

How I came to be a Baptist.

No 4.

Having thus become settled in my belief of the several points named, the question arose next, whether there was any church or body of Christians, which held views similar to mine?— This led me to look at the belief and practice of the different denominations, in detail, as I had never done before. My aim, previous to this, had been to determine what the Bible taught, and establish my own belief according to that, without regard to others. And having done this, my inquiries assumed this new form. I examined, patiently and carefully, as I was able, the different methods adopted and advocated for the building up of Christ's church. In doing this I found that the Baptists in one or two things at least, practiced as I believed the Bible required. They baptized none but believers, who brought forth "fruits meet for repentance," and they recognized nothing as scriptural baptism but immersion. In these respects I agreed with them fully. They also believed that a person must have been baptized as a believer, in order to be a communicant at the administration of the Lord's Supper. To this belief also my investigations had led me. And as there was no other denomination whose practice was the same in these respects, I found that I was inevitably advancing towards the Baptists. I was unwilling to admit this, even to myself, and yet such were the convictions of my own judgment. I paused, and reviewed the ground I had traveled over, and endeavored to ascertain if there was any wrong step taken. And the more I examined the more settled I became in the scripturalness of my conclusions. Hardly knowing what course to pursue, I called on my friend, referred to in a former communication, and frankly told him what had been the result of my investigations. He replied, "Can it be possible that you are going to join the Baptists? I never thought that of you." I remarked that a great many things were possible; but that I had formed no conclusion on that subject except to follow my own convictions of duty, after a careful investigation of the word of God. But said I, "What objections have you against the Baptists? Or why would you think it strange if I should unite with them?" "No objections particularly against them," he replied, "only they seem to think nobody right but themselves." I answered that I thought they had scripture reasons for thinking they were right in some things, and if so, and others practiced differently, it seemed very natural that they should think others were wrong. "But" said he "do you think they have any right to put up the bars and keep other Christians away from their communion?" I saw he was getting a little excited, and I very calmly said "bars?" I do not know exactly what you mean, by that. "Why, you know, do you not," said he, "that they do not allow others to commune with them?" Yes, I replied, but I do not know what that has to do with their putting up bars. If your figure is carried out you make the church an enclosure, they enter in the prescribed way, and leave the entrance just as they found it. They put up no bars and shut no gate. At least so it seems to me, and if you or I, or any others wish to enter, the way is open. "But still," said he "you know they preach close communion!" "Yes," I replied, "every body is close communion that has any communion at all." "But they are much closer than others," said he. I told him that was a matter of no consequence to me provided they followed the teachings of the Scriptures, and if I found they made any rules which the Scriptures did not warrant in this or any other respect, then I would oppose them to that extent; but if they were only carrying out rules already made and set forth in the New Testament, then I would sustain them. "But," he inquired "How would you feel to go to a communion where your father and other good Christians are excluded?" "Feel! feel," said I, "this it is not a matter to be settled by feeling, but by Scripture." He asked again, "Are you willing to separate yourself from many of your best friends, by joining a Baptist church?" I answered, "I am willing to do anything, I trust, which the Bible requires me to do. I have already separated myself from many friends in becoming a Christian, and that is not the ground upon which to argue such a question. Jesus never taught that in following him there would be harmony among friends, but that his religion would separate as well as unite; that a man's foes would be of his own household, and that whosoever loved father or mother more than he loved him, was not worthy of him." "Well," said he, "I see you are determined to be a Baptist." "No," I said, "I have not determined that, and I will be very much obliged if you will show me some reasons from Scripture why I should not be a Baptist." But he insisted it was of no use. So we parted.

Agriculture, &c.

POISON ANTIDOTE.—A farmer, who says that he knows whereof he speaks, gives the following information of a certain cure for poison of any kind, within easy reach of most families. It seems incredible that such a specific should be unknown to skilful physicians, and we give the assertion, therefore, without any voucher for its truth: It is now over twenty years since I learned that sweet oil would cure the bite of a rattlesnake, not knowing that it would cure any other poison. Practice, observation and experience have taught me that it will cure poison of any kind, both man and beast. I think no farmer should be without a bottle of it in his house.—The patient must take a spoonful internally and bathe the wound for a cure. To cure a horse it requires eight times as much as it does a man.—Here let me say of one of the most extreme cases of snake-bite in this neighborhood, eleven years ago this summer, where the case had been over thirty hours standing, and the patient given up by his physician, I heard of it, carried the oil, gave him one spoonful which created a cure.—It is an antidote for arsenic and strychnine. It will cure bloat in cattle, caused by eating too freely of the h clover; it will cure the sting of bees, spiders or any insects; and it will also cure persons who have been poisoned by a low running vine growing in meadows, called ivy.

