

WESTMINSTER STANDARD PUBLICATIONS

VOLUME 4

First Collected Edition 2020
Containing Westminster Standard Publications
number 30
Reprinted 2021

WESTMINSTER STANDARD
P.O. Box 740 - Gisborne 4040
New Zealand

IN THE FOOTSTEPS OF THE FLOCK

A MEMORIAL
TO
THE REV. WALTER SCOTT

Rev. W. MacLean, M.A.

Cover: The Brushgrove Church left derelict. The local congregation built this church (free of debt) in 1898 but were unjustly deprived of its use and locked out of their church in 1911 (see pages 115 to 118). Photographed in 2020 by Rev. E.A. Rayner who succeeded Rev. W. MacLean as minister of the Grafton congregation of the Free Prebyterian Church of Scotland.

Dedication

This reprint is dedicated to the memory of Mr. Uilke (Jim) Haringa and his wife Barbara (nee Harvey) who meticulously and labouriously proof-read this book from the original manuscript* while living in the manse in Gisborne as housekeepers shortly after their wedding in 1966.

*Mr. Maclean's handwriting was very small and difficult to read.

CONTENTS

Preface.....	1
1. Sketch of The Life of The Rev. Walter Scott Until The Time of His Induction	3
2. The Expulsion Act Of 1857	10
3. A Memorable Debate	15
4. The Testimony Maintained.....	23
5. Voluntaryism.....	27
6. The Establishment Principle	33
7. Union Controversy.....	38
8. The Declaratory Act—An Expulsion Act	44
9. “The First Three”	49
10. The Expulsion Act Of 1884	56
11. Testimony of The Reconstituted Synod	65
12. “No Compromise, No Surrender”	69
13. Binding Up The Testimony	77
14. Mr. Scott’s Marriage And Visit To Scotland	84
15. Side-Lights On Mr. Scott’s Ministry On The Clarence	92

16. Mr. Scott Joins The Free Presbyterian Church Of Scotland....	102
17. Persecution For Righteousness' Sake	110
18. Mr. Scott's Ministry In Canada And Death.....	123
19. Gathered Fragments.....	134
20. The Headship of Christ Over The Nations.....	152
21. Church and State	160
22. The Inspiration of The Scriptures.....	173
Conclusion	175

PREFACE

“In the Footsteps of the Flock” is not a memoir in the accepted sense of the term, of the Rev. Walter Scott, but an endeavour to sketch in the ecclesiastical background leading up to the position taken by the Reconstituted Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia, which Mr. Scott, after the death of some of the members and the defection of others, continued to maintain alone. It was the Expulsion Act of 1884, passed by the Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia, which led to the formation of the Reconstituted Synod.

The downgrade trend of events culminating in the passing of the Declaratory Act of 1892 by the Free Church of Scotland, which led to the position taken up by the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland, is also outlined. The bond of love, spanning oceans and continents, between Mr. Scott and the stand for the Truth made by the Rev. Donald MacFarlane, in due course became a bond of betrothal, Mr. Scott and the Brushgrove-Grafton congregation cordially identifying themselves with the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland.

It has proved a rewarding labour of love to quarry and collect the stones for this memorial. The main sources from which they came are: “The Presbyter” edited by the Rev. A. Paul; “The Free Presbyterian Church of Australia” by the Rev. J. C. Robinson; “The History of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland”; “The Magazine of the Free

Presbyterian Church of Scotland,” from the past volumes of which Mr. Scott’s obituary, sermons, letters, etc., have been extracted; “The Church of Scotland, Her Divisions and Unions” by C. G. McCrie D.D. These, and other sources are mentioned with the pages given, throughout the memorial.

The Appendices set forth and defend in the main the Establishment Principle—the Headship of Christ over the Nations, a Principle which in the words of the late Dr. Kennedy of Dingwall is not only worth living for, but a Principle worth dying for. A noble army of martyrs, and notably the Covenanters in Scotland, shed their blood in defence of Christ’s crown as King in Zion. Christ is worthy that we shed every drop of our blood in defence of His crown as King of Nations. “Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honour and power: for Thou hast created all things, and for Thy pleasure they are and were created.” (Rev. 4:11.)

The stones as placed on the cairn, lack the polish of erudition: its erection and structure, that style and symmetry which marks the work of a skilled and experienced builder: but in its rough-hewn shape, it will, I trust, help to perpetuate the memory of one whose record is on high, and who in his day and generation earnestly contended for the faith once delivered to the saints.

William MacLean

CHAPTER 1

SKETCH OF THE LIFE OF THE REV. WALTER SCOTT UNTIL THE TIME OF HIS INDUCTION

The Rev. Walter Scott was born at Edinburgh on the 8th October, 1854. He was descended from godly parents. His mother was a cousin of the Rev. Roderick Macleod, the well known minister of Snizort, Isle of Skye. On her mother's side she was a descendant of John Stobo, a Covenanter who lived towards the end of the persecution in Scotland 1660-1688. "The Religious History and Experience of Thomas Stobo," Rev. W. Scott's great grandfather, was printed in 1849. In her early days Rev. Scott's mother sat under the ministry of the Rev. Dr. Thomas McCrie the eminent biographer of John Knox. She remembered hearing the last sermon he preached, on the Sabbath previous to his death (1847), from the text "Whose fan is in his hand, and He will thoroughly purge His floor, and gather His wheat into the garner: but He will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire." (Matt. 3:12.) Mrs. Scott died at the house of her son Rev. William Scott, Edinburgh, on the 11th December, 1907, at the ripe age of eighty-seven years. One of the last

messages which she sent to her son, Rev. Walter Scott, Australia, was in these words: "Tell them that Christ is precious to me. My hope, my trust, my confidence are in Him," adding with tears in her eyes, "He is all my desire."

Mr. Scott's father, Mr. Alexander William Scott, was, in the days before the Disruption under the ministry of the Rev. William Nixon of Montrose, the Dr. Nixon of later times who valiantly opposed all departures in the Free Church from its constitution and standards. When the Disruption actually took place in 1843, Mr. A. W. Scott was in Canada, but he immediately left the Established Church and identified himself with the Free Church. Ten years later he returned to Scotland, and resided for a time in Edinburgh, where he attended the ministry of the Rev. Dr. Hetherington, the well known historian in Free St. Paul's Church. It was during this period that his son Walter was born. He was baptised by the Rev. Robert Gordon of Buccleuch Free Church, who was preaching on the occasion for Dr. Hetherington. In 1855 Mr. Scott's father removed to Perth, where he became a member in Free St. Leonard's Congregation, and was under the successive ministries of the Revs. Messrs. Huie, Milne and Cowan. Subsequently in 1876 he returned to Edinburgh and became a member of the congregation of the eminent Dr. Begg, where he was ordained an elder and later became Session Clerk. Mr. Scott's father was a military man who served in the army for the long period of over forty-one years, and that without a single mark of any kind being put on record against him. He carried his religion with him into the Service, and among those under him no profane swearing was known. This rule he carried out with the consent of his men by gaining their confidence. So observable was this reformation, that men whose conduct in this and other respects was reprehensible to a more than ordinary degree, were transferred to his company. When he finally left the Army in 1870, an order was issued by Viscount Stormont, his Colonel, that there be inserted

in the Regimental Orders for preservation, a testimonial expressing his high appreciation of the most exemplary manner in which Mr. A. W. Scott had carried out the duties of a highly responsible position.

As the offspring of worthy parents, Mr. Scott received a religious training for which in after life he was wont to express his gratitude to God. It would seem that he was serious and religiously disposed from his very earliest years. When as a child, two or three years old, he was taken to the House of God, he sat perfectly still, with his eyes fixed upon the minister. His piety became decidedly manifest in his boyhood. Those who then knew him intimately were convinced that it was not in any respect affected, but genuine and sincere.

At the early age of fifteen he sat down at the Lord's Table for the first time. In October 1871, when he was seventeen, he thus writes after a Communion Season: "Since I last wrote you, another critical season has passed by, and I have again been privileged to sit down at the Communion Table. This is a high and all important ordinance of Christ's visible Church. . . . It ought to be looked forward to and prepared for, that when the time comes, it may be partaken of with joy and gladness. I experienced comfort and fellowship in it, and would pray that it has not gone by without accomplishing the end whereto it was instituted. I could have desired more though, for it is a kingly and royal feast at which great nourishment and blessing may be expected. May this stir me up to a closer examination and more preparation in the future. This is your Communion week in Edinburgh. May the voice of Jesus be heard saying, 'Arise, my love, my fair one, and come away'; that His children may respond, 'He has brought me into His banqueting house and His banner over me is love!' And may the King's presence be felt, and His fruit sweet to the taste, that it may be a time of upbuilding and growth in grace." Mr. Scott's life at this early age corresponded with his profession.

The Bible was his constant companion, and he also took pleasure in reading other good books. He was at pains to distinguish between the truth of God and error. Nothing delighted him more than the company and conversation of the godly, and religious exercises were something far more to him than mere forms.

In 1874, when he was twenty years of age, Mr. Scott severed his connection with the Free Church and joined the Original Secession Church, which met in Forrest Road, then under the pastorate of the Rev. Andrew Lambie, an Anti-Burgher minister who did not unite with the larger body known as the United Associate Synod of Original Seceders. This step was taken by Mr. Scott owing to backsliding movements in the Free Church. He was a great admirer of Rev. Dr. Begg, and felt it a trial to part with him and other valiant witnesses. Under Rev. Lambie, Mr. Scott and his brother both solemnly renewed the covenants, and he heartily assisted his brother (first as a member and then as an elder) after the latter became a pastor in 1880.

At this point we may notice Mr. Scott's entrance on a profession. The work of the ministry was not his first intention. In Perth, where he received his early education, he became in January 1870 an apprentice to a legal firm. He was then at the age of fifteen. In October 1872 he obtained another situation in the office of Messrs. Dalgleish and Bell, W.S., Edinburgh. Here he attended the Law classes at the university. In February 1877 "The Association for the Maintenance of Purity of Worship" in Edinburgh offered three prizes in competition, of Twenty-five pounds, Fifteen pounds and Ten pounds respectively, open to all the students in all the Universities and Theological Halls of the different denominations in Scotland, for the best Essays in opposition to the "Recent Innovations in Public Worship, including especially the use of Instrumental Music in Worship." Mr. Scott who was then a student at the University, took part in the Competition. His essay "The Pattern on the Mount"

was awarded the first prize. In 1883, with a view to qualify himself further, he entered upon the Arts Curriculum, which he pursued for four sessions, ending in 1887. In several of his classes, notably the Philosophy and English Literature ones, he acquitted himself with distinction and credit. It was while thus employed, that Mr. Scott was led seriously to consider the question as to whether or not God was calling him to devote himself to the gospel ministry. One thing was manifest, that his heart was being more and more led by God in this direction. A variety of providences, ranging over several years, served not a little to strengthen his conviction that God was calling him to that sacred work; and at length he felt he was no longer at liberty to resist this conviction. He then resigned himself to the leadings of providence. From the first, he made the subject one of much prayer. At this very time his health became delicate through over work. This necessitated his seeking a change of air, and accordingly for several years he was wont to resort to various parts of the shires of Aberdeen, Caithness and Ross, where he found society agreeable to him, as well as climate beneficial to his health. It was his delight to engage in religious exercises in the many dwellings which he visited. His health, however, continued to get worse, and his medical advisers recommended him to spend a period in Australia. Providentially, through the kindness of the late worthy Sir William Mackinnon, Bart., whom he met in a Free Church Manse in the Highlands and who offered him a free passage to Australia, a way was opened for his giving effect to their advice.

Mr. Scott sailed for Australia in the S.S. "Jumna" in 1889, and landed in Queensland, where he remained for a time. Thereafter he travelled over considerable parts of New South Wales and Victoria. He became in this way acquainted with ministers of the Free Presbyterian Church of Victoria, a body which refused to join in a Church Union of Presbyterians in the State of Victoria in the year 1859. He found himself drawn by similarity of views to the Free

Presbyterians in the Colony with whom he identified himself. He then applied to be received as a student, and was admitted as such. (F.P. Mag. Vol. 21, pp. 19-23.)

As a student he gave promise of being a good soldier of Jesus Christ. The Free Church Quarterly for September 1891 (printed in Geelong) quoted the following news item from the Dunmuncle Standard, July 2nd: "Mr. Walter Scott who is a student for the ministry of the Free Presbyterian Church of Victoria, preached two sermons at Murtoa on Sabbath. He was acting in the place of the Rev. H. Livingston who had been compelled to take a brief respite from his duties as the pastor of a wide and arduous charge. Mr. Scott, is, to judge by the tone of his sermons, a staunch adherent to the 'old ways' of Presbyterianism and there was abundant evidence to be found in his discourse, with regard to the earnestness with which he had entered upon his sacred and honourable calling. Mr. Scott certainly appears to be a young man of great promise and will no doubt be heard of in the future." He was licensed on February 3rd, 1892 and ordained on August 25th of the same year, as a missionary to the Back Country Mission, New South Wales. Ultimately he received two calls to regular charges. One of these he accepted, namely that to the Brushgrove-Grafton Congregation, Clarence River, New South Wales, and was inducted on the 23rd September, 1891. The Brushgrove-Grafton Congregation had identified itself with the "Reconstituted Synod of Eastern Australia" in the year 1891 and throughout Mr. Scott's ministry in Australia, he unwaveringly maintained the testimony of the "Reconstituted Synod." This leads us to advert in a more or less general way to ecclesiastical movements in the Church life of Australia, which led to the formation of the "Reconstituted Synod of Eastern Australia," as a result of the passing of the "Expulsion Act" by the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia in May 1884. Acts of Expulsion appear to have been the technique adopted by majorities

bent on union, at the expense of truth and principle, in order to obtain unanimity. “Impracticable elements,” to make use of a phrase of Dr. Rainy’s, were by these Acts ecclesiastically liquidated. The Expulsion Act of 1884 has been described as “ecclesiastical lynch law.” The same could equally be said of the Expulsion Act of 1857, which was passed by the Synod of the Free Presbyterian Church of Victoria. The Declaratory Act passed by the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland in 1892 also proved to be an Expulsion Act. As these Expulsion Acts have a direct bearing on the position which Mr. Scott came to hold, we shall deal with them separately.

CHAPTER 2

THE EXPULSION ACT OF 1857

In 1853 there were three Presbyterian Churches in the State of Victoria.

(1) The Synod of Australia in connection with The Established Church of Scotland. (2) The United Presbyterian Church a Voluntary Church. (3) The Free Presbyterian Church of Victoria; or The Free Church as it was generally called, which came into being after the Disruption in 1843, and which adhered in principle and practice to the Free Church of Scotland.

A motion for union between these three Churches was first mooted by the United Presbyterian Church. Union Committees were appointed in each of the Churches, and in due course “Articles of Union” were drawn up. A discerning minority in the Free Presbyterian Church were dissatisfied with the “Articles of Union” and took all lawful means to oppose a Union which they held could not be consummated without the loss of vital principles. One of the prominent leaders of the minority was the Rev. Arthur Paul of St. Kilda near Melbourne. In the year 1856 he issued a pamphlet entitled, “Coalition of Interests not the Unity of Faith” which sets forth the views of those opposed to the Union “that it was a Union

of secular strength with the loss of vital principle; a compact of mere numbers in the absence of spiritual integrity. The Union was not one of principles but of interests. The Erastian Synod of Victoria had not changed and had no intention of changing. What made matters worse was that the agreement to unite was made whilst official documents were in existence, positively claiming on the part of the United body to hold communion and correspondence with the Established Church of Scotland. The statements in the written communication of the Synod of Victoria could not be reconciled with an honest and intelligent adherence to the basis of Union.” (The Free Presbyterian Church of Australia p. 253.)

It was one of the conditions of the Union that when accomplished, it should be unanimous, and in order therefore, to secure unanimity, the Act of Expulsion was the method adopted. On April 7th 1857, the Unionists produced their Expulsion Document. The minority knew what to expect and were prepared for it. When the Expulsion motion was passed, the Rev. William Miller of John Knox’s Church, Melbourne, on behalf of the opponents of Union laid on the table a Declaration and Protest. This Declaration and Protest set forth among other things, that the Synod of Victoria had given expression to views totally inconsistent with the “Articles of Union,” and did not hold these “Articles” in the only sense in which they could be held. They (the Protesters) claimed to be the true Free Presbyterian Church and accordingly adjourned the Synod to meet in John Knox’s Church on Tuesday next, 14th April at eleven o’clock. The Protest was signed by five ministers and three elders.

The Minority Synod claiming to be the true Free Presbyterian Church, met as intimated in their Protest on the above-mentioned date. The Rev. William Miller was appointed Moderator and the Rev. Arthur Paul, Clerk. Among those who identified themselves with the Minority Synod was Rev. Alexander MacIntyre who had been labouring among the Gaelic-speaking settlers on the Clarence

and Richmond rivers. It was the Rev. Alexander MacIntyre who was minister in the "Floating Church" in Strontian after the Disruption of 1843. It was under his powerful preaching that the Rev. Donald MacDonald Shieldaig, was brought to a saving knowledge of the Truth. Mr. MacDonald used to say that "Mr. MacIntyre was the most awful preacher of the law he ever heard, and that the strongest men in the congregation would fall down helpless on the ground under the spell of his utterances as he proclaimed the terrors of the law from Mount Sinai." (Memoir of Rev. D. MacDonald p. 7.) In 1859 Mr. MacIntyre was settled in Geelong in Victoria. His Congregation was mostly Gaelic-speaking immigrants from the Highlands and Islands of Scotland. It is interesting to note that the Session records of the Geelong congregation at this time were wholly written in Gaelic. "Mr. MacIntyre was a polished shaft in the hand of the Holy Spirit," wrote the late Rev. Neil Cameron, Glasgow, "and many not only in Scotland, but also in Australia will bless the adorable Head of the Church throughout eternity for making the feet of this witness beautiful upon the mountains of these widely separated lands." He died on the 9th April 1877, aged 71 years, and is buried in Newton Cemetery, Geelong.

A prophecy of his that the Church would be brought very low in Australia, but that she would rise again, has been enshrined in verse by one of his admirers, from which the following lines are quoted in "The Free Presbyterian Church of Australia," p. 307:

"Thus spake a prince of high renown, a watchman brave and true,
A prophet of the Most High One, on whom rare graces grew;
He walked with Christ, in trustful love, he leant upon His arm,
And journeyed through this wilderness secure from errors charm.
The Church you loved with all your soul, the Church of your
renown,
The Church is torn with error's tooth, her walls are broken down.

But to return to brighter times 'The Church again will rise,'
For she's The Lord's peculiar care, and precious in His eyes,
God's promise shall forever stand, His Word is firm and sure,
The Church He planted in the land, forever shall endure."

Another minister of eminence, who faithfully upheld The Testimony raised by those who by their Declaration and Protest of April 1857 separated from the Expulsion Act Free Presbyterian Church, and continued the Free Presbyterian Church, was the Rev. Peter MacPherson, M.A. Mr. MacPherson got his theological training in the Free Church College, Edinburgh, and was commended for his attainments by Dr. Cunningham and Dr. Bannerman. The Minority Synod of the Free Presbyterian Church of Victoria, licensed him to preach the Gospel on February 10th 1858. For a number of years he was minister of Meredith and Lethbridge in Victoria. In 1874 he was called and inducted to the Maitland Raymond Terrace Congregation in New South Wales. In 1859 he started "The Standard," a monthly periodical. The aim of "The Standard" was to put the Free Presbyterian people and the public in general in touch with the facts and the documents connected with the Union. "Anyone who wishes to glean the particulars necessary to a right estimate of the Presbyterian Union in Victoria, will be but meagerly furnished," wrote the Rev. Arthur Paul, "unless he consults the pages of "The Standard.'" Mr. MacPherson was a loyal Constitutionalist. By his powerful and trenchant articles he made many a unionist in both hemispheres wince." (The Free Presbyterian Church of Australia, p. 308.) We shall hear later on about the Rev. Peter MacPherson, as he was one of those cast out by the Expulsion Act of 1884 of the Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia, and one of the founders of the "Reconstituted Synod" with which the Brushgrove-Grafton congregation identified itself.

The proposed Union of the three Presbyterian Churches in

Victoria was consummated on April 7th 1859, two years after the Expulsion Act. Twenty ministers and three elders of the Synod of Victoria in connection with the Established Church of Scotland; twenty-seven ministers and five elders of the Majority Synod of the Free Presbyterian Church; four ministers of the United Presbyterian Church agreed to unite as the *Presbyterian Church of Victoria*. A minority section of the United Presbyterian Church did not enter the Union which they described as “irregular, unconstitutional and invalid.”

CHAPTER 3

A MEMORABLE DEBATE

In 1860 The Union Church—The Presbyterian Church of Victoria, rescinded the Expulsion Act of 1857. The rescinding of the Expulsion Act, the Free Presbyterian Church held, did not alter the “Articles of Union,” and they therefore deemed it their bounden duty to maintain their separated position in an unequivocal defence of the testimony of the Free Church of Scotland as set forth in the Claim of Right.

The two Churches—The Presbyterian Church of Victoria and The Free Presbyterian Church of Victoria, both sought to be recognised by the Free Church of Scotland.

The Rev. William Miller of the Free Presbyterian Church prepared a statement setting forth the reasons of their Synod for not entering the Union, seeking to be recognised as the true Free Church of Victoria. This statement was sent to the Free Church Assembly in 1858. The next year, 1859, Mr. Miller was sent by the Free Presbyterian Church as a deputy to the Free Church. In the meantime the Union Church—The Presbyterian Church of Victoria—had despatched the Rev. Dr. Macintosh MacKay and the Rev. John Tait as delegates to counteract the efforts of the Free Presbyterian Church and to plead their own case. Dr. Macintosh MacKay at the time was minister in

Sydney. He and Mr. Tait were among the most ardent Unionists in Australia. Dr. MacKay at a meeting in St. Andrew's Church, Carlton, declared, "I solemnly tell you that this profession of Free Church principles is practical nonsense." (Free Presbyterian Church of Australia, p. 268), and Mr. Tait publicly declared his willingness to preach vacant the congregations of the expelled even though he should die in the attempt. Dr. MacKay had been Free Church minister in Dunoon before going to Australia. He resigned his charge in Sydney in 1861, and returned to Scotland and became minister of Tarbert in the Isle of Harris. He lived to regret his part in the Union controversy, and died at Portobello in 1875.

Mr. Miller spent a year in Scotland prosecuting his mission. Dr. C. G. McCrie in "The Church of Scotland her Divisions and Unions," says, "The Assembly of 1860 declined to recognise Mr. Miller as a representative of the Free Presbyterian Church of Victoria in ecclesiastical connection with the Free Church of Scotland. Between that time, however, and the Assembly of 1861, he succeeded in enlisting sympathy to this extent, that the Free Synod of Glasgow and Ayr almost unanimously overtured the Assembly of the year to recognise the little band he represented and so end the agitation. When the question came before the Supreme Court (the General Assembly) on the 30th May it was discussed in a memorable debate." (p. 227.)

Before dealing with this memorable debate it is interesting to note that in *The Alarm* for May 1858, the Rev. Jonathan Ranken Anderson, Glasgow, in an article—"The Union of Presbyterians in Australia" quotes from the *Scottish Guardian* of 19th February, 1856, a report of union negotiations in Victoria. In this report Dr. MacKay is quoted as saying: "He earnestly desired the proposed Union as, united they could better spread themselves over the length and breadth of the land, and build up Zion. They had proposed large concessions, which he had felt bound to abide by." "The United Presbyterian body in

Australia we suppose,” writes Mr. Anderson, “is very much of the same character with the United Presbyterians at home, in which case a union with it is as strongly to be deprecated and dreaded as a mass of active corruption. Notwithstanding, Dr. MacKay is so lost to all sense of spiritual life, and so regardless of all consistency, that he coolly talks of abiding by concessions—large concessions—proposed with a view to such a union!” The report adds—“The Moderator further reported that after frequent communications with the Union Committee of the United Presbyterian Church, the Committee had agreed to submit to the Synod that, in order to meet the special views held by that body, the first and second articles of Union drawn up in concert with the Union Committee of the Free Church should be modified as follows:

“That the Westminster Confession of Faith, the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, the Form of Presbyterian Church Government, the Directory for Public Worship, and the Second Book of Discipline be the Standards and formulas of this Church; but that any minister or elder who disapproves of those portions of the said standards which treat of the powers and duties of the civil magistrate in reference to religion, viz. the third section of chapter 23 of the Confession of Faith, and the seventh clause of the answer to the 191st question in the Larger Catechism, shall be held as subscribing these standards, subject to the exclusion of such portions.”

“Here is goodly sop,” writes Mr. Anderson. “thrown by Free Church ministers in one of our colonies to the Cerberus of Voluntaryism, and the kindred error of Erastianism* will get whatever its capacious maw can receive: and thus at the expense of

* Erastianism, so named after Erastus, a celebrated physician and professor at Heidelberg about 1580, maintains that the State is supreme, and that the Church is subject to the State.

the Truth of God, a union will be consummated of those who, while they had any pretensions to life, were far apart, but now that death has done its work, are brought to rot in the same grave. But will the mischief be confined to the colonies? Do not coming events throw their shadows before them, and tell plainly enough that ere long all Presbyterians who have lost everything but the name, will be ranged under one banner? We know of no power that will profit by such a movement but The Prince of Darkness. The Roman vulture bides his time; and the moment when Presbyterianism is sufficiently effete, he will pounce upon his prey, and again this guilty land will be counted a province of the Pope's dominions; a branch of the Roman empire a horn in the seven-headed Beast."

But to return to the memorable debate in the Free Church Assembly. Dr. McCrie in a footnote, quotes the following from the Free Church Blue Book for 1861: Thursday, May 30th (1) The Assembly met at half past ten o'clock Dr. Candlish in the chair. (2) The Assembly adjourned at a quarter to five o'clock. (3) The Assembly met in the evening at seven o'clock. The Assembly adjourned at a quarter to one a.m.

The Presbyterian Church of Victoria represented by Dr. Macintosh MacKay and Rev. John Tait entrusted their case to Rev. Robert Rainy, (afterwards Dr. Rainy, the great unionist champion of the Free Church). Dr. Rainy in his motion, called upon the Assembly to continue to recognise the United Church in Victoria, as alone representing the Church with which hitherto the Free Church held ecclesiastical fellowship, and argued that because the majority had rescinded the unconstitutional document of the Expulsion, the minority were in duty bound to come into the union. Dr. Rainy's motion was seconded by Mr. Francis Brown Douglas, then Lord Provost of Edinburgh.

