

were principally of the Congregational order. Their minister, Rev. James Lyons, soon returned to the United States, and they fell into the hands of the Presbyterians of Truro. A manuscript history of the Baptist Church at Onslow states that "the people travelled the daily course of religious duties in the greatest security, or omitted them without any particular concern, when lo! a strange thing happened which produced a wonderful effect." This was a visit from Mr. Alline, in 1782. He preached a number of discourses at Onslow. Among others, Mr. Thomas Lynds, who had been for some time a member of the Presbyterian church at Truro, was converted. Some time after, Mr. Payzant spent some time at Onslow. "By his preaching, Mrs. Clark, wife of Captain Clark, was convinced of her dangerous and helpless condition. After much anxiety and many severe trials (occasioned by the discovery she had of her character as a sinner, and which was much increased by the violent opposition she experienced from her brothers and near relations, and from Mr. James Munro, who officiated as Presbyterian minister at Onslow, and violently opposed the work which now began to discover itself in several instances) she was comforted in the Lord by a discovery of the Lord Jesus as the Lamb of God that takes away the sin of the world. By this time a number of persons professed to be made partakers of the comfort of a hope in God, and found little satisfaction in the company or conversation of their old companions in ignorance (who now took every opportunity to show their disrespect of them by treating them with all the severity in their power and loading them plentifully with reproach) that they proposed to meet by themselves. Thus every movement they made, as it discovered more clearly their separation from the world, served as a plea to their oppressors to insult them with impunity. When they proposed to introduce a minister who visited them, into the meeting-house, in which they held a considerable share, they were prevented from entering by some who stood around to defend it against the intrusion of such heretics, who had ventured to depart from the good old way!"

In 1791 Mr. Payzant organised the converts into a church. I copy the original record:—"Onslow, 5th, Sept. 1792. Rev. Mr. John Payzant called from Cornwallis to gather a church in this town. This evening is a meeting called, the articles of faith and practice read. Officers chosen—Thomas Lynds, Joshua Higgins, Deacons; Nathaniel Marsters, Clerk."

Mr. Harding had preached some time at Onslow in 1790. He was followed by Joseph Dimock, Joseph Bailly, and Edward Manning. There was a considerable revival in the early part of 1791, which led to the formation of the church.

During Mr. Harding's visit in 1793 he was invited to the pastorate. His ordination took place Sept. 16, 1794. For reasons which do not appear the usual application was not made to sister churches to send delegates. Mr. Dimock communicated on the subject with Mr. Payzant, who had been invited, but, now on ascertaining the above mentioned fact, declined to attend. Mr. Dimock was the only minister present on the occasion. "This day," says the church record, "Mr. Harris Harding was ordained by this church as their minister, assisted in the ordination by the Rev. Mr. Joseph Dimock, he being called on for this purpose." Mr. Dimock himself, however, was not at that time ordained.

The church at Onslow was then of the Congregational or New Light order, as was Mr. Harding. How Baptist principles were introduced will appear hereafter.

Mr. Harding's connection with the church was not of long duration. He was frequently absent on itinerating excursions. In May, 1797, it was "ordered" at a church meeting "that a letter should be sent to call Rev. Mr. Harris Harding home." But he did not respond to it. Having visited Yarmouth, where he had been so blessed in former years, he was induced to remain there, and the church at Onslow so far acquiesced in it as to "give in writing their consent for him to remain officially in Yarmouth till further directions."

Yours truly,  
April 17, 1860. MENNO.

**Christian Messenger.**

HALIFAX, APRIL 25, 1860.

**"Father Chiniquy and his flock."**

We have from time to time given our readers information respecting the progress of truth amongst this interesting people. By the last accounts we learned that their use of

the Word of God, in their own language, had given more light on the subject of believers' baptism than was quite convenient or satisfactory to some parties. The limits within which they sought to bound their inquiries were somewhat narrower than these new converts to Protestantism were willing to accept.

