

The Christian Visitor.

FAMILY NEWSPAPER: DEVOTED TO RELIGIOUS AND GENERAL INTELLIGENCE.

EV. I. E. BILL,

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

EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR

EO. W. DAY, Printer.

SAINT JOHN, NEW-BRUNSWICK,

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 7, 1857.

VOL. X.—NO. 2

Correspondence.

The Controversy Continued.

We assure the editor of the *Colonia Presbyteriana* that we had no design in engaging a controversy with him or any of our do-baptist friends, when we wrote our dis-sive recollections of times past, nor by the recollections which followed. Nor, after what think his ungenerous and unprovoked back upon us, did we wish to prolong the dispute beyond what we deemed necessary in defence, and to show the unreasonableness of his position, evinced by the opprobrious epithets he used in reference to us and the Baptist denomination in general. We, therefore, after replying to him in two articles, he dropped the subject, so far as we were concerned, though we had prepared following article as a second review of first production, we very willingly supposed it, for the sake of peace. But, lo! behold! in his paper of December 27th, noticing several other writers in the *Visitor*, aims several back-handed blows at his old friend, and signifies to his readers that he knocked us down, and so completely need us on the subject. But, we tell the man that he is mistaken, and has greatly deceived his hearers; for if he fancied his sword has hurt us, or as he intimates, off a head, it only proves the dimness of sight, in imagining that he had a true mace blade, when, at best, he wielded a wooden sword.

As, then, we are called back by this champion of pseudo-baptism to the field of battle, though reluctantly, take up the gauntlet has thrown down. But, in again entering field of controversy, we shall pass by present, the later articles in the *Presbyterian*, and review the old battle-ground; de-termining to have a better settlement of the sore. Mr. Bennett will therefore per-suade us to call his attention, and that of our readers to the ground on which he built his back on us, and the position he took in the place; it was as follows:

"We published in the *Christian Visitor* a question on the subject of a 'purely con-verted church,' in which we reminded our readers that the Baptist denomination had or-dered a body on this principle, professing believe that it contained more of this ele-ment than any other sect of christians. That doctrines of our platform did not fit of the reception of any persons, under any circumstances, within the pale of the church unless they were con-verted to God, and that these principles drew separating line between us and all other denominations, as to any partnership in church-building. And, in conclusion, lamented that while we had retained, in our creed, the fundamental elements of the Gospel, had been exceedingly remiss in sustain-ing and carrying them out, in managing the affairs of our churches, both in the reception of new members, and in neglecting to discipline disorderly persons amongst us; and we marked that in this 'way a church might generate in spirit, and become a piece and creed of popery, even while it is orthodox.' On this representation of our principles and present standing, we present a motive to faithfulness and activity in ad-vancing the cause we espoused. In the in-duction to our discussion of these doc-trines, we made the remark, 'We cannot avoid the enquiry, by what power, or principles, or means, have we obtained our present standing and wide-spread influence? answer generally would be, by the bless-ing of God.' We supposed that this blessing God on the pure principles propagated by others of our denomination had given us success.

Now, we appeal to every reader of that leaf, if it contained anything worthy of commendation, of any candid christian? If it did, we are so dull as not to perceive it may be found, or in what it consists. We give any just cause for the hard and un-pleasant things said by Mr. Bennett, in his attack on us and the Baptist denomination in ge-neral? Was there anything introduced in short essay on a 'converted church,' to which he might take exceptions? If there were, and the Baptists generally, profess open to conviction, and the editor of the *Presbyterian* would have done a service for us, had he enlightened us as to the nature tendency of our errors. But how does deal with us and the Baptist church in his articles on these statements which we had re-ported? Why, after some introductory re-marks on our former communications, he is the subject in this style, 'We are some-what take some objections to—Appendix in which there is something like the 'big boy who is growing bigger all others become dwarfs.' Was there thing said by us to provoke this slur? We say anything about other sects or churches decreasing? or that we had grown of them? Did we use any depreciating language towards the Presbyterian church, or others, or did we make any invidious comparisons, between our growth and stand-ing of others? Can the editor of the *Presbyterian* mark one sentence in that publication which carried on the face of such boasts as he speaks of? Was not, this opprobrious language unjust and un-true? Did it convey to the readers of the *Presbyterian*, a true or false statement of language? If the latter, was not Mr. Bennett under a solemn obligation to set his

readers right, by a retraction of the untrue and odious representations he had made against his neighbours, the Baptists. But has he done this? or has he not rather added in-sult to the injustice he had done us?

