

Scotland?—He then alluded to the third reason. It charged the Church of Scotland with a contrariety of sentiment respecting several of “the most important doctrines,” &c. Justification by faith through Jesus Christ was the most important doctrine—the centre of the circle of eternal truth. Does the church of Scotland entertain a contrariety of sentiment upon that subject?

Dr. Barnett—Yes.

Dr. Cook said some think so, but he neither knew nor believed it. He had studied the Church of Scotland much, and he had never discovered it. He had once heard that Dr. Chalmers was at one time a Socinian, and on enquiry he found it was entirely untrue. Thus it was that rumors against the Scottish Church was propagated. Let those who attacked the Church of Scotland do so, not with vague generalities—let them give names and details—let them state facts. As to the evils of Patronage, he Dr. Cooke had for years been labouring to effect a change in the Patronage, even of their own Church; his notice had been year after year on the books, and he had not brought it forward because he was afraid he could not carry it. They had the Patronage of money in the Synod of Ulster, and it was quite as bad as the Patronage in the Church of Scotland. As he meant now to take an active part in the proceedings of the Belfast Institution, he would give one pound (a-year) as a prize for the best explanation of the unintelligibility of these reasons. He was sorry to see some of the names which were attached to that document. He moved that the reasons be rejected.

The Rev. Mr. Brown seconded the motion of Dr. Cooke.

Dr. Reid referred to the code, to prove that though they could not insert the reasons on the minutes, unless by resolution, they could not reject them. They must be held *in retentis*.

Dr. Barnett did not intend to reply to all that Dr. Cooke had said. But as the Rev. Doctor had asked for information, he should have it from Dr. Burns, in a sermon of his, entitled, “The Religious Establishment of Scotland Defended,” preached before the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr. The Rev. Dr. Burns, late Moderator of Synod, says, “Who are the worst foes of our establishment? The men who can eat her bread while they do not her work—the men who can preach Socinian, Pelagian, or Antinomian heresies, while they subscribe a Calvinistic creed—the men who can prostitute the ‘chair of truth,’ to the gratification of a base and brutal spirit of personal revenge—the men who can abuse

the holy discipline of the church to the purposes of fell malignity—the men whose zeal never kindles, save only when ‘the rights of the Church,’ as they term them, are supposed to be in danger—the men who disgrace their calling by the grossness of intemperance and by the scandals of profligacy; and yet, among these, may be sometimes seen the loudest and the boldest of our defenders. From such defenders of the church, “good Lord, deliver us.” That one extract justified their “reasons.” Dr. Barnett then referred to other publications by Ministers of the Scottish Church, to prove that the widest difference existed amongst them on the Holy Truths of God. When he referred to one of these writers whom, he said, had never been condemned for his most heterodox notions of faith.—

Dr. Cooke said—Do you mean Dr. Ritchie?

Dr. Barnett—I do.

Dr. Cooke—He is dead, and was tried for his heresy.

Dr. Barnett—He was tried—but how? His own Presbytery never noticed his case, but that most worthy man, Mr. Cunningham, laid the work on the table, before the General Assembly, and by overwhelming influence, the writer was shielded, and Mr. Cunningham almost condemned for bringing it forward. The writer of a book containing the grossest Socinianism, was well known to be a minister of the Church of Scotland. Had Dr. Burns, in his sermon, reviled the Church of Scotland? If he had not—and who would say that he had—when the Synod, by publishing his sermon, approved of it, how could the protestors be said to have stood upon no foundation? Much had been said about the admission of Dr. McLeod. He rejoiced at it, and would be proud to see such men in their Church Court. In justice to Dr. Barnett, we are bound to state that the above is merely an outline of his argumentative address.

The question *retain* or *reject* was ultimately put. The numbers were:—For *reject*, 23 ministers, and 3 elders; *not reject* 16 ministers, and 1 elder.

ERRATA IN LAST NO.

The author of the “Memoir of Dr. Spark’s Life,” earnestly requests the readers of this periodical to correct the following dates, which, if left to remain as they are, must create uncertainty and confusion in future times when they cannot be corrected.

Page 113,	1st c. ls. 2d	& 14th,	for 1736, read 1784.
Page 230	do. c. line	19th,	for 1806, read 1814.
Page 292	do. c. line	34th,	for 1833, read 1783.
Page do. do. c. line		35th,	for 1834, read 1784.
Page 223	do. c. line	11th,	for 1803, read 1804.
Page 224	do. c. line	15th,	for 1806, read 1814.