

honest men, no little importance must be attached to their own strenuous and solemn protestations of loyalty as they believe to the teaching of the church and the word of God. This is the case with Prof. Campbell.

At such a time as this while it behoves the church to be watchful, we would not have it, as if it were afraid of any weakness in its position, microscopically measure every hairsbreadth of apparent deviation from the straight line, weigh critically every syllable and word which may have a questionable sound. The position of the church at such times should not be one of nervous trepidation or alarm, but of calm, hopeful, confident, expectation and reliance upon the strength of her position, as standing firm upon the sure foundation of God's truth, as it has in substance been held in the common judgment in all ages of those who love it. In this position our church we are sure will find her strength which does not by any means imply any lack of the eternal vigilance by which truth ever has been and only can be held.

Our church along with other Christian, evangelical churches has a great work to do in laying broad and deep in a comparatively new land, rich in the highest, grandest possibilities for good, the foundations of truth and righteousness, of true national greatness in the proclamation and spread of the gospel, and all will rejoice, if instead of having her energies diverted for a lengthened period to the consideration of the case which has been settled, she can turn them with undivided earnestness, hopefulness and determination to the great work which God in His providence has set before us to do.

WE need hardly ask attention to the intimation made in another column, largely though the kind exertions of Rev. Mr. Burns, of fares to the approaching meeting of the General Assembly. Woodstock has been in some way overlooked but the fare will no doubt be the same as that from Ingersol. As sometimes members of Assembly through ignorance or inattention give the secretary who has arranged this important business much unnecessary trouble, it may be added that all members should as soon as possible after the meeting of Assembly place their certificates in his hands for signature. He is expected by the railway companies to make a correct return of certificates certified by him, and should there be less than three hundred he is bound to pay to the railway company the difference between one fare and one-third ticket and a single fare each way.

WE begin in this issue the publication in the Family Circle of a story which we trust will prove a source of interest, of pleasure and instruction as regularly, week after week, it comes into the homes of our readers. The scene of it being chiefly laid in Canada, our own dear land, will contribute to its interest and make its weekly instalment doubly welcome. It is written by a lady than whom, there is no one among all the ladies who are making and enriching our Canadian literature more familiarly known, Miss Agnes Maule Machar. The name is a guarantee that its style will be such as lovers of good English will enjoy, and that its spirit, tone and teaching will all be helpful in the best sense. We shall not take the edge off the curiosity of the wide and varied circle of those who shall read it by anticipating in the least, but send it forth to tell its own tale and do the good, which we are sure the author by writing it as well as we by publishing it, wish to do.

SYNOD OF MONTREAL AND OTTAWA.

WE now give a fuller summary of the important proceedings of this Synod in the matter of Rev. Prof. Campbell, than our limits both of time and space allowed of last week. The Moderator, it may be noticed, was Rev. J. R. MacLeod, of Three Rivers. The case came up on Wednesday afternoon. Prof. Campbell's Kingston lecture was read by the clerk. This done, Mr. D. B. McLennan, Q.C., of Cornwall, took up the defence of Prof. Campbell, charging the Presbytery of Montreal with certain irregularities, the chief of which were: neglecting, as required by the Book of Discipline, to confer with the accused, that the libel had been changed and the question of relevancy discussed and settled by the Presbytery in Prof. Campbell's absence, and generally, that the formalities laid down in the book of Procedure, for such a case had not been observed. For these reasons he moved, seconded by Rev. J. A. G. Calder, that "the matter be referred back to the Presbytery of Montreal."

Prof. Campbell followed in his own defence, stating the two counts in the indictment: "(1) A view of the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures which impugns and discredits them as the supreme and infallible source of religious truth. (2) A view of God which sets Him forth as one who does not smite either in the way of punish-

ment or discipline, and who has nothing to do with the judging or the punishment of the wicked."

He complained that by the finding of these charges relevant without proceeding to judgment he had been precluded during the whole of the past session from discharging the duties of his chair. The position taken in his lecture he stated to be one strictly of interpretation based upon an examination and comparison of exceedingly important passages in the Holy Scriptures themselves.

The presentation of these Scriptures he blamed the Presbytery for meeting so perfunctorily, as to make it appear that their object was not to adjudicate fairly in the circumstances, but to secure the sending of the case for trial to a higher court. Hence the form of protest, "that the Presbytery, in the consideration of the arguments on which the decision was based, failed to weigh those important ones presented for the defence, which the appellant regards as sufficient to exonerate him from the charges contained in the libel."