Leaving this first indictment, which was wholly gratuitous, we refer to the next sentence, which reads thus, 'Now we can, by no means, admit that standing and influence are any indication that they have been at-tained by God's blessing, by the Baptist or any other church.' And then goes on to contend at great length, that increase and standing are no evidences of the purity of the doctrine; or that God's blessing has at-tended their propagation. We have denied the first of these propositions, viz., the pros-perity of our cause a proof of the truth and purity of our principles, and complained that we were misrepresented by Mr. Bennett. And how does he deal with us and the subject here in dispute? Why, he goes over the same ground again, giving his reasons for disputing what he supposed was our argu-ment and after attempting to destroy it a second time, winds up by saying that as we had denied this, he would say nothing more on that point.

But, after finding himself foiled here, does he exhibit the christian magnanimity to own these mistakes on which his hard criticisms and distorted representations had been found-ed, and thus set himself right with his read-ers? No. This he does not do; 'but it (the Baptist Church) has grown great only in connection with superior purity is, Mr. N.'s position.' And this is made the text for ex-hibition of the powers of Mr. Bennett at sarcasm and wrong. All which we shall pass by.

Mr. Bennett makes much of our remarks on his ascribing our prosperity and that of others to craft, &c. And we do still take exceptions to the manner in which he has handled this point and to his backing it up by quoting St. Paul. We do not think with him that this is so very obvious. For instance, the passage quoted from 2 Cor. 12: 16, we do not think sanctions any such thing as intrigue or any sort of guile in promoting religion. Nor do we believe that Paul adopted any sort of guile to catch converts, true or false. We do not believe that these are the words of Paul, but the words of his detractors. He had defended himself against the false insin-uations of his defamers, and reminded the Corinthians that he had never been a burden to them, nor would he be burdensome on this third visit which he was about to make. 'True,' you say, 'I was burdensome,' I took nothing from you myself, but being crafty, I caught you with guile; i. e. getting from you by means of others what I pretended to be unwilling to receive immediately from yourselves.' This is Dr. A. Clark's opinion who says, 'Many persons suppose that the words, 'being crafty I caught you with guile,' are the words of the Apostle, and not of the slanderers, and therefore have thought it lawful to use guile, &c., in order to serve a good and religious purpose. This doctrine is abominable; and the words are much more evidently those of the Apostle's detractors, against which he defends his conduct in the two following verses.'

But Mr. Bennett does not 'believe in any pure church; and thinks there are as great a number of self-defenders, hypocrites, and humbugs in the Baptist church, as in the Methodist, Episcopal, or even the Presby-terian church. Be it so. But we are exceed-ingly more unfortunate than the church to which our respected brother belongs; we have neither porch nor noviciate into which we can put them. But, this representation of the subject, is so extraordinary that we think the editor of the *Presbyterian* has taken a bold position. If any person, Methodist, Baptist, or otherwise, in any report of their growth and standing, shall venture to ascribe their prosperity to the blessing of God on their labours, he is ready to undeceive them, and enlighten them on this subject. 'No, the papists have been more successful than you. Your success may more properly be attributed to 'tact and cunning, craft, &c., than to the truth, especially the pure truth. Your church cannot be a pure church, for you have hypocrites and humbugs, and so have all churches.' Christ set up a church when on earth, but by the same rule, it could not be a pure church, for it had one of these humbugs in it! The Apostles had churches which they set up and watched over, but what of that? What were they worth? They had hypocrites amongst them; Ananias and Saphira had got into one. Were all the churches impure, which were established under the ministry of these in-spired teachers, because there were such men as Simon Magus, Alexander, Hymeneus and Philetus, found among their members? What has this to do with the form of organi-zations, or the principles and doctrines which constitute their faith? Is it any proof that a church is corrupt in theory, because such men have imposed upon the body, and 'crept in unawares,' and have been discarded as soon as detected? On the other hand, is it any evidence that all the Presbyterian Min-istries are humbugs, because the Romish church have had such men as Ignatius Loyola, as propagandists? Must every christian body be treated as Mr. Bennett has treated the Baptists, if any one should dare to say his church has prospered by the blessing of God on her Ministry, and the pure gospel they have preached and taught in the world. Yet, there is not a sect, but every year ad-vances just such ideas as those for which Mr.

