

year was, for the French Professor \$1,600, and for the Board of French Students \$648. Montreal College has, besides the Hall bequest, an endowment capital of \$25,000, which yields over \$1,500 yearly. Its whole expenditure, as estimated in 1875, was \$8,000. It may be larger now; but yet, when the proper deductions are made, it will require little over one-third of the sixty-five cents per member for ordinary expenditure. The western Colleges will require at least as much for current expenses, after the proper deductions are made, in addition to the weighty sum of about one dollar per member, still due on the new Knox College building from its old constituency, which is about half the amount already paid. Unfortunately the colleges, both in the east and west, have large balances against them for current expenses of former years. To meet these, as well as to provide for the current expenses of the present year, will require, as I suppose, about thirty-five to forty-five cents per member, both in Ontario and Quebec. I have made these explanations to prevent injury being done by the communication which appeared in your paper of the 15th.

Toronto, 26 Dec., 1876. WM. GREGG.

#### Our Colleges and their Constituencies.

Editor BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN

In last week's "B. A. Presbyterian" a letter appears from Principal Snodgrass purporting to be an answer to my former communication on this subject. The letter does not affect one iota the position I took, nor does it refute a single one of the arguments I adduced.

(1.) As to the substitution of *or for and* in quoting the Resolution of the Assembly in the clause "those congregations west of the St. Lawrence and Ottawa Railway shall contribute towards the support of Queen's College and Knox College." That this was either a printer's mistake or a clerical error in transcribing and not intended to mislead, is evident to the most cursory reader of my former contribution, because I there explicitly stated that Queen's and Knox, as to territory, had "had their fortunes linked together," and "a common fund originated" for their support.

(2.) As to the remarks made by Dr. Snodgrass concerning the congregations "on the Line" of the St. Lawrence and Ottawa Railway, including those in the city of Ottawa, the fact still remains—Ottawa is on that Line.

Were a visitor to Canada to ask the question, "Where is the Capital of the Dominion?" the common sense answer would be, "not west of, but on the Line of the St. Lawrence and Ottawa Railway. Besides, it is well-known that many of the members of the Ottawa churches reside East of the track of said Railway. I still hold, therefore, that this territory is 'debatable'."

(3.) Dr. Snodgrass infers as "strongly probable" (and afterwards argues somewhat on this assumption) that I had read the printed statement on the financial support of Queen's and Knox Colleges, issued from Toronto on the 16th of November by the authorities of the Colleges, and he assigns as his reason for this "strongly probable" inference that the estimated amount for Queen's as given by me "occurs nowhere else." My answer to this is: I had never seen the circular referred to, and the estimated amount for Queen's as given by me does occur somewhere else. I have it before me as I now write in three newspapers, one of which is the BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN of December 1st.

(4.) Dr. Snodgrass proceeds on the assumption that my article had exclusive reference to the amounts required, etc., for the current year. The assumption is a gratuitous one. I spoke of the amounts *annually* required. My words were "the estimated amounts at present," (that is, with the present endowments, staff, etc.) "required to be raised *annually*." Had I been referring simply or mainly to the present year I would have included in my estimates the deficit of last year in the several College funds.

(5.) As to the Hall bequest, Dr. Snodgrass assumes that while I included it in the assets of Knox College, I omitted it in those of Montreal, and then goes on to refer to "howling" "omissions and commissions." The assumption is entirely gratuitous. I included the Hall bequest in both, viz: \$40,000 to Knox and \$15,000 to Montreal College.

(6.) In my estimate of the amount required annually for Knox College I deducted the interest to be derived from the Hall Estate because though the full benefit of this legacy may not be enjoyed this year it will *annually* hereafter. Dr. Snodgrass tells us that the following sentence appears in the official statement—"From the period at which the Hall bequest was paid, as well as from other circumstances, the interest accruing from it will not greatly decrease the amount required for the present year." What the "other circumstances" are, I know not. That the be-

quest was received by the Treasurer of the College at the latest early in August is shown by the acknowledgment of it in the September record. That the money did not necessarily lie any time without bearing interest is seen in the fact that \$36,549.87 of it was paid in September. That the Church Book, close on 1st May is well-known, so that under ordinary circumstances about nine months' interest would be available for the present year.

