

hundred miles, of which about two hundred and forty were done in a canoe, forty or fifty on foot, and the remaining eight or ten in a lumber waggon. Such is the nature of the work and the circumstances under which it must be done by our missionary on the Upper Ottawa. This is the summer side of it. In winter the lumbering shanties and depots have to be visited, involving long, cold and lonely drives over the same regions, not by any means free from risks from bad ice, losing one's way, or being overtaken by bitter, blinding storms. I think there may well be asked for anyone who does this work, the sympathy, interest and prayers of the whole Church. Wherever he goes, he will meet with the utmost kindness and polite attention, but the material on which he has to work is far from being the most encouraging, and he must be content to sow the seed in the faith that some one will reap, and of a day coming when they who sow and they who reap will rejoice together. He must be content and thankful even to hold forth the light in a dark place, until the day dawn and the Daystar arise in hearts now hardened in many instances with spiritual indifference, or beclouded with the errors of Romanism. Down the river there is no Protestant minister within about sixty miles; to the west, the nearest must be from thirty to forty; to the north, Fort Abitibi, three hundred miles away, is the next place where, except Roman Catholic priests, a minister of the Gospel may be found; to the east, I cannot say exactly where one may be found, I only know that it is not near, probably at Deser on the River Gatineau. Over the whole region where we travelled there are Protestant families, in some places "few and far between," in others more closely settled, nearly all able to understand English, some French, and others Indian better than English, so that a missionary, to be thoroughly equipped for this work, in addition to all needed physical and spiritual qualifications, would require also to know and speak all these languages. I need not add that there is great spiritual destitution, and that the people shew its effects. If our work in these regions does not tell in organized churches and communion rolls, except perhaps at Mattawan, for years to come—and for years yet to come no self-supporting congregation can be expected in all this district—shall we therefore give it up? Shall we be forced ignominiously to retire for lack of funds and leave Rome triumphant, to point boastfully to Roman Catholics, and to Protestants with exultation, or scorn of the apathy or niggardliness, the poverty or want of devotion of heretic churches, who are willing or compelled to leave their people to the care of their deadly enemies? I trust this will not be the case. It is in the power of our Church easily to prevent it, if it but has the will. God has for the present put that work into our hands, and if we prove recreant to the trust, I hope it may, and I cannot but believe it will be taken up by some Church more devoted and worthy than ours. The whole field cannot but be one of deep interest to us because of its very need, and should we for lack of funds be forced unworthily to retire, my humble co-operation will not fail to be given, and my prayers shall not cease to rise for the rich blessing of God to rest upon the labours and labourers of any evangelical Church which will hold forth the light, and sound out the word of the Lord, in all this widespread and needy region. Trusting that your readers will bear patiently with the length to which these jottings have extended, I am yours. W. D. BALLANTYNE.

Pembroke, Nov. 20, 1879.

#### ROMAN CATHOLIC ORDINATION.

SIR,—There are two points in connection with this important subject which are worthy of attention in the discussion of it. The first point is in reference to the stating of the question. We are asked to report our "views on the question as to the validity of ordination by the Church of Rome." Now, no one is called on to question the validity of ordination so far as the Church of Rome is concerned. Surely the Church of Rome has a right, as every Church, to ordain her priests as she pleases. And when she ordains a man to the priesthood, and pronounces him ordained in a valid manner so far as her ministry is concerned, no one outside of that Church has any reason to deny her assertion. So far as executing the office of a priest in that Church is concerned, his ordination is unquestionably valid. But the question is, as pointed out in Mr. Laing's report: Is that ordination to the priesthood to be accepted by us as a valid or adequate

setting apart or ordination to the ministry of the Gospel in a reformed Church?

I hold that it would not only be unreasonable, but absurd, to regard ordination to the priesthood as equivalent to ordination to the work of the ministry in the Presbyterian Church, and can hold this without at all calling in question the validity of ordination to the priesthood. It was valid in that Church to that end; but ordination to the priesthood, is a totally different thing from ordination to the office of the Gospel ministry. Without dwelling on this distinction, which is held by all who do not adopt the pernicious error that sacramental virtue is conferred by ordination, it is to be desired that it be kept in view in discussing the question. And the question as sent down should have been more clearly stated. In support of this view let me give a brief quotation from Archbishop Whately. In his work on the "Kingdom of Christ" (note a, page 286), he says, "Nearly similar reasoning will apply, I think, to the case of ordinations. What appears to me the wisest course, would be that each Church should require a distinct appointment by that Church itself to any ministerial office to be exercised therein, whether the person so appointed had been formerly ordained or not, to any such office in another Church. But the form of this appointment need not be such as to cast any stigma on a former ordination, by implying that the person in question had not been a real and regular minister of another distinct society. For any Church has a fair right to demand that, unless reason be shewn to the contrary, its acts should be regarded as valid within the pale of that Church itself; but no Church can reasonably claim a right to ordain ministers for another Church."

