

Temperance.

Two sides the One Canvas.

One beautiful afternoon in August there came to me the heart-broken wife of a State-prison convict. We tried to plan for his pardon and restoration to home and the world. It was a very sad case. He was the only surviving son of a very noble man, one who lived only to serve the poor, the tempted, and the criminal. All he had, all he was, he gave unreservedly to help thieves and drunkards. His house was their home; his name their bail to save them from prison; his reward their reformation. It was a happy hour to hear him tell of the hundreds he had shielded from the contamination and evil example of prisons, and of the large number he had good reason to believe permanently saved. Out of the hundreds, he once told me, only two left him to pay their bail, forfeited by neglect to show themselves in court according to agreement—only two!

Bred under such a roof, the son started in life with a generous heart, noble dreams, and high purpose. Ten years of prosperity, fairly earned, by energy, industry, and character, ended in a bankruptcy, as is often the case in our risky and changing trade; then came the struggle for business, for bread—temptation—despair—intemperance. He could not safely pass the open doors that tempted him to indulgence, forgetfulness, and crime. How hard his wife wrought to save him from exposure! How long wife, sister, and friends labored to avert conviction and State-prison! "I would spare him gladly," wrote the prosecuting attorney, "if he would stop drinking. He shall never go to prison if he will be a sober man. But all this wretchedness comes from rum."

Manfully did the young man struggle to resist the appetite. Again and again did he promise, and keep his promise about a month, then fell. He could not walk the streets and earn his bread soberly while so many open doors lured him to indulgence. So, rightfully, the State pressed on, and he went to prison. An honored name disgraced, a loving home broken up, a worthy, well-meaning man wrecked!

As I parted from the sad wife on my door-step, I looked beyond, and closely by the laughing sea stood a pretty cottage. The grounds were laid out expensively and with great taste. Over the broad piazza hung lazily an eastern hammock, while all around were richly-painted chairs and lounges of every easy and tempting form. Overhead were quaint vases of beautiful flowers, and the beautiful lane was bordered with them. On the lawn itself gaily-dressed women laughed merrily over croquet, and noisy children played near. A span of superb horses pawed the earth impatiently at the gate, while gay salutations passed between the croquet-players and the fashionable equipages that rolled by. It was a comfortable home, as well as a luxurious one. Nature, taste, and wealth had done their best. It was a scene of beauty, comfort, taste, luxury, and wealth. All came from rum.

Silks and diamonds, flowers and equipages, stately roof and costly attendance, all came from rum. The owner was one who, in a great city, coined his gold out of the vices of his fellow-men.

To me it was a dissolving view. I lost sight of the gay women, the frolicsome children, the impatient horses, and the ocean rolling up the lawn. I saw, instead, the pale convict in his cell, twelve feet by nine; the sad wife going from judge to attorney; from court to Governor's Council, begging mercy for her overtempted husband. I heard above the children's noise, the croquet, laugh, and the surf-waves, that lawyer's stern reason for exacting the full penalty of the law. All this comes from rum. —Wendell Phillips.

Temperance puts wood on the fire, meal in the barrel, flour in the tub, money in the purse, credit in the country, contentment in the house, clothes on the back, and vigour in the body.

"Sam, you are not honest. Why do you put all the good peaches on the top of the measure and the little ones below?" "Same reason, sah, dat makes de front of your house marble and de back gate chiefly slop bar'l, sah."

Correspondence.

For the Christian Messenger. Baptist Matters at Sydney and North Sydney, C. B.

In the spring of 1880 the Baptist Church in Sydney was much blessed under the labors of Rev. F. A. Kidson, and a large number of converts were buried with Christ in baptism, we trust to rise with Him to newness of life. Some of the Pedobaptist ministers at once began to interfere with anxious souls, and to lecture against baptism, and more especially against Baptists, indulging in ridicule, and misrepresentation of our views and practices, and denying that immersion was baptism. Rev. John Murray, especially, was very strong in his denunciation of Baptists and everything Baptist, boasted that he had knocked down the four pillars which upheld our system, and, I am told, dared any Baptist minister in the three Provinces to confute him.