The Editor of the *Presbyterian Witness* brings a charge of "Father Chiniquy and his flock" being "seriously molested by injudicious Protestants who" he affirms "wish to introduce among them narrow sectarian views."

What think you gentle reader are the grounds for this grave charge? There should be some facts to substantiate it, or else the party making it cannot claim to be a judicious or even a truthful Protestant. What then are the allegations on which this amiable accusation is brought?

Dr. Hellmuth, an Episcopalian clergyman, as it appears from a correspondent of the *New York Evangelist* has been spending two days in the colony and expresses himself as "deeply grieved to learn that Mr. A., who was here and at St. Anne, from the Grand Ligne Mission, has been sending Tracts on the Question of Baptism, and, while here, made efforts to propagate Baptist views. The fact is clear and palpable that he has, and is still corresponding with various parties on this vexed question; he is even ready to come among them, and thus cause an unhappy division, which must prove disastrous to the peace, unity, and prosperity of this newly born people." And although Dr. H. strongly expresses his "esteem and love for the Grand Ligne Mission and his Baptist brethren" yet "he urges that this should be stopped!" He does not however mention the means he would use to accomplish this desired object. Efforts have before been made to stop enquiry, and the progress of truth at certain points, but they have commonly resulted in its advancement. Dr. H. would probably find it more difficult than he supposes, where an open and free Bible is before the people. As well might he endeavour to stop the glorious rays of the rising sun, as the advance of gospel light and freedom of opinion with the great Light of Revelation shedding its beams on a community.

We doubt not these earnest Christian people will have many struggles yet before they enjoy full liberty from priestly control and dictation. We rejoice in the progress they have made and trust that having suffered so much for the gospel they will advance until they secure full gospel freedom.

A U.S. correspondent of the *Provincial Wesleyan*, in the last issue of that paper, refers to Father Chiniquy in an aspect somewhat different from anything we have yet heard. His statements appear to throw distrust on the representations made of distress amongst the people. We copy the following from his letter:—

"During the few months past the country has been thrilled with the recital of the wants and sufferings of thousands of the Canadian French who under Father Chiniquy had been led from Romanism to Protestantism. The Rev. Father travelling from place to place and giving an account of the sufferings of these thousands, has raised large sums of money for their relief. Over twenty five thousand dollars have been raised for that object.

In Nov. last a meeting was called of the citizens of Kankakee county to correct the stories in circulation in different parts of the country, respecting the poverty of the people. That meeting appointed a committee to consider the subject and report. The following is an extract from their report:—

"That any representations that have been made of a general state of suffering or starvation in the country are uncalled for and untrue, and that no state of affairs exists here to justify an appeal to the public at large for assistance; that public contributions of car loads of corn and potatoes to support a starving population in a country that is daily shipping thousands of bushels of grain to market, implies either a total ignorance of the condition of the country, or a most unwarrantable distrust of the liberality of our citizens, who we have yet to learn are either unable or unwilling to supply the poor among them with food necessary to keep them from starvation or suffering. We find there has been shipped from Kankakee county since July 15th, of the present year: wheat 54,000 bushels; corn 161,000; oats 1,700—total 222,000. Also 1,300 barrels of flour from Dean & Dixon's mill, in this city, which has been in operation but two months. Potatoes have been shipped from the country by the cart-load, and loads of corn are brought to this city to sell, almost every day, from Ste. Anne, the very town where Father Chiniquy's colony is situated, and that as a general thing, it is only the families of those who are indolent and shiftless, who are at all needy, and even they are not numerous."

Still the Rev. Father is abroad zealously prosecuting his mission and making his earnest appeals for money. In the *Presbyterian* of recent date he says:

"The \$25,000 you have sent have been distributed with the most scrupulous economy; not a cent has been lost to any purpose. But we have to supply more than 4,000 people; we have had, then, only a few cents more than six dollars to give to each, to feed and clothe him a whole year, when we have only six or seven dollars in hand? \* \* \* The fact is, that instead of having exaggerated the sufferings of my colony, and the people of this country, I have not known or told the half of it."

