

The Christian Visitor.

A FAMILY NEWS PAPER: DEVOTED TO RELIGIOUS AND GENERAL INTELLIGENCE

REV. I. E. BILL,

"Glory to God in the highest, and on earth Peace, good will toward Men."

EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR

GEO. W. DAY, Printer.

SAINT JOHN, NEW-BRUNSWICK,

WEDNESDAY, JULY 22, 1857.

VOL. X.—NO. 30

Our recent Baptismal Conference.

Your readers, dear brother, have not yet forgotten this controversy, nor is it too late to comment upon it. Not that I wish to reopen it. I beg leave, however, to offer a brief series of remarks in which my aim shall be to "speak the truth in love," and not to provoke rejoinder. I may be compelled in these papers to say some severe things about the editor of the *Presbyterian*. I would carefully distinguish between him and his co-religionists; not holding them responsible for his fault, nor withholding from them my Christian affection because of denominational differences, nor because of the occasional recurrence of controversy in regard to those differences. And lastly, be it observed, that nothing but absolute necessity will induce me to reply to any strictures on my present effusions.

THE LATE CONTROVERSY NEEDLESS.

I do not see why we should have had any controversy at all. Certainly the baptismal question is not without its importance. It goes far deeper, and more nearly touches the vitals of religion than is generally supposed. Yet why not suffer it to lie as a sort of open question between the different evangelical denominations—a question on which we agree to differ, since we cannot all regard it in the same light? Why stir up debate, when it is more likely to alienate than to do any thing else? Mr. Nutter ("Appendix B") makes an innocent statement. He ascribes the success of the Baptists in these provinces, first, to the blessing of heaven—next, to the Scriptural truth and power of Baptist principles. What of all this? Our brother only said what he, as a Baptist, could not help believing—what every true Baptist must needs say after him—what every Presbyterian is bound to hold with regard to his own body, if he really believes in his Presbyterianism, and thinks it has done any good in the world. Yet for this he is to be attacked and ridiculed; and then his brethren at large are to be dragged into debate; and for weary months our papers must be filled with replies and rejoinders, until every one is asking, "When will this wordy war be hushed?"

Am I to be reminded here of "Appendix C," with its queer poetry! That did not appear until after the *Presbyterian* had made its first onset upon Mr. Nutter. And what of it? It was a collection of curiosities. It was never intended for argument. And may we not tell our people, that their fathers sometimes indulged in sarcasm on the baptismal question, without being called to account for it?

"But was not your own 'Sebastopol' article rather a provoking one?" It was not so meant. It was intended to shorten controversy, not to prolong it; by narrowing it to what is essential in the baptismal question, and shutting out extraneous matter. If it was misunderstood I am sorry for it, but cannot charge myself as being in any wise the author or the helper of our late strifes. If brethren will not let us alone, why we must defend ourselves. We must not be traitors to our own convictions. But surely in such a case, the fault lies with assailants, and with none others.

THE LATE CONTROVERSY FAR TOO DISCURSIVE.

Woefully discursive. To illustrate fully here would be to become as discursive as the controversy itself. I can only hint at a few of the topics which were imported into it. Thus, from the pen of the *Presbyterian* we have—big, ignorant, lubberly boy—Jesuitism—Paganism and Julian—discussions on craft-hydras, fabulous, natural, and ecclesiastical—Baptist ignorance—speculations on Mr. Nutter's sickness—public religious exercises by females—infant salvation—Lawyers A and B—Joe Miller—Mahometan—parable—allusion to Mormon baptisms, &c. Now I do not want to limit a writer's range of illustration, nor prescribe his taste, nor dictate as to what is required by his argument. No doubt the *Presbyterian* might urge a vast amount of special pleading in favour of many of the above topics; some of which, too, were not wholly irrelevant. Yet many of them, if not most, had absolutely nothing to do with the matters in debate. Why they were dragged in, I will not pretend to explain. But a Scriptural argument about a New Testament ordinance could scarcely require their introduction. The jokes of the *Presbyterian* were very poor—witticisms rather than wit—not explosions, but evaporations—squibs not hits. It was a misapplication of talent to write them, and a waste of time to read them. It would have been well if in these respects the *Presbyterian* alone had erred. A silent rebuke of transgression would have been far more dignified and effective than any attempt to foil him at his own weapons.

BITTERNESS AND ARROGANCE.

