

column. Their object combines personal gratitude and patriotism. We hope that when the debt of gratitude is expressed by those most nearly concerned (viz.) the Alumni and Students of the Institution, that is when the portrait is completed, the feelings of the laity of Cobourg and the Archdeacon in general, will be warmed by the patriotic spark kindled by their brethren, and request the permission to have a few prints struck off: and what more appropriate offering could they make to their friends the Students, some of whom already are, and the remainder we trust soon will be numbered in the ranks of Pastors and Teachers in the vineyard of their Lord, than to send to each of them a copy of the likeness of their highly respected teacher.

The undersigned begs to acknowledge the receipt of the following sums, collected at the several Churches on Sunday last, on behalf of the "Toronto Lying-in-Hospital and General Dispensary," viz.:

From the Rector and Churchwardens of	
St. James's Church,	£20 10 6
" " Holy Trinity Church	5 7 6
" " St. George's Church	17 0 0
" " St. Paul's Church	4 18 9

Also from the Rev. R. Mitchele, £10 10s., being a subscription from himself and four members of the congregation of Trinity Church.

P. PATERSON, Treasurer.

FIRE AT YORKVILLE.—Yesterday morning about four o'clock a fire broke out in the Stables attached to the brick tavern at the corner of Yonge and St. Paul Streets, Yorkville, which destroyed the tavern itself and three adjoining rough-cast houses.

In our advertising columns will be found an announcement from Mr. Woodcock that he is about to open classes for the purpose of teaching singing. Mr. Woodcock has been introduced to us by parties in whose judgment we place implicit reliance, and have therefore no hesitation in strongly recommending him to the favourable notice of those who wish to learn the art of singing.

Communications.

[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,—The Reverend Mr. Roaf has preached and printed two Sermons in support of the practice of baptizing Infants; and the Rev. Mr. Pyper has written and published some hostile animadversions on the same subject. The pamphlets are clothed respectively in blue and yellow covers, and may be had at several of the Book stores in Toronto.

The gentlemen referred to are Ministers of two of the countless denominations which disfigure the Christian world,—denominations which support "Evangelical Alliances" and "agreeing-to-differ" Associations; whose members act fraternally upon platforms, and utter defiance from pulpits; who, amid smiles and cheering, exchange right hands of fellowship for the gratification of the chameleon mass, but who, nevertheless, employ these same right hands in publishing anathemas against the dear "Brother in Christ," who has presumed to adopt opinions at variance with the cherished errors of the aggressive sect; who spout Catholicity for the gratification of the crowd, and preach sectarianism for the comfort of the congregation; who assemble for "prayer" and "united effort," and depart for controversy and "denominational" exertion; who adopt the phraseology of the Pharisee, and do the work of the hypocrite; who denounce creeds, catechisms, and confessions of faith, as the bondage of Satan, and yet refuse admission to those who do not subscribe to their dogmas, or come up to their "notion" of what a Christian ought to believe; whose "law of love" is only to be discerned in their work of hate; whose ground of concord is aversion to the Apostolic rule; whose labour is to despoil the fair beauty of the Redeemer's Church, and erect upon its ruins the tattooed creation of the Conventicle; who begin by invoking the "Law of the Lord," and end by adopting the "Rule of the Sect"; and thus progressing, till novelty is followed by satiety, and succeeded by aversion—a new teacher is looked for—a new order of Man-worship is established—and a new swarm of heretics have to be rebuked and silenced!

We must, however, do Messrs. Roaf and Pyper the justice to say, that the dissenting bodies of which they are the local champions, are orders of some standing. It is true, indeed, that the family resemblance has long since perished; for the rough and earnest old Puritan would fail to recognize his descendant in the sleek, subtle, and worldly-wise Non-conformist of the present day. Still, we must accord to the Rev. gentlemen in question all the importance which belongs to the antiquity of their respective heresies. The Brownists, or Independents, whom Mr. Roaf represents, are Pædo Baptists, and date as far back as Robert Brown, 1580; and the Anabaptists, or Anti-Pædo Baptists, whom Mr. Pyper represents, came to the light in the year 1534.

Now, although the sects thus denominated have chopped and changed a good deal since their first organization, still it is *prima facie* an argument in their favour that they have been enabled to live at all, and the fact of their existence in any form entitles them to a degree of consideration which cannot be bestowed upon the ephemeral

"Swarms of a day, just buoyant on the flood,
Then mingled with the rubbish in the mud!"

