

It is with respect to the latter of the principles to which we have referred, that relating to the Headship of Christ over the Church, and the inherent liberty and exclusive jurisdiction of the Church itself, that the contentings between the Church and the Civil Courts in Scotland, which have issued in the disruption, have taken place; and it is the provisions of the constitution of the Church of Scotland, based on that principle, which we hold to have been destroyed.

But the Established Church, it is sometimes said, holds the doctrine of the Headship of Christ, and the principle of the inherent liberty and exclusive jurisdiction of the Church which is involved in it, as well as the Free Church; the difference between them is merely that they give a different interpretation of them. If the public reports of the speeches delivered by the deputation from the Established Church, which recently visited the colony, may be relied upon, this was a favourite assertion of theirs:—Oh! said they, we don't deny the Headship of Christ—we hold it as decidedly as any minister of the Free Church can do—we can preach it too, as fully—the only difference between us is, a trifling difference in the interpretation we put upon it. We shall not waste the time nor insult the understanding of any man of common intelligence, by pointing out at length, the paltry and contemptible evasion involved in such an assertion. We would simply remark, that the question at issue between us, is not whether or no they *profess* to hold the doctrine of Christ's Headship, but whether the interpretation which they have put upon it,—and which we thank them for so frankly admitting to be *different from* that of the Free Church,—is, indeed, a trifling one; and whether, on the contrary, it does not amount to a giving up of the doctrine altogether. Arians, we know, admit that Christ was the Son of God; but, when they come to interpret the sense in which they understand the words, they stand forth as deniers of the proper divinity and proper sonship of the Saviour of sinners. Roman Catholics profess to hold the great doctrine of the atonement; but, when we refer to the doctrines which they also hold with respect to the sacrifice of the mass, to the merit of good works, to penances, to absolution, and the like, we find that they cut up the doctrine of the atonement by the roots. And so of countless heresies; they are just erroneous interpretations of scriptural statements or of doctrines professedly held.

But, to bring matters to a point, so that no one may be hoodwinked by such an unworthy evasion, or lose himself amidst vague generalities, —as those who are not accustomed to deal with general principles are