The Rev. James Gibson, D.D., Professor of Systematic Theology in the Free Church College, Glasgow, espoused the case of the

Free Presbyterian Church of Victoria. He moved the following amendment, which was seconded by Mr. McCorkle of St. Ninian's: "That the Assembly having regard to the conscientious convictions of the brethren who feel themselves precluded from entering into the union recently consummated in Australia, recognise them as a Church in ecclesiastical fellowship with the Free Church of Scotland." In speaking to the amendment Dr. Gibson said that thirty-six overtures had been sent up to the Assembly, two thirds of them had requested recognition of the minority. He deprecated the terms 'schismatics' and 'dissentient brethren' being applied to them. He denied that the Victorian basis for union was the same as the Free Church formulary. "In the Free Church formulary there was no such statement as 'Inasmuch as there is a difference of opinion in regard to the doctrine of the civil magistrate.' The matter of personal conscience is not in our formulary. If you simply take the ground of Christian feeling, or that you are a Christian Church, and you will not determine distinctly the views you will act upon, especially as regards the view of the civil magistrate, if you do not do that explicitly, then I do not see how you are to acknowledge the Headship of Christ practically as over a visible Church. We say that Erastianism, and Voluntaryism are equally bad, this basis provides for both of them. If you refuse by your vote to pass this motion, recognising these gentlemen, you vindicate the expulsion."

Mr. McCorkle of St. Ninian's, in seconding Dr. Gibson's amendment, said a *prima facie* case in favour of the Minority calling themselves the Free Presbyterian Church of Victoria had been made out. The new basis was formed on a compromise; it covers Voluntaryism and Erastianism; it proceeds upon the ground that there is a difference of opinion among the members of the united body on these two questions: and therefore, the basis is narrowed, in order that they may more readily agree.

Dr. Nixon of Montrose trusted that the decision that day, would be such as to destroy all expectation on the part of the opposition party of carrying their object by the kind of pressure that was being used.

“Dr. Cunningham,” writes Dr. C. G. McCrie, “who had evident enjoyment in the whole debate, did not rise till a late hour, when all were becoming wearied and some were calling for the vote. So soon as he advanced to the table the House became keenly alert, and members braced themselves for the intellectual treat that awaited them. The main portion of the magnificent speech then delivered was devoted to a vindication of the soundness and sufficiency of the Articles which formed the basis on which the three Churches in Victoria had united. By some of the speakers the basis had been assailed on the ground that it did not do justice to Free Church principles. That charge Dr. Cunningham declared to be unfounded. “I believe,” said Dr. Cunningham in the course of his speech, “that any countenance, or assistance we give to this dissenting minority will tend to injure the cause of true religion and Presbyterianism in Australia. I expect no good from them, but only mischief. I expect no good to religion. I expect no good to Presbyterianism. Humanly speaking the interests of true religion and Presbyterianism are substantially identified with the prosperity and efficiency of the united Church. I solemnly believe this; and therefore I can be no party to giving any additional countenance. I think the weaker they are the better. I believe that their disappearance as a Church would be a benefit to the whole community. . . . The idea of any man venturing to stand up in this House and assert that these are intelligent and conscientious Free Churchmen, that they are entitled to special countenance and special favour as such, is preposterous—surely we shall hear no more of that. Instead of recognising them as Free Churchmen, I repudiate them as unworthy of the name. . . . We can have nothing to do with these men, unless, and until, they

abandon their claim to be regarded as distinctively and exclusively the Free Church of Victoria.” “Amid the ringing cheers of the House,” continues Dr. McCrie, “Dr. Cunningham affirmed, ‘There is nothing in the Formula of the United Presbyterian Church to which I have any objection: I could sign it myself; it does not contain an assertion of Voluntaryism, and they receive the Westminster Confession of Faith with just the same qualification and explanation which we have now introduced into our Formula, which is the very same as that embodied in the basis of the Union Church in Victoria.’”

“At the time of its delivery, this speech of Dr. Cunningham’s,” continued Dr. McCrie, “occasioned one of those dramatic episodes in General Assembly life which only occur when excitement and enthusiasm are of white-heat intensity. One of the ruling elders in the Assembly of 1861 was a retired minister, the Rev. James Beattie. . . . When the loud and prolonged applause which greeted the close of the Principal’s speech had somewhat subsided, a venerable form rose in the centre of the hall. It was that of Mr. Beattie, who, when he had gained the attention of the members, recited with great solemnity of utterance and with characteristic gestures, these four line’s of the metrical version of Psalm one hundred and six:

‘Then Phin’has rose, and justice did,
And so the plague did cease;
That to all ages counted was
To him for righteousness.’

The apposite quotation was immensely enjoyed by all in the crowded hall.”

When the vote was taken, 341 voted for Dr. Rainy’s motion and 64 for Dr. Gibson’s. Dr. Rainy in his biography of Dr. Cunningham,

describes Dr. Cunningham's speech as "salutary." It was the last great speech delivered in the General Assembly by Dr. Cunningham. Before the year came to its close, the great doctor had passed to his eternal rest at the age of fifty-six. His 'Historical Theology' is his masterpiece, unquestionably proving him to be one of the most outstanding of Scottish Theologians.

CHAPTER 4

THE TESTIMONY MAINTAINED

A wind of change was surely blowing through the Free Church. The Free Presbyterian Church in Victoria continued to uphold the testimony, in spite of the unworthy treatment received from the Free Church in publicly repudiating them as unworthy of the name of Free Churchmen, and asserting in no uncertain manner, that their disappearance would be a benefit to the whole community. The Rev. Arthur Paul, of St. Kilda, wrote a "Letter to the Rev. William Cunningham, D.D., Principal of the New College, Edinburgh, on the subject of union among Presbyterians in Australia." This letter has been said to have been a masterpiece of its kind, a great finale, a document in ecclesiastical history of the first magnitude. As editor of *The Presbyterian*, Mr. Paul wrote in the March issue, 1879, "So assiduous has been the zeal of unionists in Australia to make the most of Dr. Cunningham's authority, and to canonise the vote of the 'overwhelming majority' that followed him in 1861, that we take every right opportunity which offers to expose the worthlessness of both." That speech of Dr. Cunningham was productive, he avers, of a policy of unionism supported by Dr. Candlish and Dr. Buchanan of Glasgow, which in the words

of Dr. Kennedy of Dingwall, “was carrying the Free Church to its grave.” “Is the influence which Dr. Cunningham exerted,” asks Mr. Paul, “upon the present state of things in Scotland realised by the Free Church minority there? We doubt it.”

Dr. Cunningham’s last brilliant oration, devastating in its power and sarcasm, gave impetus and support in after years to the unionist agitation within the Free Church. “While the immediate effect of Cunningham’s pronouncement on the Colonial union,” writes Dr. McCrie, “was like that of a sweeping rain which leaveth no food, clearing the field of opposition, ending the discussion and practically terminating the agitation, the after effects made powerfully for union in Scotland. Men were led to ask, if the ablest expounder and most powerful vindicator of Free Church principles could subscribe the Victorian basis, and could sign the United Presbyterian formula, what was there to hinder the formation of a platform and a formula upon which the non-established Churches in Scotland might unite. And so when union negotiations were entered upon, no dicta of departed leaders were more frequently adduced than those uttered in the great Australian debate of 1861, and no single statement was more tellingly quoted than that of him who said, “There is nothing in the formula of the United Presbyterian Church to which I have any objection: I could sign it myself.””

The overwhelming vote of the Free Church Assembly of 1861 had also a bewitching effect, as time soon showed, on some in the Free Presbyterian Church of Victoria who had stood out against the union of 1859. In 1863 negotiations for union were begun. In 1864 it came to light that private correspondence on the question of union had been carried on between the Moderator of the Presbyterian Church of Victoria and the Rev. Andrew Maxwell, Moderator of the Free Presbyterian Church Synod of Victoria. This immediately aroused the suspicions of some in the Synod, who felt that the interests of

the Church were being betrayed by the very men who should have been their publicly accredited guardians. They maintained that union with the Presbyterian Church of Victoria would mean the abandonment of their distinctive principles. Strange to say, one of those who now supported the negotiations for union was the Rev. William Miller, who had acted as the representative of the Free Presbyterian Church of Victoria at the Free Church of Scotland Assembly in 1861. When it became apparent that the Unionists were determined to go forward with their policy of union, the Rev. Peter MacPherson on the 24th May 1864 tabled his Protest, and separated in order to carry on the Free Presbyterian Church of Victoria. Among the reasons against union set forth in his Protest, and as proof of the same, he mentions the array of evidence of steady degeneracy in the Presbyterian Church of Victoria, in the matter of resorting to degrading and demoralising practices, in raising money for Church purposes, innovation in and corruption of Presbyterian worship in reference to instrumental music, and serious perversion of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. . . . "THEREFORE, for all the foregoing reasons, and in view of all the foregoing considerations, I HEREBY PROTEST that the body, of which Rev. A. Maxwell is now the acting Moderator, has departed from the position of faithfulness, required by the Fundamental Act of the Free Presbyterian Church of Victoria, is engaged in a course of procedure directly subversive of that Church . . . and I hold and declare them, thus acting, no longer entitled to be regarded as the true representatives of the Free Presbyterian Church of Victoria, and shall withdraw from them accordingly, reserving my ministerial status, with right to continue to exercise the office of the holy ministry now, or to resume it in after time, as the Lord Jesus Christ, who holds the key of the House of David, shall in His Providence open a door." (Extract from Declaration and Protest by the Rev. Peter MacPherson, Appendix 13. History of the Free Presbyterian Church of Australia). In his Protest to uphold and

maintain the Testimony of the Free Presbyterian Church of Victoria, he was supported by the faithful and uncompromising stalwarts of former days, the eminent Rev. Alexander MacIntyre and the Rev. Arthur Paul.

Before the Union was consummated on the 19th day of November, 1867, dispensations of a solemn nature befell some of the unionist ministers of the Free Presbyterian Church. In 1865 the Rev. William Miller of the John Knox Church, Melbourne, intimated his resignation, no doubt as a result of his congregation having declared their attachment "to the Synod of which the Rev. Arthur Paul is Moderator." This was soon followed by the resignation of the Rev. A. W. Sinclair; then the following year the Rev. Andrew Maxwell passed away on the 20th May. When the union took place, two ministers and three elders were then accepted into the Presbyterian Church of Victoria. Before the actual consummation of the union, the Synod passed their last minute in which they declared "that as soon as the incorporation of this Synod with the aforesaid General Assembly takes place under the designation of the Presbyterian Church of Victoria, the existence of the Free Presbyterian Church of Victoria as a separate Church shall terminate." But it did not terminate. The testimony, as has already been noticed, was held and maintained by the Rev. Alexander MacIntyre, the Rev. Peter MacPherson and the Rev. Arthur Paul.

The Rev. Arthur Paul was a native of Greenock. He and the Rev. Alexander MacIntyre arrived in Australia in 1853. They were both in their day and generation noble and faithful witnesses on the side of Christ and His cause. Mr. Paul died on August 13th 1910, in the eighty-fifth year of his age, and the fifty-eighth of his ministry, fifty-five of which he had spent in St. Kilda. "The righteous shall be held in everlasting remembrance."

CHAPTER 5

VOLUNTARYISM

As the contending of the Free Presbyterian Church of Victoria for the most part were directed against Voluntaryism, and in defence of the Establishment Principle, and further, as the spread of Voluntaryism and Arminianism within the borders of the Free Church of Scotland led to the passing of the Declaratory Act of 1892, the meaning of the term Voluntaryism, and its far reaching implications, calls for some explanation.

“Voluntaryism” in the words of Principal Cunningham, “amounts in substance to this that the only relation that ought to subsist between the State and the Church between civil government and religion is that of entire separation; or, in other words, its advocates maintain that nations, as such, and civil rulers in their official capacity, not only are not bound, but are not at liberty, to interfere in any religious matters, or to seek to promote the welfare of the Church of Christ as such. This theory, if true, supersedes the necessity of all further inquiry into the principles that ought to regulate the relation between Church and State; for it really implies, that no connection should subsist, or can lawfully subsist between them.” (Historical Theology Vol. 1, ch. 13).

“Under the general head of the civil magistrate, or the civil

magistracy that is, in the exposition of what is taught in Scripture concerning the functions and duties of the Supreme civil authorities of a nation, whatever be its form of government the Reformers were *unanimous and decided* in asserting what has been called in modern times the principle of national establishments of religion namely, that it is competent to, and incumbent upon, nations, as such, and civil rulers in their official capacity, or in the exercise of their legitimate control over civil matters, to aim at the promotion of the honour of God, the welfare of true religion, and the prosperity of the Church of Christ. This principle, which comprehends or implies the whole of what we are concerned to maintain upon the subject of national establishments of religion, we believe to be fully sanctioned by Scripture; and we can appeal, in support of it, to the decided and unanimous testimony of the Reformers while the Anabaptists of that period seem to have been the first, if we except the Donatists of the fifth century, who stumbled upon something like the opposite doctrine, or what is now-a-days commonly called the Voluntary principle.” (Historical Theology Vol. 2, ch. 27.)

The late Dr. James Kerr gave the following definitions of Voluntaryism in its ecclesiastical sense—“The relation of civil government to Christianity really consists in having no relation at all”; “The province of the civil ruler about religion is to have no province at all”; “Religion is none of the concerns of government.” And the late Professor Eadie said that “The best legislation on the subject of religion is to repeal all previous legislation on the subject.” “Apply the principle,” continues Dr. Kerr, “to the British Constitution and Administration and the Imperial policy, and at one fell blow, all references to Christianity in them must be instantly demolished. The Protestant Succession to the Throne must be abolished, the Bible must be expelled from the National Schools, prayers in Parliament and the Court of Assize must end, and all laws

in favour of the Lord's Day must be repealed. In short, in obedience to the demands of Voluntaryism, the whole laws and policy of the British Empire must be so fashioned and conducted, that they would not show whether the God of the Mohommedan, or the God of the Christian was Governor and King of the Nations. Voluntaryism bolts the door of all public institutions against the entrance of the universal Lord. It is thus more Erastian than the Erastianism against which it is continually protesting. Thus imperiously Voluntaryism will thrust God out of the rulership of part of His own dominions and require the nation as such to conduct its affairs without any recognition of Him."

"Voluntaryism," wrote Professor G. Smeaton, D.D., in 'The Scottish Theory of Ecclesiastical Establishment,' "proposes to substitute a non-religious State that is, a State purely secular, without a religion and without a Creed for the Christian State which, as all historians allow, is the foundation of modern culture and refinement. The Confession of Faith would be expunged in Scotland, and the Thirty-nine Articles in England as the National Creed—a Creed which has brought blessing to the Empire. No man can be permitted to deny this issue on the allegation that he means it not. He may not intend that, in its corporate character the State shall be infidel, but it is not a question of intentions. He subjects himself to the inexorable logic of a class of principles which are wild and irreligious, and he will be swept before them like chaff before the wind. From their very nature they are a universal act rescissory as to the laws which regulate religious education, the observance of the Sabbath, the purity of marriage, and the religious character of all our institutions; and what is this but the official infidelity of an atheistic State? Never till the dawn of the French Revolution did this theory gain much attention or influence. For though we find it among the Anabaptists, the Quakers, and the untaught fanatical sects of the Commonwealth time—men who regarded the State as belonging to

the empire of an evil power—it never menaced the institution of the Christian State till the fury and impiety of the French Revolution insinuated themselves into other nations. The heathen philosophers, Plato and Cicero, speak with a deeper view of the religious character of States than Voluntary divines commonly evince. We are naturally led to enquire, what description of person must be the ideal ruler of the Voluntary theory, if that could ever be reduced to practice in any unhappy country? The answer can only be, that in order to be a MODEL RULER he must be a BAD MAN—a man denuded of the fear of God, to whom all religions are alike, and none worthy of encouragement.”

“The Voluntary principle,” wrote ‘Rabbi’ Duncan, “is not only anti-Christian, but atheistical.”

In a speech which Dr. Kennedy of Dingwall made in 1881 before leaving for Mentone for his health, he says, ‘We have ceased to be the Church which was constituted at the Disruption as the Free Church of Scotland. The decay which generated the fungus of disestablishment (Voluntaryism) accounts for the growth of sensationalism in worship. The taste indulged in the drawing-room and in the concert room, craves for gratification in the house of God. This is the reason why hymns and organs are demanded. Of course some plausible excuse must be devised for urging such a change, but it is weariness of Scriptural worship that causes the fashionable desire for innovations. The coincidence of this development with that of disestablishment is sufficient to indicate the character of both. And the current change has passed on to unfaithfulness as to the custody of God’s Word. A revolt against the regulations of Scripture can only result from defective views of its Divine perfection and authority. To one, who traced to growing unfaithfulness, the two former changes of feeling, there can be nothing unaccountable in the extent to which the Word of God is degraded within our pale. In a Church such as ours, Voluntaryism, Arminianism, and

Sensationalism must be the pioneers of Rationalism for they are all the offspring of unbelief.”

The Baneful Influence of Voluntaryism

At the Synod of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland which met in Glasgow in November 1900, the Rev. Walter Scott attended as a delegate from the Reconstituted Synod of the Free Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia. The Clerk having read the commission of Mr. Scott, the Moderator invited Mr. Scott to come forward and address the Court. In the course of his address which dealt with the state of religion in Australia, Mr. Scott said, “While there was an absence of distinctive Reformation principle in the large Presbyterian Churches, their position was that of Voluntaryism. Nor had the Voluntary principle in the Colonies been merely theoretical. What were the facts? In Victoria, at the instance of a certain Minister of Public Instruction, who was the son of a Voluntary minister in Scotland, Parliament had gone the length of ordering the name of the Saviour to be expunged from every lesson book used in the public schools! This almost incredible state of things was only changed in recent years. Strange to say, it was left to a Roman Catholic member to move the rescinding of the infamous order. And to this day the Bible itself stands interdicted from the schools of the colonies referred to. In New South Wales no school buildings were allowed to be used for any religious service. These were significant facts. And in the face of them, what were they to think of the present triumph of Voluntaryism in Scotland? Its baneful influence in Australia was notorious. The young were found, for the most part, unable to read the Bible with any correctness. Reverence for authority, parental or otherwise, was wanting. Crime at an early age was so prevalent that it had attracted the notice of Judges on the bench. Everything went to show that the Voluntary

principle as logically carried out, so as to eliminate religion as far as possible from the State, was not only a grave danger to the well-being of a community, but was such, as even threatened its very existence. "For the nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish: yea those nations shall be utterly wasted." (Isaiah 60:12.) (F.P. Mag. Vol. 5, p. 300.)

CHAPTER 6

THE ESTABLISHMENT PRINCIPLE

The Establishment Principle or principle of the National Recognition of Religion maintains the Scriptural view of the universal supremacy of Christ as King of Nations, as well as King of Saints, with the consequent duty of nations to honour and serve Him, by recognising His Truth and promoting His Cause.

The duty of the civil magistrate towards the Church of Christ is set forth in chapter 23 of the “Westminster Confession of Faith” “The Civil Magistrate.” The term “magistrate” or “civil magistrate,” is used to designate the authority possessed by the supreme civil power, and entitled to frame the laws, and to regulate the whole proceedings of a nation. All the Protestant and Presbyterian Churches of the Reformation both in Britain and on the Continent of Europe held and maintained the Principle of Establishment.

The ablest exposition in the English language of the Establishment Principle is Dr. Thomas McCrie’s “Statement,” first published in April 1807. In 1871 a new edition appeared with a preface by the late Dr. Smeaton of the New College, Edinburgh. Dr. Smeaton describes the “Statement” “as a masterly defence of the principles of establishments as a Scripture truth; and the most complete

vindication ever given to the world of the position occupied by the Reformed Church of Scotland, on the whole subject of national religion, and of the magistrates' legitimate power in promoting it." "The same thoroughness" wrote the late Rev. D. Beaton, "which gave such abiding value to his great biography of Knox, is shown in this, his less known work." (The Great Classic on the Establishment Principle Dr. McCrie's "Statement" by the Rev. D. Beaton, Free Presbyterian Magazine Vol. 11, p. 192.)

Dr. McCrie in his "Statement" shows from the Confessions of the Protestant and Presbyterian Churches of the Reformation that they all held the Establishment Principle. A list of these Confessions with quotations in connection with the same is given in chapter three of the "History of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland": "The Confession of Helvetia"; "The Confession of Bohemia," called also "The Confession of the Waldenses"; "The Confession of Saxony"; "The French Confession"; "The Belgic or Dutch Confession"; "The Confession of the English Congregation in Geneva" and "The Scots Confession."

The Belgic Confession teaches that it "is the duty of magistrates not only to be careful to preserve the civil government, but also to endeavour that the ministry be preserved, that all idolatry and counterfeit worship be abolished, the Kingdom of Anti-Christ brought down, and that the Kingdom of Christ be enlarged; in fine, that it is their duty to bring it to pass that the Holy Word of the gospel be preached everywhere, that all men may serve God purely and freely, according to the prescribed will of His Word."

The Westminster Confession of Faith in Section three of Chapter twenty-three states "The Civil magistrate may not assume to himself the administration of the Word and sacraments, or the power of the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven; yet he hath authority, and it is his duty 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 corruptions and abuses in worship and discipline prevented or reformed, and all the ordinances of God duly settled, administered and observed. For the better effecting thereof, he hath power to call synods,* to be present at them, and to provide that whatsoever is transacted in them be according to the mind of God.”

“The last clause of the section asserting the magistrates’ right to call synods is limited by the act of Assembly, 1647, to Kirks not constituted and settled. The word “settled” here means “fixed by legal sanction,” according to the phraseology of formal state and Church documents, of the Westminster period. The whole section has been charged as pure Erastianism, and was appealed to in connection with the state’s interference in the Disruption struggle. That charge has abundantly and satisfactorily been answered by Dr. William Cunningham in his “Remarks on the Twenty-Third Chapter of the Confession of Faith as Bearing on Existing Controversies” and reprinted in his “Discussions on Church Principles,” chapter eight. How anyone, reading the statement of the Confession on the Civil Magistrate in Chapters twenty-five, thirty and thirty-one could assert that chapter twenty-three taught Erastianism, is inexplicable

* Two noted instances of Synods being called by the “Civil Magistrate” is that of the Synod of Dort convened on the authority of the States-general in 1618, and of the Westminster Assembly convened by an Ordinance of the Lords and Commons, assembled in Parliament in London, on 12th June, 1643. In the Ordinance, Parliament declares that “the present church government of archbishops, their chancellors, deans and chapters, archdeacons, etc., is evil, and justly offensive and burdensome to the kingdom, etc.,” and that Presbyterianism be established instead. The Ordinance is printed in full in the Westminster Confession of Faith.—W.M.

unless he boldly but ignorantly asserts that the Divines glaringly contradicted their own teaching.

“This Section was also attacked by the Voluntaries, who maintained that it gave the Civil Magistrate power to exercise authority or jurisdiction in religious matters and over the concerns of the Church. Dr. Cunningham points out, however, the definition of the Establishment Principle held that there was a plain distinction between the object of the magistrate’s care, and the sphere or subject of his jurisdiction; for while he was bound to aim at the well-being of the Church, he had no jurisdiction or right of authoritative interference in religious matters. Both Dr. Cunningham and also Dr. Bannerman in his “Church of Christ” explain the technical meaning of “take order” (sec. 3). It was a common phrase, it seems, in the controversial theology of the times of the Westminster Assembly. (Extracts from “The National Recognition of Religion” and “The Headship of Christ” by the late Rev. D. Beaton.)

The late Rev. Neil Cameron, Glasgow, in his sermon on “The boar out of the wood doth waste” etc., (Psalm 80:12, 13), says, “The Scriptural connection between the Church and the State will be taken away, if the Lord permits the boars of this land to see their desire upon Zion. Nations as nations are bound to confess Christ, His Truth, and His Church. “For the nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish, yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted” (Isa. 60:12). They have raised up a loud cry for religious equality, so that idolatry might be set up, and true godliness banished forever from our coasts. Do they imagine that there is to be concord between Christ and Belial, and between light and darkness? Surely, in the words of godly Samuel Rutherford, the bottom has fallen out of the reason and consciences of many in this land. Christ will have all or nothing. But we are like the Gadarenes, we prefer our swine rather than Christ. Therefore we are beseeching Him to leave our coasts. *If the doctrine of the Establishment is in the Word of God, though only*

one man stood for it in Scotland, he would be right, and the great multitude wrong. The strength of the Church is not in the numbers of her followers, but in Christ her living Head.” (Memoir of Rev. Neil Cameron, p.p. 195 and 196.) “*The Establishment Principle*” wrote Dr. Kennedy, “*is a principle not only worth living for, but a principle worth dying for.*”

“O all ye kingdoms of the earth
Sing praises to this King;
For He is Lord that ruleth all,
Unto Him praises sing.”

Ps. 68:32

CHAPTER 7

UNION CONTROVERSY

When the Free Church separated from the Established Church of Scotland in the year 1843, it was not because she ceased to hold the duty of the Civil Magistrate as set forth in her Confession of Faith, but on account of the Civil Magistrate's intrusion into the spiritual jurisdiction of the Church—the essence of Erastianism. Dr. Chalmers declared on the day of the Disruption, “Though we quit the Establishment, we go out on the Establishment Principle. We quit a vitiated Establishment, but would rejoice in returning to a pure one. To express it otherwise, we are the advocates for a national recognition and national support of religion, and we are not Voluntaries.” The Establishment Principle was so strongly fixed in her Constitution as defined in the Claim of Rights of 1843, that when the majority in her Assembly endeavoured to force on a union with the United Presbyterian Church, which was absolutely opposed to the Principle of Establishment and Endowment of religion, it became an unsurpassable barrier. Thus, there were two forces promoting the disestablishment crusade in the Free Church—the United Presbyterian Church could not unite with them while they held this principle of establishment of religion; again they could not get rid legally of this principle but by cutting it at the roots.

The Union negotiations began in the year 1863. In 1877 when the business of Disestablishment came up before the Assembly, Dr. Begg gave notice of the following motion: "The General Assembly, while not satisfied with the existing relations between Church and State in Scotland, and deploring the divisions which exist, hold that it is the duty of this Church to maintain firmly the whole principles of the Disruption: and that can only be done in connection with a decided adherence to the universal supremacy of Christ as King of Nations as well as King of saints, with the consequent duty of nations to honour and serve Him by recognising His Truth and promoting His Cause; whereas, the direct tendency of a policy of mere disestablishment is to subvert the principles of the Reformation and of the Free Church, inasmuch as the abolition of the existing Establishment is advocated, while no clear views of national duty are maintained."

In his speech in support of his motion, he said: . . . "The proposal of disestablishment properly means the repealing of those statutes which recognised the Church of Christ, and have thrown a legislative fence around it, which have acknowledged it and sanctioned its constitution; but the question is, Are we prepared to ask the State to undo all those Acts? Virtually to abolish the Coronation Oath, disestablish the Protestant Church and the Protestant Cause in the land." As regards the principle of Voluntaryism he said, "You have here the very same difficulty which you take to be impossible in regard to the United Presbyterian Church. They don't want your principles of acknowledgment by the State. They most decidedly affirm that anything like recognition of their creed by an Act of Parliament is inconsistent with their view; they hold that anything of the nature of a public recognition of truth, as distinguished from falsehood, is inconsistent with an absolute neutrality. . . . The new theory is just the theory of the French Revolution. It began with the French Revolution, and Dr. Thomas McCrie, who was a farsighted man, indicated his opinion that it would shake every throne in Europe."

When this motion was moved at the Assembly it was seconded by Mr. William Kidston in a vigorous and enlightening speech. It is interesting to note that Mr. Kidston was the uncle of Mr. Bonar Law, the distinguished British statesman.