Swarms which any blast of vain doctrine may put into motion; but which, having created a temporary impurity in the moral atmosphere, expire of inanition, ere the duty of destroying them has been considered.

Now, we have not enumerated the contradictions of Sectarians for the purpose of proving anything new; for in schismatical societies, profession and practice are ever at war. When, however, new illustrations of mutiny in the camp do arise—when the

domestic quarrel rages—when the strife of words runs high, and the tumult assails us at our very doors—then are we permitted to observe that the practical working of Dissent is neither satisfactory nor complete; that, notwithstanding the high spirituality which it affects, there is nevertheless an earthliness about it, which shows that its abiding place is among the Tombs,—then are we enabled to see that the unrestrained use of private judgment does not secure the repose of the soul; that liberty of conscience is not synonymous with spiritual peace; that the testimony of the authorized "witness and keeper of Holy Writ" is necessary for the right interpretation of Holy Scripture, and that it is no less the right than the duty of the Church to decree in matters of faith. In this respect it is that we would suggest to those whose views may be clouded—whose inclinations may lean towards change—to read these pamphlets: they will convince them that Dissent can afford neither security nor repose. Oh, no! If the earthly semblance of the heavenly household is to be discovered here, then sure are we that the dear dissenting brethren can in no wise sit for the portrait.

But one opinion can exist in regard to the tone of these pamphlets: so much, indeed, is propriety outraged, that the *Globe*, albeit not given to squeamishness, professes to be greatly shocked at the license displayed by the disputants; and, having the testimony of the Official Jester at things sacred to the fact in question, we need scarcely be expected to adduce the internal evidence of its truth.

The subject in controversy is one of the two Sacraments of our Saviour; and the reverence and awe inseparable from a due consideration of its mysterious import, ought we should think, to have proved a secure guarantee against the indulgence of drollery—a sufficient safeguard to anything which might wear the appearance of "poking fun" between the parties. The *Globe* indeed, confines his reproof to Mr. Pyper's animadversions: we cannot, however, acquiesce in this exclusive judgment. Mr. Roaf, in our opinion, has succeeded equally well in those parts of his subject which he has seen fit to treat comically; and he has succeeded far better, we think, in making a bad cause worse, not only by throwing around it a vesture of bad taste, but by adding thereto a broad margin of impurity.

Nor are irreverence of expression and unchastity of sentiment the only blemishes in Mr. Roaf's pamphlet: the manner, which should be grave, is jocose; the tone, which should be reverent, is defiant; and the matter, which should be clear, is obscure and contradictory. From what he says, we can only guess at what he means; and were it not that we possess some knowledge of the opinions of his sect, we should not adventure a criticism upon Mr. Roaf's exposition of its tenets. It seems to us, indeed, that Mr. Roaf's argument is only positive when it is tortuous—only clear when it is weak; only distinct when it is valueless; namely,—in regard to the comparatively insignificant question of the mode in which the element of water was applied in the Sacrament of Baptism.

As to the all-important consideration,—whether children ought to be brought to Holy Baptism, Mr. Roaf, notwithstanding his laboured and to us somewhat incomprehensible argument, has surrendered the question to his more astute and consistent antagonist.

Baptism, says Mr. Roaf, is an ordinance of the "common salvation" "in which we are all interested"—which we are all required to receive. It is associated, moreover, with "repentance and faith," and in some way connected with salvation "an ordinance" in which "we dedicate our children to God," and which may prove "a benefit to them in future."

This definition of Baptism is however only the commencement of our difficulties. Mr. Roaf admits that Baptism is always spoken of as connected with the operation of the Holy Spirit; and therefore it follows that the recipients of that Sacrament, if they received anything Sacramental, must have been the recipients of Divine grace.

Again: the blessings which in Holy Scripture are said to accompany Baptism are represented as positive, and not problematical—as immediate, and not remote—as certain, and not contingent; therefore, the parties baptized were at the time of their Baptism in a condition to receive these blessings, and therefore they did receive them.

Then it follows, that as Holy Scripture nowhere separates the outward and visible sign from the inward and spiritual grace, the recipient of holy Baptism did actually and truly receive that which by nature he could not have, viz.: "the death unto sin, and the new birth unto righteousness."

Holy Scripture may and does speak doubtfully as to the mode in which the Sacrament is to be administered, as well as on the controverted question of infant and adult baptism; but it utters no uncertain sound in regard to the Divine grace which ever accompanies the Sacrament.

