

to take any notice of them, or to ask you the favour of a small corner in the *Record* for reviewing them.

The first reason complains of the Presbytery of Montreal appointing a "Committee," to deal with the Kirk Session of Knox Church, Montreal, not composed of members representing the minds of the whole Presbytery, but only a sectional part,—from rural and remote districts, whose views and prejudices in this matter, it was well known, did not harmonize, not only with ours, but with those of other congregations of the Presbytery." This complaint either betrays total ignorance or wilful misrepresentation of what the Presbytery did in appointing that Committee. The Presbytery appointed on that Committee *two worthy brethren from the City of Montreal*, to whose views and prejudices no exception could be taken by the congregation of Knox Church, but they declined to act. The brethren from the country were, therefore, under the necessity of either undertaking a very unpleasant work, without the aid of their city brethren, or allow the laws of the church to be trampled upon.

The second reason charges both Presbytery and Synod "with apparent partiality in the manner in which they have dealt by the congregation of Knox Church, Montreal;" while other congregations of the Church, equally guilty, were passed by with impunity. The groundlessness of this charge may be seen at once from the facts.

First,—That the Presbytery had no knowledge, official or otherwise, of any other congregation, within its bounds, using instrumental music in the public praise of God.

Second,—That the Synod had no official documents regularly transmitted to it, by any of the Presbyteries of the Church, charging any of the congregations with innovation in the public praise of God, but these papers, connected with the innovation of Knox Church, Montreal. In the absence of that knowledge, and such documents, neither Presbytery nor Synod could act otherwise, or can they be justly charged with *apparent partiality*.

Under the *third* reason we have several particulars, which we shall notice. The "I" particular sets forth the judgment of Knox Church congregation, as of more importance than that of the Synod, which shows the opinion they have of themselves, and of their superior judgment; nevertheless, what they call "just," the Synod called unjust, by a vote of 136 against 24.

The "II" particular declares Mr. Cameron's citation both "unconstitutional and irregular." It may be sufficient to say that the Synod declared the very opposite. As to its substance, the citation was just the finding of the Presbytery.

The "III" particular would be of force if the Session had taken no notice of Mr. Cameron's Citation, but such was not the case; the Moderator attended the first meeting of Presbytery, with a written document defending the course pursued, without waiting for a second citation; when the Presbytery dismissed the committee, and took the whole case into their own hands.

The "IV" particular complains of the judgment passed by the Presbytery against the use of the organ in Knox Church, Montreal, without citing either Session or Congregation. This particular leaves out of view facts which must be brought to light, viz. :—That the session of said congregation, resisted a previous action of the Presbytery, in not meeting the Committee; and that its moderator *did appear* in the name of the Session, and with a written document, in justification of their conduct. I quote the moderator's own words from the *Montreal Herald*. "The action of the session is embodied in the documents which have been deposited with the Clerk of this Court." The moderator, therefore, represented the Session, and defended the course which they had followed.