From Neilson's Quebec Gazette, Monday, March 4.

Presbytery of Quebec.

On Thursday last, the Presbytery of Quebec, met in St. Andrew's Church, the Rev. J. Clugston, Moderator, P. T.

A call was given in to the Presbytery, in favour of the Rev. S. Fraser, A. M., from the Presbyterian congregation of St. Charles, Belle Alliance and Kennebec Road; and also a letter from Mr. Fraser, accepting of the call. The Presbytery agreed to take Mr. Fraser's trials on the 28th day of March, and in the event of their being sustained, to proceed to his ordination that day, Mr. McMorine, of Melbourne, to preside.

It was stated that £120 had been raised towards obtaining the services of a French Protestant Missionary in Quebec, in connexion with the Presbytery. The sanction of the Presbytery was also given to a plan already in operation in St. Andrew's and St. John's Churches, for raising a Presbytery fund for the support of Ministers and Missionaries within the bounds,—and the Presbytery agreed that the administration of the said fund should rest in the hands of the Ministers of the Presbytery resident in Quebec.—It is expected that at least £200 a-year will be thus raised.

The Moderator read for the information of the Presbytery, the Resolutions of the Commission of Synod, which was presented last week, and stated that he was about to call a meeting of Synod, in compliance with these Resolutions.

Dr. Cook then addressed the Presbytery as follows:—

MODERATOR,—I entirely approve the course you have taken in laying the resolutions of the Commission before the Presbytery, and in stating your own decision to comply with the request which these resolutions contain. The points, which the Supreme Court of the Church is to be called together at so early a period to decide, deeply affect the peace and well-being of the whole Presbyterian body in this Province, and it is reasonable not only that we should consider these points ourselves, seriously, prayerfully, and with a view to a speedy decision of them, but also that we should take counsel together concerning them, and each seek to have his judgment corrected or confirmed by comparing it with the views of others equally able and equally interested to come to a right conclusion. Especially is it becoming that we should take counsel together in Presbyteries, since it is only in them that many of the office bearers of the Church have an opportunity of expressing their sentiments. That the mind of this Presbytery may be fully expressed, I shall now lay on the table an overture to the Synod, with the understanding, that you will delay any decision on it, till our next ordinary meeting, when the brethren who are absent, may have an opportunity of attending or of otherwise expressing their sentiments to us. It is not without great reluctance I confess, I take even this responsibility. I am afraid of doing harm. But the time has come when something must be risked. The emergency has been forced on us, and we must all consider how to meet it.

I observe, Sir, it is stated in your circular, that one object of the proposed meeting of Synod, is to consider the present position of the Church. It will aid us I think in this matter, to consider what has been her past position—her position in respect to the Church of Scotland previous to the disruption and to the Resolutions of last Synod. Was it or was it not an independent position?—that is, independent as respects the Church of Scotland? On this point, there has been as it appears to me, considerable misapprehension, and this has been occasioned by confounding together two things which are essentially different.—There is an independence as regards things ecclesiastical, and there is an independence as regards things civil. Our Church has always possessed the one.—But she does not possess the other.

It is not unnatural for people in this country to suppose that the Synod of Canada, consisting chiefly of Scottish Ministers, holding the standards of the Scottish Church, and in connection with it, is placed in something like the same relation to the Church of Scotland, as any one of the Scotch Synods. No mistake can be greater. The Synod of Canada was not constituted by the authority of the Church of Scotland, though it was afterwards recognized by that Church. It was constituted by a body of regularly ordained Ministers and Elders exercising jurisdiction over Christian congregations, and who, in the absence of any regular ecclesiastical government, found themselves called in the Providence of God, to establish that form of it which they believed to be most according to the word of God, and best fitted to maintain the good order of His Church. The recognition of the Synod by the General Assembly, add d nothing to its spiritual authority—though it had the effect, no doubt, of inducing many, more willingly, to recognise it. Neither could the refusal of such recognition have detracted from the spiritual power of the Synod. For the office-bearers of the Church to constitute the Synod at the time that was done, was not only to exercise a right belonging to them, but to perform a duty required by their commission not only to feed, but to rule the Church of God.

And as no dependence was involved in the manner of the Synod's establishment, so neither did the Church of Scotland subsequently assume any authority over it. How, indeed, could it do so on any sound principle of Presbyterian Church Government? That government is essentially a representative government. Who ever heard in a Presbyterian Church of the exercise of jurisdiction without representation? And as the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland has always refused, with one or two unavoidable exceptions, to admit representatives from congregations or Presbyteries out of the realm of Scotland, how could the Church of Scotland on her own acknowledged principles, pretend to exercise spiritual jurisdiction over the Synod of Canada? She never pretended to do so. She expressly refused to do so, when solicited, limiting her claim over us to the exercise of that just moral influence which her character and standing as a Church of Christ, and the many benefits she conferred on us unquestionably gave her.

The spiritual independence of the Synod has never indeed, been questioned. It has performed every act competent for a Supreme Church Court. It has sanctioned the ordination and deposition of Ministers, and the licensing of preachers. It has enacted rules. It has maintained correspondence with foreign Churches. It has received Ministers from other Churches, who were found duly qualified and willing to adhere to its standards. It has taken measures for the education of Ministers, within its own bounds. It has, in short, administered the government of the Presbyterian Church of Canada, as independently of any other authority, as ever the General Assembly administered the government of the Church of Scotland—pursuing without let or hindrance from any one, every end of ecclesiastical government, according to the views which Presbyterians take of that government, and were there no dependence civilly as the Church of Scotland, its disruption—deeply as we might be interested in so great an event, could no more affect us in this Province, than the disruption of the Synod of Ulster, or of the Presbyterian Church of the United States.

