

and treat her as a mere creature, yet the most favored," he shows that he either *has* a brow of brass, or *has not* common sense.

On the same page (27), the author treats of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin. He says that it was owing to "a singular grace and privilege of an omnipotent God, in virtue of the merits of Christ, who for His own honor and glory, saved in advance from sin His future dear mother." He then asks, "Is there Scripture for this?" The answer, of course, is "Yes." He quotes only one passage, but if it be to the point it is enough. If the doctrine be taught in Scripture, we must receive it. Well, here it is. "I will put enmities between thee and the woman, and thy seed and her seed, and she will crush thy head and thou shalt lie in wait for her heel" (Gen. iii. 15). This is the translation of the passage as it is found in the Vulgate, which any scholar knows is itself only a translation. Here, however, the Vulgate grossly mistranslates the Hebrew, and therefore Romanists should be silent about Protestant mistranslations of the Bible. (Matt. vii. 3-5.) The word rendered "she," means in Hebrew "he." True, the original is sometimes a feminine pronoun, but the context shows when it is. In this case, however, the context shows that it is masculine. Of course, for "her heel," we must read "his heel." Our translation of this passage is the correct one. Gesenius gives the same. As the word rendered "lie in wait for" belongs to the same verb as the one rendered "crush," it should also be so rendered, or rather "bite." One may lie in wait for another, without being able to do him the slightest harm. The serpent would harm the seed of the woman, but only in a most trifling degree. But how does his Grace draw the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin from this passage? In this way. "Now the enmities would not be complete if the mother of God would be stained by original sin." He believes that the adversary of the serpent was the Virgin Mary. Let us grant that she was, and see what follows. He does not believe that she was to kill a real serpent or snake. By the serpent here spoken of he understands the devil, which is plainly what is meant. Then the Virgin Mary herself overcame Satan! But we are told in Scripture that Christ spoiled principalities and powers, and made a show of them openly, triumphing over them (Col. ii. 15); that he took part of flesh and blood, that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the Devil (Heb. ii. 14); and that the Son of God was manifested that He might destroy the works of the Devil (1 John iii. 8). Thereupon, according to the Archbishop, the Virgin did what the Bible tells us her Son did! Is this treating her as a mere creature? He does not say that original sin would have unfitted her for being the mother of Him who was to crush the serpent's head, but that it would have unfitted her for crushing it herself. Truly, the Archbishop's argument in favor of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception is—to use an Irish phrase—a "mighty weak" one. It is a wonder that he does not use as an argument the words of the Virgin herself, "My spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour" (Luke i. 47). Most persons would say that they are distinctly opposed to that doctrine. The following anecdote will show that an argument of an opposite kind which would stagger some persons can be made out of them. I once asked Vicar-General Bruyere how he interpreted these words. I was sure that he would have some hole by which he would try to creep out, and I wished to see it. Here it is. "God was her Saviour, for He saved her from the taint of original sin." The one argument is just as good as the other.

If it be true that—as his Grace says—"the blessed Virgin when her soul and body were first joined and united was preserved from the sin which all the other children of Adam inherit," how is it that the Scriptures do not state distinctly a fact so very remarkable?

If the Virgin needed to be free from sin to be the mother of Jesus, her mother needed, for her daughter's sake, to be the same. We need not then be surprised if we hear by and by that Leo XIII. has defined that the Church has from the beginning believed that St. Anne, the Virgin's mother, was conceived without sin. He does not need to trouble old gentlemen to come from the ends of the earth to Rome to discuss the question. He has but to say so, and the matter is settled. Yea, he may go back till he come to Adam.

Protestants may with perfect consistency hold the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of Christ, while they believe that his mother was a sinner saved by grace. Want of space prevents me from showing how

original sin did not unfit Mary to be the mother of the Messiah.

In my next paper I shall notice his Grace's arguments in favor of image worship. They are very curious ones.

In the last line of paper IV., for "in him," read "on him." T. F.

Mettis, Que.

OUR COLLEGES.—No. I.

MR. EDITOR.—The evading of a difficult question may oft be wise, but is a manifestation of weakness somewhere. To our Church the college question has its special difficulties. Is there any weakness that render it wise to still speak of it with bated breath? The writer thinks not, and therefore speaks with your permission to the Church thereon. As the question is essentially public, the writer keeps back his personality, with this simple observation; he is in no way committed to the view herein expressed for all or any time, provided a better solution can be given, and nothing but the growing gravity of the position has forced him for one to crowd his opinions into something like definite shape.

What is the gravity of the situation? Well, the practical one here pressing is the financial. Leaving out of the question our Halifax and Manitoba Colleges which appear necessary, our remarks are confined to the western section, Ontario and Quebec. And therein we may again leave out Morrin, which whatever it does or does not, is certainly no incumbrance on our energies.

What do the Colleges cost the Church? At the beginning of our present ecclesiastical year we started with debts upon *expenditure* as follows:

Knox	\$13,477 85
Queen's	543 29
Montreal	7,383 07
Total, \$21,404 21	

representing if capitalized, an interest of \$1,700. Our Endowment Funds reach in round numbers, say, \$88,000, which invested at eight per cent., represents \$7,040 annually.

