

variety of particulars in which the abuses had been increased. They refer to the deliverance of Assembly 1784, after having rejected some overtures relating to the repeal of the law of Patronage, in which they declare "that it does not appear to this Assembly, that there is any reason for an innovation being made in the mode of settling vacant parishes;" and, in notes, they illustrate what is generally stated in the Narrative itself, by specific instances of intrusive settlements, down to those of Kiltarlity and Croy, in 1823.

The principles of the Presbyterian Synod, they professing to be Seceders, are such as should have led them to recognise, and act upon the duty not only of testifying against the evils, if they exist, on account of which the first Seceders separated from the Moderate majorities of their day; but of enlarging their Testimony, if the evils have been increased in later times. The question, then, is this, Has nothing occurred, in connexion with the Disruption, that should draw a very marked line of distinction betwixt the Free Church and the Establishment? Or, if there are admitted differences, are they of so trifling a nature as that, with any intelligent and honest Seceder, it should be as the "toss up of a half-penny" with which of them he should unite? Or, on the contrary, are they not such as that a refusal to join in a Protest against the evils which constitute the ground of difference, especially when so evident a call in duty was presented in the proposal to unite with a body that was already pledged to that Protest, is in itself a very distinct indication that the parties so refusing have no right to be recognised as Seceders, and cannot be regarded as holding by the Confession of Faith, as it was received by the Church of Scotland in 1647? The materials for answering the question are ample, and present a wide field of illustration; but they are also of such a nature that they may be presented with much condensation, and yet with a well defined outline. This condensation must now be attempted.—The task of holding up corruptions for condemnation is painful, but the Testimony of the United Secession Synod teaches, that the painfulness of the task is no reason why it should be evaded; and it may be well to remind some, who have of late shewn a wonderful sensitiveness about affixing to the corruptions of the Establishment the condemnation which they merit, that the following lan-

guage with respect to the duty of doing so is the language, as already quoted, of the United Secession Synod. "This is a duty which we owe to Jesus Christ, for it is by maintaining his gospel and ordinances in purity, that his name and salvation are declared and perpetuated;—to the best interests of men, for thus we shall warn them against errors and evils, which are injurious to their precious souls;—to the National Church herself, as a means of exciting her 'to remember whence she has fallen, and to repent and do the first works;'—and to our own character and influence as a Church, for we shall thus vindicate our secession, and promote one of its leading objects."

It is admitted that there were serious defects in the Revolution Settlement.—It is admitted that there were evils in the terms on which the Treaty of Union between England and Scotland was finally adjusted. It is admitted that a great additional grievance was inflicted on the Church of Scotland by the Act of Parliament 1712, restoring Patronage; an Act which was passed in violation of the Articles of Union. Notwithstanding these admissions, it is asserted, as a matter of plain historical fact, that at the time of the Secession, the Church of Scotland, possessed of a scriptural constitution, had such freedom to work out the principles of her own constitution, that the men who seceded, not only could have had no difficulty in remaining within her pale, but would have felt it to be their duty and their privilege to do so, *if they had not been prevented from the exercise of their constitutional liberty by the tyrannical sway of the Moderates*, who at the time were "the prevailing party" in the Church courts. This was a view of the case to which the Seceders themselves attached great importance; and, accordingly, they were careful to make it distinctly known that they had not seceded from the Church of Scotland, but merely from that party who were subverting the constitution of the Church. The brethren of the Presbyterian Synod seem to think that they represent themselves as occupying the same position, in relation to the Establishment, with these early Seceders, when they say, "we have only seceded from her judicatories, reserving the right of holding Christian and ministerial communion with the Godly within her pale." If such, however, is the view with which they have expressed themselves in the language just quoted, they are labouring under two very grave mis-