

consideration of the measure to the new House. The arrangements proposed in the Bill were susceptible of considerable improvement, and no provision was made for the collection and classification of existing Registers.

The writer would express his hope that this important desideratum will be supplied by the present Legislature. The principal objection that has been urged, as far as he is informed, is the expense. Ought that objection to be entertained in such a case as this? Can it be imagined that the people of Nova Scotia, probably the most lightly taxed people on the face of the earth, will complain of an expenditure so useful in itself, and indeed truly patriotic? Carefulness in the use of public money is undoubtedly the duty of all statesmen; but the economy which dictates the neglect of measures of acknowledged utility or, it may be, of pressing need, is unwise and injurious.

For the Christian Messenger.

### Rev. S. T. Rand's "Watchman"

MR. EDITOR,

The Rev. S. T. Rand's letter, inserted in your last, has occasioned no little surprise in this quarter.

It seems strange to us that a Baptist minister should apologise for an attempt to introduce Pædobaptist principles into a Baptist Sunday School, or endeavour to explain it away.

Mr. Rand's lady-friend, it is evident, has not unlearned her Presbyterian peculiarities. Her Baptist teachers ought to have been more careful in instructing her. There was need of it, for everybody knows that the Presbyterians regard the Abrahamic covenant as the sheet-anchor of infant baptism.

It may be charitable, however, to suppose that the good lady is sound on the difference between the two dispensations. While she thinks that baptism has come in the place of circumcision, she is aware that circumcision, belonged to the carnal dispensation, but that baptism belongs to the spiritual one; and therefore, that as circumcision was the distinction of the natural seed, so baptism is the duty of the spiritual seed, God's Israel of all nations, namely, true believers in the Lord Jesus. If these are the lady's views, she may be acquitted of any harmful heresy.

I quite agree with Mr. Rand that there would be no "special sin" in "teaching even the children of Pædobaptists the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, on baptism and every other bible doctrine," if those children are lawfully under the teacher's care, he being at liberty to instruct them as he may please, which of course he is in a Baptist Sunday School. But I maintain that if a Baptist were to become a teacher in a Presbyterian Sunday School, he would be precluded by his position from teaching Baptist sentiments; he could not honourably do it. Mr. Rand's own position presents a case in point. No one has a better "chance" than he to introduce Baptist sentiments among the Indians; but he cannot avail himself of it because he is the missionary of a Society composed of persons of all denominations. Their agent must of necessity, while acting as such, merge his denominationalism. A Presbyterian teacher in a Baptist Sunday School, and a Baptist teacher in a Presbyterian Sunday School must do the same. Honour binds them to it.

Yours,  
WATCHMAN.

March 15th 1860.

## Christian Messenger.

HALIFAX, MARCH 21, 1860.

### Revivals of Religion.

SECOND ARTICLE.

Every great and good work has made progress in the world by Revivals, which have succeeded each other, after times of comparative quiet and inactivity. Every genuine revival of religion is an advancing wave of the church of Christ, which previously, may seem to have had a retrograde movement. Where the work is, what the term revival signifies—a rekindling of life into more healthy vigorous action, there must have been a state of things preparatory to this new manifestation of activity. Facts, we believe, will fully sustain us in this opinion. True Christian philosophy would teach us to rejoice in every new display of power from on high. When a revival commences in a community it is commonly those who have long been under instruction, and frequently the children and other connections of those who are already members, who are first led to make a public profession of faith in Christ. There may

have been in the church a long absence of any special work of grace; and because iniquity abounded, the love of many seemed to be "waxing cold," but believers may have been praying for the return of a Pentecostal season, when some one or more in whom there had been an imperceptible work going on, make known their concern for the salvation of their souls, and express a desire to be numbered with the people of God.

New life and interest is thus awakened in others, and those who have perhaps long sat under the sound of the gospel, have the truth applied to their hearts, and they feel resolved to give themselves up to follow Christ, and unite with his church. Extra services are appointed, and it becomes apparent that a revival is being experienced. Those acquainted only with what appears on the surface, suppose the work to be the result merely of these extra services: this, however, is only a very imperfect view of the matter. It is almost invariably the case that many who on these occasions declare what God has done for their souls, refer to exercises of mind—the commencement of christian experience—which they had, perhaps years before. The truth, in these cases, has been the great instrument of the change, and it is folly to say that it was the excitement merely that produced the change. In some instances, a series of meetings for preaching, prayer and exhortation may precede the appearance of the revival. We care not what means are made use of, so that they be in connexion and harmony with the truth—the Word of God;—this is the great instrument of mental and moral elevation—this, is "the seed of the kingdom." Where the church is disposed to use necessary precaution, we doubt not there is as much probability of those who make profession of religion during the time of a revival, persevering in a christian course, as there is of others who make it more a matter of calm reflection and of less emotion. They know but little of the human heart, who suppose the great work of "repentance unto life," and being made "a new creature in Christ Jesus," can be accomplished with all the coolness of an ordinary commercial transaction.