Bennett has taken upon himself to castigate us and the whole Baptist people.

But, Mr. Bennett says, after this strange criticism, 'If Mr. Nutter means that the idea of the church of God is that it consists of converted or unconverted persons, we fully agree with him, but we are not aware that this idea is peculiar to the Baptists.' If Mr. Bennett is perfectly agreed with us in this idea, pray what has he been contending about? This is rather too much! To tell us that there is no such church, and ridicule the idea, and when he has said all these hard things against those who profess to have organized such a church, and then wind up by assuring them that he fully agrees with them, is more than we can comprehend! If this does not more than justify us for complain-ing that the Editor of the *Presbyterian* has set up —, but we have promised not to use those ugly words.

On the subject of infant baptism, this writer cannot introduce his views without giving the Baptists a tap on the ear, for he represents them as excluding infants who go to heaven from the outer porch, &c., while hypocrites and worldlings find their way there, and rest secure in possession of the holy things, even in the Baptist church.

Oh! most clear and potent argument in favour of infant church-membership. Hypocrites and worldlings deceive them, and get into the church, ergo, infants who have the seed of worldliness and hypocrisy, must be brought into the church, or the porch to multiply and augment the number. Again, he argues out our inconsistency in excluding them, 'not by any command, but inferentially.' And pray by what process of reason-ing does he undertake to prove the con-trary, or to enlighten us in regard to the fact, that infants are to be admitted into the church or the porch? 'Not by any command, but inferentially.' And pray whose inference is most legitimate, his, or the Baptists'? The Baptists find in the code of laws of the king of Zion, no command on the subject, and they infer that they have nothing to do in the case; but our *Presbyterian* critic finding no command there, and it is as clear as light at noon day, to his sagacious mind, that they must be brought in; and this is his conclusive inference! His mental vision is so penetra-ting that he can see the affirmative of a propo-sition, in a mere negation, and looks at the stupidity of the Baptists with wonder, at not being able to see clear through a mill-stone!

But as to water baptism, Mr. Bennett desires not to lay too much stress on it. 'It is a shadow of substance,' he says, 'nothing more, and like the shadow of the gnomon upon the dial, it may vary, yet indicate the truth.' But, what else? O much more, and a wonderful discovery, which all dull Baptists should most seriously consider. It is this; 'We think our Baptist friends al-together too much given to formality!' There, you Baptists, take that, and never open your lips again; learn how to wake up and become more spiritual, by the clear shining of the spiritual light which Presbyterians, and especially the Editor of their paper, is shedding on your dark souls. But, we think the Presbyterians may receive a little admonition in return, and it is just this: We think they 'are too superstitious.' Indeed the Editor of the *Presbyterian*, we believe is a perfect monomaniac. Baptism is nothing more than a shadow, yet, he is following this shadow every where. It haunts his imagination by night and by day, awake and asleep! He would catch this shadow and surround every one with it. Child or adult, christian or sinner. He would sprinkle—or he would dip—he would re-baptize—he would do anything, but let it alone! The very thing we would advise him to do, until his mind is a little more settled and he can trace this gnomon round the dial and answer the question: 'Watch-man, watchman, what of the night?' But we will transfer one sentence, his 'conclu-sion' on infant and adult baptism, and sprinkling, dipping and re-baptism; it is this, 'The baptism of the Spirit is the main thing; pro-fession indeed should precede water baptism, but that vicarious profession, in a system whose very foundations are vicarious, is in-admissible where personal profession is im-possible, and yet where the individual may enjoy the advantages of the vicarious work of Christ seems too sweeping a conclusion.' We intended to end our quotation here, but really the following, which is a continuation to the end of the paragraph, is too good to leave out. 'The little one may have the substance, but the substance must cast no shadow. The purity of the church forbids it, say the Baptists. Yet are your children (Ecclesiastically?) holy, when even one parent is a believer.'