Mr. Roaf insists on the authority and from the analogy of Scripture that infants were baptized. He must therefore admit on the same authority that the benefits of baptism were communicated equally to the child as to the adult; for in this respect Scripture makes no distinction. If, then, infants were baptized, they were capable of receiving the blessings of Baptism; and if they were then capable of receiving these blessings, they are so still. If, then, infants, in virtue of their Baptism, did in the Apostolic age become "members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of [the kingdom of] heaven," they must do so now; that they did so then, is proved by the fact, that we have no accounts of any conversions taking place subsequent to Baptism. But this Catholic doctrine Mr. Roaf will deny. We must, therefore, endeavour to understand what he does mean, though it sorely puzzles us to comprehend why he and those who think with him do not imitate the more consistent Quaker, and discard the Sacrament of Baptism, since they have discarded that which makes it sacramental.

Mr. Roaf, then, to be consistent, should insist—and we incline to gather thus much from his argument, that very young children who have not "arrived at an age when personal faith can be exercised"—"who cannot fulfil all righteousness"—"who cannot make the 'answer of a good conscience'—who are not in a 'moral and intellectual state' sufficient to derive benefit from the 'administration of a spiritual ordinance'—should not be brought forward as candidates for a Sacrament for which they are personally disqualified; for if, as Mr. Roaf seems to insist, intelligence must precede conversion—if reason must go before faith—if the mind must be informed ere the grace of the Holy Spirit can reach the heart—surely it would be sheer mockery to administer a Sacrament which could bring neither use, benefit, nor blessing, to the heart of the recipient.

Mr. Roaf has cut himself off from the fellowship of the Church, and sets at naught her authority; but let

him beware ere he "wrests Scripture to his destruction"—let him not put asunder what Almighty God has joined together in the Sacrament of Baptism, the "water and the Spirit." Let him not advise the recipients of, according to his teaching, a hollow and meaningless ordinance, to refuse to be rebaptized; that is to say,—that never having received "the washing of regeneration," they should be solemnly urged for evermore to decline this spiritual blessing.

Mr. Pyper is more consistent and intelligible. He, says, in effect—"Infants have not attained to a state to receive the blessings of Baptism. I can find no positive command in Scripture that they ever were baptized; and therefore, as it is not consistent with my reason that the grace of Baptism should descend on those who do not possess the qualifications which are necessary to its due reception, I will baptize none who cannot supply sufficient testimony of their ability to repent, and of their wish to believe." Now, although we know that Mr. Pyper's views are erroneous, and carry with them fearful consequences, still they are intelligible and distinct, which is much more than we can say of his opponent's.

Leaving Mr. Roaf to reconcile two most contradictory positions—1st, that infants were baptized, and have the right to be so; and, secondly, that from the absence of personal piety they can derive no positive blessing from Baptism,—we proceed to make a few other observations on other parts of his pamphlet. In passing, we observe that he has mutilated a text of Scripture, and as we have in the effusions of other dissenting writers seen the same passage misquoted, we take the liberty of stating that such conduct, though consistent enough with Dissenters' tactics, is both dishonest and unfair: there is, so far as we can discover, no such text as "he that believeth shall be saved; and he that believeth not shall be damned."

In regard to that portion of the first discourse which treats of the "Import of Baptism when applied to children," there are some passages addressed to parents which, it strikes us, could have been as properly and appropriately made on any other occasion, for we fail to recognize here, as elsewhere, what meaning is attached, by Mr. Roaf, to the Sacrament, or what benefit the recipient derives from its observance. The advantages, as we understand Mr. Roaf's meaning, seem rather to belong to the parent than the child, and these arise out of the opportunity which is afforded to the Minister of offering counsel and advice in regard to the education and training of children, with a view to their conversion taking place, on a future occasion, either "in infancy or childhood."

We have little to say of the second discourse: it is, we think, frivolous and indiscreet. We are satisfied to leave the question of Sprinkling or Immersion as the Church has left it in the Rubrics of the Baptismal Service, in which the mode of applying the water is left to the pleasure of the parents, the injunction of the Church leaning rather to the practice of dipping than of sprinkling. However, the testimony of the Church, as contained in her formularies, is not likely to receive much attention from either Messrs Roaf or Pyper; but as an evidence of Biblical criticism, it will be respected, notwithstanding the tone of defiant pedantry in which these gentlemen maintain their peculiar errors.

