



AN ACCOUNT  
OF THE  
**PROCEEDINGS**  
OF THE  
**COMMITTEES ON UNION**  
APPOINTED BY  
THE SYNOD OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH  
OF CANADA,  
AND THE  
SYNOD OF THE MISSIONARY (NOW THE UNITED  
PRESBYTERIAN) CHURCH IN CANADA,  
CONTAINING  
**MINUTES**  
OF ALL THE MEETINGS OF THE COMMITTEES, AND  
ALL THE PAPERS SUBMITTED BY THEM,  
EXPLANATORY OF  
THEIR RESPECTIVE OPINIONS  
ON  
**NATIONAL ESTABLISHMENTS OF RELIGION,**  
AND ON THE  
**ENDOWMENT OF CHURCHES.**

---

London, C. W. :—1849.



AN ACCOUNT  
OF THE  
**P R O C E E D I N G S**  
OF THE  
**COMMITTEES ON UNION**  
APPOINTED BY  
THE SYNOD OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF CANADA  
AND  
THE SYNOD OF THE MISSIONARY (NOW THE UNITED  
PRESBYTERIAN) CHURCH IN CANADA,  
CONTAINING  
**MINUTES**  
OF ALL THE MEETINGS OF THE COMMITTEES, AND ALL THE  
PAPERS SUBMITTED BY THEM,  
EXPLANATORY OF  
THEIR RESPECTIVE OPINIONS  
ON  
**NATIONAL ESTABLISHMENTS OF RELIGION,**  
AND ON THE  
**ENDOWMENT OF CHURCHES.**

---

PUBLISHED BY ORDER OF THE SYNOD OF THE UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

---

London, C. W.

PRINTED BY WM. SUTHERLAND, DUNDAS STREET  
1849.

## NOTICE.

---

The Committee of the United Presbyterian Church having been instructed by the Synod to publish an account of the proceedings of the joint Committees, have judged it courteous to the Committee of the Presbyterian Church to limit their account to the publication of the minutes, believing that this will convey all the information that may be desired.

W. PROUDFOOT,

*Convener of Committee.*

# MINUTES OF THE PROCEEDINGS

OF THE COMMITTEES OF THE

PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF CANADA, & of the UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN CANADA,

ON UNION.

---

HAMILTON, OCTOBER 22<sup>nd</sup>, 1845.

The committees appointed by the Synod of the Presbyterian Church and the Missionary Synod, met this day in Hamilton.

On the part of the Synod of the Presbyterian Church, were present,—the Rev. Messrs Alexander Gale, Mark Y. Stark, and John Bayne; and Messrs. William McMillan and William Kyle, Elders. On the part of the Missionary Synod, were present,—the Rev. Messrs. William Proudfoot, Thomas Christie, R. H. Thornton, and James Roy; and Robert Christie, Esq., and Mr. Walter Chisholm, Elders. The Rev. Mr. Gale was chosen Chairman; the meeting was constituted by prayer, and the Rev. Mr. Proudfoot was appointed Clerk. Mr. Gale read the following extract from the Minutes of the Synod of the Presbyterian Church:—

“The Synod called for the report of the Committee to wait on the Missionary Synod of the United Secession Church in Canada. Mr. Gale reported that that Synod had not yet met, but was to meet next week. The Synod continued the appointment of the Committee, with a change of some members, willing them, besides tendering to that Synod the Christian greetings of this Synod, to express to them the deep convictions entertained by this Synod of the importance and practicableness of union, on a scriptural basis, amongst all the sound Presbyterian Churches in Canada: and the Synod authorize the Committee to confer on the subject with any corresponding Committee of the Synod of the Secession Church of Canada. The Committee to be the Moderator, Mr. Gale (Convener), Mr. Bayne, and Mr. Stark, Ministers; and Messrs. McMillan and Kyle, Elders.”

Mr. Proudfoot read an extract from the Minutes of the Missionary Synod, bearing date 12th June, 1845, stating that the Rev. Alexander Gale and Mr. W. McMillan, Elder, accompanied by the Rev. George Smellie, were introduced as a deputation from the Synod of the Presby-

terian Church of Canada. Mr. Gale read an extract from the Minutes of said Synod, appointing the deputation.

“The Missionary Synod, cordially reciprocating the sentiments expressed in the above document, appointed Messrs. William Proudfoot, Thomas Christie, R. H. Thornton, and James Roy, Ministers; together with Robert Christie, Esq., and Mr. Walter Chisholm, Elders, a Committee to meet the Committee of the Synod of the Presbyterian Church, for the purpose therein stated,—Mr. Proudfoot, Convener.”

After some conversation it was unanimously

Resolved, 1.—That, whereas the Missionary Synod and the Synod of the Presbyterian Church, have the same standards of doctrine and discipline, it is highly desirable that they should unite, both for their mutual benefit and for strengthening each other's hands in the advancement of the interests of Christ's Kingdom in this Province.

Resolved, 2.—That there is a full agreement among us in holding the Westminster Confession of Faith, as the confession of our faith, expressive of the sense in which we understand the Scriptures, in all points, excepting certain statements regarding the powers of the civil magistrate, contained in chap. xx. sec. 2, xxiii. sec. 3, xxxi. sec. 4.

Resolved, 3.—That we find a very satisfactory measure of agreement generally among us, in regard to the doctrine of Christ's Headship over the nations; and that the chief point in which we differ is respecting the questions,—Whether it is lawful, under any circumstances, for the civil magistrate to devote any portion of the public funds to the support of the Church?—and, Whether, under any circumstances, it is lawful for the Church to receive such support?—the Committee of the Missionary Synod taking the negative, and the Committee of the Synod of the Presbyterian Church the affirmative, in these questions.

Resolved, 4.—That the Committees shall severally prepare written statements of their views in regard to the questions specified in the last resolution, to be submitted for consideration at a future meeting; as also on the question, whether a difference of opinion on the foregoing points continuing to exist, such difference ought to be regarded as a barrier to union, or whether satisfactory grounds of union, may not nevertheless be found,

Resolved, 5.—To adjourn till the call of the conveners.

(Signed,)

ALEXANDER GALE,

*Chairman.*

(Signed,)

WILLIAM PROUDFOOT,

*Clerk.*

# PROOF OF THE NEGATIVE.

(BY THE COMMITTEE OF THE MISSIONARY SYNOD.)

The III. and IV. Resolutions passed at the meeting of the Committees appointed by the Synod of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, and the Missionary Synod on the subject of an Union between the two bodies, held at Hamilton on the 22nd Oct., 1845, are of the following tenor:—

RESOLUTION III.—“That we find a very satisfactory measure of agreement generally among us in regard to the doctrine of Christ’s headship over the nations; and that the chief point in which we differ is respecting the questions, whether it is lawful under any circumstances for the civil magistrate to devote any portion of the public funds to the support of the Church; and whether under any circumstances it is lawful for the Church to receive such support. The Committee of the Missionary Synod taking the *negative*, and the Committee of the Synod of the Presbyterian Church the *affirmative*, in these questions.

RESOLUTION IV.—“That the Committees shall severally prepare written statements of their views in regard to the questions specified in the last Resolution,—to be submitted for consideration at a future meeting; as also on the question, whether a difference of opinion on the foregoing questions continuing to exist, such difference of opinion ought to be regarded as a barrier to Union, or whether satisfactory grounds of Union may not nevertheless be found.”

Though the Committee of the Missionary Synod might leave the onus probandi with the Committee of the Synod of the Presbyterian Church, reserving it to themselves to assent or dissent as they might see cause; and though this might be defensible in a case where there is a striving for victory, yet it would be unseemly when the object in view is, by a free expression of their sentiments, to find some common ground on which they can unite. They therefore proceed to prove the negative.

The Committee of the Missionary Synod would premise that they understand the affirmative and the negative as opposites to the same extent, viz.

The affirmative,—That it is the duty of *all nations, as such*, to devote a portion of the public funds to the endowment of the church; and



that if it be the duty of all nations to do this, it must be lawful for the Church in all circumstances to receive such support. The negative,—That to devote any part of the National funds to the support of the Church is no part of the duty of nations, as such, and therefore it is no part of the duty of the Church to accept of such support.

The personal character of the civil magistrate is no element in the question on either side. The affirmative is, that it is the duty of all nations,—of all Governments, irrespective of their character, to honour the Redeemer by endowing the Church; and that the Church may lawfully,—dutifully accept what it is the duty of the magistrate to give: the negative is, that it is not the duty of any Government, as such, whether it be Infidel or Christian, to appropriate any part of the nation's revenue to endow churches, and that it is not the duty of a church, or of churches, to accept of such endowments.

The Committee of the Missionary Synod farther premise that the affirmative, while asserting that Christ is king of nations as well as king of the church, assumes, that it is the duty of nations, as such, to honour Christ as king of the church, and that the way in which this is to be done is by endowing the church. In this the following inaccuracies are to be noticed:

1. There is a confounding of the authority which Christ has over the nations, with the authority which He has over the church. Unless the authority which he exercises over both be homogeneous, the duty of both cannot be the same. But in the affirmative, it is *assumed* that it is the duty of nations to perform to the Head of the church a duty, which it is admitted on all hands, is the duty of the church, and in both cases for the same reason, viz., because he is the Head of both, which amounts to this, that it is the duty of both to do a service, which must in the one case be different from what it is in the other, and for a reason, which in the former is assumed, (and the very point to be proved), and which in the latter is granted by both. The authority of Christ over the church is one thing. His authority over the nations is quite another thing. In the one case, the authority is mainly spiritual for the purpose of regulating its duties and promoting the ends of salvation; in the other, it is wholly of an external character, and is exercised *for the sake of the church*. Of this kind, to a certain extent, and as far as their circumstances will permit, is the authority which he exercises over the holy angels and devils. But a difference in the kind of authority is founded on a difference in relationship, and consequently, involves a difference in duties. The authority of a king is different from that of a parent, and both are different from that of a husband, because in all these the relative position of the parties is different. Therefore, what

is the duty of one of the parties in subordination, is not necessarily the duty of the other. The duty of each is founded upon entirely different premises, and is proved by entirely different arguments, and enforced by entirely different sanctions. To say therefore that it is the duty of nations to do the same thing as the church is bound in duty to do, to Christ because he is the king of both, is a fallacy of the same kind, as that the duty of a subject to a sovereign, and of a child to a parent, and of a wife to her husband, are identical; which is absurd.

2. In the affirmative there is an ambiguity in the use of the terms *churches* and *nations*, inasmuch as the same thing is predicated of *nations* which is predicated of *churches*, leaving upon the mind the impression that what is the duty of the one is necessarily the duty of the other, —that because the supporting of the church is the duty of the church it is therefore, and also, the duty of nations.

But to assume that the duties of two parties to a third are identical, is to assume that each of these parties stands in the same relation to the third party that the other does, but to predicate the same thing of the *church* and of a *nation* would be to make the church and the nation the same identical thing so far as the predication goes; a conclusion in excess of the premises, and therefore based upon a fallacy.

But a church and a nation are not one thing, but two, and very different things. They are regulated by different laws, they propose to themselves different ends,—and are not necessarily composed of the same persons, and therefore their duties do not belong to the same category. A great part of the confusion in which this subject is enveloped has arisen from confounding the two under the name of *national church*, a phrase not recognized by the New Testament. The New Testament gives no countenance to the idea of Christian nations as distinct from Christian churches. The church is not *national* in any sense consistent with the teaching of Christ and his apostles. What is national, takes its origin from the national will, and is regulated by the national mind, and is maintained by the nation's wealth and by the nation's power; but to predicate these of the church which is the kingdom of God, and which Christ purchased with his own blood, and in which he dwells by his Spirit, is alike absurd and impious.

Citizens of a nation are those born within its limits and enjoying the protection of its laws. Citizens of the kingdom of heaven are those who are born of the spirit; and the moment they undergo that process they pass into a community distinct and different from the nation within which their civil privileges lie,—a community into which the nation as such, or its Government, has no right to enter. The church has laws of its own, made by its Head, and which a human government has no right

to abrogate, or alter, or modify. To the civil government no appeal from the church can be carried, and the civil government cannot, dutifully, enforce the laws by which the Christian community is regulated. The civil government has no right to enquire who is and who is not a member of a church, and whether he is in good standing with his church, or whether his church be founded upon the word of God. The civil government has to do only with the persons and property of the subjects, and on it, all, whether Christians or Infidels, have an equal claim.

The defining of the relation in which Christ stands to the church and to nations is the first step to the understanding of the validity of the argument for the national endowment of the church; if the relation be of a different kind, the argument which proves that it is the church's duty to support the ordinances of Christ's kingdom will be altogether invalid as a proof that it is the duty of a nation to endow the church.

