

and moved to another place. Here she loyally went to a Baptist Church with her husband, and, finally, for the sake of her children, was immersed and joined the Baptist Church on profession, her letter from her own church being refused. A few years later the family moved to her native place, where they necessarily attended the Presbyterian church, there being no Baptist church in the vicinity. She wished to commune with her mother and brothers and sisters. A letter of inquiry was sent to the Baptist Church of which she was a member, and the answer came back refusing her permission. She was very deeply hurt by the refusal; but found comfort, at last, when she was taken away from her earthly home to a place where no believer, we imagine, is forbidden to sit down with dear ones at the marriage supper of the Lamb. Is such close communion "obedience," or is it not disobedience?

THE Editor may be permitted a few personal expressions regarding the correspondence now appearing in our columns on the College. In October we expressed a decided opinion that the apathy of the West which allowed the College to be removed from Toronto to Montreal must be removed. To this Prof. Fenwick replies, disclaiming for the West apathy, claiming the rather a care for the College's best interest. As Prof. Fenwick himself was a principal mover therein we accept his explanation of motive, but must be permitted to retain our view that, if not apathy it was something akin that allowed the College to slip from its true centre of missionary power to a city where of necessity it can never thus serve the denomination as effectually. The letter however raises other issues, which in view of the words of a respected alumnus of the College and minister of our body, who, over his own signature, writes in our columns, expressing "a wide-spread dissatisfaction with the present position of the College," invite calm consideration. In view of the "avowed dissatisfaction," Prof. Fenwick suggests an impartial and searching inquiry into College matters, a suggestion not made for the first time. The College Board—at least the Montreal section thereof—take this letter as suggesting "both maladministration of trust funds and inefficient internal arrangements," and enter into a frank and full statement of

the financial position. Prof. Fenwick, in his present letter emphatically repudiates any suggestion of either maladministration or inefficiency, and unless cause can be shown to the contrary, his words must be accepted as those of a Christian minister; as the very full and explicit statement of the Board must be accepted as an evidence of the singleness of their purpose and thorough conscientiousness of their doings. Yet must we say the correspondence—which, coming from the sources it does, could in no wise be excluded from our columns or altered in its form—does not seem calculated to allay the avowed unrestfelt regarding College matters. The Board tell us that Prof. Fenwick, one of the oldest members of the Corporation and of the Board, who has always taken a prominent part in the management of affairs, "has not attended Board meetings,"—though resident in Montreal—since December, 1881. There must be reasons for this, and the Board having made the fact public compel the question.—Why?

Another point is raised in the last paragraph of Prof. Fenwick's letter of last month, which deserves the earnest attention of all the churches. Already we have expressed appreciation of the zeal and willingness of friends in Montreal regarding the College, and if as an institution founded on and continued by private benevolence the College is to do its work in Montreal there can be no objection to a permanent location there, but if the College is to stand as the representative College of the denomination in Canada, and a division of interest is simply criminal in our present condition, the question of permanent location must be settled on its own merits, thus only can confidence be maintained. It will be a sad time in our judgment for that confidence we all desiderate, should financial ability rather than "the welfare of the College, and through it of the whole body of our churches," be a prevailing motive on the permanent location of the College. It must not be forgotten that avowed preference for a western location has been expressed, and the eastern location only conceded on the grounds of the liberality of the Montreal friends and necessity for immediate action. So far as the Colonial Missionary Society is concerned, its liberality—we speak from knowledge—would not in any measure be