

careful, (which it might have been, unknown to me) would have also thoroughly prevented that reply from appearing. The disclosure of that procedure I will request the favour of your insertion in a subsequent issue, your space being too largely drawn upon at this time already. The genuine reason of the policy of *Kosmich* in refusing publication to the following, will be apparent on reading it to any acquainted with the spirit and ways of close communionism. And I am, dear sir, yours respectfully, JOHN BETHUNE, *Chesley, April, 1876.*

To the Editor of the Canadian Baptist:

DEAR SIR,—My reply in your issue of the 30th ultimo, to the communication under the fictitious signature, "M," in your of the 9th preceding, exhibits some of his many gross misrepresentations of fact, sufficient to show that whoever your correspondent may be, he badly lacks the spirit of truth; who instinctively felt it desirable to screen himself from the view of those who know the facts, by withholding his own name, while he has no such delicacy in abundantly repeating mine—like the disreputable many that do under cover of the night what they shrink from in the day time when seen and known. I observe also in yours of the 23rd ult., another communication "Explanatory," of which I am the subject by name, the writer of which signs himself "P.M.," who appears from it to be, without doubt, the Rev. Peter McDonald, St. Mary's. Like the former, it is also a gross misrepresentation of facts. If these communications are specimens of other accounts of similar kind that appear in your columns, your readers must be often grievously misled.

Mr. McDonald confines his observations to a lecture I delivered in my own church here, on the evening of 16th Dec. last, on Confession of Faith, and to a meeting in the Baptist Church the following evening, in which himself took a prominent part. To these observations and the facts as they actually occurred, permit me, sir, to direct the attention of your readers. My lecture on Confession of Faith was delivered to a large audience, who, on their part, were most attentive and orderly to the close. At the beginning for fifteen or twenty minutes I read and remarked upon the very unjust strictures in a communication by "Ottawa" in your issue of 28th Oct. last, on our Presbyterian Church and its Confession of Faith, which was placed by you, as worthy of the position, in your first page, under the section permanently headed, "THE BAPTIST PULPIT." I then entered upon my lecture. (1) In regard to it Mr. McDonald says, it "was mainly based on two positions. 1st. The Confession is not 'a fetter,'—an obvious hit at Mr. MacDonald. 2nd. The Confession of Faith settles doctrinal questions and prevents various opinions on the same theological points." This account is quite incorrect. When I spoke of "a fetter" was when reading "Ottawa's" article in the *Canadian Baptist*, where that expression occurs, and before entering on my lecture. The "obvious hit" is drawn from his own imagination. And what he calls my second position of lecture is drawn entirely from the same source. I neither said nor believe that confessions prevent various theological opinions, etc. The expressions are his own and not mine. What he means by "settling doctrinal questions" I don't quite understand.

My divisions were these: the nature, uses, and necessity of Confessions of Faith, considered by those who accept them as exhibiting what they believe to be the doctrines of God's Word on the subjects referred to. My remarks under these heads, as I repeated over and over again, applied to any confessions—of other churches as well as our own. (2) Mr. McDonald says, "He (Mr. Bethune) succeeded at the close to get Mr. Carnes up beside him," evidently something very bad on Mr. B's part. The fact is as follows: When I closed my lecture, I invited Mr. Carnes, who was present, to make any reply he might desire. He then came forward to the platform, replied, and sat down of his own choice, on a chair there. Such was my "succeeding," and the way of it. (3) Mr. McDonald adds, "and as the latter (Mr. Carnes) had said, and repeated it there, that the Baptists have no Confession of Faith." Mr. B. raised a pamphlet to the face of the former, saying, "There is a Baptist Confession of Faith, patronized by your own Spurgeon." These, in regard to me, are flagrant falsehoods. When Mr. Carnes had replied, I lifted a small book from the table, rose, and said, to "the meeting," "You have heard Mr. Carnes say, 'the Baptists have always and all along contended against Confessions of Faith.' I have a small book in my hand I got by last mail from the Baptist Book Room, Toronto. I will read its title. It is called 'The Baptist Confession of Faith.' Immediately on this Mr. Carnes reached out his hand quickly, saying, 'Let me see it please.' I handed it to him without a word, and waited its return. Then he said (not I), 'O that's Spurgeon's Confession he made for his own congregation.' I replied, 'Well, I will read a little more,' which, opening it, I did as follows: 'We, the ministers and messengers of, and concerned for upwards of one hundred of Baptized Churches . . .

