

justice or injustice of this accusation. No Church on earth has more clearly and fully made known the truths and principles to which they have and must adhere, than the Church of Scotland has done. And, that our Church has never, in any shadow of form, denied the Headship of Christ, may be shown by every attainable means of proof. Her standards, to which she has adhered for centuries, declare this in the most explicit terms. In no instance, since our Church has been so strenuously charged with this sin, can it be shown that, in word or deed, His authority has been denied, or surrendered, in things spiritual, to any power beyond the pale of the Church. The supreme judges, in things temporal, as we have shown in a former paper, declared, in the clearest possible manner, that the Church of Scotland was the highest authority in Scotland, in things spiritual, and they averred that they could not adjudicate in such matters. But, let us glance at the position of our accusers, and at the evidence which they shall adduce. The testimony of witnesses and judges can be more fully appreciated when their precedents are well understood. In our last, it was shown that they had to submit to the least of the civil authority, and the manifest reason why they did not yield still more, was the fact that McMillan was compelled to withdraw, for want of pecuniary means to carry on his suit any longer. This is the opinion, not only of the Church of Scotland, but also of the dissenting bodies. And this is manifest from the fact that the Free Church exercised all her skill, and the best skill of the best civil council she could command, to prevent his case coming up to be fairly tried, on its merits,—their plea being that the proper party had not been pursued, which, of course, must have implied that McMillan's plea was legitimate. With this plea, the poor man was worried for years. But, although the Free Church was compelled to submit to the civil law, against their wishes, shall we accuse that Church with denying the Headship of Christ? Forbid. We dare not assume such a prerogative. One is their Judge, even God. "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." But, with equal, yea, with greater propriety, might we resort on them. For we hold, and purpose to show, hereafter, that those who left our Church were the very parties who brought Church and State into collision, before 1843. And they next brought their own Church into collision with the State. Had the Free Church, on finding that the harsh judgment passed on McMillan brought them into collision with the State, been willing to own their fallibility, and, had they then retraced their steps, and proceeded to try McMillan according to the constitution by which they were alike bound, they possibly might have avoided civil penalties, and submission to the arm of the civil courts. Had they seen and admitted that they were not so spiritualized in

their new order of things, but that they, as well as McMillan, had civil interests to protect, they might have discovered that the State had a right to look after and protect the civil interests of each one of her subjects. And, until that Church, or any Church, falls back or assumes the position of the Apostolic Church, and hold no vested property, as could not now be held in Spain, &c., it must be known that each one of the corporate body has not only spiritual, but civil interests, to protect, and therefore hold a certain relation to the civil authorities. But, the Free Church has never shown that McMillan has been justly condemned, in accordance with the laws of their Church. Hence, he has a right to say that he has been unfairly and illegally deprived of temporal and spiritual privileges, because it was done, not in accordance with any rational or Scriptural rule. Could this have been done after the law of Christ's kingdom?

It is now a settled opinion that McMillan would not have been so summarily dealt with, and adjudged, had it been seen that the harsh and lawless sentence passed upon him would have led that Church into so much trouble and expense. Had they anticipated this, there can be little room for doubt, but they would have tried him by the law and constitution to which they were severally bound. And, whether or not, what is more in accordance with the principles of good order and good government, sacred or civil, than to try a man by the rules of his society? Make refusal the general rule, and there would soon be an end of all society, and there would be no use to form any compact or association, over the whole earth.

It requires no lengthened course of argument to show that the Church of Scotland has recognized the Lord Jesus Christ as Supreme Head of the Church and Supreme Arbiter of the Nations. Her practice, as well as her standards, and her entire history since this baseless charge has been urged against her, bear the clearest, the most unmistakeable and uniform proof to this effect. The Church of Scotland adhered strictly to her constitution and laws, and did not encroach on the civil rights of any under her jurisdiction. Our Church has been very careful to observe the constitution and compact to which she had been pledged, in things spiritual and civil, and has avoided encroaching on the province of those constituted to rule in civil matters,—and thus our Lord Jesus Christ has been acknowledged Supreme Ruler over both. Consequently, there has been no infringement on our rights, and no collision with the civil authorities, since the Secession. This is most manifest to all within the Church who have given the subject that attention and consideration which it demands. It is also freely acknowledged by honest and charitable men in other Churches, who are most competent to judge. It may