

all. We in company with Bro. D. M. Doty of Scio, made our home in the hospitable and pleasant family of Bro. G. W. Johnson. Brother and Sister Johnson have our thanks for the special kindness shown us during our stay in Salem. The Convention convened on Wednesday, Oct. 3d, and closed on Saturday, Oct. 6, 1888. More anon.

PURCHASING THE GIFT OF GOD.

When Simon the sorcerer proposed to purchase the gift of the Holy Spirit, Peter said to him, "Thy money perish with thee, because thou hast thought that the gift of God may be purchased with money." Simon had but recently been converted, and we believe, as soundly as any one else at the city of Samaria; but he had also been a sorcerer and this old desire to bewitch the people with his wonderful works had not been wholly forgotten by him. Hence when he saw the miracles of Philip and perceived that through the laying on of the apostles' hands the Holy Spirit was imparted, the temptation was too strong. The contrast between his pretended power of God and the miracles of the apostles was too striking to be denied, and the superiority of the latter over the former was very apparent. Hence as Simon was only a man, and a child of God who needed to be fed on milk rather than on strong meat, the idea doubtless flashed on his mind that now was the time to possess himself of that real power of God which was so much desired in his old profession. Then he also had an eye single to the money there was in it. His old witchcraft had doubtless been a great source of financial profit to him, and this was insignificant compared with the profit that would arise from a possession of the real power of God. So he proposed to purchase this gift with money. This was his fatal mistake, and hence Peter's rebuke. He had allowed his strong desire for money to get the better of him, and so he erred as a child of God.

Now let each Christian take this lesson home to himself. Let him examine his own heart and see if in some way he is not trying to purchase the gifts of God with money. If so, the language of Peter to Simon should come ringing home to every one such, "Repent therefore of this thy wickedness, and pray God, if perhaps the thought of thine heart may be forgiven thee."

A WORD TO OUR CRITICS.

We notice that our Woman's Rights critics are still after us. This time it is Sister "H. A. L." to whom we had the pleasure of listening in our town some time since. She thinks we have violated the Golden Rule in calling in question some of the positions of the movement. We are not an enemy to our fair sisters by any means; but we have never understood the Golden Rule to allow those engaged in such an "important movement" to criticise and even censure those who may chance to differ with them on this question without being willing to consider a word in self defense. Have not the thousands of intelligent men and women on this coast who do not accept the doctrine of Woman Suffrage a right to hold and express their opinions? We think the Golden Rule will allow those who can not accept all features of this doctrine to speak as warmly and as earnestly in opposition to it as its advocates speak for it. We must think that when those engaged in the movement accept Henry Ward Beecher and push him to the front to advocate their cause with skeptical blasphemy of the Bible, it is high time for Christian people to call a halt. It is rather a defense of the Bible in which we are engaged than in opposing Woman Suffrage; and this we are compelled to do at all hazards.

We will close our part of this discussion by recommending to our Sister critics the following chapter from Prof. O. S. Fowler, in which he examines it from a scientific point of view. We hope they will carefully study it and act upon its wholesome lessons:

THIS WOMAN'S RIGHTS MOVEMENT ALL WRONG.

Both the entire spirit and manner of this whole reform, falsely so called, deserve severe censure. It starts with a wrong object, which it prosecutes in a way most objectionable, and calculated to thwart the very ends sought. Its *modus operandi* is quite like one man clubbing another with "Give me my rights, I tell you!" and instantly repeating the blow with, "Then give me my rights this instant, you old heathen!"

It is conducted chiefly by dissatisfied wives, or else by unmarried croakers, most of whom are in a grumbling mood. The very look and entire aspect of these

"strong-minded" too plainly declare that their affections have been reversed, and that disappointed love has thoroughly soured them throughout. What one of them all is in a warm, gushing, genial, plastic, affectionate mood? Only those who are, have any "right" to say one word; yet those have no word to say. Waiting for such to move in these rights' movement would be like waiting for the water to stop running. At least, unmarried novices, though forty, are improper spokesmen. Only laying hens have any right to cackle. Let those speak who know something by experience—that best of teachers. This entire movement is directly calculated to breed conjugal dissatisfaction.

One other absolutely determining question. Do men LOVE these women's rights women all the more, or the less, for their independent spirit? Do they admiringly flock around such with beseeching matrimonial proposals? A very few of these strong-minded bricks are indeed required in order to complete this great temple of humanity. A very few men, who are themselves two-thirds feminine, require to marry these two-thirds masculines; because opposite sexes must marry. Effeminate men naturally take and propose to these strongly masculinized women, yet most vigorous human males "pass by" such women "on the other side;" because these commanding, independent, authoritative, positive women, who insist on overruling family affairs, must either marry tame, weak-minded, putty men, who are two-thirds woman, and therefore willing to serve under them, or else create a conflict of jurisdiction. There are a few just such tame, meeching, automaton machines, just adapted to these arbitrary, driving, two-thirds masculine, "strong minded," "woman's rights" wives, who love to command, conduct business, lead off, and take the responsibility; while these easy, lazy, shiftless, inert husbands will endure to be "henpecked." This is a wise adaptation for both, because such men without such women would starve; and such women, with positive men, would "foment strife" perpetually. Yet men neither "take" to these positive women, nor many females to these negative "things." Arguing woman's rights is the surest way effectually to disgust all the others, or nine hundred and ninety-

nine in every thousand, who feel all over,—

"Away with this eternal clatter about woman's rights. It nauseates me. I want no such thing for my wife. Let such support and enjoy their own independence for aught I care."

This test—whether men like or dislike this class of women most—is the final umpire; the supreme court of appeal. Young women, all women who value masculine appreciation, or desire marriage, take fair warning that this clamor drives men from you always, attracts them never. Beware, then, how you allow it to blast your matrimonial prospects—that sole end of the female creation, and only "sphere" in which you can ever be happy. How much are woman's-rights woman loved, and how much do they love, is the test question. Let those answer that who dare, and all think out its import. Does this class produce more and better, or fewer and poorer, children? Does not this movement array itself against this only end of the female creation? If American ladies, thus petted and indulged, have just grounds for such a "movement," surely those of any and all other nations should raise heaven and earth by their clamors.

Selections and Comments.

A NEW CHURCH.—The *Christian at Work* says:

According to a Brooklyn correspondent of *The Southern Churchman*, Dr. Schaff says "that the Presbyterians are all ready to come into the Episcopal Church, if only certain concessions are made, so that their ministers may be received into the order of deacons in that church." Doubtless Dr. Schaff is right; and we may add that the concessions probably include the abrogation of the Episcopate, the fading out of Apostolic Succession—already grown very dim—the obliteration of baptismal regeneration, and the abolition of a compulsory liturgy. With these "concessions" there is no good reason why the Presbypiscopal church should not spring into being, and go forth to do effectual work for the Master.

The great trouble is that too many churches of a similar nature have already sprung into existence. What we now want in Christendom is a complete abandonment of all creeds, confessions of faith and human liturgy, and a return to primitive Christianity. Instead of one sectarian church merging into another and thus perpetuating de-