

Correspondence.

For the Christian Messenger.

Ottawa Correspondence.

THE SENATE CHAMBER.

The Senate Chamber of the Parliament Buildings at Ottawa, corresponds in size and shape with that of the Commons. The former occupies the west-centre, the latter the east. The main entrance of the Senate Chamber is from the southern end, whilst that of the Commons, is from the east. The Senate Chamber is upholstered with crimson colored carpets, hangings, &c., whilst the Commons Chamber is carpeted in dark blue, and since the former session, the walls have been tapestried with a dark green material. The effect is that the Senate Chamber has a light cheerful aspect, whilst the Commons room is exactly the reverse, it looks gloomy and heavy. The throne at the north end of the Senate Chamber is tastefully ornamented, heavily yet artistically draped, and in the recess, and beneath an imposing canopy, upon which are emblazoned the Royal Arms, stands the Royal Chair of State. A miserable caricature of a lion's head ornaments, if that is the word, disfigures, I should say, each arm of this vice-regal piece of furniture. In front of it, is a less gorgeously got up chair, occupied by the Speaker of the Senate. Whilst the Speaker of the Commons, therefore sits on the west side of that Chamber, the Speaker of the Senate sits at the north end of the Senate Chamber, and the Senators occupy seats on the right and left, gradually elevated from the main or centre space, tier behind tier in three parallel rows.

The seats of the Senators are richly covered, softly cushioned arm chairs, at easy distance one from the other, with each a desk in front. The ministers here, as in the Commons, sit upon the Speaker's right, although it would seem that the Senators occupy seats on his right and left without much, if any regard to their relation to the Government, as supporters, or opponents.

On the Speaker's right, and nearest the chair, sits the Honorable Mr. Hamilton of Kingston, one of the oldest Senators and the father, it is said, of the late Legislative Council of Canada. And a fine specimen he is of the material of which Senators should be made. This seat, it is supposed, is allotted to him, as a mark of respect and distinction for the reason just given. Next to him, and on his right, sits the Hon. A. Campbell, Post Master General and leader of the Government in the Senate. Next to him, sat the Hon. Ferguson Blair, whose chair is now occupied by the Hon. Mr. Kenny, Receiver General. The Hon. Peter Mitchell, the Minister of Marine, sits next, with the Hon. Mr. Chapais, Minister of Agriculture, on his right. The Hon. John Ross, Hon. Mr. Ryan, Mills Christie, and others sit lower down.

On the Speaker's left Hon. Mr. McCully sits first, and opposite Hon. Mr. Hamilton. Hon. Mr. Tessier, Bourinot, Crawford, Letillier St., Just and others in succession. Near the Bar, and within it upon the right, the Usher of the Black Rod sits, and has a desk also facing the Speaker.

In both Houses there is a heavy gold gilt mace, borne before the Speakers when they enter and when they leave. It is a large gilt staff with a full sized crown upon the top. The mace bearer attends and holds or rather steadies the mace erect, during prayers at the foot of the Clerk's table, and when the Speaker is in the chair it lies upon the table. When the House is in Committee it is removed, and placed upon a long stool provided for the purpose, beneath the table. This "bauble" is said to be of the value of a thousand pounds sterling, that perhaps is questionable. It is, however, one of many legacies of Canada Provincial, to Canada as a Dominion. Its history and object, may be ascertained by consulting the Antiquaries.

The Speakers of both Houses wear gowns and bands, and an old fashioned three cornered cap, of the schoolmen of "auld lang syne."

The Clerks sit at a table directly in front of the Speaker, as in the Commons, and the pages crouch about the Speaker's chairs in both Houses, sitting on the steps of the platform or elevation, whereon the Speakers chairs are placed.

In the House of Commons members address the Speaker, or Chairman, as the case may be. In the Upper House Senators do not address the Speaker or the chair, but the Senate collectively—as "Honorable Gentlemen," &c., &c.

The Speaker of the Commons, the Hon. Mr. Cockburn, as a gentleman every way qualified

for the high position he fills. His manner is all that could be desired—graceful, easy, winning, and so courteous withal. His voice is peculiarly soft and musical, and the House accepts his decisions without dissent or doubt. His duties in reference to Election disputes and scrutinies, are sometimes of the most delicate character, often demand the deepest research, and call for the wisest discrimination. Several cases of this kind have already occurred during the Session where high legal attainments are put into requisition, and I hear of no dissatisfaction expressed so far.

The Speaker of the Senate is the Hon. Joseph Cauchon, a Quebec journalist and lawyer. He is the Editor and Proprietor, as it is commonly reported, of the "Journal De-Quebec." As to how he acquired his present position, or how he fills it, or the use to which he puts his Quebec newspaper, in relation to Senators, I forbear to make a single remark. It is an obscure French journal of little or no influence even in Quebec.

