

THE STANDARD. LARGEST PAPER PUBLISHED IN CONCORD. CONTAINS MORE READING MATTER THAN ANY OTHER PAPER IN THIS SECTION.

THE STANDARD.

VOL. III.—NO. 43.

CONCORD, N. C. THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 1890.

WHOLE NO. 156.

THE STANDARD. WE DO ALL KINDS OF JOB WORK IN THE NEATEST MANNER AND AT THE LOWEST RATES.

Rev. Walter S. Creasy

REPLIES TO REV. DR. PRITCHARD'S ARTICLE ON SAM JONES.

A Time When Silence Ceases to be a Virtue—The Doctor's Statements Contradicted and His Arguments Replied To—Sam Jones and His Methods and Manners Defended.

There come times in the lives and histories of men and churches when silence ceases to be a virtue. In the humble judgment of the writer one of those times has arrived in the city of Wilmington as regards the preacher, Dr. T. H. Pritchard, a man for whom I have had the highest regard, with whom I have labored in the various matters which we believed in common to be for the good of our people, a man whose age, experience, wisdom and position I honor, and to whom I have been and ever shall be ready to give my hand and hearty co-operation in every good work and work, on three or four different occasions, in the public prints, seen fit to criticize and disparage our Brother Sam P. Jones to the detriment, as far as his influence extended, to the meeting of the Methodist church in Wilmington. We bore this in silence, choosing rather to suffer wrong than to wrangle and perhaps cause some poor sinner to be lost, excusing himself from his duty, by saying the christian minister should not agree with himself; and had Dr. Pritchard held his peace, the past would have been forgotten, and this article would never have been written. But he sees fit to revive the whole matter, to tear open a wound that we hoped was healing. Now more, he seems to challenge all who think differently with him to show a reason for their thinking, to which task we now apply ourselves.

The Doctor says: "More than a year ago, it was proposed by a member of the Evangelical Alliance of this city to invite this celebrated evangelist to hold a meeting here, that he distinctly declared that he could not co-operate with him. He says Dr. Hoge agreed with him, and he thinks at least one other member of the Alliance. Now the Doctor's thinking was not very clear about that other member. No other member expressed himself opposed to the invitation. The lapse of more than a year ago" has further belittled the Doctor's thinking. I was the member who proposed the coming of Brother Jones, and the scenes and words of that day and hour are not easily forgotten by me. Dr. Pritchard did not oppose me; he was mute as to where he stood. Dr. Hoge opposed it and made a talk against it, which of course he had a right to do. The members present on this occasion will bear testimony to this fact. Let me say further that several months later, about two weeks before Jones came to Charlotte, Dr. Pritchard said to me: "I wish you people would get Jones to come here, I want to hear him." I answered: "We are trying, and will do so as early as possible." The Doctor will not deny this.

He says again: "Let it be remembered that he was invited here by his Methodist brethren" (and of course if he claims so much harm as the Doctor claims, his Methodist brethren are responsible for it. Well, we are not ashamed of the work he did in this city) and not by the Alliance "as was Mr. Pearson." The question was sprung in the Alliance and the unanimous decision was that the Alliance did not call Mr. Pearson, they only agreed to cooperate. He was called by the Alliance had a being, or even the preacher's meeting. He says again: "And indeed he was called here against the protests of at least two members of the Alliance." Let us see. Who does he mean? I suppose he means Dr. Hoge and himself. They were the only men who belonged to the Alliance who wrote against Jones. But let us see. He says that the Alliance did not call him; would have nothing to do with him. It was the Methodist brethren, and yet two of the members, according to the Doctor, are protesting against his coming and thus interfering with matters that the Alliance has washed its hands of. We will apply the Doctor's own rule to this matter. He said on a former occasion when Brother Pearson was invited here, and he was opposed by a minister of this city through the press, that a man who did not belong to the Alliance or who was not engaged in the work ought at least to keep quiet and let the work go on. From his own standpoint I ask the Doctor how he stands to-day in this matter. But let us see. Is it a fact that Jones came here under the protest of at least two members of the Alliance? We shall see, and I will let the "Record Book" of the Evangelical Alliance speak for us on this matter. "May 26th, 1890, Rev. W. S. Creasy stated that by reason of the action of some prominent members of the Evangelical Alliance in opposing in public print the visit of Rev. Sam Jones to Wilmington for the purpose of holding a series of meetings after an invitation had been extended him to do so by the Methodist churches of the city, it became his unpleasant duty to sever his connection with the Evangelical Alliance. Rev. T. H. Pritchard and Rev. P. H. Hoge, whose statement in public prints were specially referred to, not being present, Rev. E. Peele suggested that the brethren withhold action in the matter until a meeting in which these two gentlemen should be pre-

