

# THE ECCLESIASTICAL AND MISSIONARY RECORD, For the Presbyterian Church of Canada.

VOLUME I.—No. 10.

HAMILTON, MAY, 1845.

[Price, 2s. 6d. PER ANNUM.]

## THE RECORD.

**Making of Synod.**—NOTICES TO PRESBYTERIAL CHURCHES, &c.—1st. The Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada meets at Cobourg on the 4th of June next, at 7 o'clock, P. M.; and the Commission on the day previous at the same hour. 2d. Attended Rolls of the Presbyteries should be forwarded to the Clerk at the meeting of Commission. 3d. Presbytery Records fully engrossed should be brought up to the Synod. 4th. Committees appointed at last meeting of Synod, should have their reports in readiness. 5th. Presbyteries should report on measures of the Synod, which are of an interim character. 6th. Presbyteries should report their Home Missionary operations, and the state of their Home Missions to the Rev. A. Galt, Convener H. M. Committee. 7th. Presbyteries should report collections made within their bounds, according to appointment of Synod, and the Collection for the Synod Fund should be made in all congregations on the 1st day of June, or on some Sabbath preceding it.

WILLIAM RINTOUL,  
Synod Clerk.

The Presbytery of Montreal meets in St. Gabriel Street Church on the first Monday of May.

The Presbytery of Kingston meets at Brockville on the first Tuesday of May.

The Presbytery of Cobourg meets at Cobourg on the first Monday of May.

The Presbytery of Hamilton meets at Hamilton on the second Wednesday of May, at noon.

We beg the particular attention of all concerned to the memorandum of the Synod Clerk, respecting the approaching meeting of Synod, to be held at Cobourg on the first Wednesday of June. The orderly, deliberate, and expeditious transaction of the business of the Church will be greatly promoted by the previous diligence of Presbyteries and Committees, in regard to the matters referred to. At the same time we must remind the Church generally that the office-bearers and Courts are not the only parties concerned in these matters. Let every congregation and every member of the Church consider that in this annual representative Council of the Spiritual community, every individual is virtually a party, and that the prosperity of the whole body, and of each particular member must necessarily be affected more or less by the measures which the assembled rulers shall be led to adopt, and let united and earnest prayer and supplication be made, that the Spirit of power and of love, and of a sound mind, may be abundantly given to direct and sustain them in all their deliberations and decisions. Without adverting to more general considerations respecting the condition and prospects of the Christian Church at large, which are now pressing themselves on the attention of every branch thereof, we would entreat the members of the Presbyterian Church of Canada to bear in mind that those who have been called to bear rule amongst us, have duties to perform at present, of peculiar importance, and involving peculiar responsibilities—engaged as they are in laying the very foundations of an institution, with the character and spirit of which the best interests of future generations in this land will be found, we

are deeply persuaded—most intimately bound up, and with which the providence of the Evangelical cause in Canada will prove to be largely identified. Let all those amongst us who really love Zion, and desire her prosperity, be frequent and fervent in their applications at the Throne of Grace in behalf of those who are specially appointed to watch over her interests. We trust that the Sessions will afford their several congregations suitable opportunities before and during the meetings of Synod, for the discharge of this duty.—“Except the Lord build the house, they labour in vain that build it: except the Lord keep the city, the watchmen waketh but in vain.”