But there is a civil hold which the Church of Scotland has over us. It was not by her recognition of the Synod of Canada, that it became possessed of the requisite authority as a Church Court—nor would the withdrawing of that recognition affect such authority. But it was by her recognition that the members of the Synod became entitled to the share of the Clergy Reserves allotted them in the Imperial Act settling that matter. And much of the Church property throughout the Province, is held in name of the Church of Scotland, or in name of the Synod of Canada, as being in connection with the Church of Scotland, and there can be no doubt, I fear, that of these there would be a legal forfeiture, if either she, or we, should refuse to recognize that connection. If this view of the matter be correct, as I apprehend it is, then it is plain, by a simple act of authority, such as any Church might exercise in regard of another, without pretending at all to assume ecclesiastical jurisdiction over it, the Church of Scotland can, not only deprive us of her countenance and support, and friendly co-operation—all this, any Church with which we have had friendly correspondence might do—but she might inflict on us a severe civil loss. She might deprive us of that property which though nominally hers, is rightfully our own. And thus while no Minister in Scotland could be deprived of his benefice without a regular libel being served upon him, and proved against him in the spiritual courts, we might, by an exercise of power, dictated only by caprice or party feeling, be deprived of the civil endowments we derive from the Government. Thus, it seems to me, we hold, not at the pleasure of the Government alone, but of a third party, coming between the Government and us, and that a party not exercising nor considering itself entitled to exercise ecclesiastical jurisdiction over us.

It is to be observed that the full [illegible] acknowledgment of the right of the Church of Scotland [illegible] any acknowledgment of our connexion [illegible] free to acknowledge us as a church, [illegible] according to her pleasure the intercourse [illegible] with her in matters ecclesiastical, [illegible] of her right [illegible] over us. It would be merely [illegible] ledgment of her fixed and [illegible] views of duty. But there would be [illegible] do so as to her doing so, [illegible] in the Dutch Reformed Church, [illegible] have any larger [illegible] friendly correspondence [illegible] Were the Church of Scotland [illegible] [illegible]

body else would consider for a moment that our character as ministers, or our right to act as ecclesiastical courts was in the least degree affected thereby. Such refusal many might feel now, and all would have felt lately, to be a heavy blow to our moral influence and respectability. But it would never be supposed to deprive us of our character as a regularly constituted Church. We should still be a Presbyterian Church in Canada, even in the view of the Church of Scotland herself. Our ecclesiastical independence is wholly beyond her power. It is as I said before, separate from whatever moral influence she is rightfully entitled to, simply a civil hold which she has over us.

And on this distinction between ecclesiastical and civil dependence, rests as it seems to me, the vindication of the Synod for the position it assumed at its last meeting, and which I see no reason for its altering. Had the Synod of Canada been like any Scotch Synod ecclesiastically subject to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, then such of its members as hold the principles of the Free Church would have have been bound to withdraw. As it is, they were bound only to conduct the government of the Church according to their own views. This they had always been free to do. This they still are free to do. And it is for the Church of Scotland to say, whether the Synod's doing so shall induce her to exercise whatever power she possesses to injure the civil standing of the Synod and its ministers. Assuredly it is no reason why we should voluntarily resign that standing, that possibly the Church of Scotland may hereafter attach conditions to our retaining it, with which we cannot conscientiously comply. We can enjoy no civil privileges to which such conditions may not be attached. But surely it cannot be our duty to resign them on that ground. It is soon enough to do so when these conditions are imposed. It should ever be remembered, that just in proportion, as a worldly sacrifice is honourable, when conscience really requires it, it is absurd when made without due cause. The world can understand the nobleness of the Scottish Clergy who, rather than intrude ministers or submit their ecclesiastical to the civil authority, resigned their all. But who could understand us resigning the scanty provision made for our ministers in this Province, on whom there lies no such obligation, to whom there is presented no temptation to do either the one or the other.

Moderator, I would consider it in the highest degree criminal to do so. To me personally that provision signifies little. I may say, indeed, it signifies nothing. For by the liberality of my people I received the same allowance, before that grant was given, which I do now, and so I doubt not, I would, if it was again taken away. But when I look to the circumstances of the church in this province—when I look to the privations and hardships and poverty of the country ministers, even with this provision, I cannot consent without most stringent reason to be party to any measure which would alienate that provision from them. That provision it is the duty of the Government to make, and till conditions are attached to it, with which we cannot conscientiously comply, it is ours to receive it, with thankfulness,—and to take every prudent means of retaining it. So long as the Synod is permitted to govern the church here according to its own independent views, there is no need of sacrifice, there is no sense in it. And it behoves the Synod to avoid everything which would call for such sacrifice—save and except always what duty plainly requires.

What, I would ask, has any party to gain by division or disruption here? In Scotland it was no matter of abstract theory which led to the division of the Church. It was the actually exercised power of the civil courts, to compel the Presbyteries of the Church to do what those who seceded felt that they could not do conscientiously. Nor will the example of the Free Church bear out any party here, in division, unless they are laid under a like constraint. But who can pretend that there is any thing of the kind? one thing is abundantly obvious. A visit from the eminent men who form the deputation from the Free Church to this continent,—the dissemination of Free Church Tracts, and the more general agitation of the whole subject may do much to make people here better versed in the details and principles of the unhappy controversy by which Scotland has been agitated, and to increase their reverence for men who, as all admit, have made a great and noble sacrifice for conscience sake. But one thing they cannot do—they cannot make the church here more free than it is and has always been. The Free Church is not at this moment more free from all civil control in spiritual matters than we are. Our people have every privilege as respects the election of ministers which their's have. We require relief from no grievance such as they were subject to. We have no prospect as far as can be reasonably judged, of being subjected to any such grievance. Did we all adhere immediately to the Free Church, we could not in respect of the principles of non-intrusion and spiritual independence, be in circumstances one whit different from those in which we are at this moment. To quarrel among ourselves, about the terms on which Church and State may lawfully be allied, in a country in which there is not the shadow of a prospect of any such alliance at all,—the whole tendency of opinion being against it,—or about the intrusion of ministers, when we have not ministers to intrude, and could not from the very necessities of our position intrude them, were we inclined, seems to me as preposterous as can well be conceived. The question, concerning these, is not with us, as it was in Scotland, of immediate practical importance. Our position solves the question to us practically, in the very way in which the Free Church says it should be solved theoretically. We *cannot intrude*. We have no temptation to submit unduly in spiritual things to civil rulers. [illegible] principles are called in question, it behoves us to lift up a testimony in behalf of what we consider the truth, *that* the Synod has already done—that it can do again, if it shall seem necessary. So long as we are permitted to keep the ground assumed at the last Synod—so long as we are, that is, free to do what we account right, and to protest against what we think wrong, I, for one, cannot, in conscience, object to that position, as if it involved any thing like unworthy compromise of principle—I do not see it to be such. I do not feel it to be such,—and I will not be driven into any course of action which might imply that I did.

