

cross, and follow me." The life of the Christian, both minister and layman, is a consecrated life, and we should take care lest we place before our brother the gilded prize of wealth and worldly honour, lest it tempt the unworthy and worldly into the seat of Christ's ambassador. Let us remember our neighbour, and not waste our surplus in ministering to our own vanity.

BRUCE.

NOTES FROM HAMILTON

The various cities of Canada have their proper names and their fancy names also. Toronto is called the "Queen City," London the "Forest City," and Guelph, the latest born city in the Dominion, is called the "Royal City." The flourishing city indicated in the heading of this article is sometimes called the "Ambitious City,"—a name given to it by envious outsiders; and it is also, somewhat more appropriately, called "the Manchester of Canada." Whether it has earned the former of these two titles or not I will not take upon myself to say, but I think it is fairly entitled to the latter; for the products of its manufactories find a market not only throughout the Dominion, but in Great Britain and in the other colonies. But just at present, when the hum of factories is being heard in every part of the city, and its sun of prosperity seems to be shining in its strength, suddenly a pall hangs over it. A dreadful conflagration has taken place by which millions worth of property was destroyed, and four lives sacrificed, in some cases leaving families unprovided for. In addition to carrying on a large wholesale trade and extensive manufactories, Hamilton is the head quarters for several Loan and Building Societies, also a number of Insurance Companies, besides being the Canadian seat of government for the Great Western Railway, in whose chief offices and workshops a large number of hands are employed, thus circulating a large amount of money.

In educational enterprise the "Ambitious City" is not behind. Its church edifices, college and school buildings will compare favourably with those of other cities in Canada.

PRESBYTERIANISM

was organized in 1833, is strong, vigorous and well represented. There are five congregations well equipped and actively engaged in Christian work. The church edifices are substantial and commodious. The ministers are among the foremost in the denomination, and, whether in the pulpit or on the platform, are regarded as among the most eloquent speakers in the city.

A stranger taking a cursory glance at Presbyterianism as it exists in Hamilton cannot fail to notice one or two of its features. It is united and consolidated, and this to a degree that contrasts with some other places which might be named. The multiplying of churches, sometimes at the expense of neighbouring congregations, and the seeming competition which exists is greatly to be deprecated, and, to their credit be it told, is not encouraged in sister denominations. It is far better to have fewer congregations and better paid ministers, so that our clergymen may not only *exist* as they do in some places, but that they may *live* in comparative comfort. Costly churches with a crushing load of debt, and in some (indeed most) cases a small congregation, would seem to be the growing evil of the present day. A Toronto minister lately made a good remark when he said that as the present decade was characterized by church building the next should be notable for paying off this debt. We hope soon to hear that every one of our congregations will have a church for themselves and a manse for the minister, and both free of debt.

THE CENTRAL CHURCH,

which is the largest of the Presbyterian churches in the city, was organized about the year 1844, when the Rev. Mr. Dalrymple was called, who in about two years returned to Scotland and who was succeeded by the Rev. John Hogg (afterwards Dr. Hogg), who was succeeded by the Rev. Dr. Ormiston. Shortly before Dr. Ormiston's settlement the present large edifice was erected, which is now being repainted and slated, and which is among the finest churches in the denomination. On the removal of Dr. Ormiston to New York the congregation gave a call to the lamented Rev. John McColl of Dundas, whose ministry although short was very successful, and who is still held in grateful remembrance by an affectionate people. After a vacancy of about two years the congregation called the Rev. Samuel Lyle, the present pastor. Mr. Lyle

is a native of County Antrim, Ireland. He was educated at Queen's and Assembly's Colleges, Belfast, and was pastor of one of the largest congregations in the north of Ireland. As a preacher Mr. Lyle is eloquent and fascinating. To a well stored mind there is added in his case a lively imagination and untiring industry. The Central Church is very prosperous and has a communion roll of about seven hundred.

M'NAH STREET CHURCH,

which is a fine building, is an offshoot from Knox Church. The late Rev. Dr. Inglis was the first minister being called from St. Gabriel street Church in Montreal. On the removal of Dr. Inglis to Knox College a call was extended to the Rev. D. H. Fletcher, the present pastor. Mr. Fletcher, who is among the most prominent and most popular ministers of the Church, was born in Scotland and educated in Knox College, Toronto, and was settled first in Scarborough, near Toronto. McNah street Church is in a flourishing state and has a communion roll of about four hundred.

KNOX CHURCH,

which is one of the oldest of the Presbyterian Churches here, has had a successful career. Professor Young was the first minister. On his removal to Knox College he was succeeded by the Rev. Ralph Robb from Scotland, who after a ministry of about four years died in 1850, and was succeeded by the Rev. Dr. Irvine from Ireland who resigned in 1864. The next minister was the Rev. A. B. Simpson, and after him the late Rev. Mr. Reynolds. The present pastor is the Rev. Dr. James, who is an eloquent preacher and who is proving a worthy successor to the long list of able men who preceded him.

I must reserve for another paper some notes of the other churches, of which I would like to say something. *Royal Hotel, Hamilton, August, 1879.* R

BUILDING AND ENDOWMENT FUND OF QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY.

