

THE CHRISTIAN VISITOR.

ST. JOHN, N. B., JULY 30, 1893.

Vindication of our Historic Sketches.

The strictures in the preceding columns upon our historic sketches seem to demand of us some reply. We were not, however, for the pretty free use of hard names by the *Witness* correspondent, we should allow the whole to pass without comment. Such, for example, as "unfair and exaggerated statements," "untrue," "absurd," "sneer." If we should offer no defence it might be supposed that we had none to make, and that we really had said, very naughty things; and yet we know it is quite impossible to give the facts at hand in proof of the truthfulness of our remarks, without exciting in some minds very unpleasant feelings. In giving a sketch of the rise and progress of the Baptists in this city, nothing was more natural than to recount some of the prominent obstacles that stood in their way: in fact, fidelity demanded this. We touched these obstacles as lightly, and condensed them into as small a compass as possible. A whole volume might be written on the combinations formed at different points in this country to check the progress of the Baptist element. But we wonder not at these efforts to supplant what was supposed by many to be a dangerous heresy. The parties thus opposed to us, for ought we know, were very worthy citizens; they doubtless desired the welfare of their country, and were unwilling that any doctrines or observances should gain favor that were not in their opinion thoroughly orthodox. The trouble was that the measures adopted to secure the end sadly encroached upon the rights of conscience and upon the laws of civil and religious freedom, as understood by those who believe thoroughly in the right of every man to serve his God in such modes of worship as accord best with the dictates of his own conscience. All honor to the men who, in the infancy of these Provinces, founded seminaries of learning, and built churches, to promote the educational and religious progress of the people. We hold the memory of these departed worthies in profound respect, but for the enactments that sought to restrict the education or the religion of the Provinces to a class, we feel nothing but the most perfect contempt. The idea because a man is conscientiously a Baptist, Methodist, Congregationalist, Presbyterian, or anything else, that he should be disfranchised (his religion is perfectly monstrous, and a daring insult to God and man. The Colleges of Windsor, and of Fredericton, were built and supported mainly by the public funds of the country, and therefore, as a matter of common justice, should have been free from all invidious tests; but such, we regret to have to repeat, was not the case.

"A. B." of the *News*, and "Justitia," of the *Witness*, it is true, quote a passage from the original charter of King's College, Fredericton, which, at first sight, has the semblance of making it open to all; but on examination it will be found that this very clause outrages the feelings of the very classes that it was probably designed to conciliate, by compelling all *divinity students* to accept the religious tests of the "University of Oxford," or in other words, to subscribe to the thirty-nine articles of the United Church of England and Ireland. This paragraph of the clause in question, so distasteful to all other religious bodies was, of course, quite sufficient to render nugatory all its professed liberal tendencies.

But in examining the original charter of this College, we are met with the most stringent Episcopal tests from beginning to end. For example, for what purpose was this College founded? The very first object mentioned in the charter was "the education of youth in the principles of the Christian religion." Now, who were to be the guardians of and instructors in these "Principles of the Christian religion?" Let the charter answer, "The Right Rev. Father in God, John, Bishop of the Diocese of Nova Scotia, or the Bishop for the time being of the Diocese in which the town of Fredericton may be situated." Who was appointed Chancellor? The charter replies, "The Lieutenant Governor of our Province for the time being, shall be the Chancellor of our College."

Who was to be President? The charter answers: "And we do hereby declare, ordain, and grant, that there shall be at all times one President of our said College, who shall be a Clergyman in Holy Orders of the United Church of England and Ireland." "And we do hereby grant and ordain that the Rev. George Best, Master of Arts, Archdeacon of our said Province of New Brunswick, shall be the first President of said College, and the Archdeacon of said Province for the time being, shall, by virtue of such his office, be the President of the said College."

Who were to constitute the Council and Professors? The charter furnishes the answer: "And we do hereby will and ordain that the said Council shall consist of the Chancellor and the President for the time being, and of seven of the Professors in Arts and Faculties of our said College, and that such seven Professors shall be members of the United Church of England and Ireland, and shall previously to their admission into the said College Council, severally sign and subscribe to the thirty-nine articles of Religion, as declared and set forth in the Book of Common Prayer." In this way this most extraordinary charter proceeds with its decrees and its tests, as if determined to shut it up not only for the present, but for all time to come, to the United Church of England and Ireland, and to forever prevent even the shadow of dissent from appearing upon its walls. Was it to be supposed that after such decrees as these any beside Episcopalians could feel at liberty to go there for the purpose of receiving instruction in "the principles of the Christian religion," or in any thing else? Any clause which had the appearance of opening it, so far as training in secular knowledge was concerned, was simply adding insult to injury, and was so regarded and so treated by the ministers and members of the other Christian bodies in the Province, until they succeeded, after long years of painful struggle, and the expenditure of many thousands of public funds, in so remodeling the Institution, by the removal of these exclusive tests, as to place it upon a basis of religious equality, and thus to throw open its doors to all classes of Christians.