Am I satisfied then entirely with our position as a Church? That I do not say. Our position as respects ecclesiastical independence I think indeed is all we could desire. But our position as respects the property we possess I think any thing but desirable. Hitherto we have little contemplated our civil position as respects the Church of Scotland, and are apt perhaps to be angry with those who now tell us of it. The Church of Scotland was the object to us of too profound a veneration to permit us to question the expediency or propriety of any degree of control she might possess over us. Even the spiritual jurisdiction which she wisely refused, we would once have gladly conceded. It never occurred to us to consider to what extent her internal dissensions might proceed, and how injurious they might prove to us. Our connexion with the Church of Scotland was, as we supposed, our tower of strength. Now amidst the distractions of parts, it may become a reed to pierce us, or a stone of stumbling. We cannot, many of us at least, feel sure, that the peculiar authority which she possesses over us, will be exercised with the same forbearance as heretofore—and certainly our own position is unnecessarily insecure, and so far unfavorable to an independent course of action. We receive Government support, very needful in the present state of our Church. But for the continuance of this support we are dependent, not merely on our fulfilling the duties which a Christian government has a right to expect from us in return, but on our giving satisfaction to a third party, altogether removed from the sphere of our labors, and otherwise exercising no authority over us.

Moderator, I am of opinion we should seek prudently, and patiently, but earnestly and perseveringly to have our civil position altered. Independent of any peculiar views which may be taken of recent events in Scotland, and, however the Church at home be constituted, it is not desirable we should be subject to such irresponsible authority. Not on the ground of any corruption, real or supposed, in the Church of Scotland, but on the ground of the hardship and evident unreasonableness of her possessing such power over an ecclesiastically independent body, I would endeavor to have that power done away, as an unfair and unnecessary interposition between the Government and us. I would go to the Legislature and ask to be vested with a right to the property we hold in the character which really belongs to us, as an ecclesiastically independent Presbyterian Church, adhering to the Standards and [illegible] of the Church of Scotland, and if this were granted, it would rest with the Government, and the Government alone to deprive us of its bounty, whenever we should cease such adherence.

I am the more inclined to this course, because of the danger of [illegible] with distant Church [illegible] which our present circumstances plainly point out. [illegible] [illegible]

ever us in circumstances, which only a degree of wisdom and mutual forbearance, which I hardly venture to hope for, will prevent from producing discord and division, where all has hitherto been peace and concord. Why should we be more agitated by the disruption of the Scottish Church, than other Presbyterian Churches? Simply because our civil position is less favorable. Because civilly we are not independent of these divisions. Should we rest then seek to be so? and surrendering no privilege we possess now—till a condition is attached to it, with which we cannot comply, endeavor to gain the general concurrence of the members of our Church, in petitioning the Legislature for such an act as I have described, by which all fear of such condition might be removed, in as far as the Church of Scotland is concerned. Such an act would, I know, for various reasons, not necessary to be stated now, but very good and sufficient reasons, be acceptable to some of the most influential of those of our ministers who regard the late secession with least favor. It would fully meet the wishes of those who take a different view of that event. Surely, surely, it should not be less acceptable to the one party, that it meets the views of the other. Little as we have had no party divisions in the conduct of ecclesiastical business. Our little differences of opinion have been all consistent with mutual regard and brotherly love. It seems to me that every new meeting of Synod has exhibited and drawn forth in the members, stronger feelings of cordiality to one another—and stronger sentiments of respect for and confidence in one another. And surely, if there is a way by which without compromise of principle in any, or even offending the prejudices of any, this state of things can be preserved among us, and the Presbyterian Church here saved from being divided into rival factions, weak each of them, and turning what little strength they have against one another, common sense and christian love alike require that it should be adopted. That the course I propose would be approved by the laity among us, I entertain no doubt. I have spoken with none, even of those most violently opposed to the Free Church, who did not readily agree to it as expedient. I do trust it will be as favorably received by the Synod—and that there, it shall appear, we have not been so long associated as brethren in the work of the Lord, without feeling that the union thereby is established or is too sacred and endearing to be broken up, while it can be prevented by fair & honorable means. There are some who, with scarce a show of regard to that Presbyterian order to which they have vowed submission, can throw off the ties of an ecclesiastical connexion. But few such are among us. None, I trust, now. Let us then seek the things which make for peace, in that way which ensures, in the view of one party, the stability, and of another, the purity of our Church—and while seeking an object which both desire, let each avoid all that would cause irritation and heart-burnings in the other. A right to rail at Erastians and Residuaries—or at Schismatics and Seceders, three thousand miles from us, would be dearly purchased by the disruption of the Church, and the bitter dissensions and severe privations to which that would give rise.

