

We must not omit to state that the excellent band of the 71st Regiment were in attendance, and contributed to the proceedings with a variety of popular music. The company dispersed shortly before twelve o'clock.

AN ERROR CORRECTED.

We deeply regret that in the article headed "Church University," which appeared in our issue of the 13th instant, the "Rev. R. Flood, M.A., Rector of Caradoc," was named as the author of the communication there quoted and commented upon. In point of fact the letter in question was written by the Rev. John Flood, of Richmond. We presume it is unnecessary to assure our friend, the Rector of Caradoc, that the mistake was altogether unintentional on our part.

SOIREE MUSICALE.

We beg leave to direct attention to the advertisement headed as above, which appears in our paper of to-day. The merits of Mr. Humphreys as a vocalist are universally admitted, and we cordially hope that they will be substantially rewarded this evening.

The *Mirror* very specially calls our attention to a letter from a person calling himself Heber Playfair, D.D., of Tiverton, near Durham, whom the *Mirror* affirms to be a clergyman of the English Church. We have examined the Clergy List for 1848, and find neither the name of Heber Playfair, nor that of Tiverton.

The Rev. J. G. D. McKenzie, desires to acknowledge, through the medium of *The Church*, the receipt of a thank-offering contributed (anonymously) by a person not residing in the parish, to the funds collected for a new St. Paul's Church in Yorkville.

Communication.

[We deem it necessary to follow the example of the London Church periodicals, and to apprise our readers that we are not responsible for the opinions of our Correspondents.—Ed. Ch.]

To the Editor of the Church.

THE REV. MESSRS. ROAF AND PYPER.

SIR,—We said in our last that in the controversy between Messrs. Roaf and Pyper, the latter had the best of the argument; for in choosing between two examples of error, it is clearly the Christian's duty to decide in favour of that in which he discovers the greatest respect for the Christian law.

It would, however, be to little purpose that we should occupy your valuable space, or the time of your readers, by nicely balancing the heresy of Mr. Roaf against the heresy of Mr. Pyper: the errors of each are of fearful magnitude, and grow in gravity as the mind dwells upon them. Both set at naught the testimony of the Church in all ages: one by denying the faith she has taught; the other by resisting the practice she has transmitted. Both do violence to the Divine law—Mr. Roaf, by resisting the letter, and Mr. Pyper by evading the spirit, of holy Scripture; and therefore in what follows we shall be less guided by the consideration of the particular errors of the disputants as opposed to each other, than by a consideration of them as opposed to Catholic truth.

It is no part of our duty to account for the peculiar opinions of Messrs. Roaf and Pyper, nor to enquire how they came to possess these opinions; still we may be permitted to remark, that the impiety which so frequently sullies the writings of dissenters, is, we think, to be ascribed to mistaken impressions of the duty of authors in commenting upon and interpreting holy Scriptures. Not only do they desire to be wise above that which is written, but they also attempt to describe those things which are only "spiritually discerned;" and it follows that not being able to understand that which was not given them to know—not being able to perceive that which "cometh not by observation"—not being able to comprehend that which was given as a guide to their faith, and not for the gratification of their reason—they do not pause and inquire with reverence, how "these things can be?" but in a bolder spirit they challenge their truth, while they exclaim in the language of modern scepticism, "These things are beyond our reason, and therefore they cannot be!"

Before proceeding further, we may remark that Mr. Roaf's obscurity in regard to the blessing ascribed in Scripture to holy Baptism, is only equalled by Mr. Pyper's reserve; and as the observations incidentally made by the latter gentleman do not embrace the whole question, and may moreover be liable to misapprehension, we propose, for the better understanding of what may follow, to make some propositions for our common assent.

Mr. Pyper will, we suppose, agree in saying, that Baptism consists of two parts,—the "water and the Spirit." He will also agree in saying, that either or both of two qualifications are in Scripture presupposed to be necessary to the due reception of holy Baptism, namely—Repentance and Faith. We also suppose he will admit that the first—Repentance—is the act of man, and that the last—Faith—is the gift of God. Repentance, then, arising as it does from the consideration of our actual transgressions, can be required only of those who have actually sinned, and therefore is obligatory only in such as have attained to the knowledge of good and evil. An infant, not having actually sinned, is not called upon actually to repent; and, therefore, if the absence of the impediment may be considered as a qualification for the reception of that which it impedes, there can be supplied at all events one reason why an infant should be brought to Baptism.

