

on this extract, but merely drop a few hints for the consideration of baptist brethren.

My dear friends—you profess to take the word of God for your essential rule of faith and practice. In the fear of the Lord we ask how can you exclude from your communion tables those persons who have had an application of the blood and righteousness of Jesus Christ, just simply because they have not attended to a non-essential? when christians are positively commanded to “receive one another as Christ also received us to the glory of God?”—Rom. xv. Rather let us inquire for that portion of the divine record which promises salvation to any but those immersed into the name of the Lord! Does not the Apostle plainly affirm that, “as many as were immersed into Jesus Christ were immersed into his death?” And is it possible for an individual to have an application of the blood and righteousness of Jesus Christ and enjoy the benefits of his death, until they are in him? Or do you imagine that the Lord has ordained many ways for sinners to come into him? Was it necessary for three thousand sinners to be baptized *for* the remission of their sins as recorded in Acts, chap. ii. and do you flatter yourselves and try to convince others that you have, or they may obtain the same blessing by faith alone? You know there is no such promise in the New-Testament, if you know any thing about it! Your only evidence is your feelings. Mr. Tupper—your first classical scholar in the provinces—informs you that the “mere confident persuasion that one’s sins are pardoned, is no proof that they are.” Why this apathy on a subject of so much importance? You have refused church fellowship with all who have not been immersed, and now your editors speak of it as of little or no consequence! If it is not for the remission of sins—to bring the believer to the blood of sprinkling—the act in which the penitent offers himself up a sacrifice to the Lord—the act in which those who have fallen in love with the Lord Jesus are wedded to him, do let us know why you are so anxious to have your members immersed? While in the possession of our senses we must contend, that as Saul was commanded to “arise and be baptized and wash away his sins, calling on the name of the Lord,” we must believe that there and then he had an application of the benefits of the Saviour’s death, or to use your editor’s manufactured terms, “his blood and righteousness.” Common sense tells us that water cannot wash away sins, and therefore, in the act of immersion Paul must have been washed in the blood of the Lord Jesus. The water to the body then, was a sign of the blood to the soul, and receiving the sign he no doubt had the benefits of the thing signified.

It may be possible that we have not read the New-Testament with sufficient care and attention. Will any of you be so kind as to point us to *one* conversion since the church of the Lord was set up without baptism, or *one* promise of present or future happiness to any but the obedient believer. If you will, it shall have a conspicuous place in this periodical. And do my brethren remember that the happiness of your friends who are bowing to the commands of the Lord Jesus in baptism, depends much on having scriptural views of their duty. They ought