

for the use of all denominations," &c. Behold in its true light the gigantic imposition! *Mirabile dictu, mirabile dictu!*!

Mr. Johnson informs the readers of the *Monitor* that "the Board of Trustees have always accorded to ministers of the different denominations a cordial welcome to the pulpit;"—a *cordial welcome* accorded to ministers who would subscribe to the "doctrines contained in four volumes," &c., but a *closed house* accorded to others. The *latter* was accorded to the Rev. J. H. Robbins as the following published report clearly shows:—"Our meetings [at the Port] were held in a meeting-house in which Baptists own a large number of pews, but the *Deed* of which is held by the Methodist Conference. As soon as God gave us converts and we baptized them *in the right way*, we were shut out." (See *Christian Messenger*, Jan. 7th, 1880.) Having thus violated—as he was told—"the *qualifying clause of the Deed*," my esteemed predecessor went to his "next appointment, after the second Baptism, and found no admittance" to "a free place of worship for all Protestant denominations."

The clause of the deed resurrected by Mr. Johnson satisfactorily explains other Union ruptures. It sheds "some light on a matter which is largely of local importance" at Mt. Hanly, viz.,—Dr. Bill's *expulsion* from the "union Chapel," described in the following manner:—"as the converts wished to be baptized, and join the Baptist Church, the local leader of the Circuit informed me [Dr. B.] that unless I would preach Wesleyan doctrine, I would not be allowed to preach in their chapel any more. As I was not disposed to do that, I had only to retire with the best grace possible." The doctrines contained in the "four volumes," are very probably indetical with "*Wesleyan doctrine*." "*The qualifying clause*" of this resurrected document also affords an explanation of the "Union rupture" at Maitland. The Rev. J. E. Blakeney, in the *Messenger and Visitor* of the 10th inst., writes,—“we baptized 9 willing converts, 8 of these were from Maitland.” That was sufficient. The Methodist brethren knew that these candidates were consulting the New Testament more than the "four volumes," and that the Maitland Meeting-house—though built by the aid of the Baptists—had not been decided to the Methodist Conference to afford such liberty with the Scriptures. Hence Bro. Blakeney further writes:—"we were told that we could have conference meeting and preach once a month, provided we would not preach Baptist sentiments. Up to that time we had not said a word on the subject of baptism, although our Methodist brethren had discussed the subject two evenings. So faithfulness to God and His Word compelled us to withdraw from this house, seeing we were denied liberty of conscience and free speech." "*Baptist sentiments*," we discover, are "contrary to the doctrines contained in four volumes," &c.

Thus history at Mt. Hanly is repeated at Port George, history at Port George is repeated at Maitland, and history at Maitland is repeated in many other places throughout these Provinces. Let us