What has contributed to give speciousness to the argument in the affirmative is the syllogistic form in which it is put. The following is the form:—

Christ, as mediator is king of nations,

It is the duty of nations to honour their king,

Therefore, it is the duty of nations to honour Christ.

On this we remark, 1st.—That the word *nations* is used in the widest sense, including Heathen nations, as well as those in which the Christian religion is known and professed. But the peculiarity that Christianity is professed in some, is to be dropped, so that nationalism may be predicated equally, and to the same extent, in all. 2nd.—The relation between king and subject requires that the duty of the subject be expressed by the word *obey*. But were that word used, it would be proper to ask, what obedience does he require? The Voluntary would reply, it is that they should believe on him, for he commands all men everywhere to repent and believe. The anti-Voluntary would reply, it is, that nations should endow Christ's Church. The next question would be, where does he require nations to endow his church? No where. Endowments therefore cannot be proved if they be regarded as *obedience*. Therefore 3rd;—the more general term *honour* is employed, and under this loose term it is supposed that endowments may be included. But will Christ regard himself as honoured by those who give money to persons who profess to be his servants, while he is himself rejected and despised?—Again, is endowing the church the only way of honouring him? or is it one of the ways? If it be *one* of the ways, then, we ask, is it the most acceptable way?—If it be said that it is the only way in which nations as such can honour him then, we ask have we any authority for this in the word of God?

It is useless to waste more time on so worthless a syllogism, which by the way, has more faults than those here enumerated. The Committee of the Missionary Synod would only remark concerning the matters contained in it, that they firmly believe that Jesus Christ, as mediator, is King of nations; and not of nations only, but that to him "every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God, the Father."

They also believe that it is the duty of all men to whom Christ is offered in the gospel, to honour him by believing on him, and by yielding obedience to his commands; and that they who do not believe are his enemies, and shall be subjected to the penal consequences of sin.

But they deny, that it is the duty of *nations*, as distinguished from the *church*, to appropriate "any part of the public funds for the support of the church," and for this they assign the following reasons:—

I. Jesus Christ hath no where in his Word, either directly or by implication, commanded *nations* as such, to endow his church. It is not therefore their duty, because not enjoined. Not only is there no command to *nations* as distinct from *churches*, to make such appropriation of the public funds, but there is no example of any inspired man in the New Testament claiming such endowments; nor is there any hint of their expecting that at any future time, endowments would be sought by the church, or accepted, if offered. National endowments is a subject of which they knew nothing, and of which they have said nothing. The Committee of the Missionary Synod know of no arguments in support of national endowments, which are not based on a defective syllogism, or on expediency; but doctrines of expediency being nothing more than the opinions of those who hold them, can never become articles of religious belief.

The arguments drawn from the extinct Jewish system are all inapplicable, because the Jewish dispensation was one *sui generis*—because it was local and temporary—because it has served its day and is now no more. It was a shadow, a type, and is abrogated.

Farther, the passages which are quoted from ancient prophecies they cannot admit as proof for national endowments; because, 1st, it is of the nature of prophecy that it be not clearly understood, till the event explain it. Peter tells us that prophecy is not its own interpreter. 2nd, It is not agreed whether the prophecies alluded to, refer to the present, or a yet remote period in the church's history, and, 3rd, Prophecy is not a rule of duty.

These arguments are designed to show that it cannot be fairly proved from scripture that it is the duty of *nations*, as distinct from *churches*, to endow churches.

II. But while there is no command to nations to support Christian ordinances, there is a body of persons expressly enjoined to perform that duty, and to that body, and to none other, is the command given. That body is the church. And to show that the apostles believed that it was the duty of Christians and of none else, they repeatedly brought their rights to be supported by the church before their converts; praised them when they liberally contributed for this purpose, and blamed them when they neglected to do it. It appears farther, that the apostles could, in some cases, with difficulty persuade the Christian people to believe that this was a duty incumbent upon them. There was then, the same unwillingness to support religious ordinances as is often met with now, but there was no application to any other body to furnish what the church was unwilling to furnish. It seems never to have entered into the minds of the apostles to suppose that it was the duty of any but converts to minister to their wants. That it was *their* duty, the apostles broadly asserted, and when the churches failed in their duty, they "worked with their own hands" for support.

In urging this duty upon Christians, the apostles not only told them that it was their duty, but they employed arguments to convince them, and to persuade them to discharge it. In writing to the Corinthians, Paul says, "Who goeth a warfare at any time at his own charges? who planteth a vineyard, and eateth not of the fruit thereof? or who feedeth a flock and eateth not of the milk of the flock?" "Say I these things as a man? or saith not the law the same also? For it is written in the law of Moses, thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn. Doth God take care for oxen? Or saith he it altogether for our sakes? For our sakes, no doubt, this is written: that he that plougheth should plough in hope; and that he that thrasheth in hope should be partaker of his hope. If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great thing if we shall reap your carnal things? Do ye not know that they which minister about holy things live of the things of the temple? and they which wait at the altar are partakers with the altar? Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel." (1 Cor. ix. 7—14). In this passage it is asserted that the preachers of the gospel should be supported because they preached the gospel; also, that such support in temporal things is to be given by those to whom they minister in spiritual things. And this is declared to be agreeable to the laws of God,—to be reasonable—and according to the principle which regulates support in all departments of life. And lastly, God hath so ordained it.

No less forcibly does Paul inculcate this duty in writing to the Galatians, (vi. 6—9.) "Let him that is taught in the word, communicate to

him that teacheth in all good things." And lest they should deny or neglect this duty he adds, "Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. For he that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the spirit shall of the spirit reap life everlasting." In this passage Paul tells the Churches of Galatia, that the neglecting to communicate in all good things to him that teacheth, is a mocking of God, and that whatever arguments men may employ to excuse their neglect, are only so much self-deception—are a sowing to the flesh, and that the result will be a reaping of corruption. This is the style in which Christians were spoken to on this subject, and on none but Christians is the duty inculcated. Where, in all the New Testament, are *nations* told that if they do not endow churches, they are resisting an ordinance of God?—that they are mocking God, and are guilty of self-deception? and are committing sin!!

It is enough now to add here, that the style of the New Testament which contains the law of the gospel dispensation, is uniform on this subject,—that it is churches and not nations which are commanded to support the Christian ordinances.

And what is enjoined upon the church, the church is well able to perform. And where there is a willing mind, God, who loveth a cheerful giver, is able to make all grace abound to him, that he always having all-sufficiency in all things, may abound to every good work. (2 Cor. ix. 7, 8.) As a proof that the Christian people are able to perform fully this duty; the Committee need only name the United Secession Church—the Independents—the Methodists—the Baptists—the Free Church—all Dissenters of every name—all the Churches in America, and many others. To these may be added the Romanists in Britain—in Ireland and America, if they be admitted as a sect of the Christian Church.

If in the practical carrying out of this duty there be met with many instances of short-coming, we are, from such instances, as little entitled to quarrel with the principle, as we would be to repudiate Christianity, because every Christian does not do all that every Christian ought to do. And moreover, it is believed that instances of neglecting this duty would be much fewer than they are, were the Christian people divested of the opinion, that the supporting of the administration of Christ's Kingdom on earth, is not wholly their duty, but is the duty, in whole or in part, of some other party,—and that party, one, of which the church of Christ may have no knowledge.

Seeing then that the church is commanded to support the whole institutions of the gospel,—that the church is able to perform this service, and that many Christian churches have done it, and many still do it, and do it efficiently: there does not appear any good reason why civil gov-

ernments, which are no part of the complement of the church, should be applied to for pecuniary aid. Without calling in question the motives of those who apply for such aid, and who accept it, but looking at it as one of the class of things to which it belongs, it would seem that they who seek the money of others for their own ends, seek it, because they are not willing to give their own.

III. As the supporting of Christian institutions is the duty of the church, it is believed, that this, like other duties, is healthful to the spiritual interests of those who discharge it. It must be advantageous to the church to know that Jesus Christ has devolved on it the high and honourable function of maintaining, and extending, and perpetuating his interests in the world.—It must be healthful to the Christian people to be called together to devise means for carrying out their high commission—to contribute of their substance, and to offer up their earnest prayers, for counsel and a blessing. Engaged in such work, it may be expected, that they will take a deeper interest in their own salvation,—will more intensely compassionate the “ignorant and them that are out of the way,” and will enjoy a sublime and holy delight in seeing, and hearing of souls saved, partly through their own instrumentality. Take now out of the hands of the church, duties upon which so many blessed results depend, and a grievous injury is done to it. Some of the noblest, the most God-like emotions of the Christian soul, are allowed to lie dormant, and some of the sublimest pleasures which a Christian can feel must be unknown;—Christians are then put in a position where they must reap sparingly; and they will soon plead, as an apology for indolence, that if the church be supported, it matters not how, nor by whom. All that sovereigns and governments can do will not compensate for the loss which the church sustains in checking the formation of holy sympathies for precious souls, in rendering it a stranger to those circumstances which are ever urging to a throne of grace, and which strengthen and cement brotherly love by combined, strenuous efforts, to promote a noble cause. To all such activities civil governments, with their worldliness and their political leanings, are strangers and aliens. The genius of the Gospel and of human governments are so diverse that they cannot be incorporated. They must ever remain unamalgamated, like the iron and miry clay in the feet of Nebuchadnezzar’s image, and if forced into contact and mixed, the state must be to the church a source of weakness and impurity.

But this is not all. State endowments amount to the superseding of an express command of Christ, and *de facto*, are equivalent to a repeal of one of his laws. The simple statement of which is sufficient to condemn them. That they are incompatible with that spiritual association

which Christ came to gather out of the world, may be seen from the effects which their introduction has produced. They amounted to a recasting of the whole of the church's machinery. They introduced new movements, and displaced those which for three centuries had worked with wonderful speed and heaven-aided power. The whole machine became cumbrous, the friction was vastly augmented, and the work done was far less in quantity, and greatly inferior in quality. If the production of worldly-mindedness, pride and sloth in the clergy—indolence and formalism in the people, and a thousand years of ever-thickening darkness, be sufficient to demonstrate the unwisdom of bringing in human governments to do what the church alone is commanded to do, and what the church alone can do, then the history of state-endowed churches furnishes that demonstration.

IV. The Committee of the Missionary Synod further maintain, that the State has nothing which it can honestly give to the church. The public funds belong, not to the Government, but to the nation. They are contributed by all, and all are entitled to a share in their application; and when governments deal faithfully with what is committed to them, all do share in the benefits,—in the protection given to the persons and property of the citizens,—and in the carrying on of those improvements which contribute to the prosperity and happiness of the population. To exact from a people taxes beyond what is needful for civil purposes, is tyranny and oppression; and to appropriate to religious sects, what was raised for civil purposes, is to misapply the money of the people. As a State therefore can have no money for the purpose of endowing churches, it must, when given, be given dishonestly.

Besides, Governments are not appointed by Christ to interfere with ordinances which he has given to his church, which has a government distinct from, and not dependent upon, the civil. Civil governments therefore go out of their proper sphere when they enter into the church, and offer to do for the church, what Christ has commanded the church to do, and for which service they expect the enormous hire of the church's independence.

All that the church requires from civil governments is, to be let alone,—to be allowed to prosecute her own ends by her own means, and to be protected in her right to worship God according to her own conscience. These are civil privileges, and the church requires no more.

It has been said, that a people may tax themselves, by their representatives, for endowing churches. To give this the utmost force of which it is susceptible, let it be granted that a whole nation is unanimous in their religious belief, and that not a murmur would be made in paying taxes for the endowment of the church. Even in that case endow-



ments could not be defended, because the collecting of these monies and the appropriating of them, which are Christian acts, are performed by persons who have no office in the Christian church, and over whom the church, as such, can have no control.

But in our case it is useless to speculate on this point, as in no free government is there a oneness of religious belief, and therefore, to vote taxes for the endowment of churches must be the work of the majority; but a majority has no right to tax men of different religious opinions to get money to support their own. And not only so, but as civilians they have no Christian right to compel even those who are of their own way of thinking to support institutions of which they approve. Contributing money for maintaining Christian institutions is not a civil but a Christian duty, and for the manner in which it is discharged a Christian is amenable to no court, but that in which Christ presides.

Moreover; in order that a service done to God may be acceptable, it is essential that it be a free-will offering presented from a sense of duty and gratitude; but these qualities it cannot have in very many instances when it is exacted under fear of civil pains and penalties. Again, a Christian's free-will offerings are to be in proportion to the liberality with which God hath blessed him, but a civil government cannot estimate *that*, and has no right to attempt it.

To all this it may be added, that what is true in religion is not to be determined by vote, so as to make the adopting or the supporting of the opinions of the majority, binding upon the minority.

