

evangelical doctrine, but expecting to hear views in accordance with those commonly held by the ritualistic party. Compel uniformity in outward practice, while you still leave the doctrine unchanged, and this guide is lost, much, as we think, to the disadvantage of those who are of Lord Shaftesbury's way of thinking, and would avoid churches at which High-Church doctrine was taught. You cannot make a man a judge by putting him on a wig and gown, and you cannot make a High-Churchman evangelical by dressing him in a white surplice and putting out his candles and incense pots. Lord Shaftesbury's bill may bring about uniformity of dress and other outward matters, but it will no more cure the dissensions of the Church than a bit of sticking plaster at each end will cure a sword-thrust through the body.

We have been looking for some vindication of the brethren composing the N. S. Western Baptist Association from the charges brought against them by the Rev. George Armstrong. His statements concerning their action were highly disrespectful to the whole body, and we felt that the minds of the New Brunswick brethren should be disabused. We are glad to find that the Moderator, Rev. Isaiah Wallace, has given a refutation, which we copy from the *Visitor* of last week:

REV. G. ARMSTRONG AND THE WESTERN N. S. BAPTIST ASSOCIATION.

MR. EDITOR.—In your issue of the 2nd inst., the Rev. George Armstrong has given you a letter in reference to the recent meeting of our Western Association at Freeport, N. S. I think Bro. Armstrong has misapprehended the motives and conduct of his brethren, and consequently made a misstatement regarding the manner in which the report on the *Christian Messenger* was passed by that body.

Brother A. says: "This report was rushed through with hot haste, and without allowing brethren an opportunity to show that the *Christian Messenger* deserves not the commendation of the Baptists of Nova Scotia. The honest expression of disapproval was feared and it was determined, it would seem, that all discussion on that paper must be shut out; and that determination was persistently carried out. And it is with regret that we must add—the Moderator gave the weight of his position and influence in that direction."

As the above statement reflects not a little upon the Christian deportment of the Western Association, as also upon the conduct of the Moderator, it may be my duty to present the facts of the case as they occurred:

At about 5 o'clock on Tuesday afternoon, the report on the *Christian Messenger* was presented by Rev. Dr. Tupper, the Chairman of the Committee. (Bro. Armstrong was a member of said Committee.) The adoption of the report was moved and seconded. The Moderator then deliberately and respectfully said—"Brethren have you any remarks to make on this report?" He paused, waiting for remarks longer than he was accustomed to do; and then, supposing that brethren had waived their intention to speak, and knowing that, according to the Minutes of this body for the years '64, '65, and '66, the report on the *Christian Messenger* passed without remarks, he arose and put the question. When the "ayes,"—which indicated almost unanimity—were taken, Brother A. and another Brother came to their feet, and complained that the question had been taken too suddenly, and that they were deprived of the privilege of speaking. The Moderator then, addressing the senior of these brethren, remarked: "I have always cherished the utmost veneration and regard for you, and have no wish to prevent your speaking, or to prevent discussion on this report. Move a reconsideration of this question, and then you will be in order to speak." This proposition was made *frankly and fairly*, and repeated several times; but not being accepted, other business was taken up.

Brother A. complains of a "determination" to "shut out" discussion on the *Christian Messenger*. I knew of none, and believe none existed. I expected discussion and believe the brethren generally did.

Brother A. affirms that "expression of disapproval was feared." I think it was, though certainly not for the reason implied in his remarks. Some of us remember the bitterness of feeling engendered at Gaspereaux on the preceding week by similar discussion, and feared the effects on the precious cause of Christ. Hitherto, remarkable harmony and good feeling had pervaded the Association, and it was devoutly desired that such should continue till its close.

With these facts before you, I leave your readers to judge whether the report on the *Christian Messenger* was "rushed through with hot haste" or not—whether a determination existed to "shut out all discussion" on said report or not, and whether the Moderator deserves the censure indicated by Bro. A.'s letter or not.

As I have no relish for controversy, I shall make no further reference to this matter, unless the cause of truth imperatively demand it.