. . . being met together in London, from the 3rd of the 7th month to the 11th of the same, 1689, to consider," etc. I also read from Mr. Spurgeon's short preface to it in which he speaks of it as "this excellent list of doctrines which was subscribed unto by the Baptist ministers in 1689." And I explained that it was throughout nearly word for word a repetition of our Westminster Confession, excepting on baptism and the section on the civil magistrate, and one or two other modifications in the way of omission. I also produced two other present day Baptist Confessions, and next evening presented another. These, sir, are the real facts. I did not lift a pamphlet to Mr. O's face, nor speak at all, as Mr. McD. alleges. (4) Near the end of his "Explanatory" to you, he says of that Baptist Confession of 1689, that next evening he himself "explained the circumstances under which it originated, viz.: that it was framed in the reign of Charles the II. as a vindication of

a pseudo-baptist maligned people." Just so he did say so, and other things equally contrary to the fact. You are aware, Mr. Editor, that Charles II. died in A.D. 1685, or four years before that Confession was framed in 1689; also that it was formed the year after King William III. had taken the place of James II. Had Mr. McDonald told your readers (which he omitted) the fact of that Confession, a number of them could see his misstatement for themselves. I supply it now.

At the close of my lecture and meeting, Mr. Carnes said that I had dishonestly suppressed parts of "Ottawa's" article in the *Canadian Baptist*, and invited the people to a meeting next evening in the Baptist Church, when he said that that article would be read over from beginning to end (one and a quarter columns), and my dishonesty would be seen, and my lecture on Confessions would be reviewed. Next evening, in the Baptist Church, Mr. Carnes was in the chair. After opening the meeting, the first thing he said was that the article by "Ottawa" in the *Canadian Baptist* would be dispensed with, and Rev. Peter McDonald would address the meeting. Mr. McD. began by a criticism of certain Greek words of the baptism controversy—*loao*, *nipo*, *Kataduno*, *bapto*, *baptizo*, *buthizo*, etc. (5) In his "Explanatory" to you he says, "Having understood during a former visit that Mr. Bethune had declared publicly, when *baptizo* signifies to submerge, that it is in the sense of to sink to the bottom, I named various Greek words," etc. On this I beg to say, first, he did not make any such statement at all at that meeting; and next, I NEVER declared publicly or privately since I was born any such thing, and don't believe, nor never did, any such nonsense about baptism.

(6) He further says, "The gentleman (that is Mr. Bethune) favoured the writer (Rev. P. McDonald) with early and continued interruptions." I answer that the man who could pen that statement to you in the face of the facts, which he knew, is capable of anything in the shape of slander.

He began his observations before seven o'clock and closed after nine. For about twenty minutes at the beginning he went on discussing the Greek words before mentioned of Baptistic controversy. I rose (being on the platform), stated that we had been invited to hear that article of "Ottawa" in the *Canadian Baptist* read all through, and my dishonest suppression of parts of it exposed, and a review of my lecture on Confessions of Faith, but the *Canadian Baptist's* article was dismissed, and instead of a review of my lecture we were getting one on baptism, a quite different subject. I called on the lecturer to come to the subjects he had promised, and sat down. Mr. Carnes, chairman, said I was interrupting Mr. McDonald, who proceeded; but now dwell not more than fifteen or twenty minutes on our Westminster Confession, till he came again to the subject of immersion *versus* sprinkling, on which thereafter he occupied the remaining hour and a-half, and even then had no sign of ceasing, till I rose and asked if it was intended that I should get opportunity to reply.

