

union possible. On Sept. 22nd, 1823, King's College appointed Dr. Inglis, Rector of St. Paul's, and Dr. Porter, President of King's, a committee to confer with S. G. W. Archibald, Speaker of the Assembly, and Hon. M. Wallace, Treasurer of the Province, the committee of Dalhousie College. They agreed that the Colleges should be united under the names of the United Colleges of King's and Dalhousie. Halifax was chosen as the site. The Government of the United Colleges was to be in the hands of the Patron, the Visitor and the Governors of King's with the addition of the Treasurer of the Province. The statutes objectionable to Dissenters were to be withdrawn. Lord Dalhousie wrote to Sir James Kempt, saying, that since the proposed institution would be in Halifax and open to all classes in Nova Scotia, he thought "the very character and name of Dalhousie College should at once be lost in that of the other, so that the style of King's College should alone be known and looked up to."

Chief Justice Blowers and Dr. Cochran were bitterly opposed, and when the draft of the Bill to carry the union into effect was prepared copies were sent to the Archbishop of Canterbury, who agreed with the Chief Justice and interposed his veto. Dr. Inglis secured friends in England, and "the friends of the College were now quite indifferent as to the union with Dalhousie." (Akins).

Again in 1829 the question came up. This time the Colonial Secretary proposed in Parliament to discontinue the annual grant of £1000 to King's College. In order to compel King's and Dalhousie to unite and to prevent the educational question becoming a party question which threatened to keep the Council and House in constant feud. The Home Government kept urging the union, and naturally the Governors of King's resisted. In 1835 matters came to a crisis, when the Colonial Secretary demanded the surrender of the Royal Charter. Bishop Inglis appealed to the Archbishop of Canterbury, who as Patron had the "power of a negative upon every statute or by law of the College and ought certainly to be consulted in a matter affecting its existence." (Hind) The Archbishop supported King's and the struggle was terminated in 1837.

The third attempt at Confederation began in the early eighties. The movement was designed to include all the Colleges of the Maritime Provinces. The University of Halifax, an examining university modelled after that at London, paved the way for union. From 1876 to 1880 it flourished, but its enemies were many and its friends were few. With the withdrawal of the Government grant it ceased to be operative. Consolidationists opposed it because it was merely an examining institution. They did not see that it might provide an easy way to unite at least for scientific work. In Manitoba a similar examining university offered the Government an opportunity to use it as a teaching university for scientific and technical work. The anti-Confederationists saw in the University of Halifax something hostile to the influence and prestige of the smaller colleges.

The movement for consolidation made some progress. Dalhousie was receiving Munro's generous gifts and the other colleges were embarrassed financially. For the Government had withdrawn the denominational grants. Mt. Allison seriously debated the question. The younger men were vigorous advocates, but were not strong enough to overcome the strength of historic associations and the fear of the secular tendencies of large universities. The Governors of King's decided in favor of union; but the alumni, strongly attached to the old college, with its historic connection with the church and its charming associations with Windsor, resisted stoutly, and were supported with great vigor by the people of Windsor. Again offers of assistance came from England and from many alumni. Confederation ceased to be a living question in 1885.

The fourth movement was initiated by King's College last year. Dalhousie promptly and liberally responded. Prosperity and large endowments have made Mt. Allison indifferent. Her Board of Regents has declined to confer. The Governors of Acadia have remitted the question without a recommendation to the Baptist Convention. The University of New Brunswick has appointed a committee to confer, but holds out no hope that any scheme can be acceptable to her. Her relations to the Provincial treasury and school system are such that legislative union seems to be the only way to ensure college union. The other colleges are silent.

The prospects of union between King's and Dalhousie are better than they have ever been, yet much remains to be done.—Halifax Morning Chronicle.

### Four Hundred Years Ahead.

O. P. EACHES.

When the Westminster Confession was formed, two hundred and fifty years ago, the framers of that confession held firmly to the belief that many dying in infancy were eternally lost. They were good men, tender in heart, loving God, but held in the grip of a stern theological system. Their conception of God was largely that of a sovereign God, lacking in love and fatherliness.

