage to make their collections in this manner? We do not believe any one thinks so, and yet this lesson is full of instruction. It teaches us that Christians constitute a brotherhood, and that howsoever far it may extend, or of whatsoever nationalities it may be constituted, the tie of love reaches every one; and, if one suffers, all suffer with him. It teaches that among our first duties we should make provision for the wants of the poor, and for the relief of the distressed. This is done by the direction given, to make this our first business. On the first day of the week, the Corinthians were directed to look over their gains of the week previous, and in this way determine the amounts they should give, and this sum they should lay by in store, and so on week by week, until the collection was called for. In this way it will be seen that the collection, whatever it might be, would be made sure. Had no method been prescribed and followed, but everything been left to chance, it is easy to see that when the apostle came no sufficient collection would have been gathered.

But we take exceptions to another passage in this article, as follows: "It is a part of devotion—on the first day of the week—the day when Christ rose from the dead, and when believers rejoice before him who died for their offenses, and rose again for their justification." This is spoken as if this laying in store was a part of the public devotions of a Christian assembly gathered on the first day of the week, which for several reasons can not be true. The act performed was at home; let every one of you lay by him (himself) in store (at home)." There was no meeting in the case, and therefore no "devotion" in that sense. Besides this, no meetings were held at Corinth on the first day of the week, at least, we have no account of any. It may be that Christ rose on the first day, but we have no certain knowledge of it. Nor until about the middle of the second century have we any account of such meetings. This was a thing unknown to the apostolic age. The resurrection of Christ was indeed a glorious event, one in which Christians rejoiced with fullness of joy, but they had in the first century no time especially set apart in which to express their joy. The National Baptist here has drawn on its imagination, and, following it, has said things for which it has no warrant in the Word of the Lord. But let some good suppose we are offering some ill-considered arguments against a religious gathering in this instance, on the first day of the week, we offer in support of our view, the following testimony: Mr. Barnes says, "Let him lay up at home, treasures, as he has prospered. The Greek phrase, 'by himself,' means, probably, the same as at home. Let him set it apart; let him designate a certain portion; let him do this by himself, when he is at home, when he can calmly look at the evidence of his prosperity." Lange says, the phrase "let each one of you lay up by himself" is "conclusive against the prevailing opinion that the collection was taken up in the church. It was an individual and private affair."

We could enlarge on this subject, but this is sufficient. There is not even a hint of a religious gathering on the occasion, and we wonder that so sharp a sheet as the National Baptist should make the statement it does.

OUR COMING ASSOCIATIONS.

These Associations are important gatherings of our people, as they give opportunity for thousands of the disciples of Christ to strengthen the ties that bind together loving hearts, to more perfectly understand the condition of the churches, and to counsel together concerning the wants of the cause at large. It is also a time that calls us to review the past, that we determine upon measures for our advancement in the Christian life. They also may be made occasions of growth in the graces of our religion, and we may greatly strengthen ourselves and each other.

In the conducting of these gatherings, we raise the question whether we should not make them take on a more spiritual character. It has seemed to us that we consumed more time than we need to in doing what we call the business of the Associations. We believe that if greater brevity was practiced in this department of the service, and the time thus gained spent in more strictly religious exercise, it would be a gain to us in many ways. We do not oppose the doing of business at these gatherings. As the Associations are now organized, this is demanded, and perhaps the forms of these organizations could not be essentially improved. The question we raise is, Can not some improvement be made in the use of the time appropriated to these gatherings?

Sooner or later, however, a question will be raised concerning the wisdom of sending delegates from one Association to another, as the expense attending is felt to be a burden. Some feel a strong conviction that the funds so appropriated could be employed to better advantage in other directions.

