

not meet, save in the most perfunctory manner, it being abundantly evident to my mind and to that of any candid observer that their object was not to adjudicate fairly in the premises, but to secure at any cost a conviction that should send the case for trial up to a higher court. Hence the form of my protest, "that the Presbytery, in the consideration of the arguments on which the decision was based, failed to weigh those Scriptural ones presented for the defence, which the appellant regards as sufficient to exonerate him from the charges contained in the libel." To this appeal a committee, in which I am ashamed to say the names of two of my colleagues appear, answered most disingenuously, that the Presbytery had before it all the arguments and Scriptural references written and oral used by me. If the Presbytery really had the Scriptural proofs before it, it acted as the priest and the Levite did in the parable of the good Samaritan; when they saw him they passed by on the other side. The prosecuting committee and its abettors in the house, while showering Old Testament texts as irrelevantly as abundantly, did not meet a single proof text from the words of Jesus Christ and His disciples. Never in all the history of Protestantism has there been a more conspicuous and wilful failure to ascertain the position of a theologian, nor a more glaring example of ecclesiastical injustice. Therefore, in spite of the Committee's reply, I bring entirely unaltered my protest and appeal to a larger, and more impartial, and, as I trust, more courageous tribunal.

I. The Presbytery's first count is that my Kingston lecture impugns and discredits the Holy Scriptures as the supreme and infallible source of religious truth. This I have already more than once by written and spoken word denied, but, like many another lie, it seems hard to kill. The lecture in question is full of reverence for the Scriptures, as considering its authorship, it could not fail to be.