Last winter a work of grace began in the North Sydney Church, under the labors of Rev. J. Bancroft. Bro. B. is of a quiet, peaceable disposition, and the last man to give offence or provoke discussion, but no sooner had he commenced baptizing, and naturally on such occasions alluding to our peculiar tenets, though in the most courteous and kind manner possible, when active hostility soon appeared among the Pedobaptist clergy and some others in that vicinity. The Rev. Mr. Hickey distinguished himself by his violent and eloquent assaults upon us in the pulpit, and some months after the Rev. Mr. McMillan published in the North Sydney Herald a most unchristian and insulting letter, which was replied to by Bro. B., and led to several other letters on each side, and resulted in his challenging Mr. McMillan to a public discussion, which, however, that gentleman had discretion enough to decline, (under the cover of the committee of his church), Mr. Bancroft having already proved that his statements as to Dr. Lightfoot's record, which Mr. McMillan denied, were strictly correct.

At the meeting of the Eastern Baptist Association last month at North Sydney, Rev. D. G. McDonald, of Charlottetown, P. E. I., was present as a delegate. The Committee of Arrangement appointed Bro. McDonald to preach in Sydney, and having heard of his able defence of the truth in Charlottetown, we invited him to remain and give us a few lectures on "Baptist Principles and Practices," which he consented to do, and these lectures were announced for the following Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday evenings, Bro. McD. intending to leave on Thursday to keep an engagement with the Hawkesbury Church. Subsequently, on being told of the lectures delivered here in 1880 by Revs. J. Coffin and J. Murray, and the latter gentleman's challenge, he wrote to them announcing his intention of lecturing, and courteously offered them the opportunity of defending their lectures if they so wished. They both declined any discussion, but Mr. Murray stated he had sent for a friend to meet Mr. McDonald, who would arrive in Sydney on Wednesday or Thursday. Mr. McDonald had, at the latest, to leave on Friday morning to keep his prior engagement, and on applying for the Public Hall found it was engaged for both Wednesday and Thursday, and could not be procured until after the following Thursday. In consequence of the session of the Grand Division S. of T., which was to commence the 26th. Mr. McDonald had no option but to decline full discussion with the "friend" sent for, (who proved to be the same Dr. Isaac Murray, of Charlottetown, whom Mr. McDonald so signally defeated some time since, in a public discussion covering thirteen evenings), but he offered to come back in October, and discuss the question with him at length.

On Monday evening the first lecture was delivered, and listened to with delight by a crowded audience, who were charmed with the lucid exposition of Scripture, and eminently Christian spirit which distinguished it. On Tuesday Dr. Murray arrived, and was present at the lecture that evening, when he announced he would review both lectures the next afternoon, which he did. On Thursday afternoon he reviewed the third lecture, and Mr. McDonald put off

his departure till Friday morning, and on Thursday evening reviewed the two reviews. I was not at either of the reviews, but was informed by persons competent to judge that they were very poor, having little of argument and less of Scripture in them. On Thursday evening Dr. Murray tried hard to bother Mr. McDonald, and prevent him going over the ground, by incessant interruptions, which became very annoying to the audience, who were anxious to hear both sides, till at last I had to rise to a point of order, and request him to be quiet. From want of time, and owing to so many interruptions, Mr. McDonald was not able to go over the whole of both reviews, but so far as he went he thoroughly exposed their fallacy and unscripturalness. On Saturday evening Dr. Murray gave his final review here. I was present, and gave the very closest attention for over two hours, but during that whole time I listened in vain for a single proof from Scripture, and I also listened in vain for a single argument that would stand the test of sound criticism. What puzzled me was, how clergymen and others present, who had enjoyed opportunities of mental training, and who ought to be able to distinguish between argument and sophistry, how they could approve of what was said, or how they could ever listen to it without the deepest regret that the Word of God should be handled so deceitfully. They appeared, however, to drink it all in, and to relish it, for at the close of the lecture, Rev. J. Coffin read a long preamble, and moved a resolution, condemning Mr. McDonald, and highly eulogizing Dr. Murray, which was seconded by Rev. J. Murray, and, of course, passed.

