

1877. which can For three sing, sat at eed by his as, rare in ferdid eloh and mling by s full share said to be

claimed Hugh, astonished, thinking Mr. Barnett far too much of a patrician for that sort of business. Matthew laughed. 'No, he don't play the barman himself,' he answered. 'But I guess he owns a score or two of fine public up and down London; and what's more, he brews the stuff as he puts into 'em and into many a hundred places beside' 'Oh, then, he's a brewer, is he?' 'That same he, is and too good, a pretty sight, for the business,' said Matthew. 'But, there, the poor chap was born to it: it ain't of his own makin', and I s'pose he don't see no reason for throwin' it over. He's as decent and right-down a gentleman as ever stepped in boots!' There was silence after that for some time, both Matthew and Hugh being busy clearing. Presently Hugh said, 'Please, Mr. Pedder, would you mind me giving Lisa this half-crown? It would pay her rent perhaps. 'Give it her and welcome, if ye like, my boy. She've lost many a one the way that un was got. So let her have it, and I hope it'll do her good.'

Correspondence.

For the Christian Messenger.

Home Missions and the Convention.

A HISTORICAL SKETCH.

From 1821, when New Brunswick became a separate Association, till 1838, there appears to have been no attempt to unite the Baptists of Nova Scotia in carrying on denominational work. In this year the first step was taken by the Nova Scotia Association proposing to the New Brunswick Association to form a "United Society for the maintenance of Foreign Missions." This advance, being cordially received, prepared the way for others.

In 1844 the Committee on Questions in Letters in the N. S. Association advised that the messenger to New Brunswick be instructed to confer with the Association there as to the desirableness of a "General Union" or "Convention" for Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island. In accordance with this advice it was

"Resolved, That it is recommended to the messenger who is appointed to visit the N. B. Association to express to that body the earnest desire of this Association for increased intercourse and union between the churches of the two Provinces; and that they would beg to suggest the enquiry whether the two Associations might not usefully unite their efforts in the cause of Education; and to state the conviction of this body that the interests of both Associations would be greatly advanced by such a measure."

In 1845 Revs. C. Tupper, E. A. Crawley, and Wm. Burton were appointed a Committee to confer with the messenger from the N. B. Association in reference to the union, and also to nominate delegates to meet a delegation from the N. B. Association, should one be appointed. As the result of these measures the Baptist Convention was organized in the city of St. John, on the 21st of September, 1846, eight years after the first proposal for union.

In the excellent introductory sermon preached on that occasion by Rev. Dr. Crawley, occur these words:—"It is evident that in the past we have needed combination. If we have not this, the independency of which we boast were an evil rather than a blessing. I may be permitted here to glance at some of those objects which especially demand the united counsel and efforts of our churches in these Provinces, and at which the proposed "Union" or "Convention may usefully aim."

"The importance of this measure for the prosperous management of our Foreign Mission hardly needs comment. It is evidently impossible, in any other way, to obtain that concentrated action which, it is apparent, must be necessary to the support and direction of a mission thousands of miles distant from the churches that maintain it."

"But Domestic Missions also, though not now, perhaps, proposed to be an immediate object of the Convention, might, doubtless, derive great benefit from concentrated thought and combined action. There are in Nova Scotia, and I doubt not in this Province also, modes of operation, obviously necessary

to the increase of prosperity in our Domestic Missions, which cannot be effected but by a more enlarged plan than hitherto pursued; any enlargement of plan, however, requires many minds engaged in it; it requires concentrated power, and, for my own part, I doubt not that a union of the churches in these Provinces, to some extent at least, in order to obtain the increase of means and of wisdom which constitute that power, would prove highly advantageous."

After referring to Education, the Dr. adds: "Many other objects that can well be effected in no other way might be mentioned, but I forbear."

By the third Article of the Constitution, as amended and adopted at the morning session, it was declared:

"ART. III.—That the objects of the Convention shall be to advance the interests of the Baptist denomination, and of the cause of God generally; to maintain the religious and charitable institutions hereinafter mentioned; to procure correct information relative to the Baptist body, and to advise and carry out such measures as may, with the Divine blessing, tend to advance the interests of the Baptist denomination, and the cause of God generally."

From the 8th Art. we learn that the religious and charitable institutions referred to were the Foreign Missions and Bible Cause, and the Fund for Infirm Ministers.

But though, by the Constitution, Education and Domestic Missions were not included in the objects of the Convention, the following resolution, passed immediately on the opening of the afternoon session, shows that Dr. Crawley was not alone in the opinions above quoted:—

"Resolved, That this Convention, being of the opinion that there are no existing jealousies in relation to Education or Domestic Missions that should prevent an active union of the Baptist denomination in these two objects, through the medium of the Convention, they, therefore, request the respective Associations to consider the subject of more united action in those objects, and give their views thereupon at their next meeting."

