

not but desire its down-fall. If infant baptism was to be done away with, the loss to its supporters would be an immense gain to spiritual religion. It would do away with that soul-destroying error, "baptismal regeneration."

The extinction of infant baptism would, in a great measure, destroy the union which exists between the Church and the world, and place the people of God and those of the world in their proper places.

But the question has been asked—What are we to do with our children if we cannot present them to God in baptism? I would reply—Bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord; teach them that they are by nature sinful and exposed to the wrath of God; show them the only way of salvation through the atoning sacrifice of Christ; and by an holy life, by frequent exhortation, and by endeavouring to render religion lovely and inviting, strive to bring them to decision and salvation.

And after they have given their hearts to God, then show them that it is their duty to give themselves to his people. Before I close, I would take this opportunity to express my gratitude to the members of this church for the privilege you have conferred upon me by receiving me into connection with a denomination who are not guided in affairs of conscience by the opinions of others, but who think for themselves, and act from principle, and are not afraid to confess their Lord and declare their principles to the world; though at the same time I hope I can truly say, that I love all who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, of whatever name or denomination, and exercise that Christian charity towards them which our Gospel demands.

Perhaps there are some Christians here who have not yet obeyed the Saviour's command in this ordinance. May I ask, what hinders you from being baptized? Surely you are not ashamed to confess your Lord and Master? Remember what he said when upon earth—"Whoever shall confess me before men, him will I also confess before my Father which is in heaven. But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven." Matthew x. 32, 33.

Perhaps you look upon baptism as a trifle—a thing of little importance—but I say it is not a trifle. Nothing that our Lord observed himself and commanded to his followers may be considered as a trifle. I do not say that it is necessary to salvation, but I do say that it is the duty of all who love the Lord Jesus. If you have never given the subject your attention, may I ask you to do so with prayer for the teaching of the Holy Spirit which is promised to guide us into the truth? and having settled the point in your own mind, act according to conviction. If you are led to feel that the Baptists are right, join yourself to that denomination and uphold your principles. I firmly believe that if all who hold the Baptist doctrine were to do this it would bring a blessing to the Church and to the world.

If there are any here who have not yet given their hearts to God—who have not yet cast their souls upon Christ for salvation—I would invite you, in his name, to do so. You have tried the world, but it has not yielded you any real solid happiness. Now, try Christ and religion, and I doubt not but you will be able to say and feel with the Psalmist that "happy is he that hath the God of Jacob for his help, whose hope is in the Lord his God," Psalm cxlvi. 5.

For the Christian Messenger.

Acadia College.

The end of our Collegiate year is drawing on apace, our June Anniversary will soon be here. Many, as usual, will congregate to witness the interesting close of the term and the admission to honors of Students long drilled by our unwearied Professors. But with the pleasurable anticipations indulged in by the friends of the Institution generally still not a few are anxious to know what are our expectations in reference to the finances.—This question is probably more easily answered by myself than by any other, and in a word I would say it will depend upon the prompt action of our Churches whether the June Anniversary be financially cheering or otherwise.

In April 1861 the Governors were alarmed at the prospects before them, determining not to go in debt, they left it to the Churches to decide the question—continuance or not, a favourable response was received and the difficulties were met so that the debts of £350 due in June, were all paid, and the present year entered upon free from pecuniary embarrassment. But as the Endowment is far from completed a much larger deficiency was anticipated this year which could only be met by a similar appeal to that so generally approved last year. This ought to have been

made some time since, but owing to bad roads and severe weather a Governor's meeting could not be held till yesterday, when I learn they made their estimate with the intention of an immediate application to our Churches.—However instead of a larger claim to meet, it is found to be less, by about £100, we need now some £250 to bring salaries and current expenses square up to June, this, is encouraging, and when divided among the contributing Churches will be but a small matter to each. The Endowment meanwhile is being strengthened. It has been increased recently £1000, but though this is considered in good security still it came in too late for available income the present year; so long as we keep out of debt and are steadily adding to the Endowment, our circumstances are hopeful and our prospects encouraging. But still it must be borne in mind that as the College was the creation of the Churches so it remains their Institution, and it will depend upon their united voice whether it continues its present favourable position or not. Last year out of 66 churches appealed to, but 44 responded, we hope better things this year. If all had paid their apportionment; funds unexpected, received from other sources which helped make up the sum required, would have been surplus to add this year, but out of £350 divided only about £220 of the amount was received. In some instances the Pastors were waiting for the Deacons to move in gathering the sum named in the Circular. In others the Deacons were waiting for the Pastors to move, and between them no move was made. But it was found in almost every instance where the Pastor of the Church took the matter into his own hands and went forward with it, that no difficulty was felt in collecting the amount. Mere votes at a Church meeting amount to little financially; one or two active persons in a Church with a subscription paper will very readily collect any reasonable amount. This, I presume, is the experience of most, connected with the support of their Pastors, and the benevolent operations of the Church. I feel loth to urge this matter upon those to whom the Circular will shortly be addressed, but as the one to whom all bills are presented for payment, probably I feel as the year is drawing to its termination, more anxiety to be able to meet the claims promptly than any one could, differently situated.

