

Kenneth John McKenzie, John McRae, James Morrison and Alexander McGillivray. These men, with one exception have all gone to their rest. The result of their deliberations is shown in the following extract from the Synod's Minute Book, bearing date of August, 1833. It is as follows:—

“The Ministers of the Church of Scotland, (as already mentioned), having spiritual charges in the Lower American Provinces, assembled at St. Andrew's Church, Halifax, did, after lengthened and mature deliberation form and constitute themselves into a Synod in connection with the Church of Scotland, to be called the Synod of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. The Rev. Donald A. Fraser was chosen Moderator, and the Rev. John Martin, Clerk.”

The second meeting of Synod was held in Pictou, when the Rev. John Martin, of St. Andrew's, was chosen Moderator. So that in the early history of the Synod St. Andrew's, Halifax, was the church in which the first meeting was held, and the Minister's, Mr. Martin's, is the second name on the Roll of Moderators.

At this time the Presbytery of Halifax consisted of Rev. John Martin of St. Andrew's, Rev. James Morrison of Lawrencetown, and Rev. Donald Mackintosh of West River, Pictou. Rev. John Martin, Moderator.

So that St. Andrew's deserves well of those who now worship with her walls, thus to spare no expense in erecting a new Building to perpetuate such precious memories both in her own history and that of his ministry as from these and other considerations cling around her.

ST. ANDREW'S.

Knox's Liturgy.

In reference to the above document, forming part of the Genean book of “Common Order,” a question suggests itself, viz: “What is its present authority in the Church of Scotland and all such churches as the Free and U. P. Churches, who claim to uphold her laws and institutions? Let it be observed, that the last constitution which the Scottish Church received was the Revolution settlement in 1690. In that year the Scottish parliament re-established the Presbyterian Church of Scotland. With the exception of the act of Queen

Ann in 1711, and the Chapel Act and Lord Aberdeen's Benefices Act the State has since sanctioned no material change in the Church's constitution. The aim of the Scottish parliament, in 1690, was to hold a middle course between two extreme parties—the Jacobites, who desired the restoration of James, with Episcopalianism, on the one hand, and the extreme Covenanters, who desired the complete restoration of all that had been enacted during the period of “the second reformation,” as it has been called, and the restitution of the solemn league and covenant with *all* the Westminster standards, on the other. In pursuit of this moderate course the parliament did much that the Jacobites would have liked undone, and left undone much that the Covenanters would have liked done. It ousted about 900 Episcopalian ministers, abolished episcopacy, and solemnly ratified the act of 1592, establishing Presbyterian church government. On the other hand it omitted all reference to the second reformation, to the Westminster catechisms and the Directory, and merely affirmed Presbyterianism to be *agreeable* to the word of God, without condemning prelacy. All that the revolution settlement does then, is, to ratify the Westminster confession, and confirm the act of 1592. There was a special act in reference to patronage, limiting the force of the act of 1592 upon that matter, to which it is unnecessary to refer. Thus, constitutionally, our church and its branches and offshoots have nothing to do with the catechisms or directory. This famous settlement gives us neither a catechism nor a form of worship nor a discipline. We are carried back a whole century to the act of 1592, which is thus the legal charter of the Church of Scotland. This famous act restored presbytery also, and abolished the “black acts” of 1584, by which James VI had invaded the rights and liberties of the church. It was a civil recognition of the constitution which she had previous to 1584, when episcopacy and royal supremacy were forced upon the country. There is here no mention of discipline or worship, but only of the form of government. In order to ascertain, therefore, what is valid among us as to discipline or worship, we must go still further back, and inquire—