Dr. Rainy, the great champion of Voluntaryism, in the course of his speech supporting his motion, which was in opposition to Dr. Begg's, said, "What I wish to say is this, That I am thoroughly persuaded a process of disestablishment would immediately give immensely increased weight, and influence, and fruitfulness to everything that is good and of a good tendency in the Established Church. . . . I say that Disestablishment, for our purpose, or as it is put in our motion, the termination between Church and State, simply means the repeal of so much of those Acts as gives its present position to the existing Establishment the repeal of so much of those Acts as will effect that. . . . For example, I see no reason why the disestablishment of the Church should include the repeal of certain Acts, which give a certain place to the Confession of Faith . . . the position really is this, that you can disestablish the Church, without such trouble, and maintain the position of the Confession of Faith, for the reason that the maintenance of it, is the basis of certain social arrangements, in regard to which we are perfectly agreed. . . . Well then, the same applies to the Protestant succession. That is not a religious tenet. It was no part of the Reformation doctrine that the heir to the throne must be a Protestant. The Reformers accepted a Popish Queen in the very spring-tide of the Reformation. It came in afterwards as a security which the Church and the Nation felt to be required, and I have no hesitation in saying that I believe that the mere existence on the Throne of a Popish sovereign, with the sort of operation that would be likely to go on in that connection, would go far to render a peaceable government a most impracticable thing. . . . I am not inclined to say that my hope is precisely the Establishment of Chalmers, any more than I could say that it

is precisely the Establishment of Alexander Henderson, or the Establishment precisely of Knox” Dr. Rainy’s motion was seconded by Sir Henry Moncrieff. He supported almost all that Dr. Rainy said in his speech. Several spoke to the two motions the great majority in support of Dr. Rainy’s motion. There voted for Dr. Rainy’s motion 460, and for Dr. Begg’s 78. (Extracted from the History of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland Ch. 3.)

“Why Dr. Rainy and his followers,” continues the History, “should deal so light heartedly with such a very serious matter as the change of the Coronation Oath and the prospect connected therewith, of a Papist ascending the throne, in the light of past history in Scotland and England, causes one to ask, were these men realising their responsibility, or were they careless as to persecution which might arise again in this nation? That Dr. Rainy had before his mind at the time of uttering the above, the persecutions which hurled the House of Stuart from the British throne is evident, seeing he says that: “A Popish sovereign . . . would go far to render a peaceable government a most impracticable thing.” Did he mean that in order to attain his aim in disestablishing the Church of Scotland, he would be prepared to cause the practicableness or otherwise of a Papist on the British throne to be put to the test again? His statement bears clearly that construction. That he should get a majority of 460 to follow him, and some of these, old men, who had passed through the Disruption struggles, causes amazement. But this proves the Scripture: “Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man.” (Ps. 146:3.)” (Ch. 3, p. 35.)

“Year by year the controversy was continued by which much bitterness was generated, not only among the ministers and elders of the Church as they adhered to the Constitutional or the Voluntary or Rainy party, but also in the congregations of the Church. This was urged upon the Rainy party repeatedly by members of the Assembly, but they would not listen. By 1886, the split in the Free Church had

become so pronounced that, those who favoured the original position of the Free Church would not go to hear ministers of the Rainy party, neither would the followers of the Rainy party go to hear ministers of the Constitutional camps. Still the disestablishment crusade was being vigorously pursued, as if men had really become infatuated, or were seeking the glory of leadership. . . . The true people of God within the pale of the Free Church groaned, cried, and shed many tears before the Lord in secret, over her downfall and unfaithfulness to God's Word and to her own avowed constitution. Some separated from her Communion even then, although as yet her constitution was still intact. (Ch. 3, p. 47.)

"There was another serious effect which this union proposal had on the Free Church. Up till then, Arminianism was not countenanced in her manner of admitting her office bearers, or in her pulpits, but now Arminianism was publicly preached in many of her pulpits, and defended in her Church Courts. These two baneful effects followed the discussions held by the Committees of these two Churches about the proposed union, and their consequences were really deplorable on the Free Church.

Another thing that caused searchings of heart to many in the Free Church, was the place given, even as Professors, to men who held and declared erroneous views as to the inspiration and inerrancy of the Scriptures. Professor Robertson Smith of the Free Church College, Aberdeen, made extraordinary statements about several books of the Bible, which he had learned from German rationalists, and which he partially defended in her Courts, even in the Assembly, during several years. It became apparent that there were many in the Free Church who were looking favourably upon these Higher Critical, infidel views, and who did their utmost to screen such as held and expressed publicly these most pernicious heresies from the usual discipline of the Church of Christ. Furthermore, the pernicious heresies expressed by these men turned many of the people away

from God's Word into infidelity, and caused great grief of heart and many temptations to the Lord's true people.

Another thing that followed the Union movement was the introduction of hymns of human composition, in other words, uninspired hymns, into the public worship of the Free Church. . . . In a few years instrumental music was introduced in the same way. When all these innovations and heresies, errors in doctrines and principles, are taken into consideration, should it seem strange though the true sons and daughters of the Free Church felt that she was no longer the Free Church which they loved and admired." (History of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland. Ch. 3, pp. 18-19.)

CHAPTER 8

THE DECLARATORY ACT— AN EXPULSION ACT

The continual course of defection pursued by the Free Church culminated in the passing of the Declaratory Act by an overwhelming majority of the General Assembly in May 1892, into “a binding law and constitution in the Church.” Voluntaryism, Arminianism, the infidel views of Higher Critics who were tearing the Word of God to shreds, and the carnality to which the pure worship of the Sanctuary was being reduced by uninspired hymns and instrumental music, were all shielded by the infamous Act. When the Declaratory Act was passed, a protest was entered against it, and an appeal made to the next Assembly to take steps for its repeal. This caused that no separation took place during that year. Rev. Donald MacFarlane was not a member of the 1892 Assembly. The General Assembly of 1893, led by Dr. Rainy, by a sweeping majority not only endorsed the passing of the Declaratory Act, but ordered the deletion of protests entered in Presbytery records against the Act. After the result of the vote, the Rev. Donald MacFarlane rose and read his protest, which he left on the table of the Assembly. “Thus,” says the Rev. Neil Cameron,

“a separation was constitutionally made.” (Memoir Lecture 2, p. 175.)

In connection with Mr. MacFarlane tabling his Protest, Dr. Rainy said, they were always anxious to give relief to the consciences of brethren. If this document which had just been read was merely a dissent, even though strongly worded, they should of course have no hesitation in allowing it; but it was much more than that. It was an express repudiation of the authority and validity of the final Act of the General Assembly in this matter, so far as the Assembly was concerned. He was sorry to move therefore: “That they do not receive the protest.” (Report of the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland,” 1893, pp. 164-183.).

By his historic Protest in the Free Church Assembly of May 1893, Mr. MacFarlane conserved intact and entire the Reformed Faith in Scotland for his own and succeeding generations. “Some call us Seceders,” writes Mr. MacFarlane in his diary, “But we are not Seceders. The word ‘seceder’ according to the literal meaning, is to step aside from a position. We have not stepped aside from the position of the Church of Scotland for centuries. It is those who have left the position who are Seceders from God’s Word and worship.”

“We find in the Declaratory Act,” wrote the Rev. J. S. Sinclair in his Introductory article in Vol. I of the Free Presbyterian Magazine, “the errors of Arminianism, Pelagianism, Voluntarism and Romanism. We are commanded by the Word of God to ‘have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness,’ and therefore we cannot have fellowship with a Church that adopts these errors as part of her creed and testimony. We are told by many in the Church that the Declaratory Act is a dead letter because they do not approve of it. Such persons must remember that the Act received the sanction of the Church Courts in regular form, and is now a standing law and constitution in the Church. If they are not personally compelled to accept it, the Church, of which they are a component part, has already

accepted it. All past Protests against the Act have been declared null and void by the Church, and no office-bearer can prevent his neighbour from accepting all the doctrines of the Declaratory Act. The private opinion of individuals is utterly useless to prevent the full operation of the Act. The Church of 1843 has no existence as far as the present Free Church is concerned. It is the Church that has adopted the Declaratory Act, that now lives, and it is this Church we have felt constrained to separate from. As the Free Presbyterian Church, our profession and confession are none other than those of the Church of Scotland from the beginning. We contend for all the principles of the Free Church as settled in 1843, and are, we believe, the true Free Church of Scotland. The addition of the word Presbyterian does not indicate any change in our attitude or principles as a Church. It serves, however, two purposes. It distinguishes us from the present Free Church, calling herself Free, with which we might have justly contested the title, and it emphasises the fact that it was in consistently adhering to the principles of Presbyterianism, that we are compelled to set up a separate jurisdiction. The following is a brief summary of the principles which we are called upon to emphasise at the present time; (1) the perpetual obligation upon nations, and our nation in particular, to recognise, support and defend the Church of Christ, Presbyterian in doctrine, worship and discipline; (2) The use of the Book of Psalms only, as to the matter of praise in the worship of God; and as to the manner thereof, singing with the human voice to the exclusion of instrumental music: and (3) The whole doctrine of the Confession of Faith as it relates to the infallibility, inspiration, and authority of the Holy Scriptures, the decrees of God, the atonement, man's total depravity, the work of the Holy Spirit, and the preaching of the Gospel." (F.P. Magazine, Vol. 1, May 1896.)

"At the Free Church Assembly of 1894," wrote the late Rev. Neil Cameron, Glasgow, "a motion was passed to the effect that a civil action should be raised in the Court of Session, to deprive us of all

the property which we then possessed. To the great shame of the former Constitutional Party, this motion was moved by one of them. The action was raised, and they took from us every manse, church, and meeting-house in our possession, so that in many places our people had to worship God under the canopy of the heavens. We took to the spoiling of our goods, and we felt like Mephibosheth, when his servant by fraud took from him his inheritance. All he said was, “Yea let him take all, forasmuch as my lord the king is come again in peace unto his own house.” We found that suffering for and with Christ was true happiness. . . . The Rainy Party, but especially the so-called Constitutional Party, did their level best to stigmatise us as schismatics, who were guilty of breaking up the Cause of Christ. But none of these things moved us, for we had the warrant of God’s Word for the step we had taken, and also the approval of our own conscience. The warmth and spiritual joy felt by us in the means of salvation, and the unity and love which then existed between brothers and sisters in Christ, as also seals set upon the Word preached in the conversion of sinners to God, made us absolutely sure that the Lord approved of the step we had taken. We were fully convinced that we had continued long enough with men who like wild beasts, tore God’s Word to pieces, superseded the Westminster Confession of Faith by the accumulation of old heresies contained in the Declaratory Act, and had become perjured men to the bargain. Men might call them the “Church of Christ,” and charge us with schism for separating from them: but we knew that men would not be the judges at last, but God, and therefore we appealed to Him.”

Mr. Cameron concludes his Lecture from which the above is an extract as follows: “We have endeavoured to show that, as far as we can understand God’s Word and providence, the Lord has helped us hitherto, because we, in much weakness and infirmities, have adhered to His Word, the Confession of Faith, and purity in worship and practice as a Church. Let us not forget that this has been the

cause of our overcoming such as rose against us again and again, as sure as it was the case of the Old Testament Church, who prospered while they held, even outwardly, to God's instituted means of grace and to His Word. We are, as a Church, founded solidly upon God's infallible and eternal Truth, and while our Church will continue to hold it without surrendering or compromising in the least any part thereof, no power in hell or upon earth shall prevail against her. But as soon as she will depart from that firm attitude, she is gone.” (Memoir Lecture 1.)

CHAPTER 9

“THE FIRST THREE”

We now turn to the State of New South Wales, and to the Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia, the Synod of which in 1884 passed what came to be called the Expulsion Act. It is reckoned that the history of the Presbyterian Church in Australia dates from the arrival of Dr. John Lang in New South Wales in the year 1823. In 1831 five other ministers arrived, and on the 5th October a Synod was established, designated “The Synod of Australia in connection with the Established Church of Scotland.” About twelve years after this, the Disruption of the Church of Scotland took place on the 18th of May 1843, resulting in the formation of the Free Church of Scotland.

At a meeting of the Synod of Australia on the 9th of October 1846, the discussion on the Disruption came to a climax when the majority elected to remain an integral part of the Established Church of Scotland, The members of the Synod in favour of the Disruption Free Church of 1843 were: Rev. William MacIntyre, M.A., Maitland; Rev. Colin Stewart of Vale of Clyde; Rev. John Tait of Paramatta; Dr. Hill and Mr. Samuel Martin elders. The next day, the 10th October, having read and tabled their Protest they withdrew, and in the drawing-room of Mr. William Buyers, Hunter Street, Sydney,

constituted themselves in the name of the Head of the Church, as “The Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia.” The Rev. William MacIntyre was chosen Moderator, and the Rev. John Tait, Clerk of Synod. They declared anew their adherence to the Confession of Faith, the Directory of Public Worship, and the Second Book of Discipline as the subordinate standards of the Church.

In course of time both Revs. C. Stewart and J. Tait were caught in the current of unionism and drifted from the position they professed to maintain and uphold in 1846. Mr. Tait removed to the State of Victoria where he proved himself one of the stoutest opponents the Free Presbyterian Church in Victoria encountered in 1859. He was the first minister whose death the united body had to mourn. Rev. William MacIntyre fought a good fight until he finished his course on the 12th July 1870.

Rev. William MacIntyre, who was a native of Kilmonvaig, Scotland, arrived in Sydney in 1837, where he acted for a time as assistant to Dr. Lang, and also taught in the Australian College. From 1841-1861 he was minister of Maitland. In 1861 he received a call from St. George’s Free Church, Castlereagh Street, Sydney, which he accepted and where he remained until his death. He was a Mr. Valiant for the Truth in his day and generation. He witnessed faithfully against the rising tide of encroachments which had now almost swept the Lord’s Day out of New South Wales. In his Tract on the Christian Sabbath he testifies against Sabbath travelling by “railway, omnibuses and hackney carriages to a place of worship, and clearly shows that all who do are guilty of “unmitigated Sabbath desecration.”

Among his writings is “The Token of the Covenant or The Subjects, The Mode and the Nature and Design of Baptism.” “Some hold,” he states at the outset, “that certain adults only—adults who make a credible profession of faith in Christ—are to be baptised; and others maintain that such adults, and also the infant children of baptised

parents, who make a credible profession of faith in Christ, are to be baptised. Those latter are called *paedobaptists*, *paedo* denoting child or infant—because they hold and practise infant baptism; and the former *anti-paedobaptists*, because they reject the baptism of infants; or *anabaptists* because they baptise *again* (*ana* means again) persons who were baptised in infancy; but more commonly, however, *baptists*, a name which cannot be conceded to them, if it is meant to imply that they alone baptise and are baptised with a legitimate and valid baptism. In this sense it must be classed and repudiated along with such designations as catholic and churchman. Paedobaptists and anti-paedobaptists, it will be seen from the statement just given of the positions they respectively maintain, hold in common that certain adults are to be baptised. On this point they are at one. Paedobaptists, however, hold further, and anti-paedobaptists deny, that certain infants also are to be baptised. Thus the point at issue—the only point at issue in the controversy between them with respect to the subjects of baptism is, whether the infant children of baptised parents, who make a credible profession of religion, are to be baptised.” Mr. MacIntyre’s pamphlet is an excellent critique of the innovations in connection with this holy sacrament, with which the “Anabaptists” or “Baptists” have disturbed and divided the Church of God.

In the “History of the Free Presbyterian Church of Australia” the following tribute is paid to his memory: “Australia owes a debt of gratitude to his memory, for his untiring zeal and devotion in the matter of higher education, and for his unswerving loyalty and faithful advocacy of evangelical principles. It was he who ‘kept the Faith’ in New South Wales. He was a logical thinker of the first rank, and generous to a fault. A massive tombstone one of the most dignified and classical after a European design in Rockwood cemetery where he was laid to rest, bears evidence of the esteem in which he was held. The inscription states that “as a preacher and

writer, his ministrations were esteemed of peculiar value for the clear and faithful testimony ever borne in them to Divine Truth.” The following Latin inscription supplied by the late Professor Badham, D.D., of the Sydney University, who had few equals in classical knowledge, occupies another side: “Qui in antiquis scriptoribus perlustrandis imitandisque adeo feliciter versatus est ut iudicium doctrina stabiliret doctrinam humanitate commendaret”; while a third side is occupied with Gaelic: “Ann an cuimhne air duine bha air leth firinneach agus rochomharaichte anns an fhianuis a thog e mu thimchioll Focal Dhe agus Eaglais Chrìosd air an talamh. Bi-sa firinneach gu has agus bheir mise dhuit crun na beatha.” Taisbean. 2:10. (English Translation: “In memory of a man who was singularly faithful and most notable in the testimony which he bore concerning the Word of God and the Church of Christ upon the earth. Be thou faithful unto death and I will give thee a crown of life.” Revelation 2:10) “His death closed an era in Presbyterian history.” (p. 156.)

The Rev. Allan MacIntyre, a brother of the Rev. William MacIntyre, was one of “the first three” in New South Wales. Before coming to Australia he was minister in Paisley. His ministry began on the Manning River on December 18th 1854, the Rev. Alexander MacIntyre, his fellow countryman and relative, being present on this occasion. Right from the commencement of his ministry on the Manning there was evidence of the blessing of God attending his labours. His first communion was a time to be remembered. From that time forward there were drops of heavenly dew, until the year 1860, on that memorable Thanksgiving Day, when he preached for two hours on Zechariah 12:10, “I will pour upon the house of David and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplications: and they shall look upon Me Whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for Him, as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for Him, as one that is in bitterness for his first born.” It will be a day to be remembered throughout Eternity—a day

when He who is fairer than the sons of men, girded His sword upon His thigh and in His majesty went forth to ride prosperously. The Spirit of Truth accompanied the word spoken with power. It was said by some of the elders that there were not three pairs of dry eyes within the walls.

It was the Rev. Allan MacIntyre who held the first Free Church services at Letterewe on the Hastings River. They were conducted in both Gaelic and English, and it is said though commencing at 10 a.m. the sun was after setting by the time these two services (one following the other) were concluded. He and the Rev. Alexander MacIntyre then at Ahalton on the Hunter, before going to Geelong in Victoria, paid frequent visits to the Clarence, preaching at Grafton, Brushgrove and MacLean, then known as Rockymouth, where hundreds used to flock to their services.

In June 1862, the Grafton congregation gave a call to the Rev. Allan MacIntyre, which he accepted. Mr. MacIntyre was the first minister settled in Grafton. His labours on the Clarence were greatly blessed. In 1865 he was called the second time to the Manning congregation, where he was inducted in November, and where he continued to labour until his death on the 20th of May, 1870. His brother, the Rev. William MacIntyre, Sydney, passed away as has been already noticed in the same year on the 12th of July.

In the Manning River congregation, the Rev. Allan McIntyre had a fine band of godly and devoted elders and members, who were a tower of strength to their minister. Among them was Donald MacMaster. Donald MacMaster was born in Strontian in the county of Argyll, Scotland, in the year 1821. In the year 1852 he set out for Australia along with the Rev. Alex. MacIntyre. It was under a sermon of the Rev. Alex. MacIntyre in the year 1843, that Donald was awakened to realise that he was a lost sinner. Mr. MacIntyre's text that day was: “Curse ye Meroz, said the angel of the Lord, curse ye bitterly the inhabitants thereof; because they came not to the help

of the Lord, to the help of the Lord against the mighty” (Judges 5:23.) For years, according to the “Presbyter,” Donald MacMaster was an outstanding elder in the Manning River congregation. . . . Later he returned to Scotland after spending some time in New Zealand. Although he spent sixteen or seventeen years in the Colonies before returning to Scotland, when he did, he had little heart to attach himself to the Free Church owing to its action to the Australian minority to which he belonged, and the estrangement he then felt he scarcely ever got fully over.” Donald MacMaster’s obituary, written by the Rev. Neil Cameron, appears in Vol. 2 of the Free Presbyterian Magazine. “In his public exercises,” wrote Mr. Cameron, “he was very helpful to the humble, causing them to feel low in their own eyes, and making Christ more precious to them. We often compared him to the woman who broke the alabaster box on Christ’s head—the house would be filled with the odour of the ointment. None could hear him pray without feeling that he drank deeply of the waters of Marah, and also of the river which flows clear as crystal from the Throne of God and the Lamb. His knowledge of the Bible was both profound and accurate. The Bible was his constant companion, but especially on the Sabbath day. A friend who lived with him told us that while in robust health he always rose on the Sabbath morning between five and six and spent the whole day, except the time required for public worship, between prayer and reading. He never read any book on the Sabbath but the Word of God. He often said, “A home without worship or prayer is the most pitiable of all places on earth.” . . . He was of a very retiring, meek and modest disposition; but, being very intelligent and observant, he watched all movements both in the Church and State with deep interest and concern. The deplorable departures of the Free Church from the principles and doctrines of the Reformation caused him much grief and anxiety. He often spent most of the night on his knees, pleading for the Cause of Christ in the land and for the rising generation. When that odious Declaratory Act

became the creed and constitution of that Church—as it manifestly shows how she receives the Word of God and the Confession of Faith—and when a few refused to leave the good old foundations laid by our godly forefathers on the eternal rock of truth, he became one of them in spirit though confined to his house and mostly to his bed. He compared the ministers who submitted to this new creed and constitution to those who accepted the “indulgences” at the time of the last persecution in Scotland. Indeed the comparison agrees in almost every detail. He said: “Though I had the wealth of Sir William MacKinnon, I would not support that Church in the least, in her faithlessness to the truth of God and to immortal souls.” He gave it as his opinion that it was right of the people of God to have no fellowship with her.

Till the Saturday before his death there was nothing unusual to be observed about his trouble, but during that day he became much weaker. Towards evening he said, “The end of all things is at hand.” At nine o’clock he conducted family worship as usual. After this he got much weaker, called the family to his bedside, and told them that he was going to leave them.” I have,” he said, “endeavoured to set a good example before you. Search the Scriptures late and early, and who knows but the Lord may bless it to your souls. And oh, remember the Sabbath day! The Sabbath, the Sabbath, the Sabbath! If my end should come on the Sabbath day, which is very likely, see that you will not break that holy day by sending telegrams or notices of my death.” Shortly after this he said, “This is death. ‘O death where is thy sting? O grave where is thy victory?’ He has taken the sting out of death Himself; blessed be His Name.” About one o’clock in the afternoon of Sabbath the 29th March 1896, he peaceably breathed his last, at the age of 75 years. So ended the earthly career of this man of God.”

Rev. Alexander MacIntyre’s career has already been briefly outlined in Chapter 2.

CHAPTER 10

THE EXPULSION ACT OF 1884

The background leading up to the passing of the Expulsion Act can be seen from reports and articles which appeared in *The Presbyterian*. In the 1884 April issue of the “*Presbyter*,” Mr. Paul quotes the following report of the New South Wales Unionist General Assembly which appeared in “*The Sydney Morning Herald*” of the 13th April “A discussion then took place as to the propriety of taking steps with a view to inducing the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia to join the General Assembly in the movement to bring about the union of the Presbyterian Churches of Australia. . . . Rev. Dr. Geekie said they had again and again made overtures to the Synod of Eastern Australia with a view to union, but all these overtures had been rejected and the Synod had chosen to exclude itself from the General Assembly.

Rev. J. Cameron stated that the Rev. Dr. George Sutherland, St. George’s, Sydney, of the Synod of Eastern Australia, had written to the Rev. Dr. MacDonald of Melbourne (convener of the committee appointed by the last conference), to the effect that if the General Assembly appointed a committee for bringing about union, and the

committee sent a communication to him (Rev. George Sutherland), he would pledge himself to move in their Synod that a committee be appointed to confer with the Assembly's committee upon the subject of union.

Rev. A. Gardiner detailed a conversation which he had with the Rev. George Sutherland, who expressed a desire to see the two bodies united.

The Rev. George Sutherland, a Canadian by birth, before coming to St. George's Church, Castlereagh Street, Sydney, in the year 1872, had been minister in Dunedin, New Zealand. He died while minister in Sydney on July 27th 1893.

In connection with the above report Rev. A. Paul in his editorial article "The End of a Fraud" writes, "Readers of the present number will gather from a paragraph in the 'Extract' column, that Mr. George Sutherland, sometime of Dunedin and since of Sydney, has thrown off the mask. It will not surprise any intelligent observer of this restless spirit to find that he has abandoned the disguise of Free Church profession which he never succeeded in wearing with much decent success. Like a repentant prodigal who finds himself in a far country and begins to be in want, he has made advances with a view to reconcile himself to his mother church—the Union: and it is well in keeping with the rest that he has selected for his confidential correspondent in this matter, the senior unionist minister of Emerald Hill in Victoria. It was the Emerald Hill divine who lately breathed a fervent wish to see that dreadful word 'hell' out of the Bible." And no wonder, perhaps, if he did; for any of the old Moderates of the Church of Scotland in the last century would have done the same; and out of them, or the catalogue of unionist genius in all the colonies at present, it would be hard to single out a more genuine 'man of the earth earthy' than Mr. Sutherland's correspondent."

Matters came to a head at the opening meeting of the Synod

of Eastern Australia in Sydney in May 1884. Rev. Arthur Paul (of the Free Presbyterian Church of Victoria) in connection with the report of this Synod, writes in 'The Presbyterian' "The extraordinary proceedings in Sydney, recounted in the Intelligence column of this issue, will surprise many. The Synod of Eastern Australia, as our readers know, is the highest court of the Free Church in New South Wales. . . . The Court met and was constituted. In order of rotation the choice of moderator to preside would have fallen without any discussion on the Rev. George Sutherland; but the recent unionist treachery which had come to light in connection with that name, had determined some to protest against a red-handed deserter being appointed to the most honourable post of the New South Wales Free Church. To this point the proceedings may be said to have advanced without any breach of the laws of debate. What follows however, was this: Immediately on the chair being taken by the new Moderator, one of his partisans rose in the meeting and began to read a long document. The business going on at the time seems to have been a discussion whether the protest against the new Moderator's appointment should be read by the clerk; but from this point and onward, a scene of tumult arose. In the midst of this tumult, the reading of the document was gone through, but such was the confusion, that no one, not in the secret of its composition, could tell what its contents were; except generally, that it was a string of accusations directed against the minority, who had been doing battle for Free Church consistency in the Synod for the last two years. The reader of this accusatory paper was the Rev. Isaac Mac Kay (Grafton), an ex-unionist like the Moderator himself, imported by him out of the Union into the New South Wales Free Church and well known as the man who performed a marriage ceremony on a Sabbath Day. When the dumb show of reading was over, another of the moderator's partisans, Rev. Samuel P. Stewart of the Manning congregation, started up and called out 'I second.' "The confusion

that followed,” according to “the Authentic Statement” issued by the Sutherland party, “arose from the Clerk, the Rev. Duncan MacInnes, pleading that the matter should have passed through the Committee on Bills and Overtures, which had not then been appointed; and, in opposition to the clear right of the Synod to enter upon any business that came before it, as it could not be subject to any Committee of its own creation.

“The confusion was intensified by the Revs. Peter and John S. MacPherson, H. S. Buntine, and Mr. S. Porter, who all rose to their feet and continued loudly vociferating so far as could be understood in support of the Clerk’s action.