Yours truly,  
ISA. WALLACE, Moderator  
of the Western (N. S.) Baptist Association.  
Granville, N. S., 20th July, 1868.

P. S.—The number baptized in connection with our three Associations in this Province during the past year, is considerably over 1,000. I have an appointment to baptize next Lord's day.

The above will doubtless be thankfully endorsed by every member of the N. S. Western Association, except, perhaps, "Brother A. and another Brother."

We have strong disinclination to call in question what is said by any of our contemporaries, especially by our brother the editor of the *New Brunswick Christian Visitor*. In general it is extremely repugnant to our sense of propriety to do so. We greatly prefer to find what is praiseworthy. But when wrong statements are made we have no choice, and have to listen only to the calls of duty and seek a correction of the error.

We have no objection generally to the discussion of important questions, when straightforward, manly fairness characterizes the statements and the arguments of those with whom we contend; but, when a policy and course of proceeding of a contrary character is adopted, we feel inclined to pass it by altogether as unworthy of our notice. And yet if we do that it is misconstrued, and the charges wrongfully made are held by their authors as if they were unanswerable. We shall, therefore, as briefly and as kindly as possible, endeavour to do what our brother asks—correct him in some statements he has published in his last issue—and we shall look for a full and fair amende for the wrong he has done. He says:

"Associational proceedings at Sackville appear to have been very distasteful to the *Christian Messenger*. The strictures in the *Messenger* signed C., and the *Messenger's* leader of last week, we take for granted, are from the ready pen of Dr. Cramp. If we are mistaken in this we shall be glad to be corrected. But though emanating from so high a source, the *Visitor* would be derelict in its duty were it to allow them to pass without remark."

Now we wish to inform our brother that we are not accustomed to shirk any responsibility that belongs to us, nor to adopt the writing of others as our own. We would take this opportunity of suggesting to the editor of the *Visitor*, that he is stepping beyond the bounds of his duty and meddling with what he has nothing to do, when he offers a conjecture as to who writes the *Messenger's* editorials. It matters not who writes them. What they contain may be attacked if it is thought necessary, but it is an indication of great weakness to attack any person, for what appears in the editorial columns of a newspaper, except it has the name of the writer appended. Whilst, however, we say this we may condescend to inform our brother who is advertised as the editor of the *Visitor*, that Dr. Cramp does not write leaders for the *Messenger*, and did not write the editorial article referred to. It did not "emanate from so high a source." We are sorry to find our brother so committing himself. We shall not care to say all that we might in reference to these statements of the *Visitor*. They are certainly untrue. We might designate it meanness to do as our contemporary has done, but it is worse—to assume as a fact what is not true, and then build upon that untruth a long course of argument, without the shadow of a foundation. After doing this he closes by a repetition of the wrong, in even a more objectionable form, and dares to make the following assertion:

"The Sprague (not Spragg, as it appeared before in the *Visitor*) case, on which Dr. Cramp expatiates, is just a case in point. It illustrates in the light of a sunbeam the propriety of all we have said. If the Church in dealing with Mr. Sprague had called in the aid of a Council, and reported their action to the Association, they would have saved the necessity of any further investigation. They did not do this. Hence the difficulty at the Association, of which Dr. Cramp complains"

Dr. Cramp has not written the first syllable on "the Sprague case." Our knowledge of that case was derived alone from the official Minutes of the Association, as published in the *Visitor*. What we said on this "Sprague case" was more in the way of inquiry than anything else. If we may judge by the action of the Association, the Moncton Church came to a correct conclusion on this case, without the aid of a Council. Would it have been the same if they had called in the aid of a Council? Still we contend that when Mr. Sprague ceased to be a member of a church he was no longer a member of the Association; and the Association should have been spared the trouble and painful task of pronouncing a second condemnation.

