

matter of belief and Church discipline. When the Church or majority of the Church violates the law or its own laws, then it must submit to be brought into Court, and this is the sum and substance of the Cardross Case. When it comes before the Court, the decision of the Church may be maintained as a just decision, or it may be reversed as an unjust one; but herein lies the whole dispute. Some of the clergy maintain that just or unjust it shall stand, for no Civil Court should have the power to overlook either their justice or injustice, while another party maintains that the high tribunals of the land ought to be called upon to decide whenever right and justice are in question. The question, in a word, then is, did the majority in this case violate their own laws, or did they not? the Court of Session is to decide, and all the clamor is about nothing less and nothing more than this—nothing whatever to do with belief. How different and how unjustly the sectarian press, and particularly the *New York Observer*, put it, our readers can see from this simple statement. It is a sad thing to think of, when we see our religious newspapers fall back on misrepresentation, for that is but another phrase for falsehood, for it does damage to our Saviour's Christianity.—*Scottish American Journal*.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the *Monthly Record*:

DEAR SIR,—As you may have seen, some very severe animadversions are made on your periodical in the last number of the *Colonial Presbyterian*, published in this province. It is rather singular that these should occur in an editorial professedly devoted to the advocacy of a union between the different Presbyterian bodies in New Brunswick. The editor seems especially displeased with the notice which the *Record* has, from time to time, taken of the Cardross Case, and hints, that, in this matter, it does not enjoy the sympathy of the ministers and members of the Presbyterian Church of New Brunswick in connection with the Church of Scotland. This I am disposed to doubt. I can only say for myself, that I, for one, am glad that the Cardross Case has turned up. I have for long been of opinion that there is a mighty deal of humbug in the pretensions of the Free Church party, and that the leaders of the Disruption, if not wilfully misled, were at least under a most erroneous impression of the real state of the case at issue. The truth is, the Moderates, much though they have been blamed, and in some cases perhaps deservedly, were far-seeing men, and clearly perceived that Christ's kingdom, though not of this world, is, so far as the visible Church is concerned, in this world, and that those constituting it being only men like others, are

amenable to and entitled to enjoy the protection of the law in ecclesiastical as well as in civil matters; inasmuch as there is no ecclesiastical relationship that does not involve it some civil right. Is it to be supposed that the member of a Church Court alone is to have no redress and no protection if his individual rights are trampled on, if he feels in his conscience that he has been unjustly condemned by an arbitrary decision of his copresbyters? Is a Church Court to be considered so infallible that if a misunderstanding arise between it and one of its members as to whether or not the terms of contract between them have been kept, no neutral party is to be permitted to arbitrate between them? Should a body of men be allowed to decide in a case in which they form one of the interested parties? Does experience show that Church Courts have always been composed of men of such legal discernment and impartial justice that it would be safe to concede to them such absolute powers? Yet, this is virtually what the Free Church party arrogate to themselves by their claim of spiritual independence, as is clearly shown by the Cardross Case. They deny the right of any court upon earth to interfere between an ecclesiastical court and one of its members, whatever injustice may be done him, and however they may infringe their own fundamental regulations. They deny the right of such members to seek the protection of the state as well as the right of the state to see that her oppressed child receive justice. The ecclesiastic alone of all other classes in the realm must sit mute under the wrong, meekly acquiescing in the tyranny of his spiritual fathers and brethren.

Such is really the Free Church claim of spiritual independence when followed out to its legitimate consequences: such precisely is the phase which the Cardross Case has assumed. But though the Secession party had plainly taken up an untenable position, as was obvious to their opponents, they have had it all along very much their own way. The multitude, not much accustomed to distinguish between things that differ, took all for gospel that the leaders of the Free Church chose to allege. The other party were held up as merely mercenary men, who cared neither for the interests of religion nor for those of justice, provided they could only serve their own ends,—as men, in fact, who had betrayed their Lord for a piece of silver. They took patiently the abuse which was heaped on them, and though wincing under the wrong, forbore to retaliate, (for by the editor of the *Presbyterian's* own confession, "the *Record* of the Church of Scotland, as published in Edinburgh, never yet uttered one word against 'the Free Church,') went on quietly doing their duty, and left it to a just Providence to show, in his own time and way, who were right and who were wrong. When then the Cardross case arose, and showed the utter fallacy and impracticability