Again: original or birth-sin comes with our existence, and being thereof of natural descent, can only be removed by supernatural agency. This condition of our nature applies equally to adults as to infants—the removal of the attain in either case being an act of the spiritual order, in regard to which the subject is passive. It will therefore be necessary to show that the communication of this spiritual influence is inconsistent either with the power or wisdom of God, and

that its operation cannot be exercised in the heart of a child ere that which we call reason has illumined its understanding.

Mr. Pyper attempts to prove too much when he talks about "sanctified intelligence," or "intelligence" at all, being necessary to give validity and effect to a Divine ordinance; and when he ventures to mingle the alloy of earth with the command of heaven, he should at least have supplied some reason for his presumption.

"Intelligence" necessary! where is the record?—"Sanctified intelligence!" where are the terms?—who were the subjects? Were they the troubled thousands whose impassioned sorrows found utterance in the earnest cry, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" Was it the gospel of Philippi, or the members of his household, whom, amid the terrors of the earthquake, he brought to Baptism, that this "sanctified intelligence" is discernible? Oh, no! Broken hearts were necessary—distressed spirits were necessary—humble, childlike dispositions were necessary—a sense of sin—a desire to repent—a wish to believe—a hope to be saved—these qualities were present; but the sacred narrative, in this common version, gives no account of this quality of "intelligence;" and if it is to be found, then must it be sought for in languages more numerous than those which Mr. Pyper affects, —in idioms more obscure than even his pedantry can penetrate.

In which of the Oxford Tracts did Mr. Pyper discover a resemblance to the suggestion extracted from Mr. Roaf's Sermon, at page 7? The extract strikes us as being extremely unlike any sentiment which we have met with in the publications referred to. Has Mr. Pyper really read the Tracts of which he talks so glibly?

Mr. Pyper says, page 7, that there is no command for baptizing infants, "express or implicit." The italics are his own.

An assertion like the above can only be regarded as an evidence either of lunacy on the part of the party making it, or as a charge of blasphemy against those who practice what it denounces. Charity might lead us to suppose the former; but Mr. Pyper may expect us to meet the accusation as if it were indeed the product of a reasonable mind.

We take leave in the first place to tell Mr. Pyper that before the sixteenth century—before any of the variegated sects of Anabaptists were heard of—the Church of God, clothed with and in virtue of the power which she received from her Divine Head, did not only exercise the right of baptizing infants, but also in virtue of that right, she uttered the consoling assurance, that infants, so baptized, and dying before they committed actual sin, "are undoubtedly saved." Does Mr. Pyper presume to say that these men, of whom the world was not worthy, exercised this authority, and continued in this practice in virtue of any other injunction than the positive command of Almighty God? Does Mr. Pyper mean to say that these "holy men of old" were less mindful of the will of the Lord than he is? that they were less learned, less pious, and less thoughtful than he is? No—it cannot be so, for their works testify to the contrary, and their faith in many cases was sealed with martyrdom. Yet, Mr. Pyper does say in effect, that all the most solemn acts of the Church for fifteen centuries were acts for which Holy Scripture can show neither "express nor implied" sanction, were acts therefore which brought upon the heads of those who practiced them—apostles, martyrs, and confessors—the fearful charge of blasphemy against the Holy Ghost!

That heresy, which we have heard with our ears and which our fathers have declared unto us in regard to the things which were done in their days, and in the old time before them, is not likely to receive much attention from one whose mind is moulded in hate and warped by heresy, and therefore we refrain from adducing the evidence of Mr. Pyper's errors which may be found in the writings of the Fathers. We come, at once to the law and the testimony in support of the faith and practice of the church.

The apostolic commission is to disciple all nations, baptizing them, &c. Now we don't know what rule of interpretation Mr. Pyper may be pleased to adopt in adjudicating on the Divine law, but presuming upon what is considered the ordinary mode of interpreting a statute conferring civil privileges, we should say to "baptize all nations" must signify all that it can signify—that it must include all whom it does not except, and that therefore, though it is not expressly said of the apostles that they did baptize infants, neither is it said that they did not, and as infants are embraced in the class referred to by the Saviour, "every creature," it is to be presumed that they did. But, if, for argument sake, they did not, it does not follow that they might not, or that their successors may not. It is enough that the apostles were not forbidden for us to assert that we are not forbidden. We affirm that there is no law to the contrary, and therefore that it may be done. We claim the privilege of the statute.—Mr. Pyper must produce the prohibition, or else fulfil his vow and bow to the law.