We are sorry to find our contemporary so dissatisfied with the constitution and action of Baptist Churches. He says:

"But then, we are asked, why give such advice to the churches? Where the necessity? We answer, for the very good reason, 1st. That in the absence of wise and judicious advice, churches have been thrown into the wildest disorder; 2nd. Ministers and laymen have suffered immensely from crude disciplinary action; 3rd. Offenders have been allowed to run at large unpunished, to the serious injury of the cause of God."

The terms "advice" and "unpunished" here stand in ominous relationship. We fear that the remedy our brother would prescribe for such a state of things as he affirms has existed, would be far worse than the disease.

### Politics.

The political atmosphere of our province has lately been in a state of considerable agitation. The expected appearance and the arrival in Halifax of a number of leading men from Ottawa has called forth various conjectures in the several party papers. What sort of a reception should be given them, was in dispute. Some suggested that these gentlemen might not find the feelings of the people quite so congenial as they might wish, and even intimated the possibility of personal violence being offered. This intimation called forth remonstrances in some of the papers and in the *Morning Chronicle* of Friday last the following letter appeared from the Hon. Joseph Howe:

FAIRFIELD, 30 July, 1868.

The papers inform us that Sir John A. Macdonald and his lady, and perhaps Mr. Cartier, are coming down to Nova Scotia on a visit, and the editor of an evening paper bespeaks for them, should they come, discourteous treatment if not rougher handling. I regret to see this spirit manifested in any quarter. Where actual war rages flags of truce are respected, and the soldiers in the field exchange courtesies across their lines, which lend the grace of chivalry to the sternest conflicts. Roderick Duu shared his heather couch with Fitz James, though ready and anxious to cross swords with him in the morning. We have taught the public men of Canada and of England within the past two years that the people of Nova Scotia are men and not cravens. Let us show them now that we are gentlemen and not ruffians. One rude word, one act of discourtesy, would disgrace us all, and bring such discredit on our cause as to make it hopeless hereafter.

Nineteen Nova Scotians traversed the Canadas last fall and sojourned for forty days in the capital of the Dominion. Though the great majority of them were known to be hostile to the fundamental law under which the Legislature was convened and not very friendly to the Government—though I and others denounced the Act and the policy of the majority on all suitable occasions, with indignant freedom of speech, yet from the time we entered Canada till we came out of it we received from all classes of the people hospitable and courteous treatment. I passed through the crowded corridors of the House of Commons with my hot words ringing in the ears of the people I met, but they never offered me insult, and at three o'clock in the morning I often went to my lodgings alone, as little apprehensive of obstruction or offence as I would have been in the streets of Halifax. Let us hear no more, then, of different treatment of Canadians, high or low, in any part of the Province. If we have lost our constitution let us preserve our manners.

The Secretary of State and the Imperial Parliament have thrown upon the Canadian Government the responsibility of action in the great controversy which, at the present moment, perplexes us all. It would appear that its leaders have promptly responded, and will come here to discuss with the Nova Scotians such remedial measures as they may have to propose. We are bound to give them a fair hearing and courteous treatment. Is our case so bad that we are afraid to discuss it on our own soil with the leading men of Canada? Are we so strong that we can afford to outrage the public sentiment of the whole world by reckless disregard of all the usages of civilized diplomacy? I think not, and hasten to say that I should deeply regret if any indiscretion were to sully a cause which has hitherto been conducted with dignity and temper, which have challenged the respect even of those to whom we have stood opposed. I am quite sure that, on reflection, the writer to whose article I refer, and whose views I may possibly have misapprehended, will concur in the opinions which I consider it a public duty thus frankly to express.

Yours truly  
JOSEPH HOWE.

We would not for a moment have it supposed that the respectable people of Halifax needed any remonstrances from either the press or Mr. Howe to prevent their doing anything disreputable to men of our own or any other nation. We copy the above letter merely because we think it will probably be referred to in future, and may show something of the position of the subject of Repeal on which so much is now being said.

