

property are specially dedicated is the worship of God and the advancement of His kingdom on earth as represented by the Presbyterian Church, some feeling, if not of scruple at least of shame or consistency, would have prevented them from taking an unjust advantage to despoil the tenant. If Dr. Campbell entertained any such delusive expectation, he was very speedily undeceived. No Shylock could have insisted upon his pound of flesh, according to the bond, with more tenacity and more utter disregard of every principle of justice and fair play than these officials of a Christian church. They stood out for the uttermost farthing, and the tenant was compelled to accept the outrageous decision. The burden proved too heavy for him. He soon fell behind in his rent, when the trustees at once exercised the power conferred upon them by the lease and seized the building, which the tenant had erected at a cost of \$4,000, without giving him one penny of compensation. Stripped of his hardly-accumulated property, Dr. Campbell was permitted to occupy as monthly tenant, at \$25 per month or \$300 a year, the building, the mere ground rent of which had been fixed by the award at three times the sum. Even this scant consideration was not long continued, for another tenant having offered a trifle more than he was paying, he was given summary notice to quit, without even the option of remaining on the terms accepted from the other. Can it be wondered at that men of the world sneer at religious professions, and astute merchants look with suspicion on the customer whose speech savors of the sanctuary, when church officials, chosen presumably for their piety and high moral standing, can thus in the interests of their church commit such actions? No doubt the Decalogue is sometimes read in Knox Church, and one wonders whether the pastor and leading officials of that highly respectable and orthodox body are so case-hardened in hypocrisy—so enswathed in a snug and complacent self-righteousness, as to feel no qualms of conscience at the words—

“THOU SHALT NOT STEAL.”

Possibly they quiet any such faint self-accusations with the reflection that it was done for the church, and that no mere moral considerations should stand in the way when it is a question of promoting the cause of religion. Their ethical standard appears to be much on a par with that of the brigands of Italy, many of whom are also very highly religious after their fashion, and never undertake a plundering expedition without asking the aid and protection of the saints and promising them a liberal share of their booty in case of success.

An old and respected citizen of Toronto leased in 1872 a lot comprising thirty-six feet on the South side of King Street, for the usual term of