

ment requires what he has so positively affirmed. 2nd. It would be satisfactory to know on what authority Mr. G. affirms, that "Campbellite baptism requires the profession to be that the Holy Spirit has done nothing saving to the soul." Having been conversant with their writings and preaching from childhood, and witnessed numbers baptized by the Disciples, I have certainly had as good an opportunity of knowing what is taught, and practiced by that people, as your correspondent, yet have I never heard, read, nor witnessed that they require any such negative faith, as he has emphatically laid to their charge. Indeed we would consider that person as holding no place in that body, who standing by the river's bank, would require of the candidate "the profession that the Holy Spirit had done nothing saving to his soul"; and it is certainly astonishing that Mr. G. has gone so far as to make such a statement. The invariable practice of the Disciples has been, not to measure the soundness of the candidate's faith by some modern theological creed, and then to sit as judges upon his case, but to ask an intelligent profession of his faith in Jesus as Philip did of the Eunuch. "What doth hinder thee" says the Eunuch "to be baptized." And Philip said, if thou believest with all thy heart thou mayest. And he answered, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. Such is the practice of the Disciples. As Mr. G. informs us that Paul was a "Baptist preacher" will he be so kind as to let us know if Philip belonged to the same "branch." If so the practice of the Disciples must be Baptist.

But Mr. G. makes out another case of dissimilarity, as follows:—"The object of christian baptism is an acknowledgement of Christ, as a Saviour by yielding to the ordinance he has ratified and made his own. The object of Campbellite baptism is to procure a salvation, which that church teaches, and the Candidate professes to believe, cannot be obtained prior to, nor elsewhere than in baptism." In drawing a contrast here, does the writer mean to affirm that the Disciples deny that "in baptism there is an acknowledgement of Christ as a Saviour?" Surely not. Charitably I would suppose that he only means that Disciples teach that there is an object to be obtained in baptism, beyond "an acknowledgement of Christ as a Saviour". The Disciples do teach that to the believing penitent, baptism is a term of pardon, or "for remission of sins". Nor can they believe otherwise until they can be persuaded to disbelieve a part of the New Testament. With them Peter spoke truth when he said (Acts ii. 38) "Repent and be baptized... for remission of sins." In this verse and many parallel passages, they can see a design in baptism, which Mr. G. is disposed to treat with the utmost contempt. Will your correspondent be so kind as to favor us with a clear exposition of the clause, "for remissions of sins," in the above mentioned passage. Will he say that such is an incorrect translation? If so, I would refer him to the translation of the American Bible Union, where it reads, "in order to remission." Surely Drs. Conant and Hackett do not believe in "Campbellite baptism." Still Mr. G. goes too far when he says, "that church teaches and the candidate professes to believe that salvation cannot be obtained prior to, nor elsewhere than in baptism. He will find no little difficulty in proving the above allegation. He should know that the Disciples have no such negative articles in their faith. They go not into the regions of conjecture, and adopt not the uncertain. Sufficient is it for them to know what the Lord distinctly teaches, to believe what he clearly affirms, and to obey what he commands, to expect what he promises. They are satisfied, that "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," and that Peter was carrying out that commission and meant precisely what he said, when he gave the above mentioned answer to the penitent Jews on that memorable day. If however, Mr. G. is disposed to affirm that persons, "being already justified by faith in Christ," are therefore, baptized, will he reserve the privilege of demanding the proof; and until this is given, will prefer to stand beside Peter in the design of this most important ordinance. Our opponents have labored to cast all possible odium on our position by crying "baptismal regeneration," "water gospel" &c. It will not however sound well for Mr. G. to charge us with making too much of baptism, seeing he would have those re-baptized, who have been baptized as the Eunuch was, in order to enter the Baptist Church. The Disciples have never believed nor taught that there is any salvation in water, but do most cordially agree to the following: 1st. Salvation is to be obtained only in Christ. 2nd. That this salvation can only be obtained through the mercy of God. 3rd. That Christ has been

please I to set forth certain terms on which he will receive and pardon the sinner, which terms are clearly set forth in Mark xvi. 16, and parallel passages. They therefore believe, that he who believes with all his heart in Christ, repents of his sins, and is buried with Christ in baptism, is pardoned. With these clear items before his mind, Mr. Editor, the reader must judge for himself of the fairness of your correspondent's statement, "that Campbellite baptism is administered to those who profess not to have found Christ."