RAW HIDE.—How few persons know the value of raw-hide. It seems almost strange to see them sell all of their "deacon" skins for the small sum of thirty or forty cents. Take a strip of well-anned raw-hide an inch wide, and a horse can hardly break it by pulling back—two of them he cannot break any way. Cut into narrow strips and shave the hair off with a sharp knife, to use for bag strings; the strings will outlast two sets of bags. Farmers know how perplexing it is to lend bags and have them returned minus strings. It will outlast hoopiron (common) in any shape, and is stronger. It is good to wrap around a broken thill—better than iron. Two sets of raw-hide halters will last a man's life-time—if he don't live too long. In some places the Spaniards use raw-hide log chains to work cattle with, cut into narrow strips and twisted together hawser fashion. It can be tanned so it will be soft and pliable like harness leather.

RATS AFRAID OF POWDER.—H. H. Ballard, Owen Co., Ky., writes to the American Agriculturist that with one-quarter of a pound of gunpowder he can keep every rat from his premises for a year. "The powder is not used to drive a bullet or shot through the animal, but is simply burned in small quantities, say a teaspoonful in a place, along their usual paths, and at the holes where they come out, with the proper precaution to prevent accidents, from fire." He says he has proved its efficacy by repeated trials. The rat has a keen sense of smell, and if he has sense enough to know that he is not wanted, when he perceives the odor of the burnt powder, the remedy will be of great value.

Correspondence.

For the Christian Messenger.

Is the North justifiable, in waging war against the South?

Dear Editor,— Whatever may be the issue of the war, there is a moral question involved in it, which cannon balls cannot decide.—Have rulers a right to use violence against Secessionists, in order to retain them? With wonderful unanimity, have divines from their pulpits, moralists and religious editors from their desks, and secretaries from their bible rooms and missionary rooms confirmed the United States' Government in waging war against the Southern Secessionists; and we are called upon for sympathy. Let us be fully persuaded before giving it, and see that our sympathy be not sin. The question is not,—Which is right, North or South? That the South are right in breaking allegiance with a government whose top-stone is slavery, in order to establish one whose chief corner-stone shall be slavery, even beings less depraved than slaves to slavery, might affirm. Nor is the wrong so much in the object as in the means employed for obtaining it, but the wrong of the South, is not necessarily the right of the North. The son in his minority may leave the paternal roof, but has the father a right in such case to pursue the disobedient one with fire and sword? at least it was not done in the case recorded in the 15th of Luke. Say the Northerners, if secession be allowed, we have no government, no country. What do they mean? That Jeff. Davis intends to subdue and subjugate the North? The Confederacy acknowledges the Federal government, and wishes to be acknowledged in turn. Do they mean then, that the North would not be capable of maintaining a government without the aid of the South? that they would in such case have to

be annexed to these provinces. Yankædom, we think, would still be found sufficient to do and to dare all that is necessary, especially the latter.

The argument is: If Secession is allowed, then every state may secede, then counties, then individuals. Such would no doubt be a great evil, and a great wrong, still I cannot see what right I have to force my fellow creature to combine with me for mutual defence; or that it would not be better for every one to live entirely independent of every other one, than to contend against each other to the death, for mutual assistance. I regard civil government as a wise and humane institution, which man has no right to real with his blood, which is divine; but if it be regarded as divine then divine institutions require no such defence. Here we must carefully distinguish between government and the objects of government—the protection of life, liberty &c. The former may be changed, the extent of its rule curtailed, even its existence cease, and the inalienable rights of man still regarded. Now the avowed intention of the South, is not to take away the lives, liberty or property of the citizens of the North, not even to change the form of their government, but to abridge its territorial extent—they would have a government of their own, and accord to the North the same privilege. On what principle of religion the North are justifiable in destroying the lives, and sacking the homes of those who only ask to be left alone, I cannot understand. Well has the victorious Southerner put the question to the Northerner fallen on Southern soil,—What brought him there? But for the morbid desire for a great national name, worldly glory, he might still have prolonged sweet life amid the privileges, the love and the peace of his Northern home.

It may be said the South should give a sufficient reason for seceding. I reply, no tribunal has ever been appointed to hear the cause. Their own will is dictator in their own business. They are under no more obligation that I can perceive to satisfy the North, than I am to satisfy the Pope, with reasons, for not belonging to his church. According to the above, it may be supposed that however much I may shout at the sight of a boy of Victoria's, I would not war against an army sent by President Lincoln to destroy British rule in this country, and that I would not consider this a sufficient reason either to sacrifice my own life or that of any of my fellow creatures.

To say that to allow the Southern States to secede would permit all other states, countries, and individuals, may be logical, but it is exceedingly impractical. They who thus reason do not believe that Secession would become thus contagious. I believe that the North would be the more united if separated; but, if that be not the case then the Slave States must be the cord, and slavery the tie that binds the unum e pluribus.

But instead of sacrificing all that is dear and sacred for Union, should not the sacrifice be rather made for separation. Would not more effect be given to law by a plurality of ruling powers, and without being in danger of one pinching the other, over the extent of almost a continent.

