

solved to put an end to the Tulehan System, and the Erastian Supremacy which the regent was desirous of establishing over the free kirk of Scotland. They interdicted Adamson from the exercise of prelate authority, and appointed a commissioner with full power to summon him before them, and to give judgment in his case. Enraged at these proceedings, the regent sent for Melville to his chamber, where the following characteristic conversation took place. After discoursing for some time on the desirableness of peace, the regent lamented that attempts should be made to trouble the Church by persons seeking to introduce their own conceits and foreign laws. Melville, who was at no loss to discover to whom and to what he alluded, said "that he and his brethren took the Scriptures, and not their own fancies, or the model of any foreign church, for the rule and standard of the Church Government they defended." "This General Assembly of yours," said Morton, "is a convocation of the king's lieges, and it is treason for them to meet without his permission." "If such it be," replied Melville, "then Christ and his apostles must have been guilty of treason, for they convoked hundreds and thousands, and taught and governed them without asking the permission of magistrates, and yet, they were obedient subjects, and commanded the people to give what was due unto Cæsar."—Perceiving that he was no match for Melville in argument, Morton put an end to it by exclaiming in a tone of menace and anger, "There will never be quietness in this country till half-a-dozen of you be hanged or banished the country." "Tush, sir," replied Melville, "threaten your courtiers after this manner: it is the same to me whether I rot in the air or in the ground. The earth is the Lord's; my country is wherever goodness is. I have been ready to give my life where it would not have been half so well vared. I have lived out of your country ten years, as well as in it. Let God be glorified, it will not be in your power to hang or exile his truth." Such were our forefathers! Thus did they stop the mouths of lions. The man of power quailed before the man of God. This singular interview having thus ended, Melville returned to his brethren, leaving the regent to reflect on what manner of men he had to deal with, and to contrive how he might stay the work of God in their hands, "which," says Calderwood, "had not God taken him out of the way, without question he would have done."

(To be continued.)

To the Editor of the Banner.
MONTREAL, April 9th, 1845.

DEAR SIR,—I have got thus far through life without ever having been engaged in a Newspaper Controversy. It pains me to enter upon one now, and especially with you, but the article which appeared in your paper of Friday, 21st March, on the Financial Scheme of the Presbyterian Synod of Canada, contains so much that is incorrect, and that is likely to mislead, that I feel constrained, however reluctantly, to come forward thus publicly to controvert it. I would have written sooner but it is only since I came here that I had time to do so.

In the article referred to, you speak of the Synod at their meeting in October, under the influence of the best feeling, and with the utmost harmony, agreeing to a mere Supplementary Scheme, and then you state that, in opposition to all this, and without any communication with the Sustentation Board, five or six ministers met at Hamilton, and adopted a plan entirely different. Now the truth is, that that Supplementary Scheme was drawn up in August, and published in the Missionary Record for September. It proceeded from the Commission of the Synod, but when the Synod itself met in October, it resolved to drop the Supplementary, and substitute a Sustentation Scheme; and the maturing of the Scheme was remitted to the Commission of Synod, which met at Hamilton. You

have admitted all that in your paper of the 28th of March, but how could you allow yourself to make such an admission, without a single expression of regret for the injustice which you had done to the Ministers who met at Hamilton, in holding them up as acting without authority, and as doing that which was calculated to interrupt the good feeling, and the harmony which had so lately prevailed? And besides the correction of the mistake is not carried out to that extent which the circumstances of the case required. The current of your remarks is such as might leave the impression that five or six ministers who met at Hamilton, in adopting the principle of a Sustentation Fund, in opposition to that of a mere Supplementary Fund, which you decidedly prefer, were following a course of their own, at once breaking up that harmony which had marked the proceedings of the Synod, and disregarding the lessons which might have been learned from the experience of the Free Church of Scotland. But it does surprise me that you could have forgotten that it was in consequence of the recommendations which Mr. McNaughtan and I ventured to press upon the Synod, that they themselves made the change, and made it most harmoniously. It was pressed upon them, not certainly as if the Free Church claimed or had any right to exercise authority over them, but as a Scheme which had been well considered, and the wisdom of which is still farther brought out in every day's experience of its working.