Associations among us are of comparatively recent date. They came into existence in this wise: At an earlier time, the opinion came to prevail with those then managing these affairs that it would be wise

to change the time of holding the General Conference, so as instead of holding it yearly, it should be held once in three years. This opened the way for organizing Associations, a step of which we have never heard complaint. More recently, however, we have reorganized the Conference, and again hold it annually, and this has raised the question, whether we are not spending money unwisely in the matter of delegates in our attendance on both the Associations and the Conference, and the question is now raised, whether we had not better discontinue the habit of sending delegates to the round of the Associations? That the cost of sending them is considerable, all know; but it has hitherto been held that the good done is an abundant reward for this outlay. That, however, some modification of our mode of conducting these affairs will be called for at no distant day, seems to us certain, growing out of the reorganizing of the General Conference.

As the result of the state of things above named, another question has been raised, which is, whether a church may withdraw from an Association without subjecting itself to discipline. We do not profess to be learned in ecclesiastical law, but take this view of this matter: The church is a New Testament institution, and in it is found the principle by which the actions of the church are to be guided. In the discipline of its members, the church must be guided by the New Testament. An association, synod, or conference is an organization of another character, and must furnish its own rules for the government of its members, and its members are the bodies composing it. Our Associations are composed of churches, and as organizations, must be governed by their own laws. An Association has the power to accept a church applying for membership, or to reject it; and from this it would follow that it had power to drop a church that failed to discharge the duties it had taken upon itself to perform by its connection with this body. Concerning the right of a church to break its connection with an Association, we think that depends upon the nature of the agreement made between the parties touching that matter. The wisdom of doing this is, however, entirely another question, and is a question that needs to be prayerfully considered.

THE COURTS ON SUNDAY DISOBEDIENCE.

In view of the agitation of the Sabbath question in Pennsylvania, the following report of the action of the Portland (Me.) Municipal Court, and its reference to the action of the Supreme Court of Massachusetts, which we copy from the Philadelphia Jewish Record, has special interest:

The case of David Mirando, of Portland, was reported by us in a former issue, as one of religious persecution, but it hardly deserves so strong an epithet, as there does not appear any desire to oppress or annoy, but by general consent is considered a test question. The case was heard by Judge Knight, in the Municipal Court, Portland, on Wednesday, April 24th. The city was represented by City Solicitor Cleaves, and Hiram Knowlton, Esq., appeared for Mr. Mirando. There was very little to dispute in the case.

The respondent and his father, the respondent's brother, were observed on the Sabbath, and actually refraining from secular business and labor on that day. The city was entitled to recover for doing such business or labor on the first day of the week. If he does not disturb others, he is not liable to be prosecuted by the city.

The government conceded that it was a quiet and orderly place, and the only question was as to whether the section cited applied to the case in point. Mr. Knowlton argued that "if the statute meant anything at all it meant that just such men as the respondent and his father were to be prosecuted by the city for doing such business or labor on the first day of the week, if he does not disturb others, he is not liable to be prosecuted by the city."

City Solicitor Cleaves said that it should be understood at the commencement that this respondent had not been selected out of a hundred Sabbath breakers in the city and prosecuted. On the contrary, when he was spoken to in regard to the law he invited the prosecution to settle the case once for all. He claimed that while a man had a right to observe any day, the Massachusetts statute did not intend to give an allowance to shopkeepers to keep their places of business open on the Lord's day. He cited as authority the decision of the Massachusetts Supreme Court, recently given in exactly the same case, the Massachusetts statute being the same, that quoted by the defense. The Court ruled that the statute contained two classes of offenses: first, keeping open shop, warehouse or workshop; second, doing labor, business, work, etc. The question quoted relates only to the second offense from punishment, and made the first offense absolute. The jury were instructed that they must find the defendant guilty if he did keep open shop on the Lord's day.

Mr. Cleaves admitted that according to the statute the respondent had a right to go into his shop and labor if he wished, but when he

opens his doors and invited the public in general to violate the law, he was guilty of breaking the laws of the State. He thought that the decision of the Massachusetts court was conclusive, and that as the respondent had admitted that he kept an open shop on the Lord's day, he was guilty.

