

be quite enough to mention the Rev. Dr. Hanna, son-in-law of Dr. Chalmers, one of the brightest lights in the Free Church of Scotland. We therefore adduce his name as no ordinary authority. In a sermon published by him, more than two years ago, he asserts that it is wrong to charge the Church of Scotland with denying the Headship of Christ. (We regret that we are not prepared just now to quote his express words.) And although there were some who would have him withdraw this honest avowal, all the influence that could be brought to bear on him could not induce him to do so. We take this fact as affording an additional and broader argument in attestation of his assertion. For this was nothing less than a general concession in the Free Church that Dr. Hanna was right in his declaration. We accept this concession with no ordinary amount of satisfaction,—not because we required any assurance from without to make us fully persuaded in our own minds, but as an evidence that the Free Church is coming to see the injustice of the charge, and to acknowledge the true independence of our Church, as it may and ought ultimately to lead to closer friendship and real harmony between the Churches. And this charge being withdrawn, all the rest must disappear as the “baseless fabric of a vision.” It also affords ample proof that the Free Church has been fighting against something less formidable than air. And this concession being made at Home, where the subject had been fully canvassed and tried by both Churches, for more than twenty years, how forcibly ought this to tell on the minds and hearts of those who so frequently and arrogantly accused our Church in this country! How powerfully should it induce those who took the lead in rendering the Colonial Church, to serious reflection, and to consider the amount of guilt they incurred. Nor ought it to be a matter of less serious consideration and deep contrition for those who so recently made such bitter and unprovoked attacks on us, whether in Cape Breton or elsewhere. Whatever excuse, or palliation, should be offered twenty years ago, during times of deep excitement, the remotest shadow of a shade cannot now be advanced by any intelligent man in any Church, when every honest man who has given the subject serious attention must admit the independence of our Church. But when the old war cry is raised—when ever capital is expected to be made thereby, (and the ranks of the new Church must be swelled somehow);—when this is done at the very time that friendship is professed, and desire is expressed for closer intercourse, surely such conduct must be reprobated by every honest and good man, of whatever name. Nor can it be but highly offensive in the sight of the Omnipotent One, who requires truth and honor in all our professions. It should not be forgotten that the grand reason alleged for separation or division in

the Colonies, was sympathy with the Free Church of Scotland. And for what? Sympathy, because they charged the Church of Scotland with denying the Headship of Christ, which is now discovered, in Scotland, after twenty-two years’ trial, to be a fallacy or false accusation. And, we most devoutly hope, for the sake of the accusers themselves, that this shall soon be generally and openly acknowledged in the Colonies. This we greatly desire, for the more righteous position of those who urged the unjust charge, and, likewise, for the better understanding, and a more genuine, cordial and enduring friendship between the Churches. For, as I could not hold Christian fellowship with one against whom I could righteously advance such a charge, neither could I expect that any honest man, who really believed in his heart I was really chargeable with so seriously dishonouring the alone Saviour, would desire intercourse and Christian fellowship with me. It may then be seen at a glance, that, if there is to be honest and enlightened friendship, one Church must renege from this very grave charge; or the other must plead guilty. Now, there is not the remotest probability that our Church can, or shall ever confess to the justice of this charge, nor should this, for one moment, be sought, while its falsity is being admitted by the intelligent and conscientious of that Church, who were our accusers, and, while, moreover, its falsity is being continuously proved, in the history of our Church, at Home and abroad.

(To be Continued.)

A. McK.

### Organs in Churches.

To the Editor of the *Monthly Record*:

DEAR SIR,—I beg to enclose, for insertion in the next number of the *Record*, a letter by the Rev. Dr. Hill, upon the subject of the introduction of instrumental music into Presbyterian Churches. It is scarcely necessary to mention that the author of this excellent, and, in my opinion, unanswerable letter, has long held one of the highest and most responsible positions in the Church of Scotland—that of Professor of Divinity in the University of Glasgow; and that in every thing relating to the laws and practices of our Church—to discipline and ecclesiastical judicature, he is recognized by its Courts as the highest living authority. The opinion of such a man, then, on what is known as the “Organ question,” which seems to be creating a sort of mania in some quarters, must have great weight, and it is to be hoped that the earnest language in which it is expressed shall not have been written in vain.

The proposed introduction of Organs is but the insertion of the thin end of the wedge for further innovations. We already see this