Once again during his discussion of the latter subject I rose and spoke as before, respectfully calling on him to come to the promised subjects of the evening. This Mr. Carnes said was interrupting him, and he went on on baptism to the end. Once on my seat beside him, when he gave "us" as the meaning of the Hebrew word "Haya," on which he placed weight, I answered, "It literally signifies 'has been.'" Another time, on the Greek word *Loao* he dwelt on, I mentioned on my seat the Baptist New Testament translation renders it "to wash." At two different times I respectfully requested the name of the small book he read a large number of professed quotations from Pseudo-baptist writers from, and each time he said fiercely, "O I can do that," but did not give it. Such were literally all my interruptions, which no honourable man would characterize as he has chosen to do, especially also considering what I have not yet related. (7) The points he dwelt on on our Confession as "a fetter" in his view, he states were its doctrines on "foreordination and baptism." (My lecture was not at all one proving our doctrines Scriptural, which would take many lectures from their number; but the nature, uses, and necessity of Confessions as containing what are believed and acknowledged by those whose they are to be Scriptural.) He sagaciously, however, omits to inform your readers of his other "fettors," which were that our doctrines that "faith is a saving grace," and that "the first day of the week is the Sabbath," are contrary to Scripture—cannot be proven therefrom. (Mr. Carnes took the same position on the latter, publicly in his own church some weeks before.) All the points Mr. McD. referred to I showed when my reply came, to be taught in Spurgeon's catechism and the Baptist Confessions of 1689, etc. (8) But now as to his and Mr. Carnes conduct on their side. The evening before, in my church, when I was replying to Mr. Carnes' reply—showing and reading the Baptist Confessions mentioned—he constantly called to me from his seat, and often rose up to say something, till the meeting could not stand it, and from all parts called him to order. Next evening Mr. McD. all through his observations directed his remarks to myself in brow-beating style, calling on me there and then to answer him to each thing yes or no, giving out challenges, and saying "he did not care for one of my coat," etc., etc. When I was replying at the end, he kept constantly leaping up on his feet beside me, interposing objections or calling out to me from his seat every sentence I uttered; Mr. Carnes helping him in this. I never witnessed such conduct in my life. (9) In his "Explanatory," without stating that I spoke in reply at the end, he interposes distorted statements of mine as made throughout his own lecture, no doubt to make them appear as interruptions. One of these is that when he challenged me I declined, saying, "I have enough of it." When such words were used by me it was after I had finished my reply, and been challenged again, Mr. McD. saying he would be ready to

meet me or any in Canada next morning at six o'clock. I replied that my subject was Confessions of Faith, that I had lectured on it, and they had a night also in reply, such as their reply was. Still they challenged. I then said, "Since you force me to speak my feelings, I may tell you I would feel myself degraded on entering on a controversy with men who have conducted themselves so disgracefully as you have done. If I wanted to crush the feelings of the Baptists here, I could not do better than accept your challenge, but I have no pleasure in that. Your gross rudeness and unfairness itself would ruin your cause in your hands. And to do the Baptists justice, I may say, I don't regard you as fair representatives of their ministers, though I consider their position on baptism wrong. That is my answer to you. I have had enough of it to night for a while." Want of space alone prevents me from adding further particulars.

Please to insert this my reply to Mr. McDonald, and excuse its length (which I have condensed as much as possible), as you know it necessarily takes more space to correct misstatements than to make them. Allow me also in a sentence, to add that I consider it a very unjust and demoralizing practice to send or to publish personal accusations of others, especially of another denomination, without the personal signature of the accuser. I am, dear sir, Yours respectfully,

JOHN BETHUNE.

*Chesley, 3rd April, 1876.*

#### QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY, KINGSTON.

##### CLOSE OF SESSION.

On Thursday the closing exercises in connection with the close of the thirty fifth session of Queen's University were held at Convocation Hall. The weather being very fine, there was a large attendance of ladies and gentlemen, who evidently took a great interest in the proceedings. The attendance of students was not so large as usual, many of them having left for home after the close of the examinations. At three o'clock the chair was taken by the Very Rev. Principal Snodgrass, who was accompanied to the platform by Professors Williamson, Mowat, Mackerras, Ferguson, Dupuis and Watson; Professors Lavell and Fowler, of the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons; Rev. Kenneth McLellan, M.A., Peterborough; Rev. John H. Nimmo, B.A.; Messrs Carnegie, ex-M.P.P., Peterborough; John McIntyre, M.A., T. H. McGuire, B.A.; W. H. Fuller, M.A., and W. Ireland, Treasurer of the College.