Judge Knight said that the case was not in any sense a persecution, and that he had been consulted by newspapers for several weeks, and he had given it some thought. He said "the respondent comes here with perfectly clean hands, and states his case with commendable fairness. It is not a one-sided case by any means, but one in which there is something to be said on both sides. It is therefore important that the case should go further than this court for a final decision, and I hope it will. It is not well for an inferior court to decide such important cases. The decision of the Massachusetts court makes the case all the more important, as this law is exactly the same in meaning as ours. The decision seems to be a good one. For instance, a carpenter who observed Saturday, might on Sunday go into his shop and prepare his tools or arrange his affairs without interfering with any one. He could not, however, stifle a house on the street, or open a store for trade without a disturbance, more or less. An open shop is no doubt a great annoyance to a great many, but I question as to whether the shop has done a great amount of mischief. It is not well that the case should go to a higher court, and I hope it will. The respondent is fined five dollars and costs."

Exceptions were taken, and the case was carried to the Supreme Court for a final decision, which will be looked for with much interest.

OUR PARIS LETTER.

The great day approaching—Progress is the watchword of the day. The Tiffany & Co.—The crown jewels of England—Some Marines on duty—The election of the Mayor of Paris—London—Something about our "Honorary Commissioners"—The Theatre gossip, etc., etc.

FOURTEEN DE LOUVRE, PARIS.

Another fortnight, and the grand Exposition will open. But it will be far from ready, and visitors for the first week or two will have to pick their way carefully among packing cases, shelving, canvas screens covering incomplete or unfinished sections, and *bric a brac* of all kinds. Somehow or other, these grand international exhibitions never are ready on time; Paris was not ready in 1873, Vienna was not ready in 1877, and Philadelphia was not ready in 1876. In 1887, the Emperor walked through two rows of "commitments," and declared the exhibition open, long before the workmen were able to make the same declaration in regard to most of the packing cases. Marshall MacMahon, no doubt, will do much the same thing this time; and I would advise those who contemplate visiting the grand show not to start earlier than June, as it will be the middle of that month, judging from present appearances, before all the departments will be complete and ready for inspection.

In our own section, the men are working day and night, and we will be tolerably far advanced on the opening day. The costly exhibit of Tiffany & Co., of New York, has arrived and is placed in position, guarded by four of the fifteen marines who were sent out by the government to guard the United States section; one of the rules being that the different nations have to watch their goods at their own expense, with general assistance, of course, from the local French authorities. It is curious to see soldiers from all parts of the world in the palace, on the Champ de Mars, stationed on duty in front of the sections allotted to their respective countries; no less than eighteen men of the "line" standing guard, day and night, over the case which contains the crown jewels of England, in the British section.

The arrangements for lighting the Palace of the Trocadero, as well as the Place de l'Opera, Avenue du Trocadero, and the Bridge of Jena with the electric light, are rapidly progressing, and it is expected that the machines will be in operation by the middle of May. The principal railway stations will all be supplied with this light before the close of the exhibition, and the proprietors of some of the larger retail stores are making arrangements to light their establishments by electricity, compared with which gas is as fallow dips compared to gas.

The *gamins* of Paris are looking forward in great glee to the balloon ascents that are to form one of the features of the exposition. The balloon, which will be the largest in the world, is now in course of manufacture at the Tuileries, where one hundred and sixty sewing girls are engaged in putting the pieces of which it is made together. The car will hold fifty passengers, and has a restaurant and bar attached. A wire rope, some eight hundred feet in length, will be secured in the bottom of the car and operated by a winch, so that the balloon with its living cargo will always be under control—provided the rope does not break. It will take about four minutes, under favorable circumstances, for the balloon to ascend till the end of the rope is reached, and about eight minutes to wind it down again, the winch being operated by a small steam engine. A ride in the balloon will cost two francs, and admittance to the enclosure where from the ascents take place, one franc. The chances of an accident by the rope giving way are freely dissoned, and would form, doubtless, an acceptable sensation! side show to the satiated Parisian.