We find the following in the Minutes of the N. S. Baptist Association, in reply, probably, to this request:—"In regard to more united action the Committee beg to submit the question whether a general agency, for the promotion of educational and all other objects of common interest in which the Provinces are respectively engaged, might not be extended to both Provinces as a common field to be occupied by one and the same agent."

What reply the N. B. Association gave we have not the means of ascertaining.

That this was the prevalent opinion is further shown by the report presented by the Board of Directors at the session of 1847. They say:—"But especially this Board recommend a Committee to prepare and bring in some measure for so modifying the Constitution of this Convention that all our benevolent objects may be brought under the action of this body, as they consider the interests of Education and Home Missions to be fully as much matters of common concern as any others, and matters which might easily be connected with this Convention without trespassing hurtfully on any local interests."

The Committee on amendments of Constitution, appointed in accordance with the above recommendation, reported the following alterations:—

"1st. That the business of the Education Societies and Domestic Missions be added to the objects now under the direction of the Convention."

"2nd. That the Boards, appointed annually by the respective Associations for Domestic Missions in each Province, constitute a General Board of the Convention to take charge of the objects of Domestic Missions under their direction."

They also named certain brethren as the "Board of Education."

These articles were unanimously adopted, and were declared to be a part of the Constitution, though they do not appear to have been incorporated with it till 1851, when the Art. II. appears as follows:—

"ART. II.—That the objects of the Convention shall be to advance the interests of the Baptist denomination and of the cause of God generally; to maintain the following religious, educational and charitable institutions, namely,—Foreign Missions; Domestic Missions, Acadia College, and the Fund for Superannuated Ministers; to procure correct information relative to the Baptist body, and to advise and carry out such mea-

asures as may, with the Divine blessing, tend to promote its welfare."

Thus then Home Missions became one of the objects of the Convention in the second year of its existence, i. e., in 1847. It continued to be named among the objects of the Convention till 1857, when the Constitution was again amended, and the objects reduced to Foreign Missions and Acadia College; both Home Missions and the Infirm Ministers' Fund being left out.

(This latter Fund was, at the request of the Western and Central N. S. Associations in 1852, handed over to the Associations, and the amount in fund divided among the Associations that had contributed to it.)

But though Home Missions was by the Constitution one of the objects of the Convention for the ten years above indicated, they were never so in fact. There never was a Board appointed by the Convention to manage Home Mission work, though in accordance with the Constitution the Board of Home Missions is put down as "The Boards of Domestic Missions in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick united." But so far as we can discover this "United Board" never reported to the Convention, or acted in any way under its direction.

Besides a few reports of Committees on Missions occurring at intervals through these ten years, the introduction and discussion of a resolution in relation to the employment of a vessel for missionary purposes around our shores and the adjacent islands, the passing of a few resolutions favouring the French and Gaelic Missions, nothing, aiming directly at advancing Home Missions, appears to have been attempted by the Convention.

The operation of such a Board as proposed, if ever practicable, became utterly impossible after the division of the N. S. Association in 1851, and consequently the above named Board was then dropped from the Minutes of the Convention.

From 1857 to 1874 we find no direct reference to Home Missions in the Minutes of the Convention, save the acknowledging of a communication from the N. S. Baptist Home Mission Society suggesting a systematic plan for raising monies for denominational purposes.—The absence of this reference is the more remarkable, as during all these years there is a report on the "State of the Denomination." That the framers of these reports was sensible of the importance of Home Missions in advancing the interests of the denomination the following from the report of 1856 will show:

"The Committee further bring to the notice of the Convention the fact that the considerable increase of members that has taken place in our churches in the Province of New Brunswick has mainly arisen from the extension of the Home Missionary effort in that Province during the past two years. The result is highly satisfactory, and commends to the brethren in the other Provinces the propriety and importance of adopting similar measures, with a view to the evangelization of destitute districts and the wider extension of our denominational interests."

Had Home Missions become so distasteful to the Convention that the Chairman of this Committee dare not refer to it? Or had such "measures" been adopted as left nothing more to be desired? If the latter, a word of commendation, at least, might have been given.

While observing this strict silence in reference to our own Home Mission work, it is interesting to read of the Convention in 1870 tendering "their grateful acknowledgements to Rev. Dr. Backus of U. S. for the valuable information afforded us on Home Evangelization." (In the U. S. we suppose.) Though no immediate results are apparent, it may be that to this "valuable information" is to be traced the resolution offered by Rev. George Armstrong, and seconded by Rev. W. P. Everett, in the session of 1874:—

"Resolved, That, in the opinion of this Convention, the union of all our Associations, churches and ministers in the great and vital cause of Home Missions in these Provinces is highly desirable, and its wise consummation to be sought, if practicable."

