

whole sum. If he only gave them £11,527, what became of his commission, and further, what became of the balance, nearly £13,000 (\$65,000). I leave the solution of these questions to Mr. Mitchell, and while he is considering them I may make a third quotation for the sake of your readers. It is from the Presbyterian of Australia, which was also copied in the PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW of Dec. 6, 1894, as follows:—

"Rev. Dr. John G. Paton, the famous New Hebrides missionary, has returned from a tour round the world, bringing with him the great sum of £25,000, which he has placed to the credit of the *Foreign Mission Fund of the Victorian Church*. (The Italics are mine).

I surely need not weary your readers with going over other charges which he makes, the above is a sample.

#### "THE OPPOSITION."

Mr. Mitchell shows that the opposition to the scheme is but trifling; "practically from the city of Sydney;" and, "that the steamer has been ordered" by the Victorian Church with the concurrence of the majority of the Churches and Missionaries concerned, and he proceeds to "weigh" the opposition. Note a few points with regard to this "weighing."

1. He says, in showing the zeal of the Victorian Church, that she has "ten missionaries under appointment."

In the official list of the Mission Synod for 1893, the latest I have just now at hand, the Victorian Church has four missionaries on the islands, viz., three on Male-Kula, and one on Efate, besides Rev. Dr. Paton, their Home-Agent. Where Mr. Mitchell gets the ten, or when they are going I do not know. It may be noted that the interest of the money Dr. Paton collected for them, here and elsewhere, would, at five per cent. be \$6,250 yearly, and would support five missionaries at \$1250 each, so that if there should be an increase it does not mean increased giving. However, the zeal of the Victorian Church is not up for discussion. Nobody questions it. They have always shewn an active earnest interest in missions, and this interest has been deepened by Dr. Paton's visits and earnest addresses among them, and it will no doubt continue to grow so long as there is need for it.

(2) If the Churches are to be "weighed" in this matter the fairest method is by their support of the Dayspring Fund. The income for the Maritime Service of the Mission has been about £1500 (\$7500) yearly. This has been made up as follows:—

Pres. Ch. in Canada	£250
Free Ch. of Scotland	250
Pres. Ch. of Victoria	500
Pres. Ch. of N. S. Wales	250
Pres. Ch. of Otago, N. Z.	185
Pres. Ch. of New Zealand	160
Pres. Ch. of S. Australia	50
Pres. Ch. of Tasmania	3

£1548

The smaller sums may vary slightly. The larger ones have been continuous.

Of the above named churches, the Free Church of Scotland has not approved. Our own Church has not approved. The F. M. Com. F. D., which pays the money, has not been consulted, but so far as I know there is but one opinion among them regarding it. The Pres. Ch. of N. S. Wales, giving £2000 annually, does not approve. These three churches, giving £700, nearly one half the whole amount, do not approve.

3. But, further, as I stated in my last, the Federal Assembly, representing all the Australian churches did not approve. Dr. Paton, shortly after his return to Australia, and before he met his own Assembly, sought the endorsement of the Federal Assembly. A motion was made in favour of the scheme, but it was opposed. I quote from the report of the proceedings: "Rev. Geo. McQuinn," of the Pres. Ch. N. S. Wales, late moderator, "pointed out that there was now a monthly trip, with an inter-island steamer besides, at a cost of £100 per trip; while if Dr. Paton's proposal was accepted there would only be a quarterly trip by a small vessel of 350 tons at a cost of at least £250 per trip. He moved that there was no present need of building a

steamer. This was seconded by Prof. Harper, "(of the Victorian Church)." Dr. Paton withdrew his application for the Assembly's approval and the matter dropped."

The fact of the request being withdrawn is evidence that there was no hope of its passing. I leave your readers to "weigh" the concurrence in the scheme.

#### "DR. PATON VINDICATED."

Under the above heading, Mr. Mitchell has for some months been publishing in different papers a letter of his own, containing a letter of approval and thanks given to Dr. Paton on his return to Australia; and in your last issue he calls this letter of thanks and approval, a "vindication from the aspersions cast upon him, (Dr. Paton) by Mr. Scott and others."

By "aspersions" in this case Mr. M. evidently means my statement that when Dr. Paton was urging the scheme here no Church had authorized it; and by "vindication" he means that the Victorian Assembly, in approving of the scheme after Dr. Paton went back, and in stating that they were acting along the lines of a dozen years ago, proved that he had authority for his appeal to this Church. Permit me a few words of explanation and then some quotations.

About a dozen years ago, Dr. Paton on a visit to Scotland, was commissioned by his Assembly to collect money for a vessel. He raised £6000 (\$30,000). The Victorian church then began to inquire into the cost of building and running a steam vessel, and finding the latter so great, nothing more was done. They had commissioned him to collect money, but when the cost of the scheme was ascertained, they did not decide to carry it out. They sanctioned the collecting but never sanctioned the going forward after they found out the cost of running.