Having thus disposed, as we think fairly, of the charge of "misstatement" regarding the College question, we proceed to notice other complaints of *Justitia*. He asks us for the law excluding persons of any Protestant communion from "offices of trust." *Justitia* will bear in mind that we were not dealing with laws, but with facts; and we appeal to every man acquainted with the history of this Province if it is not true that the offices of public trust of every description were held, by persons of the Episcopal faith, and as far as in 1835? Who were the Provincial Secretaries and Treasurers? Episcopalians? Who composed the members of the Council? Episcopalians. Who were the judges of the courts? Episcopalians. Who were the magistrates? Episcopalians. Who were the commissioners of public lands and surveys of roads and bridges? As a general rule Episcopalians. The exceptions to which *Justitia* refers were so rare, as to show clearly that they were the result of some peculiar circumstance, and not the standing order of the day.

But as *Justitia* asks for a law "excluding persons of any Protestant communion," we refer him to his own allusion to the Rev. Joseph Orsini's case. The people of Westmorland, feeling that it was important that they should be represented in the Legislature of their country by a man of ability and of liberal principles, they elected Mr. Orsini. He accordingly took his seat in the House, and all went on quietly until a matter of debate came up, which developed his liberal proclivities; and forthwith a law was concocted and pushed rapidly through the House, which compelled Mr. Orsini to leave the Ministry or the Legislature. He, of course, preferred to leave the latter, but took good care on his return to his County to see that a man of like political faith was returned in his place. *Justitia* attempts to justify this insulting act of ejectment upon the principle that it was Mr. Orsini's "duty to attend to the care of his flock, and not to mix in the busy turmoil of political strife." That however was a matter for Mr. Orsini and his flock to decide. But *Justitia* is aware that at the very period to which he refers the Right Reverend Father in God John, Bishop of the Diocese of Nova Scotia, was, by virtue of his office, a member of the Legislative Council of Nova Scotia, and that even he did not wholly abstain from the "busy turmoil of political strife." Perhaps Mr. Orsini thought that if Episcopal Bishops took part in the management of political affairs it was necessary that Baptist Bishops should have a watchful care over them, to see that the balance of power should be righteously preserved.

But Mr. Orsini was not the only man who fell a victim to this law of ejectment. Mr. Wilnot, father of our popular Judge Wilnot, was the representative of the County of Sunbury in General Assembly; and, although not an ordained preacher or pastor of any church, while in Fredericton, attending to his legislative duties, he accepted an urgent invitation from his friends, in the absence of a pastor, to preach or exhort in the Baptist pulpit. For so doing he was arraigned at the bar of the House, tried, condemned and expelled. This, Mr. *Justitia*, is the "law of exclusion" with a vengeance.

And then the old marriage law was certainly sufficiently exclusive to satisfy the most rigid of the favored class. Methodists, Congregationalists, Baptists and all the ministers of different shades of the Presbyterian faith, except ministers of the national Church of Scotland, were positively prohibited by law from marrying their own people. Nor was this law a dead letter upon the statute-book of the Province. In some unguarded moment ministers were overpersuaded to violate this unrighteous statute, they were fined, imprisoned or forced to leave the country. The case of the Baptist Minister Ennis in point. He was shut up in prison, and compelled to remain there until he and his friends managed to pay \$300, or \$20, the fine imposed for a breach of this shameful marriage law. An authorized Minister of the Irish Presbyterian Church was tried before a civil tribunal in the county of Charlotte for marrying a couple, and was fined \$50, and as he was unable to pay the amount, he fled the Province. We have this upon reliable testimony: if the truth of the statement be questioned, we will give the names of the parties concerned. After some years of discussion this law was amended, and ministers, generally, upon certain conditions, were allowed to marry, but some of us well remember the *huge* oath that had to be taken before the Secretary of the Province, and the *six dollars* cash that had to be paid in hand before we could obtain a license to marry our own people even under this improved law.

