

the Caledonian Railway (Buchanan Street) amounted to 2500, as against 2360 last year, and 2300 in 1859. The passengers by the Caledonian Railway (South Side) numbered:—Hamilton section, 3100; Barrhead section, 1800; and Motherwell section, 400—total, 5300, compared with 5300, last year, and 5600 in 1859. The greatest increase, it will be observed, is in the number of steamboat passengers. The river, above the bridges, presented a very animated appearance during the day, and although there were a good many immersions, no fatal accident occurred.

#### WHAT IS THE CARDROSS CASE.

At the present moment the religious community of Scotland, to some extent, are seriously exercised upon this much-talked of, and much-written on matter. In our opinion, as we have expressed ourselves before, the ministerial interest being by a few ministers pitted against the Church and the ordinary worldly interests of adherents of the Church. Much has been said in the pulpit and on platform on the matter that the speakers themselves will ere long wish had never been permitted to pass their lips; for as the agitation grew and grows, men's passions—and ministers are but men—grow quite as fast, and things have been advanced that all will be heartily ashamed of, when cool reflection takes the place of red-hot controversy. The plain matter has been grossly misrepresented on the platform, and it is only from attention to the facts, that the true matter in dispute can be made understandable. It is a simple matter at first, and as it really is; but all sorts of clouds have been cast about it, so that the simple matter is a hard thing to see; but in plain simple language it is this:

In the parish of Cardross, a minister of the Free Church was brought up before the Presbytery accused of drunkenness and other crimes. The Presbytery found him guilty; he appealed to the Synod, and the Synod found him innocent of the charges. The Presbytery appealed to the Assembly, and the Assembly maintained the sentence of the Presbytery against the Synod. The Rev. Mr. McMillan was suspended; but he, by advice of the minority, brought the matter before the Court of Session, on the grounds that he had been refused the right of giving in evidence to counteract the evidence brought against him. The Court took the matter into consideration, and concluded to have the question brought in. This is the entire question, and the real row is only about this simple fact that the majority of ministers and elders who condemned Mr. McMillan are displeased that their action in suspending the Minister McMillan is to be examined, whether it was done by Church rules, according to use and wont, or by their violation. They claim that what they do as a Church Court, no other Court is to have the

right to call in question. Herein, we with the entirety of the liberal press of Scotland, think them wrong, for we maintain that the civil law is the highest power in the realm, and it must of consequence take cognisance of all that the citizens of the realm do.

It is but a poor excuse to escape its jurisdiction, for a half dozen individuals to assert that they are a majority of a Church Court, and having made a certain decision—wrong, unjust, tyrannical—no matter, they have made that decision, and they defy the justice of the Civil Court to take their decision into consideration on the appeal of the party wronged. Divested of all verbiage and subterfuge this is the whole matter. Now a man may be a minister or member of a Church, but he is a member of society as well, and in fact he is a member of the civil body before he can be by capacity a member of the Church, and he never loses his civil rights by joining any lawful organization whatever, so if he is wronged, or thinks he is wronged in the Church, or in the odd-fellowship union, he never loses his privilege to appeal to the highest Court in the realm to say whether he has been wronged or not. This is all that the furor is about; but the very fact that the Civil Court says, Yes, Messrs. Ministers, we can, in justice to civil liberty, take cognisance of your doings, whether singly or collectively, in placing the Church under the law of the land, and these ministers who make all this disturbance insist that they who from the Church Court, in Church Court business, be it the session, the Presbytery, Synod or Assembly, are to be above and beyond all civil courts whatever. This is the old romanism that existed before the Reformation; but in these days the doctrine is intolerable, that you must give up your civil rights in all that the Church can take it on itself to oversee. Church Courts are just as liable to err as any other courts, and it would be bringing us to a fine pass indeed, to have the principle admitted that no matter how the Church Court erred, the sufferer must submit, be wronged, maligned, ruined, because the Church Court blundered or was malicious. No, no, this must not be, and while we claim, as Protestants, the full free right to have our own belief, free exercise of conscience, and make our own Church laws, regulations and customs, we claim as Protestants still, that the highest civil source of justice shall be the umpire when it is disputed whether we have or have not carried our own Church laws, regulations, and customs, into honest practice. Mr. McMillan in this Cardross Case, says they have not, and he asks the Civil Court of the realm to say whether they have or have not; the Civil Court says it will examine and say. So this is the true, simple source of all this ministerial agitation. In one word, we find that a Church is a society permitted by the law of the land, but the law of the land is paramount to that Church in all that is not merely