

denominations unanimously condemned the new proposals, and 17 missionaries have denounced them to the Committee as "ridiculous and impracticable."

Secondly, the Calcutta newspapers write on them in exactly the same strain as our correspondent. Thus *The Friend of India*, perhaps the ablest exponent of Calcutta public opinion, and a paper originated, we believe, by the Serampore Missionaries, says of the Committee's despatch:—"Not merely is it implied that the Baptist Missionaries waste the subscriptions of the Home Church, but it is complained that they are thus enabled to live in such luxury, so far above the people, and so selfishly, that they are the cause of the absence of self-sacrifice in the native church. Such are the charges. And the remedy for this is to send out a class of men whom we can most fairly describe as missionary loafers. These youths are to labour with their hands, to 'rough it,' to live among the people and as the people live, and to live at the cost of the heathen whom they are sent to convert by their example of self-denial. Moreover, as they are to be unmarried, both for cheapness and to save them from distracting cares, allusion to which called forth 'laughter' from the audience of Dr. Landels, they are mercifully to be allowed to go two and two. The Society will send them out, bid them God speed, after the fashion denounced by St. James, and 'provide a retreat' for those who live to return—a promise that may be very safely made. And this is the remedy proposed for the apathy of the native church, and as a means to quicken the unselfishness of its members into complete independence! For Indian readers the proposal is beneath discussion except in so far as it involves an insult to the Committee's agents already in the field, and must end in breaking up the Baptist mission throughout India."

These are stronger words than Mr. Grant's, and yet the Committee has not ventured to write to *The Friend of India* complaining of—"flippancy," "sneering," "caricature," or "gross misrepresentation."

Thirdly, Dr. Cramp's own letter shows us that even in England the Baptist churches thought there was something very much to be deprecated in the action of their Committee. The subject was written on "with some warmth in the public prints; and a number of the friends of the mission united in preparing a memorial to the Committee, *adverse to the resolutions.*" And the Committee in consequence had to pass at its meeting last month two explanatory resolutions. What more do we want? If there was "some warmth" in England, where, too, there was every opportunity for explanation, what wonder if there was white heat at Calcutta? If the original resolutions had been so simple, what need of supplementary ones or of protesting that the first did not reflect on the missionaries? And it is not enough to give us the resolutions. Does not every one know that it is generally in the language introducing or the letters accompanying "resolutions" that the sting is to be found? In a word, we will do Dr. Cramp the justice to believe that had he been a missionary in the Mofussil, instead of an ex-president of a college in Wolfville, N. S., he would have written with far greater warmth than he has, only on the other side.

2. Dr. Cramp's objection to the reference to the dealings of the Home Committee with the Serampore three is surely hyper-critical. We all know that it is thirty years since Marshman died; but it is only ten years since his son wrote his life and the history of the mission; and we are not aware that the committee has ever confessed and repented of its cruel treatment of him. We all know that the members of a Committee change; but still we all speak of the Committee itself, especially if on the same basis and if its spirit and acts do not change, as the same or as having a continuous existence. But enough on this.

Let no one think that Mr. Grant "has taken upon himself" to write on what does not concern him. He was defending those whose honor should be dear to every Baptist—their Foreign Missionaries. But why attack or defend? For two reasons most honorable to him and to them. Because in the presence