

should be provided; that when in Scotland they were always marched in a body to the Scotch Church; and that it appeared to him that professing to be Presbyterians, it was the duty of Major Wyndham to march them to the Presbyterian Church without inquiring whether they chose it or not, as is done in the case of Episcopalians and Roman Catholics.

Mr. Beattie, of Dundalk, stated that when the Scotch Greys came to Dundalk, Major Wyndham refused to allow him to preach to them in the barracks, but that on application to Sir E. Blakeney, this liberty was granted—only a few of the men, however, attended him, as they thought that by doing so, they were giving offence to their commander, and that he received no remuneration for any service which he rendered them.

The impression of the Synod seemed to be that the Scotch Greys refusing to attend the Scotch Church, arose from the undue influence of Major Wyndham, and it was unanimously resolved that the Moderator do immediately open a correspondence with the proper quarter, on the subject.

#### CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

**Thursday, July 6.**—The minute of the confirmed overture of last year on the restoration of communion with the Church of Scotland, and for allowing members of it to sit, deliberate, and vote in the Synod of Ulster, on being introduced, was read.

The resolution was then put and carried, and Dr Barnett said he should enter his dissent and his reasons.

Dr. Barnett said he rose to present his reasons for dissenting from the resolution to which he had called their attention in the morning. The Reverend Doctor then read the following:—

We, the undersigned, dissent from the above overture for the following reasons:

I Because we deem it inconsistent with the revealed authority of Christ, and with fidelity to our own profession, to enter into communion with any Church, unless we have secured to us all due means of testifying against her evils.

II Because the repeal of the general law of this Synod, on the point referred to in the overture, is inexpedient in itself, and of injurious tendency as a precedent.

III Because, as it is matter of public notoriety, that there exists among the ministers of the Church of Scotland a decided contrariety of sentiment respecting several of the most important doctrines contained in the formularies of that Church, respecting the law of Patronage and other evils which prevail in her administration, and as we cannot consistently, with our

solemnly avowed principles, admit to a seat in our Church Judicatories any of those ministers, who are opposed to our received doctrines or discipline, we regard the continuance of the law as indispensable, to enable this Synod to distinguish between those whom we should refuse.

Dr Barnett moved that these reasons be inserted in the minutes.

The Rev. Mr. Henry (Drumbanagher) seconded the motion.

Dr Cooke moved, as an amendment, that they be rejected, and that simply because they were not true. They complained that they had no means of testifying against the evils of the church of Scotland; and yet, were not those reasons a justification against them? They had abundant means of testifying against them. They might write a book, they had the newspapers, and they had public meetings. The first of the reasons talked of all "due means." They had those means. They might apply to the Supreme Court, and as, as the English churches were asking, the right to sit by delegation. The Scottish Synods were already making overtures that the Synod of Ulster might so sit. The reasons talked of the differences existing in the Church of Scotland. Had they no differences in the Synod of Ulster? There were more differences in this Synod than in the General Assembly. We condemn divisions, and yet we are divided. One party in that Synod condemned what they called the "moderates" of Scotland. Did they know that Dr M'Leod was condemned as a moderate? Let the protesters in this case act like men. Let them say that though Scotland has done something for us, we yet require more. She did something when she opened her pulpits to our preachers, and contributed from her purse to the wants of our schools. Let them say she actually forced her liberality on Dr Stewart and Dr. Cooke, and yet we want more. He contended that if they took the right means, they would soon be admitted into the Church Courts of Scotland, but until they took those means they could not stand *recti in curia*, when preferring a charge against the mother church. The protesters were against the resolution because it might form a "dangerous precedent." Precedent for what? Was it for admitting such men as Dr M'Leod? They were more honoured by his presence than he by being admitted. They talked of the evils of Patronage in Scotland. Why, they had an equally bad system of Patronage in their own church. Were they not in a pretty state to purify the Church of