

for ministers to advertize that "they are always glad to baptize believers *of any denomination?*" Let it be supposed that the only point of difference was in regard to the *mode*; and that we held the opinion that sprinkling and pouring were the *only* legitimate modes of applying the water; and that, on this ground, we were to announce our readiness to re-baptize the members of the Baptist churches; would they not be loud in their complaints against such conduct? Would they not protest against it, as an attempt to unsettle the minds of their church-members; and say that it looked very much like a design to entrap them? And they would be warranted in so saying. We know that the parties concerned will say that their object in offering to baptize the members of other churches is not to induce them to forsake their own folds and enter theirs; but merely to accommodate those conscientious persons who are dissatisfied with their baptism, and desire to be dipped. This is kind and considerate, no doubt. But let us look at facts. How many of the members of other churches, who are dipped by other ministers, retain their connexion with these churches? Do they not, almost to a man, join the church of the minister who dips them? And do not the men who issue these advertisements very well know this?

Then let the conscientious members of other churches be on their guard. "Surely in vain is the net spread in the sight of any bird." If they are *in doubt*, let them *inquire*: but let them not dare to *act* until they are satisfied *beyond a doubt*, lest they should offend the Lord Jesus by repeating an ordinance, which it is clear, from its very nature, as well as from His own words, we are only authorized to receive *once*.