SPECTATOR.

Ottawa, 9th April, 1868.

For the Christian Messenger.

"Chronicler" and his "critic" again.

DEAR BROTHER,—

My assailant has, in the *Witness* of March 14th, changed his tactics and resorted to 'defence,' and, beside increasing by one half the space before occupied, promises another letter in reply to my last. Were it not too late, I would refer him to the caution of Abab to the king of Syria: 'Let not him that girdeth on his harness boast himself as he that putteth it off.' I regret that his sense of honor and justice, as well as regard for his reputation would permit him without assigning any reason, to reverse the course suggested, by entering upon the argument before disposing of the 'charge.' Of course he is aware that this releases me from the obligation of replying till his next appears. But since that has been indefinitely postponed, and the errors of his 'defence' meanwhile remain uncorrected, I do not know that I am justified in longer waiting, especially since he has so materially added to the work already before him. Indeed, I find it difficult to account for such reckless increase except on the supposition that he does not expect his readers to see 'both sides,' for which his omission of the date of my last affords some additional evidence. In illustration of his indefensible statements and insecure positions, allow me to suggest a few inquiries, mainly personal, and in his order.

Having objected to my single mention of his name, how does he justify his frequent and incorrect use of mine? What are the 'other things' of which I have 'accused,' and wherein have I 'berated' the Congregationalists? To what dictionary does he apply for his definitions, and why does he, while so severe on misquotation persist in saying 'dogmas' where I say 'dogma'? Were I to imitate him, I would reply, 'doubtless to make way for what follows.' If he has not charged me with misstatement what has he done, and what constitutes a 'charge'? What instance of 'self eulogy' can he adduce. I will not say 'in connection with the principle referred to,' but in a single sentence of mine throughout this correspondence? Has his own self reproach nothing to do with this association? When did Paul 'refuse to contend for baptism,' and if ever, was it on any other ground than that suggested in my last? the dogma of infant church membership, and the substitution of pouring for baptism not having then been introduced? What evidence is there that any of my statements were 'pretences' and 'subterfuge,' or that I 'so interpreted' Scripture merely 'for the purpose of objecting'? Can he establish it that I have intentionally, or really—put words to his pen which he never wrote, or taken unfair 'advantage' by representing him as granting what it was not possible for me to believe he had admitted, and what I 'knew' could not really be concession? As I have been acting only on the defensive, where is the evidence that had there been Scripture in favor of my position I would have given it long ago? Has he authority for asserting that I 'refuse to follow the example of my Lord?' 'Charity thinketh no evil' and 'believeth all things,' in mildly representing him as 'at least exaggerating my misstatements,' did I really 'acknowledge' having made any? On the contrary, does not his belief that I 'will plead that this is misstatement,' and his unwillingness to 'depend upon it' indicate that he does not so regard it? And now, had his words been spoken in the heat of debate. I could have overlooked them, but when I remember how deliberately they have been written, I can excuse them only upon the plea that anything is admissible in self-defence.

While my friend introduces considerable new matter, much of which as usual has little bearing upon the discussion, he strongly omits some points still unsettled. For instance, the Scripture to authorize the baptism of infants, of which he has 'quite sufficient' and good, is not forth coming because 'there is no necessity.' In the circumstances one would suppose he would deem response a privilege, and is strongly reminded of his own language 'had there been Scripture testimony in favor of it he

would have given it long ago.' It is gratifying to notice that he has apparently yielded his remarkable argument from 1 John v. 8. The words in the original beside *baptizo* which 'describe the act of baptism' and the bearing of my admission on the interpretation of Rom. vi. he has also not yet favored us with. 'Want of space' probably is the reason.

Having premised thus much, let me now direct attention to his arguments. And first, he takes the position that in calling Pado-baptism a dogma without proving it to have 'no foundation in Scripture teaching,' I have merited 'the charge of having made misstatements, and consequently of being an unreliable chronicler of religious affairs.' Now had he not promised to write in 'explanation, proof, and confirmation' of the accusation in full, I might be led to the conclusion I have heard suggested, that this is the real charge, and all the rest but a rhetorical flourish 'by way of introduction.' But such a definition of misstatement amounts to about this:—generally, it is assertion without proof, in particular, representing one's belief and practice as unscriptural without convincing him of it. Now sir, I supposed the word must refer to facts, not opinions, much less to the main point at issue between two disputants and which while unsettled, would justify the one in hurling back the charge as vehemently as the other might urge it. And since my opponent has accused me of a number of things which he has not yet 'attempted' to prove, according to his own showing, and on his own plea, he stands convicted of the offence. But as he does not deem it very serious, probably the soft impeachment will not much disturb him.