But this law of exclusion for which *Justitia* asks, from his own showing, extended to the preachers of the Gospel. Mr. Manning's case is a distinct illustration of its operations. He felt himself called by God to preach the Gospel to the people of New Brunswick, and in the fulfillment of his mission he was summoned before three magistrates of the County of Sunbury, to answer for his ministry. He was told that he must not preach without a license from the Governor of the Province. As a public vindicator of the rights of conscience, he, of course, refused submission to any such enactment, and all honor to his memory that he did so. He was threatened with imprisonment, but the public feeling was so thoroughly aroused in his favor that it was found an attempt to execute the threat would be attended with serious consequences, and he was discharged.

Mr. Ansley, another Baptist preacher, was treated in like manner in the county of Charlotte, where he was positively imprisoned for a short time for daring to preach the Gospel in the face of this oppressive law.

The apology of *Justitia* for these outrages upon religious liberty are not a little curious. Mr. Manning did not "obey magistrates." Did Paul and Peter, and James and John, and the rest of the Apostolic worthies, "obey magistrates" when that obedience required a sacrifice of principle? Did the long line of martyrs "obey magistrates" during the long centuries of cruel persecutions which assailed the Christian Church? All the different forms of persecution from the days of Nero to the present hour, have been carried forward under the sanction of law. The laws of Catholic Spain forbid the reading and circulation of the sacred Scriptures. Matamoros reads and circulates the Scriptures, or in other words, he does not "obey magistrates," for this he is thrown into the dungeons of Spain. The Protestant world is aroused from centre to circumference to plead the cause of the sufferer, but, like Mr. Manning, failing to "obey magistrates," ought he not, according to *Justitia*, suffer the penalty of violated law?

The remark of the historic sketch about "funeral rites" is pronounced by *Justitia* as "simply absurd." Is it so? Why so many refusals to dissenting ministers to bury their dead in consecrated grounds? Why an unwillingness shown on the part of some of the clergy formerly, to even walk to the place of sepulture with a dissenting minister, if there was no impression on his mind that this dissenting brother had no just authority to perform "funeral rites?"

Justitia thinks that the Baptist "ministry" and "discipline" had a fine open field in this country, and that they seem well adapted to "sparsely settled places," and to "quiet nooks and corners" where "shander views cannot go." All this is certainly very complimentary, but we beg to remind *Justitia* that in the days of Paul the Baptist ministry was quite as successful in Rome, Corinth, Athens, Ephesus and the other great cities of that age, as it was in "quiet nooks and corners." So it has been all along the centuries, and so it is at the present hour. The success of the Baptist ministry in Liverpool, Manchester, Birmingham; in mighty London, and in other great cities of the old world—in Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and in nearly all the great cities of this Continent, the British Provinces not excepted, seems to us proof positive that the Gospel preached by Baptists, if not quite sound in the estimation of *Justitia*, nevertheless is as in the beginning proved to be in large cities as well as in "quiet nooks" and "retired corners."

But we have no wish to pursue this subject further. We hope we have said sufficient to satisfy "A. B." and "Justitia," as well as our readers generally, that after all, the statements in the historic sketches are substantially correct to the letter, and we have only to request our esteemed contemporaries, the *News* and the *Church Witness*, to give this reply to "A. B." and "Justitia" a place in their columns. Having admitted an attack by anonymous writers, they, of course, will recognize the justice of this request. If further strictures are published by them we shall give them a place, with the understanding that they will fully reciprocate.

We have only to add, that while we record facts we cast no reflections upon the memory of the dead,

From the Morning News.

Sir—A pamphlet was published a few days ago by Messrs. Bannister & Co., which contains two sermons recently delivered by the Rev. I. E. Bill, and printed at the special request of the German and Brussels Street Baptist Churches, before whose members they were preached. The discourses are written upon the subject of the rise and progress of the Baptist denomination in this City, and are very good of their kind. Some excellent Christian men have been, and are, members of that Church here; and the virtues of both dead and living worthies are commemorated in a brief form, and in language for the most part simple and modest. But there occurs at page 10 of the pamphlet a misstatement which has been so often publicly exposed, that it should not at this day be reiterated. Speaking of the adoption of the doctrines and views of their sect, by several of the students at King's College, Windsor, some forty years ago, the reverend author states that a large proportion of those who were converted at that time in King's College subsequently became Baptists, and several of them Baptist ministers. . . . This fact seems all the more remarkable when we remember that King's College, Windsor, like King's College, Fredericton, was so guarded by Episcopalians in its original constitution as to debar Baptists from enjoying its advantages.

