

think myself he is better able to do so than Mr. G. is to do it for him, and hence I cannot see what Mr. G. had to do with the matter unless prompted by his pure love for meddling. See Prov. xx. 3; xxvi. 17. He says 'it never has been proven and never can be that Baptism is Immersion and Immersion Baptism.' I presume he has Mr. Wesley's notes on Rom. vi. 4. What did he mean by "the ancient manner of baptizing by Immersion? What have hosts of honest Pedobaptists meant by such concessions?

Beside if Mr. G. knows of one Lexicon that gives *sprinkle* as a meaning of *BAPTIZO* he should have named it and given the edition a year ago and so helped his Bro. Currie from "under the tub." But if he knows of such a book we will be glad to hear from him even at this late hour.

He says "We can baptize all nations—children being a part of the nations, we baptize them too." Where is he told to baptize all nations? Why in Currie's Catechism, but not in his Bible. The Bible says *teach* all nations "*Panta ta Ethne*" baptize them "*Antons*." Will Mr. E. just make that masculine pronoun agree with a neuter noun. It may require the "*Importance of talent*."

He acknowledges he "trembles" when I ask him "when and where I profess to be an expert &c., then he refers me to the *Christian Messenger* of the 10th ult., where I said the "Bro. listened to the discussion on both sides and became convinced &c." He hopes I will discover no bombast in the explanation. No, but I see an amount of "evasion?" Does a man profess to be an expert in detecting the cause of another's convictions when the other tells him what the cause was? Let Mr. G., look up the meaning of the words he used and answer whether his statement was true or false.

He complains of "an ungenerous putting of the case," when I said "I did not know of one who had been brought up under Baptist influence who had recently joined the Methodists in this community. I say now there was not one. I asked for their names and he does not seem inclined to give them, but he assures me "they are written in Heaven." I wonder how Mr. G. knows. Has he been reading the book of life. God knows whose names are there, but it is a little doubtful if Mr. G. does. We are told in the Revelation of those "whose names were written in the Book of Life, from the foundation of the world, and hence before they were born. Is that the case with those converts?"

He says in His former article there were a "number" who did so. I imagine they are like the Lexicons of "Cole and Dwight," that Mr. Currie refers to in his Catechism, not to be found in this world. In that *Christian Messenger* of the 10th ult., to which Mr. G. has referred, there was an account of an Association in which the majority of its ministers came from the Methodist Society. Their names were given—a thing which Mr. G. dare not do. Will Mr. G. account for the change of their views.

Yours &c.,
Wm. E. HALL.
Melvern Square, April 17, 1880.

For the Christian Messenger.
A Suggestion.

Mr. Editor,—

Will you please give these few lines a corner in the *Christian Messenger*: I have been a subscriber for some time past to the various objects connected with the denomination, and hope so to continue. A yearly subscriber came to me a little dissatisfied that his name could not be found in the Minutes or the Year Book. Would it not be better in the future, that all names, with the amount paid, and the object subscribed to, be recorded in the Year Book, as a place to refer to. I think it would give general satisfaction. I believe it is the plan adopted by the different religious denominations, and if any mistake occurs, it may be rectified.

A FRIEND OF THE CAUSE.

The Lord Mayor of London and Mr. Horace Jones (architect to the Corporation of the City of London) have submitted for the Prince of Wales's inspection at Marlborough House the model of a memorial which it is proposed to erect on the site of old Temple Bar.

For the Christian Messenger.
The Charter and Grant Question.

SECOND LETTER.

Mr. Editor,—

Allow a reply to your editorial of the 24th March.

CHURCH AND STATE.

In that editorial you say that the first letter on this question "fosters (1) the fundamental error that Legislative grants to Acadia College involve and sanction the principle of Church and State." In refutation of this, so called, error you thus state the question, "To make it possible to have Church and State connection, there must be two parties, the Church and the State, brought into said relation." Undoubtedly so. You continue, "Now in the matter of Acadia College and Government Grants there is without doubt the Government on one side"; and further on you add, that "those receiving a Legislative grant may agree to do a certain work with it," and that "the legislature may require proof that said work is done." Your readers will mark these frank and true admissions, for these conclusively prove the close connection of the State with the College. By your own showing it is a State Agent and Institution. You proceed to prove that it is this alone.