J. W. BARSS, Treasurer A. C.

P. S.—In some Counties a money order can be procured of the Post-master on the Post Office Wolfville, it is a ready and safe mode of remittance.

J. W. B. Baptist and Visitor please copy.

Christian Messenger.

HALIFAX, APRIL 30, 1862.

More Infant Baptism.

It is due to our contemporary the Provincial Wesleyan, after what we said on the above subject a week ago, that we should notice that the last number of that paper contained article "No. 2," on "the authority" for Infant Baptism. The editor takes up the passages in the New Testament which are assumed to favor the baptism of infants, and it certainly is not his fault if they do not teach that doctrine. Great stress is laid on the connection between the Jewish and the Christian Church, and consequently a great effort is made to establish from the texts referring to that connection, some analogy between the circumcision of the male children of the Israelitish nation, and the baptism of the children of Christians. We need not attempt to controvert such argument. It carries with it its own refutation, and its foundation has been so often and so effectually destroyed, that the more intelligent Pedito-baptist writers have long ago given up the point as untenable. If the New Testament references to the covenant with Abraham be carefully examined, we think there need be no misconception about their meaning. The Covenant spoken of is not the covenant of circumcision, but the covenant of Christ, or the promise of the Messiah made to Abraham at his call long before the institution of circumcision. The privileges of church membership can never be secured to a child of either a believer or an unbeliever by baptism, but they can be to the believer himself by faith. It is possessing the same faith as Abraham and not submission to the same circumcision, or to baptism, either infant or adult, that makes the Christian a descendant of "the Father of the faithful."

The address on our first page, which, however, was selected without any reference to this discussion, will supply in brief an answer to the statements of our contemporary, and

render any repetition of them here quite unnecessary.

Admitting the absence of a command in the Word of God to baptize infants, our contemporary asks for a text "in which Christ or any of his apostles prohibited children from being baptized." Would it not be a marvellous thing to have prohibited a thing which did not exist? As well might the Roman Catholic ask for a text of scripture prohibiting the sale of Indulgences or the baptism of bells, horses, and railroads. After asking for such a text, he, in mock triumph, exclaims "If it can, let it be produced, and we shall acknowledge our error, but if it cannot, we infer that they are mistaken who so unwarrantably assume and assert that infants have no right to be baptized." Our readers will pardon us for calling their attention to such trifling with Scripture and reason. We know they are in no danger of being beguiled by such lame argument, and we might be excused perhaps if we passed it by without notice, but when we find it accepted by a respectable body of christian people like the readers of the Provincial Wesleyan, we think it not undeserving a passing word of remonstrance.

After taking the strange position, that what is not forbidden is enjoined our cotemporary unceremoniously advances the child to church membership by stating that "While however we are without the needless direction to administer this ordinance to our little children we are not destitute of evidence, that our blessed Saviour and his Apostles regarded such as suitable persons for membership, in the church." Whether this church includes all infants that are baptized by Methodist ministers, Episcopalian clergyman, Roman Catholic Priests and servant girls, or merely those baptized by Methodist ministers, we are not informed, but presume that it must embrace all, without reference to the imperfections in the administrator or in the performance of the rite; and as far as the little innocents are concerned, we know no reason why there should be any difference. Our friend talks much about the children of believers being entitled to be brought into the church by baptism, but he surely forgets that the latest invention of the advocates of this practice, is that the offspring of believers are, by natural relationship, members of the invisible church as soon as they are born, and are therefore entitled to membership with the visible church. But a small portion of those who are made to receive this rite are children of believers, such as we presume the Wesleyan would acknowledge, and we believe it is a question on which High Churchmen, Roman Catholics and evangelical Pedito-baptists will continue to differ as to the amount of faith necessary to entitle their children to baptism. Indeed we think that the Roman Catholic doctrine of infant baptism is the more consistent, seeing that with them the church membership formed by baptism, does not depend so much on the faith of the parent as upon that of the administrator of the rite.

Our cotemporary, probably feeling that he has but shallow water to sail in, and that the rocks of truth rise up in many places in his course, makes the fact of Jesus blessing "little children,"—"infants," quite a sheet-anchor to rely upon. He steers clear of the plain instructions on the subject, or they might become dangerous shoals on which his frail bark would be shattered. By varying his course, he wanders on in his sea of inference and conjecture and ignores the existence of positive truth in the matter.

