Churches, so that the interest of the sum raised and invested shall secure at least £150 annually in all time coming to as many clergymen. Surely this is no indication of decay or weakness. We would ask, in what previous period has she done so much? Most assuredly, if our Church has been burning, she has not been consumed, but has rather been burning to put forth clearer and additional lights.

We have now gone over the several charges (as we proposed in the outset) which have been frequently advanced against our Church, and we trust that it has been made sufficiently clear that these charges may with greater propriety be advanced against the accusers.

Now we shall endeavor to shew the causes which led to the troubles in our Church, and culminated in the "Disruption." Already we shewed that our Church in these Colonies is not responsible for the divisions and strife and bitterness which have been so widely sown at the expense of true charity. Now we propose to shew that the causes which led to the separation at Home, and the many sore troubles which followed, was not owing to any evil in the constitution of our Church or to the majority of those who remained in her, nor because of any foul play from the State, but rather owing to disturbing causes introduced by the party in the Church who held the reins immediately before the secession. And we conceive that these causes, on which so much has been said and written, are centred as in one or two nut-shells, and may be unfolded in few sentences.

The Church and State were parties to a compact which had been formed with the consent of both, and which lasted for centuries. In this contract there were doctrinal and secular interests included. The doctrinal part of the covenant is represented in the Westminster Confession. The Church declared that these were her beliefs, and the State agreed to have these established and recognized as the established religion of Scotland. To these, both Church and State gave their voluntary assent respectively, and never to this day have either attempted to change, or refused to maintain these, as the ground of religious belief, the established religion of the land. And surely no man who believes this Confession to contain the substance of God's Word, and to be grounded thereon, but must regard this a great boon continued to Scotland for centuries.

There were also certain rules framed for the sake of expediency, rather than because of any recognized scriptural authority, designed to be a guide in the settlement of her licentiates or ministers in vacant parishes, and also to define who should sit and adjudicate in the Courts of the Church. To these rules, both Church and State gave assent. The State never encroached on these rules—has never, we believe, violated any one of them. But, with these rules of expediency, which Church and State were both bound in covenant to maintain, the Church did interfere and set aside in two respects, and that without consulting the State. And, even after this had been done, the State did not interfere, nor disturb the peace of the Church, until interested individuals in the Church sought redress from the State, because of pecuniary loss sustained, and ecclesiastical right withheld, on account of the rules of compact having been violated by the Church, and which the State was bound to maintain inviolate for the interest of every individual in the Church, rather than for any direct benefit that could accrue to the State. Instead of one of the rules of compact which was set aside by the Church, they substituted the Veto Act. According to the constitutional rule and practice of the Church, congregations, when objecting to the settlement of any minister, must assign *reasons;* according to the new law framed by the Church, *no reasons* need be assigned. In the second case, according to the constitutional law of the Church, ministers of certain specified parishes and charges had the right to adjudicate in the Church Courts; but the new rule admitted ministers occupying *quod sacra* and side churches, without asking the assent of the State to this new arrangement. From these two new rules, all the troubles between Church and State emanated. To lay the blame of these troubles either on the constitution of the Church or on the State, is one of the most culpable accusations that has ever been invented against any party or individual. Had the State framed any new set of rules, and forced them on the Church, then there would be just ground of remonstrance or complaint. On the contrary, the dominant party in the Church framed these rules, and the State would not have interfered, had not the Church sought redress. This being done, she must needs define the laws of contract, and assert the fair meaning of them for the right of those sustaining injuries thereby.

But, to make this still clearer, and level to the meanest understanding;—supposing a teacher under our new School Act, who had borne an excellent character, and had passed a satisfactory examination, were to offer himself to the trustees of a certain school section, and that these trustees refused to employ him, and allowed the section to sustain the serious loss of wanting a school. Would it serve these trustees to say in a court of *justice*, and assign no reason, we considered the teacher incompetent—we deem ourselves better judges, without trying him, than his examiners, after subjecting him to the most searching and frequent trial? Surely, without a trial, it were inconsistent with justice or right reason to reject him, to his injury, and likewise, the great loss of the section. Would such defence serve, when called to pay the penalty imposed on Trustees by the new school bill? Again, were any section to say: we are not satisfied with three trustees; we must have