

To the Editor of the *Monthly Record*.

SIR,—Will you kindly allow me a little space for a few remarks upon an article which appeared in the *RECORD* of July, headed 'The Macdonnell Case.'

The article alluded to has, I fear, proved both a 'stumbling block' and a 'rock of offence' to many of the staunchest supporters of the Church of Scotland, within the bounds of Pictou Presbytery—the former from the manner in which it appears, the latter from the matter it contains.

'The Macdonnell case' having been presented to the readers of the *RECORD* in the form of an original article, without any qualifying statement as to the sentiments contained therein being endorsed or not by the Editor, I believe that many of those to whom I refer who are not experts in literary criticism, have overlooked the slight internal evidence it contains of its being merely extracted from some other paper, and that therefore the then acting Editor, whether he held them or not, can in nowise be considered responsible for the opinions it contains.

With regard to the more important subject—the opinions embodied in the article—although I feel that it is great presumption in so feeble a person as myself, to dare to join issue with a Goliath of the press of some city of either of the greater provinces, from a paper of one of which I believe the 'case' to have been taken, yet knowing that in the struggle of right against might, truth against error the battle is not always to the strong, I venture to do so.

The writer of the 'case' evidently considers himself a perfect master of that literary 'fence', which at no time very ingenuous, is often very convenient to men in his position, as it helps them, whilst making a great display, to hold their own *with* all sides. In this instance I think both churches have good reason to exclaim, 'save us from such

friends.' He is a blunt, honest friend this, for sooth, to both parties and consequently privileged to tell them in turn disagreeable truths as he supposes. The first of these to which he treats the Established Church is that at the disruption she lost, 'as a rule' the men who were 'most in earnest.' This is surely a sufficiently nauseous draught, but then the child may be coaxed to swallow it, for is it not a nice tempting spoonful of sugar to take *after it*, to know that these men were more severe in their views of Church doctrine and Church discipline than is compatible with the existence of a *liberal Church*, which may even look forward to a glorious future in which she 'may get along' without any other than the Congregationalist's formulated system of theology, the Bible. Far be it from me to deny that at the disruption many, very many noble and earnest men left the Church of Scotland, and deeply too did she feel their loss, but that, 'as a rule,' the men who remained were both able for and earnest in their work, I need only point this arbiter *Ecclesiarum* to results, unless, indeed, he is utterly ignorant of what he presumes to write upon, or belongs to some ornithological species allied to Coleridge's owlet atheism which

"Hoots at the glorious sun in heaven
Crying out, 'where is it?'"

as to another of those '*diries* in which he seems as strong as all the Churches combined are in '*doxies*' I should like to learn the curious mental process by which one arrives at the conclusion that a Church not alone recognized by the State as it is *organically* constituted, but actually forming part of the body politic can have less power to enforce the observance of her Standards than a mere voluntary Association. I am loth to think that the writer in his allusion to this subject would insinuate that the Church of Scotland is becoming so faithless that she will not enforce her author-