

til changes analogous to those proposed to be made in Scotland are brought into operation here, we can look for no improvement. There, according even to the Commissioners, they are asked for only for the purpose of producing uniformity and, as a consequence, greater efficiency. Here they are absolutely required to enable us to derive the slightest benefit from the large amount yearly spent without any appreciable result. That Roman Catholic parents themselves feel the evils of the present mismanagement is well known to all who have an opportunity of becoming acquainted with their real sentiments, and were it not for the thralldom in which so many of them are held, the number of those attending the non Catholic schools, large as it is proportionately, would be indefinitely increased. The movement for the promotion of Protestant education in Lower Canada, against which we argued at the time the Association was formed, has already borne the only fruits that could have been expected. The name was taken advantage of to urge claims on behalf of the Roman Catholics in Upper Canada, which would have been otherwise untenable, and to gain privileges which they had no right to demand. The duty of all who seek by means of education, to raise the population of Lower Canada to a higher level than that on which it now stands, is to demand from the Legislature a National System of Common Schools and to be satisfied with nothing short of this.



E think it unfortunate that our correspondent "Presbyter" should have brought, in the last number, the Presbytery of Renfrew case to the light of day. It is indeed remarkable that it should not have been publicly commented upon before, but we conceive that a proper and delicate regard to the feelings of some who were deeply affected by the case prompted silence. It is a pity the same silence has not continued to be observed; the public discussion of it can do no good now but will only awaken painful feelings that by this time were probably nigh lulled to sleep, and open afresh wounds that had begun to heal. It could not be but that the caustic remarks of "Presbyter" should call forth a rejoinder from the Presbytery of Renfrew, such

as that which will be found elsewhere in this month's issue; and as the subject has been brought so prominently under notice, we feel called upon to offer two or three observations both on the case itself and on "Presbyter's" remarks on the subject.

As "Renfrew" observes, it was scarcely safe for "Presbyter" to make a couple of "Memoranda" from the Synod's Minutes the ground of so sweeping a censure as he pronounced upon the Presbytery's action. "Presbyter" must know that these memoranda are not part of the church's record at all: they are just notes or jottings of events furnished to the Synod Clerk by Presbytery Clerks upon their own responsibility, and without any attestation; and it is as absurd to found an accusation upon one of these memoranda as it would be for a judge to pronounce an opinion upon a law by merely reading the marginal references and provisos. These memoranda are headings or *résumés*, but they do not pretend to exhibit the full bearings of the points summed up. From what "Renfrew" says, we learn that Mr. McMorine's defection from the ministry in our Church was based upon far stronger and more important grounds than merely doubts as to the Scriptural authority and validity of the Presbyterian form of church government. We know from other sources that he has renounced some of the more prominent doctrines, we shall not say of *Presbyterian* belief, but also of the xxxix Articles, and has espoused views regarding them which are held in abomination even by great multitudes of Evangelical Episcopalians.

Instead of presuming, in the absence of full information on the subject, everything to be in favour of the young minister who has seceded, and everything to be against the Presbytery, he might have presumed from the fact that no appeal had been taken from or dissent recorded against the action of the Presbytery that they had good grounds for taking the course they did; as it is hardly conceivable that any Presbytery as a whole should be carried away by sentiments of high churchism or any other feeling adverse to calm justice. The unanimity of the Presbytery in the matter shows that they felt the case to be a grave one, demanding a grave remedy.

But above all "Presbyter" should have been satisfied at least as to the *regularity* of the Presbytery's action from the fact that the Synod as a Court of Review saw nothing to blame in what had been done. The lynx-eyed "Committee on Records" is