

they shall have entered upon the duties of their life-work they may be enabled the more effectually to advocate the claims of the missionary enterprise.

The first and leading object of the society is to gain information in reference to the history, character, and extent of Baptist missionary operations.

The second object, namely, to aid, in some degree, in raising missionary funds, is not, however, entirely overlooked.

These statements, published at the request of the society, are not put forth in the way of ostentation, but simply as an incentive to lead to the formation of other similar societies throughout these Provinces.

Two or three weeks since—we had a letter from Rev. Mr. Cote, now laboring in Rome, to the National Baptist, written in November last.

LETTER FROM ROME.

The temporal power of the Pope is gone. This will remain the great event of the year 1870, and indeed, of the nineteenth century.

The gospel is now preached in Rome. What a privilege to continue and carry on the work of the Apostle Paul, so long interrupted by the crafty devices of the Antichrist—that "Wicked whom the Lord shall consume with the Spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming."

Then they that gladly (1) received his word (2) were baptized, and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls, and they continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine, and (3) fellowship and in breaking of bread and in prayers.

Here is not only a very strong presumption, but we think absolute proof that no other order was thought of in apostolic times. It is as improper to put baptism before faith as to put communion before baptism; and vice versa.

BAPTISM BEFORE COMMUNION.

A late number of the Richmond Religious Herald contains a brief letter from Rev. Dr. Caswell, President of Brown University, on the relation of baptism to the communion, and the duties of Baptists growing out of it.

their protection has not been required in a single instance. We find the people willing, and even anxious to read our books. Some it is true, refuse them, but always politely.

W. N. COTE. Rome, Dec. 15, 1870.

The Christian Messenger.

Halifax, N. S., February 1st, 1871.

FAITH, BAPTISM, COMMUNION.

Much space has of late been given by some of our contemporaries to a discussion of the communion question.

An attempt has been made by a few writers to open up the subject of restricted communion, by inquiring whether baptism is indeed a prerequisite to communion, or, if the Lord's Supper may not properly be administered to persons who have not received true scriptural baptism.

The question to our mind, is a very simple one, and may be easily settled beyond controversy. The plain order of a New Testament reception of Christianity is, 1. Faith, 2. Baptism, 3. Fellowship and Communion.

Believing, as we do, that the baptismal question is settled beyond controversy, resting on our Lord's word:—"Whosoever believeth and is baptized shall be saved;" it is evident that no Baptism is scriptural except the subject is first a believer.

Then they that gladly (1) received his word (2) were baptized, and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls, and they continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine, and (3) fellowship and in breaking of bread and in prayers.

Here is not only a very strong presumption, but we think absolute proof that no other order was thought of in apostolic times. It is as improper to put baptism before faith as to put communion before baptism; and vice versa.

An article in a late No. of the N. Y. Examiner by Rev. Dr. A. C. Kendrick is so much to the purpose that, believing it will be read with pleasure, we copy it entire:

BAPTISM BEFORE COMMUNION.

A late number of the Richmond Religious Herald contains a brief letter from Rev. Dr. Caswell, President of Brown University, on the relation of baptism to the communion, and the duties of Baptists growing out of it.

The very strong presumption, on my own mind, is that baptism preceded the communion, in the practice of the primitive Church.

Now, is it really a question whether, by the command of the Master, and in the practice of the Apostles, baptism precedes, and is a prerequisite to the communion?

What is the baptism of the New Testament? It is the act by which the new-born believer outwardly and symbolically puts off his body of sin and puts on Christ; by which he professedly dies to the world, and rises to it with Christ in a spiritual resurrection.

And what is the communion? It is the professed disciples recognition, from time to time, of that death which brings him life, and of Him who suffered it.

The difference in the nature of the two ordinances thus fixes their relation to each other. The one stands at the gateway of the believer's course; is done once for all, and never repeated.

And how did the Apostles interpret their Lord's command? Were there a single case recorded of apparent departure from its obvious requirement, we might hesitate in our judgment. But there is not one.

When, then, we are asked whether Christ has distinctly commanded that baptism should precede admission to the Lord's table, we answer unhesitatingly that he has.

There will be but little difficulty we presume in putting down any rioting or disturbance that may be attempted by the populace. The great question will be what form of government shall now be recognized by the people, and approved by the dominant German Empire.

forty war ships and one colony. The money indemnity must be guaranteed by the municipalities. If this is refused, the property of rich individuals will be held in possession, as a guarantee of payment.

PARIS FALLEN: THE WAR ENDED. PARIS has at last wisely resolved to surrender to its powerful foe. The terms are of course most humiliating but no choice was left but absolute starvation and the utter extinction of the city, or the acceptance of the proposals of the Prussian leaders.

53 B. C.—The Romans fought a successful battle outside the city, and then entered it. 463 A. D.—Childeric I. drove out the Romans. 845.—The Normans pillaged and burned the city.

1420.—The English troops captured the city and held it for sixteen years, notwithstanding the attempt of Charles VII. to reduce it in 1427. 1464.—The Count of Charolais attempted its capture, and failed.

1814.—The Allied troops occupied Paris, and reestablished the monarchy under Louis XVIII. 1815.—After the battle of Waterloo the Allied troops again captured the city, and occupied it for three years.

1870-71. When Prussia under the Emperor William of Germany has after several weeks bombardment, compelled submission, and will shortly enter the city in triumph; and probably dictate the form of Government France shall adopt.

The terms of peace offered by Bismarck are the surrender of Paris, cession of Alsace and Lorraine; payment of one thousand million francs, and surrender of

the army of Paris, regiments of the line, Marines and Mobiles, are to be prisoners of war, with the exception of 12,000 men who are required to maintain order in Paris.

On the assembling of the National Assembly, the form of the future government will be discussed. It will doubtless be one of the following: Napoleon will be restored to power with institutions similar to those existing before the war; or a member of the Orleans family with more restricted popular privileges; or else, what is scarcely probable, a Republic dependent wholly on the popular vote.

OUR LOCAL LEGISLATURE will meet to-morrow, and enter upon the duties of the closing session of the present Parliament. It is supposed that the sitting will be a short one.

Political bargains are sought for by those who have but a low estimate of morality and public virtue. The people should stand prepared to give support to their representatives in any measures that may be beneficial, and to remonstrate promptly against any that may be of an opposite tendency.

It will be necessary however for the constituencies to be on the alert, even more so than they commonly are.—It needs great firmness in the representatives to resist the temptations frequently offered at the close of a Parliament.

MORE ABOUT THE EXAMINATION OF TEACHERS. The address delivered before the Teachers' Association at Pictou a short time since by T. H. Rand, Esq., late Superintendent of Education, has been made the occasion of bringing forth during the past two weeks some curious matters in relation to Teachers' examinations.

The protest of Mr. Rand against the Minute of Council made on that occasion respecting the granting of licenses to Teachers without examination, called forth some remarks in an editorial of the Chronicle defending the said Minute, and at the same time charging Mr. Rand himself with not adhering to the law respecting Teachers' examinations.

We did not care to interfere with the discussion while it was in progress, but now that it has closed we believe our readers are entitled to a resumé of the case, and we are better able to give a fair review, and one that will not be