Our Local Legislature will meet tomorrow, and we shall then probably learn more definitely what course the government propose taking on that, and the many other important questions which will demand their attention. A large number of our Local and Dominion representatives arrived in town last week, and we understand have been in private session—vulgarly called caucus meetings—preparing plans of action for the real session. We shall give our readers as full an account of what is said and done as possible.

We think many of our ministers through the length and breadth of the land might profitably employ a little more of their time in writing for the press. There are many subjects with which they are familiar on which they might write very acceptable articles. But we would not have it supposed that it is from ministers alone we wish to hear. The *Christian Messenger* is the people's paper, and we wish the people to write for it as well as to read it. Brethren and

sisters do not be afraid of using your pen. You may do much good by the communication of thought to the thousands who read our pages, and we assure you that the one who will receive the greatest good by so doing will be he or she who writes for others to read. Some may be deterred because they feel that their writing will not appear so well as they would like: never mind, do the best you can, and probably it will be better than you expect. Short articles in general are the best, except from these most accustomed to write. In these days of cheap postage for letters we ought to hear from many more places than we do. We have rich supplies of learning and talent lying hidden in various parts of the provinces. Again we invite you to begin at once. Write.

HALIFAX.—Last Lord's Day was an occasion of deep interest to the Granville Street Church. At the close of the morning service the ordinance of Christian Baptism was administered to two brethren who had previously made known to the church their faith in the Lord Jesus. One of these had been for many years highly esteemed in the congregation, and one of the Trustees, and was now gladly welcomed to all the privileges of membership. Subsequently these brethren and five others with two sisters, some of whom had been received by vote and others by baptism on a recent occasion—nine in all—received the right hand of fellowship from the pastor Rev. E. M. Saunders, and joined with the church in the ordinance of the Lord's Supper. These indications of Divine favor it is hoped may be often repeated.

We are glad to find Bro. Davis, in his letter on another page, rejoicing in his liberty to deal with all human formularies, articles of faith, &c. &c., and pronouncing his opinion so freely upon them. We do not presume that he has heretofore felt any restraint in this respect, or that he regarded the "Articles of Faith and Practice of the Baptist Churches in Nova Scotia" as the Word of God. If he did we congratulate him on having secured a deliverance from such bondage. As far as we are concerned we feel no difficulty in keeping said Articles, as we believe, in their proper place. We do not regard them as having any binding force, except so far as they are in agreement with the Divine Word. We value them as convenient summaries of Christian doctrine, and generally of what is held and believed by those with whom we hold fraternal fellowship.

As we have not yet learned the particulars of the business transacted, or the steps taken in the organization of the P.E.I. Association and the framing of the Constitution, we are not prepared to express any opinion with reference to the action of the Association in these particulars. But we would just say that if our brethren in Prince Edward Island prefer to express their views of religious doctrine by saying

"The religious sentiments of our body may be described as those held by the so-called Calvinistic Baptists,"

their brethren in Nova Scotia, we presume, will not have a word to say against their doing so. But our brother will not surely contend that such a statement will be more adapted than our Articles to "send our brethren and our churches immediately to the Word of God." It is satisfactory to learn that, if any church on the Island chooses to retain the said Articles rather than the formulary chosen, as expressive generally of the religious sentiments of its members, the association "will not interfere."

The *Presbyterian Witness* of last week has an article entitled "Progress of Presbyterian Principles." After noticing what he regards as approaches to Presbyterianism in the Methodist and Episcopal bodies, he remarks:

"We observe that there is a marked restiveness among churches of the 'Independent' order—a desire to give greater authority to Councils, and to make provision for the exercise of righteous discipline. The developments of this spirit will be watched with interest by Presbyterians."

We would suggest to our neighbour that there is probably less inclination than ever "among the churches of the 'Independent' order" in Nova Scotia, "to give greater authority to Councils." Witness the action of the five Associations at their recent Anniversaries. Such "restiveness" is rather among a few individuals.

Customs Department,  
OTTAWA, 28th July, 1868.  
AUTHORIZED discount on American Invoices until further notice: 30 per cent.  
R. S. M. BOUCHETTE,  
Commissioner of Customs.