if they are constantly encouraged to see what they can do, some of those who were thought lame will be found to run, and some who fancied that they had a withered hand shall, when they at God's bidding try to stretch it out, find an unusual vitality imparted to it. It is a great mercy to keep our brethren going on in little villages where they cannot do much, because there is not population to work upon. It is a great mercy to see those brethren helped, but for my part I believe the Society is wiser in making itself truly a Mission Society, and not a supporting society. If our augmentation funds could be increased so as to support the poorer brethren better than they are now supported, what a mercy it would be! But this society, or some society, ought to concern itself in pushing further out. It ought to be a sort of Uhlan Society, riding ahead, a a pioneer society that shall find out where fortresses can be stormed for Christ, or strong positions taken up in His name. I hope the day will come when we shall have a good Baptist Church in every town in England. It is a disgrace that there should be a place of five thousand inhabitants without a Baptist Church. We Baptists have, according to a new theory that has lately started, no right whatever to exist. If any of you brethren intend to be merged into any other denomination, I wish you joy of your choice, and think you ought to carry it out, but if there should exist one Baptist in the world, I know where he will exist. I am neither going to be amalgamated with any other denomination, nor absorbed by it. I have quite another theory. I look forward in the future not to the absorption of our denomination, but to the gradual enlightenment of other churches. "It is a very small matter which divides us from them," they say. If it is small, let them give it up, then, and let them come to this point and agree with us. If really the matter of Baptism is such a trifle as to be merely the apex of a pyramid, let them strike the apex away, and have done with it. As for us, we believe that no command of Christ is trivial, and that no word of the Lord Jesus Christ is to be treated with contempt. If we should neglect one word of his, and teach men so, we should feel ourselves to be mean—meaner than the least in the Kingdom of Heaven, and we cannot do it, and we do not intend to do it. I expect to see the other denominations absorbed into our denomination, and I intend to work, by God's help, and I hope this society will, with something like that in view—that the day shall come when all Christendom shall say, "One Lord, one faith, one baptism." I have been charged sometimes with helping to form a church when there has been already an Independent church in the town. Well, I have done so, and I mean to do it again. I have never done so when there has been an earnest lively minister in the Independent place and not population enough for two, nor would I. But when I have seen a chapel and nobody in it, and a most respectable and well-educated minister the only occupier, or when I have seen a people driven out of the sanctuary because the word was not conceived by them to be the Gospel of Christ at all, I have come forward and helped them. When they have said, "We are ready to be baptized, because on looking through the Scriptures we see it there," I have been willing to baptize them, and if I have sucked the life out of the other churches, it was because they had not any life to suck out. If it comes to this—that we have not the right to maintain our views, and that the Baptist brethren are not to meet together for worship, but ought to go somewhere else where their common sense is insulted by a rite which they conceive to be more heathenish than Christian I shall always stand by their making themselves into a separate church of Jesus Christ, and going to work in their own way. We must plant more churches. (Applause.) I believe in planting a great number, like the florist who puts a great many pieces of the laurel into the ground and does not expect them all to strike. Some will, and if he gets only a percentage, that will do. Let us commence as our dear friend Mr. Oncken did in Vienna. If a church does not seem to take root, never mind, there is something done. Let us give up all sorts of apologies for being Baptists henceforth and for ever. I am surprised to hear the sort of joy with which the Methodists own their clan. I hope to see the same clan feeling among us—as broad and liberal a feeling as possible; for we are Christians, and have an intense and earnest sense of union with each other. But after all we are Baptists, and, on the whole —I am not certain—but I think I would rather of the two be called a Baptist than a Christian now, because there is a sect that call themselves Christians that I do not belong to at all—who seem to call themselves Christians for this reason, that they believe they are the only people in all the world who are Christians. I desire so to live that everybody may know I am a Christian, whether they call me so or not; and then, by way of distinction, if men like to call me a Baptist I shall not be ashamed of it. I have been a Baptist, for I have baptized seven or eight thousand persons, so that I am not only a baptized person but a *Baptist*; and I desire to be so as long as I have health and strength. If what we hold is not worth the holding, let us go back to the Church of England, to the Presbyterians, or somewhere; but if we have a reason for existing, let us work out the end for which God has made us. Brethren, be of good courage, and strengthen your hearts in the Lord. Let each man sharpen his sword for conflict, and lift up his eye to the God of heaven for new strength, for whatever may happen in politics or in the Church, we have, as Neander has told us, and as Mr. Oncken has prophesied, a future, and that future will be to God's honour. Let us renew our brotherly covenant to-night as we meet on this annual occasion. Let us set up the great banner—"One Lord, one faith, and one baptism."