The Scriptures he presented had been met, he asserted, by irrelevant passages from the Old Testament, but by not a single proof from the words of Jesus Christ and His disciples. His lecture was full of reverence for the Scriptures as the supreme authority, and infallible source of religious truth. Hence he declared that he was both technically and really guiltless of the charge laid against him. He had only asserted in his lecture, "progress in revelation," and shown the ethical imperfections of a few parts of the Old Testament upon the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ and His apostles, for which he might quote hundreds of authorities. The partial and imperfect character of Old Testament teaching as compared with that of Christ in the New, is illustrated by the law of divorce, of oaths, of hatred, by the conduct of the Jews in their fierce exterminating wars as compared with the spirit and teaching of Christ. In Him revelation, coming gradually through the ages, partial and imperfect because of the straitening influences of a hard-hearted humanity, defective education, and whatever else pertain to the earthen vessel, reached its culmination and fulfilment.

Turning to the second count, the professor stated that at two stages in the brief trial he protested against the charge as untruthful, and not fairly deducible from even the rhetorical forms of the lecture in question. His aim was to show from Scripture that in this life upon our earthly sphere, all evil, physical as well as spiritual, is one, and that, while under God's control, it is not of God. "I am not guilty," he concluded, "of the ridiculous charge brought against me as a second count, as many who condemned me know."

On Thursday forenoon the parties in the case were finally called to the bar. Prof. Campbell, appellant, and Revs. Principal MacVicar, Dr. R. Campbell, Prof. Scrimger and Dr. Paterson on behalf of the Presbytery. It was then discovered that these parties being before the bar had no right to vote, and a return was made to the former position, the discussion being resumed at the point where Mr. McLennan concluded his address.

The Rev. Mr. Calder charged the Montreal Presbytery with making two mistakes: (1) In not having, as required by our procedure, repeated conferences in a Christian spirit with the accused before proceeding to trial, and (2) there was nothing on the records to show that the accused had been served with a copy of the libel, the form of which had been changed several times by the Presbytery. Rev. Dr. McNish paid a high tribute to Prof. Campbell's worth, and asserted that his doctrines could be maintained from the Confession of Faith.

Rev. R. Campbell, D.D., of Montreal, warmly defended the Presbytery's action, declaring that Prof. Campbell had been more anxious than the Presbytery to push the matter to a conclusion; that he had been conferred with, but was immovable, that he had made no complaint about the regularity of the citations, and was, in fact, a party to the whole arrangement, acquiescing in the process from beginning to end, and claiming that Prof. Campbell's interests had in no way suffered from any changes made in the libel. If he had been judged in his absence he was to blame, as he had due notice to attend when the relevancy was discussed and his acquiescence in the proceedings was as a sponge blotting out all irregularities. Prof. Campbell had also pleaded to the libel, thus justifying any irregularities that may have occurred before. Everything was thus made ecclesiastically right, and the course of the Presbytery was justified. Rev. J. M. Crombie, Cote des Neiges, charged that personal feeling and something beneath the surface had entered from the first into the case, and that the whole object of the prosecution was to hinder Prof. Campbell from lecturing in the Presbyterian College last winter.

Rev. Dr. MacVicar replied. He said that Mr. McLennan's motion was supported from three standpoints. It was held that no sufficient conference had been held. It was charged that the case had been tried by newspapers, and that Prof. Campbell had been denied the right of speaking on the relevancy of the libel. The first point had been magnified, and he could truthfully say that he did his utmost in the direction of conferring with the accused. He appealed to Prof. Campbell, who assented, if there had not been all kindness and Christian feeling between them. He denied Mr. Crombie's inference that there was any feeling or opposition in the Presbyterian College against the professor. Regarding the second point, the Presbytery had neither initiated nor condoned the newspaper references. He had himself seen the editor in Toronto, and had told him he was inflicting griev-

ous injury on the truth and on Prof. Campbell through his anonymous scribbler. Prof. Campbell had not been denied the right of speaking; he had assented to everything, and Rev. Mr. Crombie had seconded the motion to have the libel brought.

