pardon to those who have in this life rejected Christ; that whatever his secret hope might be, whatever he might hope that God would reveal, whatever he might doubt, to whatever extent he might doubt as to the meaning of what God had revealed, he was satisfied that for the present his business was to warn men and to preach Christ crucified to men, and to tell them there was one way of salvation and no other, as he had been telling them, and did tell them every Sunday, notwithstanding what was said in that one sermon in which views which had been perplexing him for years were too frankly and injudiciously stated.

"The question," he said, "had been put to him by the convener of the Committee,—'What do you understand by the word "everlasting"? and he had answered substantially thus:—'The word everlasting means for ages of ages, possibly endless, possibly not.' He did not deny that the words might have the force which they all, he supposed, ascribed to them; that they might mean endless; but if there was even a shadow of doubt as to these words having their awfully full signification, then there was so far a shadow of room to hope—and he did hope."

Mr. Macdonnell's explanations, however, were declared not satisfactory by the Presbytery, and Professor McLaren next moved concurrence in the second section of the Committee's report:—"That in the opinion of Presbytery, Mr. Macdonnell's statement embodies a deviation from the teaching of the Scriptures, and the received doctrine of the Church, which this Court is not at liberty to allow in one of its members."

The intent and meaning of this resolution was already plain enough, but that there might be no misunderstanding it, Mr. Macdonnell asked whether it was intended to declare by it that no person making a statement such as he had made should remain a minister of the Presbyterian Church.

The Moderator.—"It means that such a deviation as that which the Committee has found from the Confession of Faith, and the teaching of Scripture, in your statement, cannot be allowed in any minister of the Church."

Rev. Mr. Macdonnell.—"The legitimate conclusion is that a person holding that should find his way cut of the Church as quickly as possible—should find his way out, or should be put out. This seems to me to be the critical point, and I desire to understand it for my own guidance, and that of others who are going to

vote."

After some discussion, the drift of which was strongly in the direction of the proposed resolution, Principal Caven suggested the suspension of the vote, and the appointment of another committee to confer with Mr. Macdonnell, and report in half an hour, which was accordingly done. The committee, however, had nothing to report, as the result of their interview, but merely asked to be allowed further time, which was granted, and they were ordered finally to report on the 2nd May. There the case rests for the present. We sincerely hope that, for their own sake, and the sake of the Church generally, the Presbytery will not feel compelled to expel so able and excellent a man as Mr. Macdonnell, on the ground of so slight a divergence from the Standards of the denomination, as the "hope" he cherishes. Had Mr. Macdonnell finally and avowedly rejected the doctrine of Future Punishment, the case would be a very different one; but that he has not done, and we entirely agree, therefore, with the Globe, when it asks—

"In such circumstances might Mr. Macdonnell not be allowed, without any danger to either Church or individual, to cherish a hope which is for himself alone, and which could not possibly be stated in public without being seen to be in manifest conflict with his own avowal of what his message as a Christian preacher is? Could he not be allowed to hold that doubt, that difficulty, and that hope, when, as a man of honour, he says he will not disturb the peace of the Church by it, or seek in any way whatever to make it a subject of public discussion or pulpit prelection." We shall soon see what Presbyterian liberty amounts

to in such a case.