For the Christian Messenger.

ONTARIO CORRESPONDENCE.

Baptist Theological Students in Ontario. How Aided. Faith and Practice of the Ministerial Education Committee. Dr. Fife and his Work. The Institute—its State and Prospects, &c.

Time flies and in its flight conscience does not fail to remind me of my partial promise to the Editor of the *Messenger*. The spirit, if not the letter, of that promise, requires, I suppose, that I should attempt to furnish a little more "copy." Nor does it quite allay the aforementioned troublesome mentor, for me to assure myself that the *Messenger's* columns are always full of more interesting matter than any I have at command and that any sin of negligence on my part is sure to be charitably regarded. That consideration does not, I suppose, absolve me, though it does enable me to assure the Editor that in the case of pressure upon his columns, he need not at any time class the sheets from Ontario as amongst those clamorous against delay.

Thus far my irresolute pen has run while I have been cudgelling my unlucky brains for something *Ontarian* in its nature, and yet having some promise of not being uninteresting to Nova Scotia Baptists. Happily, or otherwise, I am at this moment reminded of the correspondence which has recently been going on in the *Messenger*, upon the interesting question of the best means of giving pecuniary aid to Theological Students. Into the discussion itself it is not, of course, for me to enter. One fact, beyond dispute in Ontario, whatever the case may be in Nova Scotia, is that the majority of Students for the Baptist ministry *need such aid in some shape*. By far the greater number of them come, not from the comparatively wealthy city and village churches, but from the poorer and more remote rural districts. I am far from mentioning this as a matter of regret, so far as the *material* furnished is concerned. Because the back woodsman, or the farmer's son brings the sturdier physical frame, no mean qualification in itself, it by no means follows that he brings the less vigorous brain, or the less unstained and fearless moral nature. But the fact certainly contains in itself food for serious thought for the members of the "prominent" churches, which find themselves unrepresented in the "School of the Prophets" and the pulpits of the Denomination. If I am not mistaken some of our largest and wealthiest churches, worshipping in the costliest edifices, have never yet furnished a student for the Theological Department of our Institution, and, as might be expected, the amounts of their contributions for the various departments of the Master's work often fall below those of churches much more feeble in point of numbers, wealth and worldly influence.

But I thought that, as we in Ontario and Quebec have a large number of Students—in no less than *sixty-nine* at present.—having the ministry in view and now in course of actual training, in the Woodstock Institute and elsewhere, (a number of them are temporarily in the field) it might not be without interest to our Eastern brethren to be told what is done by way of aiding them. I may state at the outset that those who have the oversight of their interests are committed to no theory and no special line of conduct. They feel the force of the objections urged against the bestowment of too much aid, objections not without weight theoretically and enforced by the experience of our brethren in some of the United States, where numbers of young men who have been partially or wholly educated by churches and individuals for the Christian ministry, are now to be found in secular callings. Nevertheless we, in this new country are a practical people, and deal with the subject practically. Here are a large number of young men, in whose piety honesty and zeal the churches sending them and the teachers instructing them, have every confidence. Here are many churches and destitute sections of country, in need of trained labourers to stir the virgin soil, or reap the harvest already whitening. A few of the young men have the *time*, a few the *means*, to secure the needful culture. *They* neither receive, nor ask, pecuniary favours. But many more have neither *time* to spare—some of them being already heads of families —nor means to spend. They must relinquish all hope of adequate preparation, or be aided by their brethren who have the means. Is it any great matter that the latter should contribute of their substance to help, not their brethren, but the cause to which they wish to give themselves? We think not. We are happy to believe that many of those who have money to spare think not too. Indeed so much confidence have Dr. Fyfe and his associates of the Committee of Ministerial Education in the liberality of the churches in this respect that they have hitherto made it a rule never to refuse a grant to an applicant who has their confidence and that of his own church. The scale of appropriations is at present fixed at the rate of *twenty* dollars per term, or *sixty* per year. During the last year six hundred dollars were appropriated in this way, and the sum will doubtless be increased during the current year. If it be asked how is the money raised? Have you a fund? The reply is our fund is the purses and bank accounts of good Baptists all over the land. Dr. Fyfe the principal of the Institute is the financial agent of the whole Educational concern. He spends two or three months of the year in visiting the brethren and "stirring up their pure minds by way of remembrance." So thoroughly is he in the confidence of the body and so irresistible are his straight forward and Christian appeals that his drafts have never yet been dishonoured. He is just now on his annual round of visits. His aim is this summer to raise for the whole current expenses of the Theological Department of the Institute—the Literary Department now, I believe, pays its own way—$2700. This is of course independent of the large sum recently pledged for building purposes. His success thus far has been most encouraging, and so long as the Institution has an advocate so trusted and beloved it has no reason to fear. We can only hope that the years may yet be many ere we shall be in a position to know how much of the liberality of our brethren is due solely to their interest in the Institution, and how much to personal friendship and affection for its Principal.