“No amendment was, however, offered upon Mr. MacKay’s motion and being supported by eight of the thirteen members present (exclusively of the Revs. W. S. Donald and W. Grant), the motion was carried, and in terms of it the Moderator immediately intimated to the Revs. Peter and J. S. MacPherson that they were no longer members of the Synod, and stated further that when the Rev. Hugh Livingstone should appear in Court, a similar statement would be made to him. The Rev. H. S. Buntine then arose and said that if the ministers named were expelled, he would go with them, in which he was joined by Mr. Samuel Porter.

“The Moderator then nominated the Committee on Bills and Overtures to consist of the Moderator and Clerk, Rev. I. MacKay, Rev. S. P. Stewart, with Messrs Lobban and Martin, Elders. The confusion continuing, Mr. S. Martin moved, and Mr. Law seconded, that the Synod adjourn to meet at 11 a.m. on the following day with closed doors. There being no amendment the motion was declared carried, and intimation made accordingly, as well as of a meeting on Bills and Overtures, at 10 a.m. Those intimations having been made, the benediction was pronounced, during which loud cries were made of ‘Sacrilege,’ ‘Agony,’ ‘Mob Law,’ etc., etc. (pp. 11, 12 Authentic Statement.)

“Having thus taken a leaf out of the book of the expulsionists of Victoria in 1857,” continues Rev. A. Paul, “and evidently under the same motives that is, in order to get quit of an obstacle to their getting into the Union, the chairman and his partisans adjourned till next day at eleven o’clock, ‘then to meet with closed doors,’ in order to keep out all, except the men of their own thinking.”

The ministers expelled immediately drew up a formal protest, an account of which given by themselves is as follows: “The benediction having been thus pronounced, the gas was turned off by the church officer (acting, we believe, on instructions); we, however, commenced to write a formal protest against the proceedings by the light of the candles on the table of the Clerk, the Rev. Duncan MacInnes. Before leaving the Church, we respectively wrote and signed and handed to the Clerk of the Synod a formal protest, which was in the words following “We, the undersigned Ministers and Elders, members of the Synod of Eastern Australia in our own name and of all who adhere to us, hereby protest that the whole proceedings of a meeting of Synod in St. George’s Church, since the Rev. S. P. Stewart left the Chair, are utterly illegal and unconstitutional, and we declare that we do not recognise the proceedings as in any way affecting our position as members of the Synod of Eastern Australia.”

“On the seventh May last (being Wednesday), following the day on which the last mentioned meeting was held, we respectively arrived at St. George’s Church aforesaid, ten minutes before the hour of 11 a.m. and found the doors of the said Church locked, and though we knocked repeatedly at the said doors and remained there for about an hour, we were unable to obtain admission.”

In the July issue of “The Presbyterian” (1884) Rev. A. Paul writes: “One of the leaders in the ejectment affair has been so far left to himself as to quote the Expulsion Act at Geelong in 1857, as a precedent in justification. This is further evidence that the misled bunglers in May last “knew not what they did.” The folly of the men

who drove out the minority in Victoria in 1857, has long since been manifest. Whatever that action was, it could claim no sacredness, or privilege on the score of being an exercise of spiritual authority. On the showing of a great controversialist, in the home country, it was pronounced to be “no doubt an illegal and unconstitutional act.” The colonial unionist leader who set it in motion not very long after, moved for, and carried a vote rescinding it. This is Mr. Isaac MacKay’s valuable precedent. Mr. MacKay is an ex-unionist, like his primarius in Sydney, and somehow or other, contempt for law, and the rights of brethren seem to be bred in the bone of unionism. Plainly the ejection is intended to clear the way for a return of the ex-unionists to their former fellowship.”

In “The Presbyterian” for August 1884, Rev. A. Paul quotes the vigorous denunciation of the Expulsion by the Rev. Duncan MacInnes, Clerk of Synod. “It is certain,” said Mr. MacInnes, “that something extraordinary has taken place, namely the expulsion of three ministers from their seats in the Synod. I think I can show that the laws of Christ and the laws of the Church were transgressed. Not only was there the reading of a document that passed through no Committee on Bills, without leave of the Synod, and in spite of the protests of parties present, but there was also the strangeness of getting the names to the document, secretly before the Synod met. The laws of the Church were clearly broken. According to the laws of the Church, no one is allowed to vote unless he hears the pleadings at the bar, but here there were no pleadings at all.”

Rev. A. Paul describes the Expulsion Act as “Ecclesiastical lynch law.” “He (Dr. Sutherland) concocts a charge against three of his brethren in a secret conclave of his own minions and after no more than the form of reading it over in a Synod meeting, amidst deafening tumult, and having it seconded to order by a slipshod minister of his own making, he calls the accusation proved; and without more ado hurls three ministers of the Free Church out of

the Synod of which they are the most consistent members, and with which he never has had any other connection than that of a 'false brother' unawares brought in."

"Subsequently the Synod declared that the Rev. Duncan MacInnes, Maclean congregation, was no longer a member of Synod, and that his name be removed from the Roll, and his Church declared vacant. After many years he rejoined the body that expelled him. The Maclean Congregation followed their pastor when he was expelled, and when he returned to the expellers." (F.P. Mag. Vol. 20, p. 102.). The Maclean, or as it was formerly called the Rockymouth congregation on the Clarence, was raised to the status of a sanctioned charge in the year 1863. The first minister the congregation approached with a view to a call, was the noted Rev. Alexander MacColl, Durinish, Skye, afterward of Lochalsh, but without success. The Rev. Duncan MacInnes was the first minister to be settled in MacLean. Mr. MacInnes was born in Ardgour, Argyleshire, in 1827. As a lad he was fond of reading Boston's "Four Fold State," and wept over parts of it. He was one of a number who walked over hill and dale to hear the Rev. Alexander MacIntyre preach, and often stood knee deep in the snow listening to that eminent evangelist and others of the evangelical school, when they visited Kilmallie. At the age of 22 years he arrived in Sydney on the 27th December 1849, accompanied by his mother and three sisters. His father, Peter MacInnes, died on the way out. Mr. MacInnes received his tuition under the Rev. William MacIntyre, and was licensed in Sydney on the 8th day of November 1867. On the 15th July 1868 he accepted a numerously signed call to Rockymouth, where he laboured till his death on August 12th 1908, after 40 years ministerial service, at the advanced age of 81 years. Several times he visited the western district of Victoria, for communion seasons, where he left a fragrant memory, especially amongst the Gaelic-speaking people. Mr. MacInnes was a man who occupied a unique place in the affection of his people. Before he

finished his course in this world, he had to mourn the loss of his wife and eight children. When his eldest son, a student for the ministry, who opened the first Grammar School in Grafton; and a younger son, in his fourth year in Medicine at the University, to whom he was looking for support in his old age, were removed by death, he was heard to say, "Was it not good of the Lord to take away my props wherein I was trusting." (History of the Free Presbyterian Church of Australia, pp. 148, 149.)

On the 1st of May 1885 the expelled ministers and those who identified themselves with them met in Ebenezer Church, Riley Street Sydney, with a view to considering the advisability of reconstituting the Synod now defunct. Five ministers and six elders were of the opinion that immediate steps should be taken to reconstitute the Synod. The ministers were: The Revs. Peter MacPherson, Hugh Livingston, Duncan MacInnes, Hugh S. Buntine and John S. Macpherson; and the elders Messrs. David Lindsay, Hastings River; Samuel Porter, East Maitland; and John Donaldson, Naomi River. At a later meeting in December a resolution was adopted declaring that the following ministers, viz., G. Sutherland, D. K. McIntyre, I. McKay, S. P. Stewart, W. Grant and W. S. Donald, had forfeited all rights to be regarded as ministers of the Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia, and therefore could not be recognised as parties entitled to be consulted or to take part in reconstituting the Synod. (The Presbyter, Jan., 1886).

In the meantime the expelled ministers raised an action in the Supreme Court, Sydney, against the expellers, but the case was dismissed with expenses. The decision of the Court virtually was that it had no jurisdiction. (F.P. Mag. Vol. 20, p. 102.) It was not until April 21st, 1886 that they reconstituted the Synod in Ebenezer Church Riley Street Sydney, and from then on became known as "The Reconstituted Synod of Eastern Australia."

On the 27th October, 1891, Rev. John S. Macpherson, East

Maitland, deputy from the Reconstituted Synod, addressed a meeting in the Oddfellows' Hall, Grafton, and a resolution was passed that the friends forming the Grafton and Brushgrove congregation should unite with the Reconstituted Synod, and with such other congregations holding their principles as may unite with them. On 31st October, 1891, at an adjourned meeting of Brushgrove congregation, presided over by the Rev. John S. Macpherson, a resolution, similar to that passed by the friends at Grafton was unanimously passed.

CHAPTER 11

TESTIMONY OF THE RECONSTITUTED SYNOD

In 1900 the Reconstituted Synod received an invitation from the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of New South Wales, inviting them to enter the United Church which had recently been formed. Extracts from the reply of the Reconstituted Synod, which appears in Vol. 6 of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland magazine, make clear the testimony maintained by the Reconstituted Synod. The reply is addressed to the Revs. John C. MacDonald, M.A., Ex Moderator and James S. Laing, D.D., Clerk, Presbyterian Church New South Wales. “Dear Brethren,

By appointment of the Reconstituted Synod of Eastern Australia, the duty has been laid upon us of conveying the Synod’s reply to the Assembly’s communication of December 1900, re a proposed union between our respective Churches.

At the outset, we very cordially acknowledge the fraternal tone and spirit of the Assembly’s letter. It is our desire that the reply we have been instructed to make, shall be equally Christian and courteous in spirit and matter.

It is with deep regret we have to point out your very inadequate

statement and view of the differences between our respective Churches, in so far as may be learned from your communication and from the remarks of members of the Assembly on two occasions, when the proposal to approach our Synod was before your Supreme Court. We are willing to believe that, on your part, there was no intention to convey wrong impressions regarding these differences to any who might peruse your letter, or who were present at the diets of Assembly when the matter was considered. It is well within our knowledge that the erroneous views referred to, find very wide acceptance, not only in the Presbyterian Church of New South Wales, but also among the general community. It is not material to our purpose to enquire how these mistaken ideas have obtained so widespread and general acceptance. But we regard the receipt of the Assembly letter and the necessity of replying thereto, as a call in Providence to utilise our reply in the way of restating and emphasising our distinctive principles and position, thereby hoping in some measure, to correct and remove the wrong impressions that widely obtain.

The circumstances leading up to the formation of the Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia (of which the Reconstituted Synod of Eastern Australia claims to be, now, the only constitutionally existing Supreme or Governing Court) are doubtless familiar to the senior members of Assembly, and of the Church.

We crave your forbearance, while we briefly set forth the position occupied by this Church, in relation to various questions affecting doctrine, Church policy, life and work, in which we believe that we occupy a somewhat different standing to yours:

(1) As a Church we are still content to adhere to the "System of Doctrine" set forth in the Confession of Faith and other "Sub-ordinate Standards," as being, and containing, without qualification or evacuation of their contents by Declaratory Acts, the accepted personal confession of faith of all our ministers and office bearers.

The so called “Higher Criticism” in its bearing on the Word of God, has no place among us, nor have we seen any substantial reasons for tolerating within our borders, teachings and tendencies that, in their effects are evil, and only evil.

(2) We believe that the Mediatorial Kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ on earth is “under law to Christ,” and to be guided and ordered solely by the teachings of His Holy Word; and further, that there is an antagonistic Kingdom, the weapons of which are carnal. The Church which we represent has ever carefully sought to ascertain and to follow the mind of the King, in all matters connected with the advancement of His Kingdom. This explains the position occupied by our Church toward all carnal methods for raising money, or with the view of attracting men and women into the Visible Church. Hitherto this Church has built its places of worship, manses, etc., and carried on the various departments of Church work, solely by the free-will offerings of our people, and has entirely avoided all carnal and sensuous attractions, such as concerts, bazaars, socials, church fairs, et hoc omne genus.

(3) It has ever been strongly held by this Church, that the obligations of the Fourth Commandment are binding, not only on the individual conscience of all professors of religion, but also that it is the duty of all her ministers and office-bearers, by precept and by example, to discountenance the use of Sabbath trains, trams, and other forms of Sabbath desecration, whereby the sanctity of the Lord’s Day is either directly or indirectly assailed. Sorrowfully, we have to acknowledge that prevailing loose views at these points, have affected the opinions and practice of some within our borders. But hitherto, the Synod and Subordinate Courts, with the members thereof, have in the pulpit and press, and by personal example, lifted up a testimony against the prevailing lax observance of the Fourth Commandment.

(4) There are other social and public questions, such as the

Law of Divorce, the Marriage of a Deceased Wife's Sister, and the Coronation Oath, regarding which, the views entertained by our Synod are opposed to those held by many within and tolerated within the Courts of your Church.

(5) In the judgment of this Synod, all proposals for uniting in common Church fellowship, Churches holding opposite views in doctrine, discipline, government, or worship, are premature, and out of harmony with the principles and testimony of this Church, as those are founded on the Rule laid down in the Word of God.

On all these considerations we are shut up to the conclusion that we cannot conscientiously unite with the Presbyterian Church of New South Wales, or with the larger Church recently formed.

We acknowledge that we are "one of the least of the Tribes of Israel," and that the separate position we occupy does not commend itself to the large majority of professing Christians. Nor do we venture to predict what may be in store for our Church and testimony in these lands, nor what may be the relative effects on the coming of Christ's Spiritual Kingdom in Australia, flowing from the positions occupied by our respective Churches; but it is our prayer that in our day a measure of grace may be given us, and also to our successors, to be loyal to those doctrines, principles, and testimonies which were the glory of Scottish Presbyterianism for well-nigh three centuries.

In the name and by authority of Synod.

(Signed) John S. MacPherson, Minister; W. H. Wilson, Minister
Samuel Porter, Elder.

The Session House, Free Presbyterian Church, East Maitland.

CHAPTER 12

“NO COMPROMISE, NO SURRENDER”

In the year 1902 the Rev. William MacDonald of St. George's Church, Sydney, addressed the following letter dated 22nd December to the Rev. J. S. MacPherson, East Maitland.

Rev. and Dear Sir,
RI have been anxious for a long time to have an interview with you regarding the reunion of the Synod of Eastern Australia. As you are aware I condemned officially the Expulsion of 1884, as a member of the Victorian Synod. I have since my settlement in Sydney, when an occasion arose, re-affirmed that condemnation. My position on that question is therefore, clearly defined.

Could you find it convenient, during the holidays, or at any time, to take a run to Sydney? We could, I think, formulate terms of Union. As a matter of fact we have the same constitution, and therefore, there should be no insuperable barrier. The people are longing for union, and are prepared to do all they can to promote the peace and prosperity of our beloved Zion.

We have a prophet's chamber, and will be delighted to give you a shake-down at any time you are in Sydney.

Our Synod will meet in February as you know. If you and I met as an informal Committee prior to that date, with the Divine blessing, all barriers would, I hope, be removed Synodically. I will be delighted to hear from you on this subject, and with kind regards.

I remain, Rev. and Dear Sir,

Faithfully yours,

William MacDonald.

To Mr. MacDonald's letter the Rev. J. S. MacPherson sent the following reply, dated 15th January, 1903.

Reverend and Dear Sir,

Visitors during the holidays, my very indifferent state of health, and pressure of ministerial work, must be my apology for delay in replying to your letter of 22nd December last, but which only came into my hands on the 29th ult.

With every desire to entertain favourably the suggestion in your courteous communication, there are some considerations you seem to have overlooked, and which preclude such a reply as you desire.

(1) According to the spirit and genius of Presbyterianism, proposals for union or reunion should originate in, and can only be dealt with, by the Supreme Courts of the Churches negotiating; or between a Supreme Court and brethren outside having no Church connection; or between brethren who, having been originally appointed by Churches in other lands, but without any organised Church state, are desirous of forming themselves into a Church Court.

(2) The position asserted by the brethren who formed the Reconstituted Synod, and for long held and asserted by the Victorian Free Synod, and homologated and confirmed by actings, and in writing, by constitutional experts in Britain, and Australia, viz:—"That the old Synod of Eastern Australia became defunct in

1884”—is still held by us. Not only so, but at a public meeting held at Maclean in 1887 to consider the position of the Rev. D. McInnes, in view of a deliverance adopted by certain parties meeting in St. George’s Church, Sydney, and claiming to be the Synod of Eastern Australia, in which deliverance Mr. McInnes is declared “to be no longer a minister in the Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia,” he (the Rev. D. McInnes) protested against the validity of the sentence as being *ultra vires* and of no effect, *because the parties to the deliverance were no Synod; and certainly were not the Synod of Eastern Australia*, and a deliverance to that effect was adopted at the meeting referred to. For more than ten years, Mr. McInnes held undisputed possession of his Church and manse, and exercised all ministerial functions, solely on the grounds set forth at the said meeting. During the same period you as an individual, and the Free Church of Victoria—of which you were then a member—aided, abetted, and justified Mr. McInnes in holding that position, by inviting him to occupy your pulpits, assist at dispensation of the Lord’s Supper, etc., etc., and by lending him similar assistance in his work on the Clarence River, N.S.W. It goes without saying that, if the parties who passed the sentence of excision, were the Synod of Eastern Australia, or any other constitutionally-existent governing Court, then sentence was valid, and for upwards of ten years Mr. MacInnes was no more a minister in the Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia—or, indeed, in any other Church—than the first man you meet in the street, and as has been shown, the Victorian Synod in recognising and assisting him, as being free from Church censures, was guilty of grave sin against the Church’s Head. On the other hand, if the parties referred to were no Synod; if, as we contended, the Synod became defunct in 1884—how comes it that both you and Mr. MacInnes have joined these parties, and claim that they are, and have all along been, the Synod of Eastern Australia? By what process of magical development has it come about that the

parties who from 1884 to 1898 met in St. George’s, Sydney, claiming to be the Synod of Eastern Australia, but whose claim you derided, have now become “The Synod”? We, therefore, hold that the only constitutionally-existent Synod of Eastern Australia is that known as “The Re-Constituted Synod of Eastern Australia” and that the parties with whom you are now associated have no organised existence, nor a governing Court with which to negotiate.

(3) In harmony with this view, the Re-Constituted Synod issued invitations to some of those now associated with you, and to other congregations, members, and adherents, formerly connected with the defunct Synod, but not directly embraced in the Court at the first formation. Three of these congregations—Grafton, Brushgrove and Richmond River—closed with the invitations, and are now charges under the jurisdiction of the Re-Constituted Synod. The others still remain outside.

(4) Quite recently the Victorian Free Synod, declined to entertain an invitation or call addressed to you through that Court, assigning as its reason, that it did not regard the parties in New South Wales sending the call as a properly organised Church Court.

(5) Your personal condemnation of the Expulsion has been nullified by your having joined the Expulsionists.

(6) Although you and your associates claim to have the same Constitution as that recognised by us, yet a long-continued course of action in Synods and Presbyteries from 1877 to 1884, clearly proves that some at least, of your present friends, regarded a majority-vote in Church Courts as above all written Constitution, while the “tag” to the resolution purporting to rescind the Expulsion—in which the right to expel is practically reasserted and justified—clearly shows that, even yet, they and we are “wide as the poles asunder,” as to the value and authority of the written constitution.

(7) Among the parties sitting with you in what you claim to be “The Synod” are two gentlemen who are allowed to deliberate and

vote, neither of whom has any pastoral charge, and one of them I cannot regard as having ministerial status; the parties authorising his ordination, and conferring it, being no constitutionally-existent Church Court, and therefore, incapable of granting ordination.

(8) Regarding one or two of the brethren with whom you are now allied, there are substantial reasons for questioning their loyalty to the distinctive position occupied by the Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia.

For these and other reasons that need not be stated, I think you will agree with me that—so long as they exist—so long will it be hopeless to expect that the friendly interview you propose could lead to any practical result, such as you desiderate. I and my brethren are just as anxious as you can be, to see the laity, indeed all who are loyal to a F.C. position in this State, embraced in one organisation; and I am sure I voice the sentiment of my brethren when I say that *our Synod* will be only too pleased to receive and favourably consider applications either from yourself or others associated with you—Ministers, Office-bearers, Congregations—seeking to become connected with the Re-Constituted Synod of Eastern Australia.

Reciprocating your friendly good wishes,

I am, Reverend Dear Sir,

Yours very truly,

John S. MacPherson.

The above correspondence was printed by the Rev. J. S. MacPherson and addressed “To the Ministers, Office-bearers, Members and Adherents of the Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia,” along with the following letter:

Dear Brethren, I do myself the honour of submitting for your consideration the annexed correspondence.

Quite recently it has come to my knowledge, that certain rumours

are afloat regarding the subject-matter, as well as the substance of the letters. It is, therefore, desirable that they would be published. It has also come round to me that much capital is being made out of the resolution recently adopted by the “Expulsionists,” as if it ought to have removed the obstacles to re-union.

Apart from the fact that the resolution bears a later date than the correspondence, when it is borne in mind that the whole proceedings in connection with the so-called “Expulsion were ultra vires—null and void—it will be apparent that any resolution adopted by parties claiming to have power, and right to rescind, is substantially an assertion, of their having had power and right to expel; and a practical denial of the illegality of the Expulsion. As a matter of fact—whatever the intention—the several resolutions adopted by the “Expulsionists,” are simply an adding of insult to injury. It will be observed that in my reply to Rev. W. MacDonald, a method is pointed out by which re-union of all *loyal* Free Churchmen in this State may be brought about.

Commending the correspondence to your prayerful consideration.

I am, Yours very truly,
John S. MacPherson.

The rescinding of the Expulsion Act of 1884, without any acknowledgment being made of its character or any expression of regret for the wrong that had been done, did eventually lead to the union of the Synod of Eastern Australia with the Free Presbyterian Church of Victoria and the Free Presbyterian Church of Southern Australia, forming the present Free Presbyterian Church of Australia. “I recognise that the Expulsion Act had been cancelled by the prevailing party,” wrote the Rev. Walter Scott in a Pastoral Letter to his congregation, “but what we have to do with, in connection with it, is the fact that the moral wrong committed remains. The

public scandal occasioned is unpurged, and the violence done to Scripture precept, as well as to recognised constitutional order (Acts 25:16) unredressed, the door is left open for its repetition. The world may say “let bygones be bygones” but “God requireth that which is past.” (Eccl. 3:15.) “Only acknowledge thine iniquity, that thou hast transgressed against the Lord thy God” (Jer. 3:13.) . . . The Expulsion Synod have cancelled the Expulsion Act; but they have done so as a matter of policy—not of principle. They never expressed any regret, or sorrow, for what they did so unconstitutionally in ruin to the Cause.”

Had the eminent Rev. Peter MacPherson, M.A., who had suffered under both Expulsion Acts been alive, would he not have said about the rescinding of the Expulsion Act of 1884, what he said of the Expulsion Act of 1857, that “it was a matter of convenience”? Rev. P. MacPherson, as has already been noticed, was minister for twelve years in the congregation of Meredith and Lethridge in the State of Victoria. He was called and inducted to the Maitland and Raymond Terrace congregation on June 9th 1874, but resigned in 1878 owing to ill health. In the same year he was succeeded in the Maitland and Raymond Terrace congregation by the Rev. John S. MacPherson. At the time of the passing of the Expulsion Act of 1884, the Rev. Peter MacPherson was Professor of Sacred Languages and Apologetical Theology. He died in Sydney on July 30th 1886, in the 60th year of his age.

As has been noticed the rescinding of the Expulsion Act paved the way for union. In the year 1908 the Rev. S. P. Stewart of the Manning congregation, visited Scotland, and was received by the Free Church of Scotland Assembly, as a deputy from the Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia. From the time of Rev. S. P. Stewart’s visit, close links of affiliation have been established between the two Churches. In September 1911, a conference of delegates from the Synod of Eastern Australia, the Free Presbyterian Church of Victoria, and

the Free Presbyterian Church of Southern Australia, with a view to union was held in Sydney. The Rev. S. P. Stewart was appointed president of the Conference. The Union of the above-mentioned Churches was consummated in St. George's Church, Castlereagh Street, Sydney, on April 10th 1913, forming the Free Presbyterian Church of Australia. The first Synod of the Free Presbyterian Church of Australia then met. The Rev. William MacDonald of Sydney, who had been most instrumental in effecting the Union, was appointed first Moderator. The Rev. John S. MacPherson who at this time was minister of John Knox Church, Morpeth Vale, South Australia, did not enter the Union. He maintained a separate stand until his death on 22nd June 1921. It could be truly said on the day that he passed away to his eternal rest that a prince and a great man had fallen in Israel.

CHAPTER 13

BINDING UP THE TESTIMONY

From the time of his induction to the Brushgrove-Grafton congregation, N.S. Wales, on the 23rd September 1894, Rev. Walter Scott laboured most assiduously, shunning not to declare the whole counsel of God and witnessing faithfully as a watchman on the walls of Zion against Sabbath desecration, and the prevailing apostacy from the Faith once delivered to the Saints. “The position which I was inducted to, was distinct from, and in a way of protest against the Sutherland or Expulsion Synod,” he wrote in one of his pastoral letters. “That position I have sought consistently to maintain with all the difficulties it involved. The prevailing tendency is against a distinctive position. Against this, Scripture has warned us: “A double minded man is unstable in all his ways.” “Therefore be ye steadfast, unmoveable.” The Sutherland Synod have cancelled the Expulsion Act, but they have done so as a matter of policy—not of principle; they have never expressed any regret, or sorrow, for what they did, so unconstitutionally in ruin to the Cause. Our separate position is obviously one in behalf of the Truth, so generally departed from, and of a faithful adherence to Free Church principles. This includes both doctrine and practice. Purity of worship has been

a main part of our Church's testimony. To maintain the ordinances pure and entire, means a stern refusal to countenance any human addition to what God has appointed—such as human hymns, or paraphrases, or instrumental music. People think little of these things now; just as they do of Sabbath desecration and other evils. It was the same in Eden. Hath God said, thou shalt not do these things? Whilst knowing that God had forbidden them. Any deviation from pure Scriptural worship as appointed by Christ, is a breach of the Second Commandment which forbids the worshipping of God 'in any other way not appointed in His Word.' The Word declares New Testament worship to consist of 'the fruit of the lips'; it also limits us in such praise to the 'Psalms, hymns and spiritual songs,' which being spiritual have been inspired by the Holy Spirit. To substitute for these what is human is to invade Christ's kingly authority."

Sabbath Travelling Condemned

It has become notorious that on this vital subject they (the Expulsionists) have declined from the position of a faithful witness for God. How low their testimony for the Divine authority and Scriptural observance of the Sabbath has fallen, will be seen when it is considered that the Law of God has practically been set aside, to allow their people, even their communicants, to use trains and tram-cars on the Lord's Day.