After addresses by a number of the brethren, the further consideration of the resolution was postponed till the next annual session. Notice was also given that a resolution to amend Articles 2 and 5 of the Constitution, so as to make Home Missions one of the objects of the Convention, would be then introduced. At the session of 1875, though

the brother who gave the above notice was not present, the subject was again taken up, and, after considerable discussion, a Committee was appointed to report at the next annual meeting "upon the advisability of bringing the Home Missionary enterprises of the denomination in the Maritime Provinces under the consideration and direction of this body." For reasons not known to the writer, this Committee did not report as was expected, but a resolution proposing to make Home Missions one of the objects of the Convention was moved by Rev. T. H. Porter. The resolution was voted down, however, many voting against it because they thought its introduction untimely. Notice was also given by Bro. Porter that if spared to meet at the next annual session he should move that the second article of the Constitution be amended to read as follows:—"Art. 2. The object of the Convention shall be to maintain the Educational and Missionary interests of the body, and to advance the general interests of the denomination."

From the study of the foregoing facts we learn:

1. That at the beginning of the Convention's history the leading brethren of the denomination felt that Home Missions should be under its control.—They considered this work "as much a matter of common concern as any other," and believed that it might easily "be connected with the Convention without trespassing hurtfully on any local interest," and doubted not that it would derive great benefit from the "concentrated thought and combined action" thus obtained. They appear to have been firm believers in the principle stated in a former paper, viz.: "That in Home Mission work union is better than isolation."

2. That while the Convention by unanimous vote adopted Home Missions as one of its objects, the plan proposed for the management was such that it frustrated what they sought to effect. Had they appointed a Board for this, as for the other objects, and requested the Associations to hand over the work of their Boards to the Board of the Convention, the result, we believe, would have been different. But we refer to this more in the way of warning than of blame.

3. That the Home Mission work, deprived, by this mistake, of that "concentrated thought and combined action," referred to by Dr. Crawley, and becoming more and more divided with every division of the Association, has not advanced in equal ratio with Foreign Missions and Education, which enjoyed these advantages, and lagging behind has retarded the progress of these also. If this statement be questioned, let it be remembered that when our Foreign Missions and Education work were yet in their infancy, our Home Missions had attained to considerable growth.

4. That on account of the time that has elapsed since the subject was entirely dismissed from the Convention, and the consequent giving up of all the time and interest to other matters, many have come to regard the present effort to bring Home Missions under the control of the Convention as the introduction of a stranger instead of the bringing back of a child. They see in it only the starting of some "new thing" by the youthful generation, instead of regarding it as a return to the wisdom of the "Fathers."

In conclusion we wish to add: That in the preparation of this sketch, as well as that published in the MESSENGER of May 16th, we have sought to be correct and impartial. We have neither shut our eyes to, nor kept back any fact that came under our notice, having a bearing on the question referred to at the commencement of the former paper, viz.: "How shall the Baptists of these Provinces carry on their Home Missionary work so as to secure the greatest results." As the result of these enquiries we are established in the following opinions:

1. That as a denomination we have, in the past, failed, through lack of combination, to accomplish in Home Mission work all that we might have accomplished for Christ and His cause in these Provinces.

2. That the placing of our Home Mission work under the control of the Convention, the same as Foreign Missions and Education, can only result in good, both to the work itself and every other interest of the denomination.

As we remember how nearly our "Fathers" accomplished 30 years ago what many are now hoping soon to see accomplished, we tremble lest some unhappy difference of opinion shall cause us to wander thirty years longer in the wilderness of Isolation. A. C. Hebron, July 23rd, 1877.

For the Christian Messenger. The "Wesleyan's" Criticism criticised.

