

work in Scotland? Does not she pay her Delegates to Canada, for doing her work here? Has not the Presbyterian Church of Canada her sustentation fund, out of which some of her Ministers at least urge that they should and must be paid? A role which is good for such perfect bodies as these, cannot be so horribly bad as Mr Bayne represents, when applied to the Ministers of the Church of Scotland in Canada. But I have a little more to tell on this pecuniary matter. There was a certain number of Ministers, and Mr Bayne ranks among the number, who, up to July 1844, received a certain sum of money for doing the work of the Church of Scotland in Canada, and each of whom required to sign his name on receiving it, with the addition of the words—"Minister of the Church of Scotland." This money continued to be received for a considerable time after the discovery by those gentlemen that the Church of Scotland had become so vile a sinner. The question here seems, Were those gentlemen, while receiving the money of the Church of Scotland, and at the same time reviling her as the sinner, adorning the doctrine of the Headship of the Redeemer?

There is only one other point on which I can venture to ask indulgence for a moment to say a word. With regard to what Mr Bayne has justly said as uttered by many in reference to this controversy in Canada—that while they might have become Free Church men in Scotland, but that they could see no cause for separation here—I have already said that for the reasons I have stated, I never could adopt even this line of argument or of action—but I wish to show that although a separation has taken place among us, many of those who are now in its ranks had not at one time any idea of carrying the affair to such an extremity. Even my excellent friend Mr Bayne expressed and urged a desire, previous to the meeting of the Synod in July 1844, to a moderate course, as was manifest from a letter he wrote at that time to Mr Fordyce, of Fergus. His natural and laudable view of the matter was this: The Synod of Canada had sympathised with the majorities in the General Assemblies of the Church of Scotland, on the ground of their advocacy of the principles of non-intrusion and spiritual independence. This the Synod had done for several years up to 1842, inclusive. And, at their meeting in July 1843, after learning that the separation had taken place in Scotland two months before, the Synod solemnly expressed their thanks that they were not called on for themselves to take a step so extreme. But the Free Church leaders in Scotland, and their delegates to Canada, had thought and were determined that as there had taken place a separation in Scotland, so there must one be effected in Canada also. Ultimately, as we all know, this evil counsel, urged with such anathemas from Scotland, was, for alleged consistency's sake, taken up, pressed, and acted upon, by upwards of a score of Ministers in the Synod. But Mr Bayne, along with others, for some time at least were of opinion that the Free Church of Scotland, having got the sympathies and the monies of the people of Canada, should be there-with content. But at last they yielded. Scottish determination in Canada was too weak to resist newly imported Scottish