

matters relating to the tenure of property—church property equally with other property,—and to decide authoritatively all questions that can arise as to the ownership of it; that the civil authorities are *in no case* to degrade their office by exercising their powers as the *tools* of any party in a suit *however numerous*, but in *every* case to decide in accordance with their own independent judgment; that if the trust is such as obliges them to examine ecclesiastical documents, and judge of their meaning, they *must* do so; that, if there is anything wrong in this, (*as there is not*;) the responsibility for it belongs to the *Church* in having her trusts so framed; and that in acting on this principle the civil authorities do nothing inconsistent with a full recognition on their part of the spiritual independence of the church.

I hope discerning and candid readers will be satisfied on these points. As for "Presbyterian" and many others, I have no hope that they will do other than prove the paradox,

"Convince a man against his will,
He's of the same opinion still."

If it be said that he *has* changed his opinion, I must be allowed to doubt it. He is certainly not an Ultramontanist, and he cannot see the *juste milieu* of Presbyterianism. If he is neither at the one end nor in the middle, he must be at the other end. That is, he must be an Erastian, unless indeed he is *no-where*, or, in other words, not able to understand and appreciate the principles involved in the discussion. And perhaps it is best to think this, on the ground that it is better to be charitable than complimentary.

I am, yours truly,

JAMES MIDDLEMISS.

Elora, March 14, 1874.