One of the most amusing features of the appointment, by the President, of one hundred and fifty "honorary" commissioners, is the delusion under which some of these gentlemen labor regarding their prerogatives. Some forty or fifty of them have arrived already, and are causing Mr. McCormick, the Commissioner General, more trouble than all other things combined. In the first place, they insist on free passes, which the French government will not grant; secondly, they want choice seats at the opening ceremonies; thirdly, they want invitations to the grand banquet which will be given by the city of Paris on the opening day; and lastly, they want introductions to President MacMahon. Neither of these things are feasible, and the "honorary" are dissatisfied in consequence. England, with an exhibit more than six times as large as that of the United States, has only three honorary commissioners; Germany has seven, Russia has three, and no nation has more than ten, with the exception of the United States, which has one hundred and fifty, or about as many as all the other nations which participate in the exposition put together. The Parisians think it absurd, and in my opinion, they are not far from the truth.

The theatres, now in full blast, are reaping a rich harvest; especially those whose specialty is Opera Bouffe. At the Renaissance, Mlle. Zulma Bouffar is all the rage; although no longer young, she still possesses, in its fullest extent, that indomitable *chic* which always captivates, especially foreigners. Mme. Judic is at the Varieties, drawing crowded houses; and Theo, the queen of opera bouffe since the death of Schneider, is at the Bouffes Theatre. Jeanne Granier, or "La Petite Granier," as she is called all over Paris, has renewed her engagement at the Renaissance, and will reappear there for the first time on May 1st. The favorite bouffe operas here now are Lecocq's "Kosik," Strauss's operetta "La Reine Indigo," "La Teigne," and "Le Petite Duc," none of which, I believe, have ever been performed in the United States.

In my next, I shall endeavor to give some idea of the arrangement of the Exposition—a difficult task, owing to the unfinished condition of everything, and the fact that there are two separate and distinct exposition buildings and grounds, the palace of the Trocadero, and the palace of the Champ de Mars, divided by the river Seine, and united by the bridge of Jena. The view from the terrace back of the Trocadero is simply superb, and will form the favorite promenade for visitors to the exhibition.

A SURPRISING SURPRISE.

Although apprised of the fact, I had, for the time being, quite forgotten that our friends at Scio had repainted, remodeled, replenished, and repaired generally their house of worship. In memory, I saw it dingy, neglected, antique, inconvenient, and not overpleasant. In soiled white, high-backed seats, descended from an orchestra in the pulpit, narrow and strong, to the pit in front, with pillars and breastwork, strong and heavy. Strong being the word for those two places in the olden time. How the carpenter exulted when he planned, framed, and built those massive structures! How, too, the people admired them! What mighty preachers, and erratic, gonguic singers they must have had in those days. But the pulpit and the orchestra, I am persuaded, were equal to the occasion, and held them, I believe, as long as they stayed in. I always look and think in the presence of such stately architecture of the men, long gone, who executed such heavy work, and of the people who paid for it. Such work, even in days of cheap lumber, cost.

Well, Scio Church, like some other churches I think of, the last time I was in it still clung to the past, and as such I remembered and thought of it, though I had heard of the purpose to put the old window into a new bottle. Called there on the 25th to preach the funeral of Sister M. M. Babcock, my surprise, Bro. U. M. Babcock met me at the door, and I followed him in. I looked for the old; it had passed away. The cheerful, pleasant arrangement of the external and internal house reminded me of Himi who said, "Behold I make all things new." The pews are reversed, the people sitting as they ought, back to the door, while at the rear of the room the pleasant platform extended across the house is ornamented and furnished with a neat pulpit, which is just now well occupied, an excellent organ, and chairs for all whose business it is to be there. Altogether it is a credit to the liberality and taste of those who projected and executed it. Now, if the people of Scio are not in their places early and often, it will not be for the want of a pleasant house of worship to invite them. Here, too, I am thinking, it is not the material structure, however well arranged and furnished, that makes the house of God just what our souls need. The seats are easy, the pulpit graceful, the organ of excellent tone, the carpets new, and well chosen, while the chandelier is, in its way, just right. But all this is but a beautiful corpse if the life and power of the Master builder do not make of these worshippers living stones, fitted for the Master's use. I congratulate the Church of Scio, and her faithful

pastor, in their house made new, and pray for their mutual prosperity in their church home. J. SUMNER BELL.