These, dear brother, have but too deeply marked the late controversy. I may be blamed here by my prepossessions. It is my privilege to be personally acquainted with Dr. Halley, of Manchester, Eng. eminent alike for his ability in controversy, and for his Christian temper. He has grappled with Dr. Carson on the baptismal question. He endorses the doctor's style generally, in dealing with that question, for its harshness and severity. And yet he acknowledged, in conversation with me, that in dealing with the plea for infant baptism drawn from the Abrahamic covenant, the doctor seemed to him to write in a truly gentle and christian-like spirit. The

explanation was, that here he agreed with Dr. Carson, while elsewhere he differed from him. This is human nature; and it is mine.

Still prejudice apart, as far as possible, it does appear to me that the above charges fairly lie against the "Presbyterian." I have already avowed my conviction, that our recent controversy was entirely gratuitous. How, then, were we led into it? The "Presbyterian" was resolved to have a discussion. For this purpose he fastened upon Mr. Nutter's harmless and good-natured recollections and reasonings, and construed them into attacks on Pædobaptism. Here "the root of bitterness sprang up," and began to "trouble" us.

And the spirit in which the controversy commenced, on the side of the "Presbyterian," pervaded the whole of his productions; with some occasional abatements, but with no radical improvement. I shall give only one instance, and that a conclusive one. In the issue of April 9, there occurs the following language, in reference to the Pentecostal baptisms:—"We would like the Editor of the 'Christian Visitor' would make it appear, that it is no argument against immersion, that so many were baptized in one day. Had those who were baptized a change of dress with them? or [the italics and capitals are mine] did they go in naked, as some immersionists do now-a-days?" In the same issue there is a story of a Mormon baptism in England, in which this vile thing is reported to have been done. But what are Mormon baptisms, and Christian baptisms, by the remotest implication, to be placed in the same category? The *incendo* is simply—but I refrain. We have something of the same kind from the pen of the good and candid Matthew Henry, as quoted by Booth in his *Pædobaptism Examined*. "To baptize naked, or next to naked, (which is supposed, and generally practised in immersion,) is against the law of modesty; and to do such a thing in public solemn assemblies, is so far from being tolerable, that it is abominable to every chaste soul and especially to baptize women in this manner." Henry perhaps had derived his impressions from the saintly Richard Baxter, who, as quoted also by Booth, absolutely raves against the Baptists of his day.—But these were sins of ignorance. Baxter and Henry knew no better. The Baptists of their day might safely plead for them, "Father I forgive them! for they know not what they do." Is the editor of the "Presbyterian" entitled to the benefit of the same plea?—Well, this at all events will suit his case.—"Lord! lay not this sin to his charge!"

And then as to arrogance: neither the dead nor the living can compare with our editor in mental prowess. Witness his treatment of men whose names none can dishonour without dishonouring their own. Carson is "the great and redoubtable Dr. Carson;" a reference to whom is met with the explanation, "Alraendabra! the magic of a name." Neander is the "redoubtable Dr. Augustus Neander." His arguments and conclusions are constantly alluded to as merely "opinions." Barnes fares very little better. Indeed our editor scolds all references to uninspired, and especially to "Pædo-baptist authorities." "Why does the 'Visitor' run from the Bible to Pædo-baptist authorities to help his cause? The 'Visitor's' authorities we put no faith in. We would just as soon pin our faith to the sleeve of the 'Visitor' as to that of Dr. Macknight or Neander." I say nothing of the insinuation here. I quote it as an illustration of the arrogance of which I complain. And as to the writers who, on our part, have come forward in the present controversy, they spring up according to the "Presbyterian," like hydra-heads. Mr. Nutter is the "witty, laugh-or-producing brother," of whom we do not know, but that "he is one of the most learned men of his time." Then there is Mr. Spurden, "a full of criticism and hermeneutics." Nemo is rendered into "Mr. Nobody." Your present correspondent figures as "J. D.," full of challenge and championship, great in Greek. Bye and bye comes forth the editor of the "Visitor," himself, like Patroclus clad in the armour of Achilles, to fight it not to fight the enemy." And, again, "We really must absolve the editor of the 'Visitor' from all supposed sins of wit or humour. He has not been guilty of anything of that kind, nor is likely to be." But, enough, and more than enough! It seems difficult for the "Presbyterian" to refer to his opponents without applying to them terms of mock respect, or of direct depreciation. "Doubtless he is the man, and wisdom will die with him." What is a host of poor provincial Baptists to such a one as he? with his native talent, his vast acquirements, his irresistible logic, his flashing wit, his peerless eloquence; set off and adorned as all these are, by shrinking modesty, exemplary suavity, and overflowing charity. How is it that we are not anti-baptized? Is it owing to the soundness of our cause, or the dutiness of our understandings? With which questions I wind up for this time.