That such an act as I desire could be immediately obtained, I do not suppose—That it would be obtained ultimately, if we set about the matter in a peaceful and harmonious spirit, I have no doubt. The only danger is that in the meantime we dispute among ourselves. I cannot believe the Church of Scotland will voluntarily interpose to disturb us. If she does interpose, it will be because of our internal dissensions leading the Government to call in her interposition. Yet why should we have such dissensions, I cannot see. There is but one practical question—and that I am sorry to say, far too little a practical question for our necessities, on which such dissention can arise. That is about the receiving of probationers. One Presbytery proposes an addition to the formula, apparently with the view of preventing our receiving probationers adhering to the Church of Scotland. Another following out its apparent tendencies may propose next to exclude the probationers of the Free Church. If each is to persist inflexibly in its own view, there must be dissention. Yet, how unnecessary! in the present circumstances, of both Churches we can scarcely expect a probationer from either.—They are both rather disposed to take Ministers from us—and though it were otherwise, and though there were no legal or prudential reason to prevent me from following my own liking in the matter, I must say for one, I would not willingly reject any faithful preacher of the gospel, came he from the one or the other,—or from any Church holding our standards of doctrine. Nor to test that faithfulness, and his fitness for the exercise of the ministerial office among us, would it readily occur to me to enquire into his views of the bearing of the doctrine of the Headship of the Lord Jesus over the Church on the recently disputed points in Scotland. Let us be reasonable. There is a way of talking of those who differ from us which is utterly unjustifiable. Some cannot agree with all the views of Professor Campbell. Are they therefore to talk of him as worse than an infidel? Are they to forget the honorable uprightness of his nature? his labors for the good of the Church, his former ministerial usefulness, his high character as a Christian and a Christian minister? Some, I am one of them cannot approve of the resolutions of the Presbytery of Bathurst. But are we to forget that if the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ has been faithfully and successfully commended to the consciences of men, by any of our, it has been by one of the very men who drew up those resolutions. Some again may disapprove the course of the Presbytery of Hamilton. But ought they forget in doing so, the abounding zeal of that body and its eminent and unwearied services to the Church. Who shall say that the love of God is all on one side? It is certainly no reason why I should surrender my views of any matter, that [illegible] was I should not abuse him, aye, and that I should feel, if a Christian myself, that he and I should not needlessly separate from one another. Why cannot we do as to the receiving the probationers, as we have done hitherto? Let us thankfully receive all good men without setting up new barriers to exclude any. When we have found a probationer, or Minister, sound in the great articles of faith, and willing to labor among us, my friend Mr. Geggie here can testify, we have not, in laying hold of such a one, been too scrupulous to enquire what peculiar doctrine he might entertain about the solemn league and covenant, or the duty of civil rulers in regard of the Church. Nor have we had cause to regret such liberality. I, for one, must oppose any measure tending to limit us in this respect, and I do hope that on mature consideration it will appear unnecessary to both sides.

Moderator, I have but one object in what I have now said. It is the peace, order and prosperity of our Church in this Province. For this reason, I have not entered on the discussion of the general principles which were involved in the recent controversy in Scotland. I have my own views of these. They are well enough known, and I may say I have given proof that such as they are, I hold my opinions as sincerely as others do theirs. But I do not dwell on them, because if I did, I would, I know, incur blame perhaps to myself, but surely not the less, lose sight in my eagerness as a party man, in respect of the Church of Scotland, of the great object which I am bound most of all to keep in view, and ever to regard with most profound interest. That is the well-being of the Presbyterian Church of Canada. It is of that Church I am a Minister. It is for it I have to consult, and I should be ashamed indeed to help in sacrificing its peace by giving way to feelings which yet I may not be able to help entertaining. I conclude, Sir, by laying this overture on the table, and heartily praying that Almighty God may guide us all personally and collectively, to that course which shall best promote his glory and the true good of his Church.

"The Presbytery of Quebec, humbly overture the "Synod, in respect to the recent disruption of the "Church of Scotland, to adhere to the Resolutions "of last Synod, to avoid any proceedings which may "unnecessarily lead to the disruption of the Church "here,—and to take such measures as may unite "the Ministers and people of our Church in endeavoring to obtain a legislative enactment by which "all the property of the Church may be held by "Ministers or congregations of 'the Presbyterian "Church of Canada, adhering to the standards and "worship of the Church of Scotland,' without regard to its connexion with any other ecclesiastical "body."

Mr. Clugston said:—

The circumstances which render a measure of this kind necessary, are to be regretted. It is rendered necessary, not because our rights have been invaded, or because anything has been done, which in the least degree, infringes on our status as Ministers of Christ, or on the privileges of the Presbyterian Church of Canada.

While the Synod is as free as to spiritual jurisdictions as we could wish her to be, it would be well that we valued and improved that freedom as we ought. Yet, her relation to the Church of Scotland; and the circumstances in which that Church has recently been placed, have had an influence on the position of our Synod, and has created a spirit, which [illegible] [illegible]

are pursuing, are the best fitted to attain these objects. But without any pretension to greater zeal or wisdom, I desiderate another way of securing the unity and peace of the Church, and that way I think the overture now introduced suggests.

The real and permanent welfare of the Presbyterian Church of Canada, I am persuaded, is not to be found in adhering pertinaciously to any other Church but in maintaining the position which we already hold, viz: that of the Presbyterian Church of Canada, adhering to the standards of the Church of Scotland, and holding no such connexion with any Church, as will necessarily involve us in the troubles to which its peculiar and local circumstances may expose it. Have already said, and I cannot say it too strongly, that the Presbyterian Church of Canada is ecclesiastically as free as her warmest and truest friend could ever wish her to be.—The Church of Scotland has never interfered with any of our Church courts or their doings. When we originally formed ourselves into a Synod, we did so without the concurrence or countenance of the General Assembly. When in the year 1833, the General Assembly passed the declarator Act, authorising us to do what we have already done; it also told us, in the same Act, that it was expedient, in the then state of education in the Colonies, to exercise the power of licensing Probationers. In the face of this declaratory Act, we have both licensed Probationers and deposed Ministers, and in all our doings as a Church, we have both from necessity and choice, acted freely and independently, without interference or question from any quarter. Nay, at the last meeting, the Synod resolutions were passed and transmitted to the convenor of the Colonial Committee of the Free Church, expressive of the Synod's approval of the principles for which the Ministers of the Free Church have so nobly contended, and of the Synod's admiration of the sacrifice which for the sake of these principles they had made. And, no doubt, the Synod is prepared to abide by these resolutions, and in the exercise of the freedom which she enjoys, to bear testimony to the truth, and against error, as circumstances may demand.

But there are, among ourselves, the elements at work which forebode evil to our church, unless some means can be devised which will unite the conflicting parties, and set us to seeking the welfare of the Presbyterian Church of Canada, by some other means than by contending about names, or for anything but principles.

It may be said, if the Church is so truly, and necessarily free and independent, why do more than merely declare and maintain this? Why it is ecclesiastically free, it has, from the circumstances in which it took its rise, a nominal connexion with the established Church of Scotland, which involves certain civil rights. It may be said, that a connexion which involves such matters, can hardly be called a mere nominal connexion. Be it so. It involves no spiritual jurisdiction, but secures to us a right to share in the provision, which in this country is made for the support of a Protestant Clergy; and holding it as I do, to be the duty of the Government, as well as private individuals, to provide the pecuniary means necessary for the support of the Gospel, I deem it nothing less than rash, to do anything without a call of duty, which would endanger a sacrifice of the right referred to. I am not prepared to go the length at once without any call in providence of assuming a position which would likely be followed by such a result; and I would rather continue to hold the freedom which the Synod already virtually enjoys, and adopt measures for getting our independence legally recognized.