V. As no denomination of Christians would consent, or would contribute, to the endowment of all other denominations, the power of determining which sect is to be endowed and which is not to be endowed, must be with the party which has the endowment to give, i. e., with the civil Government; but the entrusting to the civil government the power of determining which amongst many sects is the true church, is objectionable on many accounts.

1. The civil government has not been appointed by Christ either to make laws for the church, or to interpret the laws which he has made. Amongst all who hold office in the church, the civil power is neither named nor alluded to in the scriptures. The judging, therefore, which denomination has the true doctrine and true discipline and worship of the church of Christ, does not belong to the civil power, and if exercised by it, is exercised by usurpation. The power of interpreting authoritatively, the doctrines and laws of Christ, so as to render that interpretation obligatory on others, requires infallibility which, whoever claims it, whether he be pope or king, seats himself in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God, (1 Thess. ii. 4.) And what renders the impiety

and presumption the more glaring is, that the person so sitting in the temple of God, and deciding what is the church which Christ has purchased with his own blood, may be a female who has no voice in the church, or one who may not even be a member of it. If divine authority be not claimed by him, then the assumption of the power is a tyrannical encroachment on the rights of conscience, and on the civil rights of the people. That such results are inevitable when the power of judging and determining which sect is the true church, to be raised above all other sects, and for the sake of whose ascendancy all other sects are to be discountenanced and depressed, is too obvious to require proof. Hobbes, who embraced this monstrous doctrine, says, that the "word of the interpreter of scripture is the word of God; and that the Sovereign Magistrate is the interpreter of all doctrines to whose authority we must submit—that thought is free, but when it comes to confession of faith, the private reasons must submit to the public one, i. e., God's lieutenant." Such is the unavoidable consequence of allowing the civil magistrate to interfere with a kingdom which does not belong to him.

2. Another ground of objection to the allowing the Civil Government to determine which sect is to be regarded as the true church, and in furtherance of the interest of which all the influence of Government is to be put forth, and for which a whole nation is to be taxed, and many consciences wounded, is, that all this influence, and all this favour may be employed, and has often been employed, in giving expansion and permanence to error. Has not the power of all Roman Catholic States been exerted in giving stability to that system on whose forehead are the names of blasphemy,—of that Man of Sin who has worn out the saints of the Most High, and is drunk with their blood! What miseries have been inflicted for the upholding of this power, let the vales of Piedmont and St. Bartholomew's day, tell. 'Let the hills and glens of our Fatherland over which a sanguinary persecution raged for 28 years, tell.'

VI. The Committee of the Missionary Synod farther object to all State endowments of religion, because of the jealousies which they introduce and perpetuate amongst the various denominations. The endowed, being lifted above others than whom they are not better, look down with real or affected contempt on those whom an unjust partiality has placed below them,—often misrepresent them as disaffected subjects—arrogate to themselves an exclusive loyalty, and in various ways give themselves airs, and assume a consequentiality which is felt to be as insolent as it is unjust. While the unendowed, feeling themselves placed by the Government which they support, in a degraded position regard those raised above them in political and ecclesiastical *status*, with feelings natural to

those who are unjustly treated. For this unseemly and unchristian state of matters, endowments are mainly to blame, and such results seem to be inseparable from them. They always exist where endowments exist; and they are unknown where endowments are not,—a great practical evidence that they are destructive of that brotherly feeling which Jesus Christ so earnestly inculcated on all his followers.

For these reasons, independently of many others which might have been given, the Committee of the Missionary Synod most firmly believe, that it is not lawful for the civil magistrate to devote any part of the public funds for the support of the church; and that it is not lawful for the church to accept of such support.

---

N. B.—The Committee of the Presbyterian Synod did not produce a  
“Proof of the Affirmative.”

---

MINUTES.

AT HAMILTON, 18th MARCH, 1846.

The Committees appointed by the Synod of the Presbyterian church, and the Missionary Synod, on the subject of Union of the two bodies, met. On the part of the former Synod, were present,—Messrs. Gale, (Convener), M. Y. Stark and J. Bayne, Ministers, and Messrs. W. McMillan and Wm. Kyle, Elders; and on the part of the Missionary Synod, Messrs. W. Proudfoot, (Convener), T. Christie, R. H. Thornton and James Roy, Ministers, and R. Christie, Esq. and Mr. Walter Chisholm, Elders.

The Rev. Mr. Proudfoot was called to the chair, and the meeting was constituted by prayer. The Rev. Mr. Gale was appointed Clerk.

Statements were then read by the respective conveners of the committees, respecting the questions suggested in the minutes of last meeting; and after a lengthened conference on the subject of endowments for religion by the civil magistrate as connected with the doctrine of the Headship of Christ over the nations, and the great ends of civil governments, it was agreed to adjourn till to-morrow at nine o'clock.

MARCH 19th, 1846.—The Committees met pursuant to adjournment, and the meeting was constituted by prayer. Sederunt—Messrs. W. Proudfoot, (chairman), T. Christie, R. H. Thornton, James Roy, M. Y. Stark, John Bayne, and A. Gale, Ministers; and Messrs. Robert Christie and Wm. McMillan, Elders. The committee considering, that there is a difference of opinion in regard to the points on which written statements, prepared by the two committees, were read and discussed yesterday, and apprehending that such difference may originate in some diversity of sentiment respecting the Headship of Christ over the nations, agreed to enter more fully into the views held in regard to this doctrine.

After full conference, it was resolved, that, in order to bring out the views of the committees more fully on various points, for the information of our respective Synods, statements of the views and principles held by the committees severally, respecting the following points, be prepared and interchanged by them, through their conveners, on, or before, the third Wednesday of May, for the purpose of being transmitted to their respective Synods at their first meeting:

Points on which Explanations of the Views and Principles of the Committees are mutually desired:

1. Definition of Christ's Headship over the nations, as distinguished from his Headship over the church.
2. Province of the civil magistrate.
3. Is national recognition of Christ's Headship over the nations a duty; and if so, in what form is it to be made?
4. Duties of the civil magistrate: 1. As to the recognition of the authority of Revelation, and its application to his peculiar duties.— 2. As to the suppression of sins against the first table of the moral law; and especially against the law of the Sabbath. 3. As to the promotion of religion, and especially as to the application of any portion of the public funds for the advancement of religion, or in the endowment of the church.
5. Sense in which certain statements in chap. XX. sec. 4., chap. XXIII. sec. 3, and chap. XXXI., sec. 2, of the Westminster Confession of Faith, are understood.
6. Views respecting existing establishments.
7. Relations of the Synods severally to other churches.

# STATEMENT OF OPINIONS

HELD

BY THE COMMITTEE OF THE MISSIONARY SYNOD

“ON THE POINTS ON WHICH EXPLANATIONS OF THE VIEWS AND PRINCIPLES OF THE COMMITTEES OF THE MISSIONARY SYNOD, AND OF THE SYNOD OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF CANADA ARE MUTUALLY DESIRED.”

## Point First :

DEFINITION OF CHRIST'S HEADSHIP OVER THE NATIONS AS DISTINGUISHED FROM HIS HEADSHIP OVER THE CHURCH.

1. That there is a difference, is admitted in the question. The difference arises from the different and distinct relation in which Christ stands to each. The church is a voluntary association of believers in Christ, together with their children, collected out of the world and placed under Christ as their Head, to be by him, conducted to the inheritance of which, with him, they are joint-heirs. To him exclusively it belongs, to make laws and appoint ordinances, that through these, as means rendered effective by his blessing, they may realize the objects of their faith and their fellowship. From the very nature of the Christian Church it can have no Head but Christ. He who purchased it with his own blood, who sends his Spirit to fashion it after his own image, and who hath prepared mansions for it in the house of his Father, is alone entitled to rule in the church. On him alone, as King in Zion, hath his Father placed the crown ; and for any creature to interfere with his government,—to alter, to modify, to abrogate, to supersede his laws is a sinful, a presumptuous encroachment on his high prerogatives.

2. The relation in which he stands to nations is of a very different kind. Nations are assemblages of men collected and united for the purpose of securing their natural rights, all which are civil and confined to the present life. Associations for mutual defence, in which each member resigns a portion of his natural rights into the hands of an executive power for the good of the whole, is part of the constitution which the Creator has given to man as a social being, and with which constitution

the remedial system does not interfere. That *Government* must exist, is the only part of this constitution which is ordained by God. The *kind* of Government is left to the choice of the nation. Whether it be monarchy or democracy or a mixture of both, *it is a power*, and that is the thing ordained by God. Nations are their own legislators.

3. Over all nations Christ is invested with supreme power, in order that he may gather out from amongst them those whom the Father hath given to him; and that he may make use of them in any way that may subserve the ends of his appointment.

The language of scripture on the kind and extent of the authority of Christ over the nations is remarkably full and precise. God hath put all things under him, that he may put down all rule and all authority and all power; and he shall reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet, (1 Cor. xv. 24—28.) It is as the “Head of the body—the church,” that he possesses this universal dominion, (Col. i. 18.) For “God hath set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come; and hath put all things under his feet and given him to be head over all things to the church, which is his body.” (Eph. i. 20—23.) Such is the relation in which Christ stands to the nation.

4. Over the Church and over nations his power is universal and supreme. Over the church it is exercised for the purposes for which he hath gathered his people out from the world: over the nations it is exercised for the benefit of the church. The two communities are perfectly distinct. They are organized on different principles, they have different laws, and different ordinances; they propose to themselves different ends, and they are not necessarily composed of the same persons. No two departments of government can be more distinct in nature and object, nor their limits more plainly defined than the government of Christ over the church, and over the nations.

### Point Second:

#### THE PROVINCE OF THE CIVIL MAGISTRATE.

5. The province of the civil magistrate are things civil. In all the respects in which Christians as such, stand related to Christ, they are not subject to the civil magistrate. The articles of their belief,—their worship,—the duties which they owe to one another, and their discipline, all lie out of the legitimate range of the magistrate’s functions. The magistrate’s power is founded on the constitution of nature, and the commitment of all authority into the hands of the Mediator has added nothing to his duties or his power. What it was by the original constitu-

tion it still is, and no more. Christ, as the Head of the remedial system, and as the Head of nations, has not committed the church to the magistrate's care, nor given him a commission to superintend it, nor invested him with either a legislative or executive authority over it.

6. On the other hand, the civil magistrate, as such, is not responsible to the church for any delinquencies, but to the nation from which his power is derived. Nor has the church any right authoritatively to interfere with his administrations. In their capacity as members of the civil community, Christians may interfere; but in their capacity of members of the Christian community, they may not. The church has no political character.

### Point Third:

WHETHER A NATIONAL RECOGNITION OF THE HEADSHIP OF CHRIST OVER THE NATIONS BE A DUTY.

7. On this point, the views of the Committee of the Missionary Synod will be more easily brought out by taking up the several matters in which that recognition is said to consist.

8. Before, however, entering on the details, they would premise, that to support the affirmative it would be necessary to prove that the introduction of the system of Grace has altered the natural relation in which man stands to his Maker, or the natural relation in which one man stands to another. The natural relation in which a subject stands to a ruler, or a ruler to a subject. And also, that some new power has been added to rulers by the remedial system which did not belong to them by the original constitution; and if so, then, inasmuch as it is not contained in that original constitution, it must be the subject of a specific revelation, because it could not be otherwise known or otherwise binding; and if it be revealed, then it will be needful that the statute be produced, and the law when produced will be expected to contain a shewing in what respects, and to what extent, it alters, enlarges or restricts the natural rights of man as a member of society; and also, whether this alteration is, or is not, an essential ingredient in the economy of Grace, so as that that economy would be defective were not civil rulers to have certain duties to perform to the church, necessary to her purity or her prosperity. Till these matters be proved, it must be held unproved that the recognition of the Headship of Christ is any part of the magistrate's functions.

9. In opposition to all this it is assumed that the magistrate's powers are not derived from revelation but from nature; because the apostle Paul exhorts Christians to be subject to magistrates, who were polytheists and heathen idolators, as holding a power from God which it would be

sinful to resist: leaving upon the mind the impression that the power ordained by God serves the ends of its appointment when it attends to "this very thing,"—being a terror to evil-doers and a praise to them who do well. "God has ordained civil government for the promoting of the welfare of men as members of the same civil society, and parental government, and the instruction and discipline of the church for their moral and religious improvement. And the less interference there is between these great institutions the better."

10. On the supposition that a nation is to recognise the Headship of Christ, it can do it in the only way in which all national acts are done,—by its government. Recognition made by individuals, however numerous, will not make their act a national act. Whether such recognition be a duty is to be ascertained by that revelation which makes us acquainted with the true character of Christ's Kingdom and government and with all the duty which we owe to God. But the scriptures do not enjoin any such national act. It is therefore not required of nations by Christ himself, and on that account is not a duty; nor is it anywhere in scripture, charged against nations as a crime that they did not recognise the headship of Christ over them.