Father Chiniquy has recently announced that he has united with the Presbyterian Church!

We have no means of explaining the discrepancy which appears between these conflicting statements.

We shall probably hear something further on the subject which will give the solution, and shall not hesitate to lay it before our readers.

**Our Parliamentary Reports.**

We readily comply with the request of the Hon. Jonathan McCully to give insertion in our columns to the following notes from himself, Hon. Mr. Howe, and the Hon. Mr. Young:—

To the Editors of the *Christian Messenger*,—

GENTLEMEN,—The accompanying correspondence—Copy of letter to Hon. Wm. Young and Hon. J. Howe, and their respective replies, will explain itself.

I will thank you to insert it, prefaced with this note in the next No. of your paper.

Your obt. servant,  
J. McCULLY.

Halifax, 23rd April, 1860.

Halifax, April 18th, 1860.

MY DEAR SIR,—The Editors of the *Christian Messenger* in a number of that paper of this date professing to give a Summary of the debates in the House of Assembly, among other things remark as "the principal argument" upon the recent Railway Debate—"That the statements made by Mr. Culy on the hustings at Truro being largely incorrect, (this is admitted by both the Hon. Mr. Young and the Hon. Mr. Howe) &c."

Permit me to inquire if the Editors of that Journal,—a journal professing to be the organ of the denomination to which I belong, has any authority from you, direct or implied for the statement they have thought proper to publish I remain my dear Sir,  
Yours truly,  
J. McCULLY.

HON. JOS. HOWE. [A duplicate forwarded to Hon. Wm. Young.]

DEAR McCULLY,—Referring to your note of the 18th, I beg to say, that in discussing the story of Extras, I endeavored to shew what had been said, or authorized by the Old and New Boards. As respects your speech at Truro, I neither admitted nor denied Dr. Tupper's version of it, but said that if the assertion had been made by you, that Mr. Laurie had paid all the extras, the statement would be "largely inaccurate." I may add, that I did not believe you would have made such a statement, without qualification or modification, as you knew very well that a proportion of these extras were paid before Mr. L. came into the country.  
Yours truly,  
JOSEPH HOWE.

DEAR McCULLY,—Of course I have no distinct recollection of what I said in the Railway debate, but certainly I made no such admission as is attributed to me, it seems, in the *Christian Messenger*. I touched but slightly the question of the Extras, being imperfectly acquainted with it—and brought indirectly to the notice of the House, the fact you reminded me of, that the £4,000 odd paid to Cameron appeared on the face of the return and was stated by you to have been advanced by the Government previous to '57.  
Yours faithfully,  
W. YOUNG.

Halifax, April 19th, 1860.

We know not if Mr. McCully's use of the plural in the above is intended as anything more than the ordinary complimentary form of addressing the press. Lest he should have any other meaning, on that point, we beg to inform him that the Proprietor of the *Christian Messenger* is himself the responsible editor.

If at any time injustice is unintentionally done to any individual, by what appears in our columns, we are always glad, unlike some of our contemporaries, to afford such correction as may be required.

With reference to the above, we may say we were not dependent on others, not even on our own reporter, for our brief Summary but were ourselves present in the Assembly and heard a good part of the debate. If we did not give a correct general view, as far as it went, we are very much mistaken. As however we would not be confident that we received the exact impression the speakers intended to convey by their remarks, we will call in the testimony of the Editor of the *Presbyterian Witness*; his impression seems to have been something similar to that we received ourselves. In his Summary he remarked:—

"He (Mr. Howe) went at great length into the story of the extras: admitted that Mr. McCully's statements at Truro were in some respects "largely inaccurate."

We apprehend that this will be sufficient to shew that we expressed no opinion of our own, for we could have none, with regard to the facts in this matter, but simply gave in our ordinary Parliamentary Report, what we believed would not be questioned. If it were necessary we might bring forward many other parties who heard the debate, and received the same impression as ourselves and the Editor of the *Witness*. However, as the Honorable gentlemen referred to, have given the above replies to Mr. McCully's note, we presume we may safely leave the matter in the hands of our readers.

