

country. Certain circumstances brought to light by its discovery, indicate that it was worked long before the discovery of America by Columbus. The richness of the mine may be imagined from the fact, that Mr. Mendelbaum, the manager, in causing it to be explored, had a mass of copper, which weighed 2,300 pounds, removed from the surface of the vein. There is certainly much mystery connected with these ancient traces of mining operations, discovered, from time to time in the copper region of Lake Superior.—*Colonist*.

THE TORONTO UNIVERSITY.

In our publication of Wednesday we gave the observations of Mr. Hincks when introducing a bill to amend the laws relating to the University of Toronto, by which it will be seen, it is admitted that the expectation that other Colleges would have affiliated with, or become engrafted on the godless stem has not been realized, and that a new experiment is to be made upon it by dividing the University from all Colleges, and creating a Board of Examiners to examine pupils from affiliated bodies and grant degrees, thus adopting the plan of the London University which he said had been found to work well. Mr. Hincks further stated that there would be no medical or law school connected with this University, and that the endowments would be taken out of the hands of the College and managed by the Crown on the responsibility of the Ministry.

For our own part we have neither love nor respect for this University as at present constituted, although it numbers some men of a high order of talent among its Professors; yet we cannot view the introduction of this sweeping measure on which the Senate as a body were never consulted and never even apprized of, involving as it does, a principle of the grossest injustice, if not robbery, without raising our voice against the act, even though about to be perpetrated on a body to which we are opposed.

The purposes for which Colleges have ever been founded and supported are chiefly to enable the youth to enter on the study of the learned professions, which are by common consent allowed to be pre-eminently, Law, Physic and Divinity. The latter has been already forcibly excluded from its walls, and if Physic and Divinity are to be now as forcibly ejected, we would ask for what essential study can the youth of the Province resort thereto? What are they to learn there to enable them to enter any of the learned professions, or to suit them for the higher avocations of life? Is this to be done by way of assimilating it to the London University? In that case the framers of the Bill must be ignorant of or falsify the fact that the three learned professions are connected with the London University. In thus separating the Educational Department from the University the plan of the London model is departed from.

Further we are told that the Board of Endowment is to be abolished and the large Revenues of the College managed by a Government officer, on the responsibility of the Ministry, thus virtually making him irresponsible. Here would be a nice birth for one of the "prosperous concern" and a new bait for Government support in the hour of need.

But the individual injustice of the measure is great. The Legal and Medical professorships are at one fell swoop to be abolished. As for the law faculties of the University, we do not believe that the labours of the professors were very heavy—that the number of law students gave them much trouble or interfered to any serious extent with their professional avocations outside, but in the case of the Medical faculty the instances of individual hardship and injustice would be very great. The Medical Professors have held their appointments for periods varying from four to ten years, and the discharge of the duties of their professorships can not but have interfered more or less with the exercise of private professional practice, whilst it entailed a heavy outlay in the purchase of all useful Medical works as essential to the due discharge of their duties. In fact, if we recollect rightly on the appointment of the present anatomical demonstrator an increase of salary was given to him to compensate for the total loss of Professional practice which must follow the discharge of his duty as anatomical demonstrator. Yet these are the men whom it is proposed at once to turn from the walls of the University, stripped of their appointments and salaries, to seek once more for Professional practice, in fact to begin their professional career with fearful odds against them.

In robbing one body, this paternal government do not hesitate to insult others, and intimate an intention of purchasing their assent to the principle of this bill, by the intimation that "there would be a sufficient fund after amply endowing" this emasculated College "to give some aid to other Colleges." Sorry indeed should we be to see Trinity College caught by this bait, surrender its independence. Its Board have had experience enough of the danger of such a

step, and we do not think they would be likely, under any circumstances, to participate in the spoils, and thus sanction the injustice. If it be perpetrated Trinity College must benefit otherwise, and so will the country. Within its walls the three learned professions will have found a secure retreat, and thither will flock the youth of the Province, who may be ambitious to enter on their study. Thus may Trinity College legitimately benefit without participating in the spoils, or sharing in the odium of the measure.

The Medical School of Dr. Rolph, will, by the plan, no longer have the Medical Classes of the University to compete with; and his class, raised to an affiliated school, may perhaps, come in for a slice of the government "aid to other Colleges," and might take it with clean hands if he had not been one of the reputed parents of the Bill. The Rev. Egerton Ryerson, who, perhaps aims at being at the head of every Educational Establishment in the Province, if we judge from his expansive educational tendencies, may also benefit by the measure, and he will not be over scrupulous upon the matter.