If this were denied, and if we cannot hold our civil rights without a sacrifice of our spiritual independence, then, I trust, without any unseemly spirit, we will be found ready to make any sacrifice, rather than a sacrifice of principle and conscience.

It is my anxious desire and prayer, that the overture now laid on the table of the Presbytery, may maintain the integrity, the unity and peace of our Church, and I trust that all her members will be earnest in their prayers, that the Ministers and Office-bearers of our Church may be prepared from on high, for the solemn deliberation of the approaching meeting of the Synod—and that in all her decisions, she may be guided, that they may minister to the glory of God, and the good of His church.

The Presbytery agreed that the overture should lie on the table till the meeting on the 28th March; to which day the Presbytery adjourned.

SCOTTISH GUARDIAN ON THE SYNOD'S COMMITTEE ON THE TEMPORALITIES BILL.

To the Editor of the British Colonist.

SIR,—In looking over some old country newspapers, I have met with the subjoined article in the *Scottish Guardian* of the 5th December; and you will oblige me and others to whom I have shown it, by giving it an early insertion in your paper. It is extremely curious in its way, and affords a striking illustration of the observation, that stories, especially slanderous ones, lose nothing by the distance which they travel, or the number of hands they pass through.

Every body in this country knows that whatever guilt there was in seeking the enactment of the Bill referred to, it was the guilt of our whole Synod, not that of the few persons who were appointed by the Synod to take the steps necessary for getting it introduced into the Legislature; yet the object of the *Scottish Guardian* is to hold up to the reprobation of all honest and good men, this unfortunate Committee under the name of Moderates; representing them as persons who "have applied to the secular power to give them the means of carrying out by force the slavish principles which they maintain"—as chargeable with "the grossest Erastianism"—as having [illegible] "furtive way," marking "evil intents"—as being busy actors in "a regular and deep-laid conspiracy"—as "entrapping people into signing"—as engaged within "a *Moderate camp*" in "a *dark transaction*," of which their *Evangelical* brethren in the Synod, innocent persons, were in total ignorance—as affording in their conduct "an illustration of what genuine Moderatism is—as doing things of which it is said, "it is the old story of Queen Anne's Act over again," &c. &c.

I have had the curiosity to refer to the Minutes of last Synod for information as to who these profligate and unprincipled Moderates among us are, and I find them to be the individuals named in the following extract:—"The Synod had read the draft of a Bill to provide for the management of the Temporalities in congregations, as reported by the Committee appointed at last meeting of the Synod for obtaining the sanction of the Legislature to such a Bill. The said draft being amended, by the introduction of a recognition of the office of Deacon, was unanimously approved of, and the Clerk was ordered to attest the same. The Synod re-appointed the Committee, as follows, viz.: Mr. Machar (Convener,) Principal Liddell, Dr. Mathieson, Mr. Gale, Professor Campbell, Hon. John McDonald, Hon. Thomas McKay, and Edward W. Thompson, Esquire; and authorised them to take the necessary steps for obtaining the sanction of the Legislature to the same." So these are the genuine Moderates! I feel assured that there is not a good man in our Church who will not be pained to think of the deep injury done to the characters of these gentlemen,—done, be it remembered, in a land where several of them must have relatives and friends yet living, who watch their conduct with affectionate interest. There are, however, few things so wholly bad that some good may not be extracted from them; and painful and nauseous as it is to follow the *Guardian* through his tissue of slander and vituperation, the appearance of such an article among us, at this time, may serve its use; we may learn from it several important lessons.

It may teach us, first of all, how careful we should be not to give any countenance to wilful and reckless slanderers. In this country, where the gentlemen of the Synod's Committee are known, the base charges heaped up against them, could have no other effect than to provoke a smile; but the retailed slanders of the *Guardian*,—retailed, it will be seen, with no inconsiderable addition—are now circulating in quarters whither the injured objects of them can scarcely hope that the refutation of them will penetrate, or at all, gain the attention necessary to its counteracting their injurious effects.

It may teach us, again, to be cautious as to the amount of credit we give to many of the statements that are now coming from the mother country respecting its ecclesiastical affairs. I believe it to be unsafe to give credit to a great deal of what I find written against the Free Church; but after perusing the subjoined article, so stuffed with accusations known here to be perfectly groundless, may we not reasonably demur as to the correctness of much that appears in the Free Church organs against the Establishment? Whoever among us will henceforth put his faith to the statements of the *Scottish Guardian*, He may find in our country those who will awake how his stories [illegible] pure truth, but henceforth he must not look for [illegible] persons in Canada.

It may teach us [illegible] that class of men who [illegible] have been run down, and perhaps running down, may not after all [illegible] some qualities. I have been [illegible] and am consequently little [illegible] Moderatism from my own [illegible] others, I have been [illegible] but little favour; but [illegible] *Scottish Guardian* has [illegible] [illegible] victims, whatever they may be; and however much I may expose myself to reproach in these dangerous times, I must be honest enough to say, that if the estimable men composing the Synod's Committee, viz., Mr. Machar, Principal Liddell, Dr. Mathieson, Mr. Gale, Professor Campbell, Hon. John McDonald, Hon. Thomas McKay, and Edward W. Thompson, Esquire, if these are a specimen of the *genuine Moderates*, this Moderatism, after all, to give it its due, can hardly be so bad a thing as it has been called. It is an article of which, supposing the sample we have a fair one, we might be glad to see a larger importation. To speak seriously, is there not a vast silliness, to say nothing worse, in that reckless bandying of injurious epithets which has of late come so much into fashion? Is this the way to promote the good of the Church of Christ? Ought Christians to allow themselves to indulge in this style of reckless defamation, when it is remembered that even "Michael the archangel, when contending with the Devil who disputed about the body of Moses, durst not bring against *him* a railing accusation, but said, The Lord rebuke thee?"

