

ity against recusants, for fear of their swelling the ranks of those who have begun to cry out for disestablishment—such an insinuation should be regarded by all candid men as infinitely more dishonorable in the author of it than dishonoring to the Church of Scotland. In regard to the doctrine of eternal punishment we are told that ‘the Bible seems to speak plainly enough.’ It is a great pity that this theologian’s writing does not conform more to the Scriptural injunction of the ‘yea, yea and nay, nay,’ for had he only omitted that convenient little word *seems* our unsettled minds would have been forever quieted in respect of this momentous question. As it is he has left us in the dark as to whether Mr. Macdonnell has or has not by the expression of his doubts discarded the authority, even of the Congregationalists’ formulated system of theology—the Bible. But in addition to this, the magnificent compliment paid to the Old Kirk when he states that the matter would most likely never have reached the Presbytery, much less the Synod would have been perfect and her character as a *liberal Church* established beyond all question. For my own part and I feel sure it is the opinion of all her real friends who have remained true to the remnant, representing the Church of Scotland in these Provinces, I am perfectly satisfied that the matter *would have come before the Presbytery*, but I can scarcely think, nor do I, for one, see that there would have been occasion for it, that, considering the acknowledgement and concession made by Mr. Macdonnell, there would have been such a stormy discussion over it as there has been in the Assembly of the United Church. In short, Mr. Editor, the whole article quoted in the RECORD with all its padding of threadbare expressions and phrases, is simply one of the poorest specimens of that twaddle which some-

\*times from pressure of time will find its way into even ably conducted papers.

I had intended with the above to dismiss the subject, but, if you do not think it encroaching too much upon your space, I should like in conclusion to make one or two remarks upon the ‘Case’ from my own point of view.

Mr. Macdonnell stated before the Assembly that at one time he had no difficulty about the ordinarily understood view of the Church as to the eternity of future punishment, but that he was not now exactly in that position. He certainly, he says, does not reject the teaching of the Church, but so long as he entertains doubts, difficulties and perplexities, he cannot say simply and without explanation “I am here.” If asked whether he believed the teaching of the Confession of Faith, to be founded on and agreeable to the word of God he could say, that he did. Again his final statement is this, ‘notwithstanding difficulties which I have regarding the eternity of future punishment, I continue my adhesion to the doctrine as implied in my assent to the Confession of Faith formerly given,’ and he further tells us in his speech that he believes the teaching of the Confession of Faith, to be founded on and agreeable to the word of God, and that when he falls back upon Scripture it is because he finds precisely the same difficulty which he has in regard to the use of certain words in the Scriptures, when the words are quoted in the Confession of Faith. Now, Mr. Editor, to my mind it seems difficult to conceive of a more submissive and loyal adherence to the Standards of his Church than is indicated by this language. Here we have the case of a man of intellect—an aroused, earnest, anxious inquiring mind—almost overwhelmed with those difficulties and perplexities which must ever I believe, more or less, trouble the highest finite capacity, when it attempts to fathom the