

variety of proceedings, in which those who maintained the New Light, both in the Burgher and in the Anti-Burgher Synods, endeavoured to reach their object by setting themselves and their respective churches free from an adherence to the particular points referred to in the confession, and those who adhered to the old doctrine resisted these attempts and insisted upon the maintenance of the Confession in all its integrity, the two bodies again divided. A few years before the close of the last century, the Burgher Synod formed themselves into two distinctive bodies called the Old Light and the New Light Burghers. A few years after the commencement of the present century, a similar division took place among the Anti-Burghers, who also were broken up into two separate bodies, the old Light Anti-Burghers, and the New Light Anti-Burghers. These designations are given here, not as being the most formal, but as being those by which, it is supposed, the respective bodies are most commonly known. The Free Synod, then, holding by the Confession of Faith in its integrity, and persuaded that the Basis of Union, if properly understood, had secured this, in the passage just quoted, and without a single word to aggravate the feeling of difference, referred to the well known historical fact that the United Secession had adopted the New Light, and had consequently ceased to hold the Confession in its integrity; that it might be at once seen that she could not consistently unite with that body, or with those who concurred with them in their views. Upon this, the Presbyterian Synod, in their Reply, say, "We regret that they have expressed themselves so very generally upon this subject, but from their reference to 'what has been called the new light,' we are at no loss to understand what are the duties or supposed duties of the civil magistrate to which they allude. Toward the close of the last century, a controversy arose in the United Secession Church, then divided in two branches, on the question whether or not their standards favoured persecution for conscience sake. For the purpose of terminating the controversy, and settling the agitation which it had occasioned, both branches passed what may be called a declaratory act to the effect, that they did not approve of enforcing religion by civil pains and penalties." "The New Light Seceders did not object to the conceding of any other

power to the civil magistrate, or the imposing upon him of any other duty than that of promoting religion by compulsory measures." In like manner, Mr. Trotter, in his Letter which appeared in the "Guardian" of Sept. 21st., 1849, says, "Had you been more general I should have supposed you to refer to the Voluntary movement, which is comparatively recent, but as it would be ungenerous to impute to you such palpable ignorance as this would take for granted, I must believe you to refer to the New Light controversy, which is more than fifty years old, and was terminated before the commencement of this century; and if so, the duties of the magistrate to which you refer, namely, those of roasting the living bodies of men for the benefit of souls, and of enlightening their consciences by crushing their bones, will hardly find abettors in any other body than your own."

In this latter passage, which is to be understood as something particularly smart, Mr. Trotter has expressed himself in a coarseness of style to which the Synod in their Letter have not ventured to commit themselves. Both his Letter, however, and the Synod's would represent the New Light which began to be maintained in the Secession towards the close of last century as being simply an opposition to persecuting principles. It is thus modestly assumed that the adherents to the New Light are the grand advocates of the rights of conscience, and of civil and religious liberty; while those who differed from them on the points which were really in dispute are slandered as the abettors of persecution. Speaking of that portion of the adherents to the Old Light who joined the Church of Scotland in 1839, Mr. Trotter, in the above-mentioned Letter, says, "They held, as you of course must do, since you approve of their principles, that magistrates are bound by fire and sword, boots, screws, and thumbkins, &c., to suppress heresy and preserve orthodoxy in the Christian Church." In an Appendix also (No ii.) to the Reply of the Presbyterian Synod, these brethren say, "As not many persons in this country are acquainted with the New Light controversy, it may be as well to quote the words of the Synodical decision in order that the public may see distinctly what it is, at which our Free Church brethren have taken offence." Instead, however, of quoting to the extent that is necessary to enable the public to see what are the points of difference,