## Ministers and Churches.

On the evening of the 11th inst., the Woodville manse was taken possession of by a number of ladies and gentlemen of the congregation. They spread out a delicious supper, of which surprisers and surprised cheerfully partook, after which they presented their pastor, Rev. J. L. Murray, with a handsome cutter, and a set of silver-mounted harness. The present was accompanied by the following address:—To the Rev. J. L. Murray; Dear Pastor: On behalf of a few of your friends in this village and neighborhood who are desirous of manifesting their appreciation of your work as a Christian minister, and of your urbanity in your intercourse with us since you came to reside in our midst, we beg to present you with this cutter and set of harness, which please accept, not for their intrinsic value, but as indicative of the warm, cordial feelings we entertain towards you. Our sincere prayer to Almighty God is that that you may be long spared in the happy relation to us in which He in His wise Providence has been pleased to place you. It is a position for which we deem you eminently fitted, and whose onerous duties you so instructively discharge. For Mrs. Murray and the little ones accept our best wishes and prayers. On behalf of your friends, JOHN JAMIESON.

## Presbyterian Union

According to our principle of letting all sides be heard on the question of Union, we give the following document, which has already appeared in one or two of our contemporaries:—

At a meeting of ministers and elders of the Church of Scotland in Canada, held in Toronto on Tuesday, 2nd inst., it was unanimously resolved to issue the following address to the members and adherents of the Church:—

*To the members and adherents of the Presbyterian Church of Canada, in connection with the Church of Scotland.*

BELOVED BRETHREN,—

We, the undersigned ministers and laymen, feel constrained to address you on the presents crisis—a crisis which involves the very existence of our Church—to suggest to you such measures to unity and efficiency of action as the exigencies of the occasion seems to demand.

You are aware that efforts are being made to unite the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, and the *Canada* Presbyterian Church. To consummate these efforts, articles, containing the basis of Union, have been sent down by the Synod for the consideration of the Presbyteries, Kirk Sessions of Congregations within the bounds, and you will be early called upon to assent to, or dissent from, these articles, and the issues to which they lead. While we do not object to the truths contained in these articles, we yet object most strongly to the fact that in the remit, the all important question, do our people desire union or not? is not in reality submitted.

The question might be raised, has the Superior Court the right to thus send down "acts and proceedings" which have, for their object, the obliteration of the name of our Church from the roll of the Christian Churches of our land? Is it a function of the Superior Court to take steps to undermine the constitution, by which the very existence of our Church is guaranteed and established? Or, is it not *ultra vires* of the Synod to entertain the question of the annulation, or absorption of our Church? Or, which is the same thing, to initiate proceedings which are to form the basis of Provincial Legislation for the express purpose of breaking our connection with the Church of Scotland, of blotting out our existence as a separate organization, and for securing power to despoil our Church of her hard-earned and long struggled for property and funds?

It is by many affirmed, on legal authority, that the Synod has no such power and ought not even to appear to exercise it, and that those seeking the dismemberment of our Church ought to be restrained by your refusing to vote upon the basis remitted by the Synod to Presbyteries, Kirk Sessions and congregations, and also by the entering of your solemn protest against the legality of such remit.

