

p. 260. Mr. C. says "Free Communion cuts at the root of investigation by denying all necessity for it. By admitting both parties as sufficiently correct, it practically says, there is nothing requiring investigation."

This is a gross misrepresentation. Pedobaptists are not admitted as correct, but as in a mistake; though not such a mistake as to affect their State before God, if in the sincere belief that they are right. As well might it be said that God himself, in accepting pious Pedobaptists, cuts at the root of investigation by denying all necessity for it:—by admitting them to be sufficiently correct, he practically says nothing requires investigation. That thousands of them are accepted into his favour, Mr. C. will not and cannot deny, yea, and into fellowship, as intimate and endearing as Baptists themselves can pretend to.

In the next paragraph (p. 261) it is plain that suspected want of sincerity cuts at the root of his Christian forbearance.

25. A gross misapprehension.

p. 262. Mr. Noel had alleged the propriety and necessity of requiring from candidates, *credible proofs* of true discipleship,—a *profession* of faith and *testimonials* of conduct; and in case of a dread of sanctioning disobedience, Mr. Noel suggested that it may require of each Pedobaptist candidate a distinct profession that he believes he is doing the will of Christ in refusing after examination, &c. Mr. C. remarks, here, in the shape of *credible proofs*, *testimonials*, *professions*, &c., a great deal more is admitted and proposed to be required of candidates for communion, than is necessary to salvation.

This is absolutely trifling. Mr. C. cannot but know that whether *credible proofs*, &c., of piety be necessary to salvation or not, they are absolutely necessary to enable us to distinguish between the pious and the impious; to this, baptism is not necessary. He himself believes thousands of Pedobaptists are Christians: this he could not do without *credible proofs*. As to requiring a distinct profession of sincerity in refusing to be baptised, though not strictly essential to salvation, it may yet in some rather doubtful cases be quite properly required, or at least requested, and if, on being requested, it should be declined, it might safely be viewed as no very equivocal evidence of the absence of genuine piety, and consequently of the unfitness of the party for membership in a Christian Church: for he could have no plausible pretence for refusing the special profession requested.

In conclusion, I may notice that Mr. C. assumes that the members of one particular church, have no right to commune in another particular Church, even though the church be of the same faith and order.

This is a very questionable position. Churches may have laws or regulations in their Constitution that would deny the right of members of one sister

church to commune in another; but according to the laws of the King of Zion, no Christian Church is warranted to refuse communion to a Christian, bearing satisfactory testimonials of good standing in a sister Church, or credentials of Christian character. If a member of another Church, says he, does partake, it is by Christian courtesy; as much as to say, *he might warrantably be denied the privilege*: but this assumption is quite unwarrantable: for whatever may be said as to the right which a Church has, as an independent association, to frame regulations for its own Government, it has not a tittle of right to make any regulations that would debar one of his people from the privileges of his house. It was necessary to form new and separate churches as Christians became too numerous to meet in one place; or when the distance between the localities of the believers was such as to render it impracticable for them to assemble together; but that their being formed into separate and independent societies should form a reason for the one to refuse to commune with the other as occasion offered is a notion which certainly has no countenance in the New Testament. For Churches to be formed into separate and distinct societies when numbers and distance of locality render their meeting in one place impracticable, while they acknowledge each other as brethren by communing together as occasion offers, is no schism; but to separate and refuse each other's fellowship on grounds unauthorized by the Head of the Church, is certainly schism, if such a thing exists. Z. F.

For the Gospel Tribune.

#### YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION.

*An account of the Origin, History, and Proceedings of the Association established in London, England: read before the Toronto Association, in November, 1854,*

BY EDWARD GREGORY.

MY DEAR FRIENDS,—It is very pleasant for me, an entire stranger in this city, to find here a Society of Christian Young men with whom I can claim fellowship, and who have the same objects in view, and strive to bring about the same good results that the Young Men's Christian Association of London is seeking.

I shall proceed at once, according to the best of my ability, to give you an account of that Society; and first I will tell you what I know of its history. My information on this head is not very perfect; still, as what I have heard of its origin is very interesting, and, as I believe, substantially correct, I will not omit it.

Some time previous to the year 1844, an earnest-minded Christian young man obtained a situation in a large wholesale and retail drapery establishment in the heart of London. The owner was a man of the world, and his assistants loved religion still less than he. This was not a place in which a Christian could be happy, and many would have considered it best for them to leave, lest, by so strong and so con-