May not the proverb of the wisest of men,— "How can two walk together unless they are agreed?" find some application, where anti-slavery men are made slave-catchers,—where the blood of the Senator stains the floor of the Senate chamber, where the best energies of the legislator are expended in contention? Is not this war therefore, to perpetrate fierce strife; and should not Secession be accepted as the best—the only way of settling the vexed question of Slavery, between North and South?

The interests of the slave also require Secession. The United States in no way protect the slave, but the slave-holder; but the North when separated from the South, will certainly protect the slave, and not the slave-holder.

Already good appears to have been effected in this direction. Lincoln, in his Message, does not see any reason why Hayti and Liberia should not be acknowledged. Also since this war begun, persons have, for the first time, been condemned as pirates, for engaging in the slave trade.

It seems then that this war by the people of the North, is neither in defence of themselves, nor of any person else,—nor of any right or principle which it is the proper object of governments to defend. Is it not more closely related to that of the right, or rather the wrong, of the despot: to enlarge his dominions by conquest.— Their greatest boast is their great country, and they also boldly avow their designs on Canada and Cuba. Secession however, dissipates the pleasing dream. Hence the war is just!

It has been said that were the suppression of slavery the object of the war, British sympathy would be accorded. That such an end would sanctify such means as war, I cannot understand, God has said "Vengeance is mine." Paul too sent Onesimus a slave to Philemon his master.

The United States have been offered to the world as an example—as a government,—the very beau ideal (our compositor had actually put it bear ideal.—Ed.) of governments; where all Constitution builders might come and measure, all admirers of perfection worship. It must and therefore necessarily be the controlling and moulding power for the nations. Whether the United States have hitherto fulfilled in any degree this mission or not, may be doubted. With reference to this rebellion, they had an opportunity of setting a most sublime example to the nations, by allowing Secession with peace, and I may also say with justice. To the taunts from monarchical Europe, "Your Constitution does not work," they might have retorted, "It does work gloriously—not by war and death, but by peace and life. As we have united voluntarily and peacefully so we separate; if men-stealers and enslavers are not satisfied to remain with us, we are perfectly satisfied to be without them. Our institutions do work. If those who have made us slave-catchers and have spilt our blood in the Senate chamber with impunity want any thing more of us, we think that we shall be gainers by getting rid of them; they do work,—not for universal dominion, but for universal peace." How might they not thus have put to shame the armies which now oppress Europe, and hastened the happy time when the sword shall be beaten into the ploughshare, and the spear to the pruning hook. But whilst we are sighing for a token of the promised good, for a noble illustration of peace principles, one of the most enlightened and civilised and christianised nations engaged in a bloody civil war; on the one part for Secession, on the other for territory and power.— Do we speak in haste when we call the boasted civilisation of the 19th century, but civilised barbarism? and the christian who favour such war as christianized demons? They are false witnesses, and their skirts stained with the blood of the bodies and souls of those who fall. They appear rather in the character of him who offered the kingdoms of this world and the glory of them, as a reward of submission to himself, than in that of Him who refused them. They seem to have given a dreadful jar to the key-note of the gospel, set by Angels over the infant Saviour. With them it is "Glory to the United States, ill-will to men and war on earth." PACEM.

Lakeville, Dec. 28th, 1861.

For the Christian Messenger.

Rev. Wellington Jackson and his labors.

DEAR BROTHER, As it is known to the public that I had made a proposal to christian friends in consideration of certain circumstances to invite the Rev. W. Jackson and family to take up their residence with me at Beaver River, at least for a time, I met Elder J. in St. John on his return from the Baptist Association in Keswick, N. B., and I was glad to find in meeting with him that his mind was well stayed upon the great Redeemer who for so many years he had preached as the only hope of a lost, and sinful world. Before we left St. John he preached for Elders Bill and Cady to good acceptance. After we arrived in Yarmouth, in something less than three weeks he preached six times, and was well received in all the places where he, in former days, had preached Jesus with good success in the comforting of christians, and in the conversion of multitudes of sinners to God in all these regions. For on his first visit to this place twenty-four years ago which was an exchange of pulpits with the Rev. Harris Harding, something over two hundred were gathered into the fold of Christ. The season of refreshing from the presence of God at that time can never be forgotten by the people of Yarmouth. Myself and my companion in life were enabled in that revival to take a stand for God, and we still hope to carry a savour of that glorious reformation along with us to our long desired home in the heavenly world. We offer our thanks to Almighty God that our respected brother, after a long season of trial and depression that he has passed through, still stands in the same spirit that so abundantly rested upon him at that time, to the gladdening of many hearts in this place. With the exception of a somewhat troublesome cough, brother Jackson's health at the present time is tolerably good, from that by care we hope to see him yet recover.

BUNYAN, in Zion's Advocate.