VISIT TO ELD. E. S. EYERLY.

The readers of the Recorder have already seen two articles from the pen of E. S. Eyerly, of Watson, Atchison Co., Mo. I have just returned from a visit to him, which gave me both satisfaction and encouragement. Bro. Eyerly is a man in the vigor of life, not yet thirty-four years old. Having become a Christian, at an early age he became convinced that the ministry was his work. Turning towards an education, he passed through the preparatory studies and pursued two years of the regular college course. He also gave some time to theological studies. For a few years, public education work absorbed more of his time and energy than the ministry. He served as County Superintendent of public instruction in Holt county, Mo., and worked and lectured until he wrought a wonderful reformation in the matter of school houses and schools through out the entire county. Of popular address, he was called to lecture on temperance and other subjects to interest and instruct the people on special occasions. Also being sought as a teacher, he did much work in the school room. But some three years ago he resolved to leave all this sort of work, and devote himself to the ministry. At once he was called to the pastorate of the High Creek Baptist Church, in Atchison county, Mo. The evidence is quite satisfactory to me that he was a very efficient laborer in this church and vicinity. Both the church and surrounding communities enjoyed precious revival scenes under his labors. The evidence is based on written statements addressed to him by his brethren in the ministry, by the letter from his church to the association last year, by the testimony of his neighbors, as well as by the earnest Christian character of the man. Converted in the Methodist Church, he began preaching as a Methodist. But becoming convinced that Scriptural baptism is immersion, he yielded to the ordinance, and became a Baptist, endorsing also the Baptist views of restricted communion. Last year, by his careful reading of the Word, the Sabbath question forced itself upon him. He became fully convinced that "the seventh day is the Sabbath," and soon found that he could not pray until he changed his practice. He resigned as pastor of the church about August, 1, and commenced observing the Sabbath of the Lord. Then the storm broke. He met his brethren in church meeting, stated the change in his views with regard to the Sabbath, pointed out to them the gospel rule, and the Baptist views with reference to church discipline, told them that he was ready to appear before them, and stand the trial which it belonged to them to give him, then left the house that they might act with freedom. He was at once excluded at that very meeting. The bitterness that has been manifested from that time to this has overwhelmed him with grief, and taken him completely by surprise; for it comes in its worst form from those who, up to the very time of his keeping the Sabbath, appeared to be his most devoted enthusiasts, speaking of him in the most enthusiastic terms, and again in some instances from individuals who at one time publicly declared themselves convinced that the seventh day is the Sabbath. Nor has this treatment been confined to his locality. Bro. Eyerly is well known among the Baptists of Missouri. He has been known as an officer and a speaker in the State associations and other denominational gatherings, and is personally acquainted with leading Baptists throughout Missouri. Statements both untrue and denunciatory have been put in print and circulated for both strangers and acquaintances to read, and he has not been allowed a word of explanation. I read a copy of a gentlemanly and explanatory letter sent to the *Battle Flag*, published in St. Louis. This *Battle Flag* is extensively taken in Missouri, and among Bro. Eyerly's home acquaintances, and withal, the editor, Mr. Ray, is a personal acquaintance of Bro. Eyerly, and formerly treated him with courtesy, yet he did not publish that letter. It must be said, however, in justice to the people, that all have not shown this bad disposition. To some it is a matter of grief that Bro. Eyerly has been so harshly used. These friends have been somewhat forced into silence by the fury of the storm, and will no doubt, sooner or later, be more bold in expressing their kind feelings toward him.

