

that wholly unscriptural dogma. While they are striving for liberty to themselves they wish to be a dominant church, and to treat all not of their sect as an inferior caste. We were struck with the paradoxical assertion that the "perfect liberty" for which they contend, and the establishment of the church by the civil magistrate, "although often supposed to be at variance, are perfectly consistent with each other." We ask where is the proof of this? History furnishes none for it, but many against it. Where was an established church in possession of this liberty? When was it not a tool of the state? Besides, there is no natural affinity between these things. They are not of the same order. To maintain that they are consistent is risking a statement with a bold face on the chance of its being believed.

It is manifest that the unqualified manner in which they contend for the establishment theory, "separates them as completely from their evangelical brethren of non-established communions holding the voluntary principle, as any doctrinal heresy could do."

2. There is a great deal of special, unfair, pleading in the Address, to make it appear that, the ministers of the Convocation are contending for the same objects for which the covenanters struggled so long and suffered so much. There is, to a Scotsman, a charm in the very name Covenanters. It calls to remembrance the most interesting, the most spirit-stirring period of the history of Scotland; and for any party to claim kindred with these remarkable men, is to enlist in its favour strong sympathies. The authors of the address were aware of this, and have drawn largely on the national feelings of their countrymen. Now the point for which the non-intrusionists are contending is simply the enjoyment of endowments along with the full liberty to rule the church as they please. The liberty of ordering the affairs of a christian church, according to the word of God, they may have at any moment. The law does not compel men to hold any particular system of religious truth or form of discipline and worship; every man is allowed to choose for himself; but the non-intrusionists wish to keep the endowments, and it is for these that they are contending. Now the Covenanters contended for liberty to preach the gospel, and for liberty to hear it, but never spoke a word about endowments. They took joyfully the spoiling of their goods, provided that they could enjoy the privilege of worshipping God according to their consciences. The very thing for which they have suffered so much, the non-intrusionists have, or may have, for the taking, and nobody will find fault with them. The whole passage about the Covenanters belongs to that kind of rhetoric called clap-trap.

3. The authors of the address seem to think that the most disastrous effects to religion will result from their being necessitated to leave the established church. It might appear from this that they have not much confidence in the simple truths of the gospel, unless they be accompanied with the "might and mastery" of an establishment. This is unworthy of those who are contending for the honour of Christ and for the pure ordinances of his church. Is it not true that the gospel was preached with power and that sinners were converted by thousands, centuries before establishments or endowments were ever heard of? Is it not true that the gospel is preached at this moment in many heathen lands with great success and without endowments? Why then hold out the idea, dishonouring to the Omnipotence of God's truth when accompanied with God's blessing, that its progress will be retarded for want of endowments and an establishment?

We have watched the movement in the Church of Scotland with deep interest. It began with a design to extinguish the Secession and all dissent. Almost every step taken, has been away from the point aimed at, and to-