I am pleased to find that my interpretation of Rom. xiv. is accepted. But the view now taken is that 'modes of baptism are matters of indifference.' On this point we are at issue, nor did I suppose that he could deliberately express such a belief, his position having been that 'believing' a mode 'right, makes it so to the parties so believing.' How it can be a matter of indifference when 'pouring upon' is the literal Christian meaning of the word *baptizo*; when 'the disciples doubtless affused the people when they baptized,' and this is 'Bible baptism,' and in accordance both with the 'command' and 'example' of Jesus; and when those who immerse—perhaps those who sprinkle,—refuse to follow the example of their Lord, is to me incomprehensible. Beside, if it be so, why so strenuously defend, and so much prefer his mode? But I have yet to learn that any positive command or institution can be a thing indifferent, and especially that Jesus has bidden all his disciples observe a certain rite which he has described by one intelligible and definite, not 'doubtful' word, and then permits them to follow the guidance of caprice, convenience, or mere human opinion. What! shall that be deemed a 'matter of indifference' to which our Lord submitted, respecting which he said, 'Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness,' to which His Spirit has ever since manifestly set the seal of approval, and which He has so closely connected with the promise of salvation; that to which the early disciples so universally and promptly conformed, and which symbolizes such important truths, and unspeakable blessings? Said Jehovah to Moses 'see that thou make all things according to the pattern shewed thee' and to us Jesus says, 'He that breaketh one of these least commandments, and teacheth men so, shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven.'

But my friend still clings to the absurdity, that though other modes are admirable, the Bible method is pouring. On this point he has made another attempt to 'answer me fairly.' Let us see how he has advanced this time. In plain English then, since but few of us understand French, he thinks it illogical to suppose that two distinct figures can correctly be applied to the same thing. Without dwelling here, permit me to direct attention to a brief extract on the first page of the C. M. of Feb. 26th, headed 'An argument tested.'

My friend thinks that in quoting him I designedly substituted 'baptism' for 'baptizing,' and thereby sought to strengthen my position. Now let me assure him, that until I read his article, I was entirely unconscious of the alteration, and further, that I cannot, nor do I think any one but himself can see how this change 'makes way for the citations that follow,' or why it was necessary for my illustrations to 'contain the active form of the verb *baptizo*.' All that I attempted was to show the difference between the figurative and literal uses of words, nor did I think of 'admitting that none of the passages quoted from 'throw light upon' the word *baptizo*. I simply said and proved that to apply to the figurative use of a word for its literal meaning, is to reverse things, and establish absurdities. Consequently he may yield, as soon as he pleases, the point he thinks he has gained respecting Rom. vi.

And now observe, he takes the position, that when an expression cannot be interpreted literally, it must be understood figuratively. Applying this to the case in hand, I 'affirm' that the Holy Spirit can neither be 'poured out' nor 'baptized with' literally, and I challenge him to prove the contrary, even though he can still see 'identity' between his own act and the Saviour's in baptizing. And the fact that in maintaining his position, he rejects the idea of the Spirit's personality, and represents Him as but an emanation or influence, is exceedingly significant. Respecting it I cannot do better than again apply to him his own language, 'look, brother, where you are stepping.' And let it be borne in mind that my being 'compelled to describe both acts by the same word' while *carious* words may be and are used even by him, is his 'proof of the identity.' But he suggests that 'active, transitive verbs' cannot be used figuratively when 'applied to

transitive action.' Now I am not sure that I fully comprehend his nice distinctions, not being conversant with his grammar any more than with his logic and 'dictionaries.' So far as I am aware however, there is not the slightest difficulty in the case and some of my illustrations were of just this nature. 'But lest I am mistaken, I will try my hand once more, confining myself to *Scripture*, and anxiously looking for more light. For instance, 'He breaketh me with breach upon breach. Though thou wash thee with nitre. I washed my steps with butter. I will wash my hands in innocence. Him that washed us from our sins. I will sprinkle clean water upon you.' Or, to use his word:—'Hast thou not poured me out as milk? He hath poured out His soul unto death.' Or returning to those of my last:—'Yet shall thou plunge me in the ditch. Let Asher dip his foot in oil. Lusts that drown men in perdition. If ye had not plowed with my beiter. I will sow her unto me in the earth.' He must also explain how my statement that a literal act may be figuratively described is denying that which the Scripture asserts. Surely he does not believe that figurative meanings must be contradictory to literal.

