

and intelligent congregation listens to the word of life every Sabbath. Mr. Fergusson is a delegate to the General Assembly, and for a variety of reason is likely "to get there," and much interest is already taken in the trip.

SHERBROOKE.

a thriving town about one hundred miles from Montreal, situated on the Magog River, is the capital of Sherbrooke County, possessing fine water power, and is the seat of many important industries. The scenery around the town is charming, and the G. T. R. and C. P. R. have important stations here. Presbyterianism is well represented in Sherbrooke. A fine new church is nearing completion; it will not only be an ornament to the part of the town where it stands, but a credit to the Presbyterians of the place. The building will cost about \$17,000, of which about \$10,000 has been subscribed. There is also one of the finest halls we have seen anywhere, beautifully furnished, and lighted with incandescent light. The hall is used for public worship at present.

There is also a fine manse and caretaker's residence. The successful completion of this building enterprise will be in every way creditable to all concerned, and especially to the energetic clergyman, the Rev. A. Lee. The foundation-stone was laid last September by the Rev. Dr. MacVicar, and it is expected that the church will be ready for opening by September of the present year. The congregation of Sherbrooke was organized about twenty five years ago, and have had a succession of ministers who, I think, are all still alive. The first was Rev. Mr. Evans, who was succeeded by the following in their order: Messrs. Tanner, Lindsay, Tully, Cattach and Lee. The old church was built by the Congregational body, and after being used by them was for a time occupied as an emigration shed, afterwards as a music hall, when the Presbyterians commenced to conduct service in it. I think there is little danger that the present edifice will ever be mistaken for a music hall or "barn," as it will compare favourably with the church buildings in our large cities.

This is the section of country which has for some time been, and is still, so excited over the capture of Donald Morrison, the Megantic outlaw. Well, I saw Donald in gaol, and he does not present the appearance of a man who in any sense of the word has been a desperado. He is about thirty years of age, with rather fine features, his face shaved, except a moustache. He has been all over the Pacific coast. It is stated that it was under the severest provocation that he fired the fatal shot. The conditions under which he was arrested and wounded (probably fatally) had aroused the deepest sympathy of all classes; and even some clergymen have interested themselves in his behalf to see that he will obtain a fair trial. He is a Presbyterian of Gaelic stock, and is regularly visited by the Rev. Mr. Lee. He seems to be well cared for in the gaol, and speaks highly of the kindness he receives from the officials and visitors. As the particulars of the arrest have been given in nearly all the papers, I need not here repeat them, but it is thought that when "a flag of truce" was hoisted, and a respectable deputation on hand to arrange for Morrison's surrender to justice, that to arrest him under the circumstances was unworthy of a British subject or of a British soldier.

THREE RIVERS.

This is a handsome city, situated on the north shore of the St. Lawrence River. At one time its population was largely English, but now French population and sentiment seem to predominate.

We have one congregation, of which the Rev. George Maxwell is pastor, and who is highly esteemed by his people, whose interests are carefully guarded. They are loud in their praises of Mr. Maxwell as a preacher and worker. The church is a good stone building, has a fine school-room, and is in every way well equipped for congregational work. Mr. Baptist, a large merchant, takes much interest in the congregation, and is a liberal contributor to the funds. There is a comfortable manse for the minister.

TORONTO PULPIT ECHOES.

Much interest is taken in the discourses which the Rev. Dr. Kollogg has been preaching on Romanism, and the copies of the *Globe* in which they appeared are eagerly sought after. The Doctor's style is clear and forcible, whilst the spirit and temper displayed are worthy of imitation by all who engage in polemical discussions. The concluding paragraph of his excellent sermon on "Why I cannot be a Romanist," is too good to pass over, and I take the liberty of asking you to insert it. Such discourses, proclaimed in such a Christian spirit, cannot fail to instruct all who hear or read them:

In the light of the history of the Roman Church her intolerable tyrannies over the consciences of men, and her defiant annulment—as in the veneration of images and the worship of the Virgin and many other matters—of some of the plainest commands of Holy Scripture, all made the more by far intolerable through her presumptuous arrogation in all this of the absolute infallibility of our Lord Jesus Christ Himself; we must all, I think, see one great and most momentous lesson standing out most clearly. It is this: As we value both life and liberty here, as we value the holy truth of God, as we value the salvation of our souls, let us beware that we add not to nor take an iota from what God has revealed in Holy Scripture as the rule for our belief and duty. The warning is not unneeded, even in the Presbyterian Church. We do well to take heed that, led away with this or that specious plea for moral reform, we in our Presbyteries, Synods and Assemblies, lay not law upon the conscience of men, which God has not laid on them in His Word; else we who judge Rome for this thing shall fall ourselves into the same condemnation. The smallest departure from this principle is full of danger. All that is worst in the belief and history of the Roman Church may be traced to her continual transgression on this one point, wherein, in matters more than I can number, like the Pharisees of Christ's day, she has, through her tradi-

tions, made void that very Word of God which she professes to receive, teaching in addition or contradiction thereto the traditions of men for the commandments of God, and thus laying upon the necks of men "burdens which neither we nor our fathers have been able to bear."