(7.) Dr. Snodgrass says that the same process applied to my estimate for Montreal College as to Knox—concerning the Hall legacy—would reduce the amount required for Montreal from \$7,000 to \$5,800. My answer is, I did apply the very same process to Montreal as to Knox, and yet found \$7,000 to be the amount required for Montreal College. The Treasurer of the Montreal College reported to the last Assembly a total on hand of a little less than \$18,000. Suppose this sum were all invested at eight per cent., the annual revenue would be \$1,440. Deduct this from the expenditure of last year (\$9,000) there would remain \$7,560 to be raised by collections, etc. Dr. Snodgrass assumes that I referred exclusively to the *current* year in my estimate. Now on that assumption and with the above figures in the printed minutes of the Assembly, and knowing as Dr. Snodgrass did that only a portion of the revenue from the Hall bequest was available this year, how does he reach the conclusion that \$7,000 under interest from the Hall bequest, was all that was needed for Montreal College this year? That the expenditure in more ways than one will this year be much greater than last on account of the large increase in the number of Students is evident.

Dr. Snodgrass quotes a few words from the printed report of the Montreal College Board of June last. I will not apply the rule he adopts in my case, and at once draw the inference "as strongly probable" that he saw that report and read it all, including the Treasurer's statement, and consequently was cognizant of the fact that \$7,000 was much under the amount required if the Hall bequest were not taken into account. I prefer charitably to conclude that he wrote in ignorance of the facts of the case.

(8.) As an example of "omission and commission," Dr. Snodgrass states that in the Report of the Committee which met in Montreal, in September, 1875, \$8,600 was the estimate given for Montreal College. He omits to add that the estimate then given for Queen's was \$2,000, and for Knox \$10,600, though the former now requires \$2,450 notwithstanding its Watkins' legacy of \$4,000 since bequeathed, and the latter \$11,900 notwithstanding the revenue derived in part this year from the Hall bequest. I am neither surprised nor disappointed at the increase, as in some respects it indicates progress.

(9.) Dr. Snodgrass, quoting my question, "on what principle of fairness and justice does this territorial distribution rest?" says, "the answer to this question put as he puts it, is, that the single basis of membership is a 'delusion and a snare'; and again he says that the territorial principle was not 'arrived at from considerations pertaining exclusively to membership.' This is another example of 'omission and commission.' I did not argue exclusively as to membership as Dr. Snodgrass well knows. To show the candour with which the principal of Queen's College argues, I reproduce a portion of my former communication after asking the question referred to, and pointing out the fact that the members of our Church in the Montreal Constituency were required to contribute for College purposes much more largely on an average than those in other Constituencies. I thus wrote,—"Why should the Montreal constituency be dealt with so differently from the others?"

"Is it because there is greater wealth there than in the other college constituencies? All who are acquainted with the church know that the reverse is the case. Not only is the soil more productive generally, and the farming community in better circumstances in Western Ontario than in the Montreal district, but, in the former there are a large number of prosperous cities and towns such as Kingston, Toronto, Hamilton, London, Chatham, Windsor, Sarnia, St. Mary's, Stratford, Clinton, Goderich, Seaford, Guelph, Galt, Brantford, Paris, Luganville, Woodstock, St. Catharines, Barrie, Owen Sound, Oshawa, Bowmanville, Peterboro, Port Hope, Belleville, Brockville, Perth, etc., besides numerous villages, etc., while in the Montreal College constituency, with the exception of Quebec and Montreal cities, where are the towns and villages of any size with a large Presbyterian population? Even as to the two cities named, the one, Quebec, is interested in Morrin College, and the other, Montreal, has few congregations with a large membership, the great majority finding it very difficult to maintain ordinances, and meet current expenses at home."