Few of the readers of the *Visitor* will understand this question on Mr. Bennett's vic-arious system; but although we are not quite sure that we do, we will try, by the use of our homely Anglo Saxon, to give them their due. Vicarious signifies delegated, or sub-stituting one thing or person for another. Now as our blessed Saviour was a substitute for us, the christian system is founded on the principle of substitution, consequently it would be only carrying out this idea to substitute the faith of the parent for that of the child, when it is impossible for the child to exercise faith. To deny the child the privilege of water baptism therefore, when it would be but carrying out this beautiful scheme of sub-stitution, is too sweeping a conclusion. If we have compassed our friend's argument, we have but hoped him to convince our Bap-

list people of the feasibility of infant baptism, at the risk of losing them by thousands, from our own to the Presbyterian ranks. But we admonish them not to be too precipitate. The fact is, after all, we are likely to have the advantage from this discussion, by the accession of the Presbyterians to our sect; for the Editor of the *Presbyterian* is more than two-thirds converted to our views already, indeed, he is, in some things, a more radical 'Anabaptist' than we are. We begin to think, that we have played to some good effect, on our 'one fiddle string,' since this sturdy Presbyterian polemic has already avowed his willingness 'to dip instead of to sprinkle, and if a man sought to be RE-BAP-TIZED he might even comply with his wishes.' We have been asked to do this several times, and have always positively refused. So we shall be obliged to console ourselves with the plain cognomen of Baptist, without the hon-orable prefix *Ana*, which our friend has fairly won, and to which he has altogether the best claim!

In conclusion, (and these remarks have reference only to Mr. Bennett's article on our Appendix B.) our brother has given our modern Baptist preachers a lesson on the character of a successful mode of preaching, as adopted by us old stagers, and which was successful in giving the Baptist church its present 'standing and wide-spread influence.' For the admonition of these younger, but delinquent Baptist divines, as well as for their instruction in their future work of proselyting, we give a large extract from criticism number one, in the *Presbyterian* of Saturday, Nov. 29th, 1856. 'There are persons,' (the old Baptist preacher we presume) 'who like Pagannini can draw all the world (and Mr. Bennett also) after them with one fiddle-string,—one idea men are sometimes very success-ful, preach it, harp upon it—it may be a form, a ceremony, under the touch of Ecclesiasti-cism, it shall give forth all the notes and vari-ations of the Theological gamut. Pagannini scraped cat-gut, the Theologist energizes the form of a symbol.' But, this is not the end, for lest you should be dull of apprehension our worthy brother explains, as follows: 'We mean that to fix the mind on one religious element, or on the shadow of a religious element, and make it all in all—expound from it all beauty, is a great feat very usually indulged in,' (by old Anabaptist preachers) 'and which does not fail to gain a large following' (which Mr. Bennett knows by experience, for it has allured him, like the syren music of the fascinating goddess, into Jordan's stream, to dip and dip again, and thus to out-dip all the Anabaptists of N. S. and N. B.)

We thank the worthy Editor for this bright idea, and are determined to look up this old fiddle with one string, for we have not played a tune on it these twenty years, and we hope all our ministers will try to whittle out one for their own use; for Mr. Bennett assures them (and he knows) 'that it will give forth all the notes and variations of the Theological gamut.'

In thus looking over again Mr. Bennett's first critical notice of us, we have been greatly edified, and we hope profited, notwithstanding a little of the musty and misty logic of the Schoolmen is intermingled with the clear, con-clusive and never-to-be-controverted axioms of Presbyterian theology. And we assure him—to use his own apology—'We mean no disrespect while we illustrate.'

D. NUTTER.

Sinless Craft.

The Editor of the *Colonia Presbyteriana* in his issue of the 27th December connects Paul's name with craft, which he pays the Apostle the compliment of calling his craft sinless.

If the editor of that paper had an esteemed absent friend, and any one were to justify the use of pious frauds from a misapprehension of the writings of that friend, would he not hasten to relieve the memory of his friend from the unworthy imputation cast upon him? And would he think that the union of the word *pious* with *fraud* was at all calculated to lessen the odium of the charge? What sense the editor attaches to the phrase 'sin-less craft,' I know not, I have used *craft* as synonymous with *guile*; for the original question was, the meaning of Paul's language when he says, 'Being crafty I caught you with guile;' when used in this sense, craft of every kind and degree is sinful; the expression *sinless craft* is therefore equivalent to a *sinless sinful act*, which is as intelligible as an honest theft, or a venacious lie.

If the editor of the *Colonia Presbyteriana* pleases to use such forms of expression, it is no business of mine to find fault, all I ask is that he will abstain from applying them to Paul or any other of the sacred writers. If room can be found for it, I should like to insert an extract from Mrs. Stowe's *Tale of the Dismal Swamp*. It is the character she draws of Dr. Shubael Packthread which I commend to the study of all who have confused notions of craft in general, and pious craft in particular.