sent. This suggestion was favorably received and the Alliance adjourned to meet at the call of the president, June 9th 1890; after the reading of the minutes, the object of the meeting was presented by the president, who stated that the matter under discussion at the last meeting, the resignation of Rev. W. S. Creasy from the Evangelical Alliance, would be discussed. He stated again his reasons for tendering his resignation, which were as recorded in the minutes of the previous meeting. (See above.) Rev. P. H. Hoge stated that the expression of opinion had been made by him, unconscious of the fact, that the Methodist churches of the city had invited Rev. Sam Jones to hold a meeting in our city, and that had he known this fact he should not have allowed his opinion to have appeared in public print. An extended discussion followed in which each one present participated, which resulted in the following agreement: That the matter should remain in statu quo until the close of the meetings of the Rev. Jones in Wilmington under the auspices of the Methodist churches of the city, and that the resignation of the brethren should be withheld until that time, on condition that the brethren whose criticisms have called forth Jones' meetings sufficiently to give him a fair hearing."

That is the record. Dr. Hoge did not protest. What did Dr. Pritchard do? He was not at any of those meetings, though when some of them were held he was in or about the city. His brethren of the Alliance seemed sure that he would agree to this, and so they vouched, it would seem from the record, for him. How well he met their expectation, the reader must judge. He says he was under no obligations to co-operate with him or to even hear him. (The Alliance according to the records thought he was.) He says at the request of the Methodist pastors of the city he went to hear him twice. We were glad to see the Doctor at the meeting, he was, is, and always will be welcome at our meetings, but outside of the agreement of the Evangelical Alliance. I knew of no special invitation to the Doctor, as we felt that sufficient. Does he claim that he was invited outside the Alliance agreement? If not, will he claim that he attended the meetings sufficiently to give him a fair hearing? Many who were not pleased for several times hearing were very much pleased when they had heard him of yore. We are not discussing the difference of opinion between the Doctor and Sam Jones on doctrine. It is natural they should not see alike along those lines belonging to the different denominations they do, but we have worked together and differed in doctrine, and the Doctor might have borne with Uncle Jones as he has with some of his weaker brethren.

He says: "I do not call in question the piety of Sam Jones or impugn his motives." Farther on in his article he says, "As a lecturer he would be superb, and as a boon companion delightful." Let us put those sentences in the scales and weigh them with other utterances of the Doctor's. "When he makes a good hit he pauses to note its effect and twirls his moustache or scratches his head." One would think this was striking at vanity, a motion to gain applause. The Doctor says: "Instead of pointing sin-sick souls to the Savior, to obtrude his own little personality to such flippant slang, seemed to me little short of sacrilege. He was somewhat less smutty here than in Charlotte, but he said enough in Wilmington to outrage propriety, common decency and good morals." Yet he would make a superb lecturer and boon companion. He says, "that he was vilified in some of the papers and private correspondence for styling Sam Jones a vulgarian and black-guard. After a fuller acquaintance with him I am sorry to say that I cannot withdraw those charges, on the contrary I must to do with one still more serious, that of profanity. "Superb, lecturer, boon companion." "I do not call in question his piety or impugn his motives." Now if the Doctor will explain how a man who is all he says Sam Jones is, in the above remarks, can be a delightful boon companion, when a man in his private companionships is expected not to be quite so precise as when in his public expressions, I will be obliged. The Doctor's idea of a boon companion is somewhat different from the writer's. He says "Mr. Jones was able to benefit several hard cases that the ministers could not reach but Mr. Pearson many more." And further he says, "I think it is just, however, to consider other agencies, in the meeting besides those of Mr. Jones personally, which contributed largely to its results. Mr. Stuart's preaching. Several hundred godly men and women who had been praying for weeks, the singing of Excell and Bowden." Granted. But Doctor, you forget, in your comparison, that there had been no general union meeting in this city for years before Mr. Pearson came, and that his sweeping revival, for which I shall ever thank God and bless Him that I was permitted to work in it) gathered in a large quantity of what that was ready for the garner, and a comparatively short while has elapsed since his meeting. The preparation was well nigh perfect. Seven congregations banded themselves with the seven pastors for the work. There was one month's preaching at the various churches. Prayer meetings were suspended and