The basis of membership is a "delusion and a snare!" This is "quite respectful" to the Assembly, I suppose, seeing that the Assembly largely acts on this basis in apportioning grants to our supplemented Congregations.

I believe I am prepared to show, on any reasonable basis Dr. Snodgrass pleases to name, that the preponderance is relatively as great in favour of the constituency of Queen's and Knox as it is on the basis of membership or ability.

I confess to a desire to know more of the "minutely careful statement of ascertained facts and probabilities as to the wants of the College, and the capabilities of the constituencies assigned to them" which weighs so heavily with Dr. Snodgrass. Did that statement embrace any comparison of the constituencies now assigned to them at all? If so, on what basis?

(10.) The "insinuation" and all that it implies, as to my getting Montreal figures from "headquarters" is unworthy of notice. My communication was but one of a series on various Church topics, and was neither dictated nor suggested nor inspired by any one connected with Montreal College.

was an editorial in the "B. A. Presbyterian" on College Revenues, in which, while Montreal College was utterly ignored, (intentionally I have every reason to believe), the interest of Knox and Queens were warmly advocated, as if these were the only two Colleges in the Church, the "many and special advantages" the presents to young men seeking entrance into the Gospel Ministry, being among the epithets employed in speaking of the latter institution.

(1.) It is scarcely necessary to add that I decline to make any change in my former figures. I repeat what I then said, "they will be found as nearly correct as possible." If little or no benefit is to be derived from the Hall bequest to Knox this year, the amount required for the current year will be greater than the estimate I made of the *annual* amount required. But the same remark will be largely applicable to the bequest to Montreal College. It was not, however, the present year exclusively or mainly of which I wrote, but the estimated amount needed *annually*, and I maintain my former position that with the present staff, the present endowments, etc., the amounts required to be raised *annually* by collections, as for Knox \$8,750; Queens \$2,450; Montreal \$7,000. Should my estimate of the revenue to be derived from interest on endowments be too high it does not materially alter the *relative* requirements of the Colleges, as the amounts invested for Knox and Montreal are not so widely different, and I have estimated the interest at the same per-centage in both cases.

I also maintain the correctness of my figures as to the average contribution per member required in each of the two constituencies, viz: twenty cents in that of Knox and Queens, and sixty-five and a-half cents in that of Montreal, though the *ability* in the latter to contribute for College purposes is much less, I believe, than in the former, and I again ask the question, "on what principle of fairness and justice does this territorial distribution rest?" This is the main question, side issues being irrelevant. I repudiate the imputation that I write in the interests of any College or section I write in the interests of the Church at large, and in the interests of fairness and justice to all Colleges and Sections. With sectional feeling I have no sympathy—sectional interests when they run counter to the interests of the Church as a whole shall ever meet with the strongest opposition from

YOUR CONTRIBUTOR.

#### Baptist Misrepresentation.

Editor BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN.

DEAR SIR,—A copy of a pamphlet has come into my hand, recently issued by the Rev. A. A. Cameron, Baptist Minister, Ottawa, containing two lectures of his on "The Subjects and Mode of Christian Baptism" and "published" he says in the preface, "by special request"—for avowed circulation among the *Pedo-Baptists* of that city, etc. In support of his arguments, which are conducted in vigorous style, he gives a number of quotations (a favorite resort of Baptists, from eminent infant Baptists. It may be interesting to your readers to see in the following specimens of his how in this way their *Anabaptist* cause is sought to be advanced.