I am, SIR,
Your obedient servant,
A LAY PRESBYTERIAN.
Hamilton, 28th February, 1844.

From the Scottish Guardian of 5th Dec.

"From the Toronto *Banner*, just arrived, we learn that the Presbyterians of Canada have been thrown into the greatest alarm by the unexpected introduction into the Provincial Parliament of a bill affecting in the most serious manner the interests of pure Presbyterianism. Our readers are aware, that the Canadian Synod has, by a large majority, testified its cordial sympathy with the Free Church. This, of course, was gall and wormwood to the favourers of our own Residuary Establishment. Being thus worsted in the fair field of argument within their own spiritual courts, the Moderates (doubtless with encouragement from high quarters) have followed the approved policy of Dr. Cook and his brethren at home—they have applied to the secular power to give them the means of carrying out by force the slavish principles which they maintain.

The bill now introduced is nothing less than an Act of Conformity, and if passed, will undoubtedly, to use the language of a member of the Canadian Legislature, "ruin the Presbyterian Church in Canada." It is entitled, "An Act to provide for the *management* of the Presbyterian Church of Canada, in *connexion with the Church of Scotland*." Hitherto our Canadian brethren have considered themselves, and been generally considered, entirely independent of the Scottish Establishment. Their Church, it is true, has been usually spoken of as "in connexion with the Church of Scotland;" but this phrase, we are assured by the *Banner*, was assumed merely to make a distinction between her and the other Presbyterian body in the Province, which is not only connected, but incorporated, with the United Secession. If this bill pass, her independence is at an end; she becomes thirled to the Erastianised Church of Scotland for ever, and must partake of her fortunes and her degradation.

"This circumstance of itself would in due time leaven the free Presbyterian Church of Canada with the hated principles of Erastianism. But the promoters of this bill, not satisfied with this, to make assurance doubly sure, insert the point of the Erastian wedge into the Church at once. The title itself implies the grossest Erastianism. As it stands, it claims for the civil legislature a power without any limitation, to control "the management of the Presbyterian Church." It is true that in the preamble it speaks of that Church as "already formed into an ecclesiastical community, governed by its own laws, customs, and usages, in all spiritual matters, by Sessions, Presbyteries, and Synods," and that it has for its object to make "provision for the internal management by the members of the said Church of the temporalities thereof, and also for allowing the endowment thereof." It is true, also, that in the eighteenth clause it is said, that "no spiritual or ecclesiastical rights are to be conferred by this act on any ecclesiastical person in the Church of Canada." But what avails all this, when not only is the title naturally susceptible of a much wider sense, but several of the other provisions of the bill do actually interfere with matters purely spiritual, and open a wide door for the civil courts making the most serious encroachments on the ecclesiastical province. The second clause, for instance, defines the class who are to form a congregational meeting. Now, as observed by the *Banner*, this "lays the foundations of Erastianism at the very root of the whole system; for although congregations are not held as church courts, they are the constituencies or primary assemblies for whose benefit all the church courts are erected." The bill, moreover, goes to determine how the presentor and session-clerk are to be elected. This latter provision might seem a matter of small importance. But it is not so. Both session-clerk and precentor are purely ecclesiastical officers; and, therefore, if the civil power is allowed to interfere with regard to *them*, the whole principle of spiritual independence is abandoned. It is of no consequence whether the first invasion of the spiritual territory be a great or a small one. Grant but once the principle, and every thing is granted. If the civil power may come in any where, it may come in everywhere.

"The furtive way in which this bill has been introduced, is a strong presumption of itself that it has been framed with evil intents. The Presbyterian community in general knew nothing of such a measure's being in contemplation till, on October 17th, they were startled by learning that the bill was actually read a first time, and a day fixed in the next week for its second reading. It is the old story of Queen Anne's Act over again. The Papists and the Puseyists in the Provincial Legislature will doubtless [illegible] terian Church, and by their aid, in defiance of the wishes of the people, and the opposition of the most distinguished of the clergy, the Moderates may possibly by this time, have succeeded in effecting its enactment. The bill has been the result of a regular and deep-laid conspiracy. A circular has come to light, which had been circulating about a month before in trusty quarters, calling upon the *right sort* of men among the clergy to "take immediate and energetic steps towards framing and procuring signatures to petitions in favour of the bill." And the way in which the ignorant have been entrapped into signing for it, will appear from the significant admonition of the circular referred to, that "the *petitions need not exceed a few lines, merely praying for the enactment of the bill into a law*." All this was quietly going on in the Moderate camp, while the Evangelicals remained in entire ignorance of the dark transaction. If the success of the bill depended upon the petitions of the Presbyterian community (got up no matter how,) there would be no fear. But the composition of the Canadian Legislature, where the enemies of Presbyterianism muster strong, compels us to indulge in the most painful forebodings. Whatever the result may be, the whole matter affords one more striking illustration of the true character of genuine Moderatism."

THE ALBION.

TO SUBSCRIBERS TO THE N. Y. ALBION IN THE NORTH AMERICAN PROVINCES.

THE proprietor begs to announce that all the regular and permanent subscribers to the Albion in the Provinces on paying the year's subscription for 1844, with the understanding that they remain on the list—will be presented without charge with a copy of the *Albion Gallery*, containing six plates, a copy of the large print of Washington, 20 inches by 27, or a complete copy of Chambers' Edinburgh Journal for 1843, at the option of the subscribers.

The Proprietor will also continue to pay the United States postage on the Albion, so that it will be delivered to the subscriber at one penny currency each paper.

Persons wishing to obtain the *Gallery* and *Washington* both, together with the Albion, will be charged *seven dollars*; and those who may be desirous of obtaining the Albion, the Gallery, Washington, and Chambers, will receive the whole for *eight dollars*, which, if published separately, would amount to 12 *dollars and fifty cents*.

This liberality the proprietor hopes will be duly appreciated.

New subscribers will be entitled to the same privileges on paying one year in advance.

The Gallery will contain the following plates, beautifully engraved on steel: The *Queen*, *Duke of Wellington*, *Westminster Abbey*, *Ellen Tree*, *New Houses of Parliament*, and *Buckingham Palace*, together with memoirs and letter press descriptions, beautifully bound, so as to form a splendid ornament for the drawing room table.