everybody followed the preparation meeting. Stating—Yes, all the singing talent of the seven congregations, practicing, getting ready and singing when the meeting began. After the meetings for half an hour or an hour all the preachers and many laymen and godly women working. Yet Mr. Pearson (and God knows I honor and love him and would not take one laurel from his brow or star from his crown if I could) is to have all the honor for what was done in his meeting, but Jones must stand back and let every one else come to their share first. I do not believe that saintly, godly man, Mr. Pearson himself, would think it a fair comparison.

The Doctor says: "Let it be remembered that he was invited here by his Methodist brethren and not by the Alliance." So the Methodists had to call; they had to build; they had to hold preparatory meetings; they had to assume all responsibility; they had to endure all the bitter sarcasms and thrusts of Jones' enemies, and yet his meeting is to be compared to Mr. Pearson's. Let me say here that for every word of encouragement and sympathy, for every dollar for every voice that helped us sing outside of our church we are profoundly grateful and shall forever be thankful, but the facts were demanded, since the Doctor made this comparison.

He says: "That on one occasion he turned to the preachers and said: 'You fat lazy rascals, why were you not here at the early prayer meeting, trying to save souls instead of taking your morning nap?'" The Doctor thinks this was terrible, and that Jones was assuming the roll of dictator. Well, I asked him to speak to the preachers about the early meeting. There were some forty or fifty there and from three to five out at the early meeting. The preachers felt that he was right and they were wrong, if they were well. They did not complain. Again the Doctor says: "Jones said: 'I expect to be at the judgment and to hear the excuses of some of the pastors of this city for not helping in this meeting.'" "The intimation," the Doctor says, "seemed to be that he not only expected to be at the general judgment, but to be a sort of associate justice with the Almighty in pronouncing sentence, and would enjoy the condemnation of those of us who did not see fit to join in his meeting." (The Doctor forgets that it is to be remembered that the Methodist called him, it was a Methodist meeting led by Sam Jones.) Such arrogance would be unbecoming in the Apostle Paul, much more in Sam Jones. Well, Paul said some very positive and wonderful things about the future as well as the past. Does not Brother Jones have a right to expect, if he keeps right and does right, (and the Doctor does not call in question his piety or impugn his motives) that he shall sit upon a throne and judge in his Master's kingdom, Luke xxiii, 30: "That ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." The Book gives him a right to expect it, but the Doctor seems to be in a hurry to get a seat on the judgment throne before Uncle Jones, does not wait for the last day, but declares that he believes the sentiment of the best christian people of the state as with him. It is not for me to say, I will not judge whether the limit through of from six to seven thousand who were at the tabernacle on the last night of the meeting are among the best christian people of the State. Be that as it may, when called upon to say by standing up whether they felt or believed that Sam Jones' visit and preaching in Wilmington had in any way harmed or demoralized a single soul, not one in that crowd stood up. When asked if they felt that his visit and preaching had been a blessing and a help to stand up, the vast crowd, so far as I could see, with barely two exceptions, stood up and seemed glad of the privilege. There might have been more than two who did not stand, but I did not see them, and I looked closely. I have seen quite a number of those whom I at least take to be among the best christian people of the State, who are not with the Doctor in criticisms of Sam Jones.