Sherbrooke, June 18, 1889.

THE HOLINESS THEORY.

It seems strange, indeed, that, as honest men and women, the appellants should hesitate frankly to admit that their views are in direct opposition to the teaching of our standards. Maintaining, as the Synod can see, not only from their answers which form part of the record, but from their pleadings this afternoon, that God does, on certain conditions, which the believer may fulfil, impart to him such grace that he lives without sinning in any relation, human or divine, and has no sin to confess or ask the forgiveness of, it is vain for them to attempt to evade a charge which is simply identical with their own avowed contention and claim. To affirm (reasons 3 and 4) that they do not believe or teach absolute perfection, and that they do not teach sanctification, heart purity, or Christian perfection as a second blessing, is beside the point. Whatever is implied in these expressions, our charge does not run in terms of them. It is equally beside the point to say (Reason 5) that they emphasize the receiving of the Holy Ghost in a Pentecostal sense, as the privilege of all believers, etc., for we all believe that it is the common privilege of Christians to receive the Holy Ghost for all the personal saving purposes for which He was given on the day of Pentecost. If, as they say, they find the Standards in agreement with John and Paul, in teaching that, "being born of God and abiding in Christ we sin not," and "the righteousness of the law is fulfilled in us," they overlook the fact that, in the passages referred to, John and Paul do not affirm the sinless obedience of some believers, but the freedom of all believers from the dominion of sin—that they do not teach a possible Christian attainment, such as the appellants claim they have made, but teach that no believer can live in sin or lead a life of disobedience to the commands of God. Indeed, strange as it may seem, considering their advantages, it is manifest that the appellants fail to distinguish between the dominion of sin and its inhabitation, between its reigning and rebelling, between not living in sin and living without sin. That they fail to make a distinction that is so plain to us, and of such immense importance in relation to the Christian life, does not make their error less dangerous in its tendency and actual issues.

I shall not detain the Synod by dwelling at any length on the extreme danger of the error of the appellants. But some reference to it is necessary in justification of the action of the Session in placing them under suspension, because of their expressed determination to spread it as they have opportunity. If it is really so that God, in the communication of His grace to the believer, does not, in this life, go beyond delivering him from the guilt and dominion of sin, permitting it to remain in him, a living, actively rebellious, though dethroned resident, so long as he is at home in the body and absent from the Lord,—if, that is, entire deliverance from sin is a communication of Divine grace reserved for his quitting the body, as there are other communications of grace reserved for Christ's second coming,—if, I say, this is really so, then the persuasion that this communication is not a reserve of the Divine goodness, but a present experience, cannot but be fraught with danger, implying, as it must do, false as well as slight views of sin, and great obtuseness in the perception of it. If I believe that God has made to me a communication of His grace which He has not made, and makes to no man till he quits the body—if I believe that I am entirely free from sin when I am not—if I believe that I sin not, when in reality I am sinning daily in thought, word, and deed, I must be deceiving myself. The god of this world, the arch-deceiver, must have blinded me so that I see not the sinfulness of thoughts, feelings, desires and acts that are really sinful. I cannot believe I am sinless when I am not sinless, except by believing that what is sinful is not sinful. Evidence is not wanting in the present case that dispositions, desires and feelings of a sinful character—the outcome of the sin that dwells in us, are regarded as being only the sinless outcome of the essential appetencies of humanity. Allow me, in illustration, to quote briefly from a pamphlet on "The Holy Life," by James F. Govan, the present head of a body in England (Faith Mission Pilgrims). "He can take away sin from our inmost spiritual being." And they claim that God has done so in their experience. But mark what follows. "We find in James that every man is tempted when he is drawn away from his own lust and enticed. Then, when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin. When a man feels a desire drawing towards sin, it does not say he has sinned, but only that he is tempted." This is very similar to a reply I received from one of the parties before the session, and which I could not but regard as identifying our remaining sinful corruption with the God-implanted appetencies of human nature. Can any considerate Christian fail to see the extreme danger of this, even in relation to morality? And, if the appellants themselves escape, restrained by the better influences that have hitherto surrounded them, will not those who follow them be landed in the theology of Robert Burns:

If I have wandered in those paths,
Of life I ought to shun;

Thou knowest that Thou hast formed me
With passions wild and strong.