In another passage in the same volume, p. 227, he remarks: "On the same principle which has now been set forth in respect of bishops, the acts of a presbyter, or deacon or other minister, of any Church, cease to be valid, as soon as the Christian community in which he was appointed, withdraws its sanction from his acts. If another Church thinks fit to receive him as a minister they have an undoubted right to do so; and he then becomes a minister of that Church. So he does also, when not expelled from the society to which he originally belonged, supposing the Church to which he transfers himself thinks fit to recognize the ordination of the other; which they may do, or refuse to do, entirely at their own discretion. This is a point which every Church has a full right to determine according to its own judgment."

The second point to which, with your permission, I would call attention at another time, is one not clearly brought out in Mr. Laing's able report, namely, that Romish ordination was not regarded as valid for ministry in the reformed Churches by the reformers of Calvin's time on the continent. Mr. Laing might have stated his views on this point more strongly, that is, would have been warranted in doing so, and in claiming the reformers of the time of Beza and Calvin as distinctly supporting his position. The question as to baptism, and as to whether the Roman Catholic Church is a Church of Christ, are questions to be settled on grounds distinct from the question as to ordination. D. D. M.

#### THEOLOGICAL DEGREES.

MR. EDITOR,—In my last communication to your valuable paper, upon the subject of University Degrees in Theology, I argued the question upon the higher and abstract ground, from which I think the Church should, in the first place, look at it. Without referring to any of the existing schools of the prophets connected with our Church, I attempted to shew that the establishment of a Theological University in immediate connection with the General Assembly would be at any time extremely unwise, and especially at a time when all the schemes of the Church are suffering from financial embarrassment. I wish now to consider the question from the standpoint of the actual circumstances of the Church in regard to its theological institutions.

Exclusive of the Manitoba College, which is not fully equipped, there are now five institutions recognized by the Church, at which intending ministers can receive a theological education. These institutions are located at Toronto, Kingston, Montreal, Quebec and Halifax, respectively. We have now nothing to do with considering whether there are too many of such institutions or not. As a matter of fact they

exist; it has been found impracticable to combine them in any way; and it seems impossible, even were it desirable, to abolish any one of them. The Church, therefore, may be supposed to be in perpetual possession of these five institutions for the training of the ministry. But when we look more closely into the matter, we find that these institutions are not all of the same character. In Toronto, Knox College has only a Theological Hall, and what is called a Preparatory Department, in which students in exceptional circumstances may receive a somewhat imperfect training in literature and science before entering the Hall. In Kingston, besides the Theological Hall, and the Preparatory Department instituted last year, there is a University having by Royal Charter the privilege of granting Degrees in Arts, Medicine, Law, and Theology; there is also a fully equipped Arts' College in which students are prepared for taking Degrees in Arts; and, in affiliation with the University, there is a Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons. The Presbyterian College in Montreal and the Theological Hall in Halifax have the same position and character as Knox College, Toronto. Morrin College in Quebec, is slightly different, having an imperfectly equipped Arts Faculty in addition to the Theological Hall, but without University powers. The above, I take it, an accurate statement of the relative position and character of the different institutions connected with our Church.

Now, we must bear in mind, that each of these institutions is now exactly what it was originally intended to be. Queen's University and College is the eldest of them all, being founded about forty years ago especially for the purpose of giving a full course of instruction in Arts and Theology, but also to meet a demand for a liberal education in the general community. The other so-called Colleges, but properly Theological Halls, were founded at a later period, specially for the purpose of giving theological education. The founders of them, I presume, never dreamed of the idea of investing them with University powers. They are, therefore, now exactly what they were originally intended to be, and Queen's is now exactly what she was originally intended to be. But, in their relations to one another they differ, because all of them are now brought into connection with the same Church, which originally they were not. And the Church as a whole is now possessed of a University of whose Royal Charter it may take full advantage if it pleases so to do.

It appears, however, that the authorities and friends of two of the Theological Halls, think that their institutions are placed at a disadvantage, because their founders did not see fit to invest them with University powers, whereas the founders of Queen's did do so. And now they call upon the Church to found a University in connection with the General Assembly, simply for the benefit of their Theological Halls, as distinguished from and in competition with the Theological Hall of Queen's College. Apart from the motive which prompts such a scheme, I desire to point out the unreasonableness of it. As a matter of fact, the Church has already a University for conferring, amongst others, Theological Degrees. And the governing body of Queen's University, last June, represented "to the Assembly its willingness to take any steps necessary to modify the constitution of the Senate so as to secure the representation on it of the different Theological Halls of the Church, for the purpose of conferring (Theological) Degrees. No one can say that this is anything but an honourable offer made by Queen's University to the Church; and certainly the institution which made the offer is sufficiently ancient and honourable in its origin to justify it in having done so. But we are told that for the other Theological Halls to put themselves in affiliation with Queen's University would be placing them at a disadvantage. How so? Queen's University as such is quite distinct from Queen's College, and from the Theological Hall of Queen's College. The Theological Halls established in Toronto, Montreal, and Halifax, would, if they affiliated, hold exactly the same relation to Queen's University that would be held by Queen's Theological Hall. An equitable system of representation in the Senate would be adopted, and none of the Halls would have an advantage over the others, except what might arise from the superiority of its equipment or the popularity of its professors. As to Knox College, or the Presbyterian College, Montreal, giving up their past history in becoming affiliated upon equal terms with Queen's University, such an idea could be the result only of