In 1844, our Church bore distinct testimony to what the terms "in connection with the Church of Scotland," implied. The Synod saw no occasion to be ashamed of that "connection," so we now are not ashamed of it. It was declared that, "it is a connection, 1st. of dissent; 2nd, of adherence to the same standards; 3rd, of friendly intercourse, ministerial communion, and Christian fellowship." The "draft of an answer to the dissent and protest of certain ministers and elders who have seceded *from the* Synod of Canada, *in connection* with the Church of Scotland," continues: 'The first cannot be given up, even were it desirable to do so. The second there is, on the part of the Synod, at least, and its people, no wish to give up. This Church represents the Church of Scotland in her standards, doctrines, discipline and Government. To all this, and to the connection in all this, the members of the Synod cleave with their hole heart." . . . Having affirmed farther that the Synod can represent the mother Church in these respects, without representing her or being in any way indentified with her in what is peculiar to her position of an establishment in Scotland, the draft, &c, proceeds, "Hence this church is warranted to support the connection on the third ground, viz.: 'friendly intercourse, and Ministerial and Christian communion and fellowship.' And when it is remembered that, of all the daughters of the Reformation, she has been the fairest and the most useful in the world; and that she has been made, for ages, the instrument fo unspeakable good to multitudes of immortal souls, both at home and abroad; and when it is borne in mind that there is yet within her pale, her enemies being judges, a vast amount of high talent and genuine piety, both among her ministers and people, who dare assert that the Lord hath cast her off?"

Such sentiments were true in 1844, and they were undoubtedly equally true in 1873. We have been made the recipients of innumerable favours from the mother Church, and nothing will cause us to forget her munificent benefits—benefits which she still continues to confer, and for which we, her children, will ever entertain with grateful feeling.

But without dwelling longer upon this question of the Synod's rights to send down to the Inferior Courts and the congregations the "Remit on Union," it behoves us to carefully consider another question on which "the draft of the answer, &c., speaks with no uncertain sound. "It is the opinion of many persons, and some of them men to whose opinion, on a matter of this sort, it it is hardly possible to pay too much deference, that for the Synod, by its own mere motion, to alter its style or designation in law would be at once to alienate a vast amount of property of our Church. Indeed on this there can scarcely be a shadow of a doubt." Everyone sees that it involves great temporal rights, and rights in which the people, as well as their children for many generations, have a deep and direct interest.

We belong to the class of ministers and laymen who tenaciously hold to the opinion enunciated in the above extract, and are determined to maintain it. If our brethren, fathers, and we ourselves, saw it right thus to speak and write in 1844, what reason, but that we are wrong, can possibly be assigned for our doing otherwise now? We have no distrust of our church principles. We profess ourselves strongly attached to them. We desire to honour the Church that first gave them embodiment. While we hold, with an unfaltering grasp, the Headship of the Lord Jesus Christ over His Church and over the nations, we yet believe that the duty of the State is to forward, by all means within its power, the good of Christ's cause and Christ's Covenant.

Should a portion of the Church seek for ecclesiastical connection, other than our own, at the sacrifice of principel and the risk of Church property, we reserve to ourselves the right to lay claim to the Presbyterian Church of Canada, in connexion with the Church of Scotland. And inasmuch as all the property, funds and emoluments of our Church are held for the Presbyterian Church of Canada, in connexion with the Church of Scotland, we are determined, by all legal means, to guard against the loss of the benefit of such property, funds and emoluments. The more so on this account, that should a union be consummated, any minister having a claim on the Temporalities Fund who may be transferred from one charge to another in the proposed United Church will carry his share of the Fund with him, and so our people may be deprived of the moneys that, in some instances, enable them to maintain their existance as a congregation.

*Desirous as we are of exhibiting the charity* which thinketh no evil, and of according to others the rights of private judgment, which we claim for ourselves, still we cannot forget that the protest which our seceding brethren laid on the table of Synod in 1844, is still adhered to and has often, of late, been offensively paraded in publications of ministers of the *Canada* Presbyterian Church, to the detriment of brotherly sympathy and Christian love.

We conclude, therefore, to exhort and encourage you not lightly to give up the connexion which binds us to the time honoured and beloved Church of the land of our fathers—the Church that has loaded us with past favours, and which still continues to regard us with fond attachment. Let us not rashly remove the old landmarks or abandon privileges and interests, bought with and sealed with the blood of covenanting ancestors. Our interest and duty alike dictate that no course of action can be ours, which makes us recreant to the Church of our fathers, to which our hearts cleave with profoundest love and gratitde.

ROBT. DOBIE, Sec. Com.    T. A. MCLEAN, Chairman.