One would think that like the Pope, they claimed a dispensing power in favour of setting aside the Divine Laws, when these stood in the way! In the State of New South Wales the public desecration of the Sabbath under Government authority, by railway and other traffic for purposes of revenue, has grown to alarming proportions. The number of labouring men, moreover, who are thereby deprived of their day of rest increases continually; the effect on the community has become demoralising in the extreme. Now who can contemplate

this situation from the Christian point of view without dismay? Who can think for a moment of the awful guilt being incurred, without trembling for the land? 'Horror hath taken hold upon me because of the wicked that forsake Thy Law' . . . 'I beheld the transgressors and was grieved,' exclaimed the Psalmist (Ps. 119). Yet is it possible, that in the presence of such crying evils at their doors the Expulsion party remain silent? Yea, in themselves countenancing such Sabbath-breaking, do they not openly encourage the Government in such daring defiance of the Divine Authority? Instead of coming out from among the multitude of evil-doers, are they not actually joining with them in trampling upon the Fourth Commandment? Be warned my brethren, in the presence of such drifting. 'Thinkest thou this, O man, that judgest them which do such things, and doest the same, that thou shalt escape the judgment of God?' (Rom. 2:3.) Have the denunciations against such Sabbath-breaking by a former pastor of St. George's, Sydney, the Rev. William MacIntyre been forgotten? Verily there is a change.

Some have pleaded that they could not have attended Church on the Sabbath if they did not use trains—and so they would do evil that good might come, as the heathen said in Paul's time, and as the Jesuits say now, of whom, however, the Apostle declares: 'Their damnation is just'; that is for saying or doing such a thing. Yet the Expulsion party allows what the inspired Apostle has condemned: and by permitting the use of Sabbath trains to attend Church, they serve themselves heirs to the Pharisees of whom Christ complained that they made void God's law by their tradition, or teaching. 'From all such,' Scripture says, 'turn away.'

The Working of Creameries on the Sabbath Condemned

Ordinary labour on the Sabbath, besides being a breach of the Fourth Commandment is also rebellion against Christ as Lord of the

Sabbath. It means, 'We will not have this Man to reign over us.' Yet all the surrounding Churches turn aside from the holy commandment in these matters. They have corrupted the Scriptural worship of the New Testament by so 'changing the ordinances' to please men rather than God; and you can see in the dairying that goes on, along with the working of the Creameries or Butter Factories, on the River; as well as in the running of trains and steamboats elsewhere how the Law of God is trampled under foot,"

"Zion Shall Be Builided Upon Her Own Heap"

The following letter is from the Rev. Walter Scott to a friend in Halkirk, Caithness, Scotland in 1898, and afterwards printed in Vol. 1 of the F.P. Magazine.

The Manse,
Brushgrove,
Clarence River, N.S.W.
15th June 1898

My Dear Friend,

. . . This is not a country like Scotland religiously, but at the same time, the truth has its friends even here; and it is a precious thought that, go where one will almost, the Lord has His hidden ones—those who (if only in secret) are sighing and crying for all the abominations done in the land. We are only a very small remnant here, but we are maintaining a banner because of the truth. We testify for the great doctrine of national religion, and in behalf also of Christ's sole Kingship in Zion, in the way of excluding all innovations—using only the Psalms, and no instrumental music in worship. It is the day of small things, but it is not for us to despise it; and weak and scattered as we are, yet we are enabled to pay our way, without any of the human devices resorted to by all the bodies around us for raising

money, such as bazaars, socials, concerts, picnics, dancing, etc., etc. It is ours to witness for God against defection, whether few or many, and it is truly wonderful how God maintains such a witness in dark places and in dark times, to make His truth known to the generation to come, and to torment those that dwell on the earth with the word of their testimony. (Rev. 11:10).

Although we are far apart, yet I hope and believe that our hearts beat in unison for the same glorious Cause—a Cause now despised and trampled upon, it is true, but none the less sacred on that account to God or to those that fear Him, and think upon His Name; and is it not blessed to be able to think that God shall yet arise to plead it, even at the moment when the enemy is seeming to triumph—when it is at its lowest extremity—where there is no help of man; that then God will come down to deliver, and that when He does so, He will appear in His glory. O, that that morning of joy to the witnessing Church might be hastened! O, that even now we might have earnestness of the rallying time!—the Lord bringing His sons from afar, and His daughters from the ends of the earth—yea, bringing many to say, we will go with you, enquiring the way to Zion. But let us wait for Him at the post of duty. He will surely come. And even if it be first by terrible things in righteousness—bringing His Church through fire and water, yet it will be in the way of leading her to a wealthy place, and of making the little one a thousand, and the small one a strong nation. Let us wait then until we can say, “Lo, this is our God, we have waited for Him.”

I believe that when deliverance comes, Zion shall, in Scriptural language, be built upon her own heap; that it will be upon no other foundation than upon the doctrines of the Apostles and Prophets, Christ Jesus being the chief corner stone, that the Church shall again be built up, and these doctrines as witnessed for at the Covenanted Reformation in our own Scotland in particular. Such was the faith of the martyrs—those men of God to whom was made known the

secret of His Covenant, as when James Guthrie cried with his last breath—"The Covenants, the Covenants, shall yet be Scotland's reviving." We may indeed ask, who is sufficient for these things? But, is anything too hard for the Lord? The zeal of the Lord of Hosts, we are told, shall accomplish the glorious things spoken concerning Zion.

I cannot tell you the discouraging effect that the declension in the old country has with us out here. The name of the Free Church of Scotland is often quoted and used in Australia in favour of innovations in worship and doctrine. The change at home is so general, so widespread, that it is a question with many here, whether it is worth while holding out. For my part I was glad at the secession of the Free Presbyterian Church from the Free Church. . . . Stumbled as many are by the case of the Free Church, it remains that she has departed from the faith. Thus changed in doctrine and worship, the Free Church is not what she once was. The mighty are fallen, the weapons of war are perished! Let us only be thankful if we also are not swept away with such a tide of defection. And in the midst of adverse circumstances, when our pleasant things are laid waste, and we ourselves are for signs and wonders in the land, let us like David be found encouraging ourselves in the Lord our God.

I often wonder in my own mind how many who were held in high esteem, whether among the ministers or people, can remain with a body that has been guilty of such a betrayal of Christ in His truth's cause. There have, indeed, been remarkable instances of men having been forsaken of God for culpable silence and unfaithfulness, when the trumpet should have given a certain sound. The Rev. M. M. was foremost in the battle at one stage; now he is a dog that cannot bark. This itself is ominous. And I see Dr. Rainy is speaking patronisingly of him, and that he is helping on the union with the Voluntaries. Evidently having forsaken the narrow way, he is now left with no alternative but to go on the broad way with the overwhelming

majority. But God says, If any man draws back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him. What would Dr. Begg or Dr. Kennedy have said or thought, could they have seen such compromising with the enemy on the part of Mr. M in the North or Dr. J. M in the South?

The race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong. God has chosen the foolish things in men's esteem to confound the things that are mighty, if we would be employed in the interests of Zion's glorious King, we must be emptied of self and sanctified from all selfish interests or motives. Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall.

I have pleasure in hearing occasionally from one of your ministers. I would like to hear from Scotland more frequently, and to know more of your circumstances. I hope Rev. D. Macfarlane and Rev. D. MacDonald are keeping their health, and may be spared for carrying on the great work devolving on them. Please accept of my sympathy and good wishes for yourself and the various friends in Halkirk and over Caithness. And wishing you farewell meantime, and commending you to God as able to do all things perfectly for you.

I am, yours sincerely,
Walter Scott.

CHAPTER 14

MR. SCOTT'S MARRIAGE AND VISIT TO SCOTLAND

On the 21st September 1897, Mr. Scott was married to Miss Jessie MacDonald, the youngest member of a family of eleven, two sons and nine daughters. She proved to be a true helpmate to him. Her father was the worthy Mr. Hugh MacDonald, of Dunfield, N.S. Wales, whose obituary written by Mr. Scott appears in the August issue of the Free Presbyterian Magazine for the year 1906. Mr. MacDonald was born in Ardnamurchan, Argyll, in the year 1823. He was only a lad of fifteen when his widowed mother with her two sons Hugh and John, like so many others in the Western Highlands and Islands at that time, left their native shores, never to return. They sailed in the emigrant ship "Brilliant." After a lengthened voyage of several months, and many exciting experiences, they landed safely in Sydney, N.S. Wales. Mr. MacDonald's mother's maiden name was Ann Cameron, a singularly devout Christian.

Strangers in a strange land, the young family made their way on arrival, to the Hunter River, an opening agricultural district to the North of Sydney. Later on Mr. MacDonald with his mother went further North to the Clarence River. It was while on the Hunter that

he married Ann MacFarlane in the year 1847. A little prior to 1850 he underwent a saving change. He had been long in soul trouble. He had been attending the ministrations of Rev. William MacIntyre of Maitland, afterwards of Sydney; and it was in connection with one of his sermons being blessed to him, that he found peace. His only brother, John, died on the Hunter River, leaving a widow and two children. His daughter afterwards became the wife of Mr. Hugh Grant*, a worthy and faithful elder of the Brushgrove-Grafton congregation.

That Hugh MacDonald was a fearer of God could not be hid. He hungered for the Word. Moreover, he knew the voice of the Good Shepherd. Few had a keener discernment of any deviation from the truth, however veiled. He himself was scrupulous to walk in an even path in the matter of Church fellowship. He adhered to the Free Church testimony. He made conscience of frequenting the means of grace in connection with it, so far as available; but he would not meddle with those who were given to change. He was an example in his observance of the Sabbath, and trained his family to keep it holy. When there was no regular public service, he was in his element in retirement with his Bible, and other sacred reading, whether in Gaelic or English. Thomas Boston was a favourite with him, Halyburton also. The elder Dr. Thomas McCrie's writings he esteemed very highly. He had great mental vigour, and such a thirst for spiritual knowledge, that with all his industriousness otherwise, he read largely of the works of the Puritans and Reformation Divines. One of the old school, Mr. MacDonald not only appreciated

* Mr. Grant's obituary appears in the F.P. Mag., Vol. 46, p. 239; Mrs. Grant's in Vol. 40, p. 304, and the obituary of one of their sons, John Grant, a deacon in the Brushgrove-Grafton congregation, and who was killed in France in 1916, in Vol. 21, p. 349.

the genius and principles of the Reformation Church, but was able to give a reason for his hope when necessary. He stood aloof from the defections in doctrine and worship of the Union Presbyterian Church, deploring their looseness, as he termed it. The expulsion of the more faithful brethren in 1884, from the Synod of Eastern Australia, likewise grieved him in common with all the truest friends of the Cause. At that date he, with the greater part of the local congregation, ceased to attend public worship, owing to the minister siding with the prevailing party. For years there was only an occasional service by a visiting minister which he could countenance. It was not until 1896, soon after the induction of the writer as pastor of the Brushgrove-Grafton charge, that he was able to resume regular church attendance. From that time, as formerly, he continued a steadfast attender and communicant. He was elected to the eldership, but his advanced years precluded him from acting. He proved a strength to the cause in many ways, and his tall venerable figure is sadly missed. He was a lover of Zion. Her low condition lay much on his heart. He mourned the defection of so many of his countrymen to the Union, and the lapsing of many more from all church attendance. He felt deeply the division occasioned in 1884, and its disastrous consequences. Yet he was not in favour of moving from the constitutional position, and deprecated any Union, except in the truth; "The Lord doth build up Jerusalem: He gathered together the outcasts of Israel." Ps. 117:2. He followed the events in connection with the Home Churches, and was specially interested in the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland, in her rise and subsequent progress. He appreciated the Free Presbyterian Magazine from home, and its Gaelic sermons.

Mr. MacDonald passed away after a brief illness, early on Sabbath morning of 9th March 1905, at the venerable age of eighty-two. "And I heard a voice from heaven saying unto me, Write, Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth: Yea, saith the Spirit,

that they may rest from their labours; and their works do follow them." Rev. 14:13 (abbreviated).

Mr. Scott's Visit to Scotland

In 1900 Mr. and Mrs. Scott paid a visit of six months to Scotland. 1900 was a year in which the approaching union so skilfully engineered by Dr. Rainy between the Free Church and the United Presbyterian Church was arousing keen interest, not only in Scotland but throughout the Presbyterian world. The passing of the Declaratory Act by the Free Church in 1892 paved the way for the Union. On the 30th October 1900, the Union Act was passed. Principal Rainy moved the ratification of the Act of Union. Rev. C. A. Bannatyne, Culter, moved an amendment. Principal Rainy's motion was carried by a vote of 643 to 27 a majority of 616. On Wednesday the 31st October, the Union of the two Churches was consummated, the united Church being called the United Free Church. The members of the Free Church Assembly who declined to enter the Union, met about eleven o'clock on the day of Union, but on finding the gates leading to the Assembly shut and admission being refused by the janitor, the Free Church Assembly was constituted in the open. It was then moved that it adjourn to meet at two o'clock in Queen Street hall. It was this minority, refusing to enter the Union, who formed the present Free Church of Scotland.

Mr. Scott attended the half yearly meeting of the Synod of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland in November 1900, which met in the hall of St. Jude's Church, Glasgow. Mr. Scott as a delegate from the Reconstituted Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia was asked to address the Synod.

In the course of his address, part of which has already been quoted in connection with the baneful influence of Voluntarism, he went on to speak of the state of things religiously in Australia.

“In Scotland,” he remarked, “they had the memorable periods of the Reformation as a background, with the relative struggles and sufferings of their confessors and martyrs. . . . But in Australia it was not so. Besides, their strength there was small at best; it was not even concentrated. In South Australia, for instance, there were two ministers with their congregations claiming to occupy the Free Church position. In Victoria there was a Synod comprising four ordained ministers with pastoral charges; and in New South Wales the Synod, now represented before them, had at present three ministers with congregations. In the same State there was a Synod known as the Expulsion or Sutherland Synod so called from its having expelled one half of its members containing now two ministers pastorally settled, and two others giving supply. To a certain extent, in each case, there were also vacant stations getting occasional service. These were the statistics.” Mr. Scott’s address in full appears in Vol. 5 of the F.P. Magazine (pp. 299-303). The Rev. Neil Cameron expressed the pleasure it gave them all to meet Mr. Scott, and to receive him as a representative of the Free Presbyterian Synod of Eastern Australia. . . . The Synod then recorded their thanks to Mr. Scott for his address, and their desire that he should convey reciprocal friendly greetings to the Synod of Australia which he represented.

It was at this Synod that the question of the relation between the Free Church (minority) and the Free Presbyterian Synod was discussed. The following resolution was agreed upon: “The Synod, while expressing its thankfulness that so many ministers and people of this country refused to enter the United Free Church, and while cherishing the hope that these same ministers and people may be ultimately led in the mercy of God to take up a position similar to that held by the Free Presbyterian Church, desires to inform the people under its charge that the ecclesiastical position of the Anti-Unionists is in its estimation still unsatisfactory. The Synod would therefore

urge upon all its congregations to stand fast to the testimony raised in 1893 by this Church." (History of the Free Presbyterian Church, pp. 132-133.)

Subsequent events have proved to the hilt the wisdom of this exhortation to stand fast.

In March 1901, Mr. Scott visited Raasay. The following is an abbreviated account of his visit as given on pp. 458-160 of the same Volume, containing his address to the Synod, etc.

"A public meeting of an interesting kind was held in the Free Presbyterian Church here on the evening of Monday, 18th March 1901. The Rev. D. MacFarlane, pastor of the congregation, presided. He stated that he had asked the Rev. Walter Scott, of Australia, who was visiting the Western Isles, and whom he had met at the Portree communion, to preach for him on the Sabbath. He had thought also that they would like to hear something from him about the state of the cause in the distant land where he laboured, hence their meeting that night.

"At the chairman's request, Mr. Scott opened the meeting with devotional exercises, reading a portion of Acts 28, and commenting on the words in verse 15, 'When the brethren heard of us, they came to meet us; whom when Paul saw, he thanked God and took courage.' Mr. Scott remarked that the significance of the occasion here referred to, and of the effect of thankfulness and cheer which it had upon the Apostle, was his experience of isolation and trial through the opposition of former brethren. That at such a juncture he should meet with those from distant parts who were friendly and sympathetic towards him was a circumstance so providentially encouraging to him that, whilst it led him to thank God, it also nerved him hopefully in connection with the uncertain future which was before him. Mr. Scott went on to point out that there was room, he felt, for a kindred sentiment in connection with the meeting he was addressing. To himself it was a matter of joy to

find those in Scotland who were so heartily in sympathy with the Church in Australia which he represented, and with the particular testimony which, in the distant land, they were seeking to maintain. And their pastor had indicated a similar satisfaction in reference to his visit to them. . . . Mr. Scott proceeded to refer to the particular circumstances of his own charge on the Clarence River, New South Wales. He mentioned that his immediate predecessors had been the Rev. Alexander MacIntyre of Strontian, well known in the West of Scotland as a powerful and successful preacher; and the Rev. John Finlayson, of Coigach, both of whom had been highly appreciated in Australia. Moreover, his own people had come mainly from the Western Islands; and he himself, through his maternal ancestry, had connection with Skye and with a former minister of Snizort, Rev. Roderick McLeod. His manse, like their own, was on an island, on which they had two churches. At the mainland end of the charge, namely, at Grafton, the congregation, as in Raasay, are deprived of the use of their church building, which is held by the party separated from them in a practically empty condition, those who erected it having had to worship in a hall even during Mr. Finlayson's time. In these respects there was a correspondence between the Raasay case and his own. Mr. Scott testified to the pleasure he had experienced in associating with their pastor, whose stand in 1893, and since, he had in Australia viewed most sympathetically. If spared to return to his people he said it would be with feelings of even deeper and closer interest in them and their Church. He hoped they in Scotland would not forget the cause which the Free Presbyterians of Australia were struggling to maintain in difficulties even greater, perhaps, than what obtained at home.

"The Chairman, in thanking Mr. Scott for his address, expressed the happiness which the visit had afforded him. It had been particularly pleasant to him as having been the first visit to him of a minister outside their own body since 1893—since he had been

visited for the purpose of being deprived of his church and manse. The position and principles of the two churches represented seemed so far identical.

. . . Mr. A. MacFarlane, schoolmaster, Raasay, spoke in similar terms of appreciation. Referring to the Union Church in Australia, he said he had sat in the Synod of Glenelg when the Rev. Dr. McKay of Harris, formerly of Australia, had been twitted with the fact that whilst opposing union at home he had been identified with it abroad. He remembered the deep regret which Dr. McKay then expressed that he had any hand in that union. Their expectations of blessing by it had been, he said, sadly disappointed, so that he was glad to be dissociated from it and to return to Scotland, therefore, Mr. MacFarlane remarked, what they had just heard enabled them to understand the position more clearly. He added that in Scotland they were accustomed to associate Australia in their minds with the idea of gold. But from the statement they had been listening to, they must come to the conclusion not only that there was gold in Australia, but that the gold of that land was good—there was bdellium and the onyx stone.

“There was a large attendance at the meeting, and the deepest interest was manifested throughout. The Rev. Mr. MacFarlane interpreted certain portions of the address in Gaelic. After the singing of the last three verses of the 122nd Psalm, the Benediction was pronounced by the pastor.”

CHAPTER 15

SIDE-LIGHTS ON MR. SCOTT'S MINISTRY ON THE CLARENCE

A quiet but impressive Communion service was observed at Woodford Dale on Sabbath last, 20th October 1907. The occasion opened with a solemn Fast on the Thursday previous, when suitable services were held at both Woodford Dale and Brushgrove. In the prayers, humiliation and confession of sin before God predominated. Public sins on the part of the State and locally were deplored, notably the extent to which sacred things were profaned and the absence of any fear of God, seen in Sabbath desecration, profaning of the Divine Name and ordinances, as well as neglect of Divine worship. Error and iniquity in consequence, were coming in as a flood. The suffering in the district was noticed; but we had merited the Divine displeasure, and that a fruitful land should be turned into barrenness. A spirit of repentance, national and local, was earnestly besought, with a return to the righteousness which exalteth a nation. The texts of the sermons at both diets were in accord—in the morning, Psalm 130:3: "If Thou, Lord, shouldest mark iniquities, O Lord, who should stand" etc.; evening,

Rev. 2:5: "Remember therefore from whence thou art fallen, and repent, and do the first works." On the Friday, devotional exercises were conducted in the evening. A preparation service was held on the Saturday, in view of so near an approach unto God, the subject being Song of Solomon 2:1: "I am the rose of Sharon and the lily of the valleys. As the lily among thorns, so is my love among the daughters."

On Communion Sabbath the interest reaches a climax, as seen in the great concourse of people and the solemn stillness pervading the assembly. This was on Sabbath last at Woodford Dale. The pastor, Rev. W. Scott, officiated, and preached the "action sermon" from John 1:29: "John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." The great fact of Christ's death as a satisfaction to Divine justice, its vicarious nature, and the significance to them were considered, as about to be shown forth by them in the Lord's Supper. Thereafter in "fencing" the table, the minister showed, from the Word of God, who were invited to come to the King's table, and who were debarred, concluding with encouraging appeals to tender consciences. During praise, the table was then reverently filled by communicants. The Scripture warrant having been read from 1 Corinthians 11th chapter, and thanks given in prayer, the sacred symbols of the Redeemer's dying love were passed round and partaken of amidst deepest solemnity; the table addresses being from Isaiah 53:6, "The Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all," and after communicating, Psalm 23:6, "Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life," etc. The minister on returning to the pulpit, addressed the non-communicants present, of whom there was a large number, from the words in John 1:37: "And the two disciples heard Him speak, and they followed Jesus." This was followed by praise and the benediction. Again at night, Mr. Scott preached to a large congregation from Ruth 1:16: "Intreat me not to leave thee, or to return from following after thee:

for whither thou goest I will go, and where thou lodgest I will lodge; thy people shall be my people, and thy God my God." The next day at a thanksgiving service, the concluding discourse was on the text in Numbers 10:29: "We are journeying unto the place of which the Lord said, I will give it you; come thou with us, and we shall do thee good: for the Lord hath spoken good concerning Israel."

Special thanks were offered for the rain that morning. The weather throughout the solemnity was every way suitable. There can be no disputing the simple grandeur of ancient Presbyterianism at a "Sacrament." The preparatory services lend a peculiar soundness to the high ordinance; and such is the devoutness and attention of the worshippers that a solemn awe seems to affect even the children. The praise was led by Mr. Stewart MacLachlan, Ulmarra, and the church building had been cleaned and renovated for the occasion.

CONGREGATIONAL MEETING AT BRUSHGROVE

The annual meeting of the congregation was held in Brushgrove Church on Thursday 24th October by the pastor, Rev. W. Scott, who presided.

A minute of the previous meeting having been read, Mr. Archibald MacDonald, of Grafton, the general treasurer, read the financial statement for the year. After reading the abstract he had prepared, Mr. MacDonald pointed out that the amount raised entirely represented the voluntary offerings of the people. This, they held, was the only Scriptural method. They did not, therefore, resort to any extraneous means, or appeals to outsiders. They had reason for encouragement, he said, in the increased support from Woodford Dale and Brushgrove, according to the abstract. This applied to more than the past year—the last three years having shown a steady advance. In Grafton, on the other hand, they had suffered from the removal of loyal contributors.

The foreign Mission collection had been devoted to the Kaffir Mission of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland, under the Rev. John B. Radasi. On the whole, he thought, they had cause of thankfulness to the Head of the Church for the provision that had been made for them in the interest of His Cause.

On the motion of Mr. Hugh Grant, elder, seconded by Mr. A. MacPhee, Coldstream, the report was formally adopted by the meeting, and Mr. MacDonald was cordially thanked for his work as treasurer. Several of those present expressed their satisfaction with the abstract read, but desiderated a greater interest in the affairs of the Church on the part of the congregation generally. It was pointed out that the prevailing sickness and other special causes had contributed to the smaller attendance on this occasion. Mr. Angus MacPhee drew attention to the condition of the Brushgrove Church, and on his suggestion, it was agreed to recommend the repainting of the building, along with certain other desirable improvements to the Manse. He had already received one or two spontaneous subscriptions for the work.

Mr. John MacLeod, Woodford Leigh, proposed that a special collection should be taken for these purposes, and this received unanimous consent. Mr. Grant explained the circumstances of the Woodford Dale Church, and the hope they had of getting it renovated. Mr. N. MacQueen, Lawrence, moved that the existing Committee be re-elected with the addition of Mr. A. Kidd, and this was carried.

In his concluding remarks the pastor emphasised the sense of gratitude to God already expressed, in connection with the honourable maintenance of Divine ordinances in their midst. And he desired there, to acknowledge the sympathetic interest manifested towards Mrs. Scott and himself in their domestic trouble. The spontaneity and practical nature of that sympathy they had fully appreciated. He also referred to such efforts as had been

permitted them, other than merely congregational, in the interest of religion and morals. Locally they had sought to do what they could, and as regards the foreign field, he had a letter from the Rev. J. S. Sinclair, Glasgow, testifying to the sense of the Church in Scotland of their interest in their Mission. He had also had communications from several of the home ministers, conveying fraternal greetings of the Free Presbyterian Synod there, towards themselves in their distinctive position and testimony for past Reformation attainments and purity. Mr. Scott alluded to certain encouraging elements in their congregational life. He longed for more response to the pulpit declarations of the Saviour; yet he felt cheered by the fact that the prayer-meetings among them had so extended. This was a good omen spiritually. They had also other elements of hope manifesting themselves. In the meantime he besought their united loyalty and steadfastness in a time of religious declension. He prayed that they might be as a band of men and women whose hearts God had touched for His name's glory and the good of His Cause.

The meeting was closed by singing the 122nd Psalm, "Pray that Jerusalem may have peace and felicity," and the benediction was then pronounced.

The above reports were taken from "The Clarence and Richmond Examiner" of Saturday, 26th October 1907, and reprinted in Vol. 12 of the Free Presbyterian Magazine.

The Late Miss M. MacDonald, Grafton

The 'domestic trouble' to which Mr. Scott refers in his closing remarks at the congregational meeting is to the death of his sister-in-law, Miss Margaret MacDonald, Grafton, whose obituary written by the late Rev. J. S. Sinclair, Glasgow, also appears in Vol. 12 of the F.P. Magazine. "Miss MacDonald who appears to have been a very excellent person passed away in Autumn, and her death is a

loss to the cause of truth in the place where she resided. It seems that under the wintry weather of July in Australia, there arose quite an epidemic of troubles in the field where Mr. Scott labours—influenza, pneumonia, and other diseases prevailing to a great extent. Miss MacDonald, who was of a generous and unselfish disposition, was much engaged in helping some of her friends who had taken ill, when she was seized with influenza, which carried her away at the end of a fortnight. Mr. Scott writes: "It went very hard with her: for she knew it was to be her end. When conscious she told Mrs. Scott and myself at her bedside, not to grieve for her if we did not mean to love her more than Christ. She said she was willing to go, and even desired to depart that she might be with Christ. She was calmly facing death in the intervals of the delirium, and said she had got now more than ever before, the conscious joy of her Saviour's presence. It was an ordeal for us beyond expression; for myself it seemed overpowering to have to minister spiritually at her death-bed, so unexpectedly and suddenly, and so soon after a similar experience, just seven months previously in the case of another sister, Mrs. N. MacLeod. . . . No one was more generous, thoughtful and disinterested—always helping others. She was an example in religious duty, and one who desired the sincere milk of the Word, that she might grow thereby. She directed all necessary preparations to be made, saying this would be her last day, even when we still were hopeful of a change. We have felt weakened by such a breach—she was so devoted and zealous. Yet some are taken away from the evil to come, while others are left to be the Lord's remembrancers when the ways of Zion mourn, and few comparatively come to her solemn feasts. And in any case such a solemn providence speaks to survivors "What I say unto you I say unto all, Watch."

