

sprinkling a baby, the consideration would appear to suggest an economical and a more effectual mode of reaching "China's millions," India's millions, etc., than has hitherto been adopted. We think that the warm-hearted Queen City of the West would cheerfully furnish these two renegade Methodists with a hose and all needful appliances wherewith to sprinkle China's millions, and thus reduce their theories to practice, and at the same time themselves "make room for better men."

This would-be teacher endeavoured to make some capital out of the Apostle Peter's declaration that—"the promise was to Israel and to their children," as if this expression did not relate to descendants; he cited Alford as an authority in regard to the Greek word for children, and was probably unaware that the late Dean's "usual carelessness and inaccuracy" is a fact well known on the other side the world. This gentleman is likewise unlikely to know that there is no record throughout the history of the first two centuries, of the baptism of a single infant; it was not, according to the late Dean Stanley, till three hundred years had rolled by, that we hear of the baptism of a baby. The Methodism of this ritualist cropped out as he informed us that "conversion is largely our own act;" he acknowledged that such a change is needed, because notwithstanding the alleged value of what he styles *baptism*, "baptismal grace will die out, and go for nothing;" it will be well that he should make this known among the millions of China, when he operates with the hose, otherwise there might be danger of their overestimating the value of the operation.

Such proceedings as those of these two gentlemen, while they teem with the elements of the ludicrous, are not the less to be deeply deplored inasmuch as they tend to obscure all that is sublime in connection with Christianity, and to bring it into contempt amongst such persons as assume that it is adequately represented by men of the stamp of Messrs. Lewis and McCarrol.

PERSONAL ANIMOSITY.

We read, on indisputable authority of one who "was a murderer from the beginning," and further that the same person "is a liar, and the father of it;" we cannot be said to entertain any personal animosity towards this gentleman, for we have not so much as seen him; is it necessary to observe that we are not in sympathy with *his character*? This gentleman is said to be the patron saint of lawyers, *i. e.*, of all lawyers except Messrs. Bigelow and Heighington, the gentlemen who respectively advocated the cause of the defendant, in the recent case of HUNTER *vs.* EDWARDS; that he is the patron of *the Archangel Michael*, there will be no room for doubt, on the part of those who read the article on "The Catholic Apostolic Church," in No. 13 of the First Series of PULPIT CRITICISMS. It is sometimes observed that this gentleman is "not so black as he is painted," and we live in the hope that the same remark may apply to a certain rev. friend of his, who cherishes (or professes to cherish) the impression that the dye with which he has lately been tinged is of too dark a hue. That His Impalpable Majesty is too much of a gentleman to utilize the name of *Her Majesty* in order to summon the artist who delineates him, to a Police Court, we are well assured, and we trust that either experience, or policy may induce his