

other—ie an art. There must be a harmony, a keeping in disbursement, which very few men have. Great wealth wearies. The thing to have is about ten thousand a year, and the world to think you have only five. There's some enjoyment, then; one is let alone. But the instant you have a large fortune, duties commence.—Conningsby.

#### SYNOD OF CANADA.

At the request of a subscriber, we publish the following Speech delivered by the Rev. Mr M'NAUGHTON, in the Synod of Canada.

Notwithstanding of the very unfavourable opinion entertained by some of the Church of Scotland; notwithstanding of the epithets of contempt and reproach applied, to and heaped upon her by her enemies, who are illiberal and violent in no ordinary measure, and notwithstanding of the resolute determination of those enemies to effect her overthrow, I see no reason to be ashamed of her, no reason to repudiate connexion with her; and though she is not faultless and spotless as the church above, I feel constrained to cleave to her in the day of her sore affliction, to express my approbation of the part she has acted, and to admire the spirit of Christian love, meekness, forbearance and patience she has displayed.

It is true that she believes and maintains it to be the duty of civil rulers to interfere and to do many things for the purpose of promoting the peace, purity, order and prosperity of the church; but if civil rulers, in their conscientious efforts to discharge their duties, advance further than she considers that they are warranted, is she in pride, scorn, contempt and derision to break all alliance and connection with them; to refuse all aid from their hands, and to hold them up to the hatred, the loathing and the detestation of all who adhere to and believe her?

She has not thus acted, and I cordially agree with her. I commend her for the calm, the dignified, and the Christian part she has acted. It would not be wise in her to break all alliance and connexion with civil rulers, even if she believed that they had passed their own proper bounds, and dictated to her in things of mere humane opinion; in things that do not affect her efficiency, in things that do not at all effect salvation.

It does not seem to me that civil and religious rulers should manifest any readiness to quarrel and separate about things that belong to the utmost and extreme boundaries of their respective provinces. Because peaceful neighbouring nations differ in opinion, must they prepare for battle, and must the one seek the destruction of the other? Because peaceful neighbouring nations differ in opinion, must they separate, and trust the one seek the one seek the ruin of the other? Because members of the same Church, or the same family, differ in opinion, does God command them to separate and to become implacable enemies?

In answering the question, because the civil magistrate interferes and prevents ecclesiastical rulers from enacting and enforcing obedience to laws that virtually deprive patrons of what many regard their just and lawful rights, does God command his servants to relinquish all the advantages of an establishment, and to cast themselves upon the affection and liberality of the people. I observe that the question is one regarding which God's word is silent, and is consequently to be solved by our notions of propriety, expediency, justice and necessity.

Patronage has existed and still exists in the Church of Scotland, and though I do not regard it as indispensably necessary, and though I do not contend for it as of divine authority, I am far from regarding it as a shapeless and horrible thing of which no Christian can approve, which every good man must condemn, and from which he must turn away with abhorrence; and I have no hesitation in maintaining that there are times and cases in which it is proper, expedient and necessary, and that the evils arising from its abuse are nothing to the evils of having no ministers to preach the word of God.

In solving the question, because the civil magistrate secures to the patron his just and lawful right and power, is it the duty of ministers to relinquish all the advantages of an establishment and to cast themselves upon the affections and liberality of their people? It seems to me that observation and experience of the state of things in Canada might convince all who regard the preaching of the Gospel as necessary, that those who seceded committed a great error in giving up their endowments and in committing themselves to a principle that fails so completely when brought to the test of experiment; even though they failed in their attempts to deprive those who supported them, and who built and upheld their churches and manes, of all right and power.

What ministers of the Synod of Canada does not acknowledge and lament, that in proportion to the number of destitute settlements there are few churches, and that it is with great difficulty that these few are completed and upheld, and that there are few, few ministers, and that with the exception of those in large cities, those ministers who are depending upon their congregations for support, are miserably supported; that if foreign aid does not speedily come, one after another must resign his charge. What minister of the Synod of Canada does not acknowledge and lament that thousands and thousands of our people, because there is no minister amongst them to direct them to God and to Heaven, live as if they had forgotten that there is one above who sees them, and before whose tribunal they must one day appear.

