

been accomplished ; let him study the whole subject in the light of the great principles of the Bible, touching Covenanting and Covenant obligation ; let him study God's past dealings with nations and churches for breach of their fathers' vows, and he will find the conclusion irresistible, that the British Covenants are still binding morally on the British nation, and will be so until the great and glorious objects aimed at shall be accomplished.

But what is the present attitude of Britain in relation to these national vows ? It is that of national repudiation. A very few years after they became law, they were effaced from the Statute book. On the restoration of Charles II, an act was passed by the legislature, declaring these Covenant deeds null and void, and without any legal force in any part of the realm. They were even branded as treasonable documents, and ordered to be burned by the common hangman. That act, commonly called the Act Rescissory, is still on the Statute book. It is a portion of that national constitution which the sovereign swears to support in the coronation oath, and which the people swear to support in the oath of allegiance. It is an act that has involved the nation in the guilt of national perjury, by repudiating solemn engagements sealed by an oath with uplifted hand to God. Can any one swear to support such an act as that and be guiltless ?

To such an act still unrepealed, Reformed Presbyterians cannot give their consent, either personally or by representation. For nearly two hundred years our church has occupied the position of dissent from the British constitution. We have never sought to conceal that position. We have never been ashamed of it. Our testimony is before the church and the world. We have earned a large measure of reproach by our attitude of political isolation. We are sometimes accused of hair-splitting, magnifying trifles, being righteous over much, etc., by adopting a position of such singularity. It is generally considered that the moral issues involved in our political dissent are not of sufficient value to warrant the sacrifice of such political privileges as others enjoy. To all such reproaches we reply in the language of the son of Jesse to his elder brother