It must, in charity, be presumed that the Rev. Mr. Bill, like some of our reforming legislators who used to denounce King's College, and who used, with more zeal than discretion, with more unintelligent vehemence than careful regard for truth, to demand alterations in its Charter, has never read that Royal Charter, and is quite innocent of all knowledge that it contains such a provision as the following:

"And we do hereby will and ordain, that no religious test or qualification shall be required of, or appointed for any persons admitted or matriculated as scholars within the College, or of any persons admitted to any degree in any art or faculty therein; save only that all persons admitted within our said College to a degree in Divinity, shall make such and the same declarations, and take such and the same oaths as are required of persons admitted to any degree of Divinity in the University of Oxford."

But Mr. Bill ought to have known what that Charter really was before he ventured to say that any one was precluded from enjoying under it the benefits of an academical education. And he ought to have known that no test was required of any one who ever entered King's College as a student.

The revival of this gross misrepresentation can no longer serve even an entirely political purpose, and can only tend to foster illiberal sectarian prejudices.

From the Church Witness.

Sir—A Baptist minister—the Rev. Mr. Bill—has recently published a pamphlet, containing two sermons on the rise and progress of the British denomination in St. John, preached in the German and Brussels Street Baptist Churches, and published at their request. So long as Mr. Bill confines himself to his immediate subject, his sketch is, I dare say, correct enough; but when he goes beyond it, and speaks of the early inhabitants of this city, and more particularly of those belonging to the Church of England, he makes such unfair and exaggerated statements as prove he has paid but little attention to verification, and require, I think, an immediate answer.

The following paragraphs I clip from the pamphlet entire:—"The original inhabitants of St. John belonged mostly to the Episcopal National Church. Dissent was scarcely known; and when it first made its appearance, it was frowned upon by ministers and people as a heresy of the most dangerous character. Episcopacy was the dominant and established religion in the early settlement of this country, and it engrafted itself upon all the departments of social and civil society as to give it a sort of national pre-eminence—to make it, in fact, the religion as by law established. No persons were considered eligible to offices of military, legal, political, educational or religious distinction, unless members of the dominant Church. All social and funeral rites must be administered by members of the dominant Church. . . . The Rev. Mr. Bill, in the *Apollitic succession*, has said that this idea prevails that a Baptist minister, by the name of Innis, was incarcerated in prison for some twelve months or more for yielding to the earnest solicitations of a loving young couple, who had been converted to God through his ministry, to make them one in holy wedlock."

"All offices of trust, of every sort, from the Chief Justice upon the Bench down to the most insignificant clerk in a country village, must be filled by those who recognized and abetted this Episcopal supremacy. As far down as the founding of King's College, Fredericton, in 1829, it was deemed necessary to apply such tests as should thoroughly protect it from the poisonous influence of dissent, and secure its educational immunities for all time to come, in *fee simple*, to the Episcopal Church. We refer to this state of things, not for the purpose of calling up any unpleasant feelings, but to give intentionally and openly to show the obstacles which our fathers had to surmount in proclaiming and extending what they conceived to be the Gospel of the blessed Lord Jesus."

Now much of this is untrue, and some of it very absurd. Surely the Church of England inhabitants of St. John would have been more than liberal had they raised to their posts of "religious distinction" men who rejected their Church's teachings. And I never it never occurred to Mr. Bill that the numerical superiority of the members of the Church of England, which he acknowledges, furnishes the very reason why most (not all) the public offices were, as he so bitterly complains, vested in Churchmen. There were, indeed, very few others fitted to hold them. And, in point of fact, even before New Brunswick was a separate Province, several of the early settlers on the St. John, who had brought their independent principles with them from the old world, were, nevertheless, in the Commission of the Peace. I should indeed be much obliged to Mr. Bill if he will produce the law which ever excluded persons of any Protestant communion in this Province from "offices of trust"—from "military" (I suppose he means the militia), legal or other posts of distinction. If there was one, it must be still in force, as certainly no such act was ever repealed by our Legislature. True it is that Benjamin Smith, Joseph Crandall, was ejected from the House of Assembly (Mr. Bill, by the way, does not mention this), not, however, because a dissenter, but as a minister, and because the House very properly deemed it his duty to attend to the care of his flock, and not to mix in the busy turmoil of political life.