Brethren, let us take courage in our denominational work as Sabbath keepers, for the Lord is in it. We see how this truth springs into power here and there without human agency. As with Bro. Kelly when he embraced the Sabbath, so with Bro. Eyerly. Neither of them knew anything about Sabbath-keeping, and both of them had considered and tried to learn where to address a letter for information. My heart is cheered with the case of Bro. Eyerly, for I feel assured that one more earnest and efficient gospel minister will advocate the keeping of the law of the Lord in all its fullness. Forced, as it were, out of the work, and not knowing what better to do, Bro. Eyerly; this year turned his attention to raising a crop. It is his intention to harvest

what he has sown and planted, hoping and expecting that then the door will again open for him to give himself fully to the work. May the Lord grant it. He will, providing permitting, attend the South-Western Yearly Meeting, at Long Branch, Neb., next September, and I have no doubt the occasion will prove a rich blessing to all present. This article would not be complete without saying that Brother Eyerly's excellent wife is an earnest Christian, and is thoroughly in earnest on this Sabbath question, and together they are striving to rear their young family of three children in the nurture and fear of the Lord. It must also be added that only five—Bro. Eyerly and wife, Bro. Woley and wife, and a young woman—are publicly known as Sabbath keepers. On one occasion, twenty-two rose in public, without hesitation, and by that act declared themselves convinced that the seventh day is the Sabbath. It is sad to think how many are doing violence to their consciences, and bringing barrenness and darkness to their own souls. Others are thinking deeply on this subject. Let us commit this case to God in earnest prayer.

SAMUEL R. WHEELER, PARDNER, Kan. May 1st, 1878.

WASHINGTON CORRESPONDENCE.

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 3d, 1878. The malaria of Washington is a fruitful theme to all speakers and writers who sojourn here. The Congressman whose idle and dissolute life leads him into all manner of excesses, invariably assigns as the cause of his physical prostration the malaria of his river flats and tide swamps. He may have been upon a week's spree, and with head swelled with whisky and its effects, yet he will gravely tell us, Washington is as malarious and unhealthy as Cuba, and that the city should be removed to a more healthy latitude. We very much doubt whether any city of the Union, with as large a population, can show less sickness than Washington. The infamous flats covering hundreds of acres, created by the causeway of the Long Bridge in the Potomac, which lie right before the White House, and are daily bared by the ebb of the tide, would seem sufficient in themselves to engender epidemic disease, yet the natural advantages of the city in other directions serve as admirable correctives, and as a consequence we flatter ourselves we have as much cause to be thankful for our general good health, as other cities. If we except the terrible mortality found among the young of the colored people, then our mortality rate tends to give a serious look to our death statistics, and to warrant many writers in asserting that Washington is akin to Rome in unhealthfulness.

Our society people were much exercised recently over the announcement in an evening paper that Senator Mitchell's (of Oregon) daughter had made a marriage elopement. But prolonged gossip was prevented by the subsequent publication of a letter from one of our leading Episcopal ministers, stating that he had married the couple in the presence of the bride's parents. The marriage has been opposed in the past by Mr. and Mrs. Mitchell, because of their daughter's youth, she being but sixteen, and that of her husband who is but twenty. Yet finding opposition useless, they finally gave consent, so our sensationalists had all their wonderment checked by the quiet home wedding of the children at the home of the Senator. Mr. Mitchell's life has been a varied one, and yet full of interest. A farmer boy in early life, he ran away from home to get an education. Acquiring his letters, he became a lawyer, and drifting West to Oregon, he soon accumulated wealth and a political prominence that put him into the United States Senate. While very young, he contracted a most unfortunate marriage, but obtained release from it after going West. His second, the present wife, is one of the most accomplished ladies of the Capital, and this daughter possesses her mother's graces and beauty of the highest type.

A most notable colloquy took place in the House on Tuesday between the members on the subject of economy; and Epeker Randall, who left his chair to participate in it, had need of all his powers of reply before it was ended. Economy is now the subject matter of all discussions, and, of course, Tuesday's debate was full of it. Mr. Randall was asked why he had voted in a former Congress to give himself \$7,500 salary, why he afterwards voted for the repeal of the law by which he received that amount, and why he took care not to refund any of it. He replied that he believed his services worth \$7,500, but as his constituents thought differently, he accepted their wish as the higher power which had to be obeyed, hence his vote to repeal. But as he believed he had a full, honest right to keep what had been paid him, he used it for paying his debts, and his people never blamed him for so doing. His defense was a manly one, and was well received on all sides. In all these personal tilts in Congress, there is a great deal of bitter and acrimonious display, and Tuesday's debate was certainly no exception. All the leaders took a hand in it, and many a brick was thrown by the participants, who are

all determined to put the opposite party "hors de combat" in next Fall's election, which now is the object of every move upon our Congressional chess-board. Mr. Randall's recent letter to Ohio politicians, urging the redistricting of that State, in order to ensure the election of additional Democratic Congressmen, simply shows to what extent the question of the Fall elections engrosses the attention of our statesmen. We hear it on all sides, "whoever obtains control of the next House will elect the next President;" hence every debate, every law passed, and every action in Congress has in view—first, the effect upon the Fall elections; and, second, the White House.