After Convocation had been constituted by Prayer, offered by Principal Snodgrass, the minutes of last meeting were read by Professor Mowat, Secretary. The prizes gained by the Students were then distributed by the different Professors in their order. The names of the class and honor men were then read out, the Principal remarking that the honours this year were for a much higher standard than the previous year. The Principal referred to the scholarship, and said that in former years the table in front of himself was loaded with books. As a result of recent changes, it had been resolved to make the Prince of Wales' prize an open scholarship, to be awarded to the best Student of the graduating year, and to give him the money instead of books, and this year Mr. John B. McLaren had been the fortunate student. The Principal handed Mr. McLaren a check on the Treasurer for \$50. In like manner the Cataract scholarship had been changed, and a check, value \$50, was given to Mr. George Claxton.

An interesting feature in the afternoon's proceedings then took place, namely, the opening of the envelopes containing the names of the successful competitors in essays written during the summer. The winners of the prizes were found to be as follows: \$25 offered by the Alma Mater Society for the best essay on the Oratory of Edward Burke, open to students of the graduating class, won by Mr. John Ferguson; \$25 offered by the Hon. D. L. Macpherson, Toronto, for the best essay on the Electric Telegraph, won by Mr. George Bell; \$25 offered by Mr. George Kirkpatrick, M.P., for the best essay on "the influence of David Hume on Philosophy," won by Mr. John Ferguson; \$25 offered by Mr. D. B. McLellan, M.A., for the best essay on the British House of Commons, also won by Mr. John Ferguson. Messrs. Ferguson and Bell were loudly applauded when they stepped up to receive their checks for the amounts. The Elocution Association's prizes were then presented to Mr. H. Dyckman for the best serious reading, and to Mr. T. D. Cumberland, for the best comic reading.

The ceremony of laureation was then proceeded with, when the graduates of the year took the degree of B.A., and the Rev. John Gray and Mr. W. A. Lang took the degree of M.A.

The Principal then addressed the graduates as follows:

Gentlemen, Graduates in Arts,—It is not my intention to speak to you many words on this occasion. I would, however, be depriving myself of a real pleasure did I not, in my own name and in the name of my colleagues, cordially congratulate you on obtaining that academic rank and distinction with which your names shall hereafter be associated. You have been looking forward for years to the attainment of this honor; you have fairly earned it, and it has been duly conferred upon you. I sincerely congratulate you. May you be long spared, honourably and with lives of abounding usefulness, to justify the action of the Senate in placing your names on the graduation roll of Alma Mater. Let me remind you that the mere obtaining of a degree is not the end of your studies here, and you have been labouring under a great mistake if you have been regarding it as the prime object of your ambition. You have failed and we have failed in all that is best in a University training, if you leave these halls without the conviction that now more than ever, and under a sense of responsibility greater than you have ever hitherto realised, it is incumbent upon you to "grow in knowledge." We claim nothing more than this, although it is not a little thing for us to claim, that we have been guiding your steps along some of

the initiatory stages of the great highway of learning. It is for you to go forward, and manfully ascend those steep slopes whose summit ranges lie far away in the distance before you. By the manner, I trust, rather than by the extent of your studies, you have been making yourselves familiar with the means and methods by which knowledge may be best acquired. It is henceforth your duty, by all the aids you can command, to be ever extending your researches and ever adding to your stores of information. But there is for you a still more serious business. I mean the utilizing of your knowledge by accurate reasonings, by justifiable deductions, by the formation of wise and sound opinions on all the great practical questions of thought, life, and duty, with which, perhaps more in our day than any other, men are brought face to face. Applying your selves to this business, do not commit the folly of discarding old views because they are old, or of adopting new views simply because they are new. Let opinions be accepted or rejected only as a strict regard for truth may require, let courses of action be followed or abandoned only as an enlightened, sensitive conscience may command. Be tolerant of all opinions that are not irrational, and with a large-hearted charity take the most favourable view you can of human conduct. Be ever more ready to forgive than to condemn. For the rest, with as much of the fearlessness of a true independence as it may ever become you to assume, have the courage of well formed opinions, acknowledge no standard but that of truth, and thrust from you whatever may tend to interfere with your allegiance to God. Then leave consequences to take care of themselves.

"Trust no party, Church, or faction,  
Trust no leaders in the light;  
But in every word and action  
Trust in God and do the right."

