

schism by remaining out of the true Church. This result, indeed, he has reached, but by quite a different method.

It is twenty-five years since Messrs. Leach and Ritchie were deposed by the Presbytery of Toronto, and went over to the Episcopal Church. On that occasion Mr. Leach declared: "It was not until lately that I was called to devote any time to the important question of Church government"; and Dr. Scadding, in his Review of the life of the late Bishop Strachan, gives us to understand that he threw off all his Presbyterian convictions and opinions as soon as the Historical argument for Episcopacy was set before him. Both these gentlemen would have us believe that it is mere ignorance of the facts of history and of the arguments regarding Church government that keeps men Presbyterians. Mr. McK., however, could make no such statement. He had many years ago lectured on some of the points involved, while treating of the history of the Culdees, and he had preached on the "good old paths." When, therefore, we find Mr. McK. recanting, and, on account of change in his views, leaving the Church in which he has ministered for eighteen years, we are naturally curious to know what led him to take that step. And here let it be stated once for all, that everything which has transpired forbids the supposition that he has been actuated by unworthy or mercenary motives. However we may regard Mr. McK.'s opinions and action, we cannot but express our belief that he has followed the dictates of his conscience, and has acted honorably.

The statement of principles, which occupied more than an hour in reading, was intended by Mr. McK. to indicate the way in which he was led to entertain his present opinions, and certainly it throws light on the subject. It is impossible in a few sentences to give these principles as enunciated by Mr. McK., but the gist of them seems to be as follows:—The main question may be stated as this, "Have we now, under the Gospel dispensation, a temple, a priest, sacrifices, or have we not?" There is such a thing now as dedication to God, or relative holiness. God needs something from us still to shew our love. This we set apart, give, dedicate, or sanctify; it thus becomes holy. The mode of dedicating is various, as laying on of hands, washing, sprinkling, anointing, birth and marriage (1 Cor. 7, 14), bringing to God's house, the word and prayer (as food), walking round, putting into the treasury, laying on the altar or on the Lord's table. Or holiness may be imparted through the special claim of God (as the Sabbath, Mt. Moriah, &c.), to which man responds: "Such offerings are sacrifices; persons (Rom. 12, 1) are holy people or saints; the Sanctuary is a holy place; the land is holy; houses, fields, lands, money are holy (Phil. 4-18, Heb. 13-15, 16). It is absurd to say that there is no real sacrifice. This property thus become God's, is subject to the rules of justice which obtain between man and man—exclusively God's; consecration is co-extensive with the donor's right in the case of land from surface to the centre of the earth. To use a house of worship for any other purpose is sacrilege. Dedicated persons may not do anything besides the service of God, wholly and forever holy to God. Things and persons may be hallowed temporarily and for a special purpose, so the Burning Bush, the Mount of Transfiguration, Joseph's Sepulchre, the Upper Room, the Nazarite, were holy. The tribe of Levi lost its holiness when the priesthood was changed. Churches when of no use should be destroyed or remain as a beautiful ruin. Holy things may be alienated in cases of necessity, as the Shew-bread given to David and the Sabbath. Some dedicated persons and things may be redeemed by giving to God an equivalent; if