On the Sabbath after Miss MacDonald's death, Mr. Scott preached from the words in Rev. 14:13: "And I heard a voice from heaven saying unto me, Write, Blessed are the dead which die in the

Lord from henceforth. Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours; and their works do follow them." Miss MacDonald took a deep interest in the cause of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland; and we extend our deepest sympathy to Mr. and Mrs. Scott and her other relations in the great loss they have sustained. J.S.S.

Fast Day for Rain

For a long period in 1907 there was a great drought in Eastern Australia. On the 13th November a fast-day was held in the Brushgrove-Grafton congregation. The following interesting report appeared in *The Clarence and Richmond Examiner* of Saturday 16th, and reprinted in the *F.P. Magazine*.

Wednesday last was observed as a solemn fast, with humiliation and prayer for rain. Public worship was conducted in Brushgrove Church, where a large and representative congregation assembled. After preliminary devotional exercises, the Rev. W. Scott announced as the subject of his meditation, 2 Chronicles 6:26, 27; 7:13, 14. The subject being the part of Solomon's prayer, at the dedication of the Temple, bearing on their own circumstances of drought: "When the heaven is shut up and there is no rain, because they have sinned against Thee; yet if they pray toward this place, and confess Thy name, and turn from their sin, when Thou dost afflict them; then hear Thou from heaven, and forgive the sin of Thy servants, and of Thy people Israel, when Thou hast taught them the good way wherein they should walk, and send rain upon Thy land, which Thou hast given unto Thy people for an inheritance." Why did Solomon anticipate such a calamity as the withholding of rain? He knew the fickleness of man, and his proneness to depart from God. God, moreover, had warned them by Moses in this matter—"Take heed to yourselves that your heart be not deceived, and ye turn aside and serve other gods and worship them; and then the Lord's wrath be

kindled against you, and He shut up the heavens that there be no rain, and that the land yield not her fruit." (Deut. 11:16, 17; 28:23, 24.) In his prayer Solomon sought to provide against the extremity of such threatened judgment; and he received a gracious promise from God that if, "When He shut up heaven and there was no rain, His people humbled themselves and prayed, and sought His face, and turned from their wicked ways, then He would heal their land." This explained their own service that day. They had here the fact that God providentially withholds rain, and so "turns a fruitful land into barrenness"; and again, the cause for this, "For the wickedness of them that dwell therein." Such a warning providence was to "teach us the good way wherein we should walk." This was little regarded nowadays, and secondary causes were all the talk in a time of drought. Here, however, they had the primary cause—the explanation that concerned them as moral agents—God making Himself known to a sinning people in judgment, by shutting up the heavens till they acknowledge their offence. King Solomon's sublime utterance in this matter appealed to them now. And when the heavens were as brass, distilling no dew: and the earth as iron, yielding no fruit, to whom could a people go but unto God? Wealth and substance, even when possessed, could not procure for them a drop of rain; nor could the husbandman plough or sow in hope, unless God watered his furrows. Solomon believed in a people praying for rain. They had a memorable instance afterward in Israel, when Elijah the prophet "prayed earnestly that it might not rain, and it rained not on the earth by the space of three years and six months: and he prayed again and the heaven gave rain and the earth brought forth her fruit." (James 5:17, 18.) Prayer to God, then, in such a strait, was their duty and privilege.

But while they had these Scripture principles to guide and encourage them, under the Divine correction, it was necessary to recognise that God would not regard the prayer of those who went

on in their trespasses. The direction in the text had reference to those who prayed "towards this place," namely, the Temple. That was where the sacrifices for sin were to be offered. Solomon, during his prayer, we are told, stood before the altar of the Lord. They were to do the same. Christ was their altar, their sacrifice. He was the way—the one Mediator for them with God, with whom they were to deal. They needed mercy. For this they were to confess their sin and forsake it, that the tokens of Divine displeasure might be removed. This was made clear to Israel later on, under Elijah. They had been mixing the worship of Baal with the worship of Jehovah. "How long halt ye between two opinions?" the prophet asked. Before he would pray for rain, the supremacy of the true God and the purity of His worship were recognised and established before the nation in connection with sacrifice. Thus, they exclaimed, "Jehovah, He is God." This meant the overthrow of human inventions in worship. When a people repent, they turn from such idols to the true God. In the passage before them, when God shut up heaven and there was no rain, the people were to "humble themselves, and turn from their wicked ways." Hence their own solemn fast. It represented, scripturally, a day of restraint from worldly business or pleasure, along with the abstinence from the ordinary comforts of life for the time. Such prayer, with fasting in emergent circumstances, had been attended with the Divine blessing; "Humble yourselves therefore under the mighty hand of God, that He may exalt you in due time." (1 Peter 5:6.)

In closing, Mr. Scott appealed to the assembled congregation to maintain their loyalty to the Word of God in its integrity, as their infallible guide, in the face of the infidelity and worldliness all around. He reminded them of the two great pillars of their religion, which it entrusted to them on the highest sanction: "Ye shall keep My Sabbaths, and reverence My Sanctuary: I am the Lord." (Lev. 26:2.) In connection with these, he felt that their community had sinned

a great sin. The Sabbath was openly and increasingly desecrated in various forms; the Sanctuary also was profaned by unscriptural practices, whilst many had forsaken the assembling of themselves together. God had permitted the drought and other evils to come upon them, yet there was His promise, "If ye keep My Sabbaths and reverence My Sanctuary then will I give you rain in due season, and the land shall yield her increase, and the trees of the field shall yield their fruit." (Lev. 26:2-4.) They were but a handful after all, as compared with the population around them, yet it was nothing with God to help whether with many, or with them that had no power.

Solemn intercessory prayer followed, and the service was closed with praise and the benediction, the Psalm being, "O God, Thou to Thine heritage didst send a plenteous rain." It is further to be recorded that rain began to fall in the evening after the service. This is not a solitary instance of the Lord answering prayer for rain. Members of Mr. Scott's congregation have informed me that on every occasion Mr. Scott and his congregation held a day of prayer for rain in time of drought that the Lord opened the windows of heaven, and that not once during Mr. Scott's ministry of over 14 years did the Clarence River flood the town. "The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much."

CHAPTER 16

MR. SCOTT JOINS THE FREE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF SCOTLAND

In the year 1909, Mr. and Mrs. Scott again visited Scotland. Mr. Scott attended the half-yearly meeting of the Synod of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland in November. It was moved by the Clerk, the Rev. James S. Sinclair, and seconded by the Rev. Neil MacIntyre, that Mr. Scott be associated with the Synod, and this was agreed to. During the Synod he gave an account of his work on the Clarence River and the difficulties that attended it. The following is the address in full, which Mr. Scott delivered, regarding his congregation in Australia and the state of matters in that colony:

Mr. Scott said that he felt it to be no ordinary providence that he was again in the homeland, and present in their Synod, at the end of another nine years. To him, at least, it meant very much to have been brought back to Scotland. In the interval changes had operated among them, both at home and in Australia. He remembered how, in his own congregation, he and others had followed them sympathetically in the crisis permitted to their Church, when some of their brethren finally forsook them. In the

far land, they too had their fight of afflictions. Personally, as some of them knew, he had in the mercy of God, been delivered with a great deliverance—having been taken from the very hands of death, “when all hope that we should be saved was taken away.” Publicly, also, they had suffered in the lapsing of the Presbytery he had represented on the occasion of his former visit. Instead of three ministers, as then, he and his congregation were, in the providence of God, left alone as representing the cause in New South Wales. Difficult as the situation had been to them previously, it had thereby been intensified. They had, for example, the Larger Union Church to contend with—the influence of which might be said to be adverse to all that was sacred or spiritual, as these terms were to be understood by them. It answered to the character of the United Free Church in Scotland. It was dominated by rationalism and worldliness. It was a Church, alas! whose weapons might be said to have become those of a kingdom other than Christ’s. They could understand in Scotland how demoralising such influence, in the name of religion, came to be, especially when it was, in a manner, universal—one church vying with the other in the sensationalism of its programme. Such vital questions as the sanctity of the Sabbath had to suffer in consequence, as was the case even at home. But their spiritual testimony as Free Presbyterians, had suffered from the prevailing party among themselves, by whom, in 1884, the more faithful ministers and elders had been summarily expelled from their membership in the Synod known as the Synod of Eastern Australia. That, of course, was before his own connection with Australia. But the cause had never rallied since. The consequent divisions had been such as the “Union” Church had been able to make great capital of in districts where Free Presbyterian influence, till then, had been paramount—notably on the Clarence River. His own congregation had been so cut asunder by the Expulsion that, even with a Presbytery, they were some six hundred miles by sea

and land from the nearest Presbyterian fellowship. Nor could they say that latterly, the tone of the prevailing or Expulsion party had improved evangelically. They mingle with surrounding Churches, and quietly learning their ways in such matters as Sales of Work, Socials, Burial Services, and Omission of Sacramental Fasts, etc. They have allowed preachers to use other than inspired Psalms in their public praise.

They claim to be a Synod, although now with only two settled pastors; but grave irregularities affect their constitution—incident to their expulsion policy and attendant events, which they yet refuse to have rectified. The local secular press recently taunted them with the nullity of their testimony on behalf of the Sabbath, wherein like the larger Churches, they allowed their communicants even, to use the Sabbath trains and cars! Lukewarmness in such quarters regarding the very foundations of religion, reacted on his own people, and it might be said to reflect the spirit of compromise, significant of their policy generally. They had, even so, the advantage in more recent years of the practical support of the Victorian section (also now reduced to two ministers), notwithstanding that the Synod there had actually excommunicated the actors in the Expulsion. The two parties were now, strange to say (without Synodical purgation on either side), in close fellowship together, as well as confederating against his own position. But a toning down had taken place even in Victoria, in more than one direction. Their combined influence converged largely on the Clarence River towards weakening and undermining any separate testimony. In the circumstances their very existence as a congregation, only for an overruling providence, must have become untenable long ago. Yet he need hardly say that, with his convictions of truth and duty, to join the Expulsion side, or thus aiding them, was impossible. On the other hand, they had certainly their encouragements. God had taken of the children instead of the fathers in their Zion, amidst all the opposing

influences. Men and women had become living epistles of Christ. Even financially, as the reports at their last congregational meeting had shown, their position at least compared favourably with what it had been at his induction to the charge fourteen years ago. For such elements he desired to thank the Lord. Throughout the district, moreover, God had enabled them to exert a recognised moral influence.

His only ministerial fellowship in Australia for the past few years, had been with the Rev. Arthur Paul, St. Kilda, Victoria. To the Synod or the friends present Mr. Paul was no stranger. He had to occupy a position in Victoria similar to his own in New South Wales, in his isolation from the prevailing party, with whose methods he was not in sympathy. Mr. Paul's fellowship had been a strength to himself, as had also been that of Mr. S. Porter*, elder, East Maitland, who had represented their cause in Presbytery or Synod for over thirty years, and who, for some years now, had been in the position of having to hold a meeting in his own house on the Sabbath for all who came to him. (Acts 28:30.)

The outlook in the matter of a faithful and consistent testimony in Australia was dark in the extreme. His own congregation had a difficult position in his absence. In the interval he had sought to encourage them with pastoral letters and otherwise. He would gladly have furthered any endeavour to supply them from this Synod, in the event of his not returning, had such been possible. He had communicated with them in this interest, but from the indefiniteness of their supply, he had now nothing to report. He had sought to commit their case, and his own to God.

Mr. Scott concluded by making reference to his prolonged visit

* Mr. Porter's obituary appears in the F.P. Magazine, Vol. 17, p. 402.

to the northern counties, and the refreshing fellowship which he had enjoyed.

The Rev. Neil Cameron moved to the effect that the Synod thank the Rev. Walter Scott for his excellent and touching address, and offer Mr. Scott and the congregation over which he had been placed in Australia, their deepest sympathy in the trying and isolated position in which they were placed in the providence of God. He said that since Mr. Scott was in this country on his former visit, he was sure the members of this Synod had been following with real interest, the struggles of their friend and his congregation in their efforts to maintain God's Truth and worship in that distant land. He could not conceive of any greater loss that could befall their friends there and their families, than that they should lose God's Word, with the saving doctrines and Scriptural forms of worship, government, and discipline, as these were set forth in the Westminster Confession of Faith. He hoped the Lord would strengthen them by His grace to hold fast that which they had, lest another take their crown. The motion was unanimously agreed to. The Moderator then, in the name of the Synod, thanked Mr. Scott for his address. (F.P. Mag., Vol. 14.)

At the half-yearly meeting of Synod held in the Hall of St. Jude's Church, Glasgow, in November 1910, there was before the Court an application for admission to the ministry of the Church from the Rev. Walter Scott. Rev. Neil Cameron stated that he had received a letter from Mr. Scott, in which he intimated his desire to become a minister of the Church and his willingness to accept the constitution, taken along with the "Declaration anent the Reformation Attainments and the Church relations thereto," recently issued by the Synod. The Rev. J. R. MacKay, in making a motion, said, that ever since he knew Mr. Scott, he (Mr. MacKay) had a desire that Mr. Scott would join the ministry of the Church. Mr. Scott had a profound admiration for the men and work of the

Second Reformation period in the history of the Scottish Church, and they shared with him in that esteem. They had recently asserted in a historic way their admiration of the First and Second Reformations in the Declaration that had been adopted at last Synod. Mr. MacKay said he would not enlarge further, as the whole matter of Mr. Scott's admission had been already discussed in Committee in private, but he would conclude by moving as follows: "The Synod took into consideration an application from the Rev. Walter Scott, lately of Brushgrove, Australia, and now resident in Edinburgh, craving to be received as a minister of this Church. After deliberation, the Synod, believing Mr. Scott to be a true minister of the Gospel, agree to receive him, on condition, that he accepts the constitution of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland, as set forth in her subordinate standards, and that he answers simpliciter the questions put to ministers of the Free Presbyterian Church at their ordination, and that he signs in the same manner the Formula of the said Church."

The Rev. Neil Cameron seconded the motion, which was unanimously agreed to.

Admission of the Rev. W. Scott—The Southern Presbytery met in St. Jude's Hall, Glasgow, on the 2nd of January 1911, Rev. Neil Cameron, Moderator, presiding. Rev. Walter Scott, late of Australia, was admitted into the Church. The Moderator first gave a brief narrative of the steps that had been taken by the Synod in connection with the proposed admission of the Rev. Mr. Scott, who had now indicated his acquiescence in the Synod's decision. Thereafter, Mr. Scott came forward, and the Moderator put to him the usual questions for the admission of ministers, which he answered satisfactorily. The Clerk then read the Formula, and Mr. Scott signed the same. This been done, the Moderator engaged in prayer, and at the close, in the name of the Presbytery, received Mr. Scott into the ministry of the Free Presbyterian Church. The Moderator and brethren present

gave him the right hand of fellowship. The meeting was closed with praise and prayer. (F.P. Magazine, Vol. 15.)

Petition from the Brushgrove-Grafton Congregation

At the half-yearly meeting of the Synod of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland, held in the Hall of St. Jude's Church in November 1911, the Rev. Neil Cameron as Convenor of Foreign Missions Committee, read a letter which he had received from Mr. James D. Kidd, Lawrence, Clarence River, New South Wales. Mr. Cameron said that Mr. Kidd was an elder in the Brushgrove-Grafton congregation, where their worthy friend, Rev. Walter Scott, had laboured. The following is an abstract: "I received your letter of the 16th August, and wish to thank you for the encouragement given. The elders have decided to send a petition to the Synod, asking for ministerial aid and closer relationship. We thought it advisable to send it without delay, that it might be in your hands by the time the Synod met. Owing to this, we are unable to obtain all the signatures of sympathetic friends. Messrs. D. Maclachlan, John Maclachlan and J. H. MacDonald, our best supporters, are unavoidably absent from home. I have no further particulars to give you since my last, save that the majority are putting forth their utmost endeavours to crush our position. The Free Church minister. Rev. Mr. Henry, and Mr. Herbert Ramsay, student, are both on the River, and doing all they can to turn away the people. The majority have elected trustees for our Brushgrove Church and manse and we may lose these." Mr. Kidd concludes by stating among other things, that if the Synod should see its way to send a minister the people would be willing to send £35 to help pay the passage. Rev. Mr. Cameron then read the petition, which was signed by three elders, ten members and a few adherents, and runs as follows: "To the Reverend the Moderator, and the Members of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland: We,

the undersigned elders, members, and adherents of the Brushgrove-Grafton congregation of the Free Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia, desirous of promoting the glory of God and the good of the Church, being destitute of a pastor for over two years, crave ministerial aid and closer relationship with your Church. Owing to the present unsettled condition of the congregation, no guarantee as to stipend can be given.” (Here follows signatures.) Mr. Cameron said that he was sure they all felt the deepest sympathy with their friends in Australia. The great difficulty was in providing them with ministerial supply. He moved, however, as follows, that the Synod, having much sympathy with their friends in Australia, grant the petition for closer relationship by receiving into Church fellowship, the members and adherents of Brushgrove-Grafton congregation who had forwarded this petition, and assure them that, while the Synod cannot make any promise as to sending out a minister, they will do their very utmost, if circumstances will at any time permit, to meet this requirement. Rev. D. Beaton seconded the motion, which was agreed to.

CHAPTER 17

PERSECUTION FOR RIGHTEOUSNESS' SAKE

“**W**e were opposed,” wrote Mr. Scott in his Pastoral Letter of May 14th 1909, written on board the “Carpentaria” on his way to Scotland, “because we would not be forced to join those whose unscriptural and unconstitutional act, had rent the Church into fragments to the scandal of the Cause and religion. Had their policy only affected themselves, one might well have kept silent. They have set themselves, however, to compass sea and land in order to weaken our separate position, and to scatter our people. We ourselves had no endowments; still, as you are aware, they envied us that solitary bequest to our congregation about £190 of one of our communicants, Mr. Josiah Carter*. For some years they pressed their claim to it in strong language, until at length, sworn evidence from without was given against them.

The same spirit of expulsionist persecution showed itself in

* Mr. Carter's obituary appears in the F.P. Mag., Vol. 14, p. 461.

depriving Mr. Scott's congregation of the Brushgrove property and of the Church at Woodford Dale; and also in the attack the Rev. John Sinclair of the Geelong Free Presbyterian Church of Victoria made on Mr. Scott, in his letter addressed to the editor of the Free Presbyterian Magazine, over remarks made in the Magazine on the state of Free Churches in Australia, professing to adhere in creed to the position of 1843. The remarks taken exception to by Rev. John Sinclair were: "The limited size of these bodies is not a wholly unfavourable mark in these backsliding times, but we have reason to know that while there are some very worthy people among them, they are in a decayed and divided state. They adhere to Psalms in public worship, but some of their congregations are ready to adopt modern methods in Church work, bazaars, and such like." "It will be seen," writes the editor of the F.P. Magazine, "that our correspondent directs his remarks chiefly against the Rev. Walter Scott, our informant concerning the Australian Churches. In view of this, we thought it right to submit his letter to Mr. Scott, as one who perfectly understood the whole situation, and was able to give a satisfactory reply. Of course, we are personally responsible for the remarks condemned, and adhere to them in substance. The only concession we can grant our correspondent is that the expression "sales of work" would have been perhaps more strictly accurate than "bazaars." It is found however in Scotland, that the tendency to adopt "sales of work" of any kind, is a tendency that seldom stops short of the full fledged "bazaars," and the society organized in Australia, appears to us to be laying the foundation for the same unscriptural system of making money, as obtains in several congregations of the Free Churches at home, and almost universally throughout the larger Presbyterian Churches. The following is Mr. Scott's reply, which supplies a complete answer:

Dear Mr. Editor—You have kindly given me opportunity to make

any observations called for by the foregoing letter from Geelong. A word of explanation seems necessary first.

For the writer of the letter I can have little respect. We were indeed in intimate fellowship. This, and such service as I had rendered him, he was good enough to acknowledge, and refer to even in his periodical, as what he could hardly repay. It is otherwise now, however. And why? He has alleged no fault against me, except it be that I could not resile from the distinctive position to which I had become pledged at my induction in 1894. He himself chose to transfer his ecclesiastical sympathy to a separatist party, as, till then, he had regarded it, but with whom, from the first, I had declined to be in fellowship; and against whose backslidings and unconstitutional actings he, along with his Synod (in Victoria), had most solemnly protested. In this inconsistency on his part, I could not follow him. And failing to induce or compel me, his attitude to me and my congregation thenceforward savoured of the hostility of Haman towards Mordecai and his people. This will account to your readers for the tone of his letter. Free Presbyterians at home, from their experience of brethren among themselves transferring their sympathies to the present Free Church, may understand the situation in Australia. It was practically the same. So much so that, when we were together in fellowship, your correspondent was with me in heartiest sympathy, with Free Presbyterians in Scotland. When, however, he changed to the side of the stronger party in Australia, he, along with them, became all for the Free Church. Yet they will tell us, as the writer of the above letter is so ready to do, that they have not changed!

Now for his letter. Although the remarks, in your July issue complained of, were not from me, I am made the object of attack. The writer quotes nothing to justify this, and gives only a vague reference to permit of the public judging in the matter.

In giving an account to the Synod of the religious position in

Australia, I indicated reasons why I could not there coalesce with the party now represented by your Geelong correspondent. That statement appeared in this Magazine. In a footnote the fact was instanced that, so far from becoming more evangelical, that party were learning the ways of surrounding churches "In such matters as sales of work, socials, etc." This remark (after two years interval), he now apparently challenges me to prove. Yet he does not say that in the particular congregation he mentions, such modern methods have since ceased. His letter seems to suggest that they may have been modified. But from his palliative explanations, one is left in the dark as to how far he approves or disapproves the practice itself. That is however, comparatively a matter of minor consequence. It is of far more importance to notice here that, whilst your correspondent writes from Australia, to mention a point mentioned merely incidentally on the one hand to the main charges of unfaithfulness so prominent in the body of the statement referred to, he takes no exception whatever. This should be sufficiently significant. If, like the Pharisees, your correspondent has no conscience as regards such graver evils affecting the ecclesiastical position of himself and his friends, then it almost seems, like them, straining at a gnat, to appear so concerned about a lesser detail. It indeed, reminds one of the present Free Church becoming so excited over flowers in the Church, whilst remaining quite apathetic over the doctrine of inspiration so compromised by their present Moderator (Professor Alexander). Your allusion to the small bodies, for whom your correspondent pleads, as being "in a decayed and divided state," he dismisses as due to prejudice. Has he forgotten the toning down of his Church's testimony in relation to purity of worship, for instance, in deference to individual scruple? That can hardly be said to consist with being 'steadfast and unmoveable.' The resemblance is rather to 'a reed shaken with the wind.' Moreover, has he not insisted on allowing, in his editorial pages, the advocacy

of views outside of the Confession of Faith or the recognised teaching and testimony of the Reformation Church? And did he not thereby alienate from his fellowship recognised friends of the truth? It is in grief that I thus write. Yet he compels me. And even these indications of decay and division are only illustrations by the way.

In these circumstances, and when more serious charges involved are so indifferently regarded by your correspondent, I am the less concerned about his “indignant denial” over the mention of sales of work. He acknowledges that while at Brushgrove, I consistently exposed such evils on the spot, in the case of the neighbouring Maclean congregation. That was the time to have repudiated my statement if such had been possible. That it was never publicly questioned, and that the present, years after, is the first attempted denial, a denial, moreover, that comes not directly, and from another State altogether—is sufficiently suggestive. Your correspondent says the charge is ‘untrue.’ Does he mean now, or when it was first made?

But your correspondent says, he has ‘failed to find, after inquiry, any evidence of the evil’ alleged. Now, my information was not second hand, as with him. I had the congregation’s published account of the movement. Their lady adherents were formally organised; office bearers were duly elected—the object being the making and selling of clothing in the interest of a Church fund. I might go further, much more is known locally. I am only here satisfying your readers that it was no ‘serious misrepresentation,’ to credit your correspondent’s friends in this particular with a tendency towards ‘modern methods in Church work.’ But what of your correspondent’s own misstatements? . . .

In closing his letter, the writer sadly betrays his real motive in the personal animus he exhibits against myself. In stating, however, that ‘no congregation in N.S.W. was more like a wreck than his

when he hastily left it,' he speaks at random, and as one with whom the wish was father to the thought. Certainly, he and those he now acts with, have done what they could to destroy the congregation in question, and its special testimony. The fact, however, that our last year, even financially, had been one of our best, shows, that by the time I left Brushgrove, they had not quite succeeded. But in the nearly three years' interval, no sermon has been preached to them; no ordinary supply has been available; only fellowship meetings have been possible. Yet these have been regularly held, Sabbath and week-day. It is well known that the normal strength of a congregation rarely appears in such circumstances; yet during those trying years, at least several families have kept together; three elders and other praying men have been conducting the services; they have been sending home their annual Foreign Mission collection, and have collected yearly a very considerable amount for the Trinitarian Bible Society, London. Be it remembered also, that those devoted people are not just located around the Church door, but come from distances of from three to nine miles each way. They have kept in correspondence with their wonted pastor in their trials; they may be faint indeed, yet have they still been pursuing. In such circumstances, let your readers judge whether what your correspondent has dared to write of them to Scotland, is not the doing of an enemy. Will it be believed that the man so writing, has personally gone from end to end of the district, sowing dissension to divide and scatter this pastorless flock? More than that, he has had them deprived of their most convenient church building where they congregated. Do your readers ask: In what way? By forcing an entrance in opposition to a united Session acting for the people. 'He that entereth not by the door into the sheep-fold but climbeth up some other way.' Let me here point out that, such expulsion methods notwithstanding, he has to confess to having so far failed to do what he calls 'the division.' A

compassionate Saviour has said, "Fear not, little flock." What your correspondent says of a former co-presbyter of mine may receive attention otherwise.

I am, faithfully yours, Walter Scott.

10 Shandwick Place

Edinburgh, 22nd September 1911.

P.S. A later mail from Australia brings the information that, having forcibly occupied the Woodford Dale Church against the faithful remnant there congregating, the party of your correspondent are proceeding to take Brushgrove church also—their only remaining place of worship. The party led by Dr. Rainy at home, never acted with a higher hand or with greater injustice to the suffering minority, than this small prevailing party in Australia is doing at this moment. The object, too, is the same—'to extinguish the impracticable elements'—the phrase used by Dr. Rainy in 1893. In this case your correspondent's friends are endeavouring to simply appropriate what they have no shadow of claim to. The nations are, meantime, crying out against Italy's seizure of territory not her own; that has been done in the light; this in the dark, and by a professing Church against weaker brethren. And on this occasion, the delegate of the present Free Church of Scotland, Rev. James Henry, now in Australia, is, it seems, mixed up with such unscrupulous actions.

