

should have become the victim of such arrogant intolerance? But if it be the duty of any baptised christians to refuse to commune with unbaptized christians, it would be the duty of Mr. Noel also, and in fact there are not wanting instances of christian men, circumstanced precisely as Mr. Noel, adopting the most stringent features of close communion, and doubtless heartily believing it to be their duty. Yet it matters not; surely any candid close communionist may be appealed to if such as has been represented be not the plain language of the close communion of persons so circumstanced, and if so, how can it be viewed otherwise than incongruous? Or how can it consist with that charity which "vaunteth not itself, and doth no behave itself unseemly?"

THE LONDON PATRIOT AND ENGLISH BAPTISTS.

In the *Patriot* of May 1st, the following occurs: "There was a time when, to a considerable extent, the Baptists were separated from their fellow-christians, by the exclusiveness of their practice as much as by the peculiarity of their creed. The creed remains unchanged, but the practice is *fast losing* its insulating force, and it is becoming a *rare thing* to meet with an intelligent Baptist who does not rejoice in holding christian communion with all who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, though in one point they may differ with him."

Thus it appears, that the triumph of christian communion principles is all but complete among the Baptists of England. But, would this have been the case, had Bunyan succumbed to the almost overwhelming flood of influences which his exclusive brethren brought to bear against him? Which caused him to exclaim, in obvious anguish of spirit,—"*Faith and Holiness are my professed principles, with an endeavour so far as in me lieth to be at peace with all men. But if nothing will do, unless I make my conscience a continual butchery and slaughter-shop,—unless putting out my own eyes, I commit me to the blind to lead me, I have determined, the Almighty being my help and shield, yet to suffer, if frail life might continue so long, even till the moss shall grow on my eye-brows, rather than to violate my faith and principles; touching my practice as to communion with visible saints, although not baptized with water, I say it is my present judgment so to do.*" Had Bunyan, the man of these resolves succumbed! Had Hall proved recreant to his principles! Had they both, together with the astute Jessie, refused to arraign the exclusiveness of their brethren, and to plead against it with all the deep earnestness of conviction, would the "*London Patriot*" now be able to say, "*it is becoming a rare thing to meet with an intelligent Baptist who does not rejoice in holding christian communion with all who love Our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity*"? To this inquiry one answer only can be given, and this is what overwhelms the Baptist christian communionists of Canada with a deep sense of the wrong chargeable upon their movements hitherto; that of keeping their light upon this subject under a bushel, in the vain hope of thus winning over their exclusive brethren to work with them cordial y in a

Provincial Union, similar to that which binds together the Baptists of England. Such was not the course of Jessie, Bunyan and Hall, and hence the difference in the result. In England, free communion is a prominent feature in Baptist Churches; in Canada, it is now rarely witnessed, though it is only 15 years since a close Baptist editor in Montreal, could not take it upon himself to say that the Rev. Daniel McPhail was wrong in closing a long letter to the "*New York Baptist Register*" in these words—"THE CANADA BAPTISTS ARE MOSTLY OPEN COMMUNIONISTS." Then the influence of free communionists was great. Their close brethren were uneasy and restive under it. To conciliate them the discussion of the subject was shut out of the magazine, and from that time the pens of open communionist may be said to have been still, and their lips almost sealed on the question, while their exclusive brethren have been instant in season and out of season in occupying every inch of ground as fast as it was conceded, till having pressed their open brethren to the very verge of the Canada Baptist platform—till having crowded them all on to the *outermost plank—that*, with one stroke, was suddenly knocked from under their feet, and wherever they fell to, does not appear to have at all concerned the actors; one thing only they seem to be sure of, that the parties so adroitly disposed of were no longer in Canada, let them have fallen wherever they might; for, on the first subsequent appearance of the *Christian Observer*, he that ran, might have read in its pages the announcement, "*CANADA BAPTISTS ONE!*" Thus, in the name of the Province, ignoring the existence of the men whom they had so recently precipitated from their platform.

The above gentle allusions to the past are made for the purpose of contrasting the apparent progress of the *inter-communion* question in England and in Canada, so far as the Baptist body is concerned; that in the light of the facts, every free christian communionist among them in this province, may be aroused from his lethargy, and induced to assert and defend his principles calmly and kindly, yet openly and frankly; putting the same in practice on all suitable occasions, as did their English brethren, that it may soon become as rare in this province, as it is now in the Mother Country, "to meet with an intelligent Baptist who does not rejoice in holding christian communion with all who love Our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity."

And, that the English Baptists have been remarkable progressive as a body even while passing through their transition, partially, from the exclusive to the Christian basis of communion at the Lord's table and in the church—the testimony is so abundant, as to render all the statements of exclusionists, to the contrary, now circulating through the whole of this continent, perfectly ridiculous. In proof of which, it is not necessary to go further than the last number of the "*Toronto Christian Observer*," in which are found the following very interesting statements, from the pen of the Rev. Dr. Pyper, whose zealous opposition to the communion principles of his English brethren is well known.