The Doctor says: "He called some of the most respectable gentlemen of Wilmington, 'pusillanimous polcats of hell,' and farther, of some of our citizens he said, 'if a huzzard should get scent of them, he would fly straight up ha' a mile to get away from the smell.'" Well, Doctor, these last you say are some of our citizens, not some of the most respectable citizens of Wilmington. Well, if you had heard the class he was talking about, you would have thought the old bird would be trying his wings in the upper atmosphere. But, Doctor, you were not there when the term was applied to the most respectable citizens of Wilmington. Doctor, you did not hear the character of those men, who they were, where they went, their lives. If you had, you would never again think of coupling their names with the most respectable citizens of Wilmington. Hundreds can tell you the characters referred to.

The Doctor says: "There is a strife here," and he charges it upon the pulpit manners of Sam Jones. "This," he says, "is the only issue he makes with him and his friends." If any one should say: "Creasy, why did you write?" I answer: "Dr. Pritchard made an issue with Sam Jones and his friends, and I am glad of the privilege of being called the friend of Sam P. Jones." That issue was his pulpit manners. Dr. Pritchard virtually says that we, and invited Jones before he came, and had heard him, and he came, and still endures him, knowing nothing of pulpit manners or, if we do, we run with the reckless carelessness on to our own destruction, as the storm he acknowledges to have had a part in raising, shall so transform us "that the skies will be clearer and the water purer." Ah, Doctor, you are hard on us, but we trust "Him who hath been our shield and salvation." Doctor, the issue I make is that it was not the pulpit manners of Sam Jones (why have they not torn other towns like ours?) but the opposition before he came, the bitterness while he was here and the relentless, persistent attacks upon everything about him that seems to have done more to transform us, than the issue upon which we stand. The Doctor says that he is over-looked and forgotten, and, this too, by those who are sworn followers of Christ the Lord. The Doctor sighs a case or two where children have been reproved by their parents for using what he terms Sam Jones' slang. Why did he not tell us of the great change wrought in hundreds of our people on the use of profane language, the great work of the Wilmington and Weldon car shops, of the forty or fifty young men who handed themselves together and promised to quit swearing, of the many who have joined the different churches of the city and throughout the State, of the many backslidden members that have been reclaimed, of the homes in this city made happy by the husbands stopping drink—names that can be given—short sales in bar rooms and saloons, men depositing money in bank, white and colored, who never did so before, money saved where they once drank it up. Ah, Doctor, you have not been looking for the good done, I am afraid. Many a poor heart has said to me: "The good Sam Jones has done by coming to Wilmington will not be known till the judgment."

The Doctor uses Dr. Primrose to prove that Sam Jones is profane. He quotes the phrases used by Dr. Primrose in his conversation with Jones, and then, that Jones said, "Brother Primrose, I appreciate this more than anything that has happened. You are right and I am wrong. I was thoughtless and by God's help I will stop it." There Dr. Pritchard stops. The meaning of Dr. Primrose, grand, true, kind, was lost, covered up. Dr. Primrose said, "After that no man need tell me that Sam Jones is not a good Christian, and for this reason it is with the utmost cordiality I grasped his hand last Monday night, and closed my brief remarks with these words. 'As a brother in Christ I give you my hand.'" Dr. Primrose was not trying to convict of blasphemy, but to show the great heart and character. Ah, Doctor, to have been fair with Dr. Primrose and Jones you should have given the context, but it was against you.

Now let us see the witnesses he brings against Jones in every way, pulpit manners and all. In a former article he brings Mr. Joe Caldwell, of the Statesville Landmark. He don't call any names in this article, except Dr. Paul Whitehead, of the Virginia Conference. Well, Doctor, did you have to go clear over to Virginia to find a preacher you could name against him, and then only one, and he within the last twelve months has preached in Richmond, Danville, Lynchburg, Norfolk? In his manners are running everybody and everything why don't some more of the preachers say so? The Doctor says: "He knows one of the most distinguished of the young preachers of the Methodist church, lately a popular pastor in Wilmington, N. C., proposes, at an early day, to publish structures in the Christian Advocate on the pulpit manners of Sam Jones." It is fair to infer from all the marks he gives us, though he calls no name, that he refers to Brother D. H. Tuttle, now of Wilson. Well, Brother Tuttle seemed mightily well pleased with the meeting which he held here, and he enjoyed it very much, indeed, preached with much power and seemed to be fully in the spirit of the meeting. I did not hear one word of criticism. He was with Brother Jones. If he had anything against him he did not do like Dr. Primrose—to Uncle Jones and tell him about it and receive thanks, if it was done in the proper spirit. But, somehow, when Uncle Jones gets clear away, out of reach, we do say and write things we do not when he is about. Brother Tuttle, or any other brother, has a right to say and write what they choose in this free country, and that is what this brother is trying to do now.