1. He says (p. 7): "The promise to you and your children (Acts ii. 39) is made to do duty in the *Pedo-Baptist* cause. Dr. Doddridge remarks: 'The word in the original, *tekna*, rendered *children*, signifies *posterity*; and does not necessarily imply *infancy*.' On which I note (1): by the mode of connection here the reader would suppose Doddridge to mean that in his opinion *infants* were not referred to in that promise. (2) Mr. Cameron does not state which of the many volumes of Doddridge contains these words ascribed to him, which makes an effort at verification very difficult to the few of his readers who might have his works. (3) Happening to have them, I find him (vol. v. sec. colli.) refer to that same passage as a proof for infant baptism. (4) I have to say, after careful examination, that no *where* does Dr. Doddridge make that statement ascribed to him! But (5) I have, by mere accident, found it elsewhere. In looking over a book issued by the Baptist Publication Society—"Penguin's Scripture Guide to Baptism"—to see how many of the Ottawa minister's quotations were taken from it, I came on it, (p. 29) where it is not given as Doddridge's but as *Penguin's* own! He there uses three arguments to show that the above passage of the Acts does not refer to infants, which he marks 1, 2, 3. And as the second, his words are,—"2. The word in the original, *tekna*, rendered *children*, signifies *posterity*; and does not necessarily imply *infancy*." Let your readers now compare this with Mr. Cameron's professed quotations from Doddridge, and they will see them identical not only in the words, but even in the commas, semicolon, period, and italics!

2. In pages, 9, 10, Mr. C. gives a series of quotations, at the beginning of which is one as from Rev. Dr. WM. CUNNINGHAM, *Principal of the New College, Edinburgh*. He does not specify which of the several works of the author he takes it from, besides stating which section or page should be given. But evidently inquiry into the original was not desired nor convenient, as we shall see. Happening to have all Cunningham's works, and after considerable trouble, I found the passage in his work, "The Reformer and the Theology of the Reformation, Essay v." (p. 249.) In opposition to the Romish doctrines on the sacraments he is showing that the Shorter Catechism (like the Larger and the Confession) teaches that these are means of spiritual benefits only through faith and not by their own direct operation. I will now place his statement in question and the Ottawa Baptist minister's representation of it in parallel columns.

Mr. Cameron's quote—Dr. Cunningham's own words—  
"It is impossible to deny that the general description which the Shorter Catechism gives of a Sacrament, is that of a solemn ordinance, by which the Lord seals the promises of the Gospel to the hearts of his people, and thereby renders them more effectual to the souls of his people, while they are intended only for believers, while no Protest-

I have put in capitals the limiting clause in the heart of Dr. Cunningham's sentence, which your readers will see is silently kept out with Jesuitical art by the Baptist proselytizer. Dr. C. by that clause excepts what he immediately after refers to as "the special case of infant baptism." But Mr. Cameron, by the omission, makes him affirm of baptism by implication that our Catechism teaches it is only for believers, and hence not for infants. And not to lose his aim, he puts "only for believers" in italics. Besides all this, (and more your space does not admit extension upon) he remarks in his preface,—"A careful perusal of the quotations given will open the eyes of many on this matter. All is substantiated in the interests of pure evangelical truth!"

Several of the other quotations he gave are exposed in my book recently published on "Baptist Misrepresentations," lately reviewed and now advertised in your column. Yours respectfully, JOHN BEHRENS.

Chesley, Ont., 1st Dec. 1876.

#### Young Ladies' College, Brantford

##### CHRISTMAS CONCERT.

The Christmas concert of the Young Ladies' College took place on Thursday evening in the hall of the institution. The attendance was large, but there was no overcrowding to spoil the pleasure of the entertainment. The hall was gaily adorned, the Union Jack and Stars and Stripes flowing in graceful folds on either side of the platform, while the room was festooned with overgreens and bunting. Over the platform was a handsome motto, "A Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year." The walls were hung with the productions of the pupils under the manipulation of brush and pencil, which reflected much credit on the young artists and their teacher, Professor Martin. Rev. Dr. Kemp, the Principal, presided, while Professor Norman, the accomplished musical tutor, took charge of the musical part of the entertainment. The programme opened with a piano-forte duet, "Daisies of the Meadow," excellently rendered by Misses Carrie Argo and Florence F. Large. Miss Maggie Buntun sang with much pathos and grace the good old song, "Kathleen Mavourneen," which was followed by a French dialogue, in which Misses E. Watson, L. Brothour, M. Buntun, K. McLeod, M. Blakeley, J. McCallum, M. Widdor, B. Cameron, M. Tisdale and A. Agur, took part. "It was a dream," a song by Miss Eva Tisdell, was received with merited applause, showing a voice of much sweetness and compass, while the "Valse de Concert" on the piano by Miss Lizzie Hood, evidenced a full command of the ivories. The vocal duet, "Exultation," by Miss Kemp and Prof. Norman, evidently a very difficult piece, was rendered in the happiest manner, Miss Kemp showing an improvement since we last heard her, while Prof. Norman was in the best of voice. An English recitation followed, being Longfellow's, "Death of Minnehaha," the young ladies entering dramatically into the spirit of the piece, while their articulation was wonderfully clear and distinct. The registers were Misses M. Buntun, M. Blakeley, L. Copson, A. Agur, A. Chisholm and L. Elliott. A piano solo, "Concert struck," given by Prof. Norman in his usual excellent style, concluded the first part.

