

apostles taught no such doctrine. We listen to them. Their authority is acknowledged. They did baptize those who "gladly received the word," and they baptized such "in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins;" but certainly they knew the will of the Master better than to teach them that by *the act* of baptism they were to receive remission. It was their joyful and hearty trust in Christ—their acknowledgment of his authority—and their yielding to him in obedience—which gave them the joy of sins remitted. And as to baptism giving a title to the heavenly inheritance, there are so many blunders in the sentiment that it would require half a common volume to expose and correct them.

To make the Saviour say, "He that believeth and is baptized," shall have a title to the heavenly inheritance, is an abuse of all speech—as great an incongruity as to affirm that every man who eats the Lord's supper has a title to sit with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of God. Nothing is clearer than that the scriptures treat of two great congregations—the congregation of the faithful on earth who enjoy forgiveness, and the congregation of saints above who enjoy the divine and everlasting inheritance. That baptism to a person who has faith in the Lord Jesus, and has repented of his sins, introduces him into the Lord's congregation on earth where remission of sins can be enjoyed, is scripturally indisputable; but the heavenly inheritance, Paul tells us, is to be gained by patient continuance in gospel well-doing, seeking for glory, honor, immortality. We rise from the baptismal grave to associate with the congregation of the Lord on earth—we rise at the resurrection to associate with the Lord's congregation in glory. No Bible read man confounds these sentiments. It is therefore not only incorrect but absurd to speak of baptism giving a title to the heavenly inheritance. Mr. Sands need not think to keep the Baptists uninformed as to our position on these grave topics, and thereby keep up walls of difference where none should exist. It is against these Baptist high priests, and not against Baptists as a people, that we sometimes have a sharp word to say. Mr. Sands, and Mr. Recorder Anderson, and Mr. Cleg-horn, and Messrs. Crellin and Davidson should take a few more lessons from Archbishop Hughes or our Lord Bishop of Toronto, and leave the honest Baptists to stand upon the word as the foundation on which to build. The Baptists in Germany, in Scotland, and in England have occupied noble ground, and deserve honor for having fought many a good battle for the Divine oracles; and we are not unwilling to say that there are Baptists in America, who, were Paul and Peter to