Designing to magnify and honor God, they largely ignored John 3:16, and framed a theology that ground into infant damnation. True to their logic, they accepted it as a necessary part of a true system. The Confession for centuries stated that "Erect infants dying in infancy are regenerated." Without any reservation the framers of this Confession assented to this statement, and justified their belief in it as in accord with the principles of righteousness. Dr. Twiss, the prolocutor of the Westminster Assembly, said: "Many infants depart from this life in original sin, and consequently are condemned to eternal death, on account of original sin alone; therefore from the sole transgression of Adam, condemnation to eternal death has followed upon many infants." Without a quiver in his voice he follows his system to its logical results, and finds a place for infants in hell. These old logicians placed the immeasurably larger part of infants into the ranks of the reprobate and damned. They extended this horrible doctrine to the unfortunates of the race, the deaf, the dumb, the insane. A Dutch theologian says, concerning the insane: "These latter, we believe, are left dead in sins, under just damnation, through the law of nature." John Calvin assumed, as a matter of course, that the infants of the godless were justly condemned. He says: "Who will not adore this wonderful judgment of God, whereby it comes to pass that some are born at Jerusalem, whence soon they pass to a better life, while Sodom, the gates of the lower regions, receives others at their birth."

It may be asserted, I think, that almost without exception the framers and supporters of the Westminster Confession heartily believed in the doctrine of infant damnation, and supported it by argument. Dr. Hodge was utterly in error when he stated that Calvinistic theologians had never maintained that any infants dying in infancy were lost.

For years past it has been felt that the Westminster Confession needed revision. The expression "Erect infants" implied and asserted that there were "non-elect infants," who were necessarily damned to destruction. The entire church had come to a fuller appreciation of God's nature and love. He is the same God, gracious, considerate, desiring that all should come to a knowledge of the truth. These framers of the faith, two hundred and fifty years ago, did not see God as revealed in the cross of Jesus Christ. They began their system, not with the redemption of Christ, making all else subordinate to this. They began their theological system largely with a sovereign will; they emphasized logic and law; they minimized love and redemptive agencies.

As manifesting this changed attitude of the church, the recent General Assembly in New York, with but two dissenting votes, placed upon record its belief that all dying in infancy are saved through God's grace. This conception of the truth has grown among our Presbyterian friends as the centuries have passed by. The assembly in New York has taken better care of the honor of God in his treatment of children than the Assembly at Westminster. The entire Protestant world may well rejoice that a great blot has been removed from this historic creed.

The Presbyterians, after centuries of struggle, have at last come to the ground always held by the Baptists. Four hundred years ago the doctrine of infant salvation for all dying in infancy, was universally and tenaciously held. Dr. Norman Fox, in "The Unfolding of Baptist Doctrine," says: "But the Baptists, in declaring that the believer was saved before baptism, and therefore independently thereof, naturally joined thereto the teaching that the infant dying unbaptized was saved. In the records of the trials of Baptists in the sixteenth century, we find again and again the question asked them regarding their refusal to give baptism to infants, 'But would you let them go to hell?' It was impossible for men of that day to conceive of the salvation of an infant dying unbaptized. But each time the answer of the Baptist confession is that all who die in infancy are saved by the word of Christ, and the inquisitors were especially shocked at the Baptist declaration that the dying babes of Turks and heathens were safe in the arms of Jesus. This doctrine, now so familiar, was a strange one then, and that the Augsburg Confession singles out the Baptists for condemnation as holding it reveals the fact that at that time it was held by the Baptists alone. In an article in the Presbyterian Review, Dr. Prentiss, of the Union Theological Seminary, recognized the doctrine of the salvation of all who die in infancy as originally a Baptist tenet. When the Augsburg Confession was formed in 1520, the Baptists were four hundred years ahead of the entire Christian world.

Gradually the Baptist principle is leavening all Protestant creeds. It is only a question of time, when all Protestant bodies will be compelled by the New Testament to revise their creeds as to infant baptism. The Baptists do not own the true teaching on this subject—but they alone hold it—they constitute, as in the case of infant salvation, the advance guard of the New Testament teaching.—Baptist Commonwealth.