The second part of the programme was introduced by a duet on the piano, "Pearl of the Sea Valse," from Misses Louisa Livingston and Jennie Wilson, showing considerable skill in touch and tone. The song, "Should he upbraid," by Miss Alice Chisholm, was beautifully rendered in all its portions, some of which were very difficult. The German dialogue, "Die Jahreszeiten," by Misses W. Smith, L. Cameron, A. Weinaugh, L. Livingston, was laughable, if it was incomprehensible to most of the audience. Miss Eva Tisdell appeared again at the piano in Herz's "La Violette," and fully demonstrated her skill at the instrument, as she had already in the vocal selection. A neat little German recitation, "Erl Koenig," from Miss Harriet James followed, and was well done. Miss Kemp's song, "My dear little one," was all that could be desired, and received its full meed of applause. Miss Alice Park gave in French "Les Adieux de Marie Stuart," with much confidence and evident appreciation of the piece. The duet, "I know a bank," was done full justice to by Miss Tisdell and Miss Chisholm, being sung in a most correct and tasteful manner. The programme was brought to a close by a dashing instrumental piece, "Qui Vive," from Miss Weinaugh and Prof. Norman. The concert was throughout somewhat of an improvement on any which have preceded it. A good many of the relatives of the young ladies, and some of the old pupils were present at the entertainment. Each additional concert and commencement of the College gives evidence that it is taking a wider range, and rising in the estimation of the people both here and at a distance. Dr. Cochrane and Dr. Kemp, in a few closing remarks, referred to the encouraging success the College had met, many coming to it from the neighboring States of the Union, and from the farthest confines of the Dominion. Much credit is due to the Principal, Miss Macphie and the other governesses for the aptitude shown by the pupils in their public performances, and for the graceful deportment which marked one and all in performing their allotted pieces. The proceedings concluded with "God Save the Queen," the College closing till the fourth day of January next.

#### Presbytery of Hamilton.

This Court met in Central Church, Hamilton, on the 19th and 20th inst. There were present twenty-three ministers and twelve elders. The Rev. Dr. Topp, of Toronto, and Mr. Mullen of Fergus, addressed the Presbytery in reference to the necessity of a special effort being made in support of Queen's and Knox College. \$1550 was mentioned as the amount which might be expected from this Presbytery, and it was resolved that sessions should be