The Proprietor having purchased at great expense a quantity of Mr. Dick's magnificent plate of the Monument to Sir Walter Scott, is enabled to add this to his list of presents. Some idea may be formed of the magnitude of this Engraving when we state its dimensions to be 30 inches by 21.

A new volume of the N. Y. *Albion* commenced on the 6th of January ult., and it is worthy of notice that the enterprising proprietor has purchased the copyright of publishing "Tom Burke" and "Martin Chuzzlewit," and circulating the same in the British Colonies.

Terms $6 per annum, including the U. States postage.

JOHN CREIGHTON, Agent.
Kingston, February 14, 1844.

Chronicle & Gazette.

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 13, 1844.

POLITICAL STATE OF THE NIAGARA DISTRICT.

The District of Niagara, like the Gore, comprehends within its limits four electoral divisions, viz.: two Ridings of Lincoln, the County of Haldimand and the Town of Niagara. Haldimand is represented by Andrew Thompson, Lincoln by W. Hamilton Merritt and David Thorburn, and Niagara by Henry John Boulton. The Town of Niagara, like all small boroughs, is to a considerable extent actuated by personal motives, and Mr. Boulton probably owes his return for that town quite as much to the influence of his family and their property, as to the popularity of his political doctrines. That very circumstance is in his favour, as a candidate is more likely to attain success when he depends upon personal influence rather than political popularity. It is said that Mr. Boulton will be opposed at the next election by Mr. Dickson, but although this latter gentleman is a wealthy and influential man, it does not appear likely that the former will be defeated. Mr. Boulton, it is true, gained the election in virtue of which he now holds a seat in Parliament, by the majority of a single vote; but, since then, he has taken pains to acquire the confidence of his constituents, and will doubtless be supported at a future election, by many who previously held aloof from the dread that a man, who had been such a prominent member of the old compact, could not be sincere in his professions of reform. Mr. Boulton's manly and consistent conduct throughout the recent Session, has removed all doubts as to the stability of his political character, and the reform electors of Niagara will come to the poll with the conviction that their vote for or against Mr. Boulton will be an unequivocal declaration of their adherence to those principles for which their party have always contended, or an evident abandonment of those doctrines of which they have hitherto been the ardent advocates. The town of Niagara with a sparse and scattered population, little given to political disputation, has generally returned a member through personal influence. But if political inclination were the actuating motive which impelled the electors to support any candidate, it is but reasonable to suppose that they would to some extent, be affected by the influence from without, and that the District town could hardly be otherwise than favourably disposed towards the cause of Reform, when the counties, which compose the District, without exception, return liberal members. If, therefore, the election should turn upon politics, there is little doubt that Mr. Boulton will be returned—if it should depend upon personal influence there is less. It is a matter of congratulation to Reformers that a man of such uncommon talents, and high professional standing as Mr. Boulton, has joined their ranks, and we have no doubt that his able exposition of sound constitutional principles has served, and will serve the cause of reform in an eminent degree.

The County of Haldimand has, if we recollect aright, invariably returned a liberal member. It was for some time represented by Mr. Merritt, and, since the Union, Mr. Thompson has sat as member for that County. Mr. Thompson is a Reformer, and supported the measures of the late Administration. He was opposed at the last election by Mr. Fitch, also on the liberal side of the question, who divided the Reform interest. It was not at that time very generally known which way Mr. T.'s political predilections inclined, or indeed whether he intended to assume any decided political stand. This uncertainty, while it prevented many Reformers from yielding that warm support which they would, otherwise, have accorded to him, had the effect of inducing some Conservatives to vote for him. At the next election, Mr. Thompson will come forward with no equivocal character. His conduct, like that of Mr. Boulton, has established his claim to the confidence of Reformers, and dispelled any doubts that may previously have existed as to the orthodoxy of his political doctrines. It is seldom that a political meeting is held in Haldimand, and the people of that County do not often indulge in any violent display of their feelings, but they are, notwithstanding, staunch in their adherence to the cause of Reform. Here, as elsewhere, the chief danger to be apprehended is not that arising from the attacks of their opponents, but that likely to flow from divisions among the Reformers themselves. There is want of systematic organization, an absence of any clearly defined plan which should point out the mode of operation, and in which each portion of the party [illegible] W[illegible] but every District in the Province, will follow the good example of the Gore District, and organize the forces of Reform in such a way as to render them effective in the time of action. Above all things it is to be hoped that unanimity will prevail, and petty dissensions not, as has hitherto been too often the case, impede the attainment of the general objects of the party. Should Mr. Thompson come forward again, he will be returned without any difficulty, for, although he will doubtless lose the greater portion of the conservative votes which he received at the last election, yet he will be supported by the whole strength of the reformers. We are not aware at present that any one contemplates opposing him. No conservative candidate can succeed, and we trust the reformers will not again incur the risk of defeat by putting forward a second candidate and so dividing the strength of party. It would be well for the reformers if, in this respect, they would take a leaf out of the book of their opponents who seldom or never reduce their power by dividing it.

Lincoln, previously to the Union, was represented by four members all of whom, with the exception of Mr. Rykert, were reformers, and he was unwilling to be ranked among the tories. From the earlier periods of its political history up to the present time, Lincoln has been devoted to good Government, and, when the distinctions of tory and radical were unknown in Canada, the representatives of that county were remarkable for their integrity and constant efforts to secure economy in the expenditure of the public money. A quarter of a century ago the first political agitation that was ever known in this Province was commenced in the Niagara District by Robert F. Gourlay, who was, in consequence, persecuted with an inveterate malignancy characteristic of the then existing knot of office-holders, which afterwards expanded into that tyrannical and unscrupulous party known as the Family Compact. The population of that District consists chiefly of U. E. Loyalists and their descendants, with whom an attachment to the British Constitution and their hereditary monarch, amounts almost to an instinct. But, in consequence of the Seat of Government having formerly been at Niagara, (then Newark,) the people early acquired that intimate acquaintance with the designs and corruption of those in power, which taught them to suspect their honesty and watch their actions. Hence it has been found that the representatives of that District have rarely sacrificed their political principles to personal interest, because the moment their character became suspected their influence was lost. The Niagara District, having been settled before most other parts of the Province, is thickly peopled, and at elections there are usually a great number of voters polled but there is seldom any disturbance or outrage, as evidence of political excitement.

