

practises be subjected to the same sifting process? Any child can see that that was the method our Lord adopted with both friends and foes. With Pharisees, disciples, or heathen, he held long and interesting discussions, reasoning with them concerning His creed and theirs in a free and open manner. And in many cases, those who were convinced that His was better than theirs, will thank God through all eternity for the light they received during those discussions.

Behold the Prince of Reasoners in the synagogue, and on Mars Hill, what glorious results followed his discussions! What was the Reformation but the result, through God's blessing, of long and earnest discussions in which mental and spiritual giants, such as Wicliff and Luther took part? Whereas it is the essence of Romanism to shun and to suppress free and open discussion on the greatest of all themes, Christian Truths. Free and frank discussion will always do good, if conducted in the right spirit and with God's glory in view, and the Baptists are never afraid of it, in fact they rather court it, for there was never a discussion on Baptism yet that did not add to their number. But to a kind of Guerilla warfare, all straightforward people object. One minister of this town told me, that he took one of my sermons into his pulpit, and after discussing its contents said, "I am surprised that such brazen-faced ignorance should be tolerated." On remonstrating with him for such abuse he promised to apologize for using the word "brazen-faced," but he never did so. If that gentleman (?) differed from me in the morals or the scholarship of that sermon, why could he not discuss freely and frankly the differences between us in a christian gentlemanly way. Why should he so far forget both his influence and his position, as to use language more fit for the saloon than the sanctuary, more becoming to a pugilist than a preacher? When a public teacher of morals will open his sermon on baptism, by stating that his sermon is NOT A REPLY to any body as he sees no "ground" for a reply, and then proceeds to try to prove that some of my statements are wrong, ordinary people naturally conclude that that gentleman is guilty of telling falsehoods. Would he have preached on that subject? And would