C. SPURDEN.

Dr. Shubael Packthread was a minister of a leading church, in one of the northern ci-

ties. Constitutionally, he was an amiable and kindly man, with very fair natural abili-ties, fairly improved by culture. Long hab-its, however, of theological and ecclesiastical controversy had cultivated a certain species of acuteness of mind into such disproportioned activity, that other parts of his intellectual and moral nature had been dwarfed and dwindled beside it. What might, under other circumstances, have been agreeable and use-ful tact, became in him a constant and life-long habit of stratagem. While other people look upon words as vehicles for conveying ideas, Dr. Packthread regarded them only as mediums for concealment. His constant study on every controverted topic, was so to adjust language, that, with the appearance of the utmost precision, it should always be ca-pable of a double interpretation. He was a cunning master of all forms of indirection; of all phrases by which people appear to say what they do not say, and not to say what they do say.

He was an adept also in all the mechanism of ecclesiastical debate, of the intricate lab-yrinths of heresy hunting, of every scheme by which more simple and less advised brethren, speaking with ignorant sincerity, could be entrapped and deceived. He was *au fait* also in all compromise measures, in which two parties unite in one form of words, mean-ing by them exactly opposite ideas, and call the agreement a *union*. He was also expert in all those parliamentary modes, in synod or general assembly, by which troublesome dis-cussions could be avoided or disposed of, and credulous brethren made to believe they had gained points which they had not gained; by which discussions could be at will blinded with dusty clouds of misrepresentation, or trailed on through interminable marches of weariness, to accomplish some manoeuvre of ecclesiastical tactics.

Dr. Packthread was also master of every means by which the influence of opposing parties might be broken. He could spread a convenient report on necessary occasions, by any of those from which do not assert, but which disseminate a slander quite as certainly as if they did. If it was necessary to create a suspicion of the orthodoxy, or of the piety, or even of the morality, of an opposing brother, Dr. Packthread understood how to do it in the neatest and most tasteful manner. He was an infallible judge whether it should be ac-complished by innocent interrogation, as to whether you had heard 'so and so of Mr. —;' or, by charitably expressed hopes that you had not heard so and so; or, by gentle suggestions, whether it would not be as well to inquire; or, by shakes of the head, and lifts of the eyes, at proper intervals in conversation; or, lastly by *silence* when silence became the strongest as well as safest form of assertion.

In person, he was rather tall, thin, and the lines of his face appeared, every one them, to be engraved by caution and care. In his boyhood and youth, the man had had a trick of smiling and laughing without con-sidering why; the grace of prudence, how-ever, had corrected all this. He never did either, in these days, without understanding precisely what he was about. His face was a part of his stock in trade, and he under-stood the management of it remarkably well. He knew precisely all the gradations of smile which were useful for accomplishing different purposes. The solemn smile, the smile of inquiry, the smile affirmative, the smile suggestive, the smile of incredulity and the smile of innocent credulity, which encouraged the simple-hearted narrator to go on unfolding himself to the brother, who sat quietly behind his face, as a spider does behind his web, waiting till his unsuspecting friend had tangled himself in incautious, im-pulsive, and of course contradictory meshes of statement, which were, in some future hour, in the most gentle and christian spirit, to be tightened around the incautious captive, while as much blood was sucked as the good of the cause demanded.

It is not to be supposed that the Rev. Dr. Packthread, so skilful and adroit as we have represented him, failed in the necessary climax of such skill—that of deceiving him-self. Far from it. Truly and honestly Dr. Packthread thought himself one of the hundred and forty-four thousand, who follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth, in whose mouth is found no guile. Prudence he con-sidered the chief of christian graces. He worshipped christian prudence, and the whole category of accomplishments which we have described he considered as the fruits of it. His prudence, in fact, served him all the pur-poses that the stock of the tree did to the ancient idolater. 'With part thereof he eateth flesh; he roasteth roast, and is satisfied; yea, he warmeth himself, and saith, Aha, I am warm, I have seen the fire; and the residue thereof he maketh a god, even his graven image; he falleth down unto it, and worship-peth it, and prayeth unto it, and saith, Deliver me; for thou art my god.'

No doubt, Dr. Packthread expected to enter heaven by the same judicious arrange-ment by which he had lived on earth; and so he went on, from year to year, doing deeds which even a political candidate would blush at; violating the most ordinary prin-ciples of morality and honor; while he sung hymns, made prayers, and administered the sacraments, expecting, no doubt, at last to enter heaven by some neat arrangement of words used in two senses."

