

some unexplained cause become suddenly overcast; but still he is anxious to have us start in addition to an Episcopal University and Roman Catholic School of higher education, a Presbyterian College, and to have appropriated to its support this mission property, which is of so little value. But, with all due deference to Mr. Sieveright's consistency, we think that if Prince Albert develops into a large city, as is still possible, the mission property will become very valuable, and the General Assembly may, while caring for the Indians, see its way to aid an institution for higher education. But, if on the other hand, Prince Albert goes down, now that Mr. Sieveright is about to leave it, it may not be considered necessary, in order to meet the wants of its population, to establish a second university or college, even on paper.

2. A paragraph in this letter regarding the graveyard, is so bad that it is difficult to conceive how any man with a remnant of conscience could have penned it. Mr. Sieveright allows himself to write in these terms: "An official declaration announces the sale of the graveyard claimed by the congregation, with the dead bodies still interred. That may be a most regular proceeding. It persisted in, the law courts will doubtless have an opportunity of deciding whether even a Foreign Mission Committee can make merchandise out of the bodies of their fellow men."

What are the facts? The old graveyard is included in the first survey of 180 lots, and was laid out into lots by Mr. Sieveright's direction, and I understand that a number of bodies were at his instance moved to a new burying-ground. When I visited Prince Albert last August, Mr. T. N. Campbell reported in writing the sale of 179 lots, together with the price obtained. The 179 lots included the whole of the first survey, except the large mission house, with whose sale he had nothing to do. He reported, therefore, the sale of the old graveyard, but the agent could not sell lots without the sanction of Mr. Sieveright, the missionary in charge. But this is not all. On the 28th April, 1882, Mr. Sieveright wrote to me, as follows, viz.: "You will be glad to hear that all the lots (180) surveyed on the mission property have been sold, at the prices agreed upon, with building conditions attached." He therefore himself reported the sale of the graveyard. This sale was made without the knowledge, or approbation of the Foreign Mission Committee. It could be made legitimately only with his sanction, and he himself reported the fact, as one that should make us glad, and yet he has the effrontery now to reproach the Foreign Mission Committee with "making merchandise out of the bodies of their fellow men." Comment is unnecessary. Mr. Sieveright has supplied a gauge by which we can measure the exact value of his statements.

3. It is only in the light of this exposure that we can understand how Mr. Sieveright could pen such a sentence as the following respecting Prince Albert Mission: "Nothing is clearer than that no pure Indian mission—that is, distinct from the white settlers and English speaking half-breeds, who would scarcely deem it a compliment to be classed as Indians—ever existed." If reliance can be placed in any human testimony, save that of your veracious Prince Albert correspondent, "nothing can be clearer" than that, when Rev. James Nisbet was sent in 1869 to found a mission to the Indians in the North-West, he began his work in the wilderness, on the spot now known as Prince Albert, and there was not a white settler or an English speaking half-breed to be found in the entire region for many miles around. The mission was as purely Indian as any mission that ever existed. Prince Albert was by competent judges considered admirably suited for the Indian work, and for a time the work went on hopefully. Gradually, however, the Indians who were numerous at first, in the neighbourhood, moved westward after the buffalo, and Prince Albert became less suitable as an Indian mission field. After a time English-speaking settlers attracted by the richness of the soil and the advantages of the mission, took up land in the neighbourhood, and their spiritual interests were cared for by the missionaries. All this was known and reported to the General Assembly year after year, long before Mr. Sieveright saw Prince Albert. It was at the request of the Foreign Mission Committee that the English work was ultimately transferred in 1877 to the Home Mission Committee. But these facts give no countenance to the wanton assertion that no pure Indian Mission ever existed at Prince Albert—an assertion which is a libel on the dead and on the living. The fruit of the Prince Albert mission

is not found in Prince Albert alone, although even there Mr. Sieveright could discover it somewhat pleasantly, not long since, when he urged the Foreign Mission Committee to make a liberal grant to his new church, on account of this Indian work which was still going on there. But the fact that the large band of Indians under Mis-ta-was-sis, head chief of the Carlton Cree nation, were so impressed with what they had heard long before at Prince Albert, that a few years ago they earnestly requested the Presbyterian Church to send Rev. John Mackay among them, is very conclusive evidence that a true Indian Mission, doing good work, existed at Prince Albert.

The grounds upon which he seeks to support his assertion that no pure Indian Mission ever existed at Prince Albert, do not sustain it. If there were only sixteen Cree Indians on the Communion roll, during the first ten years, there have been many missions to the heathen, ultimately successful, which had not a single convert for a much longer period. But he has a second ground for his assertion. "No Indian ever resided in Prince Albert, ever owned a lot and erected a house." This statement shows a marvellous inacquaintance with Indian habits, or a strong determination to find grounds for a baseless assertion. Mr. Sieveright ought to know that the heathen Crees of the plains had no fixed residences, and owned no lots and build no houses anywhere. But Prince Albert was a point where they camped in large numbers.

Mr. Sieveright is carried away so far as to allow himself to say of the Prince Albert Indian work, "Its main existence was in the printed report, in many respects apocryphal as to lead one cognizant of the whole fact to say, 'If that is the report of the Foreign Mission issues, I'll have no faith in their reports from India and China.'" In reference to the printed reports, I can only say that they have invariably been based with great care on the reports furnished by the missionaries in the field and by brethren in Manitoba, who, like the late Dr. Black, had very much better opportunities than I had of knowing the character and progress of the work. This paragraph raises the question of trustworthiness as between Mr. Sieveright and those who were before him at Prince Albert. It might have been wiser for him not to have suggested the comparison, for, if the Church has to choose between the reliability of men like Nisbet, McKellar, and Johnson, and the gentleman who charges the Foreign Mission Committee with making merchandise out of the bodies of their fellow men by a sale which he himself reported, and must have sanctioned, I do not think it will be greatly to the advantage of Mr. Sieveright.

