

Kenzie would publish his statement read before the Presbytery of Cobourg. It would have been his own best defence from misrepresentation. We suggest to Mr. McKenzie, even now, to do so.

We cannot enter fully into every point brought out in Mr. McKenzie's letter; but we feel it necessary to make the following remarks: 1. Mr. McKenzie complains that in the Presbytery's Report, his answers were, even when correctly reported, all given without any of those qualifying statements or explanations which usually accompanied them, and that in one instance, he is made to express the very opposite of his express declarations. In reply, we would state that we have been expressly assured by the Clerk of Presbytery, that the answers were taken down from Mr. McKenzie's own lips, were twice read over to him, and, when he requested it, changed to suit his views or taste. In these circumstances, its evident that there can be no real ground of complaint. Had Mr. McKenzie desired it, no doubt, any qualification or explanation would have been taken down.

2. As to Mr. McKenzie's remarks, with reference to the Establishment principle, Voluntaryism, Democracy, &c., we beg to state that we did not find fault with his holding the Establishment principle, or being highly Conservative. These are points, on which difference of opinion is allowed. We simply referred to these things as in some measure accounting for the great change in Mr. McKenzie's sentiments, leading him ultimately to leave the Presbyterian church altogether. The reference to the dread of disorganizing tendencies did not, by any means, imply that there were such tendencies in the Presbyterian Church. The dread of a thing may be a reality, while the thing dreaded has no existence. It is matter of fact in history, that a dread of the popular element in Presbyterianism has led individuals to adopt Episcopacy. For, undoubtedly, while we do not admit that there are any disorganizing or disloyal tendencies in Presbyterianism, there is more of the popular element in that system than in Episcopacy. Both theoretically and practically, the voice of the Christian people is allowed more free utterance in the Presbyterian Church than in the Episcopal. This we regard as one of the glories of the Presbyterian system; and we can easily see how this very distinction may lead one of very highly conservative sentiments to withdraw from the Presbyterian Church, and seek connection with another, whether there is less freedom allowed in the expression of the popular mind, and where the power rests with a single individual.

3. Mr. McKenzie complains chiefly of the remarks on the subject of relative holiness, although it will be noted that he does not find fault, in any one particular, with the summary of principles which we gave in the June Record, as set forth by him in his written statement. We really do not understand Mr. McKenzie's position with reference to this subject. When he laid his resignation on the table of the Presbytery, he declared his conviction "*that the Canada Presbyterian Church ignores, both in theory and practice, certain great scriptural principles which should be fully recognized and acted on in the worship of God and in the government of the Church.*" Yet in his present communication he makes out that the great scriptural principles of relative holiness, &c., are "*most explicitly and repeatedly acknowledged in the Confession of Faith, Catechisms, and Directory for public worship.*" Apparently, Mr. McKenzie's views on these points are just the views set forth in our own standards. Yet, Mr. McKenzie in the document laid before the Presbytery, declared that these