By the bye, it is rather strange that a copy of the bill in slips from the press was received by the Rev. Mr. Ryerson, in this city, on yesterday week, the very day the measure was introduced in Quebec, whilst the Senate, as a body up to this hour, we are informed, are in ignorance of all, save what the public press has disclosed. Perhaps it was considered that Mr. Ryerson had a deeper interest in this new Educational Scheme than the body whose rights and emoluments are about being thus so outrageously invaded.

The whole measure is as iniquitous as unjust in principle, and is strong evidence of the assertion we so lately made, that in the hands of the present ministry the rights and liberties of no class of her Majesty's subjects in Canada are secure. Friends and foes are alike objects of ministerial plunder.

POPULAR BAPTIST ARGUMENTS REVIEWED.

(Continued from last week.)

4. "The religion of the New Testament is essentially a voluntary service, &c. The Gospel admits no acts as religious but such as are voluntary. Infant baptism is not, on the part of the subject supposed to be most concerned, a voluntary, but a compulsory ceremony. It is something altogether dissimilar from the whole genius of the Gospel."

Now, even though baptism were a compulsory rite this would not make us lay it aside; circumcision, by God's appointment, having been equally compulsory. The question of its being voluntary or compulsory is quite as much out of place as its utility or non-utility: the real question being, the Scriptural authority for it. In short, all these arguments against infant baptism drawn from the 'voluntary, spiritual or personal nature of the Gospel' can only be of use as corroborative evidence, when it is first admitted that Scripture does not decide the rival claims of adult and infant baptism, as no one who could establish the theory of the Baptists from Scripture would be foolish enough to make assurance doubly sure by the addition of a doubtful argument. We may remark, however, that it is by no means true to say that infant baptism is a compulsory rite. The Gospel requirements are indeed, so far voluntary, that no credit attaches to any one who does not perform them from choice: adults only can do this; but still no person can be said to be compelled whose choice is not thwarted; infants, therefore, are not the subjects of compulsion. A man in a swoon cannot intelligibly be said to be compelled to revive by the application of water, though his recovery could not be voluntary.

Thus have we replied seriatim to the objections from Scripture which the Baptists adduce against the practice of infant baptism. Let us, then, recapitulate our argument in favour of the custom—it is admitted, on all hands, that infant baptism prevailed over the whole Christian world not long after the Apostolic age. Let Baptists, then, solve this difficulty: supposing the Apostles, by precept and example, to have authorized, exclusively, the practice of adult baptism, how came it to pass that such a wonderful transition took place in such a short time? We ask again and again how infant baptism came to gain such an undisputed sway? If adult baptism was the exclusive practice of the Apostolic age, how came all the churches in the world, founded as they were by different Apostles, with one accord, to deviate from their example? We must demand some rational account (the common principles of human

conduct demand it) of this marvellous instance of agreeing to differ. It would not have been extraordinary had some churches, or even many, departed from the truth; but how came all to do so, separated from each other by insuperable barriers, and many, from their remoteness, ignorant even of the existence of each other?

Dr. Buchanan, A.D. 1806, found 200,000 Christians in Central India; Churches whose existence was unknown till discovered by the Portuguese in the 16th century. These Churches of Syrian Christians had preserved a succession of Bishops for thirteen centuries, and, (says Dr. B.,) profess doctrines few, indeed, in number, but pure, and agreeing in essential points with the Church of England. In a conversation of one of these Bishops with Dr. Buchanan, he asked about the other Christians, besides the English, who had separated themselves from the Church of Rome. "Those which interested him most were the Quakers and Baptists." He said "it was an imposing idea to wash the body and begin a new life." He asked "whether they were baptized again every time they relapsed into sin or known apostasy." Here, then, were one hundred Churches with no communication whatever with Europe; Churches which had preserved the Bible, and were utterly unknown till the arrival of the Portuguese, who, to overthrow such a standing witness against Romanism, established the Inquisition, which accused the Syrian Clergy of the following practices and opinions:—"that they married; that they owned but two sacraments; that they neither invoked saints, worshipped images, nor believed in purgatory; and that they had no other dignitaries than Bishops, Priests and Deacons." The amusement of the Syrian Bishop shows us that not even a tradition of the Baptist theory had come down in these Churches. We quote the above from "Dr. Buchanan's Researches" to show the universality of the practice of infant baptism; and let the Baptists devise some rational account of this singular unanimity of the Christian world.