I have referred to only a small portion of the inaccuracies of this letter, but I hope enough has been said to show that the Foreign Mission Committee dealt very mildly with a gentleman who took unwarranted liberties in dealing with their property, and did not display any special wisdom or marked regard to their interests in his actings, and I trust also that the real value has been made apparent of his attempts to discredit the committee and their work.

Toronto, 7th Sep., 1883. WM. MACLAREN.

BELIEVERS MEETING AT NIAGARA—A REPLY.

MR. EDITOR,—I have just had placed in my hands a copy of your paper, of August 22nd, in which there appears a letter signed "Presbyter" professing to give a report of a Bible reading delivered by me at the Niagara Conference, and the friend who gave it me has requested that I shall write and correct the misrepresentations which have been made by your anonymous correspondent who, from under cover, has attacked me with personalities and made false statements as to what I said on that occasion. As to the personalities I am not concerned to answer them, these things move me not—they are to be expected. My work remains with Him who judgeth righteously, and neither the kindly sympathy of partial friends nor the envenomed attacks of concealed foes can affect that judgment.

As to the false statements made, it would be a wearisome and thankless task to refute them in detail, a task for which I have not the time to spare or you the space to waste, but, with your permission, I will give two or three instances of the writer's perversion of my statements which will serve as a sample of his whole letter.—Speaking of the parable of the sower, in professing to give my views, he says, "but to say

there was only one fourth of the field fruitful is a gratuitous and ridiculous assumption." Now this assumption is *his*, not *mine*. I never said so or assumed any such thing. I stated, and gave as my authority the Word of God, that only one fourth of the seed sown produced fruit. I never confounded the *seed* which is the Word, Matt. xiii. 13 and Mark iv. 14, with the field in which it is sown. If Presbyter can see no difference between the *seed* and the *field* I cannot surely be held responsible for his lack of perception.

Again he says, "Here let me give you Mr. Parlane's version of the parable of the leaven. The kingdom of heaven is corruption which the mother of harlots and abominations hid in or among the saints of God or the Church, until the whole of the saints or the whole of the Church was corrupted." I most emphatically deny that I gave any such interpretation of the parable, and assert that the statement of your correspondent is a gross perversion of what I did say. I repudiate such an exposition of the parable which must have had its origin in Presbyter's own fertile imagination. It is the first time I ever heard of it. The gist of what I said respecting the parable of the leaven (on which I dwelt but little, for the reason I then gave, that the subject had been discussed exhaustively the day before I arrived) was this, viz. that the kingdom of heaven, which I had already explained to be, not "the saints of God or the Church of God," but *professing Christendom*, was to be leavened as to three parts (like as three parts of the seed are unproductive so three measures of meal are leavened) and that leaven which is naturally fermentation and corruption was symbolical of false doctrine. The woman who hid the leaven, being, as I believed, the mother of harlots.

Just as Presbyter in the parable of the sower confounds the *seed* with the *field*, so again here as far as I am able to gather his meaning, which is difficult, he regards as one and the same thing the kingdom of heaven in Matt. xiii., which has within it "tares," Matt. xiii. 26, "things that offend," etc., Matt. xiii. 41, "every kind" "bad as well as good," Matt. xiii. 47, 48, (the kingdom in mystery, the mysteries of which it is given to the Children of God to know, Matt. xiii. 11) with the Church of God "which is His body," Eph. i. 23, "which is without spot or wrinkle or any such thing," Eph. v. 27, and as a natural result is hopelessly confused, the fact being that he is profoundly ignorant of dispensational truth. I use the word ignorant in no offensive sense, for we were all equally ignorant until Divine grace enlightened our understanding. That it is justifiable to explain heaven as false doctrine can be seen (without searching more deeply) from a study of Luke xii. 1; Matt. xvi. 6; Mark viii. 15; and whether existing facts bear us out in saying that professing Christendom has been corrupted by the false doctrines of the mystic Babylon can easily be seen by those who read the signs of the times in which we live. Is Christendom corrupted with ritualism (Pharisaic observances and hypocrisies)? Is it honeycombed with rationalism Sadduceism)? Has it been smothered in the adulterous embraces of the secular power (Herodianism)? or is it in a highly spiritual condition free from the taint of all these leavening influences? These are questions that Christians can answer for themselves.

I must not close without protesting against the cunning insinuations made in the accusation "that I had expressed very decided opinions about the character of ministers of the Gospel." It is strange that if I had done what Presbyter here asserts, that no one in the large audience I addressed, composed to a considerable extent of ministers, uttered a remonstrance against such opinions. Why did they not do so? For the simple reason that I made no charges against the character of ministers of the Gospel as Presbyter would insinuate. I did express an opinion, by no means too strong, as to "the fowls of the air," the children of the wicked one, who enter the ministry from unworthy motives; and with them I classed the wicked rulers of Christendom in the middle ages who prostituted the name of Christianity for their own purposes. If Presbyter means that in saying this "I expressed very decided opinions about the character of ministers of the Gospel," all I can say is that words to him can convey no meaning. So far from being at variance with the ministers of Christ, I count among them some of my warmest and dearest friends who are bound to me not only by the common bond of love and service to the same blessed Maker, but who are esteemed by me very highly in love for their work's