Let us examine a few witnesses on the other side. Bishops Galloway, Hendrix, Fitzgerald, Hargrove, Haygood and Key all stand by and endorse him. Talmage, Moody and, shall I say it, yes, Dr. R. G. Pearson, has precisely the same views of Jones that Dr. Primrose advances in his sermon on Sam Jones, and his pure, God-fearing, who the people of Wilmington know and love so much, after hearing him for three weeks, is ready to fully endorse the sermon of Dr. Primrose.

What shall I say of Dr. Dickenson, of Virginia, (I reckon he'll tie off Dr. Pritchard) Hawthorne, of Georgia, both eminent Baptist divines. But why peruse the list? Sam Jones numbers his brethren all over this country, and his friends by the thousands, and the signs which attend a man of God are following him, to wit, the conversion of many, many souls.

A word or two more and I am done. The Doctor says he was asked by one of the city editors to give his opinion of the man in his journal, but he preferred to write for the columns of the journal for which he wrote regularly.

The Doctor then asked, as I am informed, that it be copied in a Wilmington paper. The Doctor forced the issue upon us, at our doors, in our own homes, in our Churches. No, he did not cowardly quail when the Lord leads. We promised at the altar not to shirk. The Doctor has thrown down the gauntlet and we must pick it up. He with strength, age, wisdom, experience, all surpassing ours, may be Goliath, but with the trust in God to lead, help and defend, we will try to be David without any harness from Saul, but in the strength of the Lord of Hosts lead our people in the right way. It is queer that the Doctor should take an organ that is devoted to the interests of orphans, to criticize and streat a man in, whose life is devoted to that cause, a man whose heart is ever warm and tender towards those helpless ones, who give food, shelter, clothes and education to sixty of those helpless ones. Charity and Children, you had a queer, strange point on your face when you went out to ask help for orphans and were being trampled in the dust one of the best friends they ever had.

Now, Doctor, the way matters stand I don't know what about the Alliance, but let me tell you, I have not forgotten the lesson it impressed upon me. I had learned it before, but you know we promised not to patronize the Sunday paper. Others could do so, if they wished, but we were to be free. I was sorry when the Messenger stated on Saturday that you appear on Sunday. You may get more readers than I, but I prefer to follow the teachings and good impression made among my brethren and around my mother's knee.

And now, Doctor, you said in conclusion, you knew you were right and should not fear to speak. I will not go to that far, but will say that I feel I am right. My judgments says I am right, and with the case as submitted I leave it for the reader to decide. And now, my brother, I have calmly and dispassionately reviewed your article. God knows whether there is anything in my heart against you. He knows there is not, and I shall meet this statement at the judgment. I am ready to join with you and all my brethren in every good work as I have always done. God bless and save the people of "the City by the Sea."

W. S. CREASY.

Crime in North Carolina. By chapter 341, Laws 1890, Clerks of the Superior Courts are required to transmit to the office of the Attorney General a duly certified report of all criminal actions disposed of in their respective counties, together with their name, age, occupation, sex, race and the offense for which the party was indicted and tried. There have been 6,329 convictions, 1,774 acquittals, 2,192 were not tried and 145 dismissals. Of these were 96 tried for murder, 40 of these convicted (28 of them being for manslaughter), 45 were for rape and 4 convicted. For arson 14 and 4 convictions. Burglary 54 and 30 convictions. Forgery 68 and 37 convictions. Larceny 1,769 and 775 convictions, and 8,396 misdemeanors and 2,401 convictions. There were 5 executed, 5 lynched, 98 escapes, 3 (boys) were apprenticed and 12 prisoners were or afterwards became insane.