Dear Editor,—

The Wesleyan, organ of the Wesleyans in Nova Scotia, came to hand this morning,—thanks to my brother minister who sent it. In looking over its pages I perceive a Wesleyan's review of the sermon I preached in Liverpool before the Western Baptist Association. In this review, which manifests very frequently the surprise of its author at the strange features of the sermon, I perceive many amusing statements. Is it not amusing to hear the writer say in his first sentence, "We seldom see or hear a specimen of genuine Calvinism in these days;" and in the second sentence he says, "The reasons we will not attempt to define." Who requires a definition? If any thing is required it is a reason why our friend "seldom sees or hears a specimen of genuine Calvinism in these days." His readers will define and spare him the trouble. But the writer gives neither reasons nor definitions. May we suggest a few reasons? Perhaps he neither sees nor reads Calvinistic books; perhaps he has not in his library a book with even a "specimen of Calvinism" in it. Perhaps he never goes to churches—or even looks at them—where Calvinistic preachers preach anything of the "five points." Perhaps he has never heard of C. H. Spurgeon, who, in every sermon, has something to say of some one of the "five points," whose congregation, if it were doubled, would make a large hole (numerically) in the Wesleyans of Nova Scotia. All the world knows that Mr. Spurgeon believes in, and preaches, the "five points," and that his sermon is published, both by his own people and many orthodox editors of religious newspapers, weekly. But, somehow, our Wesleyan critic has not seen or heard of these productions; or, if he has, he "seldom sees or hears a specimen of genuine Calvinism in them." Does our friend ever consult any Theological books, or hear any preachers but those on the Arminian side? If he does not he is not qualified to give sound reasons or clear definitions; and we are not surprised that "he neither sees nor hears anything that has even the appearance of Calvinism." Perhaps it will be novel to our friend to hear that there is in existence a good deal of that thing of which he has heard and seen so little.

The greater part of the Presbyterians, both in Europe and America, believe in the "five points" of Calvinism. The most of French Protestants are Calvinists. The Baptists of England, India, and America have the "five points" in their creed,—excepting, of course, the Free Will Baptists, who are a very weak body. And Congregationalists, as a body, are Calvinists. Now, in view of these numerous witnesses, is it not marvellous that our friend cannot see or hear anything of Calvinism. But we must pass on to our friend's third sentence.

He says, "But when a dogmatic utterance is made, involving particularly one of the 'five points,' it is pretty sure to be not in any of the pulpits claiming direct succession from Calvin, but in some one of those occupied by men professing to be direct descendants of the Apostles." We have the impression that all christian churches, even the Wesleyans, who claim John Wesley for their father—they call him "the father of Wesleyanism"—go beyond uninspired men for their creed. If they do not, then we do not marvel that they are not "dogmatic" in their views.—How can they be? A dogmatic person is one who states positively what he believes; and believes that his creed is Scriptural. The more dogmatism, then, the better. By all means let us be positive in declaring our creed; otherwise our sincerity will be questioned. And where are to be found preachers who are more dogmatic than the Wesleyans?

But what about "the descendants of the Apostles?" We must look for them, for, according to our friend's statements, they are the only "dogmatic"—positive—preachers in this age. Who will not

As we remember how nearly our "Fathers" accomplished 30 years ago what many are now hoping soon to see accomplished, we tremble lest some unhappy difference of opinion shall cause us to wander thirty years longer in the wilderness of Isolation. A. C. Hebron, July 23rd, 1877.

For the Christian Messenger. The "Wesleyan's" Criticism criticised.

Dear Editor,—

The Wesleyan, organ of the Wesleyans in Nova Scotia, came to hand this morning,—thanks to my brother minister who sent it. In looking over its pages I perceive a Wesleyan's review of the sermon I preached in Liverpool before the Western Baptist Association. In this review, which manifests very frequently the surprise of its author at the strange features of the sermon, I perceive many amusing statements. Is it not amusing to hear the writer say in his first sentence, "We seldom see or hear a specimen of genuine Calvinism in these days;" and in the second sentence he says, "The reasons we will not attempt to define." Who requires a definition? If any thing is required it is a reason why our friend "seldom sees or hears a specimen of genuine Calvinism in these days." His readers will define and spare him the trouble. But the writer gives neither reasons nor definitions. May we suggest a few reasons? Perhaps he neither sees nor reads Calvinistic books; perhaps he has not in his library a book with even a "specimen of Calvinism" in it. Perhaps he never goes to churches—or even looks at them—where Calvinistic preachers preach anything of the "five points." Perhaps he has never heard of C. H. Spurgeon, who, in every sermon, has something to say of some one of the "five points," whose congregation, if it were doubled, would make a large hole (numerically) in the Wesleyans of Nova Scotia. All the world knows that Mr. Spurgeon believes in, and preaches, the "five points," and that his sermon is published, both by his own people and many orthodox editors of religious newspapers, weekly. But, somehow, our Wesleyan critic has not seen or heard of these productions; or, if he has, he "seldom sees or hears a specimen of genuine Calvinism in them." Does our friend ever consult any Theological books, or hear any preachers but those on the Arminian side? If he does not he is not qualified to give sound reasons or clear definitions; and we are not surprised that "he neither sees nor hears anything that has even the appearance of Calvinism." Perhaps it will be novel to our friend to hear that there is in existence a good deal of that thing of which he has heard and seen so little.