

against a mania," yet it is worth while to make the attempt, when that mania is, as in this instance, of a kind not at all divorced from responsibility, however much it may be utterly unconnected with reason.

PRINCIPAL GRANT AT THE PAN-PRESBYTERIAN COUNCIL.

[We lose not a single moment in making room for the following communication. It was with some hesitation that we inserted the letter of "Philaethes," but as it was from a very excellent minister of the Church, and indicated a kind of uneasiness expressed to us by others, we felt that upon the whole it was better to give it a place in our columns and have the matter settled at once and for all. Nor can we, with all our respect for a "A Lover of Truth," say that the "violence" of language rests particularly with the correspondent whose paper is here criticized. So far as we have been able to understand "Philaethes," his language is moderate and very far from disrespectful to Dr. Grant. He quotes, more in sorrow than anger, what he and others believed that Dr. Grant said, and draws from the language thus thought to have been used certain evident and unassailable conclusions; but he at the same time adds that he would be profoundly thankful if Dr. Grant should repudiate or even modify both the sentence and the sentiment. Some will more than doubt if the version given by "A Lover of Truth" either shakes the logic of "Philaethes" or improves the position of Dr. Grant. But we very willingly leave the matter as it stands, while most gravely convinced that such a question comes fairly within the scope of a "religious family paper," because a small amount of explanation can sometimes obviate much misapprehension and remove a great deal of uneasy anxiety. We have not thought it desirable to modify any of the language in the letter of "A Lover of Truth," for we have no doubt that it was not meant to be "violent." But it does look somewhat grimly whimsical as a homily on Christian moderation and mildness all the same. If some friends could only see what we *don't* publish they would perhaps find still greater reason for both astonishment and anxiety, and would thank us all the more.—ED. C. P.]

MR. EDITOR, Anonymous writing on public questions has its advantages, and no one could complain of it so long as personalities are avoided. But when an attack, and a violent attack, is made upon a Christian brother by name, the writer should have the courage to sign his own name like a man, or else, as would probably be far better, let it alone! And I think that letters not complying with a rule so obviously right should not be admitted into a Christian family paper.

The preposterously violent language used by your correspondent, "Philaethes," in his *anonymous* attack on the Rev. Principal Grant should be sufficient in itself for any thoughtful reader. But as there are many who will swallow any amount of misrepresentation, if it be only vehement enough and directed against a good and able man, I think it is worth while to expose the misrepresentation, which is inexcusable in any one who professes to have been *present* at the discussion he undertakes to relate. Instead of giving his people *his own impressions* of the debate, he simply quotes *verbatim* from the very inadequate report of a Philadelphia daily paper! Now every one who knows anything about newspaper reporting, knows how little reliance is to be placed on ordinary newspaper reports in matters requiring special mental training and delicate discrimination. If your correspondent has to fall back on the "Philadelphia Press" for an account of a discussion in which he appears to have been so deeply interested, he might as well have stayed at home, and he might much better have let other people alone.

Now, I happened to be an attentive listener to the discussion in question, and I unhesitatingly assert, and am sure Principal Grant would bear me out in asserting, that the sentence quoted by your correspondent *was not uttered by Principal Grant as it stands*. It is simply the reporter's attempt to condense two or three rapidly spoken sentences into one, and, taken by itself, it does not fairly represent his position. It was *not* uttered "in the face" of anything said about the "duty of the Church to exercise discipline," for it referred, not to *the Church* at all, but to the *individual minister*. It had been said by a representative of a "strictly constructionist" branch of Presbyterians, that whenever a minister found him-

self out of accord with the written formularies of his Church, it was his duty to walk out. Principal Grant, on the other hand, maintained that the living Church of God is at all times the pillar and ground of the truth, that it is she who must be the judge as to what deviations she can or cannot tolerate from her written standards; that a true minister's ordination vows are taken *primarily* to the Great Head of the Church; that so long as he feels himself faithful to these it is his duty to remain at his post until *the Church herself* shall refuse to endorse him any longer as one of her teachers. I do not profess to give one sentence *verbatim*, but I am sure that if Principal Grant shall read this abstract of his position, he will recognize its correctness. But had your correspondent put it thus, in its true light, he would have had no pretext for his declamatory tirade, for it is a position to which I think no reasonable Christian man could take exception. And "in the face" of your correspondent's assertion to the contrary, the burst of applause which followed the close of Principal Grant's brief and stirring speech shewed that he "carried to a remarkable extent the sympathies of the brilliant assembly that listened to" it.

