

his minister, and at a fixed time—suppose this person quite able to fulfil his obligation, and yet neglecting or refusing to fulfil it—is it right to continue such a person in the full enjoyment of church privileges? Can it be a question whether an individual, known to the minister and trustees of a congregation to be without plea of necessity, guilty of a breach of a solemn obligation, should be admitted to the Lord's Table? Is the non-fulfilment of a contract not to be regarded as sinful and scandalous, if it be only made with a minister, or for the support of the ordinances of the gospel? Is moral principle to be sacrificed to a sensitive delicacy on this subject? Or can it be hoped that the blessing of God can rest on a minister and people, where many of the latter are thus guilty, and where the former is thus lax? The Committee know well that this is a view of the matter which many are not willing seriously to take. But they press it on the consideration of the Synod. And they have no hesitation in saying, that the strict and faithful exercise of the discipline of the Church in reference to such cases,—which, they are persuaded, are of frequent occurrence in most country congregations,—would be attended with beneficial effect, and would tend to raise the general standard of morals, in a matter, on which, of all others, it would seem at present, the obligations of truth and honesty are least regarded.

All which is humbly submitted.

JOHN COOK,

Corbener.

QUEBEC, 4th July, 1842.