The following words in italics were omitted in the printing of Mr. Middlemiss' letter in B. A. PRESBYTERIAN of Dec. 12.

"It was thought up to the time of the Non-Intrusion controversy *that the Church's claim to spiritual independence was allowed by the civil authorities,* and *that it was only by the decision of the civil courts in connection with that controversy,* that it became apparent, &c.

"But only to declare and apply the law *of His Kingdom, as it is the function of the civil judge to declare and apply the law of the land?*"

## Church Independence and Ultramontanism.

*Editor* BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN

*MY DEAR SIR,*—After having occupied so much of your space, it is not without hesitation that I ask further indulgence. But the subject of Church Independence is so important, and there is so much misapprehension in relation to it, that I believe you do good service to the Church in keeping your paper open to discussion on it. It is in this behalf that I crave room for some remarks occasioned by the *third* letter of "Presbyterian," and the questions put to me by a new correspondent (X. Y. Z.) in your issue of Nov. 28th.

While "Presbyterian" professes to have changed his sentiments from Erastianism to Ultramontanism, he has all through maintained the position that there is no ground tenable between these two extremes. In this I differ from him, believing that both these extremes are alike wrong, and both fraught with danger. In his first letter, he avows Erastianism by supposing the case of a man whom, using his own words, his fellow-minister "under the cloak of church discipline, brand as infamous, though innocent, and blast all his hopes and prospects in life," and saying that in such a case the civil authorities should, without interfering with the legislative power of the Church, exercise the right of "insisting" that her courts keep by the laws she has made, and of judging finally whether they have done so or not. At the same time he seemed to be aware that there was some danger in this, for he adds immediately, "Yet, on the other hand, it would not answer well if Church Courts, at every turn in the administration of discipline, were to be threatened with civil pains and penalties as having trenched on character or vested right." To this I answered, that, while I would speak of it as a tremendous evil, I could not see that he could refuse to the civil courts the right thus to *interfere if the remedy in the extreme case* was to be such as he suggested.

But while contending against the subjection of the Church, in her administration of her laws to the civil authorities, I contend with no less earnestness that Church Rulers are amenable to the law of their country, and that whenever they break it, in whatever capacity they may be acting when they do so, they ought to be punished. I contend that the Church Ruler who "under the cloak of administering discipline, brands a man as infamous though innocent," &c., ought to be punished, and that without any "alternative," and with especial severity, because of the most peculiar heinousness of his crime. This is the whole amount of what your correspondent, in his second letter, represents; and, in his last letter, persists in representing, as my acknowledgment that the civil authorities have the right in some cases to interfere in Church difficulties and ecclesiastical disputes. Presuming upon the intelligence and caudour of your correspondent and your readers, the necessity of expressing myself in very guarded language did not occur to me. But on looking over my first letter on the subject, I cannot see anything that would warrant any honest-minded person to ascribe anything to me, except the denial to ecclesiastical persons of the *privilegium clericale*, or benefit of clergy, and detestation of which in every form and degree o it cannot be too strong, while we freely grant to them the privilege common to all official persons, and referred to in my second letter on this subject.

