

and honesty in open abuse, and we should prefer even that to dishonourable approaches. But, if there is no honesty in denunciations or friendships, no wonder should they who practice such things, become "unstable in all their ways."

It ought to be regarded as no small amount of Christian forbearance, courteously to receive those who had so long displayed so much bitterness towards us, but it might well be considered imbecility, disregard for truth, and want of fidelity to our Church, to permit recent attacks to pass unnoticed and unopposed. As we believe that our Church has been maligned and misrepresented throughout—as our Church has adhered to her standards, and maintained the principles avowed and asserted for centuries—and, as we believe our Church has done so, in all Christian forbearance and charity, towards those who opposed us, and those who differed from us, we propose to show, very briefly, by comparing their history during the last twenty years, with that of our Church, and then to show the cause of the troubles in the Church during the "years of conflict," previous to the secession. And, surely those who set out, asserting their superiority to all other churches—taking this high stand, challenge the closest scrutiny; and all men have a legitimate right to test their history by comparison, contrast or otherwise. Nor should they feel the least ill-natured on this account, as we design, in our simple statements, not to render in any measure, or in the same spirit that has often been meted out to us. At the same time, we entertain faint hope of convincing or proselytising those who have so systematically reviled us on every convenient occasion, and so highly esteemed themselves; but we desire to show to those who will attend to us, that we hold our principles more rationally, and on more stable grounds, than those who would rob us of all that is dearest to us, in time and for eternity. And, ere we proceed, we recommend them to take a calm and considerate view of the results of their rallery, more especially in Cape Breton, in those regions where pursued in its keenest virulence by successor and predecessor.

We shall notice some of the charges brought against the Church of Scotland, and test our cruel judges by these. Our Church has been represented as in servile subjection to the State, and, as a consequence, denying the headship of Christ—as refusing her people a voice in the election of ministers—as entirely at the will of patrons. Her ministers have been assailed in character and ability to preach the gospel—her people as comprising only a fraction of the once united Church of Scotland—and totally wanting in the missionary spirit, &c.

In this paper we will only direct attention to the first oft-repeated charge—that our Church is in subjection to the civil power in things spiritual, in what properly and exclu-

sively belongs to those constituted to rule in the house of God. Facts, and not assertions, shall be our proof. Shortly after the secession of '43, cases of discipline occurred in our Church, which came up to the General Assembly. The first that was found guilty in this supreme Church Court, foolishly "crediting what had been so often said before and after the secession, "that a minister could not be deposed from the Church, however immoral," appealed to the Court of Sessions, and had his case tried there, but his cause was declared without one shadow of support. The five Scottish Judges declared individually and unitedly that they could not adjudicate in spiritual matters. They declared that the Church of Scotland was the highest authority in Scotland, in things spiritual; they affirmed, moreover, that the Church of Scotland might even pass an extremely severe sentence on one of their members or ministers, inflicting severer punishment than his conduct merited, but, even in such case, that no other Court could reverse or mitigate that sentence. And what greater power than this could be desired? Here, then, we have the highest civil authority in Scotland disavow all that had been ascribed to them. This broad declaration was made in the case of Dr. Lochart, of Fraserburgh; and this case served to blast all hopes on similar grounds, in all time coming. (Let any one call this in question, and a copy of the judgment can be produced.) And this was amply confirmed in the history of the Scottish Church to this day. The Church, in every instance, when called upon to adjudicate, exercised unchallenged powers in Church discipline—no one attempting to seek reversal in the state or civil law. It will here be asked by some, How, then, did this occur before '43? This will be shown in its proper place hereafter.

But what has been the history of the Free Church of Scotland since the Secession, since they asserted absolute power and sovereignty in matters spiritual? It has actually and truly been, subjection to the State. In the case of McMillan of Cardross, this has been literally true, and must prove so in all similar cases. McMillan is declared guilty of immorality by one inferior Church Court, and declared innocent by the other, and when his case came up before their General Assembly, unheard and untried by the rules of that *Free* Assembly, he is simply asked whether he sought civil advice, and having honestly confessed to this supposed crime, he is, on this account, there and then deposed, and degraded from the office of the ministry. And what follows? he appeals to the civil law for redress, and now those who condemn him for asking civil council, now ask advice and seek protection of the same civil arm, and are, at length, compelled to "satisfy production," at the behest of the civil judges; and have to pay no small amount of expenses. Now, we challenge all men to point to any similar act