

not read in the minutes that the Revs. Dr. Wm. Taylor, Aitken, McClellan, Henderson, Hogg, Ewing, Pimbleton, W. Fraser, dissented; and is it not well known to all who were present, that Mr. Duff wished to enter his dissent, but was too late? Do we not read also that, in reasons of dissent given in, this language was employed to the Court?

"Because, there is injustice committed against the Session of Toronto, by declaring that they have 'obstructed' the business of this Court, whereas they have only expressed their unwillingness to have a private rather than a public investigation, in the exercise of a right which the Synod has already acknowledged."

"Because, there is injustice committed against Mr. Duff, for the important explanations which he is said to have made are not made public, and therefore both he and the Court are deprived of the benefit of them."

"Because this decision involves a culpable loosening of the bonds of discipline, likely to exert a pernicious influence not only in the Congregation of Toronto, but throughout the Church. It is well known that this Congregation has been involved in trouble and contention for more than a year, and now this Court has brought the whole case abruptly to a close, without having the faithfulness to say where the blame lies, or addressing any word of admonition or reproof to either party."

Talk of what the Editor has said! Why, in the article there was nothing worse, at any rate, than is employed by the dissenters. They say that the Synod, by its majority, has committed "injustice,"—that its ultimate sentence "will be deprived of all moral weight in the public mind,"—that there is "a culpable loosening of the bonds of discipline,"—and that the "Court has brought the whole case abruptly to a close, without having the faithfulness to say where the blame lies," &c. And did not the Session of Toronto, in their dissent and protest say, that "The decision of Synod subverts the ordinary principles of morality, held even by irreligious men—not to speak of the high obligations of our holy faith?" What language could possibly be stronger, than that quoted by all the dissenters? and why, again we ask, is the Magazine or its Editor to be traduced? and when, as on the showing of the Durham Presbytery, the Magazine is not the official organ, we have the voluntary right, as a public journal, to review as we please? and, above all, when neither the language of the Magazine was more severe than that of the reasons of dissents given in by others, nor when a single statement was contrary to what must be regarded as the best evidence, the Synod's minutes?

One other point remains. It will be observed that the resolutions of both Presbyteries, refer to the Synod for the trial of the Editor, but in the meantime they condemn him! In no instance do they specify one charge, and say what is its evidence. There are "foul charges," but they do not say what they are; there is "deliberate and glaring delinquency," but they do not say in what it consists; there are "misrepresentations," but they do not say of what. They are broadcast accusations without the least proof, farther than that *they say so*. There is nothing easier in the world than to make an accusation, and on it to condemn a man. We may say that a certain reader killed a man, and therefore is to be treated as a murderer, and to be hanged accordingly; but the law says, not that he is a murderer because *we say so*, and therefore to be hanged, but it compels us first to prove that a man was killed, and second, that he killed him. The Presbyteries must do a little more before they will get the public to run us to the death; they must give the full nature of the charges, and they must attempt to prove them, and then, in fair justice, they must give us the right of vindication. Hitherto they have only called us a criminal, and have condemned us, and next June they propose that the Synod shall try us! Well, really!

We shall give these Presbyteries a text, which it would be well to study, and we are sure our readers will admit the applicability of it. It once befel the apostle Paul, that he incurred the indignation of the chief priests and elders at Jerusalem, and, as the easiest way of getting rid of him, they were parties to a conspiracy to have him assassinated. That failed. They again tried several Roman governors to give him up, but were unsuccessful. Among others they tried Festus, but the Roman said to them:

ACTS XXV. 16.—"IT IS NOT THE MANNER OF THE ROMANS TO DELIVER ANY MAN TO DIE, BEFORE THAT HE WHICH IS ACCUSED HAVE THE ACCUSERS FACE TO FACE, AND HAVE LICENSE TO ANSWER FOR HIMSELF CONCERNING THE CRIME LAID AGAINST HIM."

