

We are bound to accept, as we do with thanks, the corrections made by Mr. F. L. Brooke, in his letter in another column, of certain statements which appeared in a note in our issue of September 1st, touching the Chinese question. Mr. Brooke speaks from personal knowledge. Our information was necessarily at second hand. Touching the first statement, viz: That the given case was the first instance of an actual deportation under the Geary Act, we can only say that it was made in good faith, on the authority, we think, of some one, we cannot now say which, of two or three New York journals of the highest standing. We are sorry that we cannot now determine whether the error was that of the journal in question, or the result of some misapprehension on our part. Nor is the matter of great importance, even in its bearing upon the point we were making, which was, we presume, the virtual failure of the Act in question to accomplish its object, owing to the great expense involved in carrying it into effect and the absence of any adequate appropriation for the purpose. If it be true, as we have seen repeatedly stated on what we suppose to be reliable authority, that there are nearly 100,000 Chinese in the United States who are there in violation of the Geary Act, it is evident that the few cases of deportation enumerated by Mr. Brooke, and even the "many others" which he thinks have doubtless occurred, are, in comparison with the whole number liable to deportation under the law, but the exceptions which prove the rule. Probably we were more liable to misapprehension of the facts because we had in mind the outcome of the test-case made, if we remember aright, by the arrest of one or a very few Chinese on the day on which the Act came into force. As to the other point, our use of the word "thousands" was no doubt hyperbolic. It must have been either a slip of the pen, or the result of inexcusable haste. "Hundreds" would have more correctly expressed the idea. That many Chinese do continue to make their way into the United States at various points we have not before seen doubted. No one supposes that the cunning Celestials attempt to enter at such a place as the city of Detroit.

Is all Scripture equally inspired? Was Moses as a teacher as infallible as Christ? Can such statements as "the Lord moved David to number Israel," and "Satan moved David to number Israel," be harmonized without impugning the infallibility of the writer of either? Is the God of the Old Testament in all respects the same God who is revealed by His Son in the New, or is there a progressiveness in the revelation such as to warrant the conclusion that the character and modes of government of the Supreme Being were but partially and imperfectly understood by the Old Testament writers, and were made

known in their infinite perfectness in the New, by Him who alone could speak with the authority of perfect knowledge? Is the God of the Christian revelation a God who directly and immediately governs and judges and smites, or are all sorrow and suffering and death the work of a malignant power holding sway in the realm of evil, a realm peculiarly his own? Is Satan but the personification of the spirit of evil in the world, occupying a subordinate position and made an instrument in working out the good which is to be the final goal of ill, or is he the living author and embodiment of the principle of evil, in a Christian cosmogony which is thus based on the notion of a dualism of independent though unequal powers in the universe? Such are, in varied forms of expression, some of the great questions which were mooted during the trial and condemnation of Professor Campbell by the Montreal Presbytery last week. These are profound theological questions. Even if we thought them the real questions at issue, we should shrink from attempting to discuss them in the columns of a secular paper, though they are questions of vital interest to all classes of readers and truth-seekers.

But from the point of view of most lay thinkers, the real question at issue will, we venture to think, appear quite different. At least other questions of a radically different character will be seen to be involved. Is it the prerogative of any Church to map out the realm of Scripture truth, and lay down with mathematical precision the lines of opinion which must be followed by the thinkers and teachers of that Church? Here is a man admittedly honest, earnest, reverent, devout, and able, who is to be debarred from teaching in a Christian school, not because of any heretical or mischievous views which he has promulgated in that school, but because in the pursuit of his study of the sacred writings he has been led to certain conclusions which are not in accord with those laid down by the divines of that Church two centuries ago, at a time when the facilities for the study of Scriptures were admittedly far inferior to those enjoyed by the Christian scholars of to-day; and because, on another occasion, in the freedom of discussion before a body of students banded together, we may assume, for the purpose of free enquiry, he gave expression to those conclusions. That is to say, in this age of intellectual freedom and fearless investigation, a man, whatever his qualifications in all other respects, is to be forbidden to teach under the auspices of a great Church, unless he is able to reach and hold precisely the same opinions with regard to all questions of Scripture interpretation which were cut and dried, so to speak, for the use of the ministers and members of that Church by learned divines of the seventeenth century? The point which we wish to make, and which seems to us to

contain the gist of the question raised for the consideration of all thoughtful people by the trial and suspension of Professor Campbell, is this: Is there not something incongruous with the teachings and spirit of Christianity in the idea of censuring and punishing a good man and true for having in the course of his close and conscientious study of the sacred writings, reached our conclusion rather than another on points in regard to which it cannot be denied that there is room for difference of opinion? Is it the truth which makes free, ought not the churches to leave their sermons free in the search after truth?

Whatever genuine doubt may have existed in the minds of any as to the primary and chief cause of the great financial depression in the United States, it must have by this time been pretty effectively dispelled by the evidence of facts. Though the Senate has not, at the date of this writing, passed the Bill repealing the Silver Act, the certainty that it will eventually pass it has had the effect desired. All over the country the papers are, every day, printing long lists of the mills and manufacturing and other business establishments which have re-opened. The passage of the Revenue Bill by one House, conveying as it did the assurance that there would be no depreciation of the standard of value throughout the Union, is clearly having the effect desired. In the words of Bradstreet: "No sooner had one branch of Congress voted to repeal the compulsory purchase of silver clause of the Sherman law, no sooner had the likelihood of similar action in the Senate become apparent, than hoarding and the premium on currency disappeared, domestic exchange rates became almost not quite normal, the banks stopped taking out clearing-house certificates, and almost southern and western correspondents they would be able to advance needed funds to move the crops, while last, but not least, the number of banking suspensions practically stopped short, and the number of commercial and industrial failures dropped from 17 to 20 per cent.; a 'better feeling' manifest in business circles north, south and west, and a widespread growth of confidence in an improvement in the general situation was manifest." Particularly encouraging are the bank reports showing that the private hoarding of money is ceasing. The Philadelphia clearing-house banks reported an increase in deposits of \$1,271,000 in a single week. The Boston banks gained in the same period nearly three millions. If such are the effects of the action of one branch of Congress coupled with the general belief that the other branch will follow suit, there can no longer be any doubt that when all remaining uncertainty shall have been set at rest by the Senate, as may very likely have been done before these words are printed, the returning tide of business activity will be flowing in full force and volume.