We have become quite accustomed to seeing and hearing incorrect and unkind statements of our views, still we are happy to say that not very often do we see a writer or speaker go to the extent to which Mr. G. has gone in his effort to set forth as unfavorably as possible, the faith and practice of the Disciples. Having so successfully shown the difference between Campbellite baptism and Christian baptism, his spirit is moved with holy indignation, because some of his brethren, he fears, are more than half inclined to endorse that base counterfeit, as genuine. Then in the heat of his zeal, in order to make it as odious in their esteem as it is in his own, he sets it forth in contrast with Mormon, and Greek baptism. Certainly his effort here will prove a perfect success if he can make his brethren believe that Disciples only deserve a place with Mormons,—those who have turned away from Christ to the jugglery of Joe Smith, from parity to polygamy. Should not those who boast much of a regeneration by the Holy Spirit, be very careful that they bring forth his fruits? "By their fruits ye shall know them." But here are his words on which I forbear comment. "Why approve a Campbellite baptism, and condemn a Mormon? In both cases the faith is a corruption, and though that of the Mormon may at first view seem the more glaring, a closer examination will show the other to be equally fatal." "O shame where is thy blush."

It is gratifying however to know, Mr. Editor, that you do not endorse the sentiment, nor adopt the style, of your "worthy brother's communication," and doubtless many of your brethren will look with astonishment upon such an avowal of prejudice and unkind feeling. Such a production might have answered for the 16th century, but it looks very badly in the nineteenth. If any one wishes to oppose the principles and practice of the Disciples, let him do it in a manly and christian spirit. He will ever find their papers open for a free and candid discussion of the differences between Baptists and Disciples. But it is certainly the height of folly to attempt to put down by misrepresentation, odious comparisons, and harsh epithets, a people already numbering more than half a million communicants, and who are adding tens of thousands to their number every year. Would it not be well to cultivate a kind feeling between Baptists and Disciples, by trying to find out how nearly they can agree, instead of magnifying the points on which they differ?

Yours truly,  
HIRAM WALLACE.  
Milton, Queen's Co., March 1st.

For the Christian Messenger.

BROTHER SELDEN.— I have no wish to treat you severely, I always admire your frankness, but I was a little surprised at certain positions you took in your strictures upon my article upon "Campbellite baptism vs. Christian baptism," published in your issue of Feb. 21st. First; you seem to apologise for the error I was attempting to combat. You stated your conviction that a certain people hold the sentiment I ascribed to them, but that amongst them, and in sympathy with them, are those who neither acknowledge the name or the sentiment stated. It is an old adage, and a very true one, that "persons are known by the company they keep." The fact is, that people publish no articles as exponents of their denominational faith and practice, and while they immerse and preach faith, they do not immerse for the avowed purpose that we do, nor do they place faith in the same connection. Either they or we are radically wrong. I write thus from knowledge gained by listening to their preachers, and mingling with their people in the Western parts of Nova Scotia. And those preachers who have produced and promoted the denomination in these parts, came from the United States, Cape Breton, &c. So I conclude the sentiments I named are the denominational ones, those other cases of which you speak are the exceptions. Exceptions there are to all general rules, and in all denominations are those who do not agree to all the denominational tenets. As

respects the name "Campbellite," which denotes a follower of Alexander Campbell, I observe, no person need be ashamed to acknowledge himself in sympathy with either his reasoning or literary abilities, and if an admirer of his theology, need no more hesitate to avow it, than do those who admire Wesley's, or Calvin's.

