

## Correspondence.

For the Christian Messenger.

"DENOMINATIONAL PAPERS," AND  
"EDUCATION."

Dear Brother,—

On account of their public importance, I send you here the greater part of a Report on "Denominational Papers," with the whole of the Report on "Education," adopted at the late meeting of our Island Association.

J. D.

Charlottetown, P. E. I. Aug. 1870.

## COMMITTEE ON DENOMINATIONAL PAPERS.

YOUR COMMITTEE heartily indorse the expression of the Nova Scotia Eastern Baptist Association, at their recent gathering, in regard to the *Christian Messenger*. We think, with our brethren, that it continues to deserve the support and confidence of the Baptists in these Lower Provinces. We wish it had more of these from our Island Baptists. They do not know, many of them, how much they would gain by the weekly visits of the *Messenger* to their families, nor how much they lose for want of these visits.

It were to be expected that our esteemed editor should find himself occasionally involved in controversy. But while he maintains the manly, courteous, and Christian tone by which he is wont to be distinguished in the conduct of controversy, we see not who is entitled to censure him on this account. Let him go on then, and do as well as he can, and as much better as he may, and continuing evermore to improve as he presses forward. In so doing your Committee would bid him God speed! in his difficult and useful career.

## REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION.

It is the desire of your Committee that the Association record its sense of the importance of maintaining our present system of public Education in its integrity. We trust that our Denomination will take a firm stand against the introduction of sectarian schools on the Island; believing that such schools would weaken our Educational arrangements, and originate ceaseless strife.

It is necessary that we should advert here to another point of grave importance. Our Island has lately been agitated by a controversy, which has also found its way into our politics, in relation to grants of public money for Denominational purposes. We wish to place on record our protest against any such grants. We would point this protest not only against grants for the special teachings of other religious bodies, but also against grants for the special teachings of Baptists—if indeed Baptists could so far forget their principles as to seek such grants. We would give to others all that we would ask for ourselves—no less, and no more. And thus, as we do not ask for public grants for the teaching of Baptist peculiarities, so we would oppose the making of such grants for the teaching of any other religious peculiarities. We trust that no proposal for the making of any such grants will ever come before our Island legislature; or, if it should, that it would not be sustained. And we do hereby pledge ourselves, unitedly and individually, with due regard to the private convictions of our brethren, should any such emergency arise as is here suggested, practically to maintain this our protest by all fitting means.

We desire to express our sympathy with our brethren in the Provinces in their efforts to secure the advantages of a higher education. We would urge the importance of maintaining and rendering more efficient the Collegiate Academy at Horton, in order to meet the increasing wants of an advancing age. The present condition of the Ladies' Seminary at Wolfville is to us a source of regret. We trust that the efforts now being made by the friends of that useful institution will result in its immediate re-establishment.

Your Committee regard with pleasure the present prosperous condition of Acadia College. We would impress upon every member of our Denomination the necessity of aiding in its support, as its welfare is of vital importance to the future prosperity of our Denominational interests. We are glad to observe, that the Rev. J. E. Baleom has offered his services gratuitously as agent for one year for raising the College Endowment Fund. We commend these institutions to the prayerful sympathies and liberal support of the Churches.

Ministers are stars, and Christ knows best in what part of the firmament of the Church to fix them.

For the Christian Messenger.

## LETTER FROM NEW JERSEY.

EELIZABETH, NEW JERSEY, Aug. 5th, 1870.

"HOME AGAIN."

My Dear Bro. Selden,—

It is with pleasure these few lines are dated from this loved spot, to report for myself and all our party, our safe arrival "home."

Only yesterday Aug. 4th, the last of those we left behind us, to enjoy a little longer, the delightful and invigorating atmosphere of Nova Scotia, made their appearance. Dropping down "at home" with the thermometer at 98°, it was no matter of surprise to us, who had wilted days before, that ere the shadows of evening came, they were sighing, (if not crying) for the cool breezes which fan your city, and make your evenings so pleasant for social life and intercourse, and your nights so truly delicious for rest, and yet, amidst great endurance and in moist sympathy one with the other, it would have gladdened your pious heart to have heard the old song, of course, to the same old tune. "Be it ever so humble there's no place like home."

If it will not tax your patience and forbearance too much, and that of your readers, allow me to add in respect to ourselves that we took steamer on the "home run" from St. John to Eastport, thence to Portland, Maine. By Mail then, we visited New Hampshire, stopping at the old town of Exeter, famous for its Academy; thence to Boston the "hub" of much that is good, but the fountain of a great deal of humbug and evil.

We made a flying visit to Rhode Island, historic soil to the Baptists. It was "commencement day" at "Brown University," and the Alumni and friends gave evidence, it was a day not forgotten. We tarried awhile in the "land of steady habits," "wooden nutmegs" and "pine hams," old Connecticut, when a day brought us home to find all well.

