

OUR CONTRIBUTORS.

LETTER FROM DR. FRASER.

MR. EDITOR.—Since writing you on the 10th inst., I have lighted on a very clear and concise statement of the "results" of the Conference held at Shanghai in May, and of which I wrote you in my last. It is from the pen of the Rev. Dr. Williamson, agent in China of the United Presbyterian Church, and of the Scottish National Bible Society, and is so full of useful information that I forward you a copy of it at once. If you have already a better account before this reaches you, this will do for the waste paper basket. Dr. Williamson's letter dates at Shanghai, 30th May, 1877, and is as follows:

"The Conference has been most fruitful in its results, not only in the information communicated to so many, and the blessed brotherly feeling begotten, and strengthened where it before existed, but in actual fruit.

First of all, five most important resolutions have been unanimously agreed to in reference to division of a field of labour, embracing united action in carrying on schools of all kinds, and seminaries for students.

Second, the leading representatives of the five great Presbyterian denominations have unanimously resolved to recommend the institution of ONE Presbyterian Church in China, i.e., 1, North American Presbyterian; 2nd, Southern States American Presbyterian; 3rd, Dutch Reform; 4th, the English Presbyterian; 5th the Scotch United Presbyterians.

Third, the advocates of the Shang-ti term for God have agreed, with one exception, and another not quite pronounced, not to use Shangti for false gods, and instead thereof to use Shin and other words. This is a mighty step in the right direction, and it was wonderful to find able missionaries from widely different parts, and who had never conversed on the subject, all of the same mind. There is also a widely prevalent feeling among all parties to acknowledge each others terms, so that I feel certain the root of this controversy has been killed, and that it will now die of inanition.

Fourth. Two series of school books—one primary and one advanced—have been resolved on, and a committee of five appointed to carry it out. The committee has met twice and the series is as follows: A First, Second, and Third Reader; a series of object lessons; 1st, arithmetic, algebra, geometry, trigonometry, surveying, natural philosophy, and astronomy; 2nd, mineralogy, chemistry, botany, zoology, anatomy, and physiology; 3rd, geology, physical geography, political and descriptive geography, and a set of school room maps in Chinese character; 4th, epitome of ancient history, epitome of modern history, history of China, England, and United States of America; 5th, mental philosophy, moral science, political economy; 5th, vocal and instrumental music, and drawing.

Fifth. A standing committee has been appointed to take charge of the publications of the missionaries, and see that they are circulated in the various missions, etc., etc. This committee will thus always be able to tell what has been done, what works are in preparation; and also it will be in a position to test the value of the publications as they issue from the press. The committee is formed of one missionary from each of the provinces at present occupied.

Sixth. A philological committee has been appointed to endeavour to secure uniformity in the rendering of Chinese sounds by English letters.

Seventh. A large committee was appointed to draw up an appeal to the whole of Christendom for more labourers. This has already been furnished and will be printed immediately.

Eighth. The conference also named four missionaries to draw up a paper in Chinese for the whole empire, stating our faith, our objects, and the beneficent character of Christianity, our relations to our converts, their relation to the State, and other particulars, that we may disabuse the minds of the nation, *literati*, government officials, etc., etc., of their false notions, and thus set ourselves right with this people.

There are other resolutions in reference to the opium traffic and other matters, but the above were the chief objects towards which steps were taken, which could never have been accomplished without face to face consultation and conference.

Hoping these things may be of as much interest to many of your readers as they are to us here, I am, yours sincerely,

Tamsui, Sept. 26th, 1877.

J. B. FRASER.

AT THE LORD'S TABLE.

Why am I here to-day? I cannot tell;
My fearful soul said, Nay, it is not well,
Stay yet awhile, you are not quite prepared
With saints to sit at Table of the Lord.

Long did I wait—was oft in supplication;
Of better life in hopeful expectation.
Mornings and evenings came and passed away,
Leaving no sign until my hair was gray.

I've fooled my time away I and now, awake
To a long life of error—dread mistake!
Darkness, thick darkness did enshroud my eyes,
Although the sun illumined all the skies.

The sun I could not see—the Son of God;
The cause was simple—I had lost the road.
Would not behold with faith's all-seeing eye
The lovely truth—that one for all must die!

Nothing being left for human souls to do
But scan the past in wonder, and review;
And trust with rock-like faith God's simple plan,
That Christ alone was sent to die for man.

This is the reason why I'm here to-day
That Saviour's last commandment to obey;
In hopeful faith I wait the promise given,
Sup with me on the earth, and sup with me in heaven!
Montreal. W. M.

REVIEW OF ARCHBISHOP LYNCH'S CONTROVERSIAL WORK.*

To the list of books on the Protestant-Popish controversy—already one of goodly length—His Grace the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Toronto has lately added another. "A wee bit buikie," is what a Scotchman would term that part of it which can be seen and handled. But, as Dr. Watts very justly says, a man should be judged by his mind, not by his body, so a book should be treated in like manner. Well then, let us look at what is in the Archbishop's. Perhaps we shall find it an instance of much in little, "gude gear put up in a sma' bundle," as the Scotch say, a sort of Liebig's Extract of Beef. Alas! such pleasing hopes are not realized here. The soul is of little stature, as well as the body. I have read of grave and learned doctors in the Middle Ages, discussing this very important question, "How many angels can dance on the point of a needle?" Well a goodly number of the size of the soul of the book under review, would find a spacious floor on a needle's point, and could chase each other through the eye with greater ease than a circus actor can go through a hoop. Now for proof thereof.

