

Knox College Professorship.



REV. JOHN S. MACINTOSH, D.D.

Dr. John S. MacIntosh, nominated for the chair of Apologetics in Knox College was born in Philadelphia of Scotch-Irish parentage, his father being a Scotchman and his mother an Irishwoman. When a boy he went home to Ballymoney, Co. Antrim where he received his early education. Matriculating in Queen's College Belfast with the highest honors, he maintained to the end of his university course a first position. In Edinburgh he distinguished himself as a student of theology, and during a long stay in Germany he made further progress in his philosophic and theological studies, and in Roman Law and Medicine. Thus equipped for the pulpit he began his life work in Connor, an old historic church in Ulster. After a few years he was called to succeed Dr. Henry Cooke of Belfast, the greatest orator of the Irish Presbyterian Church and one of the most gifted speakers of the nineteenth century. In this trying field Dr. MacIntosh made his influence felt in Belfast and throughout Ulster, and in every department of Church work showed himself a master. While in May Street Church he was made Convener of the Irish Assembly's Continental Mission and discharged the duties of the office with honor to himself, and with advantage to the cause of Evangelical truth. His knowledge of Hebrew and fine literary taste enabled him to aid the Irish Church in her new metrical version of the Psalms. When at the Pan-Presbyterian Council in Philadelphia he was called to one of the leading churches of that city, also to one in Chicago. Shortly after going to Philadelphia he was on the recommendation of his old teacher Dr. McCosh, offered a chair of philosophy in Princeton. Last winter he lectured in Lane Theological Seminary with great acceptance. In appearance Dr. MacIntosh is born to command, in scholarship he is ripe, has a graceful pen, is magnetic in his manner, a good educator, a warm friend, and an able administrator. Being a hard student for years he is one of the best all round scholars of the day. He is the author of several articles, of a volume of lectures, and is understood to have a work on ethics almost ready for the press. He is known by his brethren to be an unusually close reader, and as an author on all ethical, historical and cultural subjects. Should the Assembly ratify the nomination of the Board of the College, and appoint Dr. MacIntosh, the elevation of the ministers of the Church will be safe in the hands of one so able, competent, so well qualified of head and of heart to fill the chair of Apologetics and Old Testament Literature as Dr. MacIntosh undoubtedly is.

To the Editor *Presbyterian Review* :

DEAR SIR,--It was with much pain that

I read Mr. E. Scott's letter in your issue of the 9th inst., renewing his attack on Dr. Paton and the steamer *Dayspring* project. The venerable and beloved father of the New Hebrides Mission Staff is now in the midst of the naked savages for whose evangelization he has so devotedly and successfully labored for thirty-seven years. It will be months before he learns of this renewal of hostilities. He is where he cannot defend himself or his project. In the absence of any one better informed allow me space to reply in his behalf.

Mr. Scott's course throughout this controversy has been marked by strong bias against Dr. Paton, and unfair treatment of him. He began the attack in the columns of the *Record*, the official organ of our Church. He refused to admit Dr. P.'s reply when sent to him for insertion, and later when the F. M. Committee of the Victorian Church completely vindicated the Doctor and that vindication was sent for insertion in the *Record* months ago, he ignored it.

The present attack is in keeping with those that have gone before. Certain facts are arrayed with all the skill of a practised hand—other important facts are held back. The impression made is entirely misleading. Drawing from the same official documents let me supplement the information that he has seen fit to give your readers, and in addition point out a number of grossly erroneous statements which his letter contains. The attack is much more formidable in appearance than reality.

MISLEADING AND ERRONEOUS STATEMENTS.

1. Mr. Scott asserts that when Dr. P. appeared before his own Assembly on his return he presented them with sufficient to increase the amount previously collected to \$50,000 to build a steamer."

Dr. P. during his recent tour made no appeal for means to build the steamer. That work he completed ten years ago. Since that time £6,000 have laid in the hands of the Church in Victoria which, with accumulated interest he regarded sufficient. One gift of £1,000 was volunteered for the building fund by a gentleman in Liverpool which Dr. P. would gladly have received for maintenance, and so expressed himself to the generous donor.

2. He (Dr. P.) "presented them in addition for their ordinary F. M. Fund the enormous sum of £25,000 (one hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars) which he had collected in Britain, Canada and the United States."

Mr. Scott has doubled the sum (£11,527) actually handed over by Dr. P. to the "ordinary F. M. Fund" of his Church. The object of these exaggerations is apparent.

