

reckoned, the inheritance which is provided for them. 'If children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ.' 'Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be, but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is.'

UPPER CANADA, *March 23, 1839.*

MY DEAR BROTHER,—There is much in the Christian Church that must be painful to a reflecting mind and pious heart, but hardly any thing more lamentable and injurious than the prevailing spirit of schism and division. Nothing can be more agreeable to the enemies of God and true religion, of the angelic and human kind, than these; nor can any thing be more contrary to the design and tendency of the gospel and the clear and express mind of Jesus Christ, who solemnly prays to his Father, "That they all may be *one* : as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us, that the world may believe that thou hast sent me."

How tremendously awful is it for any man, but particularly a *Christian believer*, to set himself *directly against* the happy design and lovely tendency of the gospel, the conversion of the world, the express will and solemn prayer of Jesus Christ. A schismatic, in his revolutionary career, must be accountable to God for all this. Nearly all allow that schism is a great and prevalent evil, and that an union of all true believers is to be sedulously and prayerfully sought. But still, far be it from me to recommend any plan, however plausible or popular, for securing this most desirable end, that may confuse or interfere with the order of divine appointments. Neither do I consider it prudent to touch that tender and complicated subject in the small compass of a

single letter; and if I should, it would not suit the pages of your Magazine. However, although a strict Baptist, both parties will forbear with me a little, while I would attempt to answer a practical and very important question, viz.: "Can a strict Baptist, in consistency with his own principles, hold Christian fellowship at the Lord's table with his brethren of open communion principles?" My Dear Brother, the state of our churches, and the operation of our denomination in the Canadas, seem to require some answer to this, and perhaps the sooner the better, for two cannot walk together except they be agreed. The answer branches into two different points, viz.: "Can we (strict Baptists) in consistency, fellowship these open communion brethren, as individuals, in our church?" And again: "Can we fellowship them collectively in the churches to which they belong?" As to the first query, I am quite free to say that I am perfectly convinced that these brethren should live together in unity, and in so doing there cannot be any inconsistency or sacrifice of truth or Christian principle. It would seem to require no proof that an assembly of baptised believers, called a Baptist Church, are bound to receive a baptised believer, although he might differ a little from them on a certain given point of church form: but perhaps not so much as they differ from one another, in some other things of as much moment. They hold baptism a pre-requisite to church fellowship, and they are not called to sacrifice any part of their form or order when they receive him, for he is baptized as well as they are; and if his knowledge of church form be thought deficient, where should he learn but in the school of Christ? Are we not all deficient—"of yesterday," "and know nothing as we ought to know?" Perhaps he knows most who is properly convinced of how