

appear that the congregations under patronage are worse served or less moral, religious and pious than those who elect their pastors. Considering what has at different times taken place in this country, it may with confidence be anticipated, that whenever two or more candidates offer for a vacant charge (perhaps even when there is only one) to be supplied by popular election, bad feelings will be produced in the congregation, which may probably continue for years; or may very likely cause an immediate division and breaking up of the congregation, as has happened more than once in Lower Canada. It is unnecessary and would be tedious to enter into particulars; I shall therefore merely refer to the case of St. Andrew's Church in Quebec, which came before the Synod in 1835. That Church was incorporated in 1831, by a provincial act which met with no opposition, but passed exactly according to the wish of those who applied for it. Yet on the first election of a minister from among several candidates, which was done according to law, the dissatisfaction of many members was so great that if the Reverend gentleman who was duly elected, had not resigned, it was evident that the congregation would have been divided and many would have left the Church.

Another consideration impresses forcibly on my mind, the propriety and expediency—I may even say—necessity of submitting to patronage. By section 33 of the constitutional act, Her Majesty may authorize the Governor, with the advice of His Executive Council, to erect Parsonages according to the establishment of the church of England; and to endow them with part of the lands reserved for the support of a Protestant clergy. And, by the 39th section, Her Majesty may also authorize the Governor (the Council not being mentioned) to present an incumbent or minister to such Parsonages when a vacancy occurs &c. But Her Majesty is not invested, by any part of the act, with the power of erecting and endowing corporations of any sort for the benefit of the church of Scotland. On the contrary, when any bill favorable to our church is reserved for the Sovereign's pleasure (which the law requires to be done) it must, as is enacted in section 42, be submitted to both Houses of Parliament for thirty days, before it can be assented to and become a law. Now, our church has very properly urged her claim, under the fourth article of union between the two kingdoms, to all the "rights, privileges, and advantages," in Canada, that are enjoyed there by the church of England. And if our claim be admitted and granted, surely it is not unreasonable that it should be under the same, or similar, con-

ditions as are enacted for the sister church. Besides, it can never be hoped nor expected that the Executive Government will assent to a law authorizing the incorporation and endowment with lands by the crown, of congregations of any church, unless the Sovereign have the right and power of presenting ministers to such congregations, or at least that his approval of the clergyman, or that of his representative, will be required; which last is the case with the two congregations at Quebec, incorporated by provincial acts.

However much patronage may be contrary to the opinions and wishes of many members of the Scottish church, it has, nevertheless, always existed in many parishes at home (except during the short interval from 1690 to 1712) and is not inconsistent with the proper government and discipline of the church. This is fully stated and explained in principal Hill's "view of the constitution of the church of Scotland." It is not to be expected that our church will ever obtain that establishment and support which she claims in this country from the Sovereign and Parliament, except upon some such conditions as have just been mentioned. It will occur to every reader, that, if Presbyteries be careful and strict in examining candidates for licences and for ordination, no improper person can ever be appointed to any congregation, whether under patronage or not.

I am not aware of any passage in scripture, nor in our Confession of faith, that enjoins either popular elections or presentations of ministers by patrons, when their services are required; and therefore it may be inferred, that it is not a matter of conscience nor of great importance which mode is followed: But, from what has come to my knowledge, during a long residence in this Province, I am convinced that, in this country at least, patronage is the most safe, expedient, and least objectionable of the two. Particularly when the King, or Chief Magistrate, is to be the patron; and there can be no other, except some person acting by the Sovereign authority, if we obtain corporations and endowments from the *Crown*, such as we have claimed and are entitled to, both in law and equity. "The patron's right of disposing of a benefice originally arises either from the patron or his ancestors &c. being the founders or builders of the church; from their having given lands for the maintenance thereof; or from the church's being built on their ground; and frequently from all three together." So that, though by this law, which is founded in reason, we may have some private patrons, yet they are not likely to be nu-