

we view these proceedings in a very serious light, for these Presbyteries have not only thought proper to attack the *Magazine*, but also the personal character of the Editor, and, in a spirit we do not now characterize, have endeavored, through several newspapers, to do every thing possible, utterly to ruin him.

In the July number, at the close of the Editorial review of certain Synodical proceedings, (which has been the cause of these Presbyterian resolutions,) it was stated, that there was no particular desire to say more on the subject, but that the columns were open to anything that any one who thought that truth and justice had not received their due, might choose to write. Surely that was giving full scope for discussion, and for eliciting the truth on the right side, if we should be on the wrong. But no one wrote a syllable for publication. Had the Presbytery of Durham, like the Presbytery of Toronto, not sent the resolutions to the *Magazine*, but only to certain newspapers, then no more would have been said in our pages on the subject; but if an answer were given at all, it would have been in the newspapers where the resolutions appeared; but as the resolutions are sent to us, and we are bound on a pledge to admit them, whatever may be the consequences now, we have surely the right of reply and of vindication. The very worm will turn upon the foot that crushes it, and the legitimate defence of truth, and of character, is alike the law of nature and the law of God; and in those circumstances we beg the forbearance of our readers. Yes, we beg more; we beg their most intense and most conscientious scrutiny of all the facts, in regard to a case which is agitating the Church to its centre.

Regarding the Editorial in the July number, that is so unmitigatedly condemned, along with the character of the Editor personally, it may be stated that, in that article there is no reflection on any individual's personal character, nor any vile verbiage employed. Strong language, certainly, was used, but we submit that there was not a word unbecoming the use of the language among men who write within the bounds of literary courtesy. We did not copy that style which would have called the conduct of the Synod "infamous," "unhallowed," "knavery," or that the members of Synod "were a set of knaves." Neither did we attempt the style and imputations of motives and assaults on private character, which are to be found in the above resolutions, such as "deliberate and glaring delinquency," "designedly disingenuous," "false and calumnious," "foul charges," "unchristian," &c., &c. We were not educated in that mode of writing, and hope never to learn, though we are getting unwonted facilities, but we are ready to admit that, writing for the *Magazine* immediately after Synod, and with the feelings not calmed down, there was some amount of *pepper* in the article that might have been spared—this we admit frankly, but as to the statements in it, as far as matter-of-fact is concerned, we do not abate one jot, nor ever shall. We cannot; for let any man examine the Synod minutes, and they will sustain us in every statement. Let our readers scrutinise the article again, and examine the Synod minutes on the case, which were fully and faithfully given on the preceding pages, and we shall doubly thank any one—and in the dust confess our sin—who shall show us wherein we have gone contrary to evidence. Here, then, is our stand point—our language was not composed of abusive epithets, though it was strong, and it would have been better had it been less so—but the statements were true, and no condemnation, *without the proof*, can make us yield.

An indignation manifesto from a Presbytery, may seem to be very portentous, but when the facts are looked at, it loses a little of its potency. What are the facts? Every one knows that the Presbytery of Toronto was divided, latterly, on the case that gave rise to the proceedings, the ministers being *five* to *four*; and at the meeting on the 9th of August, one of the four having omitted his charge, and another being absent, one being present, and dissenting, and another (we) throwing no obstacle, the five, of course, had it their own way. It is, then, a resolution only of the majority of the Presbytery of Toronto.

In regard to the resolutions of the Durham Presbytery, they could only consistently be the decisions of *three* ministers, for two ministers of that Presbytery were not at Synod, and one dissented with the minority, and those three, of course, are just attempting to vindicate themselves for their part taken at Synod

Every one knows, too, that the Synod was seriously divided on the case, for, of those who voted, the vote stood thirteen to nine, but the ministers were eight for, to nine against. It was a decision of Synod, because majorities carry; but when there are a strong opposition, and very strong dissent, it is no use to speak of a Synod's decisions being held sacred from review on the part of one, or all of the minority.

We shall not discuss these resolutions, but merely make a few remarks.

The Presbytery of Durham say that, in the article, we professedly gave an account of the proceedings and decisions in the case of Ure versus the Session of Toronto, and "of the protest and appeal of Cameron and others against the decision of the Presbytery of Toronto." It was a pity, for their own sakes, when anxious to charge us with "deliberate delinquency," that they did not adhere to accuracy. In that article, or any other Editorial article, there is not one syllable professing to give an account of the "protest and appeal of Cameron and others." What are people to make of their condemnation, when the very subject of their accusation is not according to fact?

Next, they say that the "*Magazine* is not, and never was the official and acknowledged organ of the U. P. Church in Canada." If so, then what business have they with the *Magazine*, any more than with any other periodical; for, has a public and independent journal not the right to review the decisions of any Church Court, and is not that right constantly exercised? There is the one horn of the dilemma. But they say the *Magazine* is not and never was the "*acknowledged organ*;" then, why has the Synod for two years ordered (as see minutes) certain documents, 'Treasurer's Accounts, &c. to be sent to it? Then, why did the Durham Presbytery!—again and again—send reports of Presbytery meetings, statistics, &c. There is the other horn.

Again, they say "that the statements and teachings in certain of its Editorials, are designedly disingenuous, and highly perverasive of truth." We ask, which? where? on what? We demand that they specify, that they quote the words, and *prove* that they are what they say they are; and *until* they do this, we can use no milder term than, it is a slander; and if they *refuse*, we shall call it a slander backed by cowardice.

The resolutions of the Presbytery of Durham, we are certain, will be held by every man who has a soul touched by the charities of morality—not to say any thing of the higher charities of the gospel—as apparently vindictive, not merely against the *Magazine*, but bearing personal hatred to its Editor. That is too plain, and assuredly will tell against themselves.

We would remark further, that the members of Presbytery may find that their resolutions contain libels on personal character, and that any one member of Presbytery, or all of them, are liable to an action of damages in a Court of civil law.

We have written strongly; shall we be blamed?

"Who steals my purse, steals trash; 'tis something, nothing;
'Twas mine, 'tis his, and has been slave to thousands;
But he who filches from me my good name,
Robs me of that which not enriches him,
And makes me poor indeed."

Condemnation was passed by all of these resolutions, on what we would on the decision of Synod; but why single out the *Magazine* or the Editor? What was first complained of in the Synod's act? Was it not the avoiding of a routine trial of the case, after the parties had been summoned to the bar to have the *whole* case proceeded with, "as truth and justice may require?" and is it not to be found in the Synod minutes that the Revs. Dr. Wm. Taylor, Aitken, Henderson, McClure, and Wm. Fraser, dissented and protested, and employed the following language?

"Because, as the Synod resolved at its last Sedorant to "summon the parties to their bar, and there to deal with them," it is manifestly a rescinding of this resolution to appoint a Select Committee now to deal with them privately; and as this has been done in violation of the Rules of Order which the Synod has adopted, all proceedings arising from it ought to be regarded as null.

"Because a private investigation will not satisfy the public, which will look upon the present course of the Synod as an attempt to evade the enquiry, and smother the question. And in consequence of this suspicion, the ultimate sentence of this Court in this case will be deprived of all moral weight in the public mind, and will fail to bring about an amicable termination of the strife and heart-burning which have so long flowed from it."

And at the final decision on the report of a select committee, (which the Session of Toronto refused to meet, because it was private,) do we