

"Dismiss the protest and appeal; find that there is no valid reason in the evidence before the Court, to question the appellant's soundness in the faith, and set aside any decision of the inferior Courts, which may be thought to the contrary, but are strongly of opinion that his admission to the office of ruling elder in the United Presbyterian congregation of Toronto is inexpedient and inadvisable."

This settled the point about his admissibility to the Session; but it was unfortunately a compromise; and like all compromises on matters where doctrine and principle are concerned, was bad; and the mover and seconder, and main supporters of it, we believe, are now like-minded. The Committee of Session had not taken down his words and made him sign them; and hence, when he denied what was asserted, though he never told what he did say, it was thought the easiest way to avoid a thorough investigation, just to hinge the whole on what we put in italics—*"There is no valid reason in the evidence before the Court."*

When pleading his case before Synod in 1852, Mr. Ure made two charges, both of which were denied on the spot; but the Synod heard and did no more. The chief statement then made, and which gave rise to the present case, was this: that Mr. Ure, to get quit of the charge by the Session for heresy, made the accusation "that the minutes of Session are untrue—utterly untrue—made up—varnished—garnished—unfounded—ramped up." Though the Synod did not investigate such a grave charge against an inferior court, the Session deemed it right to protect themselves, and afterwards attempted to deal with Mr. Ure; but he refused, in writing, to do anything—retract, confess, or deny; and in these circumstances, the Session, maintaining the accuracy of their minutes both in letter and in spirit, cut him off from the membership for slander and contumacy.

Mr. Ure appealed to the Presbytery. The Presbytery, by a majority of one, decided—"Sustain the protest and appeal, reverse the decision of the Session, and leave the case of Mr. Ure's standing in the Church precisely as it was left by the decision of Synod."

The Session then appealed to the Synod.

The above is a brief epitome of the case; and now we come to the conducting of it before the Synod.

The papers were all read, and a Committee appointed "to mature this case for the decision of Synod." The Committee reported, as see pages 52 and 53 printed Minutes, and page 3 of the Magazine. The Committee's report contained eight resolutions; and the eighth resolution, especially, the Synod, by a majority, refused to adopt!! It is worthy of being put in capitals as a key to the whole thing—and we give it:—

**"THAT THIS CASE OUGHT NOT TO BE DECIDED BY THIS COURT MERELY UPON THE GROUNDS OF ECCLESIASTICAL FORMS OF PROCEDURE, BUT ON THE HIGH GROUND OF CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLE, AND UNDER A SINCERE DESIRE TO DO ALL IN OUR POWER, AS WE SHALL BE ANSWERABLE TO CHRIST, TO RESTORE PEACE TO THE CONGREGATION OF TORONTO."**

It is a serious fact, that a majority of Synod decided against that, and consequently determined that they would not be bound to decide the case on "the high ground of Christian principle!!"

But that was not all; for, according to the seventh resolution, the Synod took "the whole case into their own hands;" and did actually "summon Mr. Ure and the Session to their bar, and there to deal with them as truth and justice may require." But—

At next meeting, when the parties appeared; and when, instead of investigating the whole case in open Synod, this flexible majority appointed a Committee to meet the parties in private, and there investigate and report to Synod—thus breaking their own resolution, as well as shirking a public trial.

The Rev. Mr. Jennings, the Elders, and Managers of the Church, all refused to meet in private; and determined, according to the former resolution of Synod, that they would go into the case in public, or not at all. A large number of Ministers also dissented against the acts of the majority.

The Committee of Synod met, and reported. (See page 4.)

Then came the final decision of Synod (see page 4); and if the match for the whole can be found in ecclesiastical history, we shall, to the finder, give all that we are worth in the world.

In regard to the course pursued, and the decision come to, we refer our readers to the two sets of reasons by the dissentients, signed by the Rev. Dr. Taylor and others, and those adied by the Session of Toronto; and let them judge of their force from the whole facts of the case. Answers were given to these, prepared by a Committee, and adopted by the Synod; and on these we would make one or two remarks.