I have not yet obtained a copy of said preamble and resolution, so cannot quote it verbatim, but it condemned Mr. McDonald for challenging Messrs. Coffin and Murray to a discussion, which is not correct; for coming here, a stranger, purposely to attack Pedobaptists, which also is incorrect; and for stirring up strife and animosity in a peaceful community, etc., etc. If strife and animosity were stirred up it was not Mr. McDonald's fault, for his language was in marked contrast to that of our opponents—it was kind, courteous, Christian, and permeated with the gospel of peace. It was "very reprehensible" for Mr. McDonald to "attack the Pedobaptists," but it was perfectly proper, nay highly commendable, for Mr. Murray to first attack the Baptists, and hurl his sneers, ridicule, and misrepresentations at them; it was perfectly proper and highly commendable for Mr. Hickey to do the same at North Sydney; and for Mr. McMillan to publish insulting letters! It was highly "reprehensible" in Mr. McDonald, "a stranger," to come to Sydney and "attack Pedobaptists"; it was the very acme of propriety and highly commendable in Dr. Murray, "a stranger," to go to North Sydney, and attack the Baptists there! Truly circumstances alter cases.

There was one very noticeable difference in the lectures delivered here. Dr. Murray was plausible, and occasionally eloquent, but he called hard names, and indulged in sneers and ridicule, as is usual in all lecturers against baptism, while there was no gospel in anything he said, nothing to spiritually benefit the hearer. Mr. McDonald called no hard names, indulged in no sneers, said nothing conflicting with Christian kindness and courtesy, while through all his utterances ran the gospel message. His hearers were urged not to trust in ordinances or ceremonies, however Scriptural, but to come to Christ, to believe on Him, and thus be fitted to obey Him in symbolizing to the world His death, burial, and resurrection, according to His own commands and pattern. I have left a number of points untouched, but must close. C. H. H.

For the Christian Messenger. Baptist Colportage. No. 2. Dear Editor,— In my last article on Baptist Colportage I took it for granted that, as a denomination, we felt the importance of this mode of work for Christ. But now the query comes up. Are we intelligently interested? Do we sufficiently value this style of work for the spread of truth? The fact that in our past history as a denomination little or no colportage work has been done, except

as carried on by volunteers on their own account, is clear proof of the existence of incorrect ideas of the value of the work. There are, at least, two reasons why the work of the colporteur is a great power for good. 1st. His work gives him continual opportunity for personal appeals to individuals in reference to the claims of Christ upon them, or for winning them away from error. 2nd. He is always prepared to follow up any good impression made on individuals by putting into their hands, either by gift or sale, books or tracts which will further help in the search for truth. The following, clipped from an American paper, gives the story of BAPTIST COLPORTAGE IN SWEDEN. "The history of modern missions has but few brighter pages than those which record the wonderful blessing of God on the work of the Baptist Publication Society in Sweden. In 1851 Andreas Wiberg, an educated minister of the Lutheran Church in that country, was converted to the views of Baptists by reading a little book published by the Society, 'Penny's Scriptural Guide to Baptism.' He was soon after immersed, and joined the Baptists. Fired with a burning zeal for Christ and His truth, he devoted himself to the salvation of his countrymen. "The Missionary Union to which he applied could not afford him a missionary, the laws of Sweden prohibiting the public preaching of the gospel, except by ministers of the State Church. There was no obstacle, however, to the free use of the press, or to the more quiet, but hardly less effective, labors of colporteurs. "In 1855 Mr. Wiberg was commissioned by the Publication Society to organize and direct a system of missionary colportage in Sweden, by which, in the course of the next fourteen years, the people of every part of that country were liberally supplied with the Scriptures, and with high toned evangelical books and tracts. In a quiet way, that did not violate the laws, the gospel was preached from house to house by these earnest laborers, until the good tidings of salvation by the Cross went all over the country. The results were great and glorious. The good seed thus bountifully sown yielded a precious and abundant harvest. Many thousands of the people were converted to Christ, and to the views of Baptists. With a spirit of bitter persecution the enemies of this good work attempted to hinder its progress, and cripple the influence of its promoters. But the hand of God was with His servants to prosper them. Persecution accelerated their growth. In fourteen years there were organized by these colporteur evangelists nearly two hundred churches, with a membership of seven thousand, and nearly two hundred Sabbath Schools. Public sentiment was gradually enlightened and liberalized, and the laws of the State were made tolerant of churches and ministers of all names. Then these well sown and ripened harvest fields and full garners, the results of colportage, were transferred to the Missionary Union. Twelve years have passed since the Missionary Union took charge of the work in Sweden. Now there are about 21,000 Baptists in the country, united in over 300 churches. Besides about 7,000 have emigrated to the United States. Notice that the above is the inevitable result of earnest, personal efforts to win men away from error to Christ and His truth, seconded by the mighty power of a literature put into the hands of the people. God only knows how great has been the loss to the cause of truth in these Provinces, on account of the neglect of this branch of work for Christ. Baptist stewards of God, to you is committed the truth, not for yourselves only, but that you may by your money, prayers, and efforts give it to all who have it not. Has not the time fully come when you will with one accord pour into the treasury the money necessary for the establishment of a Baptist Book Room, and a system of colportage which will be the means of causing streams of blessing to flow in all directions to the joy of angels and to the glory of God? DIMOCK ARCHIBALD. Halifax, N. S., Aug. 11, 1881. We take less pains to be happy than to appear so.

