

loosing, to all the promise of the Holy Ghost. Let me repeat it; if He meant to make Peter his Vicar, He would have appointed him commander in chief of His spiritual army.

"Christ," says the Scripture, "Forbade Peter and his colleagues to have rule and lordship and power over believers like the princes of the Gentiles." (Luke xii. 25.) If Peter had been made Pope, Jesus would not have spoken thus, for according to our traditions, the papacy holds in its hands two swords, the symbol of spiritual and temporal power.

But here is another fact of greater importance still. An ecumenical council was gathered at Jerusalem to decide on questions on which believers were divided. Who would have convoked this council if St. Peter had been Pope? St. Peter? Who would have presided over it? St. Peter or his legates. Who would have formulated and promulgated the canons of it? St. Peter. Well, now, nothing of the kind ever took place. The apostle was present at the council like all his colleagues. But it was not he who framed its conclusions, but St. James; and when the decrees of it were promulgated this was done in the name of "the apostles, the elders and the brethren." (Acts xv.) Is this the way we manage things in our Church?

The deeper I go, my venerable brethren, in my examination, the more I am convinced that in the Holy Scriptures there is no appearance of the primacy of the son of Jonas.

While we teach that the Church is being built on St. Peter, St. Paul, whose authority cannot be questioned tells us in his epistle to the Ephesians (ii. 20) "that it is built upon the foundation of apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone." The same apostle is so far from believing in the supremacy of Peter, that he only rebukes those who say, "I am of Paul and I of Apollos" (1 Cor. i. 12), in the same terms as those who would say, "I am of Peter." If then the latter apostle was vicar of Jesus Christ, St. Paul would have taken good care not to censure so violently those who held to his colleague.

The same Apostle Paul, enumerating the offices of the church, mentions apostles, prophets, evangelists, teachers, pastors. Is it credible, venerable brethren, that St. Paul, the great teacher of the Gentiles, would have left out the greatest of all the offices—the papacy—if the papacy had been founded by divine institution? It seems to me that this omission would have been no more possible than a history of this council that should make no mention whatever of His Holiness, Pius IX. (Voices in the Assembly, "Silence, heretic, silence!") Keep calm, venerable brethren; I have not got through yet. By hindering me from going on, you will show the world that you are in the wrong, and that you have gagged the humblest member of this body.

I proceed: The Apostle Paul in not one of his letters addressed to the various churches makes any mention of the primacy of Peter. If this primacy had existed; if, in short, the church had had a supreme head, infallible in teaching, would the great teacher of the Gentiles have omitted all mention of it? Nay! He would have written a long epistle on this important, this vital subject. When, therefore, he is rearing the edifice of Christian doctrine, is it possible that he leaves out the foundation and the keystone? Now, unless the Apostolic Church is to be reckoned heretical, which we neither wish nor dare to say, we are constrained to acknowledge that the church has never been more fair, more pure, nor more holy, than in the days when it had no Pope. (Voices: It is false! it is false!)

Monsignor de Laval cannot contradict this, for if any one of you, venerable

brethren, should dare to think that the Church, which at this day has a Pope for its head, is stronger in the faith, or purer in morals, than the Apostolic Church, he must say it openly in the face of the world, for this room is the center from which our words fly from pole to pole.

I proceed: Not in the writings of St. Paul, nor in those of St. James, have I found any trace or germ of the Papal power. St. Luke, the historian of the missionary labors of the Apostles, is silent on this vital point. The silence of these holy men, whose writings are part of the canon of the inspired Scriptures, is as inexplicable, if Peter had been Pope, as that of Theirs would have been, if he had omitted the title of Emperor in the history of Napoleon Bonaparte.

I see before me a member of this body who says, pointing to me with his finger, "He is a schismatic bishop who has got among us under false pretenses."

No, no, my venerable brethren, I did not come to this august body like a thief, by the window. I came by the door just as regularly as yourselves. It is my right as a bishop, as it is my duty as a Christian, to speak and declare what I know to be true.

But the thing which astounds me beyond all expression is the silence of Peter himself. If he had been what we say—the vicar of Christ upon earth—he must have known it. If he knew it, how does it happen that he never once—not one solitary time—acted as Pope? He might have done it on the day of Pentecost, when he pronounced his first discourse, but he did not. He might have done it at the Council of Jerusalem, but he did not. He might have done it in his two epistles to the churches, but he did not. Imagine such a Pope as this, O my venerable brethren!