When we calmly and seriously survey the moral wilderness around, and the multitudes who are indifferent to things spiritual and eternal, when we look forward to futurity and take a prospective view of generations to come sinking lower and lower in vice, degradation and misery, if they are to have no ministers to direct them to Him who came to deliver man from vileness, degradation and misery, and to raise him to honour, glory and immortality, do we not feel constrained, even amid the luxuriant abundance with which God has blessed this country, to look back to our native land and to heave a sigh at the reflection that we and our descendants have bidden, perhaps an eternal adieu to its noble and heaven framed institutions, and to blame those who are stretching out their hands and pulling down that sacred edifice, where so many of the sons and daughters of Scotland received their moral worth and fitness for Heaven; do we not feel constrained to lift up our eyes to Heaven and to pray: Oh, that our Church in Canada were like the Church of Scotland, before the hand of the destroyer came upon her, when there was peace within her walls and prosperity within her palaces; when her ministers, free from strife and care, preached the Gospel, and when the people received their tidings as from God.

When I see the poverty of ministers, and the difficulties and impossibility of obtaining anything like adequate support for them; when I feel assured that the want of support is the great cause why more than a hundred congregations of our Church in this Province are without any minister; when I reflect that the authority of the patron ceases on issuing his presentation, and that the person presented has the most entire liberty to preach what God commands, unmoved by the fear of man; when I reflect that the interference of the people never ceases, and that many will be contented to have no minister rather than support him, and rather than allow him to do anything at variance with their foolish notions, opinions, or prejudices, can I persuade myself that those ministers violate any law God, or any dictate of conscience, who regard the Church as under obligations to those who build churches and manes and support ministers, even if they demand the right and power of election?

Instead of looking upon them as the greatest enemies of the Church, and of holding them up to the execration of all good men, it seems to me that they are entitled to gratitude. Instead of seeing anything objectionable in those who are obliged to bear the burthen of supporting the Gospel, entrusted with the right and power of electing a minister, I feel thankful that ministers are supported, that the Gospel is faithfully preached, and that sinners are saved.

If patronage is liable to abuses—and what good thing is not—who are to blame? Is the right of the patron not sufficiently circumscribed by the fact, that he can present none whom the ecclesiastical rulers have not examined and pronounced qualified; and therefore if blame is fixed upon any, it should be fixed, not on the patron, who is not the constituted judge of qualifications, but on ecclesiastical rulers who are the constituted judges. If the person presented is not qualified, fully qualified, not only as to character but as to literary, scientific, and theological attainments and requirements, assuredly not the patron but the Church rulers are to blame.

Those who seceded from the Church of Scotland maintain that she is in bondage, that she denies the supreme headship of the Son of God, and that she has not surrendered her own spiritual independence.—Brought up as I was in the Church of Scotland, to me it seems strange, very strange, to hear that of bondage. Brought up as I was in Scotland, to me it seems strange, yes, very strange, to hear of bondage in the land of which it has been truly and forcibly said, "the instant the slave touches the sacred soil of Britain, his chains burst and drop from around him." I thought that in Britain the body was free, and that the mind is free, and that the only persons in bondage in that land of freemen, are the guilty, the vile and the worthless, arrested by the strong arm of justice in their efforts to hurt their neighbour, either in his property or person.

To me it seems strange, yes, passing strange, to hear those in that free land, who had full liberty to preach the everlasting Gospel, and who had ample support secured to them, and who, free from worldly care and from the fear of man, might give themselves up entirely to their spiritual work, should complain that they were in bondage.—Strange and unparalleled ingratitude! awful infatuation! To me it seems clear as the light at noon, that the moment they left the Church of Scotland, they entered the land of bondage; a bondage that will daily increase, and become more and more galling. The despots to whom they are in bondage may at first, like the proud despot of Egypt, give them straw to make bricks, but in the course of time, they will issue the command, "go and gather straw for yourselves where you can find it, yet not aught of your work shall be diminished."