Dr. Middlemiss also referred to the antinomianism involved in the oversight of the distinction between the dominion

and the inhabitation of sin, the appellants appearing to think, with many others, that, if a man has a right intellectual apprehension of the doctrine of gratuitous justification, and is willing to be pardoned, he is in a state of salvation, though he may be under the dominion of sin;—as if living in sin only hindered the peace of the believer, instead of being utterly inconsistent with the reality of genuine personal religion. After considering objections made to the procedure of the Session and the Presbytery, and urging that the appellants had not only had all their rights carefully guarded, but been dealt with in the exercise of the utmost patience, kindness, and consideration, Dr. Middlemiss concluded as follows:

We are all agreed in acknowledging and deploring the low condition of the Church, and in believing that there is hardly any limit to the possibilities of the Christian life. But to base these high possibilities upon a false principle, to forget that all Christian attainment is made only in conflict, not only with evil surrounding us, but with inherited evil within as not yet extirpated, is unspeakably dangerous; and I trust this Synod will utter no uncertain sound in reference to views full of evil consequence to the interests of morality, as well as fatal to genuine Christian progress.

I have made no reference to the irrelevant declamation with which the action of the Session has been assailed, especially by parties charging us with inconsistency in allowing the immoral,—the drunkard, the impure, the profane, the pleasure-seeker, the dishonest, to nestle in the Church and to sit at the Lord's Table, and casting out good Christian men and women, of high Christian aims, whose error, at the worst, is the misinterpretation of a few passages of scripture. But I cannot help saying it is greatly to be regretted that such a charge should have been endorsed this afternoon, at the bar of the Synod, by one of the appellants speaking both for himself and for others. Such a charge involves misrepresentation of the grossest kind. As a matter of fact, the Church hardly ever deals with any of its members for heresy. In the course of a long ministry, this is the first case of erroneous teaching with which I have had to do. We are, therefore, far from being at home in dealing with such a matter. But surely, no one will say that no erroneous teaching should ever be made the subject of discipline. Surely, though I would be the last to attempt to draw the line between essential and non-essential in Christian doctrine, no reasonable person can deny that there are some scripture teachings, whose repudiation is inconsistent with the faith or trust in Christ that is saving. If it be said that the error of the appellants does not come under the head of the essentials, my answer is, that any serious error in relation to sin is, at least, not very remote from error in essentials. Of one thing I am very sure, namely, that the Synod is now dealing with an error that will poison the spiritual life at its fountain, and foster a deceitful counterfeit of genuine Christian piety. And after all, it is not for their error that the parties have been disciplined, diametrically opposed to our Standards and dangerous though it is. The Session would have greatly preferred their displaying the Christian courtesy of withdrawing from a communion, whose views on a confessedly most vital matter they feel themselves bound in conscience to oppose and denounce. But, inasmuch as they refuse to withdraw, the session cannot in its care for the purity and peace of the Church allow them to occupy undisturbed a position of privilege that would make the Church responsible for their false and dangerous teaching. I cannot conceive of anything more unreasonable than the demand which the appellants are persisting in; for they demand nothing less than that the Church should take the responsibility of the dissemination of error of a very injurious tendency. But I feel sure the Synod will see that the Session has done the very best that it could do in the circumstances.

JESUITISM THE SAME NOW AS THREE HUNDRED YEARS AGO.

In the sixteenth century seminaries and colleges were founded in Spain, France and Italy by English Catholics for educating young Catholics for the functions of the priesthood in England. From these institutions came those swarms of Jesuits and seminary priests which, in the middle of Queen Elizabeth's reign, filled England with conspiracies and treason, aiming at nothing less than the life of the Queen and the overthrow of the country. Canadians should observe that in this year of grace a Canadian college has been opened in Rome "to educate young Canadian Catholics according to the Catholic theology, for the administration of priestly functions." From Canadians so educated, this country has nothing better to expect, under similar circumstances, than sprang from the same source to the Mother Country three hundred years ago. The foreign training in medieval doctrines, in the Jesuitical and priestly arts, in dislike of English liberty and history, and antagonism to Protestant freedom and intelligence, renders them anything but an acquisition to Canada. They will return full of devotion to a foreign Church, an ancient hierarchy, absolute ecclesiastical power, the chair of St. Peter, and the thunder of the Vatican. Jesuitism is still inspired by the same principles and spirit of intolerance, cherishes the same schemes, and pursues the same ends as of old. Its dominance in Canada will be blight and debasement to Canada worse than was that of Philip the Second and Sextus the Fifth over Spain. Its aim is to tamper with, and, if possible, control education. If it cannot be altogether according to its model, to approximate it as closely as possible. It aims to mould the young—young Protestants as well as Catholics. To this end it has its camps of instruction—cheap schools and colleges—under the suasive instruction of monks and nuns, novitiates and priests. These drill masters teach their recruits to respect the triple tiara more than the royal crown, the Church of Rome more than the Saviour of men, rites and ceremonies more than the oracles of God.—*Tercentenary of England's Victory over Spain and the Armada, by Rev. James Little.*