If, then, we would maintain that Peter was Pope, it necessarily follows that we must maintain that he was not aware of it at the time. I put it to any man with a head to think and reflect, whether these two suppositions are credible.

To sum up, then: During the lifetime of the Apostles the Church never thought of the possibility of a Pope. To maintain the contrary, it would be necessary to put the Holy Scriptures into the fire, or out of the mind.

But I hear from all sides the question, "Was not St. Peter at Rome? Was he not crucified here head downward? The chair from which he taught, the altar at which he said mass, are they not in this Eternal City?"

Venerable brethren, the sojourn of St. Peter at Rome has no other proof than tradition. But if he was Bishop of Rome, what argument can be drawn from his episcopate here to prove his supremacy? A scholar of the highest rank, Scaliger, has not hesitated to say that the episcopate and sojourn of St. Peter at Rome must be classed among ridiculous legends. (Repeated cries: "Silence him! silence him! Down with him from the platform!")

Venerable brethren, I am ready to be silent; but is it not more becoming to such a body as this to prove all things, as the Apostle enjoins, and believe that which is good?

I will not press this further, venerable brethren, but pass on to the great argument which is alleged in proof of the primacy of the Bishop of Rome.

By the rock on which the holy church was built, you understand Peter. If this were true, it would be an end to the dispute. But the early fathers, who must surely have known something about it, did not think as we do on this point.

[The Bishop proceeds to cite the fathers—Cyril, Hilary, Jerome, Chrysostom, Ambrose, Basil of Seleucia—as agreeing in the view that the rock was Peter's faith, or the great truth to which he testified, and concludes with

several emphatic and decisive expressions from Augustine.]

So far was this great Bishop from believing that the church was built on St. Peter, that he said to his people in his thirteenth sermon: "Thou art Peter, and on this rock which thou hast confessed—this rock which thou hast acknowledged in declaring, 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God'—I will build my Church—on myself, in that I am the Son of the living God, will I build it—on me and not on thee."

St. Augustine's opinion on this famous text was the opinion of all Christendom in his day.

To sum up, then, I have proved:

1. That Jesus gave to all the apostles the same power as Peter.

2. That the apostles never recognized Peter as the apostle of Jesus Christ and the infallible teacher of the Church.

3. That Peter never thought of being Pope, and never acted as Pope.

4. That the councils of the first four centuries, while acknowledging the high power of the Bishop of Rome conceded to him only a pre-eminence of honor, never of power or jurisdiction.

5. That the holy fathers in the famous passage, "Thou art Peter, and on this rock will I build my church," never understood that the Church was built upon Peter (*super Petrum*), but upon the rock (*super petram*), that is the apostle's confession of faith.

I conclude triumphantly with history, with reason, with logic with common sense, and with Christian conscience, that Jesus Christ conferred no supremacy whatever on St. Peter; and that if the Bishops of Rome have come to be sovereigns of the Church, it has only been by the process of confiscating, one by one, all the rights of the bishops. (Voices—Silence the impudent Protestant! Silence him!)

I, an impudent Protestant? No! a thousand times no.

History is neither Catholic, nor Anglican, nor Calvinist, nor Lutheran, nor Arminian, nor Schismatic Greek, nor Ultramontane. It is what it is; it is something mightier than all the decisions of ecumenical councils.

You may write falsely against it if you dare; but you can no more destroy it than you can throw down the Coliseum by pulling out a brickbat. If I have said anything which history disproves, confront me with history, and without a moment's hesitation, I will make the amende honorable. But be patient awhile, and you will find that I have not yet said the whole of what I have undertaken to say, and must say. If the stake were waiting for me on the great square of St. Peter's I could not be silent—I should be bound to go on.

The remainder of this eloquent and interesting speech is devoted to the historical argument against infallibility, but our limited space forbids its publication.

## Reports from the Field.

BETHEL, OR., June 28, 1881.

Dear Bro. Campbell:

Wishing you health and the fullness of the blessings of Christ during your severe affliction, I would say that our meeting at Chehalis closed on the third Sunday in the afternoon until the next Saturday, on account of the rain, which began early on Sunday morning (the 3d Sunday), and increased during the day; but notwithstanding the rain we had a fair attendance.

On Saturday before the fourth Sunday we met at 11 A. M. and had fair attendance both in the forenoon and afternoon; but on Lord's day, notwithstanding the rain in the morning, we had a fine audience in the grove. We closed in the afternoon, to meet on Saturday, at 11 A. M., before the fourth Sunday in July, at the celebration grounds, at Newburg, to hold over

Sunday.

