

that a brother's heart beats in the bosoms of the Canadians, whose Parliament has voted £20,000 cy., for this object, yet there are sufferings in war which often baffles the utmost skill and kindness to relieve says one, writing from the spot. Even without inspecting the hospitals and hospital-ships, the merest look at our soldiers must convince any one of the hardships to which they have been exposed, their appearance tells its own tale; They have all of them lost flesh, and walk as men do who feel their limbs and their faces yellow with the accumulated dirt and sweat of many days, clothes unchanged, frizzly hair, deep set eyes, and the seaverishness of uncleanness, are the orders of the day with the men and with the most of the Subalterns. An Officer told me he had not washed his hands for a week, except the General and his staff, and you will not find a dozen of clean shirts in the army." War may be necessary, but it is an awful necessity, its evils border on the infinite.

The throb of patriotism may beat above that of humanity, and yet we cannot help sympathizing with all a man can feel, be he British, French, Turk, or Russian. Now what misery has been inflicted on our fellows, since the day which made Alma, one of our household words. New instruments of destruction have been invented and are making fearful havoc at Sebastopol, for instance, the Lancasterian gun; it derives its name from its inventor. It is made on the principle of the rifle, the bore is an oval, the balls are also oval, consequently, the same effect is produced in the motion of the ball, as in the rifle, but with what prodigious increase it projects a 96 lb. solid shot, it however moves with some degree of caprice, which subtracts somewhat from its destructive value. It is a maxim "we may learn from our enemies;" and we are sure the Czar will not be a dull pupil, and the destruction becomes mutual; we may have no doubt, who is to blame in this war, and whoever he is, or they are, they are under obligation to obey the law of love. They are human beings that are engaged in mortal strife, and how wide from the law of love, do their skill and energy diverge from that standard. Were the same energy, skill and resources employed in accordance with that law, how prodigiously would they promote the improvement and comfort of the race. It is only under the full reign of Immanuel, that Nations shall learn war no more, and yet, forsooth, this very war is smoothed over with idea of religion, at least by some of the parties, and it is like what? "Peace on earth, good will to men?" yes as like it, as a thunder storm is like a rainbow. O, that every gun in both armies were spiked, that they might be obliged to settle this matter at the bar of reason, and not at the cannon's mouth, what an amount of evil this small piece of metal can prevent. The spike is, I believe, a very hard piece of steel, of about four inches long, and is introduced in the touch hole of the gun, whose chamber when it reaches, permits it to expand its prongs, as a harpoon in a fish, and cannot be drawn thence, but must be drilled out, and being made to fit loosely at the touch hole, the drill does not easily bite, so that what before belched forth death, becomes as inoffensive as a reed. Let them all be turned to plough-shares and pruning hooks, and nations learn war no more. The cry however, at present is, more men, to gorge the maw of this Moloch—War.

In Canada we enjoy peace within our borders, tho' not free from the strife of tongues; as the united wisdom of our Province lately shewed at Quebec. The two great measure of the seasons have been past, with how much wisdom and good faith is a question; however the Clergy Reserve Bill is settled, giving ample share of the funds to those who have always enjoyed them, and leaving little to them who have always been deprived. Some fear, and not without reason, that the commutation clause, is exceedingly deceptive, surely it is not intended, that each stipendary shall

have a sum of twenty years' purchase placed in the hands of the Ecclesiastical body, or Corporation to which he belongs? This would be great injustice, *mais nous verrons*. but how can it now be helped?

REVIEW OF CURTIS ON COMMUNION.

[Continued.]

It is surely matter of surprise that Mr. C. did not anticipate and try to answer the question, *why* should not Baptists and Pedobaptists prove the necessary relationship for which he contends and then celebrate together? If indeed a satisfactory reason could be given why it should not be formed, it would settle the question of Close Communion at once. On the other term if no good reason can be assigned why they should not form such relation, then of course all that Mr. C. has advanced to establish his principle is labour thrown away; for the moment the relationship is formed the objection to communion between the parties becomes null.

Discussing the question as to the propriety of having occasional communion at the Supper with such pious Pedobaptists as he could cordially have communion with, he does anticipate the question,—then why refuse to unite with them in the Lord's Supper? His answer is, "simply because we believe that the Lord's Supper if united in would symbolize much more than that we considered them Christians. It would symbolize that they were willing to unite in church relations with us, and we with them." Here it is alleged that there is a mutual willingness between the parties, to celebrate the Supper together. It is true of Close Baptists, and no doubt of many Pedobaptists; but Mr. C. knows it is not true of all. It surely has the appearance of inconsistency to find him here talking of the willingness of Pedobaptists to unite with Baptist Churches, when we find him elsewhere speaking as if there was great danger if open communion should prevail, that Baptist churches would be immediately inundated by a flood of Roman Catholics and members of the Greek Church! He repeatedly talks of Pedobaptists entering Baptist churches in such numbers as to vote down Baptist sentiments, elect Pedobaptist pastors and deacons, and in short, carry all before them. It is hard indeed to maintain consistency in advocating an untenable position.

No doubt Mr. C. sincerely believed he could make a strong case in favour of Close Communion of the want of church relations between the parties, but surely the least reflection must show him that when "entering his edifice" he was merely building a castle in the air. The merest novice could tell him how to dispose of the mighty obstacle. He proposes to be *willing* cheerfully to hold Christian communion with his Pedobaptist brethren; be it known to him that it requires *only that we be willing* to hold church fellowship with him on the same terms, and he will be surprised to find how quickly and completely the obstacle will vanish.

It must then be obvious to any candid mind that the principle which Mr. C. undertook to establish; and on which he proposed to rest the edifice of Close Communion is really futile,—a foundation not of rock; but o