

## Correspondence.

## The Campbell Case.

Editor of PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

SIR,—In reply to "Pastor" and Dr. W. T. McMullen I beg to refer them to "Rules and Forms of Procedure."

(SECTION 300) "Primary jurisdiction over ministers and licentiates belongs to the Presbytery but the superior court may institute process when the court of primary jurisdiction has been enjoined to do so and have refused or neglected to obey." The Campbell case was in the hands of Montreal Presbytery.

(SECTION 96.) "One Presbytery may not interfere with or review the proceedings of another Presbytery. If a Presbytery considers itself aggrieved by the proceedings of another, it may remonstrate or ask explanation. If not satisfied, it may bring the matter before the Synod to which the Presbytery complained of belongs. This must be done by written statement, a copy being first furnished to the Presbytery whose proceedings are called in question. In the event of not obtaining satisfaction, the Presbytery which deems itself aggrieved may complain to its own Synod—but the complaint must be in writing."

I am perfectly aware that (Section 173) "every member of the Church has the right of access to any Church court by petition or memorial.... and that it is competent for the members of a higher court to approach that court directly by overture which if (Section 177) in proper form and in respectful language is transmitted in the same way as a petition."

(SECTION 135) "The Committee on Bills and Overtures receives all papers intended for the Assembly, considers whether they are in proper form, expressed in proper language and regularly transmitted—also whether they are part of the legitimate business of the Assembly—and transmits them or refuses to do so."

(SECTION 131) "The Committee on Bills and Overtures consists of Clerks of Assembly of Synods and Presbyteries who are commissioners, together with one member nominated by each Presbytery and such other ministers and elders as the Assembly may see fit to appoint."

And I maintain this committee was not in ignorance that the Campbell case was before the Montreal Presbytery and should have refused, as they had perfect power and right, to transmit the Maitland overture because of irregularity. If the Maitland Presbytery felt aggrieved, Section 135 would tell them that "Appeals and complaints against the decision of the Committee may be brought directly before the Assembly to be disposed of by the court." So much for the Committee on Bills and Overtures.

Now for the Moderator and Assembly. I quote from THE PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW of June 22nd, 1893: "Before Mr Hartley began to speak to the overture, Dr. D. L. McKee, of Collingwood, rose to a point of order, contending that it was utterly incompetent for the Assembly to deal with the matter as it stood at present as the Montreal Presbytery had it under their consideration and it must be dealt with by that body first."

"On behalf of Montreal, Principal McVicar explained that the Presbytery was proceeding in the matter according to the laws of the Church and had appointed a committee to confer with the accused."

"Upon hearing this, the Moderator appealed to the representatives of Maitland Presbytery to withdraw their overture." Now had this been done before lengthened discussion, the Moderator and Assembly would not have incurred blame. But the Assembly did not "at once," as Dr. McMullen asserts, desist from proceeding, it entered into a long, rambling and unseemly discussion. So much so that "Dr. Macdonald, of Seaford, feared the spirit of the Assembly would judge the accused first and try him afterwards. He desired to point out that it was dangerous to interfere with the constitution of the Church and it would be plenty of time to talk to the Montreal Presbytery when they showed signs of cow-

ardice. He endorsed the contention that it was unfair to take up the matter in Professor Campbell's absence."

"Dr. McKee in speaking on the point of order he had previously raised said that to discuss the case in Assembly and still put it in the hands of Montreal Presbytery was to try Professor Campbell twice and with no unprejudiced spirit apparently, and such a course made his British sense of fair play rebel." Principal Forrest, Halifax, "warned the Assembly that they would gain nothing by losing their heads, and warned them to make haste slowly." Principal Caven "besought the Assembly to be extremely careful to guard personal rights and have a clean record," and by his wise counsel extricated the Assembly out of its difficulty, putting its business on the proper footing of "allowing the Montreal Presbytery to proceed in the case in a constitutional way."

The zeal of Maitland Presbytery perhaps may have deserved commendation—hardly, I think, its prudence or judgment—and Dr. Caven's motion shows this by leaving the matter with Montreal.

I have done with the matter. Let me however remind Dr. McMullen that Assemblies, Moderators and Committees on Bills and Overtures are not infallible and that the calm, judicial spirit so eminently necessary in dealing with Assembly business was, in my humble opinion, sadly lacking in the Assembly of 1893.

Will Pastor kindly read, mark, learn and inwardly digest Exodus 23. 2.

J.M.C.

P.S.—The case of Professor Campbell requires to be handled with special delicacy as he is not only minister but Professor. I am perfectly aware that by 28 Vic., chap. 53—"An Act to incorporate the Presbyterian College of Montreal"—sec. 3, "the Synod of the Canada Presbyterian Church shall have power at its next or any subsequent meeting, to appoint and remove professors and tutors in such way as to them shall seem good"—but the question still remains *can an unconstitutional way be a good way.*—J.M.C.