The official census gives North Carolina a population of 1,617,340, making the percentage of indictments to population a fraction over 6. These are only a few of the results. The compilation extends to every county, grouping them by districts and giving much other valuable information in respect to the execution of the criminal law of the State.

How the Farmers are Taxed. The Republican Congress has made the living of the American farmer even more expensive than it has hitherto been. It has heavily taxed nearly every agricultural implement, his building materials, and his household furniture. Protection of the McKinley sort means the taxation of the great body of consumers to enrich a few manufacturers. Its burdens will fall particularly upon the poor. The people are taxed \$80,000,000 for three years in order that a few manufacturers may experiment in this country with the tin plate industry. If you think this a partisan statement, read what a member of Harrison's cabinet says about it in a recent advertisement: "Tinware is advancing in cost and very soon the manufacturers will have their way and you and I will have to pay very much more. In view of this state of things we made, some time since, a large purchase of kitchen tinware at what was a low price then and would be far lower now, in the face of two advances in the makers' price-lists."

A WORD FROM DR. PRITCHARD. I have but a word or two to say in reply to Dr. Creasy's article touching my criticisms of Sam Jones. Dr. Creasy says my memory is clouded as to what occurred the day he nominated Sam Jones to hold a meeting in Wilmington. He says that Dr. Hoge objected to him but I said nothing. It may be so. A distinguished English lawyer once said that "the world rather trust a line on paper as to a fact in the past than any man's memory." My recollection of what passed, is as I have stated it. I am very certain that if I said nothing I agreed with Dr. Hoge.

Nor will I deny that I said to Dr. Creasy that I should be glad to hear Sam Jones—I do not recall it, but have no doubt I said it, if Dr. Creasy says I did. But that was sometime before I read the sermons he preached in Charlotte, and I said at the close of my first article on Sam Jones, written before I knew he had been invited to Wilmington, that "I hoped he would not come to Wilmington in my day."

Another small matter of a personal nature. Dr. Creasy says I did not attend the meetings of the Alliance when the matter of the resignation of the Methodist pastors was discussed, though I was in or about the city. Does not Dr. Creasy remember that I was out of town at the meeting, the records of which he quotes; that I wrote a letter to the Alliance in which I stated three things. First, that I did not know that Sam Jones was regularly ordained Methodist minister. Second, that I did not know when I wrote, objecting to his coming to Wilmington, that he had been invited here by his Methodist brethren; and thirdly, that I intended no disrespect to the Methodist pastors or their Church. I did more than this. I published these statements in one of the city papers that there might be no mistake as to my feelings towards my Methodist brethren. Now it does seem a little strange that Dr. Creasy's memory should be so accurate as to some of the facts of this meeting, and so oblivious of others. He remembers Dr. Hoge's disclaimer but forgets mine, and indeed does not remember that I ever wrote a letter to the Alliance at all. Is not my good brother Creasy guilty here of what the lawyers call suppressio veri, a suppression of the truth. I should be sorry to think that my brother had a convenient memory and had intentionally forgotten my disclaimer in order to put me in a false light before his brethren and the public.

But all these are trivial matters and amount to nothing in this controversy. My character, and my conduct towards my brother pastors, are not the issues in this case at all. I am not concerned about my reputation. I have preached the Gospel in North Carolina for thirty-six years and my reputation can take care of itself. But if Dr. Creasy could prove an unmitigated scoundrel that would not alter the facts in this case. The main issue, and indeed the only issue I have raised with Sam Jones and his friends is his pulpit manners. I charged him with being a vulgarian, a black-guard, and a profane swearer, and what is more, I proved each of the charges from his own pulpit utterances. In all his long article Dr. Creasy does not touch the real issue. I have no quarrel with Dr. Creasy, or my Methodist brethren, but I do denounce with all the vehemence of my soul vicious and immoral language in the pulpit. There can be no excuse or apology for such language as Sam Jones uses, and I do not mean to be offensive when I say that I do not believe that Dr. Creasy or any other decent Methodist in North Carolina approves of it.

I will close these few words by saying that if Dr. Creasy had applied to the editor of the Messenger he might have learned that I did not request him to publish my article on Sunday or any other day, and thus have saved himself from sinning against charity in bringing a false charge against a brother.