AN ERROR ON THE PART OF THE BAPTISTS.

With all due deference, dear brother, I beg to notice an error into which, as it appears to me, both you and father Nutter were betrayed in the course of recent controversy. In your issue of Jan. 21, in the editorial department, I find this language:—"He (the 'Presbyterian') evidently feels that it is a hopeless case, that Neander and the 'Christian Visitor,' have the truth on their side." Such being the fact, it is only right

that we should remind him that ingenuousness demanded, that, instead of charging his failure to the "obscure vision of the Baptists," he should attribute it to its proper source, the entire absence of Scriptural testimony in his favour. Again, in the same number, in father Nutter's article entitled "Falsehood and Detraction," I find the following:—"He (Mr. Bennett) knows as well as we do, that Christ set up the institution of a 'purely converted church,' and that the principles of the Baptists are more in accordance with that model than his own beloved Presbyterian church; and that the latter will not bear to be examined by the light of God's revelation."

Now all this is highly plausible, but on one point quite fallacious. The sum of it is, that the editor of the *Presbyterian* feels himself routed, but has not the honesty to confess it. Assumptions like this are common among us Baptists. And no wonder. Our case is an exceedingly plain one. It is simply conceded, one point by one opponent, and another by another, until their case is abandoned, as shown at large by Booth, in his *Pædobaptism Examined*. It seems extraordinary, therefore, to many Baptists, probably to most, that an honest man should still take ground against us. Yet the prejudices of education are exceedingly strong. Fortified by learning, they are so much the stronger. So too are the prejudices of position, and present interest. Now all these concur in the cases of Pædo-baptist ministers, editors, &c., exerting upon them a peculiarly blinding influence; enlisting their whole faculties on the side of Pædo-baptist errors; and preventing them from the due appreciation of those arguments which strike upon the Baptist mind like so many sunbeams. How strangely was the mind of the apostles blinded, as to the real purpose of our Lord's mission, up to the very instant of his ascension! Which of us is free from errors, traceable to some or to all of the sources indicated above?

What is the inference? This,—that it is hardly fair for any man to assume, without impregnable reasons, that those who contend against his particular views know that he is right, but will not own it; and are thus wickedly fighting against their own inner convictions. Why, at this rate, what becomes, not alone of the common honesty, but of the Christianity of our brethren of other denominations? We are satisfied, that, on the points in debate between us, they are in error. But they have yet to be convinced of this, and especially their leaders and polemicists. It is, doubtless, a sin as well as a misfortune, for them and for us, that we do not always look at all truth in that angle of vision which would make us conscious of its claims, and compel our obedience. But we have not attained to that yet. Hitherto just here we all need charity from our brethren, and forgiveness from our Father. Our exercise of the one will be no mean evidence of our interest in the other.

GAINS OF THE CONTROVERSY.

Unsatisfactory as it has been in some respects, still it has yielded good results; good personally, and good in relation to our cause.

It has been personally beneficial, both to Baptists, and to those who differ from them. To Baptists, because it has brought largely before them the grounds on which their denominational peculiarities repose. Men are too apt to take their religious views on credit. Such and such sentiments are regarded as "Baptist" sentiments, and therefore to be received by Baptists without farther question. I need not show how unsatisfactory is this sort of blind assent—how unfavourable it is to a wholesome sense of personal responsibility in matters of religion—how closely it is allied to Popery. But now, through the columns of the *Visitor*, in their own journal, denominational views have been so expounded, sustained, wrought out, sifted, that our brethren, even such of them as read only their Bibles and their papers, have had an opportunity of looking to the foundation of those views, and judging for themselves of their soundness. Abiding by us, they will henceforth do so more intelligently, and therefore more firmly. Or, should any forsake us, of which we have but little apprehension, better so, than holding on by the force of habit rather than from the weight of conviction.

Then, as to our Pædo-baptist brethren and especially our Presbyterian, our views of truth on the baptismal question have been so brought home to them, borne to them in the columns of their denominational organ, to many of them probably for the first time, that it would be strange indeed if their attention had not been arrested—if they had not been aroused to investigate—if they were not some of them ultimately rescued from their errors, and brought to take their stand by our side. But if no such results should be realized, brethren will learn that our peculiar views are not so unworthy of attention as they heretofore have deemed them. Thus they will esteem us none the less, and we may hereafter walk together in the great highway of the Gospel even the more cordially for the explanations that we have been led to exchange.