The late Rev. A. Paul wrote to me, that he had warned the present Free Church against entering into relations with the party so acting. It seems that they are not particular. It will be seen from the following letters of Mr. Paul that my own experience is nothing singular at the hands of that party. Other ministers fared similarly. They have recently been eulogising the memory of Mr. Paul in their periodical in Sydney. His letters now appearing, will show how differently he estimated them; and, as they themselves allow,

Mr. Paul was 'a prince and a great man in Israel.' This might well lead the present Free Church to pause. W.S.

The Brushgrove Church Outrage

Mr. James Kidd, elder in the Brushgrove-Grafton congregation, in his letter to the Rev. Neil Cameron, accompanying the Petition of the congregation to the Synod of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland as already stated, mentions, "The Free Church minister, Rev. Mr. Henry, and Mr. Herbert Ramsay, student, are both on the River, and doing all they can to turn away the people. The majority have elected trustees for our Brushgrove Church and Manse, and we may lose these."

The said election of trustees took place on Wednesday, 26th June 1911. In "The Australian Free Presbyterian Magazine" for September 1911 the following item of Church news appears: "Appointing of Trustees on the Brushgrove Property. On Wednesday 26th July, a congregational meeting of the Brushgrove and Woodford Dale congregations met in the Temperance Hall, Cowper, and was presided over by the Rev. William MacDonald, moderator of the interim Kirk Session." The names of five men are given as the trustees appointed of the Brushgrove property. The property was accordingly appropriated. The congregation locked out of their church, had to worship in a hall until they erected a church of their own in Grafton.

The foundation stone of the Brushgrove Church was laid by the Rev. John S. MacPherson on October 11th 1898. Mr. MacPherson's name and the date engraven in the stone, can be seen to the present day. The church was opened free of debt in December. The services morning and evening were conducted by Mr. Scott, his texts being: Acts 24:14 in the morning, and Isaiah 27:13 in the evening. The church to-day is a lonesome spectacle, a pathetic symbol of the

deadly ravages of expulsionism. "O my soul come not thou into their secret; unto their assembly mine honour, be not thou united." (Gen. 49:6).

Letters of the Rev. Arthur Paul to Rev. Walter Scott

St. Kilda, 13th February 1909.

My Dear Sir,

Your last letter greatly distresses me. I do not wonder that the pressures around you have become intolerable. Experience of the men you have to contend with, renders it quite easy for me to understand what methods they are capable of pursuing. It is not easy, and for one's own peace of mind, it is hardly advisable to speak of them as they deserve. For you as well as me, it will be best to leave them and their religious professions, in the hands of Him who judgeth righteously. I have no doubt but that your refusal to "join" with the Sutherland party stung them, and accounts for much—perhaps most, if not all that you have endured at their hands. They have their fraternisers in this colony also, as you know, and these would willingly have driven me out of Australia, as they meanwhile have driven you. But I am heartily sorry for your leaving, though far from blaming it. With your departure, as I think, departs the last shred of Alexander MacIntyre's good work on the Clarence River. I have ceased to feel surprised at the sudden changes which come over our professing Free Church people; a too general decay of spiritual life among them accounts for it.

Notwithstanding all this, I hope the voyage home and your visit to the old country will set you up in bodily health. If spared to your destination in safety, you will be refreshed by fellowship with ministers and people likeminded. You know that it is the happiness of some that their youth is renewed as the eagle's. There are sad situations in the old country also, and fears for

Britain in the near future are not out of place; but there is still a remnant and an organisation, and a banner appearing for the truth. You will be seeing Mr. Cameron. Will you please tell him, how greatly I appreciated the long and very kind letter he sent me. And if you see my old friend, Mr. Robertson, colleague to Mr. Cameron, will you please convey to him my very kindest remembrances?

It will be a trial to Mrs. Scott to break up the home in which you have lived together for so many years. But I feel sure she will be content with even that rather than you should compromise your public consistency.

Yours very truly, Arthur Paul.
88 Alma Street,
St. Kilda, 18th March 1909.

Dear Mr. Scott. I write this hoping to bid you good-bye in person. But I wish to tell you in this way, how deeply I grieve at the unworthy treatment which has been shown you by some who are nominally Free Church ministers. Your absence will be a distinct loss to the Free Presbyterian interests in Australia, and the spirit which has forced you out of the vineyard for a time, is not one to be envied. No doubt it all will be overruled to you for good, and I hope the voyage back to the old country will result in a restoration of your health, and a reviving of your energies.

Yours very truly, Arthur Paul.

The Rev. A. Paul passed away, as has already been mentioned, on August 13th 1910, in the 85th year of his age. In connection with his contending against Expulsionism to the end of his course in this world, Mr. Paul used to remark, "I am not afraid of the judgement of history; history will do us justice."

The First Deputy to the Brushgrove-Grafton Congregation

The late Rev. Duncan MacKenzie, Gairloch, Ross-shire, afterwards of Kames, was the first deputy of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland to the Brushgrove-Grafton congregation. Accompanied by his wife, he sailed from Liverpool on the S.S. Suevic of the White Star Line, on the 12th March 1914. In the course of his interesting report, Mr. MacKenzie mentions that the Clarence River is over 250 miles long, and has 99 islands. It is called the River of Islands. Woodford Isle, 15 miles long, is one of these islands, and on it is Brushgrove and Woodford Dale. The country is flat, the land is very fertile, and there are some lovely spots. It is principally an agricultural country, and the people are in very comfortable circumstances. There are two thriving towns on the Clarence—Maclean and Grafton: also small towns or villages—Yamba at the mouth of the River, Lawrence, Southgate, Brushgrove, and Ulmarra. Many of the inhabitants of the Clarence district are descendants of those who emigrated from the Highlands of Scotland. Skye is largely represented: Ardnamurchan, Mull, Lochaber and Sutherland come in for a fair share; only a few speak or understand the Gaelic. The climate is tropical. Australia is a land of perpetual bloom. It is very rich in fruit: grapes grow plentifully.

The Brushgrove-Grafton congregation has been without a minister since 1909. Some have joined the Expulsion party, but a section of the congregation positively refused to identify themselves with that body. Rev. Mr. Scott was an indefatigable witness against Sabbath desecration, and against Protestant families in the district sending their children to the Roman Catholic convent schools. On Sabbath a steamer sails from Grafton to Yamba with pleasure seekers, accompanied by a brass band. Mr. Scott often raised his voice and pen against this huge contravention of the Fourth Commandment, but the pleasure seekers have not yet ceased defying Jehovah,

upon Whom they are dependent for the breath of their nostrils. There are three elders in the congregation, Messrs. Hugh Grant, Woodfordleigh; Alex. Kidd* and James D. Kidd, Lawrence, who hold regular services at Brushgrove and King's Greek, and also a weekly prayer meeting. One feels very strongly for this small congregation, so far from the home country, without a stated ministry for more than six years, struggling to maintain the "Whole counsel of God." One feels for them all the more, confronted as they are with much opposition. They have been deprived of their two Churches and Manse.

I may say that notwithstanding the heat, mosquitoes, etc., I enjoyed excellent health in New South Wales. During the six and a half months of my labours there, the services were appreciated by the congregation, and the deputy was, now and again strengthened from on High to declare the unsearchable riches of Christ Jesus. The two Communion Seasons, especially the first, were seasons of much blessing to hearers and preacher. I felt at home among the people. Our visits to the various households are green in our memory. I am often struck with the earnestness and pathos with which the officebearers pleaded in prayer for the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland, and for the continuance of the preached Gospel among themselves. I am indebted especially to Mr. Grant, elder, and to Mrs. Kidd's family, for conveying me to the different places of worship, and to the various districts I visited. I shall always have very pleasant recollections of the people and I pray the Most High to remember

* Mr. Alex. Kidd's obituary appears in the F.P. Mag., Vol. 60, p. 55; Mr. James Kidd's in Vol. 65, p. 82; their worthy mother's obituary, Mrs. Thomas Kidd in Vol. 23, p. 356, and their sister's, Mrs. Janet Shaw, a devoted friend of Mr. Scott's, in Vol. 21, p. 348. (See also *Collected Writings of Rev. William MacLean* pages 277 to 298, 2020 Ed.)

them in mercy in enlarging their borders, and in providing for them an ambassador commissioned of heaven, and endued with power from on High, who shall declare unto them the whole counsel of God. (Extracts from Report printed in the F.P. Magazine for July 1915.)

CHAPTER 18

MR. SCOTT'S MINISTRY IN CANADA AND DEATH

On the 13th of April 1912, the Rev. Walter Scott, accompanied by Mrs. Scott, sailed from Greenock on board the S.S. Cameronia of the Anchor Line, as the Church's deputy to Canada.

"It has been our lot to cross many seas," Mr. Scott wrote in his Report. "Each occasion however, was an experience of its own to us. This crossing of the Atlantic was rendered forever memorable by what befell the S.S. Titanic. We had left three days later for the same port; and when the awful news was flashed to us on board, of the sinking of the vessel on her first trip, with a loss of life exceeding all past records at sea, the effect was paralysing. It was difficult, in the circumstances, to conceive of so appalling a disaster as fact, yet the fearful tidings haunted us day and night. It was with the gravest apprehension as night came, that one ventured to lie down. On the same tract ourselves, and in the midst of icebergs, it was a moment of peril. As refuge seemed to fail, that word could be heard "Be still and know that I am God." It transpired that direction had been received, to go off the ordinary course southwards about a hundred

miles. This was hailed as precautionary. Still the tension remained, and the suspense was great until it might be possible for the details, so heartrending, to be ascertained ashore. Meantime, it was with dismay that we beheld fellow-passengers, at the first panic-stricken, becoming abandoned immediately after and losing themselves in wildest revelry as if nothing had happened. Such were our unhappy surroundings on the Atlantic—better imagined than described. No public service had been thought of that first Sabbath. The Lord's voice however, was upon the waters with solemnising effect. On the following Sabbath morning the purser appealed for a service to be held in the first saloon, and made every arrangement requisite. The doctor on board agreed to present. There were enough Bibles with the Psalms available. The morning was bright and calm; and really it seemed as if the whole ship came together on this occasion to hear the Word. The worship observed was entirely as at home; and whilst the Psalms were heartily sung by the large congregation which filled both saloons, there was a reverent attention to the Word preached. We had the satisfaction moreover, that instead of having to land on the Sabbath at New York and be involved so largely in its desecration as ordinarily happens—an experience we had dreaded—Providence had mercifully ordered it, that we should on that day be preaching the Gospel to perishing sinners of many nations on board the steamer. Throughout these anxious experiences, we confessed to having been made sensible of being remembered in prayer.”

Then continues the 12 page report which appeared in the December number of the F.P. Magazine for 1912, and is of a most interesting nature, containing a detailed account of Mr. Scott's ministrations in Chesley, Newton, Seaforth, Brucefield, East Williams, Lochalsh, Kincardine, Detroit, Winnipeg, Wardsville and Toronto. It is of interest to note, that it was during Mr. Scott's visit to Chesley, that the congregation unanimously agreed to petition the Synod to be received into the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland.

“At the congregational meeting” writes Mr. Scott, “which I was asked to attend and open with prayer, the congregation was well represented. Mr. A. Dobie, elder, presided. As already reported to the Synod, I reminded them that I was there from the home Church by then own request. They had already signified their desire to be connected with the Free Presbyterian Church. If such was still their mind, my mission was to direct them to proceed in a formal way. But the deciding of this was apart from me. The responsibility, I emphasised to them, must be their own. I was present however, to give them any information they might wish. Considerable discussion followed. (1) Their request, it was said, was for six months preaching. Such prolonged services, I replied, could only be given, if at all, after—not before—they had been formally received into the Church. (2) One remarked that the matter was being rushed. In answer, I said the Synod had not hastened to do anything in the matter at all. Nor were they urging them now. But having come so far, after repeated requests from themselves, I could hardly do less than expect them to say yea or nay, so that I might report accordingly. Only one Sabbath now remained of my time. (3) Another point was the need of more information about the Free Presbyterian Church. In reply I gave some account of the distinctive position and principles of the Church, and then offered to answer any questions they might put. A number of questions were asked and answered, resulting in satisfaction being expressed and a general agreement indicated. A resolution in favour of joining the Free Presbyterian Church was then moved and seconded. Opportunity for an amendment having been given, without result, a show of hands was taken, both for and against. No hand appearing against the motion, the chairman declared it unanimously carried. Thereafter a petition to the home Synod in favour of the congregation being received into the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland, was formally adopted without dissent, the chairman being authorised to sign and forward it to the

Synod Clerk, along with an official extract of Minute, as then read by the Clerk (Mr. MacNeil) and approved. This ended the business. After preaching again the following Sabbath and presiding at the Wednesday prayer-meeting, we took farewell, several accompanying us to the station. By arrangement with Mr. D. Clark, elder, Seaforth, we went on to Newton—about sixty miles by rail—there to begin the annual Ontario Mission Programme.”

THE CHESLEY CONGREGATION RECEIVED INTO THE FREE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

At the half-yearly meeting of Synod held in the Free Presbyterian Church, Inverness, in July 1912, the Rev. Ewen MacQueen, Dornoch, convener of the Canadian Mission Committee, read the following petition from the Chesley congregation in Ontario. “This petition of the Associate Presbyterian congregation of Chesley, Ontario, in Congregational Meeting, assembled this 8th day of May 1912, humbly sheweth that for some time past it has been the desire of the congregation, in respect of their isolated and pastorless condition, to seek connection with the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland, in the interest especially, of the Gospel ministry being restored and continued among them; that with the temporary presence at this time of your representative, they have taken the matter into their further solemn and prayerful consideration, and have formally resolved in favour of such connection. Therefore they request that your Reverend Court take the premises under their favourable cognizance, so as to receive and acknowledge us as a congregation of your Church, and further our desire for pastoral provision accordingly. And your petitioners will ever pray etc. On behalf of and by authority of the congregation petitioning. A. Dobie, elder, Chairman.”

In succession to this petition, a call had been forwarded to the

Synod Clerk dated 31st May, and addressed to the Rev. Walter Scott, minister of the Gospel, inviting him to undertake the office of pastor among them, promising to give him all “due respect, encouragement, and subjection in the Lord,” “and to contribute to him suitable maintenance, as God may prosper us.”

At the conclusion of the report, Mr. MacQueen moved as follows: “The Synod, having considered the petition of the Associate Presbyterian Congregation of Chesley, Ontario, for union with the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland, hereby resolve to receive the said Congregation as one of the congregations of this Church on the basis of the constitution of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland.” The motion was seconded and unanimously agreed to, and the Clerk was instructed to communicate the decision to the Petitioners. It was decided to communicate with the Rev. Walter Scott on the subject of the Call, and to make arrangements according to result. (F.P. Magazine, Vol. 17.)

Induction of the Rev. Walter Scott to Chesley, Ontario

At a meeting of the Southern Presbytery held in Glasgow on the 4th October 1912, the Rev. Walter Scott expressed his willingness to accept the call to Chesley, Ontario, and after prayer by the Rev. Ewen MacQueen, Kames (late of Dornoch), the Call was put into his hands. The Court then decided to induct Mr. Scott on the 11th inst., in St. Jude's Hall.

The Southern Presbytery met in the Hall of St. Jude's Church, Glasgow, on Friday evening 11th October. The chief business was the induction of the Rev. Walter Scott (late of Brushgrove-Grafton Free Presbyterian Church, New South Wales) to the pastoral charge of the Chesley congregation in Ontario, newly attached to the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland. The members of Presbytery present were Revs. Neil Cameron (Moderator), and James S. Sinclair (Clerk)

ministers, with Mr. John Auld, John Knox's, Glasgow, Elder. Revs. John Robertson, Greenock, and Ewen MacQueen, Kames, sent letters of apology for absence. Rev. James S. Sinclair went to the pulpit and preached from Colossians 1:27, 28 "Christ in you the hope of glory; whom we preach, warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom; that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus." Public worship being ended, the Moderator gave a brief narrative of the steps that had been taken in connection with the Call to Chesley and Mr. Scott's acceptance of the same. Thereafter he addressed the usual questions to Mr. Scott, who satisfactorily answered them. Mr. Cameron then engaged in prayer, and at the close by the authority of Christ and in the name of the presbytery, inducted Mr. Scott to the pastoral charge of the Chesley congregation in Ontario, giving him the right hand of fellowship and wishing him all comfort and success in the Lord. The other members of Presbytery also gave him the right hand of fellowship. Mr. Scott signed the formula in the presence of the congregation. Mr. Cameron then briefly and suitably addressed the newly inducted minister as to his work, responsibilities, and grounds of encouragements in a charge which, from its distance and isolation, naturally presented some circumstances of difficulty. Mr. Sinclair said it would have fallen to him to address the congregation as to their special privileges and opportunities, but as Chesley was at a considerable distance, it was arranged that an address would be written out and forwarded as soon as circumstances would permit. He expressed the sincere hope of all friends present, that the Rev. Mr. Scott and Mrs. Scott would be safely carried to their new abode across the Atlantic, and that the ministry about to begin at Chesley would be attended with an abundant blessing. Friends in the home country will follow with much interest Mr. Scott's labours in Canada." (F.P. Magazine Vol. 17).

A week later Mr. Scott and his wife (accompanied by her sister, Miss MacDonald) sailed for Canada, and landed at Montreal after a

voyage of ten days. When they reached Chesley, they were cordially welcomed by elders and people. Mr. Scott began his ministry in the Chesley Church on the first Sabbath of November when he preached three times, and read the extract minutes of his induction at the end of the services. During Mr. Scott's ministry in Chesley, which covered a period of three years and two months, he spent and was spent in the service of his Master. For him to live was Christ and to die gain.

Death of the Rev. Walter Scott

"It is with deep sorrow we record this month the death of the Rev. Walter Scott, our minister at Chesley, Ontario, Canada. Mr. Scott, who was of delicate constitution, took a severe illness last year from the effects of which he never recovered. He battled, we learn, heroically with his great weakness for a time, going from his bed to the pulpit and from the pulpit to his bed, but at last he was compelled, in God's providence, to succumb and was wholly confined to the house until his death, which took place on the 18th January 1916. We expect (D.V.) to have fuller particulars later on, but meantime, we subjoin an extract from a letter received from Mrs. Scott, in which an interesting account is given of his last days.

Though suffering much weakness, it is quite plain that Mr. Scott had an "abundant entrance into the everlasting Kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." He was a sound and lively preacher of the Gospel, and a faithful witness of the truth. His removal is a great loss to his congregation, and to the Cause of Christ in general.

We extend our deepest sympathy to his respected widow, to his sister, Miss Scott, and his sister-in-law, Miss MacDonald, who are in Chesley, to the congregation there, and also to his friends in Scotland. May the Lord in His mercy console and strengthen them and heal the breach on Zion's walls.

The following extract from Mrs. Scott's letter: "My last letter would prepare you for the sad tidings now. My beloved husband was taken on Tuesday, 18th January, to be, as we believe, for ever with the Lord. His latter end was that of the righteous. I wish you could have been a spectator. On Sabbath night he asked us to assemble at his bedside for worship. He then gave out the 103rd Psalm from the 13th verse, and although in great weakness of body, propped with pillows, he sang with all his heart. Then he asked us to read the 17th chapter of John's Gospel, after which he engaged earnestly in prayer. On Monday afternoon, he said to me, "Well my end is approaching, and for your comfort I wish to say that I am leaning to nothing in myself for there is nothing there but filthy rags but my hope is all centred in the righteousness of Christ, in His finished and perfect work. The blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin." He then continued, "My only regret is leaving the little flock pastorless, but the Lord knows what is best, and He can provide for His own people." The weakness then increased, and he was not able to speak for some hours, when all at once he said distinctly, I am going now; good-bye, my dear ones; the Lord bless and keep you. He will never leave nor forsake you." For several hours after he lingered, the breathing getting gradually less until we thought it had ceased forever, when all of a sudden he raised his head (which before had been sunk for hours) to a sitting posture, with his eyes uplifted and the only way I can express the look of his countenance was a heavenly rapture, a beaming smile overspreading it, and then his mouth formed the word "O!" The next moment, with a gentle sigh the spirit had flown. . . . Among his last wishes was one for an appeal to be forwarded to the Synod for the supply of the congregation."

The following in conclusion, is the sketch of the late Mr. Scott's life as given by the Rev. J. S. Sinclair in the May number of the F.P. Magazine 1916. "We have given a very brief and scanty account of some of the stages of Mr. Scott's career, especially of his time in

Australia, but we hope our friends in the colony will excuse us, as, though much might be written to profit, we cannot unduly enlarge in a general sketch of his life. A brief word in conclusion as to Mr. Scott's character and gifts. No one who knew him could fail to perceive, that he was a man of genuine and elevated piety, who sought above many to live in the fear of God and the faith of Jesus Christ. Several of his brethren at home have frequently borne testimony to Mr. Scott in this respect. He was a man of great conscientiousness in matters of religion, and, though gentle in manner, was an outspoken witness against the evils of the times, indeed everything he considered wrong in doctrine, worship or practice. He was well read in Scottish Church History and was deeply imbued with the teaching of our forefathers at the First and Second Reformations. For the witnesses of the Covenanting period he had the intensest admiration. Mr. Scott's pulpit gifts were above the average. He took a comprehensive view of any subject he handled, and was able to express himself in correct and well cultivated English. He possessed a clear, musical voice, which could be well heard in most buildings, and when he warmed with his subject, he spoke with a flowing unction and earnestness that produced a deep impression on his hearers. He preached the doctrines of Grace with accuracy and fulness and his principal theme was "Jesus Christ and Him crucified." In private intercourse, he was courteous in bearing and affectionate in disposition, and with his extensive knowledge of men and things, proved an instructive conversationalist." J.S.S. (F.P. Magazine Vol. 21.)

Mrs. Scott and her sister, Miss MacDonald, sometime after the death of Mr. Scott, returned to Grafton, where she proved herself a tower of strength to the congregation there for 38 years, till the time of her death on the 9th of June 1959. In her obituary, written by the late Rev. J. P. MacQueen, London, which appears in Vol. 64 of the F.P. Magazine, Mr. MacQueen pays the following tribute to Mr. Scott: "It would be very interesting to give details of Rev.

Walter Scott's ecclesiastical history in Australia, but the exigences of space in our magazine forbids. Suffice it here to say that Mr. Scott, in every aspect of his ministerial career in Australia, closely resembled that of the late and worthy Rev. Donald MacFarlane, Dingwall. They never were physically robust, nor characterised by physical prowess, but what they lacked in this connection they more than made up for in moral and spiritual courage, and firmness, and uncompromising fidelity to principle. Mr. Scott stood in Australia for the same Calvinistic principles of the Free Church of 1843, that Mr. MacFarlane upheld in Scotland. As Mr. MacFarlane found the so-called Constitutionalists in Scotland men of fair speeches and brave words, till testing and trials proved their hollowness, so Mr. Scott found his corresponding ministerial friends in Australia. In the day of trial they made a sudden ecclesiastical somersault, leaving Mr. Scott alone in his uncompromising loyalty to ordination vows, while his former friends became his most unrelenting antagonists, spending the rest of their days using sophistry in self-justification, under the disguise of a monopoly of tenderness of conscience, while cordially abusing Rev. Walter Scott because he would not join them in a treacherous betrayal of the distinctive scriptural testimony of the Free Church of 1843.

In all his contendings, however, for "the faith once delivered to the saints," he found in his life partner, one like-minded with himself, supporting him in his convictions and principles, not only while he lived, but till she breathed her last in time. If the present writer were asked to name Mrs. Scott's outstanding gracious virtues, he would have no hesitation in stating that firm uncompromising loyalty to the principles, convictions, and memory of her worthy saintly husband, stood conspicuous in the life of one who was truly a virtuous woman. Mrs. Scott was a well educated, refined and gentle lady, with ready wit and an entertaining sense of humour, but firm and uncompromising where the principles of eternal, immutable,

infallible truth were concerned. While she frowned unhesitatingly and candidly on any sign of any light-hearted, flippant frivolity, she was an excellent hostess, with her characteristically edifying conversation. She was as uncompromising and convinced a Free Presbyterian as the present writer ever had the privilege of meeting. In her last letter written shortly before the end, to the present writer, in which she ended with the words: "Farewell, farewell, my very dear friend," she remarked: "We are few and feeble here, yet there is still a remnant left who love the old paths, and the walls of Zion." She attended all the services of the Communion dispensed by the Rev. William MacLean, M.A. She deeply appreciated the privilege of this her last communion on earth, as she took ill the following Tuesday, realising that it was the messenger of death. She retained her faculties intact to the end, and passed peacefully away to her everlasting rest and glorious reward. We take advantage of this opportunity to express our deep sympathy with her many relatives and friends, especially to Miss Margaret Grant, who had been her companion in the home for the last eighteen years, and with our dear Grafton congregation, who have lost a true praying friend, and a faithful conscientious witness-bearer. May they be blessed too with similar uncompromising fidelity to principle, and thus be followers of them who through faith and patience, now inherit the promises."

CHAPTER 19

GATHERED FRAGMENTS

Brief Notes of a Sermon

(Taken down by a Hearer)

An impressive service was held in the Free Presbyterian Church, Brushgrove, on Sabbath, 12th November 1905, the occasion being the Rev. W. Scott's again entering the pulpit, after an absence of three months, during which time he had been laid aside from pastoral duties by a very serious illness. The subject of his discourse was Paul's voyage to Rome, the text being Acts 27:20 "And when neither sun nor stars in many days appeared, and no small tempest lay on us, all hope that we should be saved was then taken away."

After introducing the subject, Mr. Scott referred to the fact depicted in the passage, having their counterpart in the life of the individual, there being other deeps besides those of the ocean, voices still crying, "All Thy waves and Thy billows," etc. In such trials of life the religion which Paul possessed was needed. The despair of being saved on the part of the shipmaster and crew, was contrasted with Paul's faith as he wrestled in prayer. Paul prayed not only for himself, but also for his shipmates, thus illustrating the need of our coming to God in all our straits, for ourselves, our dear ones, and for the cause; for "with God all things are possible." The experience was

a happy one, when there were those of this mind, in the congregation or the home, giving God no rest, but coming continually to Him pleading His promises. After discussing Paul's varied and great trials God's providences severely testing his faith Mr. Scott said that their situation, as a congregation, had been a somewhat similar one. In his own case he had been brought so near death, that his medical attendant held out no hope of recovery. So far as man was concerned therefore, "All hope that (he) should be saved was taken away," but man's extremity was God's opportunity, and He had graciously interposed in answer to the prayers offered, by sparing his life. The text had been frequently brought to his mind during his illness, as seeming to reflect, in some sense, his own circumstances; hence his having chosen it now. As at any time such providences might overtake us all. "Do we, like Paul, know this God as our Refuge?" Can we say, in our straits like David, "God is the strength of my heart and my portion for ever"?

In concluding, Mr. Scott pointed out (1) how hard it is to arrest a sinner in his course, although exposed to a storm more dreadful than any mariner had to face on sea. It was not in man as fallen to direct his steps. Yet, like the centurion here with Paul, the sinner rejects the counsel of God and rather consults with flesh and blood. For a time things may go well, but, as in the passage before us, "contrary winds" arise. These should warn the sinner of his danger, and of his need of a guide. "I will guide thee with mine eye." But the wind again "blowing softly" (v. 13), the sinner hardens himself—not accounting that it is but the calm before the storm. He refuses therefore to anchor in the "Fair Havens," offered him in Christ. "O that they were wise," God says, "that they understood this, that they would consider their latter end."

