

members must have been startled to hear from Dr Barclay that the attitude of the Church toward the Scriptures had changed from what it was fifteen years ago. The thesis of the professor's lecture was in a word the "Imperfect Book." It was on that they had to pass judgment. He admitted that there was haste in drafting the libel, but their excuse was that it was done to accommodate Prof. Campbell himself. He knew that the position was a solemn one and that the members of the Presbytery would do what was right.

The clerk then read the motion of Dr R. Campbell, and the amendment of Dr. Barclay, and the vote was then taken upon the count and stood as follows: For the motion, 21; for the amendment, 13, viz.: Dr. Barclay, J. M. Crombie, Prof. Ross, J. Fraser, J. E. Ducloux, MacKeracher, W. D. Reid, Prof. Conisrat, Internesia and Murray Watson, ministers, and Wm. Drysdale and Colin McArthur, elders.

After the vote was declared, Professor Campbell formally declared his intention to appeal against the decision.

Prof. Campbell is thus found by the Presbytery to hold a view of the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures which impugns and discredits them as the supreme and infallible source of religious truth; contrary to the Word of God and the standards of the Presbyterian Church in Canada.

### The Second Count.

On Wednesday, the 13th inst., the Presbytery resumed consideration of Prof. Campbell's case, taking up the second count in the libel, which read as follows:—"A view of God which sets him forth as one who does not smite either in the way of punishment or discipline, and who has nothing to do with the judging or punishing of the wicked." Prof. Campbell said, in reply to a question, that he had nothing further to say so long as the statements made by him on the previous day were taken into consideration.

Rev. Dr. D. Patterson, of St. Andrews, moved that the second count of the indictment be found proven. The speaker regretted that it fell to his lot to take an initiatory step in the matter, and yet he could not see that the Presbytery could have done otherwise than take up the matter. According to Professor Campbell's idea of God, He was only a titular monarch, while the real ruler was Satan. He admitted that sin was punished, but claimed that it followed naturally, as naturally as burning followed fire or death followed the taking of poison. In Holy Writ it was expressly laid down, "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." If punishment of sin ensued by nature, who constituted Nature? The Christian sees a power behind Nature, God Himself. The punishments of God laid down in the Old Testament were famine, pestilence, the sword and wild beasts; these were sent by God to punish sin. The Old Testament ended with a warning to turn from sin to righteousness. At the beginning of the New Testament the forerunner exclaims: "Repent ye, for the kingdom of God is at hand," and enforced the declaration by a threat of judgment to come. In the Sermon on the Mount there was passage after passage relating to the justice of God. In Paul's Epistle to the Galatians the curse was repeated, and to the Hebrews it was said: "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of God." Our God is a living fire, and yet the professor taught that it was contrary to nature to inflict pain or take away life on account of sin. God, indeed, is love, but He is also light, truth and righteousness. Love itself required punishment. If the ruler of a country governed without punishing, anarchy would prevail in that country, and the ruler could not be held up as an example of the power of love. The sacrifice of Christ was justice, and if sinners did not deserve punishment, there was no necessity for the atonement, and the death of Christ must be accounted for on some other principle than the satisfaction for sin. A ruler who never punished was not only a weak and an inefficient one but he did not win that confidence and love that would be given to one who seasonably corrected and punished. It was penal retribution that was referred to in the Bible, not vindictive but righteous justice. The growth of these erroneous ideas bade fair to sap the foundations not only of sound doctrine, but of morality itself. This teaching might be productive of the weakening of the moral sense among the people, permitting them to tolerate such indifference and worse, amongst public men. The statement made in the Old Testament "Whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth," was repeated and reiterated in the New Testament. The theory of the Professor did away with the whole system of discipline, and the Christian was told to resist and resent discipline and suffering as the work of his enemies and not the result of sin. In concluding, Dr. Patterson declared that the Presbytery had a duty to perform and they must stand by the Word of God. If half of the Bible were given up the children would only be half fed and would not grow up to that sturdiness that characterized the Christians of the past who were fed on the whole Bible.

Rev. C. B. Ross, B.D., of Lachine, seconded the motion briefly. Rev. Dr. MacVicar suggested that if there was to be any amendments now was the time to present it.

Rev. J. Myers Crombie said that while he had the greatest respect for Dr. Patterson he must say that he had put up a man of straw and then knocked him down. There was not a single utterance of Dr. Patterson's but what Prof. Campbell would give adhesion to—that God smites—but that He does not do it in the vindictive way that is sometimes taught in the old Puritan theology. He did not do it, simply because He had the power to do it. It seemed to him that what Prof. Campbell taught was somewhat on the line that what a man sows that shall he reap. If a man deliberately chooses to walk away from God then punishment, his separation from God, will necessarily follow, but if a man accept of God through Christ, God will have no occasion to smite, but rather reward him. He therefore moved in amendment that the second count of the libel be found not proven.