Your correspondent, however, will have it that my view on this point involves the right of *appeal* by the injured man to the civil courts; and from this, he says it follows that the civil courts have the right of final disposal in the ecclesiastical case in which the crime originated. And inasmuch as I affirmed that, according to the Presbyterian doctrine, there can be no appeal from the court of jurisdiction to that of the other, he intimates, in the style of one who has no earnest convictions, that he is delighted with my "saying and unsaying the same thing." Now, in point of fact, his delight and self-complacency arise simply from his own confusion of thought, from an inability to distinguish between things that differ, which more or less characterizes all his communications. In reference to the matter now before us, he overlooks the difference between two very distinct senses in which the word "appeal" is used, the one *popular* and the other *technical.* When a man resorts, in the first instance, to a court, civil or ecclesiastical in the way of bringing before it any wrong-doing with which it is competent for it to deal, he is said to appeal to it; but this is not making an appeal in the technical sense of the term, which implies the removal of a cause that has been already tried, from the court in which it was tried to a higher jurisdiction. I need not occupy your space by illustrating a distinction the simple statement which makes it sufficiently obvious. It is in this technical sense that I use the term, when I say that "there can be no appeal from the one court to the other.' And I maintain that the fullest recognition of the utter incompetency of an appeal in this sense, on the ground of the difference, is no way inconsistent with the possession of a right of resort to the civil authorities against an ecclestical person, who under cloak of acting in his official capacity commits a crime, or is guilty of an offence which is, in its own essential character, such as to cognizable by a civil court. If I am mistaken in supposing that the "extreme case," as your correspondent put it, involves such a crime, that is a small matter. It is a principle I contend for. I said distinctly that the criminal character of the action must be averred and proved. Is it needfull to add that such criminality must be averred, not against the court in which the offenders were acting, but against the guilty individuals, whether one or more, or all of its members? Or is it needful to say that the criminal parties in the lower court, say the Session, may be brought before the civil court without waiting for the decision of the higher church courts, and that even if they reverse *the decision of the lower court,* the criminals are equally liable to punishment? So different are the things which he confounds. So much for my saying and unsaying the same thing; or rather so much for the confusion of thought that ascribes it to me. This confusion pervades your correspondent's reasoning upon the subject. All throughout he assumes that the man's resort to the civil court is the same thing as the appeal of his case in the technical sense of the term. Had he attempted to prove that the competency of the latter follows by just and necessary consequence from the competency of the former, his reasoning might have been to the point, however unsuccessful his attempt would have been. But he makes no such attempt. Having no thought of the difference between the two things, he sets himself to the easier task of proving what nobody denies, and what I assumed from the very first, that the competency of the appeal (properly so called) of an ecclesiastical cause to the civil courts in any one instance involves civil supremacy in the administration of the laws of the Kingdom of Christ.

In my last letter on the subject, I pointed out another important distinction, and gave an illustration, showing that the punishment by the civil power of an ecclesiastical person for an offence committed in his official capacity does not involve interference with the jurisdiction of the church. For some reason, or under some influence, which he leaves your readers and myself to conjecture, he takes no notice either of the distinction, or of the illustration, and simply reiterates his ascription to me of acknowledgements which I repudiate. On this account, I refrain from further discussion of the subject, until he argues the matter in the light of the distinctions I have pointed out. I now ask him to maintain his position in view of these distinctions. We are now agreed in relation to the independence of the Church. But he cannot, he says, hold with me on that point, without being an Ultramontanist, and *that* he is, therefore, in the meantime. Is he then, as an Ultramontanist, prepared to assert and maintain that no resort to the civil power is competent in relation to any offence, whatever be its essential character, of an ecclesiastical person acting in his official capacity,—that his privilege is of such a nature that he may "under cloak" of discharging what is official duty, do what is essentially wrong or criminal according to the law of the civil community (presumed to be righteous), without being amenable to to that law? And is he prepared to assert and maintain that the competency of such resort involves the competency of the removal by appeal of ecclesiastical causes to the civil court; or, otherwise expressed, that the trial of such an offender by the civil court is inconsistent with the church's supremacy in the administration of the laws of Christ's Kingdom, and an invasion of her independent jurisdiction, such jurisdiction being supposed to belong to her? If he is prepared for this, let him proceed with his argument. Let him grapple with the subject, instead of clinging to a misstatement of his opponent, and proving from it what needs no proof,—to say nothing of his needless explanations about Erastianism, and his incorrect statement of the claims of the civil authorities in times past.

