

with the Christian world? Will it answer theirs? If it will, why do they not abide by it? Why do they not say, "This shall be our rule of faith, and our lives and works shall correspond with its principles and precepts?" They would do so if they were honest and their belief was sincere. And it will have to be so with them if ever they gain admittance into the kingdom of God, for in the Bible are the words of life and salvation. I ask again, who can say that baptism is not necessary for the remission of sins? The question has been asked, "What virtue is there in the water?" If there is no virtue in it don't drink it; it is not good for the system if there is no virtue in it. But there is virtue in it. If there is not, we should never apply it to our clothing or to the surfaces of our bodies for cleansing purposes; we should never use any more for cooking; we should never again apply it to the soil for the purpose of irrigation. How inconsistent it is to suppose that water should be used for so many and important purposes in life if there is no virtue in it! But there is virtue in it, and there is virtue in being buried beneath the wave in the likeness of Christ, and coming forth to a newness of life. There is virtue in being born again, whether in the font or in the river, it makes no difference, for Jesus has said that "except a man be born of the water and of the spirit he cannot enter the kingdom of God." When a person is buried beneath the water he comes forth from one element to another, and is literally born again. Who, then, after the declaration of Jesus on this subject, can say that baptism is not necessary or that there is no virtue in the water? I cannot. Who can say that the laying on of hands is not necessary for the reception of

the Holy Ghost? It is true that the house of Cornelius received the Holy Ghost before the Gospel was preached unto them. But the Lord had a special purpose in view in its bestowal in their case, namely, the removal of the prejudice of Peter and his brethren, who, being Jews, and full of the traditions of their fathers, thought that the Gentiles—among whom Cornelius and his house were classed—were not privileged to receive the Gospel. But the vision which Peter had on this subject, and the message sent to him by Cornelius in obedience to the command of the Lord in connection with the fact of the bestowal of the Holy Ghost on Cornelius and his family was so convincing to Peter and his brethren that the former was constrained to exclaim, "Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" Some may say, "What was the necessity of sending for Peter, one of the Apostles, when they had already received the Holy Ghost?" The simple fact is this: there was nobody to baptize Cornelius and his household, nobody to bury them with Christ in the water; no one had authority to baptize them for the remission of their sins; and consequently, although they had received the Holy Ghost, an Apostle had to be sent for to administer that ordinance. And we read further in relation to this case, that Peter "commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord." Did any others receive the Holy Ghost before baptism? None that we have any record of; but there is no doubt that many who were worthy received it in a measure; but, whether in the days of the Apostles or in our day, when the doctrine of baptism for the remission of sins is preached by a servant of the Lord, to persons who