

very great extent for while the General Assembly's committee is to be smaller, there are to be three new Synodical Committees, the travelling expenses of whose members are to be paid if they are constituted on the same lines as the Synodical Committees which are now doing such good work in the two Western Synods. The second argument is entitled to little consideration although it seemed to be entertained by several members of Assembly in debates on Home Mission management both last year and the year before. Nobody has ever complained that the "disfranchised" Presbyterians in particular or that the North-West in general has supplied at the hands of the Home Mission Committee. On the contrary it is admitted on every hand that the treatment accorded to the West has been not only fair but in nearly every case courteous and generous. The whole Church is proud of its work in the West, and has no thought of either insulting or crippling it, and it is altogether too late in the day to allow merely theoretical considerations of equality to put the funds of the Church (funds contributed for missionary purposes) to several hundred dollars of unnecessary expense annually. But after all, that is not what the new scheme proposes to do, for it aims at perpetuating the inequality it complains of by giving to the Eastern Synod two representatives each, while those in the West have but one each.

The great argument in favor of the change is the one on which the Presbytery of Calgary seems, by the use of the phrase "it is stated," to lay the least stress. There are many reasons for believing that a reduction in size of the Central Home Mission Committee would lead to greater efficiency, not that the members would necessarily work harder; it is already one of the hardest working committees the Church has, and many of its members find its protracted sittings each April utterly exhausting. But it is too large, some of the members take but a prefatory interest in matters that do not concern their own Presbyteries, and indeed think it not out of place to excuse themselves from attendance after their own business is done. But the chief defect of the committee is that it is constituted upon a wrong basis. It is almost entirely made up of the Conveners of Presbyteries, Home Mission Committees. This suggests, if it does not necessarily involve, that nearly every member is a "representative" of some Presbytery and goes to the meeting, not with the single-eyed purpose of deliberating in the interests of the whole Church, as a Committee of the General Assembly ought to do, but to secure the passage of claims (very likely just ones, it is true) adopted by his Presbytery. So it happens that this Committee devotes so little time to the consideration of Home Mission interests as a whole. The members cannot see the wood for the trees, almost their whole time is given up to the consideration of details many of which might be better attended to by Synodical Committees, all of which are somewhat conversant with each locality under discussion. The fact that in the proposed Committee the members represent Synods is not open to the same objection as when they represent Presbyteries. It is the Presbytery not the Synod which presses for this or that grant, and besides the increase of the area represented by each member naturally diminishes the localizing and personal element, a fact which Toronto for instance, not to mention other cities, has recognized in increasing so considerably the size of the city wards from which aldermen are elected.

The scheme will certainly have the decentralizing effect: whether it will not go so far as to disintegrate remains a question. The enlargement of the sphere of the Synod in connection with Home Missions has been discussed before now by the Assembly and it was this fear that defeated the proposal. Perhaps the fear was groundless. At any rate now is the time to hear all the sides of the case so that when the Assembly comes the Church may be ready to do what is best.

The Curtain Falls.

Last week saw what is regarded as the end of the Campbell Heresy Case. The feeling which seems to obtain, as to the manner in which the case has been disposed of, is on the one hand that of thankfulness, and on the other, a qualified satisfaction. There is a sense of relief that the question will not be threshed out again at the General Assembly. Of the Professors defence, and the case as put for the Presbytery of Montreal, it is unnecessary to say more than that both maintained their original positions, fortified by very much the same arguments as have been already published. In the process of questioning or testing, these positions were still further emphasized; there was no sign of modification. Up to that point it seemed as if the day would have gone against the Presbytery, for the Professor was firm and the Synod sympathetic. Then came the conference between the Presbytery of Montreal and Professor Campbell. The tables were then turned; for the latter agreed to accept the following two statements as embodying the views he had endeavoured to express in his lecture:—

1. The statements of the Old Testament writers as to the character of God were true as far as they went, but in a few cases, were not the whole truth.
2. That in the great majority of cases, the Father, when smiting in judgment and in discipline or chastisement, acts in accordance with general laws, or through secondary causes.

This ought to satisfy even the Presbytery of Bruce; and that of Montreal is to be congratulated on the great ability which must have operated in bringing about such a change of views. It has not escaped attention that they are in striking contrast with those for which Professor Campbell was libelled and held before the Synod, viz:—

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 punishment or discipline and who has nothing to do with the judging or punishing of the wicked.

But the conclusion come to upholds the authority of Scripture and the orthodox view of God's dealings. It will be accepted frankly and by many as has been said with profound thankfulness.

Some of the members of the Synod thought it well to take the REVIEW to task for its part in this controversy. It would have shown a juster appreciation of the facts, and of the position now occupied by Professor Campbell had the allusions not been made. The interpretations of the word "duty" are "many and various," and we are not of the few who set up a standard of infallibility, but we do hold that the strictures indulged are altogether untenable. Instead of shallow cavillings and the bandying of blame and hard names, it would have been more seemly for those indignant fathers and brethren to have exercised coolness of judgment in what all admit to have been a grave crisis. Among the lessons to be learned from this case there are