

The Record.

SEPTEMBER, 1861.

FRENCH CANADIAN MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

As the Synod has recommended a collection for the above Society on the third Sabbath of this month, we think it right to direct attention to the object thus recommended to the liberality of the church. The object of the Society is the evangelization of the French Canadian Romanists, who have long been kept in a state of great ignorance, poverty and superstition, under the yoke of a numerous and wealthy priesthood. The Romish ecclesiastics have immense revenues, claimed from ancient landed endowments, from tithes, from Government grants, and from innumerable dues, exacted from the people. They own the valuable Island of Montreal, the greater part of the cities of Quebec and Montreal, and the town of Three Rivers; with several valuable seignories, which yield a vast revenue, wholly employed for the purpose of extending a system which spreads a social political and spiritual malaria over the land.

Their numerous corporations are empowered to hold land in mortmain to an extent almost unlimited; thus at once hindering the progress, and endangering the liberties of the country. These lands cannot become the homes of a free, happy and progressive people. Their tenants are merely the serfs of the priests, compelled to vote as they please. The Jesuits and other orders are putting forth the most zealous efforts to control education, to influence legislation, and in every way they can to retard the progress of the country. They have deprived their people both of intelligence and capital, the two chief sources of social progress and prosperity, and that wealth which might be spent in procuring the comforts of life, and in extending the domain of commerce and of true religion, is sunk in unproductive convents and nunneries. They thus inflict a double injury upon Protestants; they keep their people in such a state of ignorance and poverty that they are unable to pay their share of the public revenue, and at the same time withdraw vast sums from the productive business of the country.

Every true patriot and Christian in Canada feels that the future welfare of the country depends mainly on having the minds of the rising generation imbued with the principles of eternal truth—the grand clarifier of the human family—and if the Ro-

manists of Canada can once be brought under the quickening influence of the Gospel, our country has before it a glorious future, for its natural resources are very great, with its inexhaustible mines, its millions of fertile acres, its vast lakes, its noble rivers, and extensive railroads. To aid in securing this noble end is the aim of this Society. An appeal is earnestly made to its numerous friends in Canada, for aid to carry on its operations, the income of the Society being at present largely deficient (about \$20,000), owing to the commercial deficiency in Canada during the last three years. The war in the United States precludes all hope of help from that quarter for some time to come. The Society has been eminently successful, especially in the rural districts of Lower Canada, and has a most extensive field of usefulness opening up before it. The missionaries have many tokens of encouragement to go forward in their work. If liberally supported, the Society might indefinitely extend its operations, and in a few years undermine the power of Rome in Canada. This would be of the greatest importance even in its commercial and political bearing, the greatest hindrance to the welfare of the country being the influence of *Romanism*. Yet, owing to the access which we now have to the people, there is probably no portion of the Lord's vineyard which will more abundantly repay money and labour spent than French Canadians at the present time.

Last year hundreds of youths offered to attend the Missionary Institutes of the Society, but for the want of funds they could not be received—it fills the heart with sorrow to think of the vast numbers of Canadian youths left to perish under the blighting influences of the Uvas tree of Rome.

Will not earnest Christians who are looking and praying for the downfall of this dire spiritual despotism, come to the help of the Lord against the mighty, and, by aiding this highly important mission in its work, aid in the christianization and elevation of our beloved country?—To aid the Lord's work is the best way to draw down the blessing of God upon ourselves and our children—and upon the work of our hands; yea to obtain the fertilizing showers of revival among Protestants themselves.

MODE OF BAPTISM.

It is unquestionably the duty of journalists to keep before their readers every subject of practical importance; so, although we are not aware of anything which brings the

Baptist controversy at present particularly into notice, having read with approval an article in the *Princeton Review*, of April last, on the Mode of Baptism, which has the rare merit of being plain, pointed, and conclusive, we think it may do good to direct attention to it in the pages of the *Record*. A summary of the article it would be difficult to give, as it is itself a well digested and carefully condensed argument, still a passing notice of the line of argument may be of use to our readers.

After shewing that the mode is not essential to the validity of the ordinance, and cannot be, the essayist goes on to prove that the Scriptural mode of baptism is not by immersion, but by sprinkling or affusion.

Classical authors or heathen usages cannot decide the meaning of *Baptizo* or *Baptismus* in a religious sense. Dr. Carson admits, in deed, that all lexicographers and commentators are against the view that these words always signify to dip. But even if the heathen usage be conclusive against immersion, it does not follow that that is not the Christian mode of baptism; words may be used in a peculiar sense in religious matters, e.g., "Logos" has a meaning in the Christian religion, not found in heathen writers; and *the Supper*, consisting of a mouthful of bread and a sip of wine, is not a supper in the heathen sense. To the Bible alone then we appeal, and enquire do *Baptismus* and *Baptizo*, in Scripture, always mean immersion?

Now in answer to this we notice two points. 1. The circumstances in which Christian baptism was instituted. 2. Instances of baptism mentioned in the New Testament; leaving other matters unnoticed which are fully discussed in the *Review*. 1. When Christian Baptism was introduced, baptism was commonly in use among the Jews, and they were familiar with its observance. This is put beyond question by such passages as Mark vii. 4, Luke xi. 38, and Ecclesiasticus xxxiv. 25., where *baptizo* occurs, translated wash. Further, baptism was imposed by the law of Moses, Hebrews ix. 10, and from the time of Moses baptisms were part of the religious rites of the Jews. Thus then the Jews were familiar with baptism as a ceremonial rite of purification; and so, when John appeared baptizing, no objection was made or surprise expressed; only he was asked, if he were not the Messiah, nor a prophet, why he baptised. With the rite they were familiar, and they understood it, but they questioned his authority to baptise. The only difference between Jewish baptism and John's baptism was that the one was "for ceremonial purification," the other