Mr. Pyper's animadversions will receive some attention on a future occasion.

ERASMUS OLDSTYLE.

To the Editor of The Church.

MR. EDITOR.—If you have no objection, I will kindly insert the few following remarks in your next number: I am, Sir, a member of the Church of England, and generally a somewhat careful observer of the mode in which the Constitution and Rubrics of our Church are carried out in places where I chance to be: It seems evident that these are not sufficiently regarded in this city; inasmuch as the "Solemnization of Matrimony" is allowed to be performed in private houses at the desire of the parties to be married, and, as it would seem, with little or no scruple on the part of the minister called on to officiate. This irregularity I regard as a matter much to be regretted, as unworthy the sacred character of this divine Institution, as manifesting disregard for the authority of the Church, and tending to diminish the solemnity due to religious observances. The Church has provided a Form; solemn, instructive, and agreeable to the usage of primitive Christians. She therein shows to her children now about to enter into this state, and to all others present on the occasion, the nature object, and requirements of it. She seeks to impress them with its sacred importance, by reminding them, that "therein is signified and represented the spiritual marriage and unity betwixt Christ and His Church." Surely then the place for the celebration of so solemn and sacred an ordinance cannot be a matter of indifference; nor can any spot be so well adapted to such an occasion, as within the Sanctuary of the Lord! And again, our Church, with her usual wisdom and discretion, has in her Rubrics enjoined, that "at the day and time appointed" for Solemnization of Matrimony, the persons to be married shall come into the body of the Church with their friends and neighbours, &c. And that any who might enjoy so great a privilege should willingly deprive themselves of the same is to me a matter of surprise. But more especially is the Rubric above quoted binding on the officiating Minister. His Ordination Vows, ever and anon recurring to his mind and memory assure him of the truth of this assertion. It is his duty, not only to discourage at all times any deviation from the Church's rules and institutions, but to manifest in himself an uncompromising adherence to the same. Let us not plead in justification of the unbecoming practice above mentioned, the custom of former years. The same we may suppose to have been tolerated on account of the mere partial establishment of the Church, the absence of Bishops, the consequently lax state of discipline in ecclesiastical affairs; and when the Churches were few and far between." But in the present day "such things ought not be" in Toronto, a city of so much importance, and enjoying so many and great advantages. Let us hope then that the Bishop may ere long exercise his authority in this as in other matters, and remedy an evil evidently injurious to the interests of our established Church.

I am, Mr. Editor, yours respectfully.

OBSERVER.

To the Editor of The Church.

Toronto, February 18, 1851.

DEAR SIR—The *Christian* (?) *GUARDIAN* in its last issue proposes that a public meeting should be called and measures adopted to prevent the officers of the Toronto General Dispensary from carrying on the business of that institution because the different Dissenting bodies have not each got a representative in the Managing Committee.

By way of carrying out the hint the *Guardian* has dropped, we would suggest that the Editors of the

Guardian and *Globe* be deputed to wait upon the members of all denominations—the Church excepted—resident in the city, for the purpose of obtaining signatures to the following

PETITION to the Worshipful the Mayor and Corporation of the City of Toronto:

WHEREAS an Institution called the Toronto General Dispensary has been established in the City of Toronto for the relief of the sick of all denominations:

AND WHEREAS the members of all denominations bear to the members of the Church, who have supported this Institution during past years, the proportion of ONE to SIX:

AND WHEREAS the Managing Committee of this institution consisting of only 13 gentlemen do not represent all denominations:

NOW your PETITIONERS MOST HUMBLY PRAY that your worshipful body would be pleased to order the names of two of the members of the present Committee to be struck off and those of the Editor of the *Christian Guardian* and *Globe* in their OFFICIAL CAPACITY to be inserted in their place, as representatives of all denominations, or if most agreeable to all parties not concerned, the Committee be increased to 200 of whom 170 shall be selected from members of the Church and the remaining 30 from thirty of the principal denominations according to the proportion they have respectively paid towards the support of the Institution:

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

SYNTAX.

ARRIVAL OF THE "AFRICA."

SAFETY OF THE ATLANTIC.

New York, Feb. 17.