And now, to return once more to Matt. iii. let me remind him that to argue that 'the language of John's entire address is highly figurative' is not to 'declare that the entire address is so, but that this is its general tenor. To me, his prefacing the declaration respecting his own baptism, as recorded by three of the Evangelists, with the word 'indeed,' and our Lord exclaiming 'John truly baptized,' indicates a more literal use of language than occurs in the context. But admit that it does not, and that both baptisms are to be understood alike, has my friend forgotten that his argument turns upon a preposition which is translated in the 6th verse and also in Mark i. 9, 'in Jordan,' and in John iii. 23 'in Enon,' and which educated men of all denominations admit should be so translated here, as it is in many if not most versions in our own and other languages?

I observe that he again intimates that the translation 'He shall immerse you in the Holy Spirit and fire' is not 'true,' and 'would make the New Testament contradict itself.' Now were it not that he regards it 'cruel' to cite 'Pedobaptist authority,' I could bring an array of names which would compel respect, testifying that the baptism of the Spirit is 'a thorough immersion into His nature,' 'spiritual immersion,' 'immersion into the pure waters of the Holy Spirit,' a 'plunging into heavenly flame,' 'drowning all over and dipping into the ocean of His grace,' 'baptizing with the Holy Ghost indeed,—and that in the strict and proper sense of baptize, which signifies to dip, plunge, or put under, &c., &c.

And this suggests whether 'the washing of regeneration which He shed on us abundantly' of Titus iii., or the baptism by which the disciples 'were all filled with the Holy Spirit,' termed by these writers—and he has 'no objection to the words'—'an abundant pouring,' 'a copious' and 'a most plentiful effusion,' 'a very great communication,' &c., call it what you will, is fitly symbolized in the pouring of a handful of water on a babe. So the burial with Christ of Rom. vi., the baptism 'into Christ, His body, His death, in the cloud and in the sea,' the sufferings of Jesus, 'be like figure,' or any of the allusive usages of the word.

As to 'the house' being filled, I say nothing about 'the sensible manifestations of His presence.' Peter says, 'He hath shed forth this which ye hear,' and, though Mr. Duff uses the passage to support his views, he cannot admit that on the day of Pentecost there was a sufficient outpouring to fill the house. That would be granting entirely too much for his purpose, and making Bible baptism not at all difficult. His friends, however, are not so cautious, one saying 'the house was filled with the Holy Ghost so that the Apostles seemed to be plunged into it as into a fish-pool' and another, 'It [the sound] filled all the house. This is that which our Saviour calls baptizing with the Holy Ghost, so that they who sat in the house, were as if immersed.'

Respecting the baptism of fire, he remarks, 'John does not say Jesus shall baptize you with fire in addition to his baptizing with the Holy Ghost.' In reply, see Math. iii. 11, and Luke iii. 16. 'What does Mr. Duff mean? That a mixture is intended? But how does he respond to my repeated request for an instance of a literal baptism of fire? Why, in the first place, he insinuates that the fire must be understood figuratively.' But perceiving the inconsistency and untenableness of this, he says 'it is not necessary to mix up' things so. Then, not satisfied to leave it to others, he contributes the information that 'fire associated with Divine manifestation lacked consuming properties' and lastly, as the response, he cites the 'tongues sitting on the heads of the disciples at Pentecost.' This then being a baptism of fire, doubtless 'sitting upon' is baptism! And to my friend belongs the honor of discovering the fourth 'Scriptural mode,' destined, perhaps, to be proven the 'realist' of them all.

But again, his position is that genuine baptism is an application of the element to the subject, and that while 'the verb is active transitive' its true signification is affuse or pour, for the verb does not include the preposition. Surely the logical issue of all this can only be that Scriptural baptism requires the candidate to be poured and the water baptized!

And now, having occupied considerable space in illustrating, it must be a pleasing reflection that if his arguing has established anything, it is simply that the true way to discover 'the realist and fullest meaning' of such words as 'high priest, king, sacrifice and many others,' is, by studying them in 'their application to Jesus.' As he, in the capacity of a 'Baptizer' interprets His own word, so monarchs and priests must learn their position and duty by reference to Him in those offices. And as the illustration is not to be confined, of course this is the true way to learn, for instance, the meaning of shepherd and commander, or of witness and advocate, surety and judge. And since figures are not to be thought of, probably we have here a clue to the real Christian meaning of such words as bread, rock, door, star, vine, light; way, truth, life; lamb, child, lion.

Then, on the same 'principle' carried 'a little further,' we discover who and what 'Joshua' was, and the signification of his name,—why not apply it also to Adam and David?—by referring to the Jesus of the New Testament. So the word 'supper' gets its true definition in the Eucharist, and 'cross,' in our Saviour's.