The reverend author's description of the difficulties under which the early Baptist preachers labored is very feeble. He gives intentionally and openly to air of persecution, the blame resting apparently on the "ministers and people" of the Church of England. He could scarcely blame them for opposing by fair words and arguments views they believed erroneous. Such expressions as "frowned upon," "heresy," "dominant faith," "insinuate an opposition of a very different description."

Now that the "ministers and people," as a body, opposed any dissenting views, means other than fair and honorable, I emphatically deny. True, here and there a solitary instance of hasty treatment may perhaps be found. Men of illiberal views, as I regret to say, even at the present day, confined to no one denomination. But "ministers and people" must not be condemned for the acts of one or two of the latter, and Mr. Bill should scarcely accuse the "people" of unfriendly treatment towards dissenting preachers, more than one instance of Baptist preachers being kindly received into their homes—an hospitality immediately taken advantage of by those preachers to promote their own denominational views.

Indeed so far from an improper spirit of opposition being offered, the case was really the reverse. Mr. Bill has referred to the little chapel which, first used by the members of the Church of England, afterwards passed to the Methodists, and then to the Baptists. That building was purchased in 1784, and fitted as a Church by the members of the Church of England at their own expense. It remained under their control until 1791 or 1792, when Trinity Church supplied its place. Yet the following extract from the *N. B. Gazette* of 1st August, 1786, shows that our ancestors were not quite so illiberal as Mr. Bill would fain have us believe.

"Last Sunday morning preached in the Church of this city, the Rev. Mr. Biset (the Rector), lately arrived from England, and in the evening Messrs. Moor and Gibbons, of the people commonly called Quakers. The whole gave great satisfaction to crowded audiences."

So too, before Mr. Bill made such a sweeping charge against King's College, Fredericton, he should have mentioned the Royal Charter, which that College was reconstructed in 1829. Had he done so, he would have found that, so far from its "educational immunities" being confined to any one communion, they were (and this although the College was chartered and in part endowed by the Head of the English National Church) particularly made free to all. The Charter provided that no religious test

or qualification should be required of students or graduates, save that degrees in divinity should be granted only on the same terms as to declaration, subscriptions, and oaths, as were required in the University of Oxford.

And even with regard to the unfortunate Marriage Act of 1791, Mr. Bill must needs exaggerate. He says (with an ill-judged attempt at sneer) that "all marriages must be administered (?) by clergymen of the true *Apollitic succession*." This is not true. Even by that Act the Church of Scotland and Quakers could marry among themselves, and magistrates were to act where a clergyman was not resident. And the Legislature of New Brunswick, not the "ministers and people" of St. John were responsible for the difficulties which afterwards occurred.

To say that the performance of funeral rites in this Province was ever limited to the clergy of any one communion, is simply absurd.

I have hitherto confined my remarks to the paragraphs cited above. I regret to say there are others quite as objectionable.

Thus we are told (p. 8) that "When Mr. Stenning came to this country from England, he was a member of the Episcopal Church; but here he experienced a change of heart and became Baptist." The change remains a mystery, and is a Baptist synonym with Mr. Bill? So again: "When Edward Manning first visited New Brunswick, in the early part of the present century, he was called before a magistrate to give an account of himself for daring to preach Jesus and the Resurrection." Inference—that "ministers and people" had made it illegal to do so; or perhaps that none had done so in St. John before. Indeed the whole remarks on Mr. Manning's case are very curious. The simple truth is, that at the first session of our Assembly an Act was passed for establishing the Church of England and securing liberty of conscience in matters of religion. By this Act free liberty of conscience was given to all dissenters from the Church of England, and all ministers chosen by such congregations were permitted to preach—by being, however, provided that no persons not so chosen should preach without license from the Governor. The object of the proviso was probably to check the spread of wild and infidel theories. I have no intention of defending it; but, right or wrong, it was the law of the Province when Mr. Manning entered it. He had no congregation, and his course was simple—to have applied for a license. But having, as we are told, "his credentials from above"—licensed by the court of heaven—invested with such authority, and forgetting St. Paul's injunction to "obey magistrates," he would not do this. Mr. Bill says "he preferred to obey God rather than man." My impression is that he obeyed neither. And, as a very natural result, he was summoned before a magistrate—in ordinary language, for not having a license—in Mr. Bill's, for "daring to preach Jesus and the Resurrection."