I should have added above that *all* theological students proper receive free tuition, and that under the conditions of the enlargement now in progress provision is made for extending the same privilege to a large number in the preparatory course.

Though the Theological Department is not now in session and though the attendance in the Literary Department is naturally considerably smaller in the Summer term, I learn from the Registrar that there are at present more than 120 names on the Institute roll. The work is a great and good one in both east and west. The question of Endowment, if our College is to be stable and perpetual, must before many years force itself upon the attention of the denomination. As a loyal son of Acadia, though far away, my fervent hope and prayer is that *her* friends and supporters may speedily set us a worthy example, by increasing the Endowment of the oldest Baptist Institution in the Dominion to a safe and comfortable figure We should hope to follow suit in good time.

But I must stop and leave over for the present some other topics I was minded to touch upon, even at the risk of giving some the impression that the Baptists of Ontario and Quebec are expending all their energies upon one work—an impression which I am happy to testify would be far from being the fact. Possibly some of my old friends amongst your readers, not having the fear of Maud before their eyes, may charitably quote for my excuse, "*Ne sutor &c., &c.*"

J. E. W.

The Christian Messenger.

Halifax, N. S., May 29, 1872.

CHURCH ORDER.

Mr. Editor,—

Dear Sir,—The writer would solicit, through the columns of the *Messenger*, answers to the following questions:

1. A member, for just cause, is excluded from church fellowship. He remains without the pale of the church for a number of years. A neighboring church experiences revival influences, in which he becomes interested. The pastor requests the former church to restore the brother and give him a letter of dismission to his church. Is the church in a position to grant such request? Should she not hear in some way from the brother himself? If the church feel that under existing circumstances they cannot restore the brother; is it in accordance with Baptist usage for the other church—without any further action—to give him the right hand of fellowship?

2. In a time of church difficulties a member is excluded. The action of the church is too hasty. She does not labor with the brother according to scripture direction. Subsequently, earnest, prayerful effort is made for his restoration. Every possible concession is granted, which the honor and purity of the church will admit; but all of no avail.

He lives in a border section between two churches. After a few years, in a time of revival, the other church receives him into her memberhood by the right hand of fellowship, without any word to or from the church from which he was excluded. Can the first church receive him into her communion?

3. A member in good standing, changes his residence, settling within the limits of a neighbouring church. The pastor requests the clerk and deacons to give the member a letter of dismission Have *they* the power, *under ordinary circumstances*, to grant such dismission simply by private consent? If they think they cannot, would it be in accordance with church government to give the brother the right hand of fellowship, feeling confident that the other church will grant the letter at its next meeting?

Inquirer.