For, you say, "on the other side there is no church," "the Baptist Churches of the Maritime Provinces, as such, neither own nor conduct Acadia College." This is a clear declaration that the College has no definite relations to the churches; that the "Child of Providence" is but the ward of the State. Whether this declaration respects "the memory of the pious dead," "the honour of the churches" and "the interests of truth," others must say.

But is this premise "that the churches, as such, do neither own nor conduct Acadia College," on which you, Mr. Editor, rely exclusively in your attempt to refute the Church and State error, a correct one? Is it not totally incorrect? Does it not contravene the plainest facts? Delegates of and from Baptist Churches, as such, compose the representative body known as the Baptist Convention of the Maritime provinces. One of the chief functions of that Convention (Constitution Articles 2 and 7) is the support and control of Acadia College. That Convention directs and governs the College, in every detail, through its Board of Governors which it appoints and supervises. That Convention appeals directly to the churches as such, for College support, as witness the Convention Scheme. More, the College authorities who are directly amenable to the Convention, are its authorized agents in negotiating with the State in the matter of Government Aid, (Convention Minutes 1878) and they report to the Government. (Education Report 1879). If therefore there is a Convention, if our churches are united in any one organization and work, that work is the support of Acadia College. Yet this patent fact becomes "fiction" in the "fog" which envelops every one who attempts to show that Legislative Grants to Acadia College do not sanction and involve the principle of Church and State. Only by denying the undeniable can the "wicked connexion" be disproved.

But your logic, surely not your conviction and sympathies, Mr. Editor, carries you further. You complete the severance of the College from the Churches by completely secularizing it. It need scarcely be remarked that your course in this matter is not singular; for the natural and historical tendency of State Universities is to complete secularization and total separation from the Churches. You but float downward on the stream of tendency toward the bitter Dead Sea of Godless Higher Education when you declare that Acadia College is "a secular enterprise," in which Baptist Churches are unauthorized by the New Testament to engage, that it is a "worldly undertaking," into which the Fathers would not degrade Baptist Churches, that it is a work of "so secular a character," that the mere imputation that Baptist Churches, as such, are engaged in it should be "repelled with all the heart." But fortunately facts yet stem this current and refute these statements. The Theological Department of Acadia College is not yet considered as a "worldly undertaking." Nor regarded as the Churches'

"shame." The Arts Course of Acadia is not yet so purely secular as to be the Churches' "degradation." But these your statements are harmful, not intentionally, doubtless, for the "Messenger" has loyally done yeoman's service, for in proportion as they are consciously accepted, or unconsciously imbibed, the conviction of the Churches that Higher Education is Christian Church work, and their work, will be destroyed. That conviction destroyed and all grounds of appeals to the Churches for moral and financial support will be removed, and the taproots through which the College draws its life from the Churches will be severed. The College will cease to exist as a denominational College and the work of the Fathers in behalf of Higher religious education, will be largely undone. In a word your virtual surrender of the principle that Higher Education is and should be religious and under the auspices of the Churches is a yielding of the grounds on which the Denominational College system stands. Were this intended, one might well say that the Fathers departed, our dead Samuels, whom you summon from their graves as infallible counsellors, would only announce to you a disastrous Gilboa.

But the editor of the "Messenger" is surely not of those who would destroy the foundations of Acadia's independence, alienate her from the Churches and degrade her into a Governmental satellite of Halifax University. None the less, however, does his advocacy of an indefensible policy aid her enemies, and thus while he would defend the work of the Fathers he buries his axe to the haft, stroke after stroke, in the tree planted by their hands. The readers of the "Messenger" will clearly discern this; and they will also see that your intimation that the non-affiliation policy of the denomination declared at Truro, in 1876, may be reversed, and your present reasonings fully accord, and that these both indicate an unconscious tendency toward a total upheaval and overthrow of all our past denominational decisions and work.

CHARTER AND GRANT.

