

OUR CONTRIBUTORS.

PRESBYTERIAN HISTORY.

MR. EDITOR,—As probably the only surviving member of the Presbytery that met at Clinton on the third Wednesday of February, 1833, I beg leave to say that I differ from my friend Mr. McCollum in the estimate he has been led to form of the grounds on which that Presbytery acted in their dealings with the American ministers who applied then to be received into our church, as expressed in an article in the PRESBYTERIAN of the 12th ult.

I think it could easily be shewn that the points in which these brethren differed from the Presbytery were of much more importance than Mr. McCollum seems to think. For instance, there can be no reasonable doubt that they included the question, in what sense the Confession of Faith is to be interpreted and received, and it is well known that some of the most stirring events of those times owed their existence to the answers then given by different parties to this question. Our little Church was undoubtedly in full sympathy with what may be called old school views on this subject.

This, it seems to me, sufficiently accounts for and justifies what has been regarded by some as their tyrannical strictness, for it was suspected that the applicants were deeply tinged with new school views, and their own refusal to answer any questions upon the subject was not calculated to remove that suspicion. It was surely no new thing for a Presbytery to require from applicants of this class some verbal satisfaction of their soundness in the faith, especially at a time and from a quarter in which there was a widespread agitation owing to the supposed prevalence of error.

I have too much respect for Mr. McCollum to suppose that he would consciously suffer his judgment to be warped by any prejudice in such a case, but I do know that the Presbytery has been severely (and I may add) as I think unjustly censured for their action in the case. I need hardly say that I never heard of any objection being raised to the piety or personal worth of the applicants. The main question was as to their agreement with the Presbytery on points of doctrine to which the agitations of the times had given special prominence. I do, therefore, think that it was unnecessary and fitted to support, if not to create, a prejudice against the Presbytery, though I can believe it was not so intended, to say that "it is evident from many circumstances that it was as revivalists that the American ministers were specially suspected and judged."

D. McMILLAN.

Komoka, Oct. 1st, 1879.

REPORT OF THE CLERK OF THE PRESBYTERY OF HAMILTON.

MR. EDITOR,—The Presbytery of Hamilton did not instruct the session of Saltfleet to grant Mr. Soules a certificate on any motion connected with "the report" of the Committee referred to. There was only one motion on "the report" before the Presbytery, which was lost. No part of "the report" after was referred to, but alone adopted.

Regarding Mr. Shaw's case, will Mr. Laing kindly give the motion passed, as also the mover and seconder, and oblige,

W. P. WALKER.

The Manse, Binbrook, Sept. 28th, 1879.

REPLY OF THE CLERK.

The correctness of the report of the Clerk of the Presbytery of Hamilton must be decided by that court, with that we have nothing to do. Mr. Laing alone is responsible for what is published over his name—we have received from him the following reply to Mr. Walker's questions as above.

1. The motion passed was "That Mr. Shaw be restored to his place in the Church and Session, so that if he be disjoined from the congregation it may be done in a regular manner."

2. The motion thus finally adopted was reached as follows:

Mr. Lyle moved, seconded by I forget whom, the first part of the motion. The second part was moved in amendment by Mr. Laing, seconded by Mr. Murray. The motion as at first made and the amendment both began with a clause, which on further consideration, was dropped as unnecessary and somewhat severe. The motion was then amended by the addi-

tion of the second part and was unanimously adopted; Mr. Walker and Mr. Webb, both members of Presbytery, making no objection. The chief object in appending the latter part was, that the Presbytery while of opinion that the connection of Mr. Shaw with the Binbrook congregation should cease in the best interests of all parties and of peace, did not wish to interfere with the session in its actings or to dictate to that court. They had every confidence that the Session would know how the disjunction should take place in a regular manner and believed that it would take place in due course.

Allow me to express my regret that after the Presbytery has made every effort to prevent these matters becoming public they should be thus unnecessarily exposed.

JOHN LAING.

INFORMATION WANTED.

MR. EDITOR,—Suppose an elder absents himself from all ordinances for five years and when requested by his session to do his duty, and refuses, can the session remove his name from the roll? The question is not in any shape or form one of censure, but removal.

The rule in the Reformed Presbyterian Church in Scotland, now united to the Free Church, gives the Session the power. It is the practice of the Free and United Presbyterian churches. We have no rule. Have we any practice? In the Central Church of Hamilton during the pastorate of the late Rev. J. McColl, a case in point was decided. How was it begun and how did it end?

ENQUIRER.

[We publish the above for the satisfaction of our correspondent, and if any "church lawyer" sees fit to answer regarding the general question we shall publish the reply. At the same time we will not publish any communication which may reflect on the action of Central Church, Hamilton, or any other Session. In all such cases there are circumstances involving delicate questions which ought not to be published but which may lead church courts to a certain line of action; and where the party under discipline acquiesces, the decision of the court must be held as final.—[ED. C. P.]

REASON OF OMISSION IN ASSEMBLY'S MINUTES.

