

and Campbell has been in any proper sense "vexatious." That my opposition has been uniform, steady, and strong, is certain; but "vexatious" means "*wantonly malicious*." Let it be observed—Mr. R. D. Macpherson still adheres to his averment as to the "walking ticket;" and Mr. Pyper will not agree with those who say that it was just a "thoughtless expression." He is the last man who will take *that* ground of defence. If he said it, he meant it; and his meaning was grave and solemn. Moreover, it indicated a knowledge of the parties who sought my ejection; and he is not the ninny to say that all he intended was just to give utterance to a "thoughtless expression." He continues to deny—Mr. R. D. Macpherson continues to affirm—the evidence stands; and I firmly and conscientiously believe that he said it; nay, more, I believe he will say it still—that is, in substance—for why otherwise does he wonder that I took offence at it? Why shew such hatred to me? and why give expression to that hatred in such papers as those read by him before the Session, the Presbytery, and the Synod? Had he the spirit of a Christian in him, and the manliness of a generous heart, he would be the *last* to take offence because I made his withdrawal or his ordination the turning point of my pastorate in Toronto; and he would have been the first to relieve me from the difficulty,—*the moment the Synod had cleared him*.

I am blamed for allowing objections to Mr. Pyper to be given in on two separate occasions. Who, pray, is to blame for this? It is the constitution and law of the Church, and these only, that are to blame for it; and yet there is no blame any where. When the congregations return their Elders elect to the Session, it is the duty of the Session to take immediate action. If *any one of the members* knows good reason why an edict in favour of such and such individuals should not be served, *he is criminal if he conceal it*; and what is binding on a member of the court, is, *a fortiori*, as binding on the Moderator. And when a member or the Moderator has noted his objection, and obtained from the Session an order for inquiry, does it *weaken* the objection to the Elder elect that *eleven* of the members in communion shall step forward voluntarily, and intimate that they have heard of the same objection, and that they concur in it? The investigation would have gone on independently of these eleven; but should the concurrence of these eleven have marred the proceedings in the case? And shall the circumstance of these eleven