11. National recognition is therefore an abstract question resting on no scriptural authority and not legitimately deducible from the peculiar authority which Christ has over the nations. It is a question of comparatively late origin, and brought into prominence for the purpose of sanctioning certain other acts which have proved very disastrous to the Christian church.

12. That God hath committed to Christ the Mediator, authority over all nations, is a fact, known only on the authority of Revelation: a recognition of the inspiration of the scriptures must therefore precede the recognition of any doctrine or fact resting on their testimony. Now, neither a nation as such, nor Christian men in a national capacity are called upon, nor are they competent, to decide authoritatively on the inspiration of the scriptures, nor on the nature of inspiration; nor whether the inspiration of the scriptures is plenary or partial. And though nations should decide on any or all of these points, such decision would not add anything to the evidence for the inspiration of the scriptures; nor to the authority of the truths contained in them—would not convince any inquirer; nor remove any objections; nor solve any difficulties. National recognition could not, therefore, serve any good purpose where the truth or the authority of the scriptures is concerned.

13. But on the supposition that a nation by its government recognises the scriptures, it must then, of course, take the scriptures as the basis of all legislative and executive acts. If not, then the recognition



of the Bible will differ in nothing from an authoritative recognition of any other historical fact. If it amount to nothing more than this, it is paying a poor compliment to the word of God, and is besides, setting the example of national hypocrisy.

14. A national recognition of the scriptures must be made for governmental purposes, and this certainly implies the determining of what the scriptures teach; for, to recognize or sanction a book and not to recognize or sanction its doctrines, is absurd. The assumption then by a government of an exegetical character is unavoidable. And if a government enter the arena of polemical theology with its subjects, history tells with sufficient plainness what sort of arguments will be employed.

15. Shall it be said that a government may recognise the *morality* of the Bible but leave its doctrines undefined and unrecognised? This would certainly be treating the Bible in a way very different from that in which it ought to be treated. Besides, assuming that a nation ought to recognise the scriptures, what authority can the nations produce for recognising only a part? and would not such partial recognition amount to the assumption of a right on the part of the nation to determine what part of the scripture is worthy of recognition, and what is not? and would not a nation thus determining, sit in judgment on the word of God, and not only so, but determine that the morality of the Bible is of more importance than its doctrines, and not only so, but that its doctrines are not worthy of a nation's patronage?

16. Besides, the morality of the Bible is founded on its doctrines and its facts, and ought not to be detached from its own fundamental principles. If it be separated from them, it is no longer the morality of the Bible, because it wants that very principle which makes morals acceptable to God. To offer obedience to Christ on any other ground than as Mediator crowned with empire for the suffering of death, is not to honour but to insult him—is to offer the blind and the lame, and even the dead, for sacrifice. And moreover, to recognise the morality of the Bible without its peculiar sanctions and motives, is in fact not to recognise the Bible at all, but is to fall back on the constitution of nature. And this, as shewn above, is the only law which a nation by its government can recognise as the basis of its civil actings, because it is binding, not upon a party or a section, but on every human being, so that there can be no difference of opinion amongst men as to the *right* of what it commands, and the *wrong* of what it forbids.

17. Again, it is essential to governments that they enforce obedience to their laws by pains and penalties. For a government to enact the Bible and yet to allow its enactments to remain a dead letter on the statute book, is to befool both the Bible and itself.

18. It is objected to the above, that on these principles there can be no Christian government and no Christian nation. In rep'y, we would ask, has there ever been a Christian government? Certainly not those who have ruled for the benefit of Popery. Not those which have ruled for the benefit of Episcopacy, the religion of kings. Not those who have ruled for the benefit of Presbyterianism. And certainly not those which have ruled for and legalised all the three. What Christian government is, the world has not yet seen, and what shall be the form of it when it shall appear, none has yet been able to determine. But it is a mistake to suppose that the influence of religion cannot be felt in a nation unless the Headship of Christ and the Bible be enacted by authority. Government in free states is the creature of the people and reflects the character of the nation, and where this is not the case the government is a despotism, and at war with the subjects. As governments, then, derive their character from the people, so where Christianity has leavened the masses with its sublime principles the administration of civil affairs will be influenced by them, and that in a way which can offend the conscience of no man, and encroach on no man's liberty or rights. A nation becomes a Christian nation when the people become Christians. For a government to enact the Bible and thence call the nation, Christian, is a fiction of the same kind as to enact Euclid and thence call a nation a nation of mathematicians. In all free countries it is the character of the people that makes the character of their governments; of this our own Imperial government furnishes many appropriate examples. The abolition of the Slave Trade;—the passing of the Reform Bill;—the abolition of the Test and Corporation Act;—the repeal of the Corn Law, and the enactment of Free Trade, were all forced upon governments by the pressure of public opinion. Governments must follow a nation, not drive it. It is the water which moves the machine, not the machine which moves the water. Although governments have no authority from Christ to enact religious opinions or religious duties, rulers may yet conduct themselves in their official capacity by Christian principles. They may, as individual Christians, act under the influence of all those considerations which the word of God furnishes to make men discharge their duties with righteousness and fidelity. Farther than this their station does not warrant them to go.

19. The enactment of religious doctrines by governments must be injurious to both religion and governments. Civil government is a thing of progress, but to fix it down by abstract religious opinions is to prevent all improvement. Any attempt at improvement through the growing enlightenment of the age will even be resisted by those interested in antiquated legislation and abuses, as a sin against God; and thus reli-

gion will be degraded by being mixed up with party politics, an effect which has often occurred in every European nation, and which has kept back, and still keeps back, a multitude of ameliorations, which an enlightened age demands and needs. A blunder of the same kind has been committed by governments with respect to science, when, influenced by what they thought bible-truth, they denounced certain discoveries, because in their opinion, they contradicted the word of God. The former has produced not a few rebellions, and the latter has made many infidels.

20. The recognition of the Bible, then, in the only way in which they believe that recognition can be made, though apparently a harmless act, and having on the face of it what appears to be an honouring of the Saviour, the Committee believe that such recognition cannot be otherwise than injurious to religion,—on whose behalf they protest against it, as prejudicial to the rights of conscience and the civil rights of nations. At the same time they are persuaded that all the good that can be imagined from recognition can be gained; and gained in a way more consonant with the genius of the Gospel, more favourable to civil rights, and injurious to no interest, by simply leaving religion in the hands of its friends, and by leaving governments to attend to their own proper business, civil affairs.

21. Before leaving this “point,” the Committee would re-assert, that National Recognition is no where taught in the New Testament,—no-where alluded to,—no-where implied. The idea is professedly borrowed from the Old Testament, and the whole of the proofs adduced to support it are taken from the Old Testament. But that Dispensation,—its Royalty, and its authorized national acts were typical:—typical, not of what are called *Christian nations*, but of the *Church of Christ*,—that kingdom over which David’s Son and David’s Lord reigns, a kingdom which is “diverse from all the kingdoms” of the world, and which is to last as long as the sun, and endure as the moon. To keep up the types, now that the thing typified has come, is doing the very thing against which Paul spent his life in contending;—against which, some of his epistles were expressly written; which was, in his judgment, contrary to the essential character of the New Dispensation; and was in fact, a *Judaizing* of Christianity. It is in taking different views of the New Dispensation as distinguished from the Old, that the main difference between the voluntary and the compulsory system lies.

#### Point Fourth:

22. This respects the suppression by the magistrate of sins against the first table of the Law, especially against the law of the sabbath.

With respect to sins in general against the first Table of the Law,

the Committee of the Missionary Synod find no precept in the New Testament authorizing the magistrate to punish them. Nor does the New Testament contain any passage that can be fairly interpreted to mean that the magistrate shall at any time coming, or in any new combination of circumstances, possess and lawfully exercise the power of making such sins the subject of executive acts. In point of fact, the magistrate is not recognised in the New Testament as having anything to do in his official capacity with the duties which man owes directly to God. The only proofs ever adduced to authorise his attempting to prevent, suppress or punish such sins, have been quoted from the Old Testament. And these are all inapplicable. Proofs from the Old Testament are of two kinds,—those drawn from the duty and practice of Old Testament Kings, and those drawn from prophecy. Those belonging to the former class are not in point, 1st, because the whole system has been set aside by God himself and is therefore not a precedent for Gospel times. 2nd. Because Jewish royalty was typical,—typical not of national governments but of Christ's rule in his own church. Those belonging to the latter class are all inapplicable, 1st, Because prophecy is not a rule of duty, and 2nd, Because prophecy is not its own interpreter,—it not being understood till the event explain it.

23. But human governments not only have no authority for inflicting pains and penalties upon transgressors of the laws of the first table, but they have not the *Power* of preventing or suppressing such sins. They have often attempted it. They have driven men to church by the terrors of law, but did they succeed in making men worship God?—Could they succeed? Meanwhile the attempt was an act of tyranny, —was persecution. And after all it was not the worship of God that was the object aimed at, but submission to the religion of the Rulers.

24. Idolatry is the most aggravated crime forbidden in the First Table, and one which brought down innumerable evils on the Israelites. No human government has now any authority to attempt the prevention or the suppression of this most impious and foolish crime. Every Protestant believes that the worship of the Mass, and of the Virgin Mary, is idolatry. But is any Protestant Government authorized to suppress the idolatrous worship of the Romanists? Would men of enlightened minds support it in the attempt? Some Protestant Governments have made the attempt, but the attempt was persecution. Of this sin, our venerated Scottish Reformers were not free, when they forbade their Sovereign to worship God according to her own conscience, and in her own chapel; and which proceeding, when turned against themselves, they scrupled not to call persecution, and so it was. But, persecuting of Protestants, and persecuting of Romanists is the same thing; it is sin. Seeing then that

civil government has no authority for, nor power of, preventing idolatry, the first and the greatest sin forbidden in the First Table, it is but fair to conclude that sins committed directly against God lie out of the magistrate's province. The right to punish such sins God has reserved to himself.

25. Under the Theocracy, idolatry was at once a sin against God as God, and against God as the sovereign of the land, and when punished, was punished by his express command. Unless kings can make it evident that they have the same powers now which kings had under the Theocracy, they have no right to do what these kings did who acted by authority directly from God. And this is farther and conclusively evident from the fact, that the punishment which kings, under the Theocracy were commanded to inflict upon idolators was death. No modification of the penalty was ever hinted at. If this, the power of suppressing and punishing idolatry rests upon the laws which God gave to his ancient people, then the same statute which gives kings the power, renders it imperative that they should inflict the statutory punishment—death. They have no discretionary powers. The extreme results to which the exercise of such power would lead, and the total absence of any countenance to such power in the New Testament, and its obvious contrariety to the genius of the gospel dispensation, warrant us to believe that the infliction of punishment for sins committed directly against God does not belong to the magistrate.

26. There is, however, a speciality in the law, regarding the Sabbath-day. It is an ordinance of a mixed character.

First. It requires that every family,—that the man-servant, and the maid-servant, and the cattle employed in labour shall rest on one day in seven. In so far it is the declaration of a natural right. It is believed, and for reasons supposed to be good, that a day of rest every week from labour is necessary for the preservation of the physical powers of all employed in continuous toil, and if so, then, it is a law in the constitution of man, as certainly, though not to as great an extent, as the law which renders meat and drink necessary to the preservation of health and strength.

27. Owing to the derangement which sin has introduced into the whole system, there are multitudes necessarily subject to the will of others, and it will often happen, and has often happened, that they who have power over others, will exercise that power for their own benefit, without regarding the rights of those who are subject to them. Society, must, therefore, possess the means of securing to men their natural rights—the right of the man-servant and the maid-servant and the cattle, to a day of rest. The maintaining of this right, and of all other natural rights, is part of the business and duty of civil government.

28. To secure to every man the enjoyment in full, of his right to a day of rest, it is necessary that he be not disturbed in his Sabbath by a taskmaster, or by any thing which would render his Sabbath not a day of rest to him.

29. Nor ought he to be made to suffer in his lawful calling by others, who may not choose to rest, prosecuting their ordinary worldly business, which may be to his prejudice.

30. As, however, no government can compel a man to rest on the Sabbath, any more than it can compel him to eat and drink, or to enjoy any other natural right, its powers seem to extend no farther than to protect from, not only oppression, but disturbance, those who may wish to enjoy the Sabbath which the constitution of nature assigns to them as a right.

31. The powers with which civil rulers are invested to secure the observance of a Sabbath are very different from those which were given to kings under the Theocracy, and which go to shew that the Sabbath was, in some respects, to them different from what it is to all the rest of mankind. It was expressly commanded that "whosoever doeth any work on the Sabbath day, he shall surely be put to death." (Ex. xxxi. 15.) This power has ceased with the dispensation of which it formed a part, and the rest of the Sabbath is to be secured now, by such means as are necessary to secure all other natural rights. The magistrate may protect the servant and the labouring beast from oppression, and may declare illegal all contracts, bargains and sales, made upon Sabbath. Farther than restraint and protection it does not appear that he has any right to go.

