

movement, not of a party adopting new principles, but of the Church of Scotland maintaining the principles of 1617,—maintaining the principles which she held in 1690—maintaining the principles which she held in 1733, although a party called the Moderates were trampling upon them—maintaining the principles which she held forth in her Claim of Right, in 1812; and renouncing the benefits of an Establishment when, *through a new mode of interpreting and administering the civil law*, the benefits of the Establishment could no longer be enjoyed but through the sacrifice of these principles. The change effected by this new mode of administering the civil law in reference to ecclesiastical affairs is such, that no man who, in the language of the Seceders, “desires to adhere to the principles of the true presbyterian, covenanted Church of Scotland,” has an inch of ground to stand upon in the Scottish Establishment now. This was very soon brought out in the conduct of some who have a right to be regarded as at once competent and impartial judges. One instance must suffice. At the time of the Disruption, there was a deputation in Edinburgh from the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, with a commission to hold friendly correspondence, on behalf of that Church, with the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. These deputies witnessed the proceedings of the Disruption. They had now to consider how they were to execute their commission; and, after due deliberation, found that they could not acknowledge the Ecclesiastical Establishment, as it now stood, as their parent Church, the Church of Scotland. It was not there that they could find the representatives of the Bairs, and the Livingstons, whose labours had been so much blessed to Ireland, in the seventeenth century. They found their way to Canonmills, and they laid their commission before the Assembly there, as the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. When they returned to their constituents, their conduct was approved of, as in precise accordance with the terms of their commission. The correspondence continues to be maintained, not with the Establishment, but with the Free Church of Scotland.

POSTSCRIPT.

The preceding Remarks have extended so far, that there is not sufficient space

left for entering upon a statement of evidence in proof of the averment, “That Mr. Trotter calumniates the Westminster Assembly of Divines, and gives a most erroneous view of their labours with respect to the Confession of Faith.” It must therefore stand over till another opportunity, as must also some remarks on the principal portion of a Letter which he has since published in the “Presbyterian Witness”, in which he attempts still further to bolster up the same charges.

In this subsequent Letter, he comes out with additional mistatements, in his attempt to defend the untenable position which he took up, when, in his Letter which appeared in the “Guardian” of this city, Sept. 28th, 1849, he said, “but it is a fact of which you cannot be ignorant, that there are many in the Free Church, and that the number is rapidly increasing, who are willing to dispense with the Confession of Faith altogether, which would leave them at liberty to maintain or depart from its doctrines as they please. I have different authorities for making such a statement, but shall confine myself to one at present.” The one authority on which he founds so grave a charge, is an extract from a speech of Dr McKay’s, before the Free Church Commission in 1848. He now says, “we have given it as reported by their own friends, and allowed it to speak for itself; and the Professor has not ventured to correct any of the Dr’s statement.” The Doctor’s statement did not require to be corrected; but Mr. Trotter’s mistatement did; and it was corrected. It is a fact, that, from a desire to act with other bodies in the matter of education in common schools, there are numbers who would have the Church put her own standards in abeyance so far as not to insist upon the subscription of the Confession of Faith by the *school-masters*. It is not a fact, however, that what is thus admitted to be true is a warrant for Mr. Trotter to say that in this he has a proof “that there are many in the Free Church, and that the number is rapidly increasing who are willing to dispense with the Confession of Faith altogether, which would leave them at liberty to maintain or depart from its doctrines as they please.” As if, however, the admission of facts as stated by Dr. McKay were an admission of the extravagant mistatements of Mr. Trotter, he goes on with an air of triumph to say, “The commission thus adjured did not venture to deny it, and neither has the Professor.—