During our absence, one of the turrets on the main tower of our beautiful house of worship was shivered by lightning; the fluid fortunately passed directly from the top of the tower off, instead of down, as is generally its course, so no further damage was done. Three hundred dollars will make all good again. We are devoutly thankful it was no worse.

A pleasant incident, which I must mention, occurred through an acquaintance which was formed on our trip from Eastport to Portland. At the former place the Rt. Rev. Bishop Neely and family joined our passenger list. We found him the christian gentleman and possessed with an exuberance of spirit, at all times desirable, but especially in a stage coach or on a steamboat. During conversation he mentioned the fact that on the following week he was to ordain to the work of the ministry a young man, the son of a clergyman who twenty years ago "fell on sleep and was laid to the rest of the fathers." He gave me the name of the young man. You will imagine my surprise and my joy, when I tell you he was the son of the dearest friend I ever knew in the ministry. That boy, fatherless for 20 years, during his College life—as well as his days of youth, yielding himself to the "pleasures of sin" gave no evidence of the richer and grander life and labor God had in store for him. Followed with the prayers of his mother—and the counsel of his now sainted Uncle, Bishop Burgers, he was led to think "on his ways, and to turn his feet to the testimony of the Lord;" he gave himself to the work of the ministry, to the bearing of the mantle of his departed parent in the mission of righteousness. At the death of my friend, his widow sent me his *Concordance*, which for many years, he ever had before him on his study table. As soon as I heard from Bishop Neeley of the consecration of the young man and his approaching ordination, I resolved to place in his hands the volume of his late and lamented father. On my arrival home the book was forwarded, and the good Bishop, with the counsel of a father, gladdened the heart of the young preacher with the gift. Letters from both the Bishop and the Priest have already come to hand, in reply, more than compensating for the loss of an old companion from my book shelf and the memorial of friendship.

This incident in all its interests was well worth the journey to Nova Scotia. Surely we may say "praying breath is not spent in vain."

"God moves in a mysterious way  
His wonders to perform."

I must close this letter, even if I should write again sometime. The Rev. M. Dimock extended his tour, so as to visit the several fields of his labor and reward. His reception was most

gratifying, and at each place, he says it was an ovation of joy and rejoicing with the friends of other years, and those whom he was privileged to baptize into the fellowship of the church.

It is almost needless to tell you we have talked so much about Halifax, its hospitality, its hotels, its harbor and forts, its churches and their excellent pastors, its missions, its merchants, matrons, and maidens, that we have already thrown several persons into what is now styled the "Halifax fever" and we are satisfied it is contagious.

Some of our friends are already with you, fully satisfied of the correctness of our impressions. The Rector of Grace Church of this city, is on his passage, and the Hon. D. M. W.,—the patron saint of the Baptist cause in New Jersey and his family, are preparing to visit your portion of the Dominion.

Our surprise is, that Halifax and Dartmouth and the adjacent places, are not thronged with visitors during the "heated term." It is possible, you may have failed to make known the beauties and advantages of your home for prudential reasons, especially to the Yankees, but, just let me assure you that all who love liberty, the rights of man—and church dis-establishment are not *Fenians*.

We shall not fail to tell the pleasure seeker, where he can live well,—enjoy to his full the "hook and line"—make the most of his days and keep cool at night.

As to our party, our only regret is that our stay was so short; but our excellent brother, A. Vaughn Dimock, Esq., has already pledged one or two, if the Lord will, to try it again next year.

Our visit and the interest awakened in the Baptist cause, in some of your men whom we met, and in your measures, both religious and political, has created the necessity of taking a Halifax paper. We heard so much about the "*Messenger*" that we have decided to read it. Send to the following names, give credit and oblige

yours &amp;c.,

D. HENRY MILLER.

For the Christian Messenger.

Mr. Editor,—

As Mr. Davis has again brought my name before your readers, I trust that the same christian candor you have hitherto maintained will permit me through your columns to treat him, and the subjects in hand with honorable fairness. Two years ago I received a letter from Mr. Davis asking my views on given subjects. This letter appeared both candid and kind. No such reproachful epithets as "Campbellite" "Baptist Puseyite" or "Ritualist" disgraced its pages. I anticipated a pleasant and profitable correspondence, and did all in my power to give every satisfaction. I showed in my reply that he and I agreed on many vital points, such as the all sufficiency of the death of Christ, and of that alone to take away our sins—Man's entire dependence on the Holy Spirit to enlighten, and draw him to Jesus—That man never begins with God, but that God *always* begins with man in order to his salvation. I showed that if we differ it was *on the way in which a sinner comes to the death of Christ, and not upon the efficacy of the alone merit*. That as I had no way of my own I fully accepted the way which Jesus has laid down in his law of pardon, and the one preached and practised by his inspired apostles.