32. Second. The day which was to be abstracted from labour was to be spent in the worship of God, and in those exercises which are fitted to nourish pious sentiments. It will at once be admitted as a manifestation of wisdom and goodness on the part of God, to have so constituted human society, as, that a day must be left open, and which could be devoted to these purposes. There can be no doubt that the observance of the Sabbath as a day not only of rest, but of worship, is necessary in a high degree, to the best interests of man.

33. But while this is admitted in the strongest sense, it is denied to the same extent, that since the repeal of the Theocratic government, any human government is invested with the power of compelling men to worship God. The very idea involves an absurdity. Worship in spirit and truth, such as God requires under the present dispensation, cannot be forced. To be other than an abomination, it must be voluntary. No human authority has a right to enact what portion of the day is to be spent in worshipping God, nor what the worship of God shall consist of, nor

how it is to be performed. All these belong to the department of conscience, and with conscience magistrates have nothing to do.

34. All this being true, even with regard to the seventh-day Sabbath, it far more evidently so, with regard to the New Testament Sabbath.—The observance of the Christian Sabbath is a tribute of grateful affection given by his friends, at his request, to Him who died for sinners and rose again. It can be paid only by Christians, and the enforcing of the observance of it, by pains and penalties, upon those who do not believe in Christ, is a stretch of authority revolting to every pious mind, and fitted to make some act the part of hypocrites, and to make others regard religious services with abhorrence.

35. While the Committee of the Missionary Synod believe that the magistrate cannot enforce the religious observance of the Sabbath, and that he ought not to attempt it, they believe, that interference on the part of government, with the Christian Sabbath is one reason why it has to such an extent been desecrated. Christians who ought to have set the example of Sabbath sanctification, have neglected their duty, and have called in an arm of flesh with carnal weapons to do what ought to have been done by themselves. The outward influence which is to induce men to hallow the Lord's day, is the example of Christians keeping the day holy, but if they neglect to sanctify the Sabbath, it will be in vain for the magistrates to attempt to enforce it. Nor is this all; even Christians have been led to fancy that while they kept within the legal statutes they were not chargeable with Sabbath desecration. The civil statute and not the word of God becomes the rule. In such a case the magistrate renders the word of none effect by basing obedience to a divine ordinance on a civil enactment.

36. It is a truth agreeable to reason, and supported by many facts, that the obligation to Christian duties which rests on the sole authority of the Head of the Church, becomes less powerful when made to rest on an inferior authority, because the addition of an element which does not belong to it, alters its character, and divests it of that sacredness in which its authority wholly consists. The interference of the civil magistrate with the Headship of Christ over his own people, has, according to the extent to which it has been carried, degraded the church, and in many ways been productive of a vast amount of evil, of which evils not the least is the giving of a civil character to the Lord's day—an institution wholly religious—and thereby weakened the real force of the obligations to observe it.

37. The Committee farther think, that in the zeal which some have shewn to call in the aid of the civil power, there is apparent, as manifest a wish to force men to think as they do, as to see men honouring the

institutions of God. This they think evident from the fact that they would resort to the use of means wholly repugnant to the Christian religion, and also from the other fact, that in many instances they are themselves no way remarkable for sanctifying the Lord's day.

38. In a word, the religious element which is in the Sabbath, removes it, so far as that is concerned, from the list of things which legitimately belong to the magistrate's office; and farther, that the sanctification of the Sabbath can be maintained by no means consistent with its character, but by the fidelity of the Christian people themselves. The only way by which the desecration of a religious ordinance can be guarded against, is by Christians avoiding those who cause offences contrary to the doctrine which they have learned, and by withdrawing themselves from them.

#### Point Fifth:

##### RESPECTS THE EDUCATION OF THE YOUNG.

39. Education is either secular or religious. So far as secular education is concerned, it is a civil question; and it is competent to a nation to decide on all the points connected with it.

40. Religious education is, however, a very different matter. It does not belong to the class of things civil, and consequently they whose province is things civil, have no right to interfere with it. All who contend for a national religious education, mean by it the educating of the young in those religious principles of which they severally approve. Each sect regards the money spent in the indoctrinating of the young in religious principles of which they conscientiously disapprove, a misapplication of the national funds. It does not belong to a government to decide what is a religious education, nor to appoint religious teachers, nor to pay them. The religious education of the youth belongs to parents under whose care Providence places them, during the time when religious instruction can be communicated with the best effect: a government has nothing to do with them till they attain to that age at which they become responsible for their conduct. The churches to which the parents belong, have an evident right to exercise a superintendance over the religious education of the young, and for this very obvious reason, that the neglecting of the duty incumbent on parents of training up their children in the way they should go, subjects them, in all well regulated churches, to discipline.

A government has no more right to educate religiously a youth of ten years of age, than it has to educate a man of fifty.

#### Point Sixth:

41. The 6th point on which the Committee of the Missionary Synod are



requested to give their views, is "The duty of the civil magistrate as to the promotion of religion amongst the people, and especially as to the application of any portion of the public funds for the advancement of the Church."

42. This consists of two parts, the one general, and the other particular. With regard to the former, the opinion of the Committee is, that the only way in which, so far as they know, a government can rightfully promote religion among a people, is by securing to all the unalienable right which belongs to every man—the right of private judgment—the right of holding and propagating his own religious opinions; and of so ruling that no man may, in promoting his own views, interfere with the rights of others or disturb the peace of society. All beyond this is an encroachment upon the rights of conscience.

43. The Committee do not think it necessary to detail such governmental actings ostensibly for the promotion of religion as they disapprove of, because they repudiate in *toto* all state-interference in religious matters. They would not, however, do justice to their principles did they not assert their belief, that state-interference for the promotion of religion has been one of the greatest obstacles to its advancement, as well as one of the most active agencies in corrupting it and altering its character. Christianity has given abundant evidences of its capacity for self-extension, and it needs only to be left in the hands of its friends to gain, by the blessing of its Author, the empire of the world. All efforts by civil governments to advance religion, beyond protecting every man's individual right to propagate what he believes to be the truth, have hitherto signally failed,—and not only failed, but been productive of great injustice and great suffering. And believing that the principle of state-interference is radically unsound, the Committee do not think it possible in any way so to work it out as that it shall not produce the same or similar evil consequences. State-interference must ever be to the Church what it has ever been, a source of corruption and weakness. For more than a thousand years Christianity has not been permitted to appear in its true character, it has been unequally yoked, and forced to keep company with one not of its own race; and the unnatural alliance has cumbered, retarded and enfeebled its movements. An experiment tried for so long a period,—under all forms of civil government,—and in all stages of civilization—and always leading to the same results,—teaches lessons which it were alike unwise and unsafe to disregard.

44. The second part of this question respects the endowment of the Church out of the National Funds. On that subject the Committee of the Missionary Synod have already fully given their views, and they need not now therefore detail them at any great length. They think it suffi-

ent for the present to remark, that they stated, and to a considerable extent illustrated, the following propositions :

45. 1st. That Jesus Christ bath no-where in his word, either directly or by implication, commanded nations, as such, to endow his Church.

46. 2nd. While there is no command to nations to support Christian ordinances, there is a class of persons expressly enjoined to do it; and to that class and to none other, is the command given. That class is the Church. When nations, then, presume to endow the Church of Christ, they do an unbidden service, and by thrusting themselves forward to do what is the duty of others, they virtually supersede an ordinance of Christ.

47. 3rd. Inasmuch as the supporting of Christian ordinances is the duty of the Church, the discharge of that duty must be beneficial to the Church,—a means of doing good and of getting good. And therefore for the State to step in between the Church and its duties must be injurious in many ways to the Church.

48. 4th. That the State has nothing which it can honestly give to the Church : its funds being collected for other and different purposes.

49. 5th. As no denomination of Christians would consent or contribute to the endowment of all other denominations, the power of determining which sect shall be endowed must be assumed by the party endowing, i. e., the Civil Government. But the assumption by the Civil Government of the right of determining which, amongst the many sects, is the true Church, is objectionable on many accounts, especially on the two following : 1. The Civil Government has not been appointed by Christ to make laws for his Church, nor to interpret authoritatively those which he has made. Amongst all who hold office in the Church of Christ, the civil power is never named and never alluded to. 2. The assumption of a right to determine which sect is to be regarded as the true Church, and on that account endowed, and in furtherance of the interests of which all the influence of Government is to be put forth, and for which a whole nation is to be taxed, and many consciences wounded,—has often led to the giving of extension and permanency to error.

50. 6th. That state-endowments occasion perpetual jealousies amongst the various denominations of Christians, and engender strife and contentions amongst those who ought to live in peace, and not only live in peace, but co-operate for the advancement of the common salvation, and which contentions derogate from the character which Christian Churches ought to maintain.

51. On these grounds, independently of many others that might be given, the Committee of the Missionary Synod believe, that it is not lawful for the civil power to devote any portion of the public funds for the

endowment of the Church ; and also, that it is not lawful for the Church to accept of any such endowment.

—

**Point Seventh :**

52. The Committee now proceed to state their views respecting certain passages in the Westminster Confession of Faith, which refer to the Magistrate's power, *civica sacra*. The first of these is chap. XX. section 4. In reference to the matters contained in that passage, the Committee believe that no Christian is warranted upon pretence of Christian liberty to oppose any lawful civil power, or the lawful exercise of it, by publishing such opinions or maintaining such practices as are contrary to the light of nature, or as are destructive to external peace and order, and that they who do so may be proceeded against by the power of the Civil Magistrate.

53. But they do peremptorily deny that any lawful civil power, is, *ex officio*, an ecclesiastical power,—and also, that any ecclesiastical power may call in the aid of the civil power to proceed against those who may publish opinions contrary to what that power may call the known principles of Christianity, whether concerning faith, worship or conversation, or the power of Godliness. Ecclesiastical offences are cognizable only by the Church and not by the Magistrate. When the publication of such opinions as are contrary to the light of nature, is followed by overt acts destructive of external peace, the Magistrate may interfere to restore and preserve peace. Whatever penalty may be inflicted, ought in such a case to be inflicted for the disturbance, not for the opinions; and the more so, because in very few instances, have the publishers of such supposed destructive opinions been the instigators of the disturbance, but they whose opinions have been assailed ; and in very many instances the suffering party has been right and the punishing party been wrong.—Pertinent proofs of this are furnished by the introduction of Christianity, and by every attempt at Reformation by the civil power.

54. The next passage is in Conf. XXIII. § 2. On this section the Committee of the M. S. remark, that they do not believe that the Civil Magistrate hath any authority from Christ, or that it belongs to his office, to “take order that unity and peace be preserved in the Church, that the truth of God be kept pure and entire, that all blasphemies and heresies be suppressed, all abuses and corruptions in worship and discipline be prevented or reformed, and all the ordinances of God duly settled and administered.” Nor do they believe that “he hath power to call Synods, to be present at them, and to provide that whatever is transacted in them be according to the mind of God.”

55. Such power belonged to the kings under the Dispensation which

is now abrogated, and seems to be necessary in Churches established by law and endowed out of the national funds ; but are wholly inconsistent with the idea of a Christian Church, and of the entireness of Christ's Headship. The claiming of such powers is an encroachment on Christ's prerogative, and the exercise of them is persecution.

56. The last passage quoted, is Conf. Chap. xxxi. § 2, and asserts that "Magistrates may lawfully call a Synod of Ministers, and other fit persons to consult and advise with about matters of religion."

The Committee of the Missionary Synod, believe that Magistrates have no such power granted by Christ.

57. Respecting the powers, said in these passages to belong to the civil magistrate, the Committee remark :

1st. That by those who allow to the magistrate power in matters of religion, it is admitted, that his power of interference ceases at a certain point, but where that point is, they are not agreed. By each party it is fixed arbitrarily. Some maintaining that it goes as far as the power of Jewish kings, and some denying this. But neither party having any authority for determining it of more weight than their own opinion.

58. 2nd. The compilers of the Confession evidently seem to have supposed that Christianity was a carrying out of Judaism to a greater extent than was authorized under the Old Testament, thereby showing that they were defective in the knowledge of the extent to which the old economy was abrogated, and also of the ecclesiastical form of the Church under the new dispensation.