The estimated expenditure for the year may be thus summed up:

Knox	\$14,000
Queen's	2,000
Montreal	13,000

Interest on debt as above, \$1,700; making a round total of \$30,000, from which deducting endowment receipts we find an annual requirement of \$23,000, upon the liberality of our Church. Let it however, not be forgotten that what we actually spend upon our three Colleges is much greater, thus

Montreal, ordinary,	\$13,600
Queen's, Theological, say	7,000
Knox,	24,000
Total, \$34,600	

to say nothing of the interest upon the sums sunk on buildings, etc., which would be available were the funds to be otherwise applied. We may safely say, that in this section we are expending more on our Colleges than upon the entire Home and Foreign Mission work in which we are engaged. \$50,000 would be a fair estimate of our annual College expenditure, whilst our missions have cost about the same.

Now we have little or nothing to say against luxuries when honestly gained and paid for, but when *debt* begins, honesty requires that we examine and curtail. If there are those in our Church who feel that this expenditure is required, considering all circumstances, they can readily settle, if honest, the question at issue. Let them step forward and *endow*. This is the honest straightforward, business-like course. The widow's mites should not be by public trustees required, where economy is not enforced. They who demand three Colleges fully equipped—and to leave them half equipped is to deal unfairly—should, as they well may, support theory by practice, and place them upon a firm and lasting footing.

Not being a monied man, but a systematic supporter of our Church schemes, the writer cannot demand endowment, and that failing, he has in another paper, to present a practical solution of the question at issue, which in the present state and prospects of our funds commends itself as the best upon the whole. He is not for one, prepared to ask the lay element who supply the sinews of war to spend more upon College work than upon missionary enterprise. B.

WIDOWS' AND ORPHANS' FUND.

MR. EDITOR, —I wish to call the attention of ministers, contributors to the Widows' and Orphans' Fund of the late Canada Presbyterian Church, to the action of the General Assembly in putting the widow of the late Mr. Travers of Brockville, on said fund.

The facts of the case as given by the report of the Committee of Widows' and Orphans' Fund (see page 127 of the appendix to the minutes of General Assembly), are these: Mr. Travers, a minister of a good congregation, did not during his life, contribute to the Widows' and Orphans' Fund, but insured his life in an American Insurance Company. The company after much trouble only paid \$200, instead of several thousands. Mrs. Travers being disappointed in this, applies to be put on the Widows' and Orphans' Fund; and although she is in the prime of life, healthy and vigorous, without family, and with some means of her own, the General Assembly accedes to her wishes, and puts her on the fund from the date of her husband's death, retaining out of the allowance coming to her the amount her husband would have paid during his life with interest thereon.

I call particular attention to this matter as it may have escaped the notice of some; and with the view of drawing out an expression of public opinion on the matter. Are there not some widows of ministers with families who are not in this fund? Why should not they present their claims? I feel confident any of them has as strong a claim as this one. We are also framing the regulations for a fund for the whole Church. Should there not be something respecting this? Dr. Reid says the fund did not suffer, because she paid the amount of the rates Mr. Travers would have paid during his life, with interest thereon. Why then not make provision for receiving all parties under like circumstances?

By giving this a place in your columns at an early date you will much oblige, yours truly,

JOHN IRVINE.

P.S.—What is the opinion of ministers respecting that regulation in the regulations for the common fund, which requires ministers placed on the Aged and Infirm Ministers' Fund, and ministers not on the fund, retired with the approbation of the Church, to pay yearly eight dollars additional to their rate? J. I.

THE MODERATORSHIP.

MR. EDITOR,— "Presbyter" wants to know whether it was "in the bond" of union that each of the four bodies that now compose our Church should be successively represented in the Moderator's chair. I am not aware whether it is in the bond or not; but the Church is none the less indebted to "Canada Presbyterian" for pointing out in time what is required by a more authoritative document than even the basis of union. In the first epistle of Peter, Christians are commanded to be "courteous." In every constitutional government there are unwritten laws as binding as those that are written. Had the Church from the date of the union disregarded the previous organizations, and chosen its moderators irrespective of the old divisions, it might have been a better way. But the Church has not done so. It has successively honored three of the parties; and it cannot now leave the fourth out, simply because the fourth was the smallest. Doubtless our old divisions should now be forgotten as soon as possible; but they will be forgotten all the sooner when it is seen that there is no disposition to overlook the claims of Christian courtesy simply because these are not "in the bond." The letter of "Presbyter" augurs the existence of such a disposition in some quarter, and is therefore unfortunate.

However, it is unnecessary to say much on this subject. It may be left safely to the right feeling of the Church. But if the subject is to be continued, I shall claim permission to say a little more. Believe me, yours, etc.,

COURTESY.

"THE SABBATH SCHOOL NOT A SUBSTITUTE FOR PARENTAL INSTRUCTION."

BY REV. W. LOCKHEAD.

The Sabbath School, however useful in gathering in the youth of our land, and teaching them the word of God, that they may be brought to Christ, and built up in faith and holiness, should never be allowed to usurp the place assigned to "parental instruction."

The tendency on the part, even of parents who are professors of religion: to transfer the responsibility