For the Christian Messenger. Intercommunion. No. 5. BY J. C. BLEAKNEY. It is to be regretted that Bro. Hall could not have withheld his animadversions until Brother Munro, who has undertaken to advocate intercommunion, had finished his articles. It is regarded as an unnecessary reflection on Bro. M's. effort, and contrary to good taste. And Bro. H's singular failure to sustain his assumptions, and his almost immediate falling back of Bro. Munro's demolished forts, argue badly for the reinforcement. See my former articles. The following will enable our readers to see how unreliable, and damaging to their cause, Bro. Hall's statements are. He says, "Bro. Bleakney who started this discussion on the question of Intercommunion," &c. The truth is, that a brother, in the King's County Ministerial Conference, was appointed to write a paper giving the scriptural authority for Intercommunion at the Lord's Supper; and it was intimated to me that it might be well to have a paper on the negative side of the question, and that I had better write one. Whereupon I did so, and, at the request of the M. C., it was read, after the affirmative paper had been presented. Then some of the brethren expressed a desire to see both papers in the CHRISTIAN MESSENGER, but it was thought best to leave the matter of publication to the writers, and having been solicited, after the Conference, to publish my paper, I complied, and have no regrets for any thing that I have written on the subject. The following truthful statement made by Bro. H., is quite in order here. "Dr. H., (Hovey) with the caution characteristic of a great man, does not speak with positiveness where he is not sure," &c. Bro. Hall, in the next place, endeavors to give the impression that I have declined any further discussion of this subject, by "crying 'all hands off,'" which is an inexcusable misrepresentation. Here is what I did, and do now, say, leaving the public to return a just verdict. "Would it not be proper and fair for brethren, who are not immediately connected with the discussion between Bro. Munro and myself, to wait until Bro. M., has closed his affirmative of this question? It is inconvenient for one person to conduct the negative of a proposition against two or three affirmatives. Brethren should consider this." Again, Bro. H., having some sense of right, attempts to justify his questionable conduct by accusing me of "undertaking to overturn the faith and practice of a (the Baptist) denomination. I deny the accusation, and challenge him to show wherein I have written one word that is contrary to "the faith and practice" of the New Testament, which is the faith and practice of all true Baptists. I know of but two men, in the Baptist denomination, who would venture even a partial affirmation that the members of one Baptist Church have the scriptural right to commune in other Baptist Churches of the same faith and order! There are several other objectionable statements and insinuations in the brother's last article, which are calculated to nauseate any intelligent reader. Take as an illustration that I have given a false impression concerning Dr. Hovey's views of the celebration of the passover, "where the families were small." To show that his covert charge is utterly unfounded, I will furnish the whole of Dr. H's letter. "My dear Bro. I cannot answer your question. My impression has been that two families sometimes met and ate the passover together, but I can find nothing to justify my impression. Perhaps the lamb was divided and a part eaten by each family—when the families were small. Very truly yours, ALVAH HOVEY." I have put a part of the language in italics so that our readers may see the difference between the scholarly concession of Dr. Hovey and the persistent and rash assertion of Bro. W. E. Hall. Dr. Hovey says "my impression has been that two families sometimes met and ate the passover together, but I can find nothing to justify my impression. Perhaps the lamb was divided and a part

as carried on by volunteers on their own account, is clear proof of the existence of incorrect ideas of the value of the work. There are, at least, two reasons why the work of the colporteur is a great power for good. 1st. His work gives him continual opportunity for personal appeals to individuals in reference to the claims of Christ upon them, or for winning them away from error. 2nd. He is always prepared to follow up any good impression made on individuals by putting into their hands, either by gift or sale, books or tracts which will further help in the search for truth.