But let us call the attention of the Baptists to a fact still more strange than this wondrous, this universal change which they must believe took place, viz: that not an intimation of it occurs in any writing extant—not a particle of notice is taken of it by any writer—not a Christian disputed the daring change in the sacrament. Now, is this possible? On the supposition that infant baptism was a forgery on the world, was it possible that no one, though he had the means of exposure in his hands, ever took the trouble to do so? Heresies, sects, and schisms have arisen in every age; but, then, there is testimony for and against them. A great part of the world was once Arian; but we have the history of it: it was too important not to be noticed. In the earliest ages there arose heresies of the most extravagant nature; so numerous were they, (Augustine enumerates over eighty) that the three first centuries seem one record of false doctrine; but, then, the true was preserved, and the false branded in history. And is it natural, credible, or possible, that no one of all these heretics should have upbraided his opponent with having transferred Christ's sacrament from adults to infants? So irresistible is this argument, that if there existed in Scripture one plain command limiting baptism to adults, it would shake our belief in the inspiration of the Apostles. So forcibly do the arguments adduced prove the custom of infant baptism to have originated in the Apostolic age, that did there exist a text of Scripture prohibiting the practice, we should have been led to conclude that the Apostles must either have set the example of disobedience to their own commands, or silently acquiesced in it. But no such text exists, as will appear to anyone who examines the futility of all the inferences drawn from Scripture by the opponents of infant baptism. We have seen that not one of these texts militates against the practice; this is all we require to make our proof incontestible: but more corroboration we possess.—Some of the arguments brought forward by our adversaries making clearly for infant baptism or giving a considerable degree of probability to it. Still further, we have a separate and powerful evidence from the analogy of circumcision, which must have great weight,

unless we are prepared to reject or depreciate typical prophecy. As the Lord's Supper supplanted the Passover, so baptism superseded circumcision. The Jewish religion was based on this principle—a covenant between God and the Jew. The Christian religion is based on the same—a covenant between God and man; Christ being called the mediator of a new and better covenant.—Heb. 12, 24, &c. Now, if God required children to be brought into covenant with him under his first dispensation, why should he not require the same under his second? at least, why should we not take it for granted that he does so require, unless the contrary be affirmed in Scripture? Might we not have calculated on our Lord's undeceiving the Apostles on this point? Might we not reasonable conjecture that the Apostles would have undeceived us? Thus does the analogy of the Jewish Church substantiate the practice of the whole Church for fifteen centuries.

It is sheer simplicity, or prejudice, to deny a typical import to circumcision, and yet to ascribe it to other Jewish ordinances. What reason is there why the Passover should be thought symbolical of the Lord's Supper, and yet circumcision be deemed a mere national badge, without spiritual significance? Why should the year of Jubilee be regarded as typical, and circumcision not so? The Jubilee year partook much more of a civil, national character than circumcision can be supposed to have done; yet that year was undoubtedly typical. Observe, God commanded that the Jubilee trumpet should sound "on the tenth day of the seventh month, in the day of atonement. The remission of debts, and the reversion of inheritance, in that year, were all plainly typical of the grand Jubilee of the Gospel; indeed, our Lord himself sets this matter at rest, by plainly declaring that he came "to preach the acceptable year of the Lord: this day is this Scripture fulfilled in your ears." Now, if the very laws which regulated inheritance and debt, contracts and servitude, though national or civil arrangements, were still representative of Gospel liberty, why should circumcision be an exception to the rule, on the ground of its being a national badge or characteristic, especially when we are distinctly told in Scripture that circumcision involved a deep spiritual meaning? "Abraham," says the Apostle, "received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had."—Rom. 4, 11. Here is clear evidence that circumcision ratified a covenant: the terms of the covenant being, on the side of the Jew, faith or faithful obedience; and on the side of God, temporal blessings. To this corresponds most accurately Christian baptism, which is the seal of God's Gospel covenant; and if the first covenant, which was undoubtedly spiritual, included infants, why should not that covenant "established upon better promises" (Heb. 8, 6) embrace the offspring of Christian parents, at least, if not, might we not have expected to have been told so? It will not, therefore, answer any purpose but that of showing the strength of prejudice, to say that circumcision was merely a national Jewish observance.—"Circumcise the foreskin of your heart," says Moses.—Deut. 10, 16; so also Jer. 4, 4. Baptism, say the Baptists, is "the outward sign of a renewed heart." And was not circumcision also? St. Paul evidently considered circumcision not only as emblematical of baptism, but as an ordinance with a deep spiritual reference. He tells the Colossians that they had put off the sins of the flesh "by the circumcision of Christ," and explains this to mean, being "buried with him in baptism."—Col. 2, 12. Again, he tells the Romans "that circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter."—Rom. 2, 29. He tells the Philipians that "we are the circumcision which worship God in the spirit."—Phil. 3, 3. St. Stephen, too, was of the same opinion when he upbraided the Jews with being "uncircumcised in heart and ears."—Acts 7, 51. In the face of such texts, to affirm the mere temporal character of circumcision, seems equal to "resisting the Holy Ghost." The plain fact being, that a deeply spiritual ordinance was administered to infants, by God's command, in the Jewish covenant. Why not administer the typhoid character, and infants of Ch?