

More than two hours were spent in conference with Rev. J. Glyn Williams, who was present by special request, for the purpose of securing, if possible, further light on his report of Professor Matthews' lectures and his thesis, which documents formed the basis of Dr. Harris' charges. And finally one whole evening was given up by the Committee to an interview with Dr. Harris himself, in order that he might have an opportunity to explain in detail the charges he had made, and present any further evidence he had to offer in the support of the same.

THE DOCUMENTS

On Which the Charges Were Based.

Coming to the documents filed by Dr. Harris in support of his charges against Professor Matthews, the Committee found that they consisted of:

1. A typewritten report of thirteen lectures taken down in shorthand and given by the Professor between October 3rd and November 28th, 1907—being lectures one to twelve and lecture fifteen, of a course of twenty-one lectures on Old Testament Introduction.

2. An original manuscript copy of a thesis on the "Composition of the Hexateuch," prepared by Mr. Williams as a class exercise, at the request of Professor Matthews, and purporting to embody the results of the student's own investigations.

3. An excerpt from a letter from Mr. Williams to Rev. C. J. Cameron, in which certain charges were made against the general effect of the Professor's teaching.

With regard to the typewritten report of the lectures, the Committee regrets to have to state that they found it interlarded with exclamatory paragraphs (not a part of the original copy, but specially intended for the eye of Dr. Harris for whom the report was made), calculated to cast contempt upon the Professor, and revealing an animus and an attitude scarcely becoming in a student toward his teacher.

In answer to the enquiries of the Committee, Mr. Williams stated that the lectures were verbatim so far as they went, but that of course they did not contain all that the Professor had said in the class. Nevertheless, they faithfully mirrored the Professor.

Professor Matthews, however, on being questioned, stated that they did not correctly mirror his teaching, that they bore evidence of being a selection rather than a verbatim report, that they contradicted his position on essential points and that Mr. Williams had frequently left out qualifying adjectives and adverbs which would greatly modify the meaning in many places.

While not expressing any opinion as to whether the report of