

come, could not be influenced by personal considerations, might not be inappropriate. I may state that I have been for the last twenty years accustomed to regard the British and Foreign Bible Society as one of the noblest institutions of which Britain can boast, as beneficent in its operations as it is unsectarian in its constitution. Often in Scotland have I attended public meetings at which I have heard, year after year, its claims advocated by leading men of the various evangelical denominations with a pathos and power which at once touched the heart and the intellect. The institution is one which has struck its roots deep, and whose ramifications are extended to almost every portion of the habitable globe. Established upwards of sixty years ago, its operations have been yearly enlarging,—its receipts last year having amounted to upwards of £186,000 sterling, there being now one hundred and eighty-two languages or dialects in which the Society has promoted the distribution, printing, or translation of the Scriptures. To bring a series of very grave charges against an association of this character, is no light matter. Yet this is precisely what Mr. Sutherland and Mr. Munro have done. Let us then examine the main counts in the indictment in a judicial spirit, and ascertain to what extent they have been able to substantiate them.

The Revd. authors have come before the public in order “to prevent the Church with which they are connected being compromised, or restriction being laid upon the liberty and liberality of her people.” As they do not state by whom they have been accredited in this matter as the champions of the Church, the public is led naturally to infer that their functions are self-assumed. In other words, Mr. Sutherland and Mr. Munro profess to speak for the Church, whilst they are only entitled to speak for themselves.

What, then, are the principal charges brought against the Society? They affirm that the Society circulates bibles containing the Apocrypha, the Unitarian bible, which they very properly describe “as culled of all that makes the bible tidings of salvation to lost sinners,” and Popish versions. They also affirm “that Popery is a constituent element of the Committee”—that “there were Unitarians connected with the committee,” they say, “is beyond question.” Since conviction as to the truth of these charges can only be produced in intelligent minds by satisfactory evidence, the reader will naturally suppose that Messrs. Sutherland and Munro must have been prepared to adduce irrefragable proof in support of their accusations. If they were so prepared, their pamphlet presents miserable evidence of it. It is a false statement that the Apocryphal books are circulated with the bible. For the last forty-three years not a line of the Apocrypha has been circulated by the British and Foreign Bible Society. Although I am not old enough to remember the keen discussion that occurred in Scotland on the subject when Dr. Andrew Thompson of Edinburgh fulminated in the pages of the *Christian Instructor* against the Apocrypha, and the Committee of the Bible Society published resolutions binding themselves to the total exclusion of the Apocryphal books in future, yet I have read a good deal concerning these stirring times, and give the resolutions as adopted by the Bible Society Committee, and which have been since strictly adhered to.

1. “That the fundamental law of the Society, which limits its operations to the circulation of the Holy Scriptures, be distinctly recognized as excluding the circulation of the Apocrypha.”

2. “That in conformity with the preceding resolution, no pecuniary aid can be granted to any Society circulating the Apocrypha; nor, except for the purpose of being applied in conformity with the said resolution, to any individual whatever.”

3. “That in all cases in which grants, whether gratuitous or otherwise, of the Holy Scriptures, either in whole or in part, shall be made to any Society,