

It is one striking peculiarity in all defences of close-communion, that Pedobaptists are held to be precisely in the same predicament as persons refusing to be baptized in apostolic times; hence the free use of such designations as *subverters, rejectors, despisers, &c.*, of the teaching and example of the Son of God. (See Report of Bloomsburg debate, Ch. Mess.) If indeed the assumption referred to were well grounded; if Pedobaptists were as inexcusable as persons refusing to be immersed in apostolic times, the epithets might be very applicable, and consequently the argument for close-communion would be irrefragible; but let good Mr. Kinghorn be heard on this important point, whose testimony must be allowed to be free of bias in favour of open communion. It may be remarked that probably the good man did not see that his admissions were so much in favour of open communion, for in his general reasoning he tries hard to make it out that to be unimmersed now is precisely the same as it was to be so in apostolic times.

Mr. Hall had remarked, that "to be unbaptised now, is, in a moral view, a very distinct thing, and involves very different consequences from being in that predicament in the times of the Apostles." In reference to this Mr. K. says, "Mr. Hall presents this to our notice, and offers it as an alternative, that we may either deny or affirm it, and, doubtless, thinks it a dilemma from which we cannot escape." Mr. Kinghorn does make his escape, and it deserves special notice how he does so. He proceeds as follows:—

"He who admits the permanency of baptism, who believes that he has been a subject of that rite in a valid form from his infancy, is *not in the situation of those who refused to obey the dictates of inspired men.* We differ from him, we acknowledge; but the nature of the difference is very distinct from what it would be if he denied the authority of the Apostles. For this reason, we (Close Communionists) treat him, not as a person who designedly opposes the dictates of the Apostles, but as a mistaken good man." Good! We (Open Communionists) want nothing better as far as relates to this point. But if Mr. H., or any one, should have asked the good man, why then do you not admit him to the supper? he would have replied, because the Apostles did not admit the unbaptised to the supper! forgetting that neither did the Apostle view them as *good men.*

Again, Mr. K., in defending himself from the charge of inconsistency in communing with the unbaptized in other Christian duties, while he refuses to do so at the Lord's table, pleads the cause of Open Communion to perfection. He says "The conduct of the Apostle in attending the temple-worship furnishes another case in our favour," (that is, in favour of partial fellowship.) Observe how good Mr. K. conducts the argument. He proceeds thus: "Peter and John went up to the temple at the hour of prayer" (Acts vii. 1.) They did not forsake the house of

prayer, whither they had been habituated to go, so long as they had the opportunity. The Apostle Paul many years afterwards went up to Jerusalem to worship (Acts xxiv. 11.) This is his defence for being found in the temple: and he contended that though, in the very way which the Jews called heresy, yet said he, so worship I the God of my fathers, the same God whom they worshipped: thus declaring that, *though he differed from them, yet since there was one great point of union, he acceded to their worship AS FAR AS HE COULD:* and his taking the vow of the Nazarite upon him, and being found in the temple for the purpose of fulfilling the commanded rites, part of which consisted in an offering made by the Jewish priests according to the law, was a proof that, *as far as he thought* them right, he gave them such complete countenance, that he made use of their ministrations; and yet we know that his sentiments as a christian would necessarily prevent him from holding complete communion with that people." Just as our principles as Baptists, prevent us from holding communion with Pedo-baptists, in their baptism of infants.

Now, what was the principle (according to Mr. K.) on which Paul joined in the devotional exercises of the Jews? "There was" (he says) "*one great point of union* between him and them, and he acceded to their worship *as far as he could.* But between us and many Pedo-baptists there is union *on every point but one;* why then should we not unite with them *AS FAR AS WE CAN?* Had it not been the fetters of his system, Mr. Kinghorn was as open as Mr. Hall. No doubt Mr. Hall and he are perfectly at one on the subject long ago, and we are strongly inclined to think it may safely be presumed that Mr. K. is as well convinced as Mr. H. that it is not the will of the King of heaven that a mere external rite should separate his disciples even though it be his own institution. Sacrifice was his institution, yet he says, I will have mercy and not sacrifice. So when the two come into competition, we believe he says I will have love and not baptism.

Z. F.

CONVOCAION OF THE BAPTISTS OF CANADA.

Two of the answers returned to the circular, proposing the convention which is now called to meet in Toronto on the 13th of June next, prove that it is possible to understand from the circular, that the convocation is intended to be exclusive in its character, a thought so far removed from the minds of the movers in this matter, that it was deemed quite unnecessary to make any direct reference to the subject. And it is still thought, that a comprehensive view of the circular must satisfy all that it aims simply at gathering together the scattered fragments of the Baptist denomination, such as may wish to proceed on the old basis, of leaving each minister and each church, and each member of every church, *at perfect liberty* to act, not only on the communion question, but on every other question *precisely* as to them may seem in the most perfect harmony with the holy standards of Divine Truth—nothing to be demanded of any one, save this necessary thing, that