

duat's promotion, which while it misled the Church at home, was read with strange feelings by the people among whom he travelled in this country. Were the evil confined to the guilty we should not regret it, but it spreads itself over the whole Church and is especially calculated to work injury upon the innocent, and even cause the worthiest to be suspected. We trust that the fate of Mr. Harper will be a beacon to us all—that it will teach us to be especially jealous of the purity and sacred character of our Church, and that while giving all praise and encouragement where they are justly due—all in authority will reflect that a grave responsibility is upon them. In this very Record we regret to say Mr. Harper was thoughtlessly praised, when had he been dealt with in a different spirit—firm, dignified, and honest, he might to-day have retained his fair name, and our Church have been saved a grave scandal.

“COMMISSIONERS OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND—BRITISH GUIANA.—The Rev. A. Irvine, of Blair-Atholl, and the Rev. T. Monroe, of Campsie, Commissioners for the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland to British Guiana, were received with much consideration and hospitality by his Excellency the Governor, the Chief Justice, the Lord Bishop, the Attorney General, and most of the leading persons of the colony. An ordinance was passed in the Court of Policy, empowering them to cite and compel the attendance of witnesses, and the result of their labors has been that the Rev. G. Macculloch, of St. Saviour's Parish, has resigned his benefice and cast himself on the clemency of the General Assembly; and Rev. G. Harper, of St. Clement's, has been found guilty of various counts in the libel raised against him, and has been suspended from the office of the holy ministry. The Commissioners were six weeks in the colony, visited all the three provinces of Demerara, Essequibo, and Berbice, and obtained minute statistics of all the Presbyterian parishes. They had the great satisfaction of taking a part in a large and very influential public meeting, presided over by the Governor, and called at their suggestion, at which a missionary Society in connection with the Church of Scotland, was formed, principally for the purpose of obtaining assistant ministers for the Presbyterian parishes; and a sum of more than £600 in annual payments and donations, was subscribed before the close of the meeting. Should the decisions and proceedings of the Commissioners be approved of at the Commission of the General Assembly in March, no less than three parish ministers, whose salaries are £500 each, and two or three

assistant ministers, whose salaries have been fixed at £300 each, will be immediately required for this colony. The Commissioners are of opinion that the expense of living in the country parishes is not much greater than at home; that the climate, on the whole, is as salubrious as any within the tropics; and that in the present state of society, it is desirable that only married clergymen, or those who purpose to be married before they enter on their charges, be appointed.—*Edinburgh Herald.*

#### THE CARDROSS CASE.

The following is an American view of this now celebrated case:—

(From the Boston Recorder—Congregationalist.)

“We see by the papers that the Free Church of Scotland is now greatly excited by a question which would (if we understand it) raise no excitement here.

A minister of the Free Church, Mr. Macmillan of Cardross, was deposed about a year ago by the General Assembly for drunkenness, with aggravated circumstances. It is believed by some that there was some irregularity in the procedure adopted by the Court on the occasion; and Mr. McMillan, taking advantage of the supposed flaw, applied to the Court of Session to set aside the sentence that had been passed upon him. The ground his counsel took was that the Free Church, being non-established, was in the eye of the law just a voluntary association of persons, like a banking or insurance company; that in this capacity they made a contract with Mr. McMillan; and that it was competent for the Civil Court to review any proceedings connected with an alleged breach of that contract, and, if necessary, to compel the terms of it to be kept. The counsel of the Free Church replied that the terms of the contract had been kept; but that, whether or no, the Civil Courts had no right of review, in spiritual matters, over Ecclesiastical Courts.

This is the substance of the case as stated in various papers. Now, few churches are freer than our Congregational churches. Yet in cases similar to this, the action of our churches is subject to revision by the Civil Courts. If by regular ecclesiastical process a member of a church is disciplined for immorality, the civil authorities do not interfere, and would not sustain an action of slander. But if under the forms and pretences of discipline, yet, in a manner contrary to our ecclesiastical law and usage, a member of the Church was made unjustly to suffer in reputation, he would have his remedy in the Civil Courts reviewing the proceedings of the Church Courts. And the question for the Civil Court would be, Was it regular process of discipline? or was the plaintiff made to suffer by the violation of church law and usage?