The details of the Scheme proposed by the Commission at Hamilton, differ in various important particulars from those of the Free Church, and I repeat here what I have stated elsewhere, that I do not think the changes are improvements, but this opinion I hold under correction, and with that deference which a stranger ought to entertain for the better information of those who have a more intimate acquaintance with the state of the country. But without entering into the specialities of the Scheme recommended by the Commission, I must again express my surprise that you should say, "It has been attempted to draw a reluctant approbation to it, by stating that the details would be modified; but although there has been another meeting of the Synod Commission, not one detail has been withdrawn." In the first place, that particular Scheme was never adopted by the Church. It was only recommended by the Commission of the Synod. Their language is thus given in the Missionary Record for December, "unanimously approved of the following Scheme, and recommended the same to the adoption of all congregations under the jurisdiction of the Synod." But in the second place, whatever misapprehension might exist in the mind of others as to the import of the word *recommended*, I cannot account for any mistake upon your part, for, if my recollection has not altogether failed me, you were present at the meeting of the Commission in Toronto when the matter was explained—when it was declared that the details were not obligatory, and when it was stated that the recommendation might be dealt with as an overture. I need not tell you that an overture is a proposal submitted to the Church Courts for their opinion, and that they may adopt it, or simply reject it, or suggest alterations upon it, as they may see cause. The approbation that was sought for was not to the details of the Scheme, but to the plan of a Sustentation, as distinguished from a Supplementary Fund. There was no need to attempt to draw a reluctant approbation to that, for, with the exception perhaps of yourself, I am not aware of any one who does not cordially approve of it. It is of importance that this should be known, because there is no reason why congregations should suspend their efforts in behalf of the Sustentation Fund, upon the principle of which all are agreed, till the details also are satisfactorily adjusted. That can be brought about by degrees.

I have no doubt the *Witness* will be very much surprised to see the use which you make of his article, which you extract in your paper of the

28th ult. It would be rather extravagant to expect that in the working of such a Scheme, all its details would be at once so thoroughly understood, and all employed in carrying it out, would be so judicious in their proceedings, that no part would fail of its due result. But in setting forth the extent of the evil, have you not misapprehended the statement of the *Witness*? You speak upon it as if it amounted to this, that three-fourths of the ministers of the Free Church have been left, without supplement from their Congregations, to maintain themselves on the one hundred pounds per annum from the Sustentation Fund. The statement in the *Witness* is "that the proportion of those who are thus dealt with is, in some places, as about six to two." I would be far from making light of this had it occurred even in only two or three instances, but since, in the conducting of the Scheme, where men are the agents, it might have been expected that errors would be committed, I am not sorry that the evil has occurred in that particular shape. I do not know what may be the proportion between the contributions to the Sustentation, and those to the Supplementary Fund, in my own Congregation; but I have been all along very much concerned lest their feelings towards me should cause them to turn into the Supplementary that should rather go to the Sustentation Fund. It is to the honour of these ministers, although it is connected with some special suffering to themselves, that the Sustentation Fund has been thus attended to. They have still further been exposed to suffering from their people overlooking, amid the efforts which they were making to effect places of worship for themselves, the arrangements which had been suggested for applying a due proportion of what they might be able to contribute to the support of those who were ministering to them in holy things. But while the consideration of such cases should impress us with the necessity of maintaining the utmost vigilance in the working of the system, and exercising that control which Presbyterianism can do with the greatest efficiency, should it not also serve to modify the views which you have formed of our Deacons' Courts? Trifles does not require that we should view them as necessarily under the control of the minister, nor does it require us to view the minister as one who, as a matter of course, will use his influence for mere personal objects. You remind your readers that "there is no virtue in ordination which gives a monopoly of wisdom or principle to those on whom it has passed." May it not be well also to remember that there is no virus in ordination; converting into scoundrels those on whom it is conferred? You have indeed striven hard to convince your readers that the clergy are not to be trusted. You call upon them to look to the United States, to the Episcopal Church in Canada, and so the Church of England, to see how little in the way of reform is to be expected from the Clergy. You tell them with respect to the Presbyterian Church of Canada, that few of the Clergy came out, and that these were accompanied by their flocks; and while with regard to the Disruption in Scotland you admit that "the number of the Clergy who came out for the sake of principle, was numerous and imposing," and that they were the leaders in that great event, yet you add that the laity were more numerous still, leaving it to be inferred, according to the tenor of your argument, that but for the laity there would have been no disruption in either case. I trust the excellent ministers of the Presbyterian Synod of Canada will find in the esteem and attachment of their flocks, what may comfort them under the injustice which they meet at your hands, and as for the insinuation against the ministers of the Free Church of Scotland, I must tell you that it is utterly groundless. At the meeting of the Convocation, where our grand was finally taken up before the disruption, none but ministers were present. We there agreed to Resolutions pledging ourselves to a particular course, in the event of our claims being refused by Government. Declarations of adherence to the