Your refutation of what you consider the second fundamental error of the first letter remains to be considered. The one question of that letter was, "Does a Legislative Charter confer the same or a like degree of Legislative control?" To that question, you give, Mr. Editor, no clear or cogent answer. You continue to admit with categorical fullness, that a Legislative grant to a College implies an agreement to do work, and a right to see that it is done. And yet all this does not imply, you say, governmental supervision and control! Again, let it be asked, "Can any responsible government do otherwise than retain the right to control the expenditure of its grants; and can it exercise that right, otherwise than by supervising the actions of its grantees, or agents?" The question has, as every one knows, but one answer. Legislative grants carry with them invariably, the right of legislative oversight and control. That the exercise of this right may be held wholly or in part in abeyance alters not the case.

But the letter in question, while holding this tenable position, and while showing that a College Charter conferred no legislative rights of this character, by no means asserted, as you assume, "that the seeking and obtaining of a legislative charter means no account-ability to the State." On the contrary the letter declared that the corporate rights conferred by the College Charter must be so used as not to interfere with the rights of others. The wrongs against the public resulting from such an interference may be of such a nature as to necessitate appeals to the Courts of Law and ultimate punishment by the State. This is the full extent of a private, unsubsidized Corporation's accountability to the public or the State. This would be an unsubsidized Colleges position under a Charter only. A College Charter gives corporate rights to manufacture graduates and to label them A. B.'s and M. A.'s, &c. If, in the process of manufacture, individuals are injured (and this covers your "Dotheboys' Hall," and steam ferry illustrations in which you confound the State with the public,) the remedy lies in a civil or criminal action, not in State control of methods. If again, the labels are placed on poor articles and the rights of others who use the same label

are injured by its depreciation in value, these parties may apply for a revocation of the abused Charter right. The Crown may grant the prayer of this petition. But neither before nor after the revocation of the Charter can the government, in one iota, control or supervise the educative functions of the unsubsidized Collegiate body. An appeal to the College Charter, and to Legal authorities will show this to be law and common sense.

But why this undue anxiety to prove that Acadia is by virtue of her charter under government control? This is unnatural and Un-Baptistic. While Baptists ignore no just claim of the public, or of the State, they willingly submit to no unjust restrictions. Why lead them then to think that they are already under the trammels of the State by virtue of their College Charter when this will but prepare them to submit to the "tether" of a State Grant, and to receive patently, by and by, the additional fetter of a closer connexion with the State through affiliation with Halifax University? In this connection your illustrative allusion to Acadia's request that her graduates should be placed on a par at least with those of the government paper University is most unfortunate. For, it will be remembered, that request took the form of a protest against coercive legislation, discriminating against the graduates of Acadia and in favor of those of Halifax University, and this Act remained long on the Statute Book, amid ominous silence. It would seem that among those who lingered long and lovingly round the cradle of the Government, "some one might have been found to resent this imputation upon the "Child of Providence."

In view of the present aspect of the question of Higher Education in this Province and of movements which are historical, the outgrowth of hostility to Denominational Colleges in general, and to Acadia College in particular, and in view of the recent advocacy of the always ruinous policy of indecision, not a few feel convinced that the time has come for the re-enunciation of a clear and well understood college policy based on sound scriptural and unchangeable principles. Acadia College, free of State connection, supported and controlled by Maritime Baptists under God and for God and the people. This will retain the confidence and the material and moral support of the churches and the blessing of God.

J. A. DURKEE.

Lockport, April 16th, 1880.

Editorial comments on Brother Durkee's Letter.

THINGS THAT ARE NOT.

We have already affirmed things that are not—(1) there is not state control involved in a charter-gift; (2) there is not state control in money-gift; (3) there is no such thing as a Baptist Church wickedly, incestuously bound to the State; (4) Baptist Churches, as Churches of Christ, do not own and control the University of Acadia College; (5) the churches of Christ in their divinely organized capacity are not warranted in founding and conducting Common and Higher School systems, Academies, Seminaries for young ladies, Schools of Law, Schools of Medicine, Schools of Science and Art, Technological Schools, Schools and Colleges for courses in the Arts and Sciences; (6) Baptist Churches cannot, in view of their polity of separate and independent Church Government, combine and form a second body and delegate to it ecclesiastical authority; (7) the Baptist Churches of these provinces have never formed such an ecclesiastical body; therefore no such body exists!

