

PROFESSOR KING AND THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

In conducting the Record we have studiously avoided all controversy. Our motto has been to live at peace with all men, and to inculcate those principles of charity and brotherly love which form so large a portion of the Christian faith. A charge however has been brought against our Church and the ministers of our Church, by a gentleman, occupying an important and responsible position, and which we feel bound as a matter of duty to answer and refute. It is true that the bitter and unchristian spirit in which Mr. King brings forward his accusations strips them of much, perhaps of almost all importance, still it is well that we should place on record our protest against the manner of the charge and disprove also the charge itself. And first of all we have no desire nor intention to interfere in the remotest manner with the subject of Union between the Free and Presbyterian Churches. That Union has now taken place, and if its effect should be the promotion of God's glory, none will rejoice more sincerely than ourselves. Most of our readers are aware, that a speech said to have been delivered by Mr. King in the Free Church Assembly, Edinburgh, was reported in the organ of that Church at home, and copied into some Colonial papers, to the effect that several ministers of the Church of Scotland in Nova Scotia had stated to Mr. King that they considered themselves quite independent and that if they were in Scotland they would belong to the Free Church. This extraordinary statement of course attracted a good deal of attention, and the Presbytery officious felt it their duty to give it a formal and emphatic contradiction so far as they were concerned. On the 4th of October Mr. King took occasion to allude to the subject, and to state that he spoke of the people not the ministers of the Church of Scotland, and proceeded in language most abusive and insulting to attack both our Church and its ministers. It will be observed that in this matter Mr. King was not only aggressor but the aggressor after a most worthy and unchristian fashion. The ministers of the Church of Scotland were not precipitate in the action they took. The speech was before the public some months before they refuted the gross slander which seemed to be cast upon them. During all that time Mr. King made no attempt to correct the misstatement, and in all probability could not have corrected it at all, had not the official denial been made public. He acted before a large Assembly that the great object of ambition of the ministers of the Church of Scotland in Nova Scotia was to obtain a charge in Scotland, and were they to deny it, he would not believe them. Such language used by one clergyman towards brethren of a different denomination, with whom the Church to which Mr. K. belongs professes

an anxious desire for Union, is perhaps beneath notice. It is imputing motives in the worst possible spirit, not only with very little ground work but in the face of the truth, for it is very well known that more than one minister of our Church in 1843 stood faithfully at their post, when they easily could have got comfortable parishes in Scotland and at a time too when their temporal comforts were slenderly cared for in this country.

Professor King went on to say that enlightened or pious man would belong to the Church of Scotland. Well might the Rev. Mr. Scott characterize this and other statements of a similar character "as bold and reckless assertions." We believe that had Dr. Guthrie or Dr. Hanna, or even Mr. Candlish been present at that meeting, would have been taken to task in a manner that would have put even him to open shame. To answer such a charge, would be to insult our readers, and give the poor calumny importance to which it is not entitled. Professor King has offered a personal and studied insult not only to the ministers of our Church in this Province, but to every minister and every member of that Church at home and abroad.

He tells us that the Church of Scotland "an enslaved Church." We answer that is practically the freest Church in Christendom. What is known as the Scoonie Case has proved this most triumphantly. Here presentee was set aside by the Assembly, simply because a majority of the people preferred another. The individual rejected was a man of great accomplishments and of irreproachable character, in addition to this was the choice of the rich and influential portion of the congregation, and yet by an overwhelming majority the presentation was set aside. The wishes of the great body of the people were respected in opposition to those of the select few, but who in all probability pay nine-tenths of the minister's salary. This is slavery, we would like to understand what liberty is. Is there any dissentient Church that could or would have acted in this manner. There is no such liberty Churches of any denomination in this Province, for it is well known to every body that the real patrons of a Church here when becomes vacant are half a dozen or at most a dozen who pay the highest pew rents. Such a decision as that of Scoonie in a Presbyterian Church in Nova Scotia, would be a virtual impossibility. If 10 or 12 persons who pay from £6 to £10 a year towards the support of a minister were to fix upon any particular man, those who pay a dollar or at most nothing would not dare to open their mouths or if they did, it would be looked upon as a gross presumption. In practice, almost every appointment is made by a few, and had it been a minority in the Scoonie Case been in Nova Scotia instead of in Scotland, they would doubt have carried the day. It was a conti-