Our cause as a denomination has been aided by our recent controversy. Others, besides those with whom we have been brought into direct contact, have had an opportunity of learning, that after all the Baptists are not a set of ignorant, whimsical, or interested fanatics of the Joanna Southcote or Joe Smith order—that our appeal on the

baptismal question, as on all others, is to Scripture and reason, and not to wild impressions, and baseless imaginations—that we know how to answer those that oppose themselves, as well as how to tell a plausible tale to consenting audiences. And moreover that, though sorely provoked, we can argue our cause without losing our temper,—an excellent presumption in favor of any cause.—We have been assaulted with great zeal, if not with high ability. Our leading antagonist had reading if not learning,—tactics if not logical skill—persistence if not bravery—assertion if not argument—the cunning of the advocate if not the force of the fair reasoner. Another such champion on the side of Pædo-baptism will not soon be found. His experience will not be likely to seduce others into an imitation of his example. We hail the return of peace, and the prospect of its continuance. We are again at liberty to cultivate its arts. The God of peace grant us both its spirit and its fruits!

MISCELLANEOUS TOPICS.

With a reference to a few of these, dear Brother, I will terminate this series of papers.

1. Much was said, in the opening of our late controversy about the "interpretation of 2 Cor. 12. 16. Now it is worth remarking that Henry, Doddridge, Scott and Barnes all interpret here with brethren Nutter and Spurden. There is A. Clarke also, to whose testimony Brother Nutter has already referred. Scott, after having interpreted as above stated, proceeds to say, "In this indeed commentators of every kind are almost unanimous." Surely the testimonies of such men are not lightly to be set aside. They appear to me to be all but decisive.

I add here a curiosity from John Trapp, a Puritan commentator:

"[Verse 16.—Being crafty I caught.] A blessed craft, a high point of heavenly wisdom, Dan 12. 3. It is written of the fox, that when he is very hungry after prey, and can find none, he lieth down and feigneth himself to be a dead carcase; and so the fowls fall upon him, and then he catcheth them. Saint Paul, hungering after the souls of his Corinthians, deities himself to gain them."

2. "The distinction between precepts and duties as moral or positive," was scarcely noticed in the course of our recent controversy. It is however virtually important.—Let me ask a careful attention to that distinction, and to its consequences.

Bishop Butler, in his celebrated *Analogy*, thus defines here. "Moral precepts are precepts, the reason of which we see; positive precepts are precepts, the reasons of which we do not see. Moral duties arise out of the nature of the case itself, prior to external command. Positive duties do not arise out of the nature of the case, but from external command; nor would they be duties at all were it not for such command received from Him, whose creatures and subjects we are." This surely is "sound speech that cannot be condemned." It is eminently applicable to the baptismal question. Baptism is a positive duty, depending upon positive precept. It is a Christian rite, and not a Mosical one. Its authority reposes upon the New Testament, and not upon the old. It demands clear enactment, suited to its positive nature. It cannot be reasoned out. It cannot rest upon an inferential basis. "What saith the Scripture?"—the Scripture of the New Testament—is the only inquiry which can here be admitted. One clear New Testament enactment were enough to establish its authority; in the absence of which no pinning of texts together, however ingenious, can be of the least possible avail.

I apply this to the case of infant baptism. Nowhere in scripture can we find infants and baptism side by side—in juxta position. Booth thus illustrates here writing on 1 Cor. vii. 14. "The cause of infant baptism seems indeed to be very unhappy circumstance. For if a passage produced in its favour mention baptism, it says nothing of infants. If it mention seed, or sons, or little children, or indefinitely, or individual, it says nothing of baptism. If it mention children, in connection with the term promise, the word baptized being in the context, it very unwarily falls out, that the blessing promised is not baptism, nor does the word children signify infants.—If it mention first-fruits and lump, root and branches, the sacred writer neither speaks of baptism, nor seems to have had any thought about it. So here, though children are mentioned, and though they are denominated holy, yet there is a deep silence about baptism. If, therefore, infant baptism be a divine appointment, the predicament in which it stands, as a positive rite, must be quite peculiar—so peculiar, that we challenge our opposers to produce a similar instance, relating to a ritual service, and allowed by Protestants to have a divine warrant."

