

correspondent must have lived in the very balmy atmosphere of brotherly love all his days, if he has not frequently heard similar expressions from the pulpit.' But as he does not "pledge himself to defend all the practices of the Baptist denomination," and seems cordially to condemn this one, we shall let it pass.

With regard to the refusal of Baptists to acknowledge the validity of immersion when not performed by a Baptist minister, our correspondent admits that if that can be proven, the statements we have made are not altogether groundless.

Hear, then, what is said upon this point by the Rev. Dr. Davidson, Secretary of the Ontario Baptist Missionary Convention, in his lectures on "Baptism and Communion," pp. 238, 239:—

"Baptists, in refusing to recognize the immersions of unimmersed *Pædobaptist* ministers as valid baptism, do not lay claim to 'Apostolical succession as to baptism.' They claim to 'keep the ordinance as it was delivered to them,' and believe that 'whatsoever is not of faith is sin.' If a *Pædobaptist* minister immerse a candidate, while he himself is unimmersed, and does not believe immersion to be valid baptism, merely for the sake of satisfying the conscience of the party who is immersed, and to prevent him from uniting with the Baptists--and the like is done constantly--then we regard the act of that minister as a sin against his own soul, for he has, while immersing the candidate, said, 'I baptize thee,' &c., while at the same time, in his soul, he did not *believe* it was baptism. Is not such an act somewhat analogous to 'speaking lies in the name of the Lord?' I sincerely pity the individual who can be so far duped as to commit himself into the hands of such an administrator. The act is certainly *an immersion*, but for one, I should be very loth to acknowledge it as regular or valid Christian baptism."

We presume Dr. Davidson will be accepted as an "authority," and that his testimony to the practice of the denomination will be regarded as conclusive upon the point in question. Besides, our Baptist friends, to be consistent with themselves, are compelled either to go the length we have described, or to abandon the principle of close communion altogether: for if a *Pædobaptist* minister may not even *receive* the sacred emblems of the Lord's body and blood at the same table with them, how can he be recognized as capable of validly *administering* either baptism or the Lord's supper? G. M. and we are entire strangers to each other, but we will venture to say that his demand for proof upon this point is evidence that he has had a much more intimate acquaintance with English Baptist Churches, whose practice is almost exclusively that of open communion, than with those in this country.

The reply given by our correspondent to the third of the questions which we proposed to him for discussion, and which he prefers to take up first, is, we submit, "quite beside the mark." He has produced no "positive injunction" for the practice of close communion, and for the best of all reasons, viz., that the New Testament does not contain one. He *infers* it by putting two passages together, a mode of argument which Baptists won't listen to when we employ it in defence of infant baptism; but certainly neither the one nor the other enjoins it. We claim that the Apostolic practice of household baptism, taken in connection with the "not disannulled" covenant with Abraham, which associated