As respects the name "Christian," for a denomination title, it is so exclusive, that I think denominations will not very soon agree to concede to any one party the honorable right to bear it.

In the apostolic age the term was very sparingly used. It occurs but three times in the New Testament, and in the first case, it is not, perhaps, fully decided whether it was employed by the disciples as a term of honor, or by their adversaries as an epithet of reproach. It is not so much, however, the name as the sentiment that in this case I have to do with, I use no names reproachfully. I only aim to bring out a certain sentiment in its imposing character and dangerous tendencies.

Second. You institute two questions bearing upon the reception of members into Baptist Churches.

The first question is very well; but in the second upon which you principally lay stress, either you or I have greatly mistaken the New Testament theology, which is the basis of our Baptist Church membership. You make it a matter of consideration with the candidate to name the terms of connection, by allowing him to decide the validity of any baptism previously received. While that heavenly commission under which Baptist Churches professedly arrange themselves, as recorded in Matt. xxviii. 20, puts the matter into the hands of the church and requires it to teach outsiders, instead of submitting to their dictation. The classification, too, that you make of the baptism of Campbellites, Methodists and Episcopalians, I think none of the parties named will agree to. If a Methodist or Episcopalian immerse an adult person, however inconsistent it may be thought for them to immerse, I think they immerse upon a true profession of faith in Christ. So that Campbellite baptism still stands more properly on the list I placed it, with Mormon and Greek baptism.

You stated your belief that I was mistaken in my interpretation of Acts xix. 3. I am aware that some persons have given an interpretation to prove that the persons there mentioned were only once immersed. I consider, however, notwithstanding the ability that may be expended upon that rendering, that it is a forced one, and is not sustained by the context.

I have not time at present to write, but thought it due to myself to offer the above remarks. By giving them place in your paper, you will oblige,

Yours fraternally,  
W. G. GOUCHER.  
Yarmouth, March 5th, 1866.

Provincial Parliament.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

MONDAY, March 12th.

Mr. McKay presented a petition from 700 persons in Colchester and Pictou Counties, in reference to a Railway Station.

Mr. C. J. Campbell presented three petitions; Mr. Robichéau, one; Mr. Hatfield, one; Mr. Colin Campbell, four; Mr. Ross, four; Mr. Churchill, one; Mr. Archibald, two; and Mr. Townsend, three; all were on local or postal matters.

Mr. Pryor, as Chairman of Committee on Private and Local bills reported favourable on several Mining bills, and that of the Strait of Canso Marine Railway Company.

Hon. Atty. Gen. presented a petition.

Hon. Mr. Shannon introduced a bill to establish a system of Sewerage in the City of Halifax.—Also a petition on the subject of Education.

Mr. Archibald enquired of the Government whether certain lands at Lower Stewiacke had been disposed of.

Hon. Atty. General explained that the lot referred to was not required for Railway purposes and the applicant offered an exchange, giving instead of this lot a property about double the dimensions in another locality.

Mr. Archibald presented a petition, and Mr. Jas. Fraser, one.

Hon. Atty. General introduced a bill to amend chaps. 124 and 125 of the Revised Statutes, in reference to Equity proceedings.

Mr. Archibald said it would now seem as if not the Chancery Court, but the Judge who had sat in that court had been legislated against, and nature having removed him, and the Attorney General having obtained a Judge whom he liked better, that gentleman was asking the house to go back to a system which was unsuited to this country.

Mr. Miller said he did not deny the propriety of allowing Equity to give a remedy where Law could apply none.

Hon. Atty. General said that his wish was not

to limit the power of the Supreme Court Judges in applying equitable principles, nor to change the venue of country causes. If any members of the profession could make any suggestion by which pure Law could be had when it was wanted and pure Equity when that was wanted they would be gladly received.