The following, clipped from an American paper, gives the story of BAPTIST COLPORTAGE IN SWEDEN. "The history of modern missions has but few brighter pages than those which record the wonderful blessing of God on the work of the Baptist Publication Society in Sweden. In 1851 Andreas Wiberg, an educated minister of the Lutheran Church in that country, was converted to the views of Baptists by reading a little book published by the Society, 'Penny's Scriptural Guide to Baptism.' He was soon after immersed, and joined the Baptists. Fired with a burning zeal for Christ and His truth, he devoted himself to the salvation of his countrymen.

"The Missionary Union to which he applied could not afford him a missionary, the laws of Sweden prohibiting the public preaching of the gospel, except by ministers of the State Church. There was no obstacle, however, to the free use of the press, or to the more quiet, but hardly less effective, labors of colporteurs.

In 1855 Mr. Wiberg was commissioned by the Publication Society to organize and direct a system of missionary colportage in Sweden, by which, in the course of the next fourteen years, the people of every part of that country were liberally supplied with the Scriptures, and with high toned evangelical books and tracts. In a quiet way, that did not violate the laws, the gospel was preached from house to house by these earnest laborers, until the good tidings of salvation by the Cross went all over the country. The results were great and glorious. The good seed thus bountifully sown yielded a precious and abundant harvest. Many thousands of the people were converted to Christ, and to the views of Baptists. With a spirit of bitter persecution the enemies of this good work attempted to hinder its progress, and cripple the influence of its promoters. But the hand of God was with His servants to prosper them. Persecution accelerated their growth. In fourteen years there were organized by these colporteur evangelists nearly two hundred churches, with a membership of seven thousand, and nearly two hundred Sabbath Schools. Public sentiment was gradually enlightened and liberalized, and the laws of the State were made tolerant of churches and ministers of all names. Then these well sown and ripened harvest fields and full garners, the results of colportage, were transferred to the Missionary Union.

Twelve years have passed since the Missionary Union took charge of the work in Sweden. Now there are about 21,000 Baptists in the country, united in over 300 churches. Besides about 7,000 have emigrated to the United States. Notice that the above is the inevitable result of earnest, personal efforts to win men away from error to Christ and His truth, seconded by the mighty power of a literature put into the hands of the people. God only knows how great has been the loss to the cause of truth in these Provinces, on account of the neglect of this branch of work for Christ.

Baptist stewards of God, to you is committed the truth, not for yourselves only, but that you may by your money, prayers, and efforts give it to all who have it not. Has not the time fully come when you will with one accord pour into the treasury the money necessary for the establishment of a Baptist Book Room, and a system of colportage which will be the means of causing streams of blessing to flow in all directions to the joy of angels and to the glory of God? DIMOCK ARCHIBALD. Halifax, N. S., Aug. 11, 1881.

We take less pains to be happy than to appear so.

For the Christian Messenger.

Intercommunion.

No. 5.

BY J. C. BLEAKNEY. It is to be regretted that Bro. Hall could not have withheld his animadversions until Brother Munro, who has undertaken to advocate intercommunion, had finished his articles. It is regarded as an unnecessary reflection on Bro. M's. effort, and contrary to good taste. And Bro. H's singular failure to sustain his assumptions, and his almost immediate falling back of Bro. Munro's demolished forts, argue badly for the reinforcement. See my former articles. The following will enable our readers to see how unreliable, and damaging to their cause, Bro. Hall's statements are. He says, "Bro. Bleakney who started this discussion on the question of Intercommunion," &c.