We care not to weary our readers by any attempt to expose the mistake which we believe is made by those who flatter themselves that by infant baptism they obey the injunction "Suffer little children to come unto me," &c. The cheat that is thus practised upon the child, is often no less than the offering a stone where bread is needed. Instead of bringing them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, "the mere form of a ceremony" is performed without a thought of really bringing the child to Jesus; and, instead of seeking that his hands shall be put upon them and his blessing bestowed, the caricature of a gospel ordinance is performed, which prevents the child, when come to mature age, from having the privilege of assuming the responsibility of putting on Christ for himself.

The use our friend makes of the expression of our Saviour respecting little children, that "of such is the kingdom of heaven," is truly marvellous. In the endeavour to make the kingdom spoken of—the visible church on earth, and peopling it with actual babes, he involves himself in a maze that we presume would deter ordinary men, unless blind to danger and reckless of consequences. He says in reference to the children brought to Jesus:

"Is it not likely that all these infants presented to Christ did die in their immaturity, and possibly they might live to sin, and die to be for

ever lost. Of such then, it could not be absolutely affirmed is the kingdom of God, in the sense of eternal glory; but in regard to them all, without exception this might be said in the other sense of the phrase. But if so, if the Head of the church, and its builder, has warranted and encouraged parents to bring their infant offspring to Him (?) and has testified that of such His church is composed on earth, it follows that infant children ought to be baptized, seeing that this is the initiatory ordinance of Christianity, and none can be members of the visible church without it."

We presume that our friend is proposing to make a change in the course hitherto pursued by that body, and that he is unwilling longer to yield "more than is proper for the sake of peace." The anomalies we have seen of the Methodist body having three different modes of baptism, often administered at one time, will probably not continue. It was not long since that candidates were allowed to choose between sprinkling, pouring and immersion. Probably hereafter infant baptism, so called, will be the rule, and no choice as to the mode will be admitted.

It is strange that thinking men can see infant baptism in so many places where it not only does not exist, but where an entirely different doctrine is taught. The commission given by our Saviour to the Apostles to "Go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever he had commanded them;" is, to an ordinary mind, a series of natural sequences, as plainly as possible following each other—here is 1st the proclamation of the Gospel; 2nd, baptism into the faith, and 3rd, fellowship for the observance of all things taught by the Master; but our advocate of infant discipleship would reverse the order of the Lord, and make baptism precede the teaching. He says:

To whom were they authorized to go, and of whom were they required to make Christians? All nations. Infants then necessarily included; for what nation has ever existed without them? and again

But, how were the Apostles to make christians of all nations? Evidently, first, by settling before them the nature and evidences of the religion of Jesus; then upon the profession of the faith of them who received the truth, "baptizing them" and theirs in the name of the true Jehovah, and finally, by "teaching them to observe all things" whatsoever Christ had commanded his people to do.

He sees no way in which "all nations" could be made disciples but by the baptism of infants, and considers that he is warranted in making the addition of "and theirs" to God's Word, because the apostles baptized "the households" of Lydia and Stephanas, and the Jailor; whereas, if he had been willing to tell "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth," he would have said that there is evidence that, in two of these cases, the said households believed and were baptized, and in the other that "the house of Stephanas addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints," and there is not the slightest probability that an infant was in either of them. Let him refer to Acts xvi. 31-34, 40, and 1 Corinthians xvi. 15, and we believe he will have no further question on that point.

To be consistent, in advocating the rite of baptism for infants, by way of analogy to the rite of circumcision among the Jews, our Pedito-baptist friends should confine it to male children and extend it to servants, but this would be somewhat inconvenient.

We may just remark in closing that Circumcision was a positive institution under the law and intended to pass away with the ceremonial law of Moses. It cannot be shown that it was ever a moral obligation, and therefore to be continued, either itself or by a substitute. At the Council of the Apostles in Acts xv. 23-29 it was clearly stated in their letter to the churches that its necessity and uses had ceased and therefore not longer to be observed. Baptism is also a positive institution, but under the Gospel. If it was intended that baptism should become a counterpart and substitute for circumcision, would not the apostles, when the question was submitted to them, have so written, but no intimation to that effect is given, we therefore conclude that no such analogy exists.

We are content to abide by the Divine Record and until some other light appears on the subject, more than the cloudiness thrown over it by the Wesleyan, we shall take our Lord's words, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," as His law in reference to this matter.

HALIFAX TEACHERS' ASSOCIATION.—The Constitution of this body has been laid on our table. No class of men and women have such means of good in their hands as teachers. By combining themselves into such societies as this, they may confer much benefit on each other, and secure more public recognition than has hitherto been accorded to