

four. Were any troubles to arise, it requires little demonstration to prove that the acts of these four trustees could not stand the test in Court, acting under the new bill. And what use to frame laws of any kind, if persons are allowed to break them at will? That which constitutes the excellency of the British rule is, that not only good laws are devised, but also enforced. Of what advantage can the laws of God be to individuals or communities, but in the observance of them; and what occasions all evil but the violation of them?

Thus, in the violation of the constitutional and accredited laws of our Church, ministers were rejected, and ministers were admitted into the Church Courts, and allowed to adjudicate in civil and ecclesiastical matters, and thus an opportunity was afforded to those who felt that they had been wronged, to bring the Church into collision with the State, and to obtain sentence submitting the Church to civil penalties.

Now, four things may serve to prove that neither the Constitutional Church of Scotland nor the State was to blame for the troubles which ensued; but, rather, those who were pledged to maintain the rules and laws of contract, and yet introduced new rules and new elements into the Church Courts, which caused these troubles and grievances.

First: After the secession of '43, the Church reverted to her constitutional laws in the admission of ministers, and did not admit any to sit in her Church Courts but such as had a legal ecclesiastical right. Hence there has been no collision between Church and State since the Disruption. Second: The Church made the requisite provision for admitting *quod sacra* ministers into the Church Courts, and the State at once consented to have these admitted into the compact, on the same terms with those formerly received. Third: The Free Church has not adopted the principle involved in the Veto Act, when they framed laws for themselves. And moreover, they do not regard it a sufficient reason for admitting into the Church Courts, that a minister labors in a certain field, or that he is ordained. The people to whom he ministers must make up a certain fixed salary before he is allowed to sit in Church Courts and adjudicate there in matters spiritual or temporal. And thus they may (as had been often laid to the charge of our Church) exclude a much wiser and better minister from the Church Courts than some who rule in their Church. Fourth: The fact of separating from the Established Church does not prevent collision with the State, when the ecclesiastical and secular rights of individuals are interfered with, contrary to the rules of compact framed for the guidance and protection of the society. This is abundantly verified in the case of *McMillan versus the Free Church*.

We have now gone over the several points proposed at the outset of our review. In our

next paper we shall adduce some testimonials of the friends of the Church, who spoke of her when interested in her welfare, and then of those who gave their willing and disinterested testimony, and conclude our subject with some general observations.

A. M'K.

—o—

Meeting of the Synod of New Brunswick.

THE Synod of our Church in New Brunswick held its session at Fredericton in the second week of August; and, as we had the happiness of being present, we can certainly say that a more agreeable meeting of Synod we seldom, if ever, attended. The weather was beautiful—the place of meeting very delightful—our friends in the city most kind, and every member of the Court anxious to promote the best interests of the Church. The Synod sermon (which, the readers of the *Record* may see, was an excellent one) was preached by Mr. Kidd of Richmond. Dr. Donald was chosen Moderator, and Dr. Brooke acted as Clerk of Synod. Three of the ministers of New Brunswick were absent. The Synod of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island was fully represented, having, in addition to the Corresponding Members, no less than three of the brethren from the Pictou Presbytery attending the deliberations of the Court. Our welcome was most cordial, and our intercourse with the brethren in New Brunswick most agreeable.

The Synod of our Church in New Brunswick is numerically less than that of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. Several of the charges are at present vacant. Many of the stations are not yet in a position to support those ministers settled among them, and, consequently, are aided by the parent Church. Still, the Synod in the other Province has many elements of strength and prosperity. She numbers among her members such names as those of Dr. Donald, Dr. Brooke, Dr. Henderson and Mr. Ross,—veterans in the service of the Church, who have long been laborers in the Colonial field, and whose experience must always be valuable in guiding the deliberations of Synod, as their character and learning impart dignity and strength to the Court. They have also young men brim-full of enthusiasm, willing to do their work, and able to do it well. Several measures of importance were earnestly but calmly discussed, and several important findings recorded. Some of those were of a local character, and others of a more general: but, as the Minutes may appear in next No. of the *Record*, we need not give them in detail. The members from the Synod of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island were, however, specially pleased with the following resolutions:—

1. A grant of \$40 from the Synod Fund