In the 1st, it is said that at the Select Committee, it was not intended to proceed with a private investigation, but only to prepare for and facilitate a subsequent public investigation! Why,

there was nothing to prepare or facilitate. The case was ready for investigation; but in the estimation of some it was not ready for public investigation; for had that been done, it is well known what would have been the issue.

In the 2nd, it is said that the important explanations made by Mr. Ure were made public before the Court in the report of the Select Committee. We ask, where, in that report, are they to be found? Nowhere.

In the second paragraph of the 2nd, it is said that the Synod did say where the blame lay, and that it was on the Session for taking up the case. That's not the point—but this is it: Is one man to be blamed for making such an accusation against a Session in regard to the falsity of their minutes; or the Session, for making false minutes; or the Session, for cutting off from Church communion one who made such a charge? Did the Synod decide those points? No—these were the points that were shirked and smothered in a select committee. Again, it is said, "Nor is it consistent with fact, that no word of admonition was addressed to either party." We say it is consistent with fact; for not one syllable of admonition was ever uttered to either party; and we appeal to the Moderator and Clerk to sustain us in this.

The answers given to the Session's reasons are of a piece with the former, and afford good ground for a long and crushing review; but enough of explanation has been given.

There is the case; and we ask any man with a conscience, if there is any wonder at the indignation of the Toronto congregation, and that the bonds of ecclesiastical connection were almost broken; or, that Mr. Jennings, when protesting against the decision, declared "that it is the most iniquitous decision that was ever perpetrated by any court."

Because this is apparently a local case, some may think we have given too much prominence to it. It is not because we, individually, are interested, that so much is written; but because the ploughshare of division has made a deep and a broad furrow.

There are at least fifteen ministers in a state of high dissatisfaction with the issue; and that is no light matter in one Church. It is notorious through our communion, and our membership, all, have a right to know the actual facts and merits of it. We hold that the Synod is not the Church, but the Church is composed of the whole membership, and one member cannot suffer without all the other members suffering along with it.

NOTE.—We have avoided personalities in regard to members of Synod—but that there may be no mistake, if any individual feels aggrieved at anything we have written, or thinks that truth and justice have not received their due at our hands, our columns are open to anything he may choose to write on this subject. We have no particular wish to say more on it, but we shall not deter any one, by hedging ourselves round with an editorial privilege.

#### To the Editor of the Canadian Presbyterian Magazine.

SIR.—I have been credibly informed, that at the meeting of the United Presbyterian Synod last week, there was circulated among certain members, a letter from the Rev. Andrew Somerville, Secretary of the Board of Missions of the U. P. Church in Scotland. It was also said that the letter had relation to the aiding of congregations in procuring libraries; that something of this kind was offered, viz:—That if any ten congregations should raise the sum of nine pounds each, fifteen pounds would be added—making twenty-five pounds to each congregation for the purchase of books.

Now, there are a few questions about this affair which I should like to have satisfactorily answered; and first, Is the said letter a fact? To whom was it addressed? What was the nature and extent of its proposals? Was it designed by the writer that it should be communicated only to certain individuals? Or had the Synod a right to be made acquainted with its contents? It does seem to me very strange, that the Secretary of the Board in Scotland should be authorised to make proposals to individuals, in the way which would appear to be indicated, by the alleged private currency given to the said letter! And if the letter contained offers to congregations generally, what shall be said of the person to whom it was addressed, and who thus prevented its being made known to the Synod.

Our Committee of Missions in this country, it will be remembered, are entrusted with the correspondence with the Board of Missions in Scotland, and, though I am unwilling to cast any unmerited imputation, they may rest assured, that suspicion of partiality and unfairness, on their part, in this matter, exists, which nothing but a full and frank explanation can remove.

June 27, 1853.

A MEMBER OF SYNOD.