## Rome at the Parliament of Religions.

Editor PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW:

SIR,—It was with some surprise that I read last week your criticism of a remark, touching the Roman Catholic Church, which I was reported to have made to a representative of the Montreal Star. As a matter of fact, the remark was a mere interpolation. The statement attributed to me was a slip, and evidently only a slip, on the part of the newspaper reporter, and, in fairness to me, I do think that the interview, as a whole, might have been read with somewhat closer attention, for, if you will glance over it again, you will see that I expressed the opinion that the Roman Catholic Church had made what seemed to me "a departure in sending representatives to this Parliament to discuss theological issues with opponents." Such a belief is hardly compatible with my holding, as you affirm, that "the Roman Catholic Church is always willing to submit its dogmas to the test of reason." Not even yet does it submit its dogmas to that test. Far from maintaining that such a procedure was universal, or even usual, on the part of the Roman Church, I noted with pleasure its readiness to adopt somewhat more fully the ordinary Protestant attitude on this question. So far, I take it, we are found in substantial agreement.

But when you go on to affirm your judgment that the Roman Catholic Church is always and everywhere the same, we part company at once. The motto of that Church and its intensely conservative spirit, remain indeed unchanged; but *semper idem* is no more true of Roman Catholicism than it is of Protestantism. Who, that has studied the former faith at first hand, as it exists on different continents or even in different countries—in Italy as contrasted with Spain, or in Canada as contrasted with the United States, will dare affirm that it is invariably the same. The great religious upheaval of

the sixteenth century, repudiated though it is by the Roman Church, has affected that Church for good almost as much as either the Lutheran Church or the Reformed Church. In every land, moulded necessarily by its environment, the Church of Rome is changing; and nowhere is this fact more manifest than in America. One of the best proofs of it that can be adduced, is found in the position which that Church so honourably claimed in the recent Parliament at Chicago. Custom, tradition and its assumption of supreme ecclesiastical authority might seem to have precluded its participation in the debates and conferences of such a uniquely democratic council; but the statement remains true, that in such debates and conferences it did take its part, and with scarcely an exception it bore itself right nobly. Moreover its religious enquiry-room in the Art Institute,—voluntarily opened and kept open for eight hours every day and to which all who had difficulties as to their faith (whether Protestants or Catholics) were invited for the purpose of friendly conversation,—was eagerly made use of by hundreds who were anxious or perplexed. Verily such events, it seems to me, are well worthy of being chronicled. They deserve to be spoken of often and with emphasis. Especially by Protestants ought they to be quickly and gladly made note of, for they are full of significance. They indicate that under the influence of our less conventional Western life, Roman Catholicism is relaxing somewhat the rigidity of its ancient ecclesiastical bonds and this fact we ought frankly and cheerfully to admit, whilst we applaud this advance towards an ever widening intellectual enlightenment.

I hail then the support which the Church of Rome lent so cordially to the Congress of the Creeds at Chicago, and with special satisfaction for the three following reasons: (1) This step is prophetic. It ensures yet other advances, which the Church in question will certainly be constrained to make in the not distant future. (2) Notwithstanding your personal conviction to the contrary, I cannot but believe that many of the adherents of Romanism have carried away the impression that greater freedom of discussion is now to be allowed in the elucidation of difficult theological problems. This impression may be a mistaken one, wholly unwarranted by either Pope or bishop; but it is one of the unmistakable fruits of the Parliament, and it remains now to be reckoned with. It will be as useless to strive to control it as it would be hopeless to seek to eradicate it. And finally, (3) a great deal has been achieved in the removal of yet another ill-grounded popular prejudice: Protestantism exalts much higher, but Romanism does not ignore the claims and prerogatives of reason.

LEWIS H. JORDAN.

Queen's Hotel, Toronto, Nov. 27, 1893.

THE Presbytery of Matura has passed a resolution urging the importance of religious instruction in the public schools.

THE annual meeting of the Grafton branch of the Bible Society was held in the Presbyterian church, when Rev. Mr. Manly, the agent, addressed the meeting, and the following officers were elected:—President, Rev. C. S. Lord; vice-president, Rev. M. E. Wilson; secretary, James Blacklock; depository, Thos. Lawless.

THE Church is giving attention to the question of ministerial efficiency, and the Presbytery of Newcastle has adopted a report containing a clause under which the Presbytery shall have power to dissolve the pastoral tie in cases where ministers are deemed inefficient, but in all such cases a pecuniary settlement must be agreed upon previous to the dissolution of the tie.

THE Synod of Nebraska sent a message to the Y.P.S.C.E. State Convention at Omaha commending the strong attitude of the young people on the proper observance of the Sabbath and the success, in God's way, in the great efforts to protect the Sabbath from national desecration. It expressed the desire that the young people would continue to regard this as the holiest of all days and set themselves for the defense of the Gospel