MR. EDITOR,—An anonymous person called "Loyalty" commenced a correspondence in your columns more than three months ago in which free use was made of my name in connection with the Building and Endowment Fund of the University of Queen's College. Considering that the General Assembly of 1878 unanimously expressed "their sincere gratification with the success which has attended the efforts to increase the endowment of Queen's College, and recommend to the friends of the College the completion of the whole so successfully begun;" and that the General Assembly of 1879 again unanimously adopted the Report of our Trustees and "expressed satisfaction at the great success which has attended the effort to raise a Building Fund and to secure an increase of endowment for the College," I took no notice of the effusions of "Loyalty." I could well afford to despise anonymous attacks on what two successive General Assemblies unanimously approved. It is otherwise when Dr. Macvicar seems to make the accusation of "Loyalty" his own, as far as Montreal Presbyterian College is concerned. The accusation was substantially that in my canvass for subscriptions "the moral rights of Knox and Montreal have been wantonly invaded." Prodigious! And there was no member in either of two General Assemblies to rise in his place and repel the wanton invasion! Their defence is left to a correspondent who shields himself under a cloak of darkness to which he gives the high sounding name of "Loyalty." I hope that the friends of Queen's may show a different style of loyalty should her rights be wantonly invaded. This cloaked person assures us that both the West and the Province of Quebec are emphatic in their disapproval of what has been done for Queen's. Surely, the madness of envy can no further go. If Queen's can appeal to neither the West nor the East, to which quarter is she to look?

Knox College aside, for far from any representative from it having uttered complaint, its honoured head has done everything in his power, by voice and subscription, to aid the movement commenced eighteen months ago, the accusation of "Loyalty," so far as Montreal is concerned, is in effect taken up, by Dr. Macvicar, when in connection with the previous correspondence he says, "I would never dream of collecting in territory set apart by the General Assembly for the support of any of the other Colleges." This implies that I did what Dr. Macvicar considers wrong in not only dreaming about but actually collecting in Montreal on behalf

of Queen's. As I am perfectly well aware that I acted not only strictly within my rights but with the utmost courtesy towards all other institutions of the Church, I have to thank Dr. Macvicar for giving me a public opportunity of stating the principal ground on which appeal was made to our friends in the Province of Quebec.

Queen's is not simply a Divinity Hall like Montreal Presbyterian College, but an University, with all the faculties, based on the model of the old Scottish Universities. The University is governed by a Board of Trustees—ministers and members of our Church—a large proportion of whom live in Montreal "constituency" since the union as before the union. This of itself is enough to show that Queen's looks for support and for students to the whole country. It did so in the past, it does so still, and it will continue to do so in future. We understand that the arrangements as to division of territory made by the General Assembly apply only to the collections raised to partially defray the cost of maintaining her Divinity Halls or Colleges from year to year. The utter folly of our attempting to understand them from any other point of view may be seen from the fact that the sum received by Queen's from this source amounts to only about one fifteenth of the total necessary actual expenditure of the University. Desiring to avoid the slightest appearance of conflicting with the work done in Montreal Presbyterian College, I stated at the public meeting held in St. Paul's Church there that I sought subscriptions in and around Montreal for a chair in science and for assistants in ancient classics and science, in classics especially, as Professor McKerras had always been doing two men's work. This statement was reported in the newspapers, so that all knew the object. My work could therefore by no possibility conflict with that of a Divinity Hall. That it did not so conflict is proved by the fact that St. Paul's Church, the members of which contributed four-fifths of the amount subscribed in Montreal "constituency," gave more to Montreal Presbyterian College last year than it ever gave before.

One word about "the magnificent endowment," which it is said that Queen's is getting from its friends. We ask for only between \$60,000 and \$70,000 for the Divinity department, \$40,000 of which is required by the withdrawal of the Church of Scotland's annual grant. So far, we have received one-fifth of the modest amount asked for. Suppose we get it all paid in, would Knox or Montreal consider \$70,000 a "magnificent" endowment?

I am sorry to have to write on this subject. The public meetings which were everywhere called, and the General Assembly, are the places where it should be discussed. But no one ever peeped or muttered there. I think, too, that when successive General Assemblies have endorsed a movement and urged its friends to complete it, a newspaper avowedly conducted in the interests of the Church would best consult the interests of justice by declining anonymous communications reflecting offensively on the person or persons who are doing all in their power to prosecute the movement. With regard to our Colleges, I do not think the interests of one are antagonistic to the interests of the others. The Church having established them all, I am a willing annual contributor to every one of them from Halifax to Manitoba. I think that we on the one side have given proofs that we look upon the institutions that belonged to the churches with which we united as now our institutions. We think that those with whom we united should look upon Queen's as theirs, and if not able to contribute to it, at least rejoice in its prosperity. That many do so regard Queen's we well know. Those who are actuated by different feelings are surely bound in honour to hold their peace, or if they must speak, to speak out frankly in the courts of the Church where they can be as frankly answered. But whether they do so or not, my duty both to the University of which I am Principal and to the other institutions of the Church is plain, and to the utmost of my power I shall continue to do my duty.

GEORGE M. GRANT.

[We have taken no part in this controversy and we do not intend to do so now. Our readers have had the matter placed before them in all its bearings by our various correspondents; and we are fully convinced that, had we smothered discussion on the subject as Principal Grant thinks we ought to have done, much more serious evils would have arisen than can possibly arise from having it ventilated. All our Colleges have our warmest sympathy; the Church