**Editors with names, versus Editors without names.**

One of the corps editorial of the *Morning Chronicle* seems determined that his readers shall know who the Editor of the *Christian Messenger* is. In his issue of Thursday last, he has a long article endeavouring to shew that the Hon. Mr. Johnston had, in the Legislature, served his own clients. He remarks:—

"Did he (Hon. Mr. Johnston) not bring an action for Mr. Selden, the Editor of the *C. Messenger* against the city of Halifax, for damages in partly pulling down his house, and then did he not bring in a bill and carry it by a strict party vote through the House, to enable Mr. Selden to recover his loss?"

We really ought to feel much obliged to this writer, for the honor, or whatever else it may be, he wishes to put upon us, by the frequent mention of our name. It is really giving us a personal fame which we had no idea of claiming. If he would but let us know to whom we are indebted, we might make him a visit some morning, and tender our personal acknowledgments. He appears, however, to think that his writing without giving his name to the public, will save him from some inconveniences which might otherwise arise from his lucubrations. Of course we have no objection to his retaining his incognito. If, however, we have no such reasons for concealing our name, or shirking the responsibilities of editorship, he will pardon us for supposing that his want of a responsible editor is an amiable weakness.

Mr. What's-his-name, the Editor of the *Chronicle* well knows that he is not speaking the truth when he says that the Bill above referred to, was carried "by a strict party vote." The sense of justice in the minds of some members of the then Opposition, induced them to assert their manliness and give their vote for the bill. If we had the opportunity, we might call on the gentleman who wrote the above, and offer some correction of the view he appears to entertain respecting the bill he refers to. Although it was one of the means "to enable Mr. Selden to recover his loss," yet Mr. S. would be glad to be able to add that his loss had been fully recovered by it. He has now to console himself with the reflection that as his property was taken possession of by the Lieutenant Governor and Aldermen, and destroyed by their order, he has lost something less than some of his neighbours whose property was entirely consumed.

The Honorable Mr. Young the Attorney General at the time of the fire, on whom Mr. S. waited by direction of Sir Gaspard Le Marchant, asserted, that under the circumstances of the case the law would probably be inefficient to do Mr. Selden justice. The Bill which the Hon. Mr. Johnston introduced to the Legislature was as much an act to protect His Excellency Sir Gaspard LeMarchant and the Aldermen who pulled Mr. Selden's house down without authority, as it was "to enable Mr. Selden to recover his loss." This perhaps was a strong reason for the opposition to the bill.

The City of Halifax is greatly indebted to the Hon. Mr. Johnston and those members of the House of Assembly who voted for the bill, for their efforts to prevent litigation. The Aldermen who took upon themselves the responsibility of pulling down Mr. Selden's house, may consider themselves as under special and lasting obligation to the same parties, for relieving them of their responsibility; and His Excellency Sir Gaspard LeMarchant must feel that it was his good fortune to have, in the Hon. Mr. Johnston, an Attorney General willing to protect him in the discharge of what he deemed his duty for the public welfare, but which brought a prospect of ruin and destitution to Mr. Selden. If ever Mr. Johnston took a disinterested course, as a lawyer or a legislator, it was in the various steps of bringing the bill spoken of before Parliament. No comparison can be drawn, for no analogy exists, between that piece of legislation and any other.

We feel that we are wishing a blessing to the gentleman to whom reference is made in the earlier part of the article referred to, and between whom and the Hon. Mr. Johnston a comparison is attempted to be drawn, when we say, we hope he may never do an act for which he may have less cause to reproach himself, than that he charges Mr. Johnston with doing "to enable Mr. Selden to recover his loss."

Our readers will be pleased to receive the information on another page from the Cape of Good Hope, giving an account of the progress of Dr. Hobbs and his fellow-voyagers to New Zealand.

The letter from our English Correspondent gives an excellent resume of European News.

The touching narrative on our fourth page is for the young people. The conclusion will appear next week.