

is accepted according to what a man hath and not according to what he hath not."

March 5. P. E. Island. F. B., enclosing twenty five dollars from Gen. W., (England); the writer's father. "I will tell you the fate of your letter, written from Shediao, (Nov. 30, 1865). I forthwith enclosed it to Capt. L., in one to my dear father, begging him to read it before posting it. However, he happened to be at a post office when he opened my letter so he posted it "right off," and it came back to us from Capt. L., my father saying in explanation to me that he deemed himself to have been forunate in having posted it without reading it, as he had as much missionary work on hand as he could manage. Well, I reported it to him, telling him that I knew that, and did not mean it for a "begging letter," but to show him the Lord's answers to faithful prayer. Because I had written to him so fully on your "new plan," so back again came your letter this mail, and with it a five pound Bank of England note, "for Mrs. Rand and the children, not for the mission, as you seem to deprecate asking me for assistance thereto, I having my own pet missions to cherish." This is an extract from his letter.

"I think I told you that he (the writer's father, Gen. W.) gives everything to God's cause and lives on very little himself. The Ragged School, the Bible Women and Bible Society, being his favorite objects."

The letter referred to, which by the kindness and zeal of his christian friend, was made to cross the Atlantic so many times, was made the means of bringing another five pound Bank of England note. Thus writer another friend from England—Capt. Orlebar "I did at last venture to send a copy of your letter (to Mrs. B.) with a summary of the mission drawn up from memory, to Mrs. M. W., and to Gen. W., her husband. They both read it and back my letter came with a five pound note and their expressions of sympathy with you. I thank you for giving me the right hand of fellowship, I shall ever feel a deep interest in you and yours, and trust that you will abound in love still more and more, and be strengthened by the Holy Spirit. May the Lord give you souls for your hire and make your work among the Indians a blessing to yourself and to them."

The whole amount received from London with the above letter, was fifty-six Dollars and 25 cents. I shall add no remarks of my own upon the preceding extracts, except that our friends will I think agree with me, that aid received in this way, is much more agreeable, and better calculated to awaken "abundant thanksgivings to God, than some of the ways we have resorted to in former days.

"My soul shall make her boast in the Lord." The humble shall hear thereof and be glad," Psalm xxxiv. 2.

S. T. RAND.

Hantsport, N. S., April 5, 1866.

# Christian Messenger.

HALIFAX, APRIL 18, 1866.

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION is disowned by many who nevertheless shew by some of their practices that they are not free from its tendencies. The anxiety manifested by parents when danger threatens their infants, that they should receive the rite of baptism, so-called, by the hands of the priest, clergyman, or minister, as the case may be, indicate that they suppose some beneficial effects arise from the ceremonial. This doctrine lies at the foundation of almost all the error that has been associated with christianity from the earliest ages, but is directly opposed to New Testament teaching. It makes its appearance not only in the case of infant baptism, but in other forms of religious profession wherever nominal christianity is substituted for vital godliness. Baptismal regeneration is diametrically opposed to the observance of ordinances being demanded as acts of obedience to Christ's command, and of submission to His authority. Adult baptism too may have some of the baptismal regeneration theory; when evidence of conversion—faith in Jesus Christ—is not demanded as an essential prerequisite to baptism. If baptism is put in the place of the influence of the Holy Spirit, and ceremonial regeneration is allowed to usurp the place of regeneration effected by the Spirit, there can be no proper appreciation of the real design of christian baptism. Every evangelical christian seeks to rid himself of the error that salvation is secured by any other means than that of faith in the Lord Jesus. The imperfectly taught man now as formerly asks, "What good thing shall I do?" The principles controlling christian fellowship, are in harmony with the great truths by which sinners are saved from over-

lasting death. Unless this be the case the association formed in such ecclesiastical organization is valueless; the individual by this change of position is brought no nearer to God, nor the better qualified for communion with heaven. The church cannot save the man any more than baptism or the Lord's Supper. No mere assent to the truths of the gospel is enough to secure salvation, there must be a hearty reception of Christ, entire reliance on him, and an appropriation of his divinity, his death, and his resurrection, so as to supply the wants of the soul—giving pardon, peace, hope and joy; even as the food is appropriated to build up the physical system, or—otherwise there is no christian life—we are dead in trespasses and sins. Jesus Christ is the bread of life which if a man eat he shall never die.

The slanderous statement published in the London Freeman sometime since, signed by "a member of the Tabernacle Church," has caused us but little concern, except on behalf of the writer. Those who know the parties concerned are able to understand the matter, and it is therefore unnecessary that we should say a word by way of characterizing the act. Untruthful statements do no permanent injury except to those who make them. As, however, the defamatory statement went forth, and was doubtless read by many who are unacquainted with the parties defamed,—the Baptist denomination,—we have thought it our duty to copy the following refutation thereof which appears in the Freeman of the 21st ult. In doing this, it is right and proper that we should state what we know to be a fact,—that those connected with the Tabernacle Church, as well as others having no connection with the Baptist denomination, deeply regret the publication of a statement so wrong and mischievous:

THE LATE REV. J. J. JOPLIN, OF HALIFAX, N. S.

