

of more importance with both God and man than what pertains to a part only.

This doctrine will be stigmatised as *Eras-tian*, but, if it is true, hard names will not hurt its upholders. It is difficult to conceive how there can be a perfectly independent "imperium in imperio." One or other must be supreme, but Christ said, "My kingdom is not of this world," meaning that it was to be humble, private, unshowy. Some would invert our Saviour's statement, and make him say, "This world is my kingdom,"—would have a present kingdom or Church of *outward* splendour and independent power, to be lord-over by man, however, in the person of one or more vicegerents. But this can never be without subverting civil powers, which Christians are forbidden by Christ to attempt upon any pretext. The great function of the Christian Church in its present stage, is not governing, but teaching. True, the time will come when this world will indeed become the kingdom of Christ; but this state of things will be brought about, not by overthrowing human governments, or by antagonism to them, but by transfusing the principles of the Gospel entirely through the hearts of all parties in the state—subjects, rulers, and all executive agencies—the proper relation of the church to the state—not to oppose but to influence towards what is good. However, this question has not advanced one inch towards a solution by the disruption, as is shown by the recent Cardross case. All human judgments are fallible; and perhaps, considering the constitution of ecclesiastical and civil courts, the latter being brought to a much higher degree of perfection than the former, more complete justice may be looked for from Lords of Session and Chief Justices, than from a conglomeration of minis-terial brains.

Both these questions having arisen out of the circumstances of the Christian Church, and having had an importance assigned them through the subtlety of human speculation, which did not rightly belong to them, we think that difference of opinion upon them did not warrant a disruption. All may grant that revolution against constituted authority is allowable under certain circumstances—when that authority abuses its power, and there is no other remedy than revolution. Things had not come to the pass in the Church of Scotland, which required so urgent a remedy. If anything was wrong within it, there should have been a long and strenuous effort to correct it, remaining in it. But the Free Church party in rebelling because they could not immediately have their own way in the General Assembly, acted in violation of one of their own precious principles, namely, that the majority should rule. If the Church was not fulfilling its mission satisfactorily, then it was manifestly their duty to remain in it, and strive to put things as they ought to be. It is nothing short of petulance for a member of

a society to withdraw from it because he cannot get his own way. If the Free Church agitators had right on their side, surely it was only necessary to declare that right in the Church courts, in order to get men to believe it; and if they believed that the right was on their side, then it was their duty to continue patiently setting forth that right, and they would certainly in due time have a majority. But because they could not get a majority in the church courts, they chose rather to withdraw from the church altogether, in opposition to the fundamental constitution of the church courts, that the minority must submit to the majority. The Free Church was thus, in the humble opinion of the writer, founded upon irresistible pride, and the subversion of constitutional principles.

But we are of a different opinion from "A Layman," who cites the Cardross case as arguing against a union. Notwithstanding that the Free Church has foregone any claim to Government money, it cannot free itself from civil supervision and so, its leaders ought to be now convinced, that the ground they took on "going out" was very doubtful, and therefore they will not throw the blame on the church *established*, for not accomplishing what the church *free* cannot accomplish. If they were guided by the logic of events, they would no longer stickle for what they called their *principle*, but be prepared to coalesce again.

CORRESPONDENCE.

New Brunswick.

THE Presbytery of St. John held their usual autumnal meeting at St. John, on Wednesday, 8th October. The business was chiefly of a routine character. The only matter of interest was a communication from the Trustees of St. John's Church, Moncton. Our congregation there appears, in common, it is to be feared, with all classes of the community, to feel the pressure of the times. I do not think it necessary at present to go into particulars, as a committee of Presbytery has been appointed to correspond with the Trustees, and make such arrangements as may be best in the circumstances.

The congregation at Moncton occupies an interesting and somewhat peculiar position. Many years ago a minister of our Church resided and laboured there. It was the day of small things; and as was to be expected, he had many privations to endure. The secession of '43 occurred. A few of the people sympathised with the Free Church. Free Church ministers visited the place. A few Free Church residents settled there; and for a short time a Free Church minister laboured there.

After his removal it was a question from which Church a minister should be solicited. The people acted wisely. They called a general meeting. The question was put, and the