T. H. PRITCHARD.

Rev. Dr. Reid on Rev. Dr. Pritchard. Rev. Dr. T. H. Pritchard, of Wilmington, N. C., has essayed the task of setting the country right in reference to Rev. Sam Jones. He is out in a three column attack upon him, so we see from the papers. Dr. Pritchard is only hurting himself and helping Sam Jones. His criticisms on Mr. Jones will be like pouring water on a duck's back—it runs right off and makes no impression. Pritchard pitted against Jones reminds us of the sheep that got on the railroad track to butt against the approaching engine—he shows spunk but poor judgement.

Grand Jury's Report. To his Honor, John G. Bynum, Judge presiding at Fall Term of Court for Cabarrus County, 1890: The Grand Jury, through its committee, consisting of John A. Barnhardt, J. C. Lippard and L. J. Foil, have examined the records of the county, and find them neatly and properly kept, and a further examination of the books of the Grand Jury indicates that the official bonds of the county officers have been properly approved by the Chairman of the Board of County Commissioners. The Grand Jury find that the books and records are in a book for that purpose.

Through its committee, Chas. T. Allison, J. L. Shinn and Charles H. Fisher, the Grand Jury respectfully request the reference to its examination of the county officers has been properly approved by the Chairman of the Board of County Commissioners. The Grand Jury find that the books and records are in a book for that purpose.

The Grand Jury through its committee, R. C. White, Ed. F. Correll and Alexander Bostian, respectfully report with reference to the court house and the County Jail. The court house is furnished with chairs, and the inside wood work needs painting; and the Grand Jury further suggest that the County Commissioners have the walls whitewashed, and so as to cover up the other writing that appears on the walls.

The Grand Jury find that the lot is well kept, but some repairs should be made on the fence. Upon the examination of the committee, Noah Blackwelder and David H. McEachern, the Grand Jury respectfully submits the following report in regard to the County Jail: The inside wood work needs painting; and the Grand Jury further suggest that the County Commissioners have the walls whitewashed, and so as to cover up the other writing that appears on the walls.

Approved and ordered, J. SO. GRAY BRYEN, Judge Presiding.

"THE BEST." It is easy to say of anything, especially of a medicine that it is "the best"; but to show the reason of its superiority to the satisfaction of the public, may be quite another matter. When we affirm, however, that a medicine is the best, we make no inconsiderate statement, but tell the plain, unvarnished truth. Other so-called blood-purifiers may produce a temporary, but the cures effected by taking Ayer's Sarsaparilla are radical and permanent. It not only purifies the blood, but renews and invigorates the system.

Ayer's Sarsaparilla has been in use for the better part of half a century, and has achieved a success which is without parallel in the history of medicine. People early learned to appreciate its value as a purifier of the blood, and the lapse of years has only confirmed and strengthened the popular opinion of its merits.

THE CONFEDERATE PRESIDENT AND HIS FAMILY—THEIR MODEST STYLE OF LIVING. In the October number of Bell's Magazine, an article on "President Lincoln's Entrance into Richmond," refers to a visit made to the mansion occupied by President Davis and family, while engaged in discharging the duties of his high station.

The Admiral says: "In a short time we reached the mansion of Mr. Davis, President of the Southern Confederacy. It was quite a small affair, compared with the White House, and modest in all its appointments, showing that while President Davis was engaged in heart and soul in the struggle to effect a division of the States, he was not at least surrendering himself with regard to the matter of his own quarters."

Not Worth Dam. Don is a small brass coin current in Persia and India, and is worth the value to one fourth of a rupee, or rupee, or about a cent. The phrase "not worth a dam," was used by Englishmen trading in the East to express their sense of the worthlessness of a thing. In England, however, owing to ignorance of its origin and meaning, it suffered orthographical profanation, and to signify a thing of so small amount as not to be worth the mention of breath involved in damning it.

It has been found that a yellow jacket sting is super-charged with red pepper tea.

It is known that President Davis always preferred simplicity to show that he never indulged in extravagance of any kind.

It is known that President Davis always preferred simplicity to show that he never indulged in extravagance of any kind.

It is known that President Davis always preferred simplicity to show that he never indulged in extravagance of any kind.