The steamer *Atlantic* arrived at Cork, on the 22nd January. She broke both her shafts, when nine days out, and ran to the westward six days, and had to put into Cork. She has chartered the *Cambria* to bring her freight; the *Cambria* was to sail for New York on the 4th February. It is thought that it will take three months to repair the damage to the *Atlantic's* machinery. Her mails have arrived here by the *Africa*, and also the passengers. The *Atlantic* experienced very severe weather. She broke the shafts of both engines during a hurricane, and the paddle boxes being both carried away, she was totally disabled. After six days' beating westward, she finally put back, and reached Cork, on the 22nd ultimo, p. m. The vessel sustained no damage beyond that above stated. Crew and passengers all well. A card was published at Cork by the passengers, bearing high testimony to the great strength and power of the ship, in contending for nine days against an almost unparalleled western gale, and to her admirable conduct under sail, in returning 1800 miles. They accorded high praise to Captain West, for his great exertions, to his first officer, Mr. Sharpland, and also to the chief engineer, The *Cambria* left Liverpool for Cork on the 27th ult., and was to leave that port on the 4th instant, with nothing but the cargo of the *Atlantic*.

A FORTNIGHT LATER FROM EUROPE.

THE QUEEN'S SPEECH.

The steamship *Africa* arrived at New York on Saturday night, at ten o'clock, with dates from Liverpool to the 1st instant.

Intelligence from London, under date January 31st, communicates the following as the substance of the Royal Speech, to be delivered on the opening of the Imperial Parliament:—

Her Majesty will announce that she receives the most friendly assurances from foreign powers, and is gratified to know that peace has been restored in those states in the north of Europe, so lately, either engaged in war or preparing for hostilities. The Queen then congratulates the members of both Houses on the tranquility which prevails, not only at home, but in our foreign possessions and colonies. The people are contented. The revenue is in excess of expenditure. Her Majesty regrets that in some counties agriculture is rather depressed, but she trusts that the depression will be only temporary. Since Parliament last met, the Queen regrets that considerable excitement has been naturally occasioned by an aggressive proceeding on the part of the head of the Roman Catholic Church, who had, without seeking or obtaining permission to do so, bestowed territorial titles on the ecclesiastics and distributed the country into dioceses. The state of the laws on this matter being somewhat uncertain, the Queen recommends to the Parliament immediate attention to the subject, with a view to having a declaratory act, defining and amending the law if necessary; but whilst indicating Her Majesty's prerogative, they will take care not to infringe upon those great principles of religious liberty, the recognition of which is the boast of the empire. Her Majesty next recommends a thorough reform of the Equity Courts, and the introduction of an act for the registration of deeds, to be equally applicable to England, Ireland and Scotland. Her Majesty then directs attention to the trade with Brazil, and suggests the desirableness of arranging the sugar trade, &c., with that country.

The chief nations in Europe are preparing to send their productions to the World's Exhibition.

The propeller *City of Glasgow*, arrived out from Philadelphia on the 30th ult.

The weather on the British coast has been very stormy. Many vessels were obliged to put back.

It is said that ministers have a plan for relieving agriculture, but it will not be matured until the Chancellor of the Exchequer sees what kind of financial statement he can make.

TORONTO MARKETS.

Toronto, Feb. 19, 1851.

Fall Wheat, per 60 lbs.	3 9	a	4 0
Spring do. do.	3 3	a	3 7
Oats, per 34 lbs.	1 6	a	1 9
Barley, per 48 lbs.	2 10	a	3 2
Pens.	2 3	a	2 6
Rye	2 4	a	2 6
Flour, superfine (in Barrels)	21 3	a	0 0
Do. fine (in Bags)	20 0	a	0 0
Market Flour, (in Barrels)	17 6	a	15 9
Do. (in Bags)	16 3	a	16 3
Oatmeal, per barrel	15 0	a	18 6
Beet, per lb.	15 0	a	20 4
Do. per 100 lbs.	0 2	a	0 4
Pork per lb.	18 9	a	25 0
Do. per 100 lbs.	0 2	a	0 4
Mutton per lb.	25 0	a	27 6
Bacon	30 0	a	32 6
Hams, per cwt.	2 3	a	2 6
Potatoes, per bushel	0 9	a	1 0
Butter, fresh, per lb.	0 6	a	0 7
Do. salt, do.	0 3	a	0 5
Cheese, per lb.	1 6	a	2 0
Fowls	25 0	a	36 0
Straw	45 0	a	75 0
Hay	14 0	a	16 0
Fire Wood per cord	0 4	a	0 5
Bread	32 6	a	35 6
Coals per ton			