Whilst, however, we have no sympathy with those who would see the kingdom of Christ extended only by certain rules they may have adopted as their mode of action, and object to the earnestness and anxiety frequently seen during times of revival; we think there are duties connected with a revival which are too often neglected, both in the admission of members to churches and in the subsequent instruction of such converts as are but little versed in Christian doctrine. As the truth is the instrument of conversion, so it is the food by which the new-born soul is to be nourished. The Word of God is also the armour from which the believer is to obtain his weapons of attack and defence, against the enemy of souls, and all his adversaries. The Bible is also the manual of Christ's followers which contains the instructions needed by them, respecting his church and its members. If therefore on occasions of revival, churches become anxious for their extension rather than for the holiness of their members, or fail to use the truth for their instruction, it is not to be wondered at if declension follows. Our Saviour established a beautiful connexion between the proclamation of the Gospel, its reception, and the subsequent course to be observed; which, when pursued by his Ministers, must cause his people to grow up into his likeness. When giving his great commission to his disciples he said, "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." This was not all however, for he immediately added, "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." Where this "teaching" is made as necessary to members in a church as "baptism" is to their admission there will be seen the fulfilment of the promise annexed, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."

The doctrine of the final perseverance of the saints, which we hold, is that of—going on to the end in holiness and love,—not by periodical seasons of excitement, but by a continued course of christian activity and usefulness.

This is a matter of vital importance. Ignorance in some denominations may be the mother of devotion. Not so in Baptist churches. In those bodies who leave matters of government and discipline to a select few, it may not be of so much consequence if they do receive material of inferior quality into their communion; but where each individual is expected to fulfil all the duties of the christian character, and take his place as one of the constituents of which the body is composed, it is evident that the importance of care in the reception of members and their subsequent instruction is of paramount importance. Every individual brought into a church where matters of government rest

upon the whole, is either an addition of strength or of weakness, according as he is a true believer, or otherwise. We commend this subject to the serious attention of the Pastors of churches and our readers generally.

### The Communion Question.

We had no intention of pursuing this matter further at present, but the futile attempt of the Editor of the *Witness*, in his last issue, to sustain the Rev. Dr. Richey in his statements, to which we referred last week, seems to demand a few remarks by way of explanation. We are not anxious to win laurels by controversy with our contemporary, as we know something of the mode he adopts when he finds himself in a difficulty, but as there appears much misconception on what pædobaptists term "close communion," we have no objection to give the subject a little further ventilation. Our neighbour makes assertions in his article which we imagine he would find somewhat difficult to substantiate. He says, "Methodists invite to the Lord's table pious members of any other Protestant churches, be they Baptists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, or Independents. The same is true of Episcopalians, and indeed of almost every other denomination, except Baptists."

This statement of his we believe to be untrue in both fact and theory, until he substantiate it by satisfactory evidence. Any clergyman of the Church of England who should admit members of other bodies to the communion of that church, if he knows they have not been received into it by either infant or adult baptism, would do so, we believe, at the risk of losing his gown. Conformity to the canons of their church, evidently, would not permit such an innovation. In the loose practice of some Pædobaptist churches they may possibly admit parties without enquiring if they have been baptized or not. We believe we may safely challenge our neighbour to bring forward an instance deserving of being received as authority to sustain his assertion. Perhaps, too, he will define where he draws the line between "pious" and profane members of these several communions. Who are to be the judges in reference to these members of churches. If he admits them on the ground of their being "pious," why reject the "pious" Quaker, who has not been baptized? or the "pious" High Churchman who seems so obnoxious to him? or even the "pious" Roman Catholic, with whose name he seems so much terrified? He admits, however, that the opinion that "other churches are a little closer in their terms of communion than Baptists," "may be true theoretically;" and then after such unsuccessful efforts to justify Dr. Richey's misrepresentation, he adds, "We are not now arguing a question of right or wrong,—but simply one of fact. Presbyterians will freely commune with Baptists but Baptists will not reciprocate." "Which is the most liberal?" he asks, and gives the following very significant reply: "Perhaps the latter is, theoretically; but certainly not in practice." We doubt not our readers will agree with us, that but little can be said in favour of a religious theory which will not bear being carried out into practice. We are not informed whether this Editor, who volunteers to speak for Presbyterians, wishes to receive Baptists, Methodists, Episcopalians, and Independents to his communion, as members of those churches, or, how far he desires to extend his invitation,—whether he would include among the "Protestant Churches," Mormons, Spiritualists, and Universalists, &c. Perhaps he would make the term "evangelical" the talisman by which to separate them, as he does for the purpose of classifying the members of the Church of England.

Although we do not wish for controversy, yet we are most desirous of inculcating what we believe to be the truth,—and the teaching of God's Word, on this, and every other subject connected with the gospel of Christ, and its dissemination in the world.