The Principal then addressed the audience, and said:

Ladies and gentlemen,—Since the last meeting of Convocation, an event has occurred which is so important in itself, and of such interest to the friends of Queen's University and College, that it seems to be entitled in some notice to-day. I refer to the great union of Presbyterian Churches, which took place at Montreal on the 15th day of June last. The Senate has felt that the consummation alluded to is worthy of a special place in its proceedings, and has resolved to mark its appreciation of the importance of it by conferring an unusual number of honorary degrees. It is, of course, to be distinctly understood that, apart from the union of certain Churches, which only furnishes the occasion, the Senate recognizes in the gentlemen whose names I am about to mention those claims on the ground of scholarship, position, and public service, of which the conferring of such academic distinction is properly supposed to be an acknowledgment.

[The names of the gentlemen on whom the Senate had, on Tuesday last, conferred the degree of D.D., were then announced as published elsewhere.]

This union of the Presbyterian Churches is very closely related to us and our work in many ways, and we cannot prevent ourselves from anticipating to some extent the bearing of its results, as they may show themselves from time to time, upon the future history of this institution. Queen's College has been founded, and has been nourished and sustained chiefly by one of these uniting Churches—the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland. If the views entertained and expressed by that Church for years prior to 1840—t a year in which a Provincial act of incorporation in favor of the College was obtained—if the views to which I refer had prevailed, this college might not have been brought into existence. Opinions adverse to University education on a broad and liberal basis were dominant in the councils of the country. Repeated attempts were made to induce a change, and a repetition of delays was allowed to occur, in the hope of securing equal privileges and facilities irrespective of denominational influence and connections. These attempts failed, and that hope again and again disappointed was compelled to look elsewhere for the means of gratifying itself. The foundation of a college by Presbyterians became a necessity. Bravely did they contend with all the difficulties of the situation into which they were driven—with all the difficulties connected with so great an undertaking, in a country then comparatively new and poor. We are here this day—are we not?—to testify that what they found to be necessary has proved itself to be so useful that we require no special incentive to labor for its continuance with ever increasing efficiency. The College had not emerged from the first stage of infancy when a serious division took place in the Presbyterian Church by which it was founded. That happened in the year 1844. Nearly thirty-two years of separation have passed since then, and now in the good providence of God, two Christian communities, existing as distinct Churches through that interval of time have become one again. Let us hope that a union, for which multitudes have ardently longed and not a few have patiently toiled, shall survive all threatening causes of disturbance, and outlast the coming and going of many generations. Let us hope that such a spirit of toleration and charity shall animate what is now the Presbyterian Church in Canada, as that it shall be an extremely difficult thing for any conflict of diverging views to occasion a rupture. The authorities of Queen's College who favored this union had no selfish end to serve. They might have acted differently had they been influenced by purely personal considerations, or had they permitted the thought that "it is best to let well alone" to be their governing principle. I claim for them the credit which is due to men whose conduct proceeds from the dictates of Christian patriotism, while I express the belief that it will be to them a bitter disappointment should the course which they have dutifully taken endanger in any way the precious trust which has been committed to them. Queen's College being one of the recognized educational institutions of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, with powers and privileges which no other