The fact, however, that the magistrate, on seeing Mr. Manning's real character, refused him for trial, as he might have done, dismissed him in freedom, shows very forcibly how far the "people" "frowned upon" dissent. Let it not be imagined that the above remarks are actuated by any illiberal feeling in regard to the progress of Baptist views in some sections of this Province. Believing that many excellent Christian men have been and are to be found in that body, we may think, well rejoice that his ministrations have spread to such a retired nook and corner, where what we believe to be sounder and truer views could not. Suited as the Baptist discipline is to a sparsely populated country, such as has been and still is ours, the Baptist teachers, so far from having really serious obstacles to surmount, have had an admirable field. Strange indeed would it have been if their teachings had not spread. But the historian of that increase should cling to truth, particularly in alluding to other communions, above all in speaking of the dead. The early clergy of the Church of England have, with their people, long passed to their reward. They cannot defend themselves. They are too often looked upon as fair prey by those who know little of their characters, and have taken little pains to test the truth of their attacks. It is time this was checked. Many now living remember how faithfully and zealously some of those clergy preached Christ crucified—how earnestly they labored to win kind hearts. And it is, very sad, to see their memories wrongfully reflected on when they themselves have passed away.

JUSTITIA.

(From the Colonial Presbyterian.)

Sir—Will you allow me to enquire through you at what time and place the Rev. Samuel Robinson received any authority from the Synod of the Presbyterian Church, or any legally authorized body of said church, enabling him to claim in early life the position of a Presbyterian minister, and that he is justified in proclaiming the same to those of his present flock, or allow others to do so on his behalf. This matter suggests itself to me by the perusal of two sermons recently delivered in this city by the Rev. I. E. Bill, and now issued in pamphlet form to the world. I find therein these statements (p. 13), "Rev. Samuel Robinson . . . experienced a change in early life, and when quite a youth commenced preaching in his own country (Ireland) as a Presbyterian." (p. 14). "Accordingly the baptism of the Presbyterian preacher, converted to the Baptist faith, was appointed to take place at St. David's, a most central position." While I am in sentiment a Baptist, I cannot appreciate such statements, however cheering the news of such change of opinions, while in the public mind there rests a doubt respecting their veracity. The Mr. Robinson was never a Presbyterian, and enjoyed such parental teaching, but few will question, but that he was ever entitled to the name and position of a preacher, in connection with the Presbyterian body in this Province or elsewhere, very many doubt; neither is his miraculous conversion from the errors of the Presbyterian faith so much a matter of history as the Rev. Gentleman's sermons seem to imply.

Your respectfully,

ST. JOHN, N. B., 17th July, 1893.

In reference to the enquiry of our correspondent, we have been informed that it was in the Presbyterian fold that Mr. Robinson, early dedicated to God in baptism, was brought to the knowledge of Christ, and that his early training in the shorter catechism did much to fit him for his subsequent usefulness. But we understand that Mr. Robinson never was educated or set apart as a Presbyterian preacher, and that upon the subject of his early life, his correspondent is well fitted, though doubtless not intended, to leave a wrong impression upon the mind of the reader. The whole history of Mr. Robinson's connection with the Baptist Church, of which he is a most useful and influential minister, is pitched on a very high key in this sermon, particularly that part in which he relates that after Mr. Ansley left Mr. Robinson's house, he felt "constrained by the Spirit of God to return and deliver a solemn charge to him to embrace the Baptist sentiments, and to charge on that vast district of country as a Baptist preacher." The sequel is thus given in Mr. Bill's sermon:—"Having delivered his message, he again took his leave and left for home. All this appeared strange to Mr. Robinson, but it took such hold on his conscience that he was led prudently to examine the New Testament as he had never done before, in reference to his ministerial duties, and he found that the apostle Paul had said, 'I should glory even in the cross of the Lord Jesus Christ.' Accordingly the baptism of the Presbyterian preacher, converted to the Baptist faith, was appointed to take place at St. David's, a most central position. The baptismal day arrived, and crowds flocked from all sections of the country, and the venerable administrator came to the discharge of his duty invested with the majesty of the Spirit's power. He was in the reformation tide, and his words were born to the hearts of the people with irresistible impressiveness. The administrator, the candidate, saints, sinners, friends, foes, all felt 'Surely God is in this place.'"

If we mistake not, Mr. Robinson had some slight connexion with the Methodist body before he joined the Baptists.