Our meeting on Sunday was very pleasant. The immediate result of our meeting was one accession by confession, to be baptized on the first Sunday in July, at Amity.

In hope,

T. M. MORGAN.

Moscow, I. T., June 5, 1881.

Bro. Campbell:

Believing that you and quite a number of the readers of the P. C. MESSENGER would like to know how the cause of our Master is prospering in this part of his vineyard, we would beg leave to report through the columns of the MESSENGER, so that all may know how we as a little band of disciples are getting along.

It is a well known fact that there has been a Christian church organized here since '76, (and a part of the time in a prospering condition), until recently while trying to adjust a difficulty that had existed for some time, the church became disorganized. But notwithstanding all that we never once thought of turning back into the world and forsaking our Master. As soon as we could consistently we made arrangements to have prayer meeting once a week, and kept it up regularly, with an increased interest, Bro. Cannon preaching for us once a month a part of the time.

But not feeling altogether satisfied, living in a disorganized condition and believing that we could accomplish more good by forming ourselves in to a body, we appointed a meeting for that purpose on Tuesday evening, May 24, 1881. A very respectable congregation was present on the occasion. Old Bro. T. J. Pasley was present and presided over the meeting. Thirty-two names were enrolled as charter members.

Bro. John Russell, H. M. Rogers and W. D. Craig was selected for elders. Bro. J. W. Ellis and O. H. P. Beagle was selected for deacons.

All seems to be peace and harmony. We think our prospects are rather flattering. This is to be known as the Christian church at Moscow.

The above report was read and approved by the congregation meeting at Moscow for worship this first Lord's day in June, 1881.

T. J. PASLEY, Chairman.  
W. D. CRAIG, Secretary.

## Benton County Annual Meeting.

The Benton county annual meeting was held at Beaver creek school house, commencing on Saturday, June 4th, in business capacity. Wallace Post in the chair.

Bro. Wigle offered the following motion: Inasmuch as there is strength in the assembling together of disciples from distant localities, we are favorable to annual state coöperative efforts in comforting the brethren and teaching the word in its simplicity; such efforts not to be restricted to any one locality. Prevailed.

Motion, that in case the state meetings are re-established, that our county meetings be discontinued. Prevailed.

Motion that the chair will appoint a committee to make arrangements for our next annual county meeting in case the state meetings are not re-established. Prevailed.

Motion that the chair will appoint county delegate to attend the state co-operation meeting. Prevailed. Bro. Wigle was chosen by the chair.

Motion that the elders of the congregation at Beaver creek will act as delegates at the state meeting for this congregation. Prevailed.

After announcing that there will be preaching and a basket dinner on to-morrow, on motion, the meeting adjourned.

WALLACE POST,  
Chairman.

—No one can imagine the influence and efficiency of a life entirely Christian. It is a blessing to the whole neighborhood in which it is displayed. It is like a dew from the Lord, and as showers upon the grass. But by an unworthy and unbecoming conduct, a professor of religion can destroy much good. He causes the way of truth to be evil spoken of. He hardens transgressors; perplexes the weak; grieves the strong. He opposes and discourages all those who are laboring to win souls. Woe to the world because of offences; but woe to that man by whom the offence cometh! —Wm. Jay.

## A RICH EXPERIENCE.

What a Prominent and Well-Known New York Physician Told a Reporter.

His Revelations Upon a Subject of Vital Interest to All.

(Detroit Free Press.)

The experience of any one of education and learning extending over a long period of time must necessarily be valuable, and while no two experiences in this world are alike, there is such a similarity between them as to render one which is valuable facts to all. America's greatest orator declared that he knew of no way of judging the future but by the past; and past personal experience is of the same nature as that history which repeats itself.

A representative of the paper while lingering in the lobby of a prominent New York hotel, met a gentleman whom he had known years before in the city of Detroit, but whom he had not seen in a number of years. When the knight of the quill had last seen this gentleman, he was giving his entire time and attention to an extensive medical practice, and was on the crest of the wave of popularity. From Detroit he removed to New York, where he could find a more extensive field for his talents and experience. Although several years had passed, the doctor's physical condition had evidently very much improved, for he was looking much better than when the man of news had last seen him. After some general talk, the doctor fell into an easy train of conversation and uttered some truths so scientific and valuable as to justify their reproduction in print.