59. 3rd. The passages of scripture by which their opinions were supposed to be sanctioned, seem to have been selected in the most careless manner, and without any judgment. The Committee have examined them all. By far the greater number of them are quoted from the Old Testament, and refer to a dispensation which has been set aside by the authority which ordained it. Some of these seem to be quoted upon the principle that whatever a king, Jewish or heathen, is said to have done for the Jewish nation, or in any connection with it, is divine authority for kings doing similar things under the Christian dispensation. In some the principle of quotation, if principle there was, cannot fail to call forth a smile ; in others a blush, and in others indignation. And in a word, *none* of them *prove* the doctrines taught in the chapters referred to.

### Point Eighth

#### REGARDS THE VIEWS ENTERTAINED BY THE COMMITTEE OF THE MISSIONARY SYNOD "RESPECTING EXISTING ESTABLISHMENTS."

60. In holding this primitive principle, fundamental and essential to the Reformation, the opposite of a principle fundamental and essential to Popery, the Committee are happy to find their opinions clearly and scripturally expressed in the Confession of Augsburg: "The political administration is busied with every thing else but the gospel. The magistrature protects, not souls, but bodies and temporal possessions. He defends them from all attacks from without, and, by making use of the sword and of punishment, compels men to observe civil justice and peace. For this reason we must take particular care not to mingle the power of the Church with the power of the State. The power of the Church ought never to invade an office that is foreign to it; for Christ himself said: 'My kingdom is not of this world. And again; 'Who made me a judge over you? Paul said to the Philippians: Our citizenship is in heaven. And to the Corinthians: The weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God.' It is thus that we distinguish the two governments and the two powers, and we honour both as the most excellent gifts that God has given here on earth."\*

61. This "primitive principle essential to the Reformation," was unfortunately checked in its development, and the principle essential to Popery permitted to keep it greatly in abeyance, the consequence has been, that a second Reformation has become necessary. The first Reformation recovered from the rubbish of of Popery, the original doctrine, the "articulum stantis vel cadentis ecclesiæ," justification by faith alone without the works of the law. The second great Reformation has for its object the deliverance of the Church from the thealdom of State dominancy, State superintendance, and State pay, and setting her free to go forth and publish in every land the glad tidings of heaven's peace. With emancipation from State connection, the remainder of Popery which still clings to her, will fall off, and she will appear in the simple but heavenly attire befitting the bride, the Lamb's wife. The Missionary Synod dare not put themselves in the way of a movement so glorious and fraught with such blessings to man, convinced that by doing so they would be opposing the Headship of Christ over his own Church, and doing what in them lay to retard the glory of the coming millenium.

62. The views held on the subject of State connection, by the Mission-

---

\* D'Aubigné's Reformation, Vol. iv. 191.

ary Synod, are the views which mark the character of the present age. They have already arrayed in their defence the names of many whose praise is in all the churches. From the writings of one of whom we quote the following extract,—the excellence of which will be sufficient apology for its length: “Society, or more strictly speaking, the State, which seems to have renounced the persecution of creeds, has not yet renounced their *protection*; and, perhaps, it will be expected, that having protested against persecution, we shall accept of *protection* with avidity. Yes, it is most true, that we desire that the profession of religious convictions should be *protected*, but protected as the *common right* of all, and consequently without distinction of creeds. We are not desirous that any particular creed should be protected, nor in general, believers to the exclusion of unbelievers. We deprecate *protection* for the same reason that we deprecate *persecution*, for the right of *protection* necessarily involves the right of *persecution*. Endeavours are made to limit this right; to prevent its exercise beyond the point where protection terminates; it may be forbidden to advance farther; but the limit is arbitrary; and it is impossible to conceive how, in sound logic, the State can be denied the right of persecution, after having been allowed the right of *protection*.—For any religion whatever to accept of protection, is to accept, as a consequence, the right of persecution. You tell us, that you desire only protection; that you abhor persecution; but the distinction is idle. You condemn yourself to submit to it, and what is worse, to make use of it. Yes, whatever be the modesty of your pretensions, or the meekness of your dispositions, rest assured you will persecute; every protected religion has ended by persecuting; nay, even when trodden under foot, it has persecuted. It has received as the price of its own liberty, the power of trampling upon other liberties which in their subjection could yet eclipse it. And in either case, whether free or in subjection, it has never refused to persecute; it has ever been found that every *protected* religion has persecuted: it will not merely consent to persecution, it will claim it as a right and the chief of its rights; it will regard it as the seal of its protection; and it will only consider itself sufficiently protected, when it possesses the power to persecute. *Corruptio optimi pessima*. The more serious the religion, the more is it the result of conviction; the greater the importance attached by its followers to the knowledge and profession of its doctrines, the stronger will be the temptation. A religion whose motto is ‘*no salvation out of my pale*’ is likely to become violent and ferocious by the slightest contact with the civil power. The sword of the magistrate becomes drunken, according to the expression of the prophet; this sword becomes blind and furious in the hands of power. No law can regulate its use; its use is an abuse from the commencement, because it is an abuse in

principle, and the only way to prevent religion from injuring both itself and humanity with this dangerous weapon, is not to leave it for one single moment in her hands."

64. The Committee have only farther to observe, that the Missionary Synod is an independent body competent to enter into union with any other body, with which it may choose to associate itself.

**STATEMENT OF THE VIEWS**  
OF THE  
**COMMITTEE OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF CANADA**  
RESPECTING THE  
POINTS SELECTED AND ARGUED UPON AT THE JOINT MEETING OF THE COM-  
MITTEES, AS THOSE ON WHICH EXPLANATIONS ARE MUTUALLY DESIRED.

---

**Point First :**

**DEFINITION OF CHRIST'S HEADSHIP OVER THE NATIONS AS DIS-  
TINGUISHED FROM HIS HEADSHIP OVER THE CHURCH.**

1. Christ is king of nations in this sense,—that as God he is possessed of absolute supremacy over all men, as his dependent responsible creatures ; and, again, as Mediator he has been invested by the Father with all authority and power, as the Governor and Judge of the world, all things being put under his feet, and He being made Head over all things to His Church, and in virtue of this twofold supremacy, *all men, in every relation of life*, are bound to honour and serve him as king.\*

2. Christ is King of Saints or Head of the Church in this sense,—that having in terms of his Covenant with the Father, redeemed a people to himself by his blood, and having formed them into a visible institute in the world,—a spiritual Kingdom in the world, but distinct from the world, whose members stand in a peculiar relation to Him, enjoy peculiar privileges, and are called to the performance of peculiar duties —He is the sole and immediate lawgiver of that kingdom, and in matters peculiar to that kingdom, its members are bound to honour and serve him as their only king.†

And 3. The distinction between Christ's Headship over the nations and his Headship over the Church, while it implies that Christ has supremacy over the unbelieving world as well as over the Church, yet corresponds especially and so far as it lays a basis for distinguishing between two classes of duties which men owe to Christ, not to the distinction be-

---

\* See Remark A by the Committee of the United Presbyterian Synod.

† See Remark B.



tween the Church and the world, but to the distinction between what is peculiar to the Church, and what is not peculiar. In other words, the Headship of Christ over the nations, implies that all men, whether members or not members of the Church, are bound in every secular relation, and especially as members of civil society and organized under Civil Government, to honour and serve him as King.—And again, His Headship over the Church implies, that apart from the honour and service which all men owe to Christ in every secular relation, those who are members of the Church (as all men ought to be) are especially bound to honour and serve him as King, in respect of the spiritual duties which are *peculiar* to the Church.

The *religious aspect* in which duties proper to the secular relations of life may be regarded, and in virtue of which they become *so far* subject to the cognizance of the Church as duties which its members owe to Christ as Head of the Church, does not, it is plain, interfere with the distinction between Christ's Headship over the Church and His Headship over the nations. Even if all the world were within the Church these distinctions would still remain.\*

---

### Point Second :

#### THE PROVINCE OF THE CIVIL MAGISTRATE.

The province of the Civil Magistrate is the care and protection of the properties of the members of the Commonwealth, over which he presides as “the minister of God ;”—for the accomplishment of the ends which, within his province, he is appointed to promote; he is invested by God with authority to use means, both for the punishment and prevention of crime, or of whatever would hinder the public welfare ;—and as his province is not perfectly distinct from that of the Rulers of the Church, so he is not warranted in any way to intrude into the spiritual province, or even in seeking to accomplish the ends proper to his own province, to make use of means which the Head of the Church has appointed to be used by the Church alone.†

---

### Point Third :

#### IS NATIONAL RECOGNITION OF CHRIST'S HEADSHIP OVER THE NATIONS A DUTY, AND IF SO, IN WHAT FORM IS IT TO BE MADE ?

It is the duty of all who are placed under the Headship of Christ to confess Christ as well as to obey Him in every relation of life ; and es-

---

\* See Remark C.

† See Remark D.

pecially it is the duty of men in their natural capacity, or in the relation as members of a Commonwealth placed under God's ordinance of Civil Government, to make a public and formal recognition of Christ's Headship, or in other words: a material profession of allegiance to their King. with respect to the particular mode in which this ought to be done, it appears to us that the simplest and least objectionable mode would be, if not by a national covenant, at least by a national act incorporated into the constitution of the state, and made the basis, so far as applicable, of all after legislation and administration.\*

#### Point Fourth :

##### THE DUTIES OF THE CIVIL MAGISTRATE.

(1.) As to the recognition of the authority of Revelation and its application to his peculiar duties. (2.) As to the suppression of sins against the first table of the moral law, especially against the law of the Sabbath. (3.) As to the education of the young. (4.) As to the promotion of religion, and especially as to the application of any portion of the public funds for the advancement of religion or in the endowment of the Church.

1. As Christ has given in his word a revelation of his will applicable to every *relation* of life in which men can be placed, and as, in particular, the duties of magistrates and of those under their authority are distinctly and fully pointed out in it, it is the duty of the Civil Magistrate to make a formal recognition of the authority of the Bible, and to appeal to its principles or precepts as his directory in every department of his peculiar duties.†

2. It is the duty of the Civil Magistrate to suppress and punish sins against the first table of the law of God when such sins are over acts, injurious to, or obstructive of, the welfare of civil society. He is not called to take cognizance of sins simply as sins, but as sins against the society over whose interests he is appointed to watch, and only such sins as are also subversive or frustrative of the interests of society is he warranted or bound to punish and suppress. But at the same time all sins, whether against the first or second table—whether more directly against God or against man, which are hurtful to society, and the suppression of which (as is always the case in regard to such sins) can involve no violation of the rights of conscience, he is entitled, nay bound to suppress.

Indeed, the open violation of any one of God's Commandments, because of necessity hurtful to society, it may be said to be the magistrate's duty to suppress.—The extent of interference, and the measures to be

\* See Remark E.

† See Remark F.

employed in discharging this duty, must, in respect of the sins above specified, as of all other sins, be matters for the determination of Christian expediency.\*

3. Education in all its branches ought to be based on religion, that is, it ought to be leavened with religion, and ought to be of such a kind as may be fitted to exert a wholesome influence on the side of religion, even when religion is not expressly taught as a separate branch of education. And if the Civil Magistrate is to provide for the education of the young at all, he must have reference to religion in doing so,—and cannot discharge his duty to Christ and to society without making, and acting on, the distinction between the sound and the false in religion.—If it could be shewn that it was not within the province of the Civil Magistrate to make this distinction, we should infer that it was not his duty to provide for the young at all.†

Whether it is the duty of the Civil Magistrate to provide that the young shall be taught religion as a branch of education will be better considered in connection with the next point to be considered, as the same principles, in a great measure, apply to both.

4. It is the duty of the Civil Magistrate to take cognizance of the provision made for the religious training of the nation, and to see to it that such provision is effectual: but the mode in which this duty shall be performed, has not been prescribed, and no rule of positive and invariable obligation has been given in regard to it;—the mode of endowing schools for the religious training of the young, and the mode also of endowing churches, is lawful; but the adoption of such modes of performing his duty with respect to the promotion of religion, is to be determined by the Civil Magistrate, by a reference to considerations of Christian expediency.‡

If it be a part of the duty of the Civil Magistrate to prevent, as well as to punish crime, then it follows demonstrably, that he is bound to see to the promotion of religion in the nation. No truth is more clearly taught in the word of God, or more conclusively established by experience than this, that religion alone can effectually prevent crime and promote order, industry and virtue in the world.—And to say that the magistrate is not to see that this means is brought to bear on the accomplishment of the ends of government, is just to deprive him of the most effectual, or rather, of the only effectual instrumentality by which the ends he is appointed to seek can be attained.||

At the same time, if adequate provision is otherwise made in a nation

\* See Remarks G and H.

† See Remark K.