An Anonimous paper, says that if anything could arouse the members of the Federal Administration from the dream in which power and the passion of party have left, it should be the spectacle of a candidate for the highest office in the gift of the people of their State of the Union addressing his constituents as an exile from beneath the shelter of the British flag.

upon the piety of the living. We are quite willing to believe that the actors in political and religious life of the past generation were quite as wise and virtuous as "Justitia" supposes they were. As we are all more or less influenced by circumstances, we can quite understand how all these acts could have been performed under the influence of conscientious motives; but while we cheerfully go as far as *Justitia* does in the way of extenuation, the facts themselves remain unaltered.

The English Baptists.—Statistics Corrected.

DEAR BROTHER.—Your last contained a report of correspondence between the Strict Baptists of London and the Baptist ministers of New York. In the communication sent by the latter the following extract from Dr. Arnold's "Scriptural Terms of Admission to the Lord's Supper" is given:—"When Robert Hall died, thirty years ago (1831), there were more than 100,000 Baptists in England and less than 400,000 in the United States. The population of England has increased since then from 13,000,000 to 20,000,000, but the number of Baptists remains about the same. The population of the United States, which was then about the same as that of England, has fully doubled, but the number of Baptists has much more than kept pace with this rapid increase, having risen from less than 400,000 to more than 1,000,000. Thus it appears that in England, where mixed communities have generally prevailed, our numbers have diminished, compared with the population, at the ratio of thirty-three per cent; while in the country, where strict communion is the rule, our numbers have increased, relatively to the population, in the ratio of about fifty per cent."

I was a little startled by these statements, and determined to test them. By the help of the Baptist Magazine for April and May, 1881, and the Baptist Hand-book for the present year, I arrived at the following results, which perhaps may be interesting to some of your readers.

1. I saw that Dr. Arnold refers to England only, not including Wales. The population of England in 1831 was 13,091,003. There were at that time 1026 Baptist churches in England. The number of members is not stated; but in 1824, in which year the reports of the Baptist Union were first published, the average was 92 per church. In 1835, however, the average was 99. Adopting that average, the number of members of Baptist churches of England, in 1831, was 102,600.

2. The population of England in 1881 was 18,849,980; that is now 30,000,000. If the Baptists had increased in proportion to the population, their number would now be upwards of 155,000. But what are the facts? There are now 1637 Baptist churches in England. The average of those reporting last year was 123 per church. This gives us 202,966 members of Baptist churches in England; which, instead of being about the same, is a diminution, "compared with the population, in the ratio of thirty-three per cent," is nearly double the number in 1831.

3. If Wales be added, the result is more striking. In 1831 there were 241 Baptist churches in Wales; and these to 1026 Baptist churches, and we have 1267; and taking the same average as before (99) the membership in England and Wales in 1831 was 125,483. The present number of Baptist churches in Wales is 424, giving us a total, for England and Wales, of 2051 churches. The membership, taking last year's average (123), is 252,277, which is more than double the membership of 1831. The population of Wales, it may be added, was 805,122 in 1831; in 1861 it was 1,111,795.

4. Hence we see the incorrectness of Dr. Arnold's calculations. Instead of our numbers having "diminished compared with the population, in the ratio of thirty-three per cent," they have nearly doubled in England, and more than doubled in England and Wales!

Dr. Arnold seems to think that the supposed diminution is the consequence of "mixed communion"; but the figures show that, notwithstanding "mixed communion," our denomination has increased in a remarkable manner.

5. This enquiry is instructive. One inference is, that statistics are very useful, if they are correct. Yours truly, J. M. CHAMBERLAIN.

Acadia College, July 21, 1888.

Donation Visit.

While at Butterworth Ridge, during our late visit, we had the pleasure of attending a festival got up by the church as a mark of respect to their retiring pastor, Rev. Henry Charlton. His friends visited his place of residence in large numbers on Wednesday afternoon, bringing with them ample supplies to furnish a most delicious repast. The tables extended through the whole house, and were all surrounded by those prepared to enjoy the good things provided. After tea the people were called to order by Mr. Amos Keith. An excellent address was read by Bro. Charlton, expressive of attachment to him and his family and of appreciation of his valuable pastoral labours. To this the retiring pastor made an appropriate reply. After which addresses were made by Rev. Messrs. Wallace, Marshall, W. A. Corey, Burnham, Dr. Jones, Smith, and I. E. Bill. A purse of money was presented to Bro. Charlton, and other useful articles, as a token of good will and respect on the part of the church, and altogether it was a most pleasant and profitable occasion, and one that will not soon be forgotten by those in attendance. Brother James Herriot was there a short time, but had to leave at an early hour. Rev. Messrs. Bancroft and W. T. Corey were present also, but excused themselves from making speeches.