In reference to the matter of property, I have certain questions to propose for the consideration of your correspondent and his friends, L. M. N., and X. Y. Z., with a view to the removal of the confusion of mind they are in upon the subject. It is plain to me that none of them has any perception of the line that marks off the jurisdiction of the church from that of the civil power. Without going into discussion in the meantime, let me only say in reference to "Presbyterian," that he indicates something like total ignorance of the principle on which the disposal of church property rests, when he says it hangs on settling the question whether the decision of the Ecclesiastical Court in the case supposed was a just one or not; and that his remarks on the peculiarities of Presbyterian organization have no bearing whatever on the question at issue.

The questions I have to propose are the following: *First.* On the supposition that certain property is held on trust for the maintenance and promulgation of certain religious views, and that the church to which the property belongs, determines by a majority to change its principles, say from Orthodoxy to Socinianism, or from Socinianism to Orthodoxy, the minority protesting, separating, and appealing to the civil authorities as to the future use of the property, or defending themselves against such appeal made by the majority, does the civil court, in forming its own independent judgment on the conditions of the trust, and and deciding accordingly, invade the jurisdiction of the church, or do anything inconsistent with its spiritual independence? *Second.* Narrowing the case by further supposing that the majority maintain that there is no change of principle as averred by the minority, does the civil court, in still forming its own independent judgment and deciding accordingly, invade the jurisdiction of the church? Let your correspondents consider these questions, looking at the matter to which they refer in all its bearings, and taking care how they commit themselves. And until they are satisfactorily disposed of, let the charge of inconsistency remain in abeyance. I shall allow them in the meantime to pass over another question that may afterwards be considered, viz.: Does an application to Parliament in relation to property, by a majority or by a minority imply their recognition of the supremacy of the civil power in relation to matters within the church's distinct and exclusive jurisdiction; or does it do so only on the part of the minority, and, if so, on what ground does it do so on the part of the one and not the other?

While proposing the above questions to your correspondents, in discussing which it is their part to take the lead, as making a change which depends upon a settlement of them, and which it is their part to sustain, let me say that I earnestly hope and pray that there may be no disruption; and that if there is, everything may be done that is necessary to prevent the scandal and other evils of litigation. I consider it little less than heartless in X. Y. Z. to seek to drag me into a discussion about what I would do in circumstances that I cannot think of without pain, and that I have no wish no speak of. I really do not know what I would do. There are elements in the determination of such questions as he puts, that he evidently has no idea of. And let me further say that it was not quite honourable in "Presbyterian," *while concealing his own name,* to take advantage of his knowledge of mine, to introduce new matter, and in no good spirit, into a discussion which he originated, and in which he might have been answered by a Unionist presenting substantially the same views as I did in my first letter on church independence. Is it too much to ask him to make what amends he can, by reverting to the discussion of principles, and that over his proper signature?

I am, yours truly,

JAMES MIDDLEMISS.

Elora, Dec. 17, 1873.

## Presbytery of Stratford.

This Presbytery held its regular meeting in Knox Church, Stratford, on Tuesday. After the [illegible] the following minute was [illegible] ly adopted:—"Dr. W[illegible] to be his duty to accept the call from St. David's Church, St. [illegible] N. B., has been [illegible] of this Presbytery [illegible] him [illegible] without expressing their [illegible] and, and [illegible] for him [illegible] to co-operate. In our [illegible] and social relations we have been led to admire his kindly readiness to oblige, though at much trouble to himself, and his trustworthiness as a friend in time of need. During the time in which he has been a member of this Presbytery, he has taken an active part in, and greatly forwarded the business, by his sober [illegible]; and in doing the work assigned to him by the Presbytery he was ever prompt and faithful, as he also was in the [illegible] laid on him by the Assembly. In parting with him we feel we are losing from our midst one of our most useful members and one of our most successful preachers of the Word. We will follow him to his new sphere of labour with no little interest, and our prayer is that he may be long enabled to hold fast and to hold forth the word of life, that he may be wise in winning souls and that when the Chief Shepherd shall appear he may receive the crown of life which fadeth not away." The Presbytery promised to take into consideration the Assembly's re[illegible] on Foreign Missions, when it was agreed that while the Presbytery gratefully recognize the interest Mr. Gordon has taken in the missions of the church, they cannot approve of the overture. The Rev. Thos. McPherson, of Stratford, was unanimously nominated as moderator of the next General Assembly. The basis of Union was adopted by a vote of seventeen to one. The next meeting of Presbytery was appointed to be held in Knox church, Stratford, on the first Tuesday of March next.