To the Editor of The Freeman.

DEAR SIR,—The Freeman of Jan. 21 last, contains a letter from a gentleman who subscribes himself "A member of the Tabernacle Church, Halifax, N. S." giving an account of the lamented death of the Rev. J. J. Joplin, late pastor of that church. Cordially concurring in the observations of the writer respecting the character and varied excellences of the departed minister, I should not have troubled you with any remarks on the communication were it not for a misstatement which I feel it my duty to correct.

I refer to the following passage:—"The Tabernacle Church stands out separate and distinct from all other Baptist Churches in this province as an open communion church; and hence the determined opposition, and I might almost say persecution, of the Church and their affectionate pastor from the Baptist denomination of this province, who are close communionists."

Now there were circumstances connected with the erection of the place of worship called "The Tabernacle," and the formation of the church there, which prevented sympathy and co operation on the part of the Baptists of Halifax generally. It is unnecessary to enter into detail, which would be uninteresting on your side of the water.

When Mr. Joplin came to Halifax, he doubtless expected to find such a church and such an established order of things as he had been accustomed to at home. He was to some extent disappointed. Much toil and anxiety ensued; but he entertained the hope that his principal difficulties were overcome, and was anticipating a happier ministry, when he was mysteriously smitten down.

Your correspondent affirms that the Tabernacle Church and its pastor met with "determined opposition"—"he almost ventures to call it "persecution"—"from the Baptist denomination of this province." I give to that statement the most unqualified contradiction.

Mr. Joplin was not known to the denomination. Had he attended our Associations he would have been welcomed as a brother and invited to a seat among us. But he chose to live in retirement at Halifax.

In August last, however, he had planned to attend our Convention. He was invited by the Rev. A. S. Hunt, M.A., pastor of the First Cornwallis Church (containing upwards of 400 members) to visit him, preach to his people on the Lord's day, and proceed to the Convention the next morning. His intentions were somehow frustrated, greatly to the disappointment of a large congregation which had assembled to hear him, and he did not reach the place till Monday evening. Tuesday morning proved rainy, so that he was unable to go to the Convention. Brother Hunt had great pleasure in receiving him at his house and showing him fraternal hospitality.

He came to this place in the following October, to deliver a lecture before the "Acadia Athenaeum," at the invitation of our students. I had a very pleasant interview with him on that occasion, and hoped for frequent intercourse in time to come.

I mention these things for the purpose of showing that there was no "determined opposition," much less any semblance of "persecution," in the conduct of "the Baptist denomination of this province" towards Mr. Joplin. Had he lived longer among us, and given us the opportunity of knowing him, there can be no doubt that the results would have been mutually agreeable.

Much sympathy has been shown in Halifax for the widow and children of our deceased brother. The Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and Wesleyans, came forward nobly. A subscription has been raised for the benefit of the bereaved, and the sum of £500 currency (including £75 from the Baptist Church in Grandville-street) obtained, which is dully invested in trustees.

The Baptists of this province, as your correspondent states, are "close communionists," that is, they restrict their fellowship to baptized believers, deeming that arrangement more in harmony with apostolic practice than any other with which they are acquainted. But they understand Christianity too well to inflict "determined opposition," not to speak of "persecution," on any brethren who may choose to differ from them. "To their own master they stand or fall."

Our legislature is now in session. You may expect some notice of provincial affairs by next mail.

Yours truly,

J. M. CRAMP.

Acadia College, Nova Scotia,  
Feb. 28, 1866.

The papers which were induced to copy the first letter on this subject, containing the poison, will, we presume, also copy this—the antidote, and thus disabuse their readers' minds.

## CONFEDERATION.

The question of Confederation is now fairly before the Legislature; a resolution having been submitted to both branches simultaneously on Tuesday the 10th inst. We regretted that we were obliged to go to press with our last issue before receiving a copy of the resolution. It will be found in the Parliamentary report in our present number.—We are expecting to have a Christian Messenger Extra, with a full phonographic report of the debate on the question, in the Legislative Council. It is in course of preparation by Henry Oldwright, Esq., the reporter for the Council, and we shall forward it with our next issue, if not sooner.

This subject is not one which should be made a party question, or on which efforts to create a sensation, either for or against, should be allowed to have the slightest effect.

Earnest discussion it must have, and that it is now receiving in our Legislature, in the Press, and at the fireside. For years past, the attention of the leading minds in the Province has been given to this matter more or less earnestly. We have not hesitated to express our opinion on all proper occasions in favor of the contemplated change, as affording various advantages to the British Provinces generally, and to the people of Nova Scotia in particular. Every year has brought forth fresh reasons why the Provinces of British America should draw together more closely in their political relationship; and we believe it has now become a necessity greater than ever before, and we, through our representatives, must now not only think, but act, unless we would subject ourselves to the charge of indifference to British connection. We regard Union as a natural sequence in our provincial history, which, if we reject, we should shew ourselves false to the age in which we live, and render our future welfare an exceedingly doubtful problem. It is the most reasonable thing in the world, that the British Government should prefer to have the interests of a United British America to consider and protect, rather than six or seven different provinces with conflicting interests and claims pressing upon her, thereby embarrassing her more or less in negotiations with other countries. As well might the people of the United Kingdom wish for a return to the days of the Saxon Heptarchy, the Scottish clans and the five hostile kingdoms of Ireland; or to the time when England, Wales, Scotland and Ireland, were under separate and distinct governments, as for us to prefer remaining in a state of isolation, whilst an opportunity presents itself of combining in one government for all general purposes. We greatly deprecate the appeals against Confederation founded on the idle vaporings of the miserable Fenian swindlers. We have reason to believe that with ordinary vigilance and preparation, such as have already been made, there need be no apprehension of such men leaving their cash operations in the United States, at the risk of their liberty and lives.