We were detained until nearly dark, after which a kind friend drove us over to the hospitable residence of Deacon I. Stevens, where we were kindly entertained for the night.

Personal.

As we passed through Salisbury the other day we enquired for the pastor, Rev. Geo. Seely. He was absent from home and therefore could not see him, but we were happy to learn that the state of his health is more hopeful than it was. May he soon be restored to his blessed work of preaching Christ.

We met the Rev. E. F. Foshat at his father's residence in Salisbury. He is looking thin, but is rapidly improving, and hopes, in a few months, to be able to resume his ministerial duties.

Rev. A. B. McDonald was in town the other day, and feels encouraged in the belief that his former health is returning. He delivered a short discourse to his people the preceding Sabbath. God grant that the best hopes of these valued brethren may be speedily realized.

Rev. E. R. DeMille, we regret to state, continues in a very feeble condition, and is growing weaker daily. His brother, Professor James DeMille, is with him to comfort him with acts of brotherly sympathy in this hour of his extreme weakness. We trust he enjoys the presence of a "friend that stoiceth closer even than a brother," a friend who "knows what sore temptations mean, for he has felt the same."

The new Vestry of the Portland Church is to be opened next Sabbath afternoon, with appropriate services, at 8 o'clock, p. m. The city pastors are expected to be in attendance. We congratulate our Bro. Cady and his church on the completion of these rooms so admirably adapted to accommodate their Sabbath School and social meetings. We regret that absence from home next Sabbath will prevent our attendance at the opening, but we doubt not the season will be one of much interest.

In reply to the remarks of the Colonial Presbyterian of last week, respecting the Rev. S. Robinson, we have only to say, that we learn from Mr. Robinson that he was never licensed or ordained by a Presbytery, or by any Church, until he was licensed and ordained, thirty-two years ago, by the Baptist Church. He had been brought up a Presbyterian, and continued in connection with that Church up to the time he united with the Baptists; and for some years before he left the former church and connected himself with the latter, wherever in the providence of God his lot was cast, although young, and

without any support from the people, or authority from man, he felt it his duty to speak to his fellow sinners about the finished work of Christ, and to warn sinners to flee from the wrath to come. If he was not a Presbyterian preacher, he was a preaching Presbyterian, and preached their doctrine.

Home Missions.

At a meeting of the N. B. B. H. Missionary Society, held at Sackville on the 10th inst., the Board were ordered to supply the Buctouche field as soon as the fund will warrant. \$15.33, from H. M. fund, were appropriated to Elder C. Sprague, for missionary labour at Buctouche. Two appropriations, of \$10 each, from Infirmary Ministers' fund, to two ministering brethren who had been ill for some time, viz., brethren L. H. Marshall, and W. Poleifer.

On motion of Elder John Rowe, it was recommended, that the Churches in the Eastern Association allow their ministers to spend a few weeks during the year in collecting funds for the Union Society. The following brethren were recommended, some of whom volunteered to canvass the following localities, viz.: Elders Todd, Coleman, and Newcomb, Westmorland County; Elders Smith, Hughes, and Irvin, Albert County; Elders W. A. Corey and E. C. Cady, King's County; Elders W. T. Corey, D. Crandall, and Burnham, Queen's County; Elders J. Rowe, Cady, Bill, Robinson and Vaughan, St. John County.

The Annual Reports were read, and the Officers, as follows, elected:—President, Rev. S. Robinson; Vice Presidents, Elders C. Sporden, D. I. E. Bill, J. Rowe, J. A. Smith, W. A. Coleman, J. H. Hughes, A. D. Thomson, T. W. Saunders, and E. B. DeMille, A. M.; Corresponding Secretary, Elder E. C. Cady; Recording Secretary, James E. Marsters; Treasurer, C. D. Everett, Esq.; Auditor, Hon. A. McL. Seely; Executive Board, F. A. Congrove, J. S. May, E. J. Bantam, Jonathan Titus, Alex. Sime, Geo. D. Godsoe, A. W. Marsters, John Smith, J. O. Beattie, Z. G. Gabel, Reuben Lunt, John Harding, John Fisher, John J. Wright.

Resolved, That a synopsis of the business transacted by the Board at the meeting, be published in the Visitor.