License Law.—Mr. Archibald said that a number of petitions had been placed in his hands, praying an alteration of the license law. When this matter had been discussed previously, the decision of the legislature had been that the sale of liquors and the sale of groceries should be separated;—this principle had been conceded as a sound one by nearly every member whatever his abstract opinions on the subject of temperance might be. It had been assumed and admitted that there was no such dangerous combination as that which formerly existed, and his opinion had been that the matter was thus disposed of, but it appeared by a decision of the Recorder of Halifax that the law could be evaded, or its difficulties got over, by granting two licenses to each individual, so that, instead of separating the two branches of trade, the effect was merely to impose a heavier tax upon the dealer. He presented petitions from the residents of Wallace, Argyle, St. Margaret's Bay, Elmsdale, and Margaree on this subject, and obtained leave to introduce a bill to amend chap. 19 of the Revised Statutes.

Mr. Blanchard said that in the license law there had always been a distinction made between the town of Pictou, the city of Halifax, and the other portions of the Province. He did not understand why some of his constituents had petitioned for a change in the license law of Halifax.

Mr. Archibald replied that the matter was by no means local, and he presumed that these petitions were signed in the general interest of the cause of temperance.

Hon. Atty. Gen. said he could not conceive how the two licenses could enable parties to evade the law, inasmuch as the tavern licenses itself stipulated that goods should not be sold in the same premises with liquors, nor did it seem to him consistent with the duty of the session to grant them. By the decision of the Recorder, however, it appeared that the law could be so evaded, and if the separation of liquors from other goods had been the settled policy of the House, it should be carried out. It was intended to restrain a system which was undoubtedly a gross abuse.

Mr. Blanchard said he could explain the existing difficulty, and he would do so the more readily from the fact that in previous sessions he had taken great pains to effect the separation, and because the organ of the temperance body had gone out of its way to make a personal attack upon the member for Richmond and himself. The House had distinctly refused to make such an enactment as would compel the separation in the city, and had decided to leave the matter in the hands of the City Council. The provision for the general license still remaining, he and other gentlemen had been applied to for advice, and had given it as their opinion that the old general license could be granted. The fault did not lie with the House or with the Committee on City Bills, but no form of general licenses being specified, the law had become inoperative. If the House chose to take the matter out of the hands of the City Council, and to dictate what licenses should be granted, he would have no objection.

Mr. Archibald thought the hon. member for Richmond was not right in treating the organ of the Temperance body with contempt, he considered a paper fighting in the cause of Temperance and morality, against such opposition as it must have to encounter, should be referred to with respect. He had never seen anything in that paper to lead him to think it other than the organ of a very large, influential, and respectable class of people.

Mr. Tobin said he had never considered this a question with which the House should deal; it was a matter for the City Council and the Sessions, because the Province derived no revenue from the licenses. The leader of the Opposition had once contended that the country should be governed by cold water principles, but that gentleman seemed to have changed his opinions, and to have come to the conclusion that hot piety and cold water were not best after all. Even the Chairman of Railways would admit that something besides cold water was necessary in his department.

Mr. Archibald said he did not see why authority should be given to the City Council to deal differently with the community of Halifax from any other portion of the Province.

The bill was read a first time.

Mr. S. MacDonnell presented a petition from Inverness against the Union of the Colonies, and one for a daily mail to Port Hood and Margaree.

Mr. Longley, in accordance with leave previously obtained, introduced a bill in reference to a public landing at Paradise.

Railway Damages.—Mr. D. Fraser presented a petition from certain inhabitants of Pictou, praying for an alteration in the 70th chapter of the Revised Statutes, respecting Railways and introduced an Act in accordance with the prayer of the petition.

Hon. Prov. Secy. said he hoped that the hon. member would be able to suggest a means by which the interests of the public, as well as those of private individuals, would be equally protected. The House should not forget that an expenditure of \$2,000,000 was now going on for a great public work, which, whilst of undoubted advantage to the whole Province, would especially benefit Pictou, and largely increase the value of property within miles of the railway. Under such circumstances he thought it strange to see persons objecting to incur a small amount of inconvenience in connection with a