This, however, is not the only argument by which we propose to meet Mr. Pyper's impudent boast.

Our Saviour said "suffer little children to come unto me and forbid them not;" they were brought to him, and though nothing is said about "sanctified intelligence," they departed with a blessing. It was our Saviour's command that they should be brought, that command is unrevoked, and therefore it is still obligatory upon all who name his name to bring their children to Christ. The object of their being brought to him was to receive blessing, they were then capable of receiving blessing, and did receive it, and can only be incapacitated from receiving the like blessing from a decree to the contrary, of Him who is the author of all blessing, which is not alleged.

Again, in his natural state, man cannot attain to heaven. Infants then in their natural state are children of wrath, and have therefore no assurance of heaven, but in reference to those brought to Him, the Saviour said, of such is the kingdom of heaven. Infants then being able to attain to heaven must also be able to attain to a state fit for heaven, i.e. a state of salvation. To attain to this state, they must possess those qualifications which are necessary to salvation. Therefore, as Holy Scripture nowhere proposes any other channel than baptism through which they can receive the grace of salvation—it follows not only that infants ought to be baptized, but that the Christian law would be violated if they were withheld from baptism. The greater includes the less—we have the highest sanction for affirming that infants may be saved, and if they are fit for salvation they cannot be unfit for baptism.

Infants then can be saved—they can be numbered with the communion of saints—they can be participants in the Divine nature; but how? Certainly by

no act of power of their own; then they must become so in virtue of a Divine agency, and by means of a spiritual communication, made direct to themselves.—How, it may be asked, can these things be? Scripture affords no other answer than, at their baptism; the early Church echoes the same truth, and almost universal voice of Christendom still reiterates the same testimony, and yet in the presence of this mass of positive testimony, Mr. Pyper has the temerity to affirm that in Scripture there is "no command either 'express or implicit' for baptizing infants."

We cannot permit ourselves to occupy more of your valuable space on this occasion; we must therefore defer our concluding remarks till next week.

ERASMUS OLDSTYLE.

ARRIVAL OF THE "BALTIC."

New York, Feb. 20.

The *Baltic* arrived at 12 o'clock to day, making the passage in 12 days. She brings 30 passengers, and Liverpool dates to the 8th instant.

ENGLAND.—The fourth Session of Parliament was opened on the 4th instant, by the Queen in person.—The weather was remarkably fine, and an immense concourse was attracted to view the Royal procession. The Queen was received with unwonted enthusiasm along the whole line of the route, and frequent cries of "No Popery" were raised. Her Majesty attired in a white satin brocade, embroidered in gold, and wearing a splendid tiara of diamonds, entered a little after two o'clock, attended by the Prince Consort and accompanied by the officers of state, heralds, pages, &c. She ascended the throne, and after the House of Commons had been summoned, read the following speech with a clear voice and distinct accent:—

MY LORDS AND GENTLEMEN:—

It is with great satisfaction that I again meet my Parliament, and resort to your advice and assistance in the consideration of measures which affect the welfare of our country.

I continue to maintain the relations of peace and amity with foreign powers. It has been my endeavour to induce the states of Germany to carry into full effect the provision of the treaty with Denmark, which was concluded at Berlin in the month of July of last year. I am much gratified in being able to inform you that the German Confederation and the Government of Denmark are now engaged in fulfilling the stipulations of that treaty, and thereby putting an end to hostilities which at one time appeared full of danger to the peace of Europe.

I trust that the affairs of Germany may be arranged by mutual agreement, in such a manner as to preserve the strength of the Confederation and to maintain the freedom of its separate states.

I have concluded, with the King of Sardinia, Articles Additional to the Treaty of September 1841, and I have directed that those Articles shall be laid before you.

The Government of Brazil has taken new, and, I hope, efficient measures for the suppression of the atrocious traffic in slaves.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons.—I have directed the estimates of the year to be prepared and laid before you without delay. They have been framed with a due regard to economy, and the necessities of the public service.