### BIRTHS.

At Brighton, on Monday, the 15th inst., the wife of Mr. Peter Begg, Editor and Proprietor of the ENSIGN, of a daughter.

At Cobourg, on Sunday last, December 14th, the wife of Mr. John Jeffrey, Hardware merchant, of a daughter.


## New Advertisements.

VICTORIA WOOD YARD,

23 and 25, VICTORIA STREET.

AND

COR QUEEN and EIGHT STREETS.

All kinds Coal and Wood on hand and for sale at lowest rates.

Narow-gauge Wood by the car-load. Order promptly delivered.

J. & A. McINTYRE.

BLAIKIE & ALEXANDER,

10 KING ST. EAST, TORONTO.

WILLIAM ALEXANDER,

JOHN STARK, - LAWRENCE BUCHAN

*Members of the Stock Exchange,*

BANKERS,

STOCK BROKERS & FINANCIAL AGENTS

Stocks, Bonds, Debentures, &c., bought and sold. Money loaned on Mortgage. Mortgages negotiated. Investments made.

Agents for Canada Guarantee Co., and Scottish Amicable Life Insurance Co

THE BEST PAPER! TRY IT!

BEAUTFULLY ILLUSTRATED.

The SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN now in its 29th year enjoys the widest circulation of any weekly newspaper of the kind in the world. A new volume commences January 3, 1874.

Its contents embrace the latest and most interesting information pertaining to the Industrial, Mechanical, and Scientific Progress of the World; Descriptions with Beautiful Engravings, of New Inventions, New Implements New Processes, and Improved Industries of all kinds Useful Notes, Receipes, Suggestions and Advice, by Practical Writers, for Workmen and Employers, in all the various arts.

The SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN is the cheapest and best illustrated weekly paper published. Every number contains from 10 to 15 original engravings of new machinery and inventions.

ENGRAVINGS, illustrating Improvements, Discoveries, and Important Works, pertaining to Civil and Mechanical Engineering, Milling, Mining, and Metallurgy; Records of the latest progress in the Applications of steam, steam engineering, railways, ship building, navigation, telegraphy, telegraph engineering, electricity, magnetism, light and heat.

Farmers, Mechanics, Engineers, Inventors, Manufacturers, Chemists, Lovers of Science, Teachers, Clergymen, Lawyers, and People of all Professions, will find the SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN to be of great value. It should have a place in every Family, Library Study Office and Counting Room in Every Reading Room, College, Academy, or School.

A years number contains 832 pages, and several hundred engravings. Thousands of volumes are preserved for binding and reference. The practical receipts are well worth ten times the subscription price. Terms $3 a year by mail. Discount to Clubs. Specimens sent free. May be had of all News Dealers.

PATENTS. In connection with the SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN, Messrs. Munn, & Co are Solicitors of American and Foreign Patents, and have the largest establishment in the world. More than fifty thousand application have been made for patents through their agency.

Patents are obtained on the best terms. Models of New inventions and sketches examined and advice free. All patents are published in the Scientific American the week they issue. Send for Phamphlet 110 pages, containing laws and full direction for obtaining Patents.

Address to the paper, or concerning Patents, MUNN & CO. 37 Park Row, N.Y. Branch Office cor. F and 7th Sts., Washington, D.C.

THE WESTERN ADVERTISER LONDON, ONT.

The Great Family Newspaper has now attained the largest circulation in Ontario outside of Toronto.

ONLY ONE DOLLAR PER YEAR