### Having Our Own Way.

He is a troubler, says one. He is obstinate, says another. He is a hindrance, says a third. He is a good

man, but self-willed, says a fourth. And so it goes through the entire round of opinion respecting the person who seeks to have his own way in the church; especially where he shows opposition, because his view is not adopted and his plan is not endorsed, or where he finds fault with what is done and resorts to obstructive tactics to verify his prediction that if his course of action had been pursued, there would have been a different result.

Men of this kind are found everywhere; and, perhaps, if we were honest with ourselves, we would have to acknowledge that something of their spirit appears in us. However this may be, the matter of having our own way calls for more consideration than it usually receives.

Principle is a grand and vital thing, while obstinacy is a poor affair. If our way is the Lord's way, it is right, and even necessary, for us to see it carried out; but if it is only one of several ways of doing his work, we should not mix two distinct things, or be too persistent in having our own wishes gratified as if they were God's. In such a case we become selfish, wilful workers. We lose our reward. We become disturbers in Zion.

Our work in the church is a continued one. Others contribute to its success. They are counsellors and helpers. They are hence to be consulted. They have opinions as well as we. Their rights are equal to our own in respect to proposing and executing. The same deference accordingly is to be paid to their counsels, suggestions and desires by us as we require of them to our advice and proposals. Mutual consultation and mutual co-operation are demanded. This is a law in Christ's kingdom.

By seeking to have our own way upon every occasion, we discount our future usefulness. We desire to attain a certain end. We propose it and show how it can be done. Another suggests an alteration. Other come in with their modifications. A compromise is the result. Now if we refuse to co-operate because everything is not what we wanted, we lose influence; or if we only lend an indifferent support, we either defeat our original design, or make its accomplishment the more difficult.

If our way cannot be had this time, it may be at another; if our plan was the better one, though others could not see it, so be it; we did our best; now it behooves us to fall into line, and do all we can to bring to a happy completion what has been generally agreed upon. Thus we gain power, and our next measure may fare better. As we acquiesced cordially and promptly on previous occasions, our associates will be more disposed to concede to our preferences now. They see that we are sincere and reliable, that we aim at what is for the good of the church, and that we will do what is right and honorable, come what may. Thus we multiply our influence and obtain our way oftener than we would otherwise do. An experienced pastor once said to a youthful minister: "Yield sometimes; where no principle is involved, defer to the judgment of other advisers; if you are always self-willed, you defeat your own ends, but if you concede judiciously, your turn will come, and more frequently will concessions be made to your judgment."

There is an excellent and wise rule for ministers and elders and those in influential positions to observe. Let each defer on questions of opinion and judgment to one another as there is need. Generally it is the combined wisdom of advisers and workers that is most effective. Individual opinions from even the wisest does not always fill the exact requirement.

People do not usually care to respond to the self-assertive. The man of quiet, reserved force, who says little and only at the right time, who does everything that comes to hand without regard to who proposes it and who is equal to the arising emergency, as a rule commands the largest following, particularly at critical moments, and has most frequently his own way, because his way is along lines that are feasible and practicable, and because it evinces the greatest regard to the good of others and the advancement of religion.—Presbyterian.

### When Jesus Dwells in Us.

When Jesus dwells in us, then we are filled with love unto all the fulness of God—the Triune God, not only in heaven, but in our hearts. Fix your heart upon this: the Father must do it, and what the Father will do, I must expect—the Father, God Almighty, to give this Jesus into my heart as an indwelling Saviour; what the Father does is to strengthen us with might by the Holy Spirit in the inner men. Expect that. Fix your heart upon God. That is the one way to the Father, and as we go along step by step, let your heart be filled with this: God is love. Love is the divine omnipotence. Love is the life and the glory of God. Yes, God is love. There is the love of the Father and the love of the Son and the love of the Spirit. Let us fix our hope on the love of the Father giving the Son into our hearts. Let us rejoice in the Son coming with God's perfect love to dwell within. Let us bow in stillness while the Holy Spirit works mightily within us to shed abroad the love. God will come unto us and will bring us into his banqueting house and his banner over us will be love. May God teach the waiting heart to expect this, nothing less than the perfect love of God perfected in us.—Rev. Andrew Murray.