When Dr. Paton left for America, there was no mention of it, and from their own resolutions given below, no thought of it. When Dr. Paton came here and found a deep interest in the New Hebrides Mission, he took upon himself, upon his own responsibility, in all sincerity and good faith, to complete the work begun so long ago, and issued appeals to our Church urging Sabbath schools to band themselves and guarantee a certain amount annually for the maintenance of a steam vessel. In common with many others I thought that such an appeal should not be made, that the whole movement was unwise, and stated in the Record that no church engaged in the New Hebrides had sanctioned it.

Before Dr. Paton's return, news reached Australia that he was making an appeal for that object, and leading men strongly opposed it, urging that he be instructed to cease from it. When he returned and reported his work, although they had not authorized the appeal they now approved of it. Now for some quotations in support of this statement:

#### 1. Extract from the Presbyterian Record of Feb., 1894:—

"As the Mission ship,—Dr. Paton would like that there should be one, but thus far none of the churches at work there have authorized such a movement or appeal."

#### 2. Extract from Dr. Paton's letter of Feb. 17, 1894, in reply to the Record:—

"Formally, no Church may have 'authorized' the taking of this step, but simply and solely because of the financial responsibilities being heavier than they see their way to meet. But to me it is as certain as anything can be that if the people of God in Britain and America put the money into my hands there will be but one opinion in Victoria as to building the vessel."

#### 3. Extracts from the Minutes of Commission of the Victorian Assembly, May, 1894:—

Professor Harper moved:—"Whereas there appears in the *Messenger* of our Church and in the English papers, a report that Dr. Paton is pleading for £1600 per annum for the maintenance and support of a Mission steamer, the Commission instruct the Foreign Mission Committee to call Dr. Paton's attention to the fact that no such steamer exists, and that no such *vénement* has been sanctioned by the Church or is likely to be, and to request him to abstain from pressing the scheme upon the British public, whether as the representative of this Church,

or under the auspices of any other association."

Rev. J. Gibson (convener of their F. M. Committee), moved as an amendment:

"That any action with regard to Dr. Paton be delayed till his return to the Colony."

Rev. George Tait (Clerk of the Victorian Assembly) moved as a further amendment:

"That whereas there appears in the *Messenger* of our Church and in the English papers, a report that Dr. Paton is pleading for £1,000 per annum for the maintenance and support of a Mission steamer, the Commission declare that no such scheme has been sanctioned by the Church, and that the Church holds itself uncommitted on this important matter of Mission policy."

The Rev. A. Stewart moved as a further amendment:

"That Mr. Tait's amendment be referred to the F. M. Committee for investigation."

Prof. Harper withdrew his motion, and the amendment of Mr. Stewart was carried.

If my statement in the *Record* was not correct, what becomes of the admission of Dr. Paton in his letter, and of the statements of these leaders of the Victorian Church in their resolutions? If my statement was an "aspersion," what are these resolutions? And yet for months, Mr. Mitchell has been writing under the heading "Dr. Paton vindicated," as he says in his last letter "from the aspersions cast upon him by Mr. Scott," because I said that "thus far none of the Churches at work there have authorized such a movement or appeal."

With thanks for space. E. SCOTT.  
Montreal, June 1, 1895.

#### The Vacant Professorship.

Editor PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

SIR,—In your notice of the various nominees for the professional chairs in Knox College, Toronto, I was surprised to find no notice taken of the nominee of the Ottawa Presbytery. Dr. Armstrong is a graduate of that College and has proved himself, during twenty years of service in the Church, one of her best men. Besides the qualifications necessary for such a position in the way of scholarship and thorough acquaintance with his subject, he possesses qualifications which peculiarly fit him for a professional chair. The magnetism of the man makes him peculiarly one who would win for himself the respect and esteem of the students under his care. Students like friends in their professors. One of the most notable examples of this is Professor Calderwood in the University of Edinburgh. He is the most popular professor, perhaps, in Scotland, and the most successful. Dr. Armstrong reminds me much of Dr. Calderwood, not only in his magnetic spirit but also in the clear concise manner in which he expresses himself. Every one must have been struck with this, who has heard him address the Assembly. The work which the Church has laid upon him has always been well done. His reports are clear, concise, and forceful, and I feel sure that were he in one of the professional chairs the same careful thorough work would be found there. The Church will do herself honour in honouring one who has already done her valiant service and who will in such a new position be able to do her more effective service.

I do not intend, by the foregoing, to detract from the merits of the other nominees. I do not know many of them. One, however, I must mention Dr. Stalker. He is certainly a splendid man every way, but until our Church concentrates her efforts more as to our colleges, and thus enable her to offer inducements to the best that can be found in the world, it will be hopeless to expect such men to come. Dr. Stalker has, at present, a larger salary than our Church can offer and, doubtless, the prospect of a chair at home. Besides, when we have men in our own ranks every way fitted to occupy our chairs with dignity, why should we look to other lands? I trust the Assembly will appoint the best man in our own Church, and I know none better than Dr. Armstrong.

JAS. H. BEATT.

Rockburn, Que., May 27, 1895.

[The nominations by Presbyteries were recorded in the REVIEW as news; we have