If the confessions of the participants in the so-called Louisiana frauds have disturbed the political equilibrium here, for either dismay on the Republican side, or joy of the Democrats, we have not been able to perceive it; they hardly proved a nine-days' wonder, and no one now in Congress seems to care a pin for them. One thing seems assured, those who in Congress voted to sustain the results of the Electoral Commission will not now join any one to reopen the vexed question. Mr. Hayes came into power upon an undoubted compromise, and we have seen no one who was party to it that is now inclined to undo his action. The Electoral Commission Bill was found so full of flaws in the final contest that by compromise only could the counting of the votes be secured, and the generally expressed sentiment is, that right or wrong, Hayes is President, and must remain so. FELIX.

CONSECRATION.

Paul wrote to the Corinthians, "Ye are not your own, for ye are bought with a price." And to the Roman saints he also wrote, "Present your bodies a living sacrifice unto God." To consecrate means to set apart to a particular purpose, and Christians are supposed to be set apart to the holy purpose of serving God with all their hearts. Consecration may therefore be defined as the act of performing this great and important duty—recognizing in our own minds the truth of the statement made in the first quotation above, that God has the entire and absolute ownership of us, spirit, soul, and body, with everything pertaining thereto, including our mental faculties, moral powers, and bodily appetites and habits. Not only giving the consent of our wills to this great fact, but actually choosing to have it so, feeling that God's claims upon us are higher than any other claim, and with the action of our wills giving full and complete submission to those claims without any mental reservation whatever. This act of the will is what is implied in the exhortation contained in the second quotation above. This consecration implies that we earnestly consent and will to do, whatever the word and law of God requires us to do, and that we abstain from doing whatever they forbid. This will include not only our outward conduct, taking in all our habits and actions, such as eating and drinking, business, conversation, dress, amusements, etc., but also our thoughts, feelings, desires, motives, and imaginations. A consecrated person will not think wrong thoughts—they may enter the mind unbidden, but they will be driven out very quickly, even as the traffickers were driven from the temple. He will not cherish unlawful or wicked feelings, indulge impure desires, harbor unchaste emotions, or gratify unholy passions or appetites, because the law of God takes cognizance of all these things, in letter and spirit, and positively prohibits them. Hence, as the Psalmist very emphatically declares, "Thy commandment is exceeding broad," even a discernor of the thoughts and intents of the heart.

But many professing Christians are very willing to admit that we must be pure and holy in heart, but our bodies need not be so much under the influence of this complete consecration; or, in other words, if our hearts are only right, it is not of so much consequence how we get or appear, and therefore do indulge in many things outwardly, or with their bodies, contrary to the word of God and to the spirit of holiness, indulging in things merely for the gratification of depraved appetites, or to conform to the customs and fashions of the world. A person fully consecrated to do the will of God in all things will not partake of food or drink which impairs the health, or injures the bodily or mental powers in any way. He certainly will not use any intoxicating liquor as a beverage, and will be cautious as to highly seasoned food, and the common stimulating drinks. And in view of these statements, what shall be said of those who use tobacco in any or all the ways so common and almost universal? How can bodies be presented to God a holy sacrifice, which are continually being made impure by such an unclean article? How can bodies be temples of the Holy Ghost that are constantly being defiled by such a filthy practice? Can a sacrifice be acceptable to God with such uncleanness adhering to it? And in relation to dress, how many forget the plain and pointed directions given by Paul and Peter about this common every day affair of life. Let every one in the habit of wearing fashionable, gaudy apparel, or of putting on gold, or pearls, or gewgaws of any kind, or