It was further shown that as Mr. Davis held baptism to be a burial with Christ, and a resurrection to a new life, he could not consistently bury a living active christian, for the grave always lay between two states. If a man living in sin were buried in water he could have no union with Christ, for we bury *dead* and not *living* men. It is when the sinner believes with all his heart in Jesus, and dies to sin, that he is fit to be buried with him in baptism, and rise to walk in newness of life. We conclude that Mr. Davis felt the force of this as he made no attempt to gainsay it.

I showed moreover that he could not admit any man however pious to christian privileges until he had put on Christ in baptism, and that consistency compelled him to hold baptism to be one of the steps in coming to Christ. Why a man who is in Christ—a christian, should be refused christian privileges is what Mr. Davis cannot tell, neither can he tell how a man who is in Christ, can be baptized into Christ or put on Christ in baptism.

I also answered several questions he asked respecting *election* as clearly as I could.

Now how did Mr. Davis meet these things? By acknowledging their force? no, no. By referring to the passages and showing that I had prevented them, or that I reasoned false by?

Not at all. How then? By denouncing me as a notorious errorist. It is true he made some attempt at argument, but argument was the exception, denunciation the rule. I had quoted, the Lord's last Commission as the law of pardon, but to exclude baptism from that law he reasons as follows. "We do read in the Commission, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but we do not read, He that believeth not and is *not baptized* shall be damned." When I showed that we were not seeking for what Jesus did *not* say, but for what he *did* say—not for the law that damned but for the law that saved, his quibble was lifeless. It is what we *do* read that is the Sword of the Spirit, and it is a great pity that Mr. Davis should in any way oppose it. That he feels badly in so doing I have no manner of doubt. That he does it knowingly I would be very sorry to think. Good men have been greatly mistaken. Be that as it may, after a silence of 8 or 9 months, he comes out again, not with arguments but with a *protest*. He will not, he says, weary himself or the reader with labored attempts to follow me in debate. He chooses rather to present a protest than an argument. Who that has noticed his "*weary labors*" in the past will doubt the wisdom of his choice? Certainly he feels it easier in the premises to "present a protest than an argument," and if he can induce his readers to accept of his protest, and reject argument he will glide into a victory as easy as it is desirable. But against what does Mr. Davis *protest*? Why against "*Campbellism*"? And what pray is "*Campbellism*"? This may be asked by a thousand voices at once, but no one can tell what it is because there is no such thing. But as those who use this term mean something by it, I will, after I have noticed Mr. Davis's charges against me call attention to the term "*Campbellism*." Let it suffice in the meantime to state that it is a term of reproach ill naturedly employed instead of argument. It is known to be a nickname which nobody acknowledges, and is, hence, so unpleasant a weapon that no one will use it in sober earnest until he finds himself badly beaten in argument, or wishes to be unkind to an opponent.

His first *protest* is against my "unworthy insinuation and lofty assumption." After he had denounced me as treating sacred mysteries with irreverence, and the Lord's Divinity with dishonor teaching "baptismal fallacies," "Baptist Puseyism" and the worst errors of Rome, that while Romanists taught these *openly*, I (more dishonest of course) did it *insidiously*, and that he was solemnly bound to expose me, he says that he treats me courteously. Now because I stated this, he calls it an *insinuation*, that his courtesy is mere *pretense*, and protests against it. This I have neither said nor insinuated. He might think that the above denunciation is courteous treatment, and if so there is no pretence about it. I am as willing now as I was before that the above stand as a specimen of his courteous treatment if he so desires, and although one might be curious to hear him tell what *he would* say when he meant to be discourteous to an opponent, there was no insinuation, hence his first "*Protest*" was leveled at a phantom. My "lofty assumption." He charges me with making my teaching, of like authority with those of the New Testament and denying another the right to controvert my interpretation of Scripture. To this charge I plead not guilty. I am anxious that my interpretation of Scripture should undergo the severest scrutiny, and if found wrong I am more than willing to abandon it. When have I refused Mr. Davis the right to controvert my interpretation? Can he or any one else point to the case? But when I repeat the words of the Lord Jesus, they are not my words nor my teachings. It is not my teaching nor my law that says "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved. But he that believeth not shall be damned." If Mr. Davis thinks these are my words or my teaching he is mistaken. This was spoken by the Lord and confirmed to us by them that heard him, &c. The point at issue between him and me is this. He contends for a law of pardon for the unconverted sinner without baptism in it—I give him the only law I ever saw in God's word since Jesus rose from the dead. I give this law in the very words of Jesus—adding nothing, subtracting nothing, altering nothing. I show this law preached, practiced, and confirmed by the apostles with the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven. Hence I cannot allow any man to call it my law or my teachings. I have called on Mr. Davis again and again to find any law in God's word since the death of Christ that offers salvation to the sinner without baptism in it. This he cannot do. I have called on him in vain to show where an apostle offered salvation