recommended to aim at a minimum rate of seventy-seven cents for each communicant, so as to obtain the amount required, while the action of the Presbytery was not to be regarded as imposing a tax on congregations. A petition from Brerly was brought before the Presbytery, asking that if it could be done, action might be stayed in the matter of separation between the congregation and its pastor, as Mr. Campbell had encouraged them in the hope that he would return to labor among them, with the content of the Presbytery. Mr. C. was not present, and as there was no evidence on his part, of any wish to have the matter considered, the petition was summarily dismissed, and Mr. Carveth was appointed to deliver the valedictory Sabbath, leave was granted to Mr. Carveth in a call at Thorold and Merridale, arrangements were made for holding a conference of Sabbath School teachers within the bounds, on Tuesday the 1st of February, and following day, and it was resolved that Schools having ten teachers and under, should send one representative, those having twenty teachers, two, and those having thirty, three. A committee was appointed to accomplish the proposed conference. Rev. W. F. Clarke, of Wolland, tendered his resignation on account of bad health, and his determination to enter upon literary work. The congregation are to be cited to appear for their interests on January, 11th prox. The greater part of the afternoon, and part of the evening were spent in conference on the State of Religion, and the Presbytery agreed to put on record its regret that many of the ministerial brethren were absent from the conference without known cause, thus manifesting unbecoming indifference to the important matter under consideration. It was resolved to remove Ayns's Avenue Church, St. Catharines, from the list of vacancies, and obtain, if possible, a missionary to labour there for a time. Dr. James was present and intimated his acceptance of the call from Knox Church. He had been regularly released from his charge in Albany, N. Y., and gave in his Presbyterian certificate of good standing. It was resolved that the Indiction take place at 7.30 p. m., on Thursday the 11th day of January, 1877, Mr. Fletcher to preside, Mr. Gordon to preach, Mr. Burson to address the pastor, and Mr. Laing the people. Mr. Smith withdrew the motion of which he had given notice, regarding the appointment of a Presbyterian Missions agent, but gave notice of an overture at next ordinary meeting for the appointment of a Synodical Missions Agent, by the Synod of Hamilton and London. The remit of Assembly anent the Ministers' Widows' and Orphans' Fund was considered and agreed to, with the following amendment of the ninth Regulation, "That in the event of a minister leaving the Church, the continuance of his connexion with this fund, be subject to an examination by the committee; and in the event of his ceasing to participate in the fund, he shall receive such an amount as shall be deemed equitable. The amendment was carried by a majority of two. Also the remit of Assembly, on the aged and infirm Ministers' fund, was considered and approved, with the addition to the second regulation of the words, "and ministerial assessment." Other business transacted was not of public interest.

—JOHN LAING, Clerk.

#### Anti-Missionary Movement in China.

The Shanghai correspondent of the London Times writes:—The anti-missionary movement, to which I have several times lately referred, seems rather inclined to spread than to subside. A letter from a French missionary living at Cheng-tu, the capital of Sze-chuen, describes some horrible atrocities perpetrated in that Province. On the morning of the 20th of July a cordon of several thousand men, with arms in their hands, drew round the market-place in the town of Yuen-hin-chang, and set to work to catch the Christians among the crowd who were thus enclosed. They manufactured a large wooden cross, on which they tied their victims, and then cut them to pieces. Among the victims were two heathen, of whom one was the father of a convert, and the other a young girl of fifteen, whose brother was a Christian. Like the others, she was stripped and cut to pieces. Altogether eight were killed; many were wounded and escaped. Two days later the assassins went to another town and repeated the proceedings. The authorities appear to have taken no notice of these outrages, any more than they have done of the persecutions in the neighbourhood of Chung-king, to which I have alluded in former letters. There is no doubt the circular by the literary Chancellor of Szechuen, which I quote some months ago, has had much to do with exciting these proceedings, and an anti-Christian book, called the "Ki-king-lu," which is also in circulation there, is calculated to excite the gravest excitement among ignorant and superstitious people. The skill and intelligence of foreigners are stated to have been obtained by robbing the Chinese; one method by which this was done was taking an extract from the eyes of Chinese who had become Christians and touching their own eyes with it, when they were able to see and understand astronomy and perceive the mineral wealth of the earth. Another valuable medicine for the purpose of producing intelligence was manufactured with the brains of a Chinese girl who had joined Christianity; other medicines were mixed with these, and the whole made up into pills, which were further improved by incantations. The writer professed to have lived three years in England, and to have had three princesses given him to wife by the Queen of Szechuen, and that term of residence, he got permission to return to China, on his promising not to expose to his countrymen the improprieties he had witnessed. Such are the tales circulated for the purpose of exciting hostility and contempt among a people so ignorant and superstitious that no charge, however outrageous, seems too extravagant for belief.

Every branch of the true vine produces the same kind of fruit, let that be much or little.