‡ See Remark I.

|| See Remark L.

for the support of religion, we can see no reason which would warrant the civil magistrate to *substitute* for the support thus given; support out of the funds of the State,—or, if the national endowment of religion were likely to lead to jealousy, division and strife, and in a word to produce practically more evil than good, then also we conceive that a regard to the interests of religion itself, as well as the peace and good order of the State, ought to prevent the adoption of such a measure.\*

With respect, however, to the common objections of injustice and violation of the rights of conscience brought against the national endowment of religion, on the ground of the money thus appropriated being in part the money of those of a different and perhaps opposite creed, it appears to us that the use of national funds for any object within the province of the Civil Magistrate can involve no injustice and no violation of the rights of conscience in *any case*. And the objections referred to, are, in our estimation, just illustrations of the *petitio principii*. They assume that the national endowment of religion is not within the province of the civil magistrate, and if this assumption be admitted, they are doubtless valid; but the correctness of this assumption is the very point in question, and it must first be proved.†

Point Fifth:

THE SENSE IN WHICH CERTAIN STATEMENTS IN CHAP. XX. § 4—  
CHAP. XXIII. § 3—AND CHAP. XXXI. § 2—OF THE CONFESSION OF  
FAITH ARE UNDERSTOOD.

1. As to Chap. xx. § 4. It being declared explicitly in a preceding section of this chapter—that God alone is Lord of the conscience and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men which are in anything contrary to his word or beside it in matters of faith or worship,—the statements in the section in question, cannot reasonably be understood, and are not understood by us as giving any sanction or countenance to persecution for conscience sake, or to any attempt to promote Christianity by forcible means; nor as recognizing any right in the civil magistrate to dictate to his subjects in matters purely religious,—all which we regard as alike contrary to the law of God, the spirit of the gospel and the true import of the confession.

2. As to Chap. xxiii. § 3, and Chap. xxxi. § 2 of the Confession. Receiving the Confession as we do with the limitations or explanations contained in the Act of Assembly, 1647 prefixed to it, we hold that the

\* See Remark M.

† See Remark N.

Church being a spiritual institute, a kingdom not of this world, the free and independent kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ,—who has appointed therein a government in the hands of church officers, distinct from the civil magistrate, has been invested by its Gracious Head with ample and inalienable power to meet, deliberate and determine in all things pertaining to his kingdom in His name, whenever and as often as the rights, interests, and administration thereof may require; that the civil magistrate has no supremacy over the church, nor any power therein, nor any right in virtue of any pretended supremacy or power to convoke or preside in, or dictate to the assemblies of the Church,—or to regulate or review their proceedings in matters ecclesiastical; and in particular—that any judgment which the civil magistrate may come to, with respect to the proceedings and doctrines of the church, in such matters, is limited entirely to the regulation of his own conduct in the promoting within his own province, of the interest confided to his care, he having, in our estimation, no right of public ministerial judgment for the determination of matters of faith—or for the regulation of the profession or practice of the Church.\*

### Point Sixth:

#### VIEWS RESPECTING EXISTING ESTABLISHMENTS.

With reference to the foregoing views and principles, and for reasons which they obviously suggest, we are of opinion that the existing establishments in this Empire ought to be removed; that it is wholly inexpedient in present circumstances, to call upon the Government of Britain to grant religious endowments,—and that if such endowments were offered to us as a church, it would be our bounden duty to refuse them.†

#### RELATIONS OF SYNOD TO OTHER CHURCHES SEVERALLY.

From the documents contained in the *Ecclesiastical and Missionary Record* for September 1844, which is herewith transmitted, it is manifest that the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada is in all respects free and completely independent of foreign jurisdiction and interference, holding, however, friendly intercourse with sister churches, (especially with the Free Church of Scotland,) whose soundness in the faith, and whose ecclesiastical polity accord with the sentiments of the Synod; and maintaining a special testimony against Erastianism in principle and in practice.

For the Committee of the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada,

(SIGNED)

ALEXANDER GALE, *Convener*.

\* See Remark O.

† See Remark P.

# REMARKS

BY THE

COMMITTEE OF THE UNITED PRESBYTERIAN SYNOD.

---

## REMARK A—(Page 37.)

The authority which Christ as Mediator has over nations, as such, is the chief point at issue.

Christ has the authority over all things which belonged to God, transferred to him as Mediator. He is on the throne of God. All things are put under his feet, so that there remaineth nothing which is not put under him. But while this is the case, the obligation to obey Christ is in one respect at least, different from the obligation to obey God. By the constitution of nature all men are under obligations to obey God, and all men have the means of knowing this to such an extent as that they are without excuse for disobedience. But it is not so with regard to Christ. His is a delegated authority: and as there are no significations in nature to tell of Christ, and no suggestions in our own minds in connexion with Christ, no man is bound to obey Christ, till God, by the preaching of the gospel, give information and evidence such as ought to be given to a man who is responsible for his conduct, that He has committed all authority into the hands of his Son. Men are not blameable for doing what is contrary to laws which are not original in their constitution, and respecting which they never received information. (Rom. ii. 14, 15.) God's authority is original, universal and eternal; Christ's authority is derived—is a new thing—and is temporary; (for he shall one day deliver it back to God.) No man is bound to obey Him, no man is a sinner for not obeying Him, till God acquaint him with the New Covenant. We therefore do not believe the unqualified statement in this section, that "*all men, in every relation of life, are bound to honour and serve him as King.*"

---

## REMARK B—(Page 37.)

So far as we can understand this section, the meaning seems to be, that while Christ is the head of two departments, the world and the Church—that all men, whether belonging to either of these, are alike

and equally bound to honour and serve him as King. It does not, however, appear whether the nations are to honour him as the Head of the Church, or as the administrator of that department of God's government which God gave to him, and which had originally no reference to the scheme of mercy, but which was given to him that it might furnish him with the means of ruling all men to the furtherance of his special appointment,—or, whether his government be direct in the one case, and relative and indirect in the other, or direct in both. From the explanatory paragraph at the close of the section, it would seem that the Church and the world, as both belonging to the *genus man*, are alike and equally bound to honour Christ, while the Church belonging to the *species believers*, have different and superadded duties to Christ as their King.

Upon the supposition that this last is the meaning of the passage, then we remark—1. That we agree in this, that in Christ's government there are two departments, the one including all men as such, and the other all believers. 2. In administering the latter department there is no difference between us. 3. In administering the former, he has a right to all the honour and service which are due to God when he has made his commission known to them, but not before. Up to this time they owe no duties to him, because they know him not. The fact that God has given to Him the government of all men does not necessarily imply that they owe duties to him. Their owing duties to him depends on the condition that they be informed of the place which God has assigned to him. The invariable tenor of Scripture on this point is, that men will not be condemned for not obeying him, or not believing in him, if they have never heard of him—"How shall they believe without a preacher?"

The exhibition of his commission, however places, them in a different position: men then become responsible to him. But his commission is not exhibited primarily to acquaint them with the fact, that God hath transferred his power to him, and that what was formerly service due to *God* must now be paid to *him*: but that He *hath* sent Him to save sinners, and to assure all, that whosoever believeth in him shall not perish. The commission, however, is exhibited not to nations as such, for the sake of getting a national act or vote recorded in his favour, but is exhibited to individual men, and those of them who admit his right, pass man by man, into his peculiar department, and become his subjects for salvation. They who do not believe are regarded by him as his enemies, and his rule over them is for the purpose, either of conquering or restraining them.

Regarding unbelievers as enemies, it does not seem consistent with the idea of his position, nor with the account which the scriptures give of it, that they can perform any act recognizing him in either of his charact-

ers. That can only be done by those only who receive him. But they who receive him are a church, not a nation, which, it is admitted by both are essentially distinct. In ruling the church as such, he rules according to its peculiar constitution, a king in Zion—in ruling *nations as such*, he rules according to the natural constitution of society—a constitution essential to the existence of society. So far as his government goes in regard to the natural duties of man to man, it makes no alteration as to the substance of these duties, but his rule in the church throws a clearer light upon them, and will in this way indirectly secure to a great extent the discharge of them. The relative influence for good thus becomes reciprocal, but the influence originates in, and comes up from the church to society; and as long as the church throws into society the purifying and vivifying influence of its spirit, it may benefit society and receive benefit from it, by the reflection of its own influence back upon itself. If, however the vitality in the church become feeble there is nothing in the national constitution to revive it.

---

REMARK C—(Page 38.)

With this paragraph we agree, provided that the “*duties proper to the secular relations of life*,” be regarded as duties incumbent on the subjects of Christ’s spiritual kingdom, in their character of members of society, because the church has no right to take cognizance of the conduct of any but of its own members. Their violating of those laws would be a sin, though they never heard of the name of Christ. But having heard of him as administrating the government of God, and having given themselves to him, not only brings such conduct to the cognizance of the church, but aggravates, through an increase of knowledge, privileges and motives, their guiltiness.

---

REMARK D—(Page 38.)

To all this we assent, if the powers with which the magistrate is invested for the prevention of crime, are understood in the same sense by both committees. The power of the magistrate is legitimately employed to prevent crime by being a terror to evil-doers through punishing them, and by restraining evil-doers by an effective police. It does not belong to him to use any other means than those which the natural constitution of society puts into his hands. These powers consist only of that portion of the natural right of self-defence and self-redress which the members of society surrender to him to be used for their own benefit. He may not therefore, employ any means not belonging to the class of things within his own sphere, even though these may be more powerful. He



may not employ religion and education as a moral police, both because these do not belong to the class of means suitable to his office, and because also, in the one case he would interfere with the rights of conscience, and in the other, with the rights of parents, neither of which can be surrendered, and which, if assumed, must be assumed by usurpation,—and if so usurped, are destructive of civil and religious liberty.

---

REMARK E—(Page 39.)

The views of the Committee of the United Presbyterian Synod are contained in the “Statement of Opinions,” from No. 7th to No. 21 inclusive. While they refer to these as containing a full expression of their “Opinions,” they deem it proper here—1. To reiterate the statement already made, that the fact, that all men are placed under the government of Christ, does not bind all men to honour Christ. It can be their duty to honour Him only when God requires it of them. In this lies the difference between the duty of honouring God, and the duty of honouring Christ: the one is the law of nature which every man may know, and ought to know and obey, the other is a superadded law, not knowable by the things which are made and which do appear, and therefore not binding till made known. 2. That the modes in which recognition is proposed to be made are highly objectionable.—A religious covenant is the covenant of those only who enter into it, and can bind none but themselves. No man nor class of men has a right to lay another man under religious obligations without his own consent.—A national act of the kind proposed would identify the church and the nation, and no human skill could so keep clear the line of separation as to prevent the one from intruding into the province of the other. The history of the church furnishes no successful instance of it. 3. The difficulty (not yet surmounted) of finding a mode in which recognition can be made, so as not to secularize religion,—to produce national hypocrisy—and to interfere with natural rights, and the rights of conscience—very significantly shows that there is a radical mistake as to *national recognition* being a duty. And, moreover, a person cannot help wondering if national recognition be a duty, that no writer in the New Testament has not only not told how it is to be gone about, but has not even alluded to it.

---

REMARK F—(Page 39.)

The office of magistrate belongs to the social state as originally constituted by the Creator. His duties lie in the administering of that portion of natural rights which are surrendered by society for its own benefit; they

are, therefore, not derived originally from the Remedial system. As an illustration of this it may be remarked, that certain additional portions of natural rights have sometimes been surrendered to governments when the interests of society required it, and afterwards in other circumstances taken back. Some governments are purely despotic, and others are republican, but these, and all the intermediate shades have been *ordinances* of God—they have been each, a *power*, and as such ordained by God—*Ordained*, not by Revelation but by the constitution of society. The section now before us, seems to base the rule of the magistrate upon Revelation, whereas it is of much more ancient origin. The revelation of God's will gives to the magistrate no duties beyond the conserving of the persons and properties and natural rights of man, nor does it give him any new powers. But though the origin of governments is not of Revelation, yet the revealed will of God is of incalculable benefit to them, both by enabling governments and subjects to distinguish with greater accuracy what their respective duties are, and by furnishing them with the strongest motives to discharge them faithfully. But the revealed will of God did not make magistracy, nor does it take the magistrate out of his place as an ordinance of God for man as a social being, and intrust him with the administration of the ordinances of Christ's Kingdom, which is diverse from the magistrate's kingdom,—a kingdom not of this world,—a kingdom whose affairs are administered by office-bearers of its own.

In looking over the passages of scripture which are said to point out the duties of magistrates, we meet with no duty peculiar to the Remedial system as distinguished from the original constitution of society, but we meet with many most useful incentives to urge him faithfully to discharge his duties.

---

REMARK G—(Page 40.)