"Yes," said the doctor, "I have improved in health since you last saw me and I hope also in my other ways. One thing, however, I have succeeded in doing, and it is one of the hardest things for anyone, and especially a doctor, to do, and that is I have overcome my prejudices. You know there are some people who prefer to remain in the wrong rather than acknowledge the manifest right. Such prejudice leads to bigotry of the worst order, and of precisely the same nature as characterized the sixteenth century when people were burned at the stake. Now I am a physician and of the 'old school' order, too; but I have after years of experience, and observation, come to the conclusion that truth is the highest of all things, and that if prejudice or bigotry stand in the way of truth, so much the worse for them—they are certain to be crushed sooner or later. Why, when I knew you, in Detroit I would no sooner have thought of violating the code of ethics laid down by the profession, or of prescribing anything out of the regular order, than I would of amputating my hand. Now, however, I prescribe and advise those things which I believe to be adapted to cure, and which my experience has proven to be such."

"This is rather an unusual way for a physician to talk, is it not, doctor?"

"Certainly it is. It is way outside of our code of ethics, but I have grown far beyond the code. I have all I can attend to, and am determined to be honest with my patients and mankind, whether my brother physicians are with me or not. Why, I prescribe medicines every day, some of them so-called patent medicines, which would render me liable to expulsion from the medical fraternity, but I am so supremely indifferent to their laws, that I believe to be adapted to cure, and which my experience has proven to be such."

"How did you come to get such heretical ideas as these, doctor?"

"Oh, they are the result of my experience and observation. I obtained my first ideas upon the subject, however, from having been cured after all my care and skill of my professional brethren had failed to relieve me. Why, I was so badly off with a complication of troubles, including dyspepsia, and consequently imperfect kidneys and liver, that I feared I should have to give up my practice. For more than a month I could not sit down or get up without the most intense agony, and I was suffering all the while. Some one advised me to go out of the regular channels and try a remedy that was becoming quite famous for the remarkable cures it was effecting; but my prejudice was altogether too strong for that. However, I did quietly begin trying the remedy, but I promise you I said nothing to my brother physicians, or even to my family about it. Well, sir, it was a revelation to me; for in all my medical experience I never saw anything operate so rapidly as that did. I suppose I analyzed all the leading proprietary medicines that are made. Many of them I found perfectly useless, being compounded simply of water with a little flavoring. A vast majority of them all, however, I found made up of prescriptions used by physicians in their every-day practice; and I suppose the entire number I found only two that contained absolutely harmful ingredients and then in a very slight quantities. Indeed we are prescribing things constantly that have more deleterious matter in them than they had. After discovering this I said to myself: Why should the medical fraternity be prejudiced against those prescriptions which they are writing every day, simply because they are put up by wholesale and sold with a government stamp in the wrapper? I saw its manifest absurdity and resolved that I would be bound by it no longer. Since that time, I have prescribed proprietary remedies nearly every day, in my practice, and I have no reason to regret having done so. Why, only a few days ago I advised a lady who was suffering from a serious female difficulty and displacement to use this same Safe Kidney and Liver Cure which cured me. I saw her this morning and she is nearly well; the pain and inflammation are all gone and she is around as usual. We have no right in the medical fraternity to sit back and declare there is no such thing as improvement or advancement, or that we have no monopoly of the remedies which nature has given mankind. There are great changes going on in every department of life and there are great developments in medicine as well. Thousands of people die every year from supposed typhoid fever, rheumatism or other complaints, when in reality it is from trichina, and the result of eating poorly cooked and diseased pork. A vast majority of all diseases arise from imperfect kidneys or liver. The liver becomes clogged, and its work is thrown upon the kidneys; they become overworked and break down, and the poison gets into the blood instead of being thrown from the system. No one with perfect kidneys or liver is ever troubled with trichina, and it is the poisonous particles which get into the blood that clog the capillaries of the lungs and cause intercalaria and consumption. Thousands of children are dying every year from dropsy as the sequel to scarlatina, when in reality it is diseased kidneys which have become weakened by the fever they have just had. Here is another strange thing, not one in ten people who have diseased kidneys, notice pain in the vicinity of the kidneys, for these organs lose their nervous sensibilities when they become diseased, and the symptoms are shown in hundreds of other ways."

"Well, doctor, you have got some new truths here, certainly, but they sound very reasonable to me."

"Well, whether they are reasonable or not, I have demonstrated to my own satisfaction that they are true, and I propose to stand by them, no matter how much opposition I may raise by doing so. Any man, be he politician, preacher or physician, who is so considerate of his pocket book or of his own personal ends as to stultify himself by suppressing the manifest truth, is unworthy the name of a man, and unworthy the confidence of the public whom he serves."