My Lords and Gentlemen:—Notwithstanding the large reductions of taxation which have been effected in late years the receipts of the revenue have been satisfactory.

The state of the commerce and manufactures of the United Kingdom has been such as to afford general employment to the labouring classes.

I have to lament, however, the difficulties which are still felt by that most important body among my people who are owners and occupiers of lands.

But it is my confident hope that the prosperous condition of other classes of my subjects will have a favorable effect in diminishing these difficulties and promoting the interests of agriculture.

The recent assumption of certain ecclesiastical titles, conferred by a foreign power, has excited strong feelings in this country, and large bodies of my subjects have presented addresses to me, expressing their attachment to the throne, and praying that such assumptions should be resisted. I have assured them of my resolution to maintain the rights of my crown and the independence of the nation against all encroachment, from whatever quarter it may proceed. I have at the same time expressed my earnest desire and firm determination, under God's blessing, to maintain unimpaired the religious liberty which is so justly prized by the people of this country.

It will be for you to consider the measures which will be laid before you on this subject.

The administration of justice in several departments of law and equity, will no doubt receive the serious attention of Parliament; and I feel confident that the measures which may be submitted, with a view of improving that administration, will be discussed with that mature deliberation which important changes in the highest Courts of Judicature in the kingdom imperatively demand.

A measure will be laid before you, providing for the establishment of a system of Registration of Deeds and Instruments relating to the transfer of property. This measure is the result of inquiries which I have caused to be made into the practicability of adopting a system of registration calculated to give security to titles, and to diminish the causes of litigation to which they have hitherto been liable, and to reduce the cost of transfer.

To combine the progress of improvement with the stability of our institutions will, I am confident, be your constant care. We may esteem ourselves fortunate that we can pursue, without disturbance, the course of calm and peaceful amelioration; and we have every cause to be thankful to Almighty God for the measure of tranquillity and happiness which has been vouchsafed to us.

At the conclusion of the speech, the Queen and her attendants retired.

Further Extracts from our English Files.

The *Daily News* says it is now certain that the Roman Catholic clergy of this country are for the most part opposed to their Cardinal Archbishop on the very question to which he owes his giddy elevation. It is equally certain that the great majority of the laity side with their priests, and condemn the Cardinal. In the same paper "A Catholic Priest" complains of "the underhand practice going on to enslave us," instancing the appointment of the Cardinal as "Prætor" of the Colleges at Ushaw, and his intended interference as such; also stating that his Eminence has obtained from the same Propaganda a confirmation of his famous "statute," by which he substituted his own authority for the legal and canonical powers and rights of patrons, incumbents, and congregations:—

"This is the avowed principle of the Cardinalities.—We have the spiritual power, but we will rule by holding the temporal control also." They care a great deal more about titles. It would be a great kindness to us if Parliament were, first, to secure to the courts of justice all matters concerning our temporalities—the court of archbishops, &c., when, and only when, found, by canonical process, to be canonically unfit; and secondly, to stop all intercourse with Propaganda—a secret, exceptional, and aggressive tribunal, not tolerated by any real hierarchy, and only loved by ours because guided by no law but what suits the temporary purpose. No Catholic State allow it. Even the priests of Rome refused to accept its jurisdiction. So long as we are under the intriguing Propaganda peace between Protestants and Catholics will never exist. Thirdly, all our Bishops should be required by law to be natural born subjects, and elected by priests, also natural born subjects of this Crown. Fourthly, the oath of ordination should be forbidden. It is uncanonical, and against English law, and it leads to great injustice. As for the oath of testimony in spiritual courts, a solemn affirmation ought to suffice.

The same paper also publishes, under the head of "Roman Catholic Opponents of Wiseman," the following translation of "An Address and memorial to his Eminence Nicholas Cardinal Wiseman, Archbishop of Westminster, &c., agreed to by the Roman Catholic clergy of the diocese of Beverley, in meeting assembled at Selby, in Yorkshire, on Tuesday, the 14th of Jan'y, 1851, the Very Reverend the Dean of the district in the chair:—

"May it please your Eminence graciously to receive this dutiful, as well as respectful, address and memorial. It is the address and memorial of Catholic priests who take an interest in the re-establishment of the hierarchy, and are, at the same time, strongly attached to the free institutions of England.