Rev. Dr. Barclay regretted that he could not see his way clear to second Mr. Crombie's amendment, for after very, very careful study he

had been forced to the conclusion that the count was proven. He had not been able to get himself at all into the position which Prof. Campbell had adopted. It seemed to him a confusion of ideas. "Prof. Campbell," he continued, "has adduced a theology which is certainly not in strict accordance with the theology of the Bible. I cannot agree with him that God does not smite, but punishment comes from the hand of Satan. He has put Satan in a new light, which was refreshing. I thought that belief had rather died out. He gives Satan much greater power than he really possesses. Suffering is surely the punishment of God, and I think the Professor has failed to give due weight to that aspect of the Divine will." Continuing, Dr. Barclay considered that Prof. Campbell's mistakes were mistakes of expression, and, to his mind, some very grave mistakes in expression.

Rev. Prof. Campbell held that it was the duty of the Church to explain obscure passages of Scripture. There were things there exceedingly simple that any child had a right to investigate. Did not Christ Himself say that He came to destroy the works of the devil—those works even regarding the healing of the sick and the casting out of devils? What kind of a God was it that the Church wanted him to believe in—a God who strikes down with one hand while He blesses with the other? Did they want to believe in the Baals and the Molochs. That was the Old Testament theory. When Christ came to represent the Father, the Jews asked, "Where is the smiter to drive away the Romans?" Would they have him believe that God stretched forth His hand to strike the martyr down? Would they have him believe that God was present in the heart of Judas Iscariot to betray his Master? No, it was a terrible blasphemy to proclaim in the name of our holy religion. "I cannot," he said, "believe in a God like that." The justice of God, which was really righteousness, had been referred to. He never denied that justice which sprung out of the love of God. Did we not in our households exercise justice? But he pitied the man who believed that the justice of God was as great as the love of God. Sin, he continued, was a violation of the law of God, and its punishment was death, and away back in the geological ages it was found that where death reigned there sin reigned before. He might be accused of ignoring the death side. Not at all. The death side was not of God at all, but the power of killing was the devil. When a parent sent his son to the missionary field and he was eaten by cannibals, was it the parent who killed him? When a parent sent his son to fight for his country, and he was killed in battle, was it the parent who fired the gun? They could not saddle the responsibility of sin and death upon God. Proceeding further, Prof. Campbell said he was a believer in the testimony of the Scriptures in so far as they were found in conformity with the testimony of Christ, and only in so far as the Old Testament was opposed to the testimony of Christ did he call it into question. He thought with all due respect to the grand old covenants and to their fore-fathers in Germany, that these men were actuated by the Old Testament spirit and not by the spirit of Christ. God was the God of battles to them. Were they growing as a church in the direction of Christ-mindedness, or were they growing more and more confirmed in their Old Testament principles? He left it for them to answer.

Then Dr. McVicar concluded that the text, "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God," would be read by Prof. Campbell to mean "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the devil." The Principal waited it understood that texts of Scripture were not being quoted alone, but that due regard was being made to the scope of each passage and all its bearings considered. Reading the whole of the second chapter of the 2nd Epistle of Peter, the speaker declared that a God of limited scope could have no place in his theology. He believed in a God of justice. It was extraordinary that the Professor should wish to give such prominence to the devil in these days when so many denied the existence of a devil at all. Prof. Campbell had a great work before him before he would win many sensible people to his way of thinking in this respect. After presenting these passages, if any one said that no proof had been given from the New Testament that God smites, the Principal declared that he would produce the proofs he had left unread.

Professor Scrimger considered that the libel had been proven, although he considered that in his remarks yesterday Professor Campbell had qualified his former statements somewhat. He inferred that Professor Campbell's idea was that God smites sometimes through nature, sometimes through the devil and sometimes through the Son. The speaker failed to see the advantage of this. It was just as easy to believe that God would smite, as it was to believe that the Son would smite. The speaker could see no reason for changing the verdict in anything that had been said since.

Rev. J. A. Ducloux had sat under Professor Campbell as well as under Dr. Briggs, and from neither in teaching did he hear a word of their unusual views. Yet, he would consider the fruits of Dr. Campbell's labours to be the Kingston address, for he said he had been twenty-five years in considering the subject.

Rev. Murray Watson of St. Lambert, declared that if none had seen as Professor Campbell it was because he had never presented the questions to the students.

The vote was then taken on the motion of Dr. Patterson, and the second count of the libel was sustained by a vote of 27 to 2, the dissidents being the Rev. J. Miles Crombie, and the Rev. W. D. Reid. Some members of the Presbytery did not vote.

Rev. Prof. Campbell then said, "I protest against the decision of the majority of the Presbytery and appeal to the Synod of Montreal and Ottawa at its next meeting for the following reason: That the Presbytery in the consideration of its arguments on which its decision was based failed to weigh the Scriptural ones presented by the defence which the appellant regards as sufficient to exonerate him from the charges contained in the libel."

Rev. Dr. MacVicar, Dr. Robert Campbell, Dr. Daniel Patterson and Prof. Scrimger were appointed a committee to answer the reasons for an appeal to the Synod.