

bilities," which have all been refuted and disposed of by eminent theologians in whose judgment we may have the utmost confidence.

Such is an outline of what seem to me to be the chief reasons and views advanced in opposition to the organ in public worship.

I shall state the reasons advanced in favor of the organ in my next.

A. McK.

LETTER FROM A. MCGIBBON, ESQ., MONTREAL.

MONTREAL, 17th September, 1867.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE RECORD.

SIR,—In the *Record* for September you publish the resolutions of Knox Church Congregation, Montreal, on the Synod's order to discontinue the use of the organ in that Church. My name is there given as dissenting from the resolution which was carried by a majority of two.

As my reason for this step may be misunderstood, I ask you to allow me a little space for an explanation.

I dissented from the reasons given by the congregation, because I felt that if obedience were due to the Synod's orders, it should be given unconditionally, and I felt that a grudging obedience, accompanied by a protest with reasons, was more detrimental to the discipline of the Canada Presbyterian Church, than a refusal on legal grounds to obey and injunction, ordered in contravention of the laws which regulate all proceedings of Presbyteries and Synods. I will not here refer to the steps taken by the Committee appointed by Presbyteries, whose *citation* was altogether irregular as is acknowledged by all who have looked into the subject. I will confine myself to the reference, and on this the law is very explicit. In the Forms of Procedure, Chap. II, Sec. 2, under the head "References," it is stated that in references for judgment, "all the papers must be regularly transmitted, and the parties concerned are warned to appear before the Court, by intimation to them personally if present, or by timely notice sent to them, that they may be heard for their interest." Sec. 13, when other parties are interested in a case carried to a Superior Court, they are necessarily carried along with it, and intimation is made to them that they may appear for their interest. Sec. 14, states proceedings to be taken, one of which is to ascertain "that parties have all been cited and are present." The order in which parties are to be heard is given, the last being "any other parties having an interest."

Whether the action of the Synod be right or wrong in ordering the discontinuance of the organ in Knox Church is not now the question, nor is it material to ask whether the hearing of "*all parties for their interests*" would have made any difference in the judgment. The question is one of more importance. Can the tyranny of a majority set aside the safe-guards provided by the laws? If it can in one case it may in another. The congregation of Knox Church was not called to appear either before the Presbytery or Synod on the reference, but contrary to law, the majority declared that that congregation must submit, without any opportunity of having its case pleaded. To some this may seem a small thing, but to those who regard the matter in its proper light it is a most dangerous innovation, a large stride towards irresponsible tyranny.

I had intended to quote some instances of the practice of the Synod in previous cases, but they are so numerous that it is almost unnecessary.

I would merely refer to the steps taken with regard to the Brockville Church, in which a musical instrument had been retained for three years, in spite of the orders of Synod.