The people of Ireland, as a whole, know their own interests better than to join with such rulers as the men who are at the head of that movement. It is very evident that Ireland has no greater enemies than the Fenians of the United States. The argument against Confederation drawn from their existence and bombast we regard as unworthy of serious consideration. It would be more rational to counsel combination to meet the common foe.

By Confederation our privileges will be greatly enlarged, instead of being contracted. When the Confederation is accomplished, we

shall have to send representatives to the combined Parliament, governing the whole, as well as to our own Legislature for local purposes. Besides the political advantages of the proposed Union, the Intercolonial Railway will be forthwith put into operation, and we shall not remain so socially separated from all the western continent as hitherto. Benefits will spring up in a hundred ways from this great highway. Confederation is now the only means we have of securing that long sought link to bind us to our sister provinces. Eventually doubtless our railways will reach to Yarmouth, uniting the extremities of the province, and thus the whole country will receive a stimulus which it could not by any other measure. The proposal to have a gathering of delegates meet in London with the British Government, and there to decide the terms of Union by an equal number of representatives from each province, is giving the Lower Provinces a large preponderance in such Council.

Such terms as these we should be well satisfied to adopt. We dictate these views to none of our readers, but cannot forbear thus to state distinctly our conviction, that Union is strength.

Since the above was in print we learn that the Legislative Council have brought the discussion to a close, by a vote of 13 to 5, as follows:—

For the Resolution—Hon. Rec. General, Hon. Messrs. Anderson, McCully, Archibald, Pineo, Creighton, Patterson, Holmes, Hon. Sol. General, Hon. Messrs. Keith, Cutler, Dickey, Hon. President—13. Against—Hon. Messrs. McHaffey, Brown, Chipman, Whitman, Tupper—5.

The Rev. G. M. Grant has published an explanation of his remark at the Dalhousie College meeting respecting the Hon. Joseph Howe's religion. As we referred to that remark, we feel it incumbent on us to give his own version of it. He was alluding to the complexion of the Board of Governors of Dalhousie College, and states;

"That among the nine Governors, we could count seven theological varieties, 'though to make up that number.' I added, 'I have to consider Mr. Howe as being a Denomination in himself.' Those were the exact words, I think, and why did I use them? Simply because I had always understood that Mr. Howe was a Sandemanian, and because I knew that the Sandemanians have now no organization in the Province."

"You will now see that I did not even allude to Mr. Howe's 'religion,' or any other man's religion; and that the allusion I made to his denominational standing was not intended for a sneer, but to express what I considered a fact. True there was a humorous sound about the words actually used, which Mr. Howe would be the first to catch up and laugh at; for he is not like Sydney Smith's Scotchman on whose head a surgical operation had to be performed before you could get a joke in."

A question was asked by a correspondent in our last, as to the meaning of the Bill before the Legislature for the purpose of empowering the Protestant Bishop of Nova Scotia, to admit Episcopal clergymen from the United States to officiate in this colony.

We have been since informed by clergymen of the Church of England, that the object of the bill alluded to, is, simply for the purpose of releasing the Bishop from certain restrictions imposed by an imperial enactment, passed in the time of the American revolution, prohibiting clergymen ordained in the United States from preaching in an Episcopal Church of these provinces.

We do not suppose there would be any danger of an obsolete law of that description being put in force, still we see no objection, why an Act for the purpose of disannulling such a law should not be passed.

Our correspondent will we presume be quite satisfied with this explanation.

Since the above was in type we have received the following note in reference to this matter:

MR. EDITOR,—

In your paper of 11th inst. I observe a communication signed "Vigil," touching a Bill introduced into the Assembly for the purpose of enabling the Bishop of Nova Scotia to allow Episcopal ministers, ordained in the United States, to officiate in churches in Nova Scotia. Your correspondent misapprehends the object of the Bill, and I hope a few words will quiet his "watchful" fears as to Ecclesiastical favoritism. There is an Act of the Imperial Parliament passed since the Independence of the U. States, which forbids, under certain penalties, the licensing, by any Bishop of the Church of England, of any clergyman ordained in the U. States, to preach or otherwise exercise his functions, for more than three Sundays in any Parish in his Diocese. It is to relieve the Bishop of N. Scotia from such penalty, and to do away with the invidious distinction, that he asks the Legislature to pass this Bill, which gives the church no sectarian preference, but is simply to strike off one of the old fetters, incident to our former connexion with the State. But your correspondent naturally asks. Why not seek re-