We stand by that text. It was not the manner of the Romans, the courts pursued. It is not the manner of British justice. It is not the

manner of Bible law—and surely we might expect in a Christian land, and from professedly Christian Church Courts, that measure of justice that the very *heathen* Romans administered even to a slave.

We have done; and are sorry that we were compelled to begin. As the Magazine, as well as its Editor's character is at stake for integrity, we trust our readers will bear with us patiently; and while, as yet, they have no proof, and only vague assertion, and vindictive acrimony against us, that, on the evidence we have given, they will give to us, in the meantime, the benefit of a fair portion of the exercise of the intellect of all the traces—CHARITY—which "rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth."

N. D.—We hereby pledge ourselves to throw open our columns to anything the other party may choose to write: and as they have begun with accusing and condemning, it would be wise for them now to give the proof.

OPENING OF THE NEW UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, PARIS.

The following account of the interesting proceedings, in opening the new church, sent to us for republication, is taken from the *Paris Star*. We rejoice with the brethren there in the success of their undertaking, and especially call attention to their right spirit, when building, in having a handsome house of worship, and in acting so differently from a too common Canadian opinion, that any kind of house may be good enough for a church; and also to their great liberality, which shows what can be done, when there is the willing mind. In regard to such an effort, and for pastor and people, we may adapt the Psalmist's prayer:—"May the beauty of the Lord our God be upon them: and establish the work of their hands upon them: yea, the work of their hands establish thou it."

This edifice, which has just been finished, is highly creditable to the enterprise, taste, and liberality of the members of the United Presbyterian congregation. The building is of brick, 60 feet by 48, tastefully finished, and capable, with galleries—which will be fitted up when required—of holding 800 persons. The congregation intend, without soliciting aid by subscription from others, to meet the whole expense of building themselves, which has been £750.

The opening took place on Sabbath, the 28th inst. The Rev. William Barrie, Erasmuss, preached in the morning and afternoon, and the Rev. Robert Torrance, Guelp, preached in the evening. The sermons were most suitable, earnest, and able. The congregation assembled, which were the most numerous that ever met in Paris, listened attentively to Divine truth, seemed deeply affected, and we have no doubt but, by the Divine blessing, much good was accomplished among them.

On the Monday evening following, a Tea Meeting was held by the congregation and friends. About 500 persons sat down to tea. We observed on the platform, the Revs. W. Barrie, Robert Torrance, Alexander Drummond, Robert Rodgers, James Vincent, John Duff, and others.

Rev. David Caw, pastor of the congregation, took the chair, and after prayer, introduced the proceedings of the evening, and remarked: To us as a congregation this is an auspicious period—we see the object on which our hearts were set, now accomplished; the building this house in which to worship our God and the God of our fathers. The building this house originated from necessity; for the Great Master of assemblies has prospered his own cause in the midst of us, that the place in which we formerly assembled became too strait; and we have, by the blessing of God, reared this house of worship. This congregation was taken under the care of Presbytery in 1836: we, consequently as a congregation, are 17 years old. At the first communion, 14 members commemorated the death of Christ; 8 of these are still alive, and remain in the church. When I accepted your call, and was inducted as pastor among you, there were 113 members on the roll:—the congregation being 10 years under the pastoral care of Rev. George Murray, now in Glenheim. Of these 113 only 60 now remain in communion. Since my induction among you, 199 have been received into communion, 190 are on the roll, and 38 have been added since January last.

The want of room forbids us doing more than merely stating the names of the speakers and their subjects on the above occasion.

Rev. George Murray—"The prosperity of the Church."

Rev. William Barrie—"The Liberality of Voluntaryism."

Rev. Robert Torrance—"The bad effects of State Support on the Church."

Mr. William Barker—"Christian Unity."

Rev. John Duff—"The Advantages of Early Piety."

Rev. James Vincent—"The Signs of the Times."

Rev. Alexander Drummond—"The Duty which the Church owes to God in supporting the Gospel, can only be acceptably performed on the Voluntary Principle."

Rev. Mr. Shipley—"The pleasant effects of Denominational Association."