THINGS THAT HAVE BEEN AND THINGS THAT ARE.

(1) In 1828 Horton Academy was founded by an EDUCATION SOCIETY—not by a church or churches; (2) nothing more than a money qualification was required for membership of said Society; (3) it was entirely open to any persons of any belief or no belief; (4) the denominational and religious control of said Academy was secured by the requirement that a majority of the governing Boards should be members of Baptist Churches; (5) this society conducted Horton Academy for ten years and then founded Acadia College and conducted both it and the Academy for eight years more; (6) the Baptist Convention of the Maritime Provinces took the College

from the hands of the Education Society and has conducted said College for thirty-four years, a few years ago having received the Academy from the hands of the Education Society; the Convention was at first composed of persons qualified by church membership and also by money alone; (7) the Convention is now composed entirely of church members; (8) the Education Society, not the churches, got charters from the Legislature; (9) the Education Society, not the churches, took money from the Legislature to help build and sustain the Horton Institutions; the Convention, and not the churches, continues to take money from the Legislature to aid in the work of Higher Education at Wolfville.

THE COMPOSITION OF THE CONVENTION AT THIS PRESENT TIME.

(1) The President and Faculty of Acadia College; (2) all ordained Baptist ministers; (3) all who had paid fifty dollars at one time to the objects of the Convention previous to 1879, or an hundred dollars subsequent to that date; (4) delegates from Baptist Associations in the Maritime Provinces; (5) delegates from the Baptist Churches in the Maritime Provinces. All these must be members of Baptist Churches.

DELEGATES AND HOW MUCH DELEGATED.

There are (1) Delegates from the Associations—from six Associations—three in Nova Scotia two in New Brunswick and one in P. E. Island. Six Associations send thirty delegates to the Convention. With what authority are these thirty men clothed by the six Associations? What power have these thirty men to act for and bind these six Associations? What is the work of the Convention?

the body of which they are a component part, not as individuals; but as clothed with power to act for the Associations, to bind them in legal relations, to bind them in any of the relations of the legitimate business of the Convention? What, we ask again, is the lawful and avowed work of the Convention? It is undoubtedly a part of said work to found and foster Academies and the College. Well let the Convention decide at its next session, as it will have an undoubted right to do, to found an Academy in the territory of each one of the six Associations, and let the delegates as delegates from the six Associations require these bodies to accept the decision and raise the money to carry on the work. In this case we will guarantee that these thirty men will find out how much delegated power and authority they took with them from six Baptist Associations; and they will learn the definition of *delegate*, as defined in the vocabulary of Baptist Associations.

(2) Delegates from churches.—How much power do they carry on their shoulders to the Convention to act for the churches, to bind the churches as churches? Let them return home after the Convention has decided to establish six Academies, and tell their several churches that they, as delegates, have bound them to raise at once money to build and support such additional Academies. We know the Baptist Churches of these Maritime Provinces would forthwith proceed to give these delegates a little information in regard to the authority and power delegated to them. We can fancy a deliverance like this to delegates who would seek to bind their churches,—“Brethren, We, as churches, are commissioned to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. In our church capacity we carry out the specific instructions of our Master. As divinely organized churches, our mission is to give the gospel to the whole world. We remain where our Master left us both in government and work. Soon after our Master's ascension to heaven, his churches combined in a second body by delegates, hence the Church of Rome, the Lutheran Church, the Church of England, and the Church of Scotland. These bodies have done some strange things—they have shorn off peoples' heads, made and applied instruments of torture, and have whipped, imprisoned and killed Baptists. Brethren, delegates to the Convention, you have been misled by a word—by the word 'delegate.' Brethren, delegates to the Convention, Baptist Churches do not create ecclesiastical bodies other than churches, and clothe them with ecclesiastical authority and power. Dear Brethren, Delegates to the Convention, you will understand after this that you do not hold in your hand, while you