For the Christian Visitor.

Woodstock, Jan. 2d, 1857.

DEAR BRO.—Pursuant to the request of the Richmond Baptist church, a council met with them, on Tuesday the 30th ult., to con-sider the propriety of ordaining Bro. G. Springer as their pastor. The following Elders, Deacons, and Brethren assembled, viz., Elders Harris, Saunders, Tupper, Outhouse, Miles, Wallace, Seely, and Todd; Deacons Churchill and Blake, Brethren Harvey, Hovey and Everitt. These having conferred with the committee appointed by the church, and each preliminary being carefully ex-aminated, the unanimous conclusion was that he be set a part to the ministry. The arrange-ment for the service was then concluded upon, which is as follows:—

To meet at 10 o'clock a. m., next day and that Bro. Seely read the Scriptures and offer prayer, Bro. Harris preach the ordination sermon, questions by T. Todd, ordaining prayer, J. H. Tapper, Hand of fellowship, G. F. Miles, charge to candidate, T. W. Saunders, charge to the church, Isa. Wallace, closing prayer, by D. Outhouse, benediction by the candidate. Father Harris' discourse was founded on 1st Timothy 4th chap. and first part of the 6th verse "If thou put the Brethren in remembrance of these things, thou shalt be a good Minister of Jesus Christ." I would like to give you a synopsis of the sermon but I would only spoil it; suffice to say, it was orthodox, practical and original, and the long experience of our brother in the Ministry enabled him to fill his subject with valuable instruction. The other brethren performed their respective parts, most admir-ably. So that we believe the good Shepherd of the sheep sent them to the place, and helped them while there. The occasion will not be soon forgotten by this increasing church, nor by the deeply affected congrega-tion. Our prayer on leaving the beloved young pastor and his flock, was that God would bless him and make him a blessing, Yours &c.,

THOS. TODD
Clerk of the Council.

P. S. We were very sorry that Elder Rigby of Tobique, arrived too late to take part in the above proceedings, owing to a mis-take in his letter received from the church. T. T.

Newcastle, Grand Lake, Dec. 15, 1856.

DEAR BRO.—Having a few leisure mo-ments, I will forward you a few lines for the *Visitor*; briefly relating how we are getting along in this region.

You are perfectly well aware of the loss which a church sustains in not having the ministrations of a pastor to go in and out before the people of his charge. It has been so with us during the absence of our much esteemed minister, brother Wallace, while prosecuting his agency in Nova Scotia and elsewhere, although during his absence we have been favoured with the visits of min-istering brethren, but those were only passing visits.

On Saturday last we met in conference, being the first since brother Wallace returned to resume his labours of love with us, when there was a manifest coming up to duty, and the principles of the spiritual church was the theme that pervaded the minds of the brethren in consequence of the faithful remarks made by our pastor at the commence-ment of the meeting, when a solemn appeal was made by him to the members to stay up his hands in order that his labours might not be in vain in the Lord.

We remembered with pleasure and grate-itude how we enjoyed refreshing seasons at the conference meetings, and the baptismal waters, previous to our minister's being called away from his widely extended field of use-fulness. We may freely use the saying of an inspired Apostle, "we have no man like-minded."

We were made glad to have one more ad-ded to our number at the close of the confer-ence; after this a business meeting, which resulted in a pleasing manner; also an addi-tional prayer meeting was established at Upper Newcastle, being within the precincts of the church.

Yesterday forenoon, brother Wallace del-ivered an impressive sermon founded upon the words "and with his stripes we are healed." First, The disease—Sin. Second, The great physician—Jesus. Third, The complicated sufferings and the shed blood of the Son of God. Fourth, The glorious re-sults to the Christian, and lastly, a faithful warning to sinners to flee to the great physi-cian to be healed.

At the close of the service a goodly num-ber of brethren and sisters partook of the Lord's Supper, after which brother Wallace had to leave Newcastle and fulfil an appoint-ment at Little River, (Sunbury) at 3 o'clock, P. M., and in the evening at Maquapit Lake. We expect a visit from our valued brother Saunders, of Prince William shortly, which will be hailed with pleasure, by many who are seals to his ministry in this region, as well as to many others, whom he led down into the baptismal waters. Hoping the co-operation of Brother Saunders with our pas-tor will result in the good of souls.

I remain with kind regard,
JAMES BUTLER.