

3. On page 103, the expression occurs "In a nation Christianised." Now from the previous argument I have been led to suppose that the writer considers Christianity, or the reign of Christ, can be predicated only of the individual believer. I enquire in what sense is a nation Christianised? What proportion must be real Christians, or in a word what is meant by the phrase.

In reference to the whole argument—we do not differ as to what is the duty of a true Christian when acting as a Magistrate—nor as to its being the duty of every man to submit to Christ by believing, but we ask—

4. When a man confesses the bible to be a revelation from God, acknowledges what it commands to be right, and what it forbids to be wrong, or in other words owns it should be the rule of his conduct,—is it the duty (not *should* it be the duty, but *is* it the duty) of such a person, to legislate and rule according to it? or is he to ignore it, saying that as he is not converted his rule must be solely the dictates of reason and expediency?

5. Must we *know* a man to be a *real* Christian, not a professor, before we are to expect him to legislate on religious principles? We accept that a man must act according to his conscience, but is a man justified merely by being unconverted in refusing to let the bible direct him in forming a conscientious opinion on civil matters? or in other words, does a man's infidelity remove his responsibility as civil Magistrate?

I purposely refrain from making any comments, but by inserting the above, your correspondent, W. R. A., will have an opportunity of satisfying the mind of one who sincerely desires to have every obstacle to a satisfactory union removed.

I am, &c.,

A CANADIAN PRESBYTERIAN.

April 23rd, 1855.

ANSWER TO THE ABOVE.

The writer of the foregoing communication seems to be sincere, yet to be perplexing himself unnecessarily about distinctions which can have no practical bearing. His mode of putting questions, especially where the language is somewhat ambiguous, is one which cannot lead to much satisfaction. He hints that an answer will doubtless be forthcoming to our paper: and we have had the May number of the *Ecclesiastical Record* put into our hands, where Mr. Ure makes some strictures. But, as he pays no attention to the Scriptural view we endeavoured to present of Christ's Headship, in opposition to the Free Church view, which leads them into so many mistakes; and as he draws his inferences not from any premises of ours, but from his own misconceptions, and, without seeming to understand the subject, loses himself in airy speculations, we have no intention to prosecute the discussion. We would only say that our views neither limit—as Mr. Ure supposes—the Headship of Christ, nor the duty and obligation of Ministers to inculcate on all, whether rulers or ruled, their duty to believe on Christ, and regulate their whole conduct by the standard of Scripture. We, however, acquit Mr. Ure of intentional misrepresentation, of which we believe him incapable, and ascribe what is dark and exceptionable in his strictures to misconception. But as it would be injurious to the cause of union, we forbear to enter on disputation; and unless we had been somewhat committed by the note in your May number, we would rather have declined giving any reply to the questions of the *Canadian Presbyterian*.

The first quotation from page 99, can be made no plainer than it is. We do not ask our brethren of the Free Church to suppress their testimony. We may see no cause for testifying on the matter referred to, we may not be able to concur in it; and may even have objections to it. But believing they would be acting conscientiously we would not forbid them. Our language does not mean that we would join our brethren in any testimony, should such there be, on the magistrate's power, which our principles as scriptural voluntaries condemn.