MR. EDITOR,—In last week's issue, Mr. Macmillan expresses surprise at not finding the report of his congregation in the Assembly's minutes. He further states that he knew not where the omission had taken place. Did it never occur to him that the omission might be with himself? He must surely have forgotten that I wrote reminding him that the report of his congregation had not been received, that I could only wait for it a day or two longer, and that he wrote in reply that he had still another collection to take up. The report consequently came too late.

S. YOUNG, Pres. Clerk.

WORTHY OF ATTENTION.

MR. EDITOR,—There is a species of blasphemy, and otherwise dishonouring the holy name and Word of God, becoming very prevalent in certain quarters that I think ought to be very loudly spoken against. I refer to the tendency of some political journalists of the present day, while conducting the low political discussions that disgrace the press of Canada, to make a free use of Bible phraseology, often dragging into a very unworthy connection, expressions peculiarly sacred from a hallowed association with the precious solemn truth they reveal. So notably is this the case with one of your city confreres that I have been tempted more than once to draw attention to it, and call upon our Christian people to condemn it. And now again in one of yesterday's dailies we are insulted by having put into our hands an editorial replete with specimens of such profanity as that to which I refer. For instance, to say nothing of the too frequent and questionable references to Divine Providence in connection with an article of the nature of this, there occur, besides, in this editorial alone, the following scriptural expressions and allusions. (Referring to one of our political leaders), "He is driven from power, and the heavens put on sackcloth, the earth refuses to yield her fruit, the vine languishes, and all faces gather blackness." (comp. Is. l. 3, and Heb. iii. 17.) "Little did they know who was . . . holding

their concerns in the hollow of his hand." (comp. Is. xl. 12.). "Causing the sun to shine on the evil and on the good, and sending rain with commendable impartiality upon the just and the unjust."—(comp. Matt. v. 45.) "The hands were held up and washed in conscious innocence" (comp. Ps. xxvi. 6); when that gentleman's "hands were clean, his heart pure, and when he had not lifted up his soul to vanity, nor sworn deceitfully," (comp. Ps. xxiv. 4); "and when the world confessed its iniquity it was forgiven" (comp. Ps. xxxii. 5); "And lo, the voice of the turtle and the 'hum' is heard in our land" (comp. Cant. ii. 12).

Now, surely all this is quite uncalled for. This appears to me anything but "a holy and reverend use of God's Word." Is it not rather an evident, "profaning and abusing" thereof. The writer of that article seems to be a man who is familiar with the Bible. It may be even difficult for him to restrain an almost natural tendency to use Bible phraseology. In that case, let him write on subjects worthy of such sacred allusions. At all events the effect of giving way to such a habit must be injurious to the spiritual state of the writer and eminently demoralizing to the readers.

H.

Sept. 27th, 1879.

"PRINCIPISSA LOUISA."

I lately consulted the following Latin dictionaries, and here is my report of the result of my labours. Friend "J." lend me your ears for a moment.

Riddle and Arnold's (Oxford and Cambridge Edit., 1872) gives *princeps* for "princess."

Dr. White's (Oxon. 1872) gives *regina* for "princess."

Dr. Smith's (1878) gives a masculine rendering of *princeps*.

White and Riddle's (1869) gives *princeps* as a noun of the common gender, the same as *homo*.

Yonge's (1855) gives *princeps* for "prince" or "princess."

Not one of the above takes the slightest notice of *principissa* as a word either good, bad, or indifferent.

The authors are all "most potent, grave, and learned seigniors." Friend "J.," like Mark Antony, "I pause for a reply."

Metis, Que.

T. F.

A CORRECTION.

MR. EDITOR,—Allow me to say that Principal Grant is incorrect in insinuating, in your last issue, that I have made the accusation of "Loyalty" virtually my own.

In exposing the untruthfulness of the statement of "Laic" respecting me, I said what I now repeat, that "I have not asked a single dollar from the constituency of Queen's College, and would never dream of collecting in territory set apart by the General Assembly for the support of any of the other Colleges." Yours truly,

D. H. MACVICAR.

Presbyterian College, Oct. 3rd, 1879.

COLLECTING FOR COLLEGES.

MR. EDITOR,—I read with much surprise Principal Macvicar's communication, declaring that he had collected no funds for the Montreal College in Kingston since the union. I have repeatedly been told that he had done so, but my chief authority for making the statement was a friend of the Rev. Principal, who, on the occasion of a visit made by Principal McVicar to Kingston—certainly within the last two or three years—informed me that he was then collecting for Montreal College in the two congregations he has himself specified. If I felt at liberty to give the name of my informant, Principal Macvicar himself would admit that he should have been considered a good authority, and if I am not much mistaken, I also heard the names of individuals who had contributed considerable sums. Of course I can only suppose there must have been some strange mistake about the matter. I simply desire to explain that I made the statement in the most perfect good faith, believing on what I considered excellent authority, that its truth was beyond a doubt; and furthermore, that I made it, not as a reflection on Principal Macvicar, but simply to show that the friends of Queen's were not so ready to complain as was your correspondent "Loyalty."

LAIC.