"They implore your Eminence to use whatever influence your Eminence may possess to establish such laws and such institutions for their ecclesiastical government as may be in accordance with the free constitution and equitable laws of their country.

"They are of opinion that the ecclesiastical law of every nation originally was, or at all events was intended by the Church to be, of this description.

"One of the noblest features of their religion is, that its canonical institutions can and do accord with the equitable institutions of the most despotic, as well as of the freest nations of the earth.

"They therefore ask, and they ask with confidence

—1. That their ecclesiastical constitution be compounded of these four ingredients—the civil law" of England, the canon law (in spirituals) of the Catholic Church, the common law, and the just and equitable statute laws of their beloved country; for they are convinced that these would constitute, if properly compounded, a safe, salutary, and uniform system of ecclesiastical legislation for the Catholics of England.

2. They deprecate all spiritual interference with the civil rights of individuals, in reference to property, knowing, as they do, the fatal consequences arising from such interference, in a country when Catholic Bishops cannot exercise any civil authority whatsoever, in order to carry out the sentence of spiritual tribunals.

3. They deprecate the introduction of any more foreign system of ecclesiastical legislation, as obnoxious to their own feelings, and as hateful to the millions by whom they are surrounded, and with whom they are in constant intercourse. 4. They implore your Eminence to oppose the establishment of any spiritual courts which may, in the mode of their construction, be liable to the imputation of undue influence; such courts being in England held in utter abhorrence, and in all countries condemned by men who have been nurtured in the principles of rational freedom. 5. The memorialists have long borne, but fifty have borne with an impatience subdued only by a sense of religion, the system which has prevailed in the nomination of Bishops. On this point they now look forward to a complete change—a change which may give to the governed an effective in the nomination of those who are to be their governors.

"Finally, the memorialists beg permission to assure your Eminence that they anticipate a favourable reply to this their dutiful address and memorial; for they are convinced that the contemplated restoration of the hierarchy without these measures, instead of conducing to the advancement, will be the cause of the deterioration, of religion in England.

"And the memorialists will ever pray that the contemplated government, so constituted, may be long and prosperous in reference to your Eminence, and in reference to the Church, so long as the Church itself shall exist."

* That of the Ecclesiastical Courts is supposed to be here meant.

AUTOCRATIC SIMPLICITY.—The following is an extract from a letter dated St. Petersburg, November 22, (O.S.):—"The new iron bridge over the Neva was opened yesterday by his Majesty in very simple guise. He met the merchants on the English quay, who approached him to return thanks for the construction of such a beautiful bridge. His Imperial Majesty turned, and pointed to the engineers (English and American), and said 'These are the gentlemen you must thank. Now, gentlemen,' said he, 'let us walk over.' They were bawling back, not understanding they were to accompany him; perceiving which, he said, 'Come along, gentlemen.' And seeing that the crowd of workmen (thousands in number) were kept back, he waved his hand for them to come over also, when they rushed on en masse, like a drove of cattle, follow and almost driving his good-natured Majesty, with his two sons, the few officers who accompanied him, and the merchants, before them. There was no music, no soldiers, tout simple. And the splendid bridge is now open to the public. It is brilliantly lighted with gas, and forms quite a beautiful promenade. Another superb bridge is to be immediately erected from the Litany to the Wiburg side of the Neva. Next November the Moscow railway will be finished. —Builder.

TORONTO MARKETS.

Toronto, Feb. 27, 1851.

Fall Wheat, per 60 lbs.	3 4	4 0
Spring do.	3 2	4 7
Oats, per 30 lbs.	1 4	1 5
Barley, per 40 lbs.	2 10	2 3
Powd.	2 2	2 6
Flax	2 9	3 0
Flour, superfine (in barrels)	21 3	0 0
Do. fine (in barrels)	20 0	0 0
Market Flour, (in barrels)	19 9	0 0
Do. (in bags)	16 2	19 6
Oatmeal, per barrel	17 6	14 0
Beef, per lb.	0 24	0 4
Lard, per 100 lbs.	15 0	21 4
Pork per lb.	0 2	0 0
Do. per 100 lbs.	18 9	25 4
Mutton per lb.	0 2	0 0
Bread	0 4	0 5
Coal per ton	32 6	32 8