3. Mr. S. asserts that the F. M. Committee of the Victorian church have gone forward and ordered the steamer on their own responsibility. The statement is entirely unwarranted. The Victorian Assembly, which has now ten missionaries under appointment to the Islands, adopted the steamer *Dayspring* scheme as submitted by its F. M. Committee and authorized it "to communicate with the sister Churches, *Dayspring* Board and the missionaries in the New Hebrides to ask their approbation, and on obtaining a reasonable amount of concurrence to go on to order the vessel."

No long ago as last January Dr. P. wrote "virtually a majority both of the missionaries and churches have expressed approval of the scheme." A number had not at that date replied. The F. M. Committee did not order the steamer till March. No doubt in the interval the answers received gave them additional "concurrence" and amply warranted them to order the vessel. The steamer has been ordered on the authority of the Victorian Assembly and with the concurrence of the majority of the missionaries and churches concerned.

4. Mr. Scott asserts that the Victorian Church "has at length, for the first time sanctioned the scheme" of a steamer *Dayspring*.

Dr. Paton on the contrary states that he brought the scheme before the Assembly of Victoria in 1883 and was then empowered

and authorized to lay the proposal before the churches of Great Britain and Ireland, and to ask and receive from God's people whatever contributions they felt disposed to give toward the needed sum of £6,000.

The F. M. Committee of the Victorian Church in their recent vindication of Dr. Paton, from the aspersions cast on him by Mr. Scott and others, state that the Assembly in its final act of approval, of the project last November "had simply proceeded on lines laid down some ten years ago when you (Dr. Paton) were commissioned to visit Great Britain and Ireland for the purpose of raising funds to build a vessel."

Their retention of the £6,000 is conclusive proof of their intention to order the steamship as soon as the way was clear. Had they abandoned the project they would no doubt have felt bound as honest men to return the money to those who gave it.

In the face of these facts published and in your correspondents hands he has the courage to assert that the scheme is now for the first time approved by the Victorian Assembly.

THE OPPOSITION.

There is and has been for ten years past decided opposition to the project. Mr. Scott has told your readers, that two churches out of eight concerned have expressed themselves adversely. On his own showing, that is not such a formidable opposition as should lead to the abandonment of the Steamer. But the opposition requires to be weighed as well as counted. Whence does it emanate? By whom is it offered? Practically by the city of Sydney. The *Day Spring* Board, with its six or seven gentlemen who have long directed its affairs, has its seat in Sydney. That same city is the influential centre of the Church of New South Wales. Sydney is also the headquarters of the Australasian New Hebrides Company and other trading and manufacturing concerns that have large pecuniary interests in the New Hebrides and in the Steamship service to the islands. The annual subsidy of \$7,500 given by the *Dayspring* Board to the A. N. H. Co., is a very important part of their revenue and it is natural that strong opposition should be offered there to any project that involves its withdrawal. As Mr. Scott put it in the *Record*, "There is not sufficient traffic to make a steamer pay for commercial purposes only and if a mission steamer were on the route there would not likely be a commercial one. With the work of the Mission and the payment received for it the mercantile steamer may be made to pay." And so fearfully the eight churches who have missionaries in the New Hebrides must make the work of Christ under their hand there, subordinate to the pecuniary profit of a Steamship Company, which, on the way to its dividend, exercises as Mr. Scott assures us, a valuable civilizing and Christianizing influence.

I ask your readers which is the safer course, where the interests of the cause of Christ in the New Hebrides is concerned, to trust the judgement of gentlemen in Victoria, unbiassed by local or personal interests, or that of gentlemen in and around Sydney and surrounded by those whose large monetary interests are at stake?

But that is not all. The opposition which emanates from Sydney may be weighed in another way—by the interest which the Church in New South Wales manifests in the mission work in the New Hebrides. Mr. Scott tells your readers that it "is one of the leading churches in Australia." It is nearer to the New Hebrides than any other Church engaged in work there. It shows a keen interest in the expenditure of the *Dayspring* Fund but when it comes to sending and maintaining missionaries it is another matter. This "leading" church maintains just one missionary in the New Hebrides while the Church of Victoria has now six under appointment to the same field.

I reserve what I have to say regarding the need and cost of the Steamer *Dayspring* for your next number.

Yours truly,

Thorold,

J. W. MITCHELL.

May 25th, 1893.