

takes. First, they are greatly mistaken when they think that their term "Godly" is equivalent to the description which the Seceders gave of those with whom they would still hold communion with the Establishment. The Seceders did not consider themselves very well qualified to search the heart and to try the reins of the children of men, so as to be able to say who of them were "godly" and who were not: but they knew that they could judge of a man's profession—that they could form some opinion of his conduct; for these are visible things.—Accordingly, they do not say, with the brethren of the Presbyterian Synod, We reserve "the right of holding Christian and ministerial communion with the *Godly* within her pale" (with all deference, that might have kept them in communion with Moderates still, miserably misguided though these men were in their management of the affairs of church government); but they say, in their Protest, as given in the fourth Article of these Remarks, "We still hold communion with all and every one who desire, with us, to adhere to the principles of the true Presbyterian, Covenanted Church of Scotland, in her doctrine, worship, government and discipline: and particularly with every one who are groaning under the evils, and who are affected with the grievances we have been complaining of; who are, in their several spheres, wrestling against the same." Secondly, when this mistake is corrected, and, instead of the term "Godly," the description which the Seceders themselves gave of the persons in the Establishment with whom they would be willing to hold communion is inserted the brethren of the Presbyterian Synod are grievously mistaken in imagining that there would be found a single person in the communion of the Establishment, from the Moderator of the General Assembly downwards, with whom they would be at liberty to hold communion, *on the ground that they correspond with the description given.*

These brethren say, "our fathers of the Secession raised their standard against the Erastianism of the Church of Scotland long before the members of the Free Church thought of unfurling their banner." This may be allowed to pass as true; for it is not likely that any of the members of the Free Church are old enough to have been capable of unfurling any banner in 1733. It is, however, more to the purpose to observe, that the banner of the Free Church was not un-

furled for the first time when the procession moved from St. Andrew's Church to take up their position at Canonmills, on the 18th of May, 1843. That banner floated over the General Assembly in 1647. When, in the time of Charles II., the state interfered with sacred things, and required the Scottish nation to adopt new modes of worship, "in obedience to the law of the land;" that banner, the banner of the Church of Scotland, waved in the breezes which fanned the temples of those who, forsaking houses and lands, betook themselves to the moors, and the mountain sides, that they might obey the law of Christ. It was under that banner that the "outed ministers" returned, when, upon the Revolution they regained their position as ministers of the Establishment. It was for the purpose of upholding that banner that the first Seceders, as has been shewn, separated from the Moderates. It was to uphold that banner that others, at the same time, kept their places in the Establishment, where they could still consistently strive to prevent the guaranteed privileges of her constitution from being trampled upon by their oppressors, the Moderates. It was as upholding that banner that, when at length in the providence of God they became the majority, they prosecuted those measures of reform which gladdened the heart of every true Seceder, and which drew within the pale of the Establishment numbers who worthily borne that name. It was when consistently acting under that banner that the Church of Scotland was resisted and obstructed by the unconstitutional interference of the civil courts. It was in defence of that banner that, in her Claim of Right, agreed to in 1842, she sought redress of the grievances of which she had so much cause to complain. When that claim was rejected, when the encroachments of the civil courts were ratified by the acquiescence of the State, when it was made distinctly known that the benefits of the Establishment were no longer to be enjoyed but upon the condition that the Church should submit to the control of the civil power; determined still to obey God rather than man, it was under the same banner that the Church of Scotland, for the second time, forsook houses and lands, manses, glebes, and stipends; and left an Establishment that was now to have a banner flaring over her head inscribed "Obey the law of the land."

This was not a Secession. It was the