I think your correspondent has acted very unwisely in introducing into your columns any controversy regarding the discussions at the late Council. There exists among the readers of your paper quite as wide a divergence of opinion regarding some unessential matters as there existed in the Council; but why, in the name of all that is Christian, should we waste time and excite irritation by wrangling over them in print? These Presbyterian Councils are instituted for the express purpose of free and open conference, and for the frank expression of different opinions on all subjects affecting the welfare of our Church, and the assembled wisdom of such Councils may be safely left to take care of their own discussions. There were other Canadian delegates to some of whose remarks others of us might be inclined to take serious exception, particularly where very gratuitous criticism of brethren was indulged in without much respect to good taste or Christian courtesy. But the columns of a Christian family newspaper should be occupied with matters more practical and more profitable, matters on which we all profess to agree, but in which we do not all act up to our professions. With a sceptical world watching to say, "See how these Christians *hate* one another," and a heathen world waiting for the manifestation of a more Christ-like spirit in Christ's Church. I do not envy the man who can spend time or strength in denouncing a noble and devoted Christian brother on the ground of a newspaper report, the correctness of which he could so easily have verified by private inquiry before committing himself to a public attack, and I hope, Mr. Editor, that you will *shut down* on all controversy which has not an immediate practical bearing on our Christian work. But, after your correspondent's attack, I think it is but bare justice to say, on behalf of a large proportion of the intelligent Christian *laity* of our Church, for whom I speak more especially, and without disparagement to other able delegates, that we rejoiced that, at the late Council, our Church was so worthily represented by a man so fully combining evangelical earnestness with enlightened Christian liberality, as does Principal Grant—a man who could fearlessly denounce as idolatrous all *untrue bondage* to traditional forms and formularies, however venerable, and who so ably vindicated one of the principles most distinctly laid down in our standards, that "the Word of God which is contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments is the *only* rule to direct us how we may glorify God and enjoy Him forever." Yours (in plain English),

[A LOVER OF TRUTH.

Dec. 6, 1880.

THE Foreign Mission Board (Eastern Division) met at New Glasgow on the 23rd ult. After mature deliberation the Rev. J. W. Macleod was appointed as the fourth missionary to Trinidad. Mr. Macleod will be ordained by the Presbytery of Halifax, and will probably proceed to his field of labour in a few weeks. Of his fitness for the work to which he has been called there is every reason to feel confident. He is an excellent student, an acceptable preacher, a very industrious worker. The Church will follow him with earnest prayer and cordial support. The Trinidad mission is becoming increasingly important, and Mr. Macleod's appointment will serve to strengthen and encourage those who are already in the field.

BOOKS AND MAGAZINES.

CASSELL'S FAMILY MAGAZINE for November. (Toronto: J. P. Clougher.)—We have often spoken of this magazine, and in language of strong but deserved commendation. The present number is quite on a par with those which have preceded it. Indeed, all Cassell's publications are of an exceedingly attractive character, and all such that they can with safety be introduced into the family circle. We cannot too strongly express our earnest desire for their ever widening circulation. Inferior injurious publications will never be driven out of circulation by mere denunciation. They must be supplanted by others, of a higher and more attractive description. We are astonished that in so many families not at all pinched by poverty so little provision is made for the children in the way of having them supplied with healthy and attractive reading. Parents are heard continually mourning over the fact that their young people are "continually going out." How can they expect anything else? They don't make home attractive. A few dollars a year on such periodicals as this are grudged, and home life is made as dull as it well can be. It is an awful mistake.

PRINCETON REVIEW for November. (New York: 37 Park Row. London, Ont.: Rev. Andrew Kennedy.)—The "Princeton" still holds on its way in this its 56th year, with, we think, all its old vigour and effectiveness. Nobody would even expect that every statement in such a publication would meet with its ready and absolute endorsement, but upon the whole, most of our readers will be inclined to think that the general tone and drift of the "Princeton" are still of the right character and in the right direction. There are some articles in the present number, all very well worthy of a careful perusal. The "Sabbath Question" is discussed very ably by President Seelye of Amherst College. Principal Dawson of Montreal, comes out on his favourite subject, "The Antiquity of Man and the Origin of Species." Professor Fisher of Yale College, dwells upon the "Historical Proofs of Christianity," and President McCosh has a paper on "Criteria of the Various Kinds of Truth." We should think that in the absence of any native publication of the kind, the "Princeton" ought to have a very considerable circulation in Canada, where there is an ever increasing class of people who could appreciate and profit by the discussions found in its pages. The Rev. Andrew Kennedy, London, Ont., still, as for a long time past, continues to act as agent for this and other publications in the western part of Canada.

IMMERSION PROVED TO BE NOT A SCRIPTURAL MODE OF BAPTISM BUT A ROMISH INVENTION, etc. By Rev. W. A. McKay, B.A., Woodstock. Second edition, revised and enlarged, with a "Reviewer Reviewed." (Toronto: C. B. Robinson, 5 Jordan street.)—We are glad to see that Mr. McKay's pamphlet which we noticed some time ago has been in such demand as to warrant the issue of a new and enlarged edition. It certainly "carries the war into Africa," and with a good deal of vigour and plainness of speech. We hope to see this edition also go off very rapidly. We quite sympathize with Mr. McKay in his introductory statement that "Christian baptism in its nature, design, mode, and subjects, does not receive the attention in our Presbyterian pulpits that its importance demands, especially in view of another fact that our people are being constantly assailed as to the scriptural warrant of our practice." It would of course be exceedingly undesirable for our ministers to dwell so much on the subject as Baptists do, but a little more teaching and discussion on the point would be opportune and profitable in no ordinary degree. Many find themselves in perplexity when they come into discussion with Baptist neighbours and acquaintances, and there is no need that they should be. The literature on the subject is both large and varied, but very many have not access to much of this, and these will find the prominent points in the controversy over both the mode and subjects of baptism put very clearly and very pithily in Mr. McKay's vigorous and timely pamphlet.

A CORRESPONDENT writes us to say in reference to a dissent taken in the London Presbytery with reference to the call from Delaware, that the reason was "that Delaware congregation furnished no guarantee of stipend."