Let us first glance for a moment at the literary qualities of His Grace's "little book." From several passages it is plain that he is not infallible in his English composition. "Homer sometimes nods." For example, the Dedication, page vi, "its friends or enemies," should be, "its friends or its enemies." On the next page, he says, "We considered it due to truth and honor to explain, 1st, what was *not* the faith of Catholics; and 2nd, what they do actually believe." Here, the verbs "was" and "do" should be either "was" and "did," or "is" and "do." It would be more elegant if "1st" and "2nd" were expressed as nearly as possible in the very same words. Again, he says, "Many bear false witness (we hope unwittingly) to the faith and practices of the Catholic Church." For "to" read "against." Once more he says, "We put the questions and objections concerning the Catholic Church as nearly as we could recollect, in the very words used by our Protestant interrogators." The word "could" in this sentence, should be "can." In the "Answers," page 1, he says, "Faith is to believe that which we cannot understand, relying on the authority of God who reveals it." According to this, a noun (*faith*) is a verb (*to believe*). To use a common phrase, "Well now, I declare! Did you ever?" John Joseph Lynch, you should be ashamed of yourself for having expressed yourself in such a clumsy manner. My friend, many a school-master, "all of the olden time," if he had you under his charge, would make you do penance therefor. He would be very apt to make you doff the archbishop's mitre, and don the dunce's

*Questions and Objections concerning Catholic Doctrine and Practices; answered by John Joseph Lynch, Archbishop of Toronto. Toronto: W. Warwick. Wellington Street. 1877.

cap. On page 15, he says, "The Kingdom of England differs from that of the United States." One always learning. It will startle many when they hear that the people of the United States are living under a monarchy. "His majesty King, Hayes I." Well that does sound strange. The statement of the learned prelate regarding the great country beside us, may well make Brother Jonathan pause in the midst of his whittling, arch his eyebrows to their utmost, and give, first a long sigh, and then a long whistle. On page 17, he says, "All those who live and die protesting against the truths revealed by our Lord, * * * and who live disobeying His commandments, are lost." Why does he not put in "and die" before the word "disobeying"? On page 51, he says, "If the priest knowingly pronounces absolution." On page 55, he says, "If a man be forgiven." His Grace is, therefore, not very careful about his subjunctions. Other instances of faulty composition could be given, but let the foregoing suffice. Some may think that I am too severe on the writer. But an archbishop is no common man. What comes from his pen should, therefore, be "A. No 1."

Let us now turn to what is of more importance. Let us begin with the dedication. It is like the wood spoken of in 1 Samuel, xiv. 25-26, in which the honey dropped. It is addressed to "Our Protestant Friends." The writer calls them "My dear friends." He speaks of his "kindly feelings towards persons of all denominations." He says, "We acknowledge that the precept of loving our neighbour as ourselves, extends beyond our relations and church associates—Christ has made no distinction, neither should we—all mankind are our brethren. Trusting to a reciprocal feeling on the part of our Protestant friends, we dedicate to them this little work, as a testimony of our good will and interest in them." All this is very pleasant, but is it the language of sincerity? "Aye, there's the rub." It may be, but we have great reason to bless the Lord that in our land Popery has not the power which she once had. His Grace knows very well that, according to her teachings, no faith should be kept with Protestants, and that they deserve nothing but death, and are to be tolerated only when they cannot safely be meddled with. She never changes, as he says himself in his work. If his professions of love to Protestants be sincere, he is not a good son of his Church. If he be, they are only a piece of hypocrisy. The best way to prove his sincerity would be to give him full power. It is better however, to let well enough alone—"prevention is better than cure." If a caged tiger puts out his paw to me, I am quite willing to shake it, provided I am sure that his claws are clipped, and the bars are strong enough to keep him in. There is a well known song which begins with the words,

"Will you walk into my parlour?
Said the spider to the fly."

His Grace says that the Catholic Church (Roman) "is acknowledged by all to be the first." Statements of the same kind he makes in other passages. The coolness with which he does so, is fitted to be most refreshing to an intelligent reader on a summer's day, when the thermometer is 100 or more in the shade. If the Romish Church be the first, she must be in accordance with the word of God. But any candid person who tries her by that standard, will very soon see that there is a wide difference between the two. When the Archbishop makes such statements as those referred to, he is either very ignorant, or he utters a lie.

Further, he says, "Would you not like as a just man, before pronouncing judgment, to give fair play, and hear the other side of the question?" This is most excellent. Nothing could be more reasonable. Now, the Protestants are a very large body. Among them there are—to say the least—as learned and as good men as there are among Romanists. This is not a proof that their doctrines are true, but it is a reason why Romanists should examine them with respect. But will His Grace give the same counsel to members of his Church regarding Protestantism that he here gives Protestants regarding Romanism? Aha! "The case is altered, quoth Plowden." To his own people he says, "you have no right to think for yourselves. I think for you. You have just to believe and do what I say to you." Of course, this plan would not succeed with Protestants, so he takes another with them.

Here, I shall pause for the present. In another paper, I shall begin a review of the work itself.

Metis, Que.

T. F.