

that the "Presbyterian" was conducted by laymen of Christian temper and prudence, and from whom, at least, we might always expect to be treated as gentlemen—must we think otherwise in future? Our readers have no conception of the silly stories which from time to time through a Scotch Correspondent have been wantonly retailed by that Journal about the Free Church. When anything, too, was said about the proceedings of the Church of Scotland in any of our papers straightway we find a bitter reply full of personalities; but not content in such cases with reply, the tempting opportunity is also taken, in long and weary columns to vilify the Free Church and her labours. No opportunity has been allowed to escape of holding her up to the contempt of its readers. In the article referred to there is a repetition of the same offence. If the party who writes this review of our statements thinks them unfounded let him reply in a manly way; but instead of this we have here over and above words of reply a tirade of simple abuse. Doubtless the writer thinks it very smart and very weighty, and imagines that he has settled both the "Presbyter" and the "Free Church" at one stroke. We can afford to smile at his simplicity. He speaks somewhat boastingly of the strength of his Church and the weakness of ours. Every one knows that the Free Church in this Province is, at least, twice as strong in ministers, members and means as the representative of the Church of Scotland. We wish this latter Church were strong for then it could afford to be magnanimous. At present the Presbyterian faith and polity are more likely to suffer from its weakness than benefit by its strength.

Notwithstanding the denial by the "Presbyterian" of the accuracy of our statement about the Clergy Reserves, we beg to reassert that his Church has the reversion of the commutation money at its absolute disposal for the purposes of aggressive extension, and for this purpose, we believe, it has already been used, and so far it has been a weapon of an unspiritual and unhallowed kind.

We further beg to say, that we know the reasons for which we have left the communion of the Church of Scotland as by law established, although the "Presbyterian" remains in "utter ignorance" of all that has been said on the subject. The question with us is not, as the "Presbyterian" insinuates, simply the position of his Church in this Province. To put the matter in debate in this form is to throw dust in the eyes of the people. We have to consider not only the character of his Church, but its complicity with the State Church at home. Our reviewer and others may boast of the freedom of their Church in this country, and claim for it all the attributes of a free community, and none will object; but in this they have no choice. They cannot barter the liberties of Christ's people here, as is done at home, for the sake of State connection. They know that not one of their Congregations would for a day submit to the yoke which their brethren bear at home. We do not, therefore, wonder at ministers of the State Church of Scotland in this Province being so solicitous to make known to every one that there is no difference between them and the Free Church. This is an unconscious homage to the truth of our principles and the rectitude of our procedure. But the comparison is not between us and the Church of Scotland in Canada; it is with the State Church of Scotland which it represents. Will the reviewer tell us that there is no difference between the position of that Church and the Free Church of Scotland? We trow not. The State Church at home, with which he claims connection, does not, it is well known, permit her people to elect their own ministers, but subjects them to the caprice of irresponsible patrons. If a presentee be ever so unsuitable and acceptable, as in the humiliating case of Kilmalcolm now pending, the only right which the people possess in the case is the right of unlimited grumbling. Lord Aberdeen's Act permits objections to be stated at the expense of a long, harassing, and costly process of law sufficient to ruin any parish; even then