

sion, our Mother Church, under the wise guidance of Dr. Inglis, directed its efforts chiefly to the training of the Hindoo youth to be the spiritual teachers of their countrymen; and this wise policy is now followed by every other Church that is laboring in India. Further proof on this point is surely unnecessary. It is true that many of those who oppose the project of a Hall would admit all that I have now said, while they would seek to evade the point of it by professing that Bursaries, or a Young Men's Scheme, would meet all our requirements. I ought to know something of such a scheme, and may, in another article, show the impossibility of continuing and extending it, or of depending mainly on it for ministers. It is essentially partial and one-sided; at the best it is uncertain, unsatisfactory, and full of risks. But as there is plenty of time before the next meeting of Synod, and as I do not like to take up too much space in any one *Record*, I shall defer the discussion of the subject for a month.

GEORGE M. GRANT.

*The Manse, Halifax, Oct., 1865.*

—o—  
Letter from Rev. Mr. Law.

HALIFAX, 19th Oct., 1865.

Dear Mr. Editor:

I hope I may be in time for the smallest possible nook in your November issue; if not, I trust you will consider this entitled to a place in your next. I observed, in your last, a communication, headed "The project of a Divinity Hall," signed "G. M. Grant," in which, to my surprise, I found my name dragged before your readers in a manner quite unwarrantable, and certainly in no very complimentary terms—I know not whether intentionally or not; but the passage to which I refer is certainly insulting,—and so much the worse for Mr. Grant, seeing that it is as certainly untrue, and, so far as I am aware, deliberately untrue, too, to all appearance. I will quote the passage. It runs thus: "True," says Mr. Grant, "we were a little hurried at the close of Saturday, but by whom? By Mr. Law, who again and again asked the Moderator to close that he might have a meeting of the Presbytery of Pictou, as Mr. Philip had induced him to leave the Court that afternoon to go with him to Truro."

I wish merely to say, with reference to the clause in italics, in our own behalf and that of Mr. Philip, that, to say the least of it, it is simply untrue: Mr. Grant knows whether or not it be a pure fabrication of his own. If it is—like Mr. Grant, in his reply to Mr. Philip, I might turn round to the readers of the *Record*, and, after his example, enquire, "What are we to think of Mr. Grant?"

Moreover, I observe that I am partly

blamed for hurrying on the discussions on the subject of the Theological Hall at the last meeting of Synod. I understand Mr. Grant, in effect, to say, that if there was any unwonted haste in the matter, the opponents of the scheme have themselves to blame. Now, although I agree with much of what Mr. Philip says in opposition to a Theological Hall, I do not entirely agree with Mr. Philip when he says of the scheme, that it was "slipt hurriedly through Court"; that is to say, if Mr. Philip meant to convey the idea that there was plotting in the business. I am not in a position to make any such charge. But Mr. Philip is certainly right when he says that the scheme was "suddenly disclosed at the eleventh hour," and "at the 'tag end of the session,'" and he is also right, I believe, in declaring that he and others were "altogether taken by surprise." These are neither more nor less than facts, and certainly they do look like as if they were the result of conspiracy; but, unless Mr. Philip happen to be acquainted with other facts, which are unknown to me, upon such imperfect evidence I would not consider him altogether justified in positively affirming that there had actually been plotting in connection with the scheme in question. The facts mentioned above do certainly furnish ground for suspicion, but for nothing more; and therefore, although Mr. Philip is in so far to be sympathized with, he is, at the same time, in the absence of all other evidence, deserving, in some measure, of censure.

I am disposed to lean more to the charitable side than Mr. Philip. I am willing to believe that there was no "plotting" whatever about the scheme in question.

The projectors of the "Hall," as seems to me, committed some serious errors, but, I believe, innocent ones—errors rather of the head than of the heart.

Candidly speaking: would it not have been an improvement, on the whole, if a question of such vast importance had been broached, let me say, at an earlier period of the session, and a little longer time, in consequence, devoted to its consideration? I know not, moreover, whether any serious violence had been offered, either to the spirit or the letter of Presbyterianism, if the brethren in general had got some timely notice beforehand—the slightest possible hint, let us say, that such a scheme was in contemplation, and that there was a likelihood of its being seriously discussed at the Synod.

It may be that "the project in question was brought before the Synod in precisely the same way as the Dalhousie overture had been brought up three years previously." This piece of information only serves to make matters worse instead of better. It only informs me that the same grave errors had been perpetrated in the case of Dalhousie College, as in the instance of "the projected Theological Hall." Both are questions of extraor-