

The subject under discussion at present is not who are, and who are not Christians, but what is the scriptural rule of Church-fellowship, or in other words, the Communion question. Logical reasoners do not hop from one question to another, in order to throw dust in peoples' eyes. When they begin to a subject, they keep by it until it is finished. The question as to whether a Pede-Baptist may, or may not be a Christian, has no more relation to our present question than the Newtonian theory of gravitation.

In reference to household baptism, you remark that when "our correspondent can show us where the Apostles have *prohibited* the baptism of children (infants I suppose) with their parents, we will confess to have misread their Acts, and abandon the practice."

I cannot, Mr. Editor, show where the Apostles have prohibited the baptism of infants. Neither can I shown any part of God's Word which prohibits the use of holy water, and wax candles in places of worship. Are we then to use these articles in our places of worship, because they are not prohibited in the Bible? Christ says, "Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you," John xv., 14. But Christ has given you no command either to baptize or *rhantize* unconscious infants, consequently, it would be better for you, Sir, to abide by your Master's orders. Infant baptism is a question on which the Scriptures are silent, and where the Scriptures are silent we cannot have firm footing. Remember it is written, "Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken, than the fat of rams," 1 Samuel, xv., 22.

In alluding to Apostolic baptism, you say, "The fact that the Apostles baptized men and women upon profession of their faith proves nothing, for these converts were all previously Jews or heathen, and not having received the rite in infancy, were baptized of course in adult age, just as is common in modern missionary fields, &c."

Prove that the Apostolic practice of baptizing men and women upon profession of their faith is to be confined to Jews and heathen. Do the Scriptures say so?

In speaking of the Baptists denying the validity of baptism, when not administered by a Baptist minister, you ask, "will our brother now admit, what he promised to admit, if the fact could be substantiated?"

Well, brother, this is a fair question, and I will endeavour to give it a fair answer:—

I agree with you that Dr. Davidson is an authority among the Baptists. But I am not sure that his opinion, in reference to the necessity of baptism being administered by a Baptist minister, is endorsed by the Baptist denomination. I have conversed with a Baptist elder on the subject, and he says that Dr. Davidson's opinion is not generally received. Hence, I come to the conclusion, that the necessity of a Baptist minister to perform the rite of baptism, in order to give it validity, is an open question. However, if you or I can collect facts to prove that even the majority of the Baptist denomination hold Dr. Davidson's opinion, I will "admit what I promised to admit." I am not pledged to defend a party. Truth is truth, and error is error, either among Baptists or Pede-Baptists.

I am, dear sir,

Yours faithfully,

G. M.

WARWICK, April 11, 1870.