The truth is, that a brother, in the King's County Ministerial Conference, was appointed to write a paper giving the scriptural authority for Intercommunion at the Lord's Supper; and it was intimated to me that it might be well to have a paper on the negative side of the question, and that I had better write one. Whereupon I did so, and, at the request of the M. C., it was read, after the affirmative paper had been presented. Then some of the brethren expressed a desire to see both papers in the CHRISTIAN MESSENGER, but it was thought best to leave the matter of publication to the writers, and having been solicited, after the Conference, to publish my paper, I complied, and have no regrets for any thing that I have written on the subject. The following truthful statement made by Bro. H., is quite in order here. "Dr. H., (Hovey) with the caution characteristic of a great man, does not speak with positiveness where he is not sure," &c. Bro. Hall, in the next place, endeavors to give the impression that I have declined any further discussion of this subject, by "crying 'all hands off,'" which is an inexcusable misrepresentation. Here is what I did, and do now, say, leaving the public to return a just verdict. "Would it not be proper and fair for brethren, who are not immediately connected with the discussion between Bro. Munro and myself, to wait until Bro. M., has closed his affirmative of this question? It is inconvenient for one person to conduct the negative of a proposition against two or three affirmatives. Brethren should consider this." Again, Bro. H., having some sense of right, attempts to justify his questionable conduct by accusing me of "undertaking to overturn the faith and practice of a (the Baptist) denomination. I deny the accusation, and challenge him to show wherein I have written one word that is contrary to "the faith and practice" of the New Testament, which is the faith and practice of all true Baptists. I know of but two men, in the Baptist denomination, who would venture even a partial affirmation that the members of one Baptist Church have the scriptural right to commune in other Baptist Churches of the same faith and order! There are several other objectionable statements and insinuations in the brother's last article, which are calculated to nauseate any intelligent reader. Take as an illustration that I have given a false impression concerning Dr. Hovey's views of the celebration of the passover, "where the families were small." To show that his covert charge is utterly unfounded, I will furnish the whole of Dr. H's letter. "My dear Bro. I cannot answer your question. My impression has been that two families sometimes met and ate the passover together, but I can find nothing to justify my impression. Perhaps the lamb was divided and a part eaten by each family—when the families were small. Very truly yours, ALVAH HOVEY." I have put a part of the language in italics so that our readers may see the difference between the scholarly concession of Dr. Hovey and the persistent and rash assertion of Bro. W. E. Hall. Dr. Hovey says "my impression has been that two families sometimes met and ate the passover together, but I can find nothing to justify my impression. Perhaps the lamb was divided and a part

The following truthful statement made by Bro. H., is quite in order here. "Dr. H., (Hovey) with the caution characteristic of a great man, does not speak with positiveness where he is not sure," &c.

Bro. Hall, in the next place, endeavors to give the impression that I have declined any further discussion of this subject, by "crying 'all hands off,'" which is an inexcusable misrepresentation.

Here is what I did, and do now, say, leaving the public to return a just verdict. "Would it not be proper and fair for brethren, who are not immediately connected with the discussion between Bro. Munro and myself, to wait until Bro. M., has closed his affirmative of this question? It is inconvenient for one person to conduct the negative of a proposition against two or three affirmatives. Brethren should consider this."

Again, Bro. H., having some sense of right, attempts to justify his questionable conduct by accusing me of "undertaking to overturn the faith and practice of a (the Baptist) denomination. I deny the accusation, and challenge him to show wherein I have written one word that is contrary to "the faith and practice" of the New Testament, which is the faith and practice of all true Baptists. I know of but two men, in the Baptist denomination, who would venture even a partial affirmation that the members of one Baptist Church have the scriptural right to commune in other Baptist Churches of the same faith and order!

There are several other objectionable statements and insinuations in the brother's last article, which are calculated to nauseate any intelligent reader. Take as an illustration that I have given a false impression concerning Dr. Hovey's views of the celebration of the passover, "where the families were small." To show that his covert charge is utterly unfounded, I will furnish the whole of Dr. H's letter.

"My dear Bro. I cannot answer your question. My impression has been that two families sometimes met and ate the passover together, but I can find nothing to justify my impression. Perhaps the lamb was divided and a part eaten by each family—when the families were small.

Very truly yours, ALVAH HOVEY."

I have put a part of the language in italics so that our readers may see the difference between the scholarly concession of Dr. Hovey and the persistent and rash assertion of Bro. W. E. Hall. Dr. Hovey says "my impression has been that two families sometimes met and ate the passover together, but I can find nothing to justify my impression. Perhaps the lamb was divided and a part