To whom is it said that the Church of Scotland is in bondage? To the Court of Session, to the House of Commons, and to the House of Lords. How passing strange! In bondage to judges and rulers the most upright, learned, and honourable! In bondage to the judges and rulers of the finest, the noblest, and most Christian people on earth! In bondage to those whose arm is stretched out to relieve the oppressed, and to secure the rights, the freedom, the property and life of all! How passing incredible! Can it afford any pleasure, profit or honour to the Lords of Session, to the House of Commons, or to the House of Lords to deprive the Church of Scotland of any right bequeathed her by the Son of God; to oppose their human power to his divine power! Con-

vince them by calm and sound reasoning that they have misunderstood the divine record, and that they are perverting the sacred laws of God, and they will speedily give evidence that they have no greater desire, interest, and enjoyment, than that Britain's laws should harmonize with the sacred laws of God.

Wherein consists the alleged bondage of the Church of Scotland? She has not power to enact laws that render the rights of patrons a nullity—rights which a General Assembly in 1565 pronounced lawful—rights which the Scots' and British Parliaments pronounced just and lawful. This is the extent of her alleged bondage. The interference of the civil magistrate consists in securing certain granted rights to certain parties, in securing their just and lawful rights to patrons—rights acquired on account of important services done to the Church. The ministers of the Church of Scotland have the fullest liberty to declare the whole counsel of God. No attempt is made by the civil magistrate to prevent them from preaching those glorious truths recorded in the Westminster Confession of Faith, and in the larger and shorter catechisms. No attempt is made to alter the form of Presbyterian Church Government.

Wherein consists the alleged invasion by the civil magistrates of the spiritual independence of the Church of Scotland? Those who succeeded, while ministers of the Church of Scotland, in their pride and presumption enacted laws, which they claimed Divine authority to enact, laws which we in vain search for among those enacted by God, and demanded from civil rulers obedience to them. Because civil rulers could not see it to be their duty to God and his Church to sanction these human laws, and to regard them as of Divine authority, they denounced them as denying the authority of Christ to rule his own Church, as oppressing God's people, and depriving them of their Christian liberty, as if it necessarily followed that those who denied their authority denied the authority of God, and that those who refused to do homage to them refused to do homage to Jesus Christ. Presumptuous folly and impiety! Did God clothe them with authority to enact whatever they pleased, and to denounce all who questioned their authority as denying the headship of the Son of God, and the spiritual independence of his Church?

Therefore, though the enemies of the church of Scotland bring charges against her, it seems evident to me that these charges are groundless and false. Ask the Church of Scotland, and she will tell you that she is not in bondage, that she openly and distinctly avows the Supreme headship of the Son of God, and that she maintains her own spiritual independence. Are we to believe her enemies? Though many leave the Church of Scotland, how can any, in truth and sincerity, affirm and believe, that the Son of God has left her, and that her ministers have no divine authority to preach the Word of God, to dispense the sacraments, and to perform other ministerial duties?

Can any in truth and sincerity affirm, that the Son of God will not be with her, and employ her to direct future generations to Heaven? What though some of her spiritual children, to whom she paid more than common respect and reverence, have left her, and are unceasing in their efforts to effect her overthrow, are they, in place of God, to build up or to destroy?—Are they guided by unerring wisdom, and acting a part that will prove a blessing to future generations? What though these are hailed, joined, and followed by thousands! Is this any proof that the spirit of God is poured upon them, and that they are turning men from sin and Satan to serve the living and true God.

Have they no ground to be afraid, a spirit of delusion may have fallen upon them, and that as Jeroam the son of Nebat, led the people away from the house and family of David, and from the worship and service of God, so they are taking the people to what will eventually lead to total apostasy and ruin. What though many join in the cry against the Church of Scotland! am I to join in the loud and angry cry, raise it, raise it, to the foundations thereof? No, I had rather join those who say, "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem! let my right hand forget her cunning. If I do not remember thee, let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth, if I prefer not Jerusalem above my chief joy."

My sense of duty, not only to the sacred, but to the civil institutions of my native land constrains me thus to express my sentiments. Though many hate the civil and sacred institutions of Scotland, and though many seek their destruction, I do not, and cannot. For the sake of Scotland, whose noble and heaven-framed institutions I admire; for the sake of the Church of Christ, my hope and fervent prayers are, that the Church of Scotland may enjoy the protection of God, and remain a blessing to future generations, sure and secure amid the whims, prejudices, caprices, opposition and enmity of those who have left her, and have become her deadly enemies. I adhere to the Church of Scotland, because her great standards of doctrine, government, and discipline are founded on, and harmonize in every part with God's unalterable word, and because there is good security that they cannot be altered, and because her ministers cannot depart from the truth.