The gentlemen who at present sit as members for the County of Lincoln possess the confidence of the electors in an eminent degree, and would experience little difficulty in securing their re-election. Mr. Thorburn, who is the Warden of the District, has [illegible]

by the most unbending integrity and a consistent adherence to the principles of good government. His constant watchfulness to prevent extravagance, and reduce the expenses of Government within the narrowest limits compatible with the efficient discharge of the public business entitle him to the highest praise, so that he has sometimes been styled the Joe Hume of Canada, a *sobriquet* of which "Honest Davie" has every reason to be proud. Mr. Merritt deservedly stands high in the estimation of his constituents. Independently of the liberal political course which Mr. Merritt has pursued, the District owes much to his energy and perseverance. To his almost unaided exertions is owed the commencement and construction of the Welland Canal, which has been the source of so much prosperity to the adjacent country, and to which, we may say, St. Catharines owes its existence. Mr. Merritt has distinguished himself by the ingenuity of his plans for the improvement of the country, and the soundness of his opinions upon financial subjects. We do not know whether he intends coming forward again, but we should suppose that he will be returned almost without opposition, certainly without difficulty.

The tories have never been able to make much display in the Niagara District. Indeed they have but seldom attempted, and, when they have, it has only served to render their weakness more apparent.

Having on former occasions made some remarks on the position of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, as affected by recent events in the Parent Church of Scotland, we have deemed it our duty to re-print the Speech, on that subject, of the Rev. Dr. Cook, at the late meeting of the Presbytery of Quebec. That we agree with the Rev. Doctor, either theoretically or as to what ought to be done, we are not prepared to say, but we should not do justice to our own feelings, were we not to hail his speech as an evidence of what we always expected in that quarter,—an earnest desire to secure, what in our view is more precious than all theories, the peace and prosperity of the Church. While we see parties not belonging to the Body, sowing industriously, by means of party pamphlets, the seeds of dissension among its members, and listen to the extreme opinions, the reckless proposals and harsh expressions which emanate from some inconsiderate friends of the Free Church within it, we turn with no small pleasure to a display of so much good feeling and good sense on the part of one respecting whose sympathy with the late seceders, there can be no shadow of doubt, and whose sincerity and high practical talent are acknowledged by all.

In a report of the late meeting of the Presbytery of Montreal, we observe that the Rev. Dr. Mathieson also, while declaring his adherence to the Established Church, expresses a deep sense of duty to the Church in which his lot has been cast, and an earnest desire to secure for it at the present crisis that integrity and efficiency, without which it must be instantly destroyed and which are so madly endangered from without and from within. We regret that from the imperfectness of the report we are unable to give more particularly the Rev. Doctor's views on the subject. Let us hope that the spirit now manifested on different sides of the question (as regarding matters in *Scotland*) may prevail at the ensuing meeting of the Synod, to disappoint the hopes of interested agitators, and put an end to the romantic schemes of half-instructed theorists.

The Proprietors and Editors of the Fredericton *Loyalist*, Messrs. Doak & Hill, have been sent to gaol by order of the House of Assembly of New Brunswick, for an alleged breach of the privileges of the House. The Address of confidence in Sir Charles Metcalfe, passed by the Assembly, was very strenuously opposed by several members of that body—particularly by Major Wilmot, a member of the Government. In reviewing the debate on the Address, the *Loyalist* made some very grave charges against Major W. and those who voted with him—and although the Address passed in the affirmative, it appears the majority did not agree in the aspersions of the *Loyalist*—of which the incarceration of the Editors is very strong proof. These gentlemen accuse Major W. and his friends of disloyalty, impeach their honor and veracity, and say a great many other silly things to gratify their vindictive party feelings—and if their ignorance on these points is equal to their recklessness in speaking of Canadian affairs, they are highly culpable.—[illegible] successors will tend rather to confirm than allay the excitement created by the discussion of the Address in question. We hope Messrs. Doak & Hall may be speedily set at liberty.

Beware of Counterfeiters.—A person calling himself Jackson Wellington, was yesterday committed to the Gaol of this District, to stand his trial at the next Court of General Quarter Sessions of the Peace, for uttering counterfeit American half-dollar pieces. Twenty-two of these spurious pieces were found upon his person, and he succeeded in passing a few of them to some of the Inhabitants of this place.

John C. Calhoun, of South Carolina, has been appointed Secretary of State of the United States. This appointment must prove satisfactory to the lovers of peace and good order in the Union. Mr. C. is one of those who were for peace with Great Britain in 1812, and we have no reason to believe that he has changed his sentiments. He will, no doubt, conduct the Oregon negotiation with Mr. Packenham.

Lakes Erie, Huron and Michigan are almost entirely clear of ice. Should the present mild weather continue, Kingston Harbour will be open about the 1st of April.

New and old Subscribers to the N. Y. Albion will be furnished with a copy of Dick's splendid Engraving of Sir Walter Scott's Monument, on paying a year's subscription to that Journal in advance.

The Albion re-print of Chamber's Edinburgh Journal has reached the 1st No. of the 2d Vol. The highly interesting and instructive character of this Journal, and the low price at which it is published (7s 6d per annum) should secure for it an extensive circulation.

We have received the first No. of the "*Montreal Medical Gazette*," published in French and English by Messrs. Lovell & Gibson, and edited by Francis Badgley, M. D., and William Sutherland, M. D. Terms 15s per annum.

We have also received the third number of Mr. Evans's "*Montreal Agricultural Journal*."

Libel Case.—Several Magistrates of our town were rather unexpectedly called on Monday evening last to enquire into a charge of Libel, in the shape of a criminal prosecution by O. R. Gowan against his late partner in the newspaper business, Mr. William Harris. The information was laid against Harris as being the writer of an article signed *Cato*, published in the *British Whig* in Kingston in the forepart of the present month. The examination resulted in Mr. Harris being held to bail to answer the Charge at the next [illegible] [illegible]