Before Prof. Scrimger followed Dr. MacVicar in a similar strain, Rev. Dr. Campbell, Renfrew, pleaded earnestly for a reconciliation of the professor with the church. Finally a vote was taken upon Mr. McLennan's motion, that the matter be referred back to the Presbytery, which was defeated by a vote of 74 to 32.

From this decision Rev. W. T. Herridge and many others dissented, chiefly for the reason of the failure to hear Mr. McLennan as agreed.

The parties were now again called to the bar and Prof. Campbell, amid intense silence, read his defence, which took up a little over an hour. It would be impossible to give in a few sentences, with justice to the professor, the briefest synopsis even of this closely reasoned address. It was read in a clear, emphatic manner, rising at times to impassioned declamation, and the eloquent arguments advanced by the distinguished speaker created a profound impression.

To do justice to the Presbytery as well as the accused makes it difficult to give the gist of the reply. Rev. Dr. Campbell, of Montreal, was the first speaker. He stated at the outset the precise grounds of the libel, as distinguished from wrong views which had been taken up. Fault was not found with all of Prof. Campbell's lecture, but with the views he had given utterance to with regard to the authority of parts of the Scripture. Speaking on the first count of the libel, he quoted in support of it the Westminster Confession of Faith, and parts of the Scriptures to sustain the views of the Presbytery. Prof. Campbell mistook love for tenderness and forgiveness, forgetting that the term also implied justice.

Inconsistencies and discrepancies, so-called, others had charged as due to the human imperfections and weaknesses of the writers, but the professor regarded these as due to the active interference of the devil, who influenced the writers to give a false idea of God.

Prof. Scrimger, who spoke for nearly an hour, commented severely upon the newspaper references to the matter under discussion, and repudiated all knowledge of who was the author of the attack upon Prof. Campbell in the *Presbyterian Review*, or any connection with it. "The Bible, the supreme and infallible word of God," was the text of his defence of the Presbytery's action. He put strongly the Old Testament references to the character of God as, quoted by the professor, "being intolerable blasphemy," thereby as he, the speaker, considered impugning the Scriptures as the infallible word of God, and so sustaining as correct the view of the Presbytery. He was followed on its behalf by Rev. Dr. Paterson, who delivered a closely reasoned speech on the second count of the libel. He defended the action of the Presbytery in refusing to add the word "immediately," to the libel after the words "God does not smite," as it would not at all affect the professor's position. He quoted many passages to show that God inflicted punishment with His own hand, as in the case of the Egyptians, for example. Christ himself had uttered terrible denunciations against the Scribes and Pharisees. The last book of Scripture was full of the judging and punishing of the wicked by God.

Rev. Dr. MacVicar closed for the Presbytery which had appointed him, by a vote of 27 to 2, to this duty. He thought it a very strange mission to give to Satan, the opposing and smiting of sin, and proceeded to make an analysis of the famous lecture, criticizing different passages and taking generally very much the same grounds as Dr. Paterson. He asked who had cast Satan out of Paradise when he sinned? Was there another devil to do it, if God had not punished him? If God did not smite, what became of the judgment in the world to come?

Prof. Campbell replied, saying that he failed to see the kindness in his treatment which had been referred to, and complained of the great injury which had been done him. He claimed the right allowed others to use rhetorical figures of exaggeration without being called to book as he had been over his lecture. He quoted several arguments advanced in his original defence, and concluded by saying that his views were clearly set forth there, and they were to judge him by that if they believed him a truthful man.

His speech produced a powerful effect and was applauded at its close. This finished the argument, and the Moderator, in prayer, asked for the guidance of the Holy Spirit in the Synod's decision.

Prof. Campbell was now subjected, by members of the Synod, to a long and severe cross-examination, in which further light was sought upon difficulties still existing in the minds of members. At the close of this examination the action took place referred to in our brief notice of the case last week, and which we need not repeat here, namely, the moving by Rev. W. T. Herridge of a motion which was not put, the conference between Prof. Campbell and the Presbytery, moved for by Rev. A. A. Scott, the report of the conference stating the agreement which had been arrived at, and the final motion of Rev. Mr. Herridge, which was carried, whereby all proceedings drop, to the effect that, "having received the report, the Synod give thanks to God, and declare all proceedings against Prof. Campbell at an end."

This finding was welcomed with enthusiastic congratulations and manifestations of deep feeling on the part of the Synod.