institution belonging to that Church possesses—with powers and privileges equal to those of any college in the land, excepting maybe that of spending large sums of money—it is surely not too much to expect that in all legitimate ways the Church will enable it not only to preserve the reputation it has acquired, but also to extend to increasing numbers, with augmenting effectiveness, the benefits which it is capable of dispensing. While naturally looking to a particular Church for the principal part of the means upon which its usefulness largely depends, it claims to stand on a Catholic basis and to be doing work of such a kind as that neither class, connection, nor creed need ever interfere with a generous patronage, and I mistake altogether the disposition of those who have its management in their hands, if they shall be seen lending themselves to a policy that shall diminish in any way the advantages and facilities, which all youthful aspirants to an acquaintance with the higher branches of learning, have ever found to be accessible to them, without respect to any consideration but their own laudable ambition to be men of culture and refinement. In proof of this I might refer to an Act recently obtained from the Provincial Legislature, by which a University Council is to be instituted, the elective members of which, 33 in number, to be appointed in the first instance to-morrow morning at a joint meeting of the Board of Trustees and the Senate, are required to have no other qualification than that of being graduates or alumni, and this Council will have greater powers than any other College Council with which I am acquainted. Reviewing for a little the session which is now near its close, there are some things of an encouraging kind that are worthy of notice. The attendance of students has been larger than in any former session. The new regulations, which have been on their trial, have worked well. Any disadvantages that have been experienced will be easily avoided in future. Many of those classes and University prizes which you have seen distributed, more valuable than what we have been hitherto able to give, are the gifts of graduates of former years. No past year has equalled the present with regard to the permanent foundation of scholarships. We have had the Buehan bequest of \$3,000 yielding to scholarships of the value of \$100 and \$80, the McIntyre bequest of \$400, an additional donation of \$500 from the founder of the Dominion Scholarship, making the capital of it \$1,000, and the annual value of \$80, and recently the benefaction of \$1,500 from Mr. David Strathern Dow, of Toronto, for a single scholarship—showing a total of \$5,400 for these purposes in one year. For many years there have been two scholarships of \$80 each, taking pupils of the Collegiate Institute into the University. One of these, the gift of Mr. John Watkins, a warm friend of the College, remains; the other has been discontinued. Is it too much to expect that some liberal Kingstonian will forthwith supply the gap? The room which contains our library and museum is so crowded that we have no comfort in inviting citizens to visit it and inspect its contents. An additional building is urgently required. We shall be delighted if any one will furnish the means of erecting it, and we shall have no objections to call it by his name. The students I am sure, will excuse me, if in their behalf I plead for the erection of a gymnasium on the site now occupied by the structure which they call the "Venerable Pile." I do not see why, for the sake of healthful physical exercise, the young men of this city might not combine with the students in erecting such a building for their common use.

The interesting meeting was closed by the pronouncing of the benediction.

After the proceedings had been brought to a close, the election of Fellows in the different Faculties took place, resulting as follows:

Faculty of Theology—Rev. Wm. Reid, D.D., Toronto.  
Faculty of Arts—Mr. W. A. Lang, M.A., Almonte.  
Faculty of Law—Hon. Oliver Mowat, LL.D., Toronto.  
Faculty of Medicine—Michael Sullivan, M.D., Kingston.

##### THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL.

The following graduates and alumni were this morning appointed members of the University Council of Queen's College, under the Provincial Act of 1874:

Charles E. Legge, C.E., Montreal;  
James MacLennan, M.A., Q.C., Toronto;  
Rev. James Gordon, M.A., Cranlin;  
Rev. Robert Campbell, M.A., Montreal;  
Donald B. McLennan, M.A., Q.C., Cornwall;  
John M. Machar, M.A., Kingston;  
Rev. James Carmichael, Laskey; Rev. Donald Ross, Lancaster; Michael Sullivan, M.D., Kingston; Herbert S. Macdonald, M.A., Brockville; Rev. John K. McMorine, B.A., Almonte; Andrew T. Drummond, B.A., LL.B., Montreal; Thomas R. Dupuis, M.D., Kingston; Rev. James C. Smith, M.A., Hamilton; John McIntyre, M.A., Kingston; Rev. James S. Millar, Woodlands; Rev. Hugh Cameron, Keppen; Rev. Charles I. Cameron, M.A., New Edinburgh; Robert V. Rogers, B.A., Kingston; John Bell, M.A., M.D., Montreal; John A. Mudie, B.A., Kingston; Thos. F. McLean, M.D., Goderich; James MacCammon, M.D., Kingston; Rev. Donald Fraser, M.A., Southampton; James Neish, M.D., Ojess; Alexander G. McBean, B.A., Montreal; William Caldwell, B.A., Lanark; Rev. Robert Campbell, M.A., Renfrew; William H. Fuller, M.A., Kingston; Rev. Matthew W. Maclean, M.A., Belleville; Rev. Ebenezer D. McLaren, M.A., B.D., Cheltenham; Kenneth N. Fenwick, M.A., M.D., Kingston; Rev. Malcolm Mc-Gilvray, M.A., Scarborough.

##### The Premium Photograph.

We have not yet exhausted the stock of photographs on hand, and shall continue sending them out in the order in which we receive subscriptions until further notice. If our readers will kindly make mention of this fact, it will be serviceable to us, and help the circulation of the paper.