costly array, or braiding or curling their hair, take their Bibles, and turn to 1 Tim. 2, and to 1 Peter 3, and see, and read, and understand what Peter refers to the habits of holy persons, as in the old time, "going back as far as the time when Sarah, the wife of Abraham, lived, to show how they dressed and conducted, and if it was wrong then, and at the time when the apostles wrote, for Christians to array themselves with such things as are named in the chapters referred to, surely it must be so now. The lapse of time and popular custom do not make wrong actions right. The apostles were writing as they were inspired by the Spirit, and therefore what they found must have been wrong, because so pointedly condemned by them, and a consecrated soul will always rejoice in the Word of God so plainly enjoins, and abstain from what so plainly forbids. There is also considerable said about dress in Isaiah, third chapter, which those interested would do well to read very carefully and prayerfully. These instructions and directions about this particular subject, come to us with the same authority and force that any part of the Word of God does, in relation to any other subject of which it speaks, and hence ought to be heeded with the same attention and obedience. O how very much is implied in being really consecrated Christians, not only in the condition and character of our hearts, but also in the state of our bodies, and the absolute control we maintain over them. Paul says: "I keep my body and bring it into subjection; but your bodies are not for fornication, but for the Lord." Know ye not that your bodies are the members of Christ? "Ye are not your own; ye are bought with a price, therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's." J. H. HATHORN.

WHITWATER, WIS.

CHURCH ORGANIZATION.

By request, I propose to make a statement of my views of church organization and order. I suppose my views are in harmony, at least with a majority, if not the entire denomination. First, as to church organization. No form of organization is laid down by the Great Teacher. Baptism seems to be the act by which one was recognized as a member of the visible body, or Christ's church. All baptized believers were recognized as belonging to the great family. As to new organizations, I think the General Conference has set forth the real truth on this subject, in answer to questions raised by Rev. N. Y. Hull in the Fall of 1843, by adopting the report of a committee raised by that body, as follows:

"1. In the judgment of your committee, it is due to good order and public opinion, that in the organization of churches, the aid of ordained ministers should be had when it can be consistently and conveniently obtained; but when this cannot be consistently and conveniently obtained, we believe that the Scriptures warrant any number of brethren, harmonizing in the truth of the gospel, to resolve themselves a good church, that the act of a church thus organized, has all the power and authority requisite in appointing their administrator, and receiving the ordinances of the gospel, no less than if they had been organized by a council of ministers, that the administration of such persons are made valid by the church under which they act."

All churches thus organized are gospel churches in the opinion of the Conference, and not "so-called" gospel churches, and the Conference is bound by its own creed to regard the organization as "Scriptural." The church has no right to impose any conditions of membership not imposed by Christ or his apostles. Too often human wisdom has called in question the wisdom of Christ, and made the beauty and wisdom of Christ's order of non-effect, by imposing its own sense of wisdom and propriety, and has terribly marred its beauty! As to changing our standing from one church to another, the Conference and the Associations have advised such persons to take letters of standing. The object of this is to inform the church, where the member holding the letter proposes to join, of the real standing of the brother. Where no information is imparted, no letter is demanded. It often occurs that the church where the brother proposes to join, knows the Christian character of the brother better than the one where he holds his membership. To require a letter in such a case, would be simply supercilious and a positive wrong. What right has a church to impose conditions of membership on men not imposed by Christ? Simply none. When the church refuses membership and its privileges, knowing me to be guilty of no moral wrong for which Christ or his apostles would have me labeled, and they are expelled, if not recalled, they are offenders, losing it over God's heritage. Individuals have rights as well as churches. Churches are not legislative bodies. No church has legislative authority over the church. If so, where is it? What are its bounds, if any? The moment a church claims the right of imposing one thing not imposed by Christ or his inspired apostles, it has stepped over the threshold of popery, and belongs there. V. HULL.

This Paris International Exposition was opened May 1st, by President MacMahon, with appropriate ceremonies.