We believe that Christ has taught that He is the "door" to His Church, and that "if any man enter in" by this door, "he shall be saved, and shall go in and out and find pasture." No person can enter by proxy. Whether his parents be pious or profane he must enter for himself, or he cannot be saved. Although he may have had a religious rite administered to him by the hands of a pious minister, either Roman Catholic or Protestant, until he has for himself come and sought admission by this "Way," and submitted to the direction of Jesus in the matter, he can lay claim to no other character than one who "climbeth up some other way," and who is by the Master himself called "a thief and a robber." Nay, human ordinances are insufficient to admit even the most "pious" to the Church of Christ on earth or in heaven. Some even of those who glory in the term "evangelical," shew by their actions they are as far from the kingdom of God as the most profane Roman Catholic. If it is thought by

any, that Baptists wish to exclude Christians from the Lord's Table, we beg to say that they are greatly mistaken. On the other hand, they are most anxious to welcome them to this and all other Christian privileges. Where there is evidence of parties being in Christ Jesus, such persons only require further the baptism that Christ has commanded. With the light of God's Word Baptists believe that Christian churches cannot consistently receive others into their fellowship. This act of obedience was given as the line of demarcation between the church and the world. All human efforts to provide a substitute for believer's baptism, have signally failed, and have produced confusion in the minds of both believers and unbelievers,—the church and the world. The Lord's Supper we hold is a Church ordinance, and has value only as it "shews the Lord's death," which is to be continued, as we are informed by the apostle in 1 Corinthians, xi. 26, "till He come." This can only be properly observed by a Church holding Christ as its Head, and conforming to His precepts. To prevent an indiscriminate administration of this Divine institution, it is added, "whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." Every attempt to make the ordinance a sacrament having any saving power; and to be administered to other bodies than churches, with the power and duty of discipline vested in themselves; either to communities embracing several churches, or to individuals privately, has resulted in desecrating it to the purposes of priestcraft, and supporting the errors and superstition of apostate churches.

### Thomas Cooper,

Formerly an infidel lecturer in various parts of Great Britain, was some time ago convinced of the truths of Divine Revelation and wishing to undo the mischief he had done, commenced, in the large towns of England, lecturing to Sceptics on Christianity, inviting them particularly and desiring them to state their objections. He met with various success, and has been the means of great good to thousands in the north and west of England. He did not for a while unite with any christian body, but last year, we believe, was baptized and united with the general Baptist church in Nottingham. He appears by a letter in the *Freeman* to be further renouncing errors and habits, which conflict with christian character. We shall give an extract or two, which we think will interest our readers.

"For four months I have been a teetotaller. I broke off smoking more than a year and a-half ago, and vowed never to smoke more. But when friends urged their total-abstinence doctrines upon me, I resisted, under the persuasion that, with my life of labour, a draught of bottled stout, or a 'night-cap' of spirit and water, was necessary—absolutely necessary for me—if I meant to continue to work hard and keep tolerable health. Last summer, however, on revisiting some dear friends in Northumberland and Durham, characterised by holy lives and prayerful habits, I felt self-condemned because I saw that they were grieved with me. I reflected that Paul would not 'eat flesh, or drink wine, or do anything whereby his brother stumbled, or was offended, or was made weak;' and I said within myself—'I must not grieve the children of God.' Yet, I thought, Paul would not have killed himself outright in order to avoid giving offence to his brethren. So I said again—'I will try, in right good earnest, whether I can abstain, and yet be as strong for work as heretofore.' And I have tried; and I hereby declare that I believe I am stronger and better without alcoholic drinks; and, by God's help, I will be a teetotaller as long as I live. I lecture usually every night, and most commonly preach three times on Sundays; and I find I am well enough to go on, and have no need to say, 'I am wearied.' I could enlarge on the happy feeling resulting from the consciousness that slavish habits are broken, but I refrain—begging pardon for having said so much about myself, instead of my work.

I visited various towns in Staffordshire, Cheshire, Warwickshire, Norfolk, Cambridgeshire, &c. in the last quarter of 1859, without finding a single individual who would accept the challenge to rise and contest an argument. Some of these towns were crowded with manufacturing operatives, and understood to contain many sceptics; but those who were present did not gather courage to speak, though we often waited some minutes to give them an opportunity. In London, however, last November, one combatant appeared who is worth mention. She was a woman; but I declare her to be the best man I have yet found in the sceptic camp. She had more presence of mind, and a more perfect command of the usual sceptical arguments, than any male objector I have yet been my lot to meet. With all this she was, nevertheless, so ignorant (insisting on calling entities "phenomena," and phenomena entities, for instance) that she could not understand when she was answered. Still, one could not tell a woman she was ignorant, in a public debate; and for even having simply hinted that she was a woman, sceptics treated me with a hiss! So my fair opponent was a "very slippery fish to handle," as they say at Yarmouth. January of the present year was spent in Lancashire; but no one who rose to object would