When we look to churches that are not established, we find that their standards constantly vary, and that they are apt to reject all standards and confessions of faith, as inimical to freedom of inquiry, of thought, of opinion, belief, and practice. Look at Presbyterianism in England, and see its gradual progress in error, till it reached Socinianism, and left its places of worship and endowments to those of that persuasion. If we break asunder the sacred tie that unites us to the Church of

Scotland, what security have we that our churches and endowments may not follow the same course, with that of the churches and church property in England?

Look to Presbyterianism in the North of Ireland, and see the progress that Arianism as one time made among its ministers and people. Look at the secession in Scotland, and see its divisions, its cold, speculative, withering, and dead faith, whose great tendency has been to produce rancorous hatred to those who differed from them in opinion. Dr. Chalmers is represented as having said in the General Assembly of 1833—"Though they retained a form of sound words, they had become spiritually dead—or if any free remained, it was the fierce and untamed fervor of political passions."

I have no confidence in the stability of those who have seceded, and in their adherence to the pure, and humbling doctrines of the Christian religion. I have no hope that they will either remain united, or abide by the standards of a church they so much hate. Division after division will take place, and every one will find himself set free from creeds and confessions of faith, and at full liberty to choose his own course. They will imitate one error after another, and every false step they will take will lead to another.

Instead of spending their whole time in studying the Word of God, and the Westminster Confession of Faith, and the larger and shorter catechisms; instead of being entirely free from the fear of man, and at full liberty to seek the glory of God and the salvation of perishing sinners, they must study the whims, the notions, and the prejudices of their hearers. They have come down from the elevated position they occupied while ministers of the Church of Scotland, and no longer continue to possess their wonted status, respectability and influence, and instead of fearlessly declaring the whole counsel of God, whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear, they must, in order to be popular, suit themselves to the taste of their hearers, and modify what they find in the Bible. The standards which they must chiefly consult, to which they must chiefly look, and by which they must be guided, are the opinions of their hearers, to whom they are in bondage, and who claim unlimited authority over them.

For these and other reasons, since measures are to be decided that must separate those who till now regarded each other with Christian love—measures whose withering and blasting influence no future healing measures can arrest and resist, and the future and eternal consequences of which none can foresee—it seems to me that the position of this Synod in relation to the Church of Scotland, should remain unchanged, and that this will afford security, that at least in one section of the Presbyterian Church, a chosen band will be found who adhere to the Confession of Faith, who adhere to pure Presbyterianism.

#### Editor's Department.

MIRAMICHI:

CHATHAM, SATURDAY, SEPT. 7, 1844.

EUROPEAN NEWS.—The steamer Hibernia, with the second August mail, arrived at Halifax on the morning of Saturday last, after a short passage of ten days and a half. She brought 130 passengers.

The papers obtained by her arrival, are to the 20th of last month. The news is important. Our beloved Queen gave birth to a Prince on the morning of the 6th ult., and the mother and child were well. The French were continuing their warlike operations against Morocco. They had bombarded Tangiers, and threatened to pay Magador a visit, with similar intentions. They have perpetrated some further outrages in Tahiti, and taken possession of the Gambier Islands, in the Pacific.

Mehemet Ali, Pacha of Egypt, has suddenly abdicated the sovereignty of that country in favour of his son. Various reasons are assigned for this unexpected event. In connection with this affair, we find the following under date of Beyrout, July 16.

"The Geyser brought us news that Sir H. Hardinge had in three days completed a treaty with Mehemet Ali, that the English government guaranteed to himself, as well as to his descendants, the government of Egypt, and that no other power should interfere with him. In return, Mehemet Ali has treated that the English government should do as they like in the country, and to protect all English subjects—he consents, moreover, to allow troops to go through Egypt whenever necessary. The railroads from Cairo to Suez are to be commenced without loss of time; and in fact, the Pacha has become a complete Englishman."

A contemporary in copying the above remark—it may be that the above is true and that Mehemet Ali having the guarantee of England for the security of his family possessions of Egypt, has really