And now, dear brother, what follows? 1. That you were perfectly right in demanding from the editor of the *Presbyterian* "one passage from the Sacred Scriptures in which the dogma of infant baptism is distinctly taught by precept or example as an ordinance of the Christian church." This was not "sapience" it was wisdom, Bishop Butler being judge. It was no "dodge," it was advancing to the heart of the controversy. The "dodge" belongs to him who declines to produce the passage demanded, and ran off crying "a dodge! a dodge!" to cover his own dodging. But I proceed. I infer, 2. That one passage such as was demanded would have been properly

decisive of the whole controversy, so far as the subject of baptism was concerned. 3. That if such a passage had been in existence, it could not have been "ill-chosen," since it would have been the very thing for the Pædo-baptist argument. 4. That no inference, no witticism, no insinuation, no concatenation of words and sentences, however skilful, can stand as a substitute for that one passage.—And, 5. That the editor of the "Presbyterian," by his failure to produce the required passage, as well as by the apology which he attempted for that failure, in one main branch of his argument lost his cause.

3. The Presbyterian tried once, in alluding to the number of writers in your columns, in support of Baptist theories, to be very witty about "The Hydra," hydra heads, and the hydra headed Baptists. This taunt suggested to my mind the idea of hydra headed arguments. Baptists, through all their hosts, pursue but one line of argument in dealing with the baptismal question; furnishing thus no mean presumption in favour of the soundness of their views. But how is it with Pædo-baptists? Take the following illustration from the Boston "Watchman and Reflector," of Feb. 12, in the present year. "Is it at all surprising" asks the editor of that paper, "that pious hearts should abandon infant baptism, when its defences are so weak and untenable? They look anxiously through the New Testament, and find no allusion, however remote, to the ordinance as existing in apostolic times, but personal faith uniformly insisted on as a pre-requisite to baptism. They inquire of their pastors, why the ordinance must be observed. One tells them, that it has taken the place of circumcision; but another at once replies, 'circumcision was abolished with the Jewish commonwealth, and nothing was substituted in its place.' A third declares, that it washes away original sin; but a fourth says, 'No! all children, by the unconditional benefits of the atonement, are free from the taint of original sin.' A fifth breaks in 'children are to be baptized on the faith of their parents;' but a sixth says, 'Hold! all children, by their own purity, are members of the kingdom of God;' a seventh adds, 'children are regenerated by the waters of baptism;' but an eighth interrupts him, 'beware of this pestilent heresy! it is fatal to spirituality in the Christian church.' A ninth affirms, 'baptized children are rightful members of the church;' but a tenth replies, 'they are not really members, but sustain a sort of quasi-membership' while an eleventh declares boldly, 'they are not members at all, but need to be born again by the Divine Spirit, even as those who have not been baptized.' Here are hydra heads with a witness. Your readers will draw their own inferences.

Let this suffice for the present. More hereafter, in other connections. The baptismal question is not our only question, as some choose to suggest. But it is too important to be suffered to lie in abeyance, save as forced into notice by the recurrence of controversy. And so, reserving some things which otherwise might have found place here, I once more subscribe myself,

Yours for the truth's sake,

St. George, July, 1857.

J. D.

[For the Christian Visitor.]

The Nova Scotia Eastern Baptist Association.

Believing that a short account of the proceedings of this association held this year at Onslow, might interest most of the readers of the "Visitor," I shall attempt to give them a slight sketch.

After the choice of Moderator (Rev. E. B. Demill) and the other officers, the letters were read—whilst in many of the churches there had been small additions, there was in one only (that at Amherst) any very marked increase, but on the contrary the letters of too many exhibited the appalling fact that they were on the decrease. This was so much the case, that if the increase of the Amherst church were not taken into account the full statistics would probably shew, upon the whole, a slight decrease. Of course there were some which did not report, but it is reasonable to believe that returns from these would not vary the result to any great extent, as, if there had been much enlargement, those brethren would not only have been glad, but anxious to have reported the glad tidings. Neither my time nor your space will permit me to comment upon this deplorable state of things, but I trust I have given to some one more competent, a text which he will not fail to elucidate and improve.

