

it all. Its doctrine regarding the civil magistrate and the deceased wife's sister it rejects, and it virtually declines to believe in predestination to sin and wrath. But wherein have I offended the Confession? Has it any theory of inspiration? Did its framers formulate any articles on diabolical agency? Does it not assert that in God's providence "things fall out according to the nature of second causes?" The Presbytery of Montreal was blind to the very traditions of the Church when it wrongfully condemned me. To condemn an honest enquirer because his views are not those of the dying school of verbal inspirationists and anti diabolists, evolutionary or otherwise, imputing to him inferences which he has not stated and for which he refuses to be responsible is conduct directly opposed to all law and justice. Are we ministers and elders tied by the *ipsissima verba* of the Confession, or are we free to search the Scriptures? For my part, I do not wish to remain a single moment longer in any church that is narrower than the Word of God. What have I presented to this court? The Word and nothing but the Word. I have said let God be true and every man a liar. Christ is God and all that is in accordance with Christ is of God. What I contend for is purity of doctrine, perfection of character, the living face of God. It is far from a pleasant experience for a man of my habits to be dragged into publicity, tossed about and baited in church courts, after five and twenty years defence of the Gospel, and that by men who, knowing me as they do, are well aware that I can do nothing against the truth but for the truth. Yet unpleasant as it may be in many ways, I stand here with the answer of a good conscience in the sight of God and men to protest against the adverse ruling of the Presbytery of Montreal and to appeal to a wider constituency and higher court of the Church from its hasty and ill-judged decision.

JOHN CAMPBELL.