Although on this point we have very fully explained our views in our "Statement of Opinions," (See Nos. 22—25,) yet we think it proper in addition now to remark, that we are glad to see in this section the distinction made between acts as sins against God, and as sins against society, and that the exercise of the magistrate's powers is limited to the latter. This principle if carried out to its legitimate results contains on this point nearly all that we contend for. It seems to give up the power hitherto contended for, viz: that the magistrate is to take the Bible in his hand and to "make it the basis, so far as applicable, of all legislation and administration." The qualifying sentence at the close of the first paragraph, importing, that all sins against the first or second table—whether committed directly against God or against man—are to be looked at, prevented or

suppressed, just so far forth as they are sins against society, and that in dealing with them he is to take care that he violate none of the rights of conscience. This still farther coincides with our views. But it is at variance with the principles hitherto maintained, for if the magistrate have a commission from God to prevent or suppress crime, and must in so doing honour Christ as a King, then how can it be that any man's conscience can neutralize his positive duty.

The subject is still farther thrown loose by the concluding sentence of the second paragraph, viz. : "The extent of interference and the measures "to be employed in discharging this duty must, in respect of the sins "above specified, as of all other sins, be matters for the determination of "Christian expediency."

Expediency is founded upon human prudence, on looking at all the circumstances of a case and judging of the probable consequences of punishing or not punishing, but surely *expediency* could have no place if, as is said, "the duties of the magistrate are fully pointed out," and if he is invested with powers to prevent and to punish, and "authorized to appeal to the authority of the bible as his directory in every department of his peculiar duties.

We dislike the phrase "*Christian expediency*" because it has no fixed principle, and because it has so often been made the cloak of both ecclesiastical and political tyranny.

---

REMARK H—(Page 40.)

We notice that in the "Statement of Opinions" by the Committee of the Presbyterian Synod, no notice is taken of the law of the Sabbath, and no explanation of the duties of the magistrate with regard to it is given. And we regret this omission the more as there are supposed to be certain peculiarities regarding the law of the Sabbath which do not belong to the other duties of the first table.

---

REMARK I—(Page 40.)

Without repeating what has been already oftener than once stated, namely, that the Magistrate, in his official character, has nothing to do with the religion of others. We remark--1. That a great amount of education may be given to the youth of a country which does not necessarily come into contact with conscience, and *that* only can any government lawfully undertake to provide. 2. A magistrate discharges his duty to Christ when he confines himself as a magistrate to the duties of his own vocation. And 3. We can on no account grant to a mere civil

functionary a power which belongs to no man or class of men on earth, of deciding authoratively, for others "what is the sound and what is the false in religion." This power has been usurped by magistrates and by churches. It belongs to God only. Every man who believes, believes for himself.

As in the "Statement of Opinions," the right of the magistrate is said to depend on his right to "make the distinction between the true and the false in religion, and to act on that distinction," then we assert that the assumption that he has that right, has never been proved, and is incapable of proof, and if so, then the argument for a national religious education is invalid.

---

REMARK K—(Page 40.)

The statement that it is the duty of the civil magistrate to make provision for the religious training of the nation—and that the mode of endowing churches is lawful, were denied and fully discussed in the 1st paper given in by the Committee, entitled the "*Proof of the Negative.*" The facts and the reasonings in that paper were never denied nor refuted; and it is with some surprise we see that the doctrine is now brought up as if it had never been before the joint Committee.

---

REMARK L—(Page 40.)

We grant that the magistrate is to exert himself to prevent and punish crime, but that he may not use ALL the means by which crime may be prevented or punished. He has his own department, and his is a most useful power in its own place. He bears the *sword* not the *Bible*.

---

REMARK M—(Page 41.)

In this paragraph it is assumed that adequate provision may be made in a nation for the support of religion, otherwise than by drawing on the national funds. If this can be done, then let it be done, and there will be no room for jealousy, division and strife. It can be done, and it has been done, on a scale sufficiently extensive to justify the belief that all the expenses connected with the maintenance and extension of religion may be provided by the Christian people. It was well to leave this in the hands of those on whom it devolves both as a duty and a privilege, rather than to entrust it to those to whom it is no duty, and whose mode of doing it has been productive, practically, of more evil than good.

In the first sentence of this paragraph it is stated that "it is the duty

of the Civil Magistrate to take cognizance for the regular training of the nation, and to see to it that such provision is effectual," we trust that this does not mean that he is to look into the provision which voluntary churches make for the support of their own worship, and to see that it is effectual.

---

REMARK N—(*Page 41.*)

The opinion of our Committee on this head is fully set forth in the "Proof of the Negative, No. 4," and we think it unnecessary to add to it.

We must remark however, that it is a mistake to suppose that our argument rests on a *petitio principii*, ours is a *negatio principii*, and the *onus probandi* lies with those who assert that it is the duty of Governments to appropriate part of the nation's funds to the support of a church or churches; of this we have never met with any thing that deserves the name of proof.

We reiterate our assertion, that the taxing of a people for what is called religion, and giving the proceeds to one church or two churches, is an act of tyranny. These taxes are raised through fear of civil pains and penalties and therefore this mode amounts to a supporting of religion by the sword, which is directly opposed to the gospel.

---

REMARK O—(*Page 42.*)

"See Statement of Opinions."

# MINUTES

OF THE

## COMMITTEES ON UNION OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF CANADA, AND OF THE UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN CANADA.

---

HAMILTON. 17th NOVEMBER, 1846.

The Committees of the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada and of the Missionary Synod, met. Dr. Burns was chosen chairman and the meeting was constituted by prayer. Were present of the Presbyterian Church of Canada:—Rev. Dr. Burns and Rev. A. Gale with Mr. William McMillan, elder,—and of the Missionary Synod, Rev. Messrs. W. Proudfoot, Thomas Christie, James Roy and R. H. Thornton, and R. Christie Esq., elder.

Rev. W. Proudfoot was chosen Clerk.

Read the minutes of former meetings.

The Rev. Mr. Gale for the Committee of the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada, and the Rev. Mr. Proudfoot on the part of the Missionary Synod, read statements of opinions as agreed upon at last meeting of the Committees; to be submitted.

It was moved by Mr. Gale, seconded by Mr. Proudfoot,—That the respective Committees exchange papers, and at some future time, written remarks by both parties be exchanged, and that at an early day thereafter, the said Committees meet for further conference; and being understood that these remarks be exchanged at a sufficient time previous to said meeting to allow necessary consideration to each Committee. Closed with prayer.

R. BURNS, *Chairman.*

W. PROUDFOOT, *Clerk of Com.*

---

HAMILTON, the 26th OCTOBER, 1847.

The Committee of the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada, and of the Synod of the United Presbyterian Church in Canada appointed to consider the practicableness of Union between these bodies, met on the call of the Rev. W. Proudfoot and of the Rev. Alexander Gale.

Present—The Rev. Dr. Burns, Rev. A. Gale, Rev. Ralph Robb, Rev. M. Y. Stark, and Mr. William McMillan, on the part of the Presbyterian Church: the Rev. Messrs. W. Proudfoot, Thomas Christie, R. H. Thornton, and James Roy, and Robert Christie, Esq., and Mr. Walter Chisholm, Elders, on the part of the United Presbyterian Church.

On motion by Mr. Gale, and seconded by Mr. Proudfoot,—R. Christie, Esq. was called to the chair. On the call of the chairman, the Rev. Dr. Burns opened the meeting by prayer. On motion by Mr. Proudfoot, seconded by Mr. Roy,—Mr. Gale was appointed Clerk.

The minutes of the last meeting were read and approved of.

Messrs. Proudfoot and Gale reported to the meeting the proceedings of their respective Synods in regard to the previous actings of these Committees; and that each Synod had re-appointed its Committee.

The Committee called for the remarks which, according to agreement, were to be given in by each party on the papers interchanged at last meeting.

Mr. Proudfoot stated that the Committee on the part of the United Presbyterian Church had prepared certain remarks on the documents communicated to them by the Committee of the Presbyterian Church.

Mr. Gale explained that in consequence of the absence of Mr. Bayne from the Province, in whose hands the documents on the part of the Presbyterian Church were, no remarks had as yet been prepared on the part of the Committee of the Presbyterian Church.

It was agreed that the document given in by the Committee of the United Presbyterian Church at last meeting, together with the remarks thereon by the Committee of the United Presbyterian Church, be read.

These documents were read, article by article, and members were heard in regard to the statements contained in them.

Wherefore it was agreed that farther time be afforded for careful and deliberate examination of these documents on both sides, and for the giving in by the Committee of the Presbyterian Church, of such remarks as they may be disposed to offer on the document of the other Committee, and that it be submitted for the consideration of the Committees severally, whether, after due examination of the whole statements mutually communicated—it may not be expedient on each side to draft a basis of union; if union shall seem to them attainable—such draft to be submitted at a joint meeting to be called by the conveners not later than the second week in May next.

A. GALE, *Clerk.*

---

HAMILTON, 9th May, 1848.

The Committees of the Presbyterian Church of Canada, and of the United Presbyterian Church met this day according to appointment, as in the minutes of last meeting. Present on the part of the former, the Rev. Messrs. John Bayne and Ralph Robb, Ministers, and Mr. W. McMillan, Elder; and on the part of the latter, the Rev. Messrs. William Proudfoot, Thomas Christie, R. H. Thornton and James Roy, and Messrs. R. Christie and W. Chisholm, Elders.

It was moved by Mr. Bayne and agreed, that the Rev. T. Christie take the chair. Upon the call of the chairman, the Rev. Mr. Bayne opened the meeting with prayer. It was then proposed and agreed that the Rev. R. H. Thornton act as clerk.

Read the minutes of last meeting.

The papers referred to in said minutes as not forthcoming, on account of Mr. Bayne's absence from the Province, being called for, Mr. Bayne read the Report of the Committee of the Presbyterian Church upon the "Statement of Opinions" mutually given by the parties at previous meetings.

After conference, the Committee agreed to take up the subjects which had been under consideration, and on which written statements of their respective opinions had been previously given in, and resolved to embody in a formal statement the points on which they agreed and those also on which they differed. According to which plan the Joint Committee concurred in the following synopsis :

I.—*Regarding Christ's Headship over the nations, as distinguished from his Headship over the Church.*

The Committees agreed in holding Christ's appointment by the Father Head and King of nations, as well as Head and King of the Church.— With regard to the design of the appointment, and the duties that result from it, there is some difference. The Committee of the Presbyterian Church holding that while the province of the Civil Magistrate remains the same, the revelation of Christ's appointment as Head and King of nations, has imposed new duties upon nations and rulers. And the Committee of the United Presbyterian Church holding that the revelation of Christ's appointment as Ruler, has not added anything to the department over which the Civil Magistrate is placed, nor formed any new relationship between him and his subjects, nor imposed any new duties different from those, to discharge which he was previously bound ; “and, moreover, as the whole institution and end of his office are cut out by, and lie within the compass of, natural principles, it is not their opinion that there can or ought to be any exercise thereof toward its end but what could be argued for, and defended from, natural principles.”

Adjourned, to meet to-morrow morning at nine o'clock. Closed with prayer.

MAY 10th.

The Committees met again at this date. Present as above, with the exception of the Rev. M. Y. Stark being present, and Mr. McMillan, Elder, being absent. Resumed consideration of the above subjects.

II.—*Province of the Civil Magistrate.*

The Committees concurred in holding that the province of the civil magistrate is purely civil, as contra-distinguished from ecclesiastical, and that no ecclesiastical power, and no right of interfering in the administration of the affairs of the Church, has been committed to him. But with regard to the duties of the Civil Magistrate, within his peculiar province, there seems a difference between the Committees to this extent,—that the Committee of the Presbyterian Church hold that religion is the concern of legislators and civil rulers, as such, and ought to be not only protected by the maintenance of religious liberty, but also publicly countenanced, favoured and promoted by them; while the Committee of the United Presbyterian Church think that the duty of the Civil Magistrate is only to protect every subject in the exercise of the right which God has given him, to judge for himself in matters religious, and to act in them according to his own judgment, so far as not to interfere with the rights of conscience.



## CONTENTS.

---

	PAGE
Proof of the Negative, by the Committee of the Missionary (now the United Presbyterian) Synod, - - - - -	4
Statement of Opinions, by the Committee of the Missionary Synod - - -	18
Statement of Opinions, by the Committee of the Presbyterian Church of Canada,	37
Remarks by the Committee of the United Presbyterian Synod on the Statement of Opinions, by the Committee of the Presbyterian Church, - . -	43
Synopsis of Opinions, - - - - -	51
Minutes of Meetings interspersed	



## CONTENTS.

---

	PAGE
Proof of the Negative, by the Committee of the Missionary (now the United Presbyterian) Synod, - - - - -	4
Statement of Opinions, by the Committee of the Missionary Synod - - -	18
Statement of Opinions, by the Committee of the Presbyterian Church of Canada, -	37
Remarks by the Committee of the United Presbyterian Synod on the Statement of Opinions, by the Committee of the Presbyterian Church, - - - - -	43
Synopsis of Opinions, - - - - -	51
Minutes of Meetings interspersed.	