We find we must content ourselves here with a mere reference to some of the extracts and documents which this No. of the Record contains—having been obliged, for want of room, to lay aside much interesting matter which we had prepared—especially the communication of Philadelphia, on the establishment of a Fund for the widows and children of Presbyterian Ministers. This last we shall give entire in our next. We continue our extracts under the title “Headship of Christ,” and we doubt not they will be read with interest and profit. They exhibit a just and clear view of the principles and contending of the Church of Scotland from the reformation downward, and enable us by the best possible test to determine where we are to find that Church in the present day. We would especially direct the attention of our readers to the letter of the Revd. Andrew King—the highly esteemed deputy of the Free Church of Scotland, to Canada—whose valuable services to our Church generally, in the Theological Institute, and to the Congregation of Knox’s Church, Toronto, will not soon be forgotten. We have been furnished with a separate and authentic copy of this letter, and publish it entire at Mr. King’s special request—heartily sympathising with this excellent Minister in the repugnance which he has evidently felt to place himself in the arena of newspaper controversy, under such circumstances—a position, if we may judge from our own feelings, not much more congenial or attractive to him in the present instance, than a bear-garden would be. It is obvious, however, that he had no alternative, and we are aware that he gave intimation of the course he meant to pursue immediately after the offence occurred, although he seems to have been prevented from fulfilling his purpose so soon as he intended, no doubt by his multiplied engagements before his departure. The report of the Revd. Mr. Leishman’s Missionary labours in the Presbytery of Kingston, will be read, we are sure, with the greatest interest. We trust we shall speedily be furnished with the continuation of it. The Revd. Mr. Rintoul’s account of his recent visit to the townships adjacent to the western extremity of Lake Simcoe, will appear in our next No.; also, we hope, that of the Revd. Angus Mackintosh to the Owen’s Sound Settlements.

We intended, for reasons which will be obvious to many, to re-print the brief statements contained in our last No., respecting the history of the Sustentation Fund Scheme, but we have not room for them, and can only beg that our readers will read them again, and understand that by reprinting them we intended to indicate our deliberate transaction of their entire accuracy in every particular.

## HEADSHIP OF CHRIST.

(Continued.)

II.

THE REVD. MORTON—ERSKINE OF DUN—  
ANDREW MELVILLE.

Notwithstanding the above act, no sooner had Morton entered the regency, than, desirous to introduce prelacy, he began, if not openly to assert the Erastian supremacy, to act on the Erastian principle, viz. “that all authority, civil and ecclesiastical, flows from the crown.” It was on this occasion that John Erskine, of Dun, one of the early reformers, wrote his famous Letter to the regent, in which he laid down the following well-known distinctions between the magistracy and the ministry: “There is,” he thus wrote, “a spiritual jurisdiction and power which God has given unto his kirk, and to them that bear office therein; and there is a temporal jurisdiction and power given of God to Kings and civil magistrates. Both are powers of God, and most agreeing to the fortifying one of the other, if they be right used. But when the corruption of man enters in, confounding the offices, usurping to himself what he pleases, nothing regarding the good order of God, then confusion follows in all estates.” The kirk of God should fortify all lawful power and authority that pertains to the civil magistrate, because it is the ordinator of God, but if he pass the bounds of his office, and enter within the sanctuary of the Lord, meddling with such things as appertain to the ministry of God’s kirk, then the servants of God should withstand his unjust enterprise, for so they are commanded.” The attempts of Morton to introduce prelacy, were, however, to a certain extent successful. A convention of ministers that met at Leith in 1572, were prevailed upon through his influence to consent that the title but not the order of bishop should be introduced. This was complying so far with Morton’s wishes, that it gave him and other nobles the power of nominating the titular bishop, but of retaining in their own hands the revenues that belong to the benefice. The bishops created in this way were called by the common people, who had sense enough to discern the recent drift, Tulehan bishops. Thus they called them from a custom, at that time prevalent in Scotland, of placing a calf’s skin stuffed with straw, called a tullehan, before cows when milking, to induce them to give their milk; for, says an old historian, “the bishop had the tulle, but my lord got the milk.” This new order of bishops led Patrick Adamson to say in a sermon, “that there were now three kinds of bishops: my lord’s bishop, my lord’s bishop, and the Lord’s bishop.” My lord bishop being the popish bishop, my lord’s bishop the regent’s, and the Lord’s being the minister of Christ Adamson, however, we are sorry to add, afterwards became a bishop himself. The apostasy of this accomplished, but unhappy man, while it was a source of great regret to his brethren, gave occasion to the following pleasantry among the countrymen. He had a favourite phrase which he often made use of in his sermons, viz. “The prophet would mean here.” Montgomery a court poet observing this, and hearing of his acceptance of the archbishoprick of St. Andrews, said, “For as often as I have been told what the prophet would mean, I never knew what he really meant till now.” In 1571, Andrew Melville returned to Scotland, and under his influence the General Assembly re-