Very much of the happiness of christian churches depends on the right performance of discipline. "Let all things be done decently and in order," is a law which is applicable to all cases and a rational interpretation of it would greatly assist in dealing with all difficult ones, such as those mentioned by our correspondent. Looking at the abstract right of a church to receive members to its fellowship there is perhaps nothing to prevent their reception of any person who gives proper evidence of christian character; but the mutual obligations existing between churches in fraternal relationship demand that respect should be paid to such relationship in the reception and dismission of those who have stood in connection with them respectively. Neighbouring churches should seek by all means in their power to sustain each others' action, and so to maintain cordiality and co-operation. Injury sometimes arises from a want of promptness, whilst at other times too hasty a decision occasions future trouble. Unlike worldly organizations christian churches, in the administration of the law of Christ, should not be ruled by precedents. Each case, must be dealt with on its own merits. There are so many diversities of character and circumstance in one case, which require to be taken into account, that do not exist in another, which renders it unsafe to take one as a rule by which another should be decided.—Only the law of love must be made to apply in all cases. This is especially necessary between churches of the same Faith and Order. In every case credit should be given, where it is possible to do so, that the church in its decisions was influenced by love to the individual, and by sincere regard for the honor of Christ. Mistakes may of course be made by churches as well as by individuals, but, where love reigns, and the spirit of Christ abides, the rectification of such mistakes may be an additional occasion of promoting union and joy among its membership.

Neglect of the preliminary rules, given by Christ himself in Matthew xviii. 15–17, to be observed in cases of offence, is commonly the cause of subsequent difficulty. In very many cases faithful attention to these would prevent the necessity for resorting to the more severe and painful duties devolving upon the church.

Nevertheless offences will come, and it is well for churches to have the grace and wisdom which will enable them to grapple with them and carry out what the Master has directed. It is the neglect to do this that often deprives the church of its strength, destroys its testimony for truth, and renders membership a very uncertain guarantee of christian character.

We know nothing of the cases referred to above, further than the questions themselves inform us, and we therefore offer such replies as common sense—a very desirable commodity—would appear to dictate. In answer to the 1st we would remark that we think the brother should in some way—personally, if possible—communicate with the church of which he was formerly a member. We do not see the necessity for his formal restoration to membership in the first church before uniting with the second, but some intimation might be expected from said church, supposing the acknowledgment of his former error and sin to be accepted, shewing that no cause of disunion would exist between the members of the two bodies by his reception into the second.

If however after such acknowledgment the church of which he was first a member persists in refusing to accept the same, and the two churches have conferred with each other on the matter, and every means of reconciliation exhausted, and the second church still unanimously regard him as a fit and proper person for their fellowship, they then could not refuse to receive him, or they would sacrifice their independency and absolutely shut the door against any future restoration of the brother to christian fellowship. This however is an extreme case which can hardly be supposed to arise.

The 2nd Question is not put so clearly, but the ground of it is in effect covered by the 1st. If the church "has granted every possible concession," the member should be willing to accept the same and forgive the injury done to him. Does the question mean, Can the first church receive the brother referred to into its *membership*? or, Can the said church receive him to *occasional communion at the Lord's table?* If it be the latter it is evident that the brother would not care to avail himself of the privilege until a reconciliation had taken place. If the former, his reception would be a restoration. The *right* to communion at the Lord's Table we think belongs to the members of such church, and only to them. The church may give an invitation to members of sister churches to participate in the privilege, but the doing so is simply extending an invitation to such brethren and sisters *as visitors*. If it were otherwise there would be no security against improper persons presenting themselves for participation in commemorating the Lord's death.

In the 3rd case we would reply that we should not regard such action as orderly. A member must be dismissed by one church before he can be properly received by another. No letter from the officers should be permitted to over-ride the vote of the church. As in the case of marriage, if a party already married contracts marriage with another person, the first alone is binding, so a person cannot strictly be a member of two churches at one time. Still in the transfer of membership from our church to another, there are often little irregularities, which, while they are not exactly in order, yet are not permitted to stand as barriers to fellowship and communion. Nevertheless the reception and dismission of members can only be regularly done by the church itself.

BAPTIST PROGRESS IN QUEBEC AND ONTARIO.

"R. A. F." (Dr. Fyfe) in the *Canadian Baptist*, institutes a comparison between the progress of the Baptists in the United States and the two Canadian Provinces. He says:

"We are unable to trace any organizations of Baptists in these two Provinces farther back than 1794, that is 78 years. For a considerable time the itinerant missionaries kept no accurate statistics, so that we cannot perfectly trace their growth by accurate figures for the whole period of fifty years. But in the year 1828, (that is 44 years ago), there were 1,500 Com-