On Sabbath morning Rev. A. B. Thompson of New Brunswick preached in the Onslow Meeting House, which, though large was almost crowded to suffocation. In the afternoon Rev. W. G. Parker occupied the same pulpit, R. D. McKeen and Rev. S. N. Bently preached respectively at North River and Truro at 3 P. M., and Rev. W. Burton at Truro at 7 1/2 P. M. On Monday on 10 o'clock A. M., the introductory sermon was preached by Rev. E. B. Demill from Rom. 16, after which the association proceeded to business as usual, the hearing of the reports of the several committees occupied the greater part of the remaining time. The committee on the Bible Cause made a report pre-eminently non-committal and conciliatory in its tone, earnestly pressing the importance of circulating the word of God, and recommending to all a full and hearty support of those several societies for this object, with which each could conscientiously unite, yet not presuming to dic-

tate to any. Although some attempt was made to provoke a discussion of the merits of these several societies, the report so evidently echoed the mind of the association, that no great encouragement was given to this disposition. Brethren should try to avoid any thing which would tend to destroy those feelings of kindness and forbearance which should pervade the Christian heart especially when disconnected from anything in itself wrong or injurious to the cause of God.

A committee on Home Missions reported, advising the discontinuance of the present Home Mission Board, and union with the general society, lately formed at Hantsport. This was accepted, allowing, however, the present Board to remain in existence long enough to settle up matters already on hand. This Board (the old) could not of necessity report any great amount of missionary labor during the past year, both on account of lowness of funds, and scarcity of labourers. It is hoped, however, that the new Board will be able to accomplish much more, as their plan of organization is more complete, and the sphere of their operations more enlarged. The Report on Education was well received, and brought out the best speeches delivered. There was exhibited much of the old feeling with regard to the college, which used to characterise our denominational meetings, and from the substantial tokens of regard given, we venture to predict for bro. Thompson, the agent, a successful mission. Interesting and able reports were made upon Foreign and the French mission, the observance of the Sabbath, temperance, Sabbath schools, colportage and Christian messenger, and it was evident from the expression of opinion upon these important subjects, that our denomination is second to none in the interest taken in everything which tends to the advancement of true piety and morality. The session was brought to a close on Tuesday evening, adjourning to meet at Portique next year. Thus ended a pleasant and with very slight exceptions a harmonious meeting. The roads were good, weather pleasant, friends at Onslow and Truro kind, and every thing gratifying to one who delights in the service of God and the advancement of his cause.

In conclusion it might not be amiss for the writer (a layman) to express his satisfaction at the piety, and intelligence exhibited by our ministering brethren, nor to express a hope that none may consider the time and labor spent in enabling them to exhibit gospel truth with greater power, and acceptance as time and labor lost. Go on, dear brethren, raise the standard of excellence still higher, the cause you are engaged in demands the fullest and most powerful exercise of the affections and intellect, and may He who has called you still continue to bless and prosper you.

Nova Scotia, July, 1857.

U.

[For the Christian Visitor.]

DEAR BROTHER:—According to appointment, the Quarterly Meeting, of St. John and King's, commenced on Friday, June 26, with the second Union churches, a goodly number were present, Bro. W. J. Blakeney preached to us on that occasion. The subject was, "The blessings accruing from sitting together with Christ." The meeting was of a deeply interesting nature. We met on Saturday at half-past nine for prayer; at half-past ten, bro. D. Crandall preached, subject, "The necessity of constantly seeing Jesus." At three P. M., brother J. S. Smith preached, subject, "The perfect law of liberty." This was followed by a social meeting which was a time of rejoicing and of honest confession which is good for the soul. Sabbath morning, at ten, Bro. D. Crandall preached to an overflowing assembly, subject, "Christ's kingdom not of this world." He preached the truth in the love of it. At three P. M., Bro. J. A. Smith preached a forcible sermon, subject, "Salvation of the Lord." We then had an intermission of ten minutes, after which Bro. W. J. Blakeney preached, subject, "The broad and narrow roads."

On Monday, at 9 o'clock, a ministerial meeting was held at which quite a number of the brethren and others assembled. The meeting was opened by prayer, after which Bro. D. Crandall was chosen Chairman, and the writer Secretary. It was then resolved, that the next Quarterly Meeting be held with the church at St. Martin's on the first Friday in October, commencing at two o'clock.—Several doctrinal questions came up for discussion, after which several brethren addressed the meeting interestingly upon Quarterly Meetings, their management and benefits.—We then reluctantly parted, feeling thankful to God for the marked increase of union in the Church, which was apparent through the whole course of the meetings. All His people, who were present, seemed to rejoice in feeling that they were the purchasers of his agonies on Calvary, and that they composed one brotherhood in Christ, and were bound together with the strongest ties of brotherly love, and hence they could but say to each other, hail! fellow travellers—hail! fellow pilgrims to the better land.—O the soul animating thought that we shall all at last meet on Canaan's happy shore where parting shall not be known. Yours, &c., J. W. GOUCHER, Secretary. Upham Vale, June 30, 1857.