(2) The darkness to which a believer may be left. The text had great meaning for the Christian. The absence of sensible signs of comfort did not discomfit Paul. He prayed. God never leaves nor forsakes

any who trust in Him, yet even the Man of Sorrows was in such darkness that He cried, "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?" We should consider the design of dark providences. We are to walk by faith. God means us to walk humbly, to the purging out of the old leaven, whilst He reminds us also that this is not our rest.

(3) The low condition to which the Church of God may be brought. Why was it told that Enoch and Noah, for instance, walked with God? Was it not because there were no others doing it? Elijah's day was likewise one of general defection from the truth; this prophet had to exclaim accordingly: "I, even I, only am left." In Malachi's time, we find the true fearers of God had to go apart by themselves. Thus isolated from the crowd of unfaithful professors, they had freedom to speak often one to another.

Coming to our own day, was it not foretold that the sun would go down over the prophets; and, again, that the day would be dark over them? In the last days, false Christs and false prophets were to arise, showing signs and wonders, to seduce, if it were possible, even the elect. All this has significance for us. What a light, for instance, the prediction of the Saviour sheds on our experience of almost incredible apostacy, on consequent spiritual darkness! "But in those days, after that tribulation, the sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars of heaven shall fall, and the powers that are in heaven shall be shaken" (Mark 13:24, 25). How otherwise could we explain the treatment which the Word of God is receiving, the extent to which the Sabbath is desecrated, and the sanctuary profaned by human devices? Let us remember, that it was "when neither sun nor stars for many days appeared, and no small tempest lay on them, so that all hope that they should be saved was then taken away," that Paul and his two companions stood their ground. And why? Because they believed God and trusted in His Word. Paul, in such a dark night to the church, is surely an example to us to pray as he did.

At the close of the sermon, Mr. Scott, in thanking brethren and friends for kindness shewn to him during his illness, said, it had been an element of much comfort to him that the services had been maintained in the three centres, viz: Grafton, Brushgrove, and Woodford Dale, during his prolonged absence from their midst, and also that people had been willing to come up to the House of the Lord for prayer and fellowship. He requested his people to hold up his hands by their prayers.

The service was a refreshing one to the congregation, and afforded a token of the Lord's thinking upon them, though poor and needy, in His giving their pastor back to them (as it were) from the very gates of death.

PURITY OF WORSHIP

Among all God's works nothing is so beautiful as His ordinances rightly administered in His Church. "O worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness . . ."

The church is God's sacred domain. Here His authority is supreme. He has appointed her form, ordinances and laws, and He is a rock, His work is perfect. His people, therefore, can acknowledge no lawgiver, judge or king, save Him who is the blessed and only Potentate. "What thing soever I command you, observe to do it: Thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it." (Deut. 12:32).

This principle lies at the foundation of true religion. If the Church is God's building her form and beauty must be perfect. Everything that pertains to her must be enjoined by Him, and His will must therefore be her alone rule. Accordingly at the Reformation, it was upon this principle that the Church of Scotland was established. Nothing was admitted into her constitution that was not divinely prescribed. "All worship, honour, or service, invented by the brain of man in the religion of God, without express commandment,

is idolatry.” This was the principle laid down by John Knox, and, at the Second Reformation the Church of Scotland declared, that “the acceptable way of worshipping the true God is instituted by Himself and so limited by His own revealed will, that He may not be worshipped according to the imaginations and devices of men, or the suggestions of Satan, under any visible representation, or any other way not prescribed in the Holy Scripture” (Confession of Faith ch. 21, Sec. 1). Such was the ground taken up by the Reformed Church. She made the Word of God her rule in Doctrine, Worship, Discipline and Government; and the high degree of purity which she attained was the result. Many daughters had done virtuously, but she excelled them all.

Thomas Brooks, the Puritan divine, says in connection with our subject: “When a man suffers for doing that which Christ commands, then he suffers for well doing, then he suffers as a Christian, and then his cause is good. You know, there is nothing in all the Scripture that God stands more upon than purity of religion, than purity of worship, than purity of ordinances, in opposition to all mixtures and corruptions whatsoever. O sirs! the great God stands upon nothing more in all the world, than upon purity of His worship. There is nothing that doth so provoke and exasperate God against a people, as mixtures in His worship and service; and no wonder! for mixtures in His worship are exactly cross to His commands, and pollutions in worship do sadly reflect upon the name of God, the honour of God, the truth of God; and therefore His heart rises against them.”

But purity of worship consists not only in observing the ordinances in their entirety, but in an intelligent and pious observance of them. May not ministers preach too little on the integral parts of public worship? Consequently may not the people observe them more from habit and in a way of following their ministers; and thus may not innovations get an easier entrance? Once convince the people that their ordinances, their principles, their constitution, and their

attainments, are heaven-born, in that they are parts of unchangeable truth and that they are committed to the custody of the Church as a sacred trust to be kept and observed inviolably they, being rooted and grounded in the faith, will not be readily moved away . . .

At the Reformation, the Church of Scotland, as we have seen, took her stand on the Word of God. Accordingly, at the Westminster Assembly, after a lengthened debate and solemn scriptural inquiry, Presbytery was acknowledged to be, “*the only form* of Church Government authorised by the Word of God.” It was adopted both here and in England and Ireland because of its *divine right*. And here alone lies the value of anything in religion.

The Singing of Psalms in the Worship of God

In the Psalms, God has given the Church infallible security for the purity of His praise. They are the product of the Holy Spirit, and their use is expressly laid down in the New Testament.

“Is any merry? let him sing Psalms” (James 5:13). Why make the singing of inspired Psalms in the Church a matter of positive injunction, if uninspired hymns could also be sung? In Eph. 5:19, the Christians are enjoined to “speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord,” where the apostle, as will afterwards be shown, refers to the threefold division of the inspired Psalmody which had been so long in use in the Church, requiring the Ephesian Christians to substitute its Psalms, Hymns and Spiritual Songs for the odes of the Gentiles.

If, during the former economy, the Psalms of David were exclusively used in the worship of the sanctuary, and they were neither abrogated nor altered by our Lord or His apostles, surely, then, it must be an usurpation of one of the highest prerogatives of the Redeemer, to presume to introduce new Psalms, Paraphrases or

Hymns of our own, into the worship of the Church. "Add thou not unto His words, lest He reprove thee, and thou be found a liar" (Prov. 30:6). Once placed in the worship of the Church by divine authority, none dare displace them but the same "only one blessed Potentate." It was the dignity of His Person, as divine, that gave worth to the atoning sacrifice of Christ. In like manner, He has ordained, that the "sacrifice of praise" to be offered by the Church, shall have the divine impress, that so she may be accepted in Him.

So long as the scriptural simplicity of faith and worship prevailed, so long was there no word of human hymns in the Church. It was not till the errors and ritual of Rome appeared, that the use of the compositions of man with other corruptions of Anti-Christ were in any way sanctioned. . . . We have heard Dr. Begg remark from the pulpit, that when human hymns came to be introduced into the Church, it was a sure sign of the decay of spiritual life. So true is this, that it is a notable circumstance, verified by history, that their introduction in the past has been the fruit of great spiritual declension. Such may be said of Dr. Watt's publications; and need we mention those of Wesley, or to come to our own day those of Moody and Sankey. Indeed not only have the times been times of defection, but the authors have themselves been remarkable for their unsound views; and these views, it cannot be denied, their hymns have been used to promote. Can this be well-pleasing to the Lord? He terms it iniquity. The moment we recognise any authority save God in His house, then He says we defile His Holy name. It is putting a power into the hands of men to prescribe ordinances for the Church equally with God, while He says, "My glory will I not give to another, neither my praise to graven images."

Romaine puts the matter in a true light. He says, "What! say some, is it unlawful to sing human compositions in the Church? How can that be? Why, they sing them at such a place and such a place; great men and good men aye and lively ministers, too, sing them. Will you

set up your judgment against theirs? It is an odious thing to speak of one's self except it be to magnify the grace of God. What is my private judgment? I set it up against nobody in indifferent things. I wish to yield to every man's infirmity for I want the same indulgence myself. But in the present case, the Scripture, which is the only rule of judgment, has not left the matter indifferent. God has given us a large collection of hymns and has commanded them to be sung in the Church, and has promised His blessing to the singing of them. No respect here must be paid to names or authorities, though they be the greatest on earth, because no one can dispense with the command of God, and no one, by his wit, can compose hymns to be compared with the Psalms of God. I want a name for that man who should pretend that he could make better hymns than the Holy Ghost. His collection is large enough; it wants no addition. It is perfect as its Author, and not capable of any improvement. Why, in such a case, would any man in the world take into his head to sit down to write hymns for the use of the Church? It is just the same as if he was to write a new Bible, not only better than the old, but so much better, that the old may be thrown aside. What a blasphemous attempt! and yet our hymn-mongers, inadvertently, I hope, have come very near to this blasphemy; for they shut out the Psalms, introduce their own verses into the Church, sing them with great delight, and, as they fancy, with great profit, although the whole practice be in direct opposition to the command of God and, therefore, they cannot possibly be accompanied with the blessing of God."

Paraphrases

The Paraphrases had their origin during the dark days of Moderatism in the Church of Scotland. . . . The objections which militate against hymns, apply equally to Paraphrases. In some respect they are

more dangerous than hymns. Unlike hymns, they profess to be a paraphrase or translation in verse of passages of Scripture, while in many cases, entirely misrepresenting the meaning of the sacred text. But what device has not been tried, whereby to get something of man into the ordinances of God? When the evil one cannot get man to give up the worship of God he does the next best by getting them to corrupt it. As a divine of the Reformation period says: "What God appoints is an ornament, hath beauty, is for glory, but let men set up ought in the worship of God, it hath no beauty but blackness, no holiness but iniquity, and God must be worshipped in the beauty of holiness." (1 Chron. 16:29)

INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC

Did the use, then, of instrumental music, in the worship of God belong exclusively, like sacrifice and incense, to the Ceremonial Dispensation? That it did, we think, will appear if we consider the nature of ceremonial rites. One of their chief characteristics was, that they typified something to be more fully revealed and set forth under the Gospel. But that instrumental music was typical of the praises of the Christian Church cannot be denied. It is spoken of in the New Testament in connection with incense, an emblem of prayer. "And when He had taken the book, the four beasts and four and twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps, and golden vials full of odours, which are the prayers of saints" (Rev. 5:8). If the vials full of odours were types of the prayers of the church, it must follow that the harps represented her praises. Hence in the verse following after, referring to the harps, it is said "they sung a new song."

The use of instrumental music in the Old Testament was a ceremonial rite. It was no casual thing. It formed the principal part of the Old Testament worship (Numbers 10:1-10). It was a constant

attendant of sacrifice, intimately connected with it from the days of David, and the blowing of trumpets from the days of Moses. (2 Chron. 29:24, 27, 28). All these ceremonial observances are no longer in force. And can we except instrumental music? On the contrary, Dr. Begg, in his *Treatise on Organs*, remarks that “as the sacrifices under the law terminated in the death and sacrifice of Christ, it is most reasonable to conclude that all the concomitants of the typical service were also abolished with them.” Accordingly in the whole of the New Testament no mention is made of instrumental music being used in the worship of God. On the other hand, it is clearly stated what the worship of God is to be. Paul, writing to the Hebrews about the doing away of their priests, sacrifices, and all that pertains to the “worldly sanctuary,” says most emphatically, “By Him therefore let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually,” and lest there should be any misunderstanding, or any should think this praise was to include instrumental music, he adds a particular definition of what he means. “That is,” says he, “the fruit of our lips giving thanks to His name.” (Heb. 13:15).

We search in vain for any direction or example in favour of musical instruments in the New Testament.

There was no instrumental music in the Primitive Church. Clement of Alexandria who was born about the year 150, contrasts the worship of the Christians with the instruments used by the heathen at their idolatrous worship, and says: “We Christians make use of only one organ or instrument, even the peaceful Word with which we honour God: no longer with the old psaltery, trumpet, drum or cymbal and pipe, and commence the blessing, and praising of God by Thanksgiving and Singing of Psalms.”

Chrysostom who flourished about the year 400, remarks on Psalm 110: “As therefore the Jews did praise the Lord with all instruments, so we are, in like manner, commanded to glorify God with our members. Let no man deceive you: these (musical instruments) are

alien to the Catholic Church, all these things do the nations of the world seek after.”

Having seen that instrumental music in the worship of God was not authorised by Christ or His apostles, nor used by the Primitive Church, we have now to show that its introduction belonged to a corrupt era, when darkness was again “covering the earth and gross darkness the people.” Like human hymns and other corruptions in the worship of God, instrumental music owes its origin to Popery.

Bellarmino, the Romish author, states that the organ began to be used in the service of the Church about the year 660, and that when Pope Vitallian reformed the singing of the Roman Church, he added to it organs in order to support and embellish it.

After the long night of popish idolatry and superstition, the dawn of the Reformation was the signal of light and purity. Accordingly, at the Reformation from Popery in Scotland, the worship of God was purged from all those corrupt practices by which it had been polluted, and restored to its original simplicity and purity.

Scotland was not alone in abolishing the use of organs at the Reformation: the same is recorded of the Reformed Churches of Germany, France, Piedmont, Helvetia, Transylvania, and most of the Reformed Churches of Poland, Sweden, Denmark, the United Provinces of Holland, England, and to a great extent, Ireland. Luther, according to Eckhart, a German doctor of theology, considered musical instruments among the badges of Baal (*organa musica inter Baalis insignia refert*).

Calvin in his commentary on Exodus 15:20 says: “Instrumental music is not fitted to be adopted into the public worship of the Christian Church any more than incense, the candlestick, and the shadows of the Mosaic Law. . . . We know that our Lord Jesus Christ has appeared and, by His advent, has abolished these legal shadows. For instruments of music in gospel times, we must not have recourse

to these, unless we wish to destroy the evangelical perfection and to obscure the meridian light which we enjoy in Christ our Lord.”

We are told that the use of instrumental music is not forbidden in Scripture. This is a dangerous principle to go upon. In the case of Nadab and Abihu, it was for offering “strange fire before the Lord, *which He commanded them not*” that “fire went out from the Lord and devoured them.” The example of Artaxerxes, a heathen monarch, is a reproof of those who use this argument. In his royal decree he orders “whatsoever is commanded by the God of heaven, to be diligently done for the house of the God of heaven” and he adds as the reason “for why should there be wrath against the realm of the king and his sons?” (Ezra 7:23). But is the use of instrumental music not forbidden? Does not Christ Himself lay down the opposite principle as our rule? “Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you” (Matt. 28:20), intimating that a divine command is necessary as our warrant for every observance in the Church, and that therefore, “In vain do they worship Me teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.” Of the tribe of Judah, Moses “saith nothing” concerning priesthood. Hence Paul inferred that there was nothing: and so nothing is said of instrumental music in the New Testament.

It is said that the use of organs lends a majesty to the worship and inspires a reverence and veneration in the worshippers. In answer, we say, that the thrill of music and the divine joys of the soul are very different things. But the argument supposes that we may accommodate the worship of God to our own tastes and feelings; and papists plead the same things for their images, tapers, etc.: But God says of such, “Who hath required this at your hand?” There never was a corruption in the Church which was not introduced under plausible pretence. The will-worship and carnal inventions of primitive times had a show of wisdom and humility (Col. 2:23). “Beware,” says the apostle, “lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit

after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world and not after Christ" (Col. 2:8). Charnock observes that "when God has by His sovereign order formed a religion for the heart, men are ready to usurp authority to frame one for the sense: to dress the ordinances of God in new and gaudy habits to take the eye or the ear with a vain pomp."

In connection with choirs and singing in parts, the evils which necessarily attend such a state of things are obvious. Luther introduced harmony or singing in parts into the service, but Calvin refused to admit anything but the simple melody. With choirs and organs, instead of the praise being the spiritual sacrifice of Scripture, it degenerates into mere sensuous enjoyments. The music is rendered in the finest style to gratify the audience, thereby profanity is not only practised in the house of God, but there is a worshipping and serving of the creature more than the Creator. The sacred song is the entertainment, the choir is the entertainer, and the congregation the entertained. Thus amusement is afforded, and the third commandment is broken. The singers admit that they cannot think of the language they are using, as all their attention is required for the music. And can a Church be blameless in allowing such a thing? Moreover, when the desire for such entertainment has been created and fostered by the profane use of Scripture, is it to be wondered at that the organs are longed for? The late Dr. Lee uses this very thing as a plea for organs. He says: "You have introduced choirs . . . you have done twenty things and you have not received the sanction of any Presbytery," "and who," he asks, "should require authority for his innovations?"

We cannot, then, but regard the existence of choirs as in themselves unnecessary, and as highly detrimental to the interests of Purity of Worship.

Standing at Singing an Innovation

Along with the introduction of choirs, etc., came also the practice of standing at the singing. As sitting during the prayer is so intimately connected with the practice so largely prevailing of standing at praise, Mr. Scott quotes an extract from Nicolts Diary (Oct. 1662, p. 382), showing that standing at praise was an innovation introduced into the Church when Episcopacy had the ascendancy in the country.

Unfermented Wine at the Lord's Supper An Innovation

Merely referring to the use of unfermented wine in the Lord's Supper, it is to be observed that Paul when writing to the Corinthians, charging them with abusing the Sacrament of the supper, remonstrates with them for drinking to excess: "One is hungry and another is drunken." Here the word used is 'methuei' which denotes being intoxicated, and is the same word used in Matt. 24:49 "and shall begin to smite his fellow servants and to eat and drink with the drunken" 'meta ton methuonton.' This shows us that it was fermented wine that the Corinthians used at the Communion Table, and Paul rebukes them, not for so doing, but only for drinking it to excess.

(The above—Purity of Worship, The Singing of Psalms, etc., etc., are extracts from Mr. Scott's Essay, "The Pattern on the Mount," written when he was a student at the Edinburgh University.)

THE ELEVENTH HOUR

Christ saves to the uttermost. He is able to do so. Such is the merit and efficacy of His sacrifice. Such is His power as a priest upon His throne. Thus, He goes out early in the morning to hire labourers into His vineyard. About the third hour He says to others, "Go ye also into the vineyard." Again, about the sixth and ninth hour He does likewise: "All day long I have stretched forth my hands unto a

disobedient and gainsaying people” (Rom. 10:21). At the closing of the day He finds others standing idle. He says even to them, “Go ye also into the vineyard,” although the day is far spent, for already it is “about the eleventh hour.” Yet it is still day, and He says, “I must work the works of him that sent me, while it is day: the night cometh, when no man can work” (John 9:4). “Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him” (Heb. 7:25). Scripture has its encouragements to early piety; yet salvation is of grace, and of grace so abounding that, late in the day as a sinner may feel it to be, he may not despair if then, he makes haste and delays not to keep His commandments (Psalms 119:60). How alarmingly near to the final reckoning is the eleventh hour; yet, with the judgment almost upon them, there are those—alas, how many!—still “standing idle.” The day of grace expiring! The last sermons, the last invitations, the last warnings, reaching the sinner! O glorious grace that says even then, “Go ye also into the vineyard!”

Of such precious and solemn truth, the writer has had occasion to feel the reality. In the course of his ministry on the Clarence River, N.S.W., no deathbed scene more remained with him than that of a young man in his congregation—James M’Phee, Clarenza—at the eleventh hour, as it seemed, delivered from going down into the pit. Now some ten years ago, at the very moment of attaining to full manhood (on 7th June, 1902), this bright youth was suddenly brought to face death. Pneumonia was the malady which so fatally seized him. He had been a church-goer, but hitherto a stranger to grace. And now, so terrible was the destruction which wasted at noon-day of that young man’s career, that, once seized, there was but the step of a few days between him and eternity. “Behold, I come as a thief” (Rev. 16:15).

On the previous Sabbath, as the writer well remembers, his eye had been specially directed towards him whilst preaching from Hebrews 4:16: “Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of

grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need." During the sermon, he even felt led to direct the message to him in particular. It was the end of the same week that God's hand came so irresistibly upon him. To the stricken one himself, as he said, it immediately presaged death. Of that he felt so satisfied, that he could not go up to the bed, which he apprehended would be his deathbed, without seeking first to be brought to peace with God. With the deadly disease already upon him, but with consciousness yet undisturbed, he fell on his knees and prayed as never before for the mercy that he needed through Jesus Christ. He recognised himself a lost sinner, needing salvation, and that his time was short; and he wrestled in prayer. This was his own account to the writer. Nor did he rise till, as he indicated, he was made willing to die, trusting in Christ as his Saviour.

To that exercise, to which he had felt impelled as on the verge of eternity—to what then passed between his soul and God, as so strangely brought to his knees with such trouble upon him—must be traced, the hope that he had in his death. To it we seemed pointed, under God, for the change which then became manifest. For, once laid down, great was the struggle between life and death. By and by delirium set in; yet there were bright intermissions in which the state of his mind found wonderful expression. To these the reader is pointed for his dying testimony. Free access to the sick chamber was allowed to interested friends and companions. To such, as well as to his minister, he addressed himself from time to time. He spoke not only as a dying man, but out of the abundance of his heart, and in such manner as had never been his wont. He acknowledged the vain life he had lived—only desiring life prolonged, that he might live differently. He professed his faith in Christ and his trust in Him in view of death, which he recognised as very near. Prostrated as he was, he, without scruple, went to work in the vineyard, it was the eleventh hour, but he was as one doing with his might what his

hand found to do. Thus, while consciousness lasted, he exhorted those around him. He warned his youthful companions, gathered at his bedside, to forsake their way and turn to the Lord—pointing them to his own case in connection with the danger of delay and the awfulness, as he said, of entering eternity unprepared. It was with affecting solemnity that he bade comrade-lads who came into his room, to flee from their sins to the Saviour, not knowing in what hour the Lord would come. Those whom he thus charged, were taken aback—so great was the change. Nor had they witnessed the like before. One or two, on getting outside, attempted to jeer, saying, “Oh, he’s turned preacher!”—so completely nonplussed were they by their unexpected experience. Ah, have not men even, and rulers, derided in circumstances unspeakably more solemn? The writer, on his part, felt the moving effect of the scene witnessed, and of the appeals of that young man in the very grip of death. Not only did he plead with those at his bedside to take warning by his case, and to repent without delay and turn to God; but he testified again, to his deepest sorrow, that he had lived as he had done—without God. He had seen his error, and it made him agonize in death over his near acquaintances beseeching them to come to the Saviour in the day of opportunity.

Thus did he spend his remaining strength while the hand of death was paralysing him, and life was fast ebbing. The persuasion of its being his last illness remained with him, despite the fact that everything was been done medically at the instance of grief-stricken relatives to arrest the disease—such grief meantime, however, only intensifying, by the life of one of the parents (the pious mother) being equally threatened. He had no resentment at his condition. He was not afraid to die, he said: he was trusting in Christ. Yet, he exclaimed, if he had his life to live over again, it would be to live very differently. Anxious to use his latest breath seeking the salvation of his associates, he expressed regret when disabled. During his ravings

he was troubled lest his repentance was not genuine. His thoughts, even in delirium, were all of his soul, as now entering the great eternity. And thus it was that his spirit returned to God who gave it.

Reader, have you considered your latter end and how near it may be? It is a solemn thing to see one die. In this case, it was not the wasted, emaciated frame, the effect of age or lingering disease. It was the strong youth, in his 21st year, suddenly arrested in his life's course. The powerful arm was there, apparently unchanged: yet was life ebbing from it. Under the delirium, it seemed, for the moment, stronger than ever; again, it lay motionless, powerless. Soon the cheeks became sunken and hollow; the eyes glazed and vacant; the features sharp. There were the death throes. The earthly house of this tabernacle—how quickly it was dissolving! Yet the heart remained strong, and still life lingered, but all unconscious. Life pulsed; but there was neither voice nor any to answer. A few days had sufficed to bring this strong, active youth to the dust of death. Reader, "Because I will do this unto thee, prepare to meet thy God" (Amos 4:12).

The outward man here was perishing, but what of the soul? A conflict was being waged, greater than that with flesh and blood. Realities unseen were here involved. Had the spark of grace been kindled in that soul? Was the prey being taken from the mighty? Was the inward man being renewed? Eternity will reveal it.

To the writer looking on, nothing could be more solemn and affecting than that last struggle. Here was one of his flock to whom, as a hearer in the pew, his eye had been directed so recently; now, alas, in the very jaws of death, yet testifying that, in the brief interval, he had come boldly to the throne of grace, and had obtained mercy, and was finding grace to help in his time of need. "And the Lord said unto Satan, The Lord rebuke thee, O Satan; even the Lord that hath chosen Jerusalem rebuke thee: is not this a brand plucked out of the fire?" (Zech. 3:2). (FP. Mag., Vol. 16, p. 469).

CHAPTER 20

THE HEADSHIP OF CHRIST OVER THE NATIONS

Among the people to whom the Rev. Walter Scott ministered in Ontario, were the followers of the Rev. Lachlan MacPherson, East Williams, who died in 1886, and of the Rev. John Ross, Brucefield, who died in 1887, two eminent and faithful servants of Christ who refused to enter the Canadian Presbyterian Union in 1875. In the reasons they state in their Protest against the Union, *inter alia*, was the place given to Voluntaryism in the basis for union, and as a consequence no recognition of the Headship of Christ over the Nations. Two elders who were members of Assembly, Donald Fraser, East Williams, and George Forrest, Brucefield, also signed the Protest.

But is the doctrine of the Headship of Christ over the nations of much practical importance as regards church life in this new world?" said one who strongly favoured the Union, to the Rev. John Ross.

"It is of practical importance here and now," he answered, "to bid the sabbath trains stop their wheels and their whistles on the Lord's Day; and to put the Word of God as a text-book in the hand of every scholar educated in the public schools; and it shall have more

marvellous application still in the days that are close upon us. My own conviction is, that this is the doctrine that shall yet demand its martyrs. Christ as Prophet has had His witnesses. How many men and women have perished at the stake rather than give up the Word of God as their guide. Christ as Priest has had His witnesses, who sealed their testimony with their blood, refusing to honour any sacrifice but His, or to approach God through any mediator but Himself. Christ as King over His own church has had His cloud of witnesses, when Scotchmen would cry with their dying breath, 'though every hair on my head were a life, I would give them all for the crown rights of my Redeemer.' Jesus Christ as King over the nations has yet to be vindicated. That will be the last pre-millennial conflict, when the Lord shall send out of Zion the rod of His strength, and rule in the midst of His enemies. But our Zion has just taken the rod of His strength, which is His sceptre, and decided that it is of no practical importance in these modern times. It is the case of the Scribes and Pharisees over again. This is the stone which God's accredited builders are again rejecting, but it shall yet be made the head of the corner. . . .

"The Headship of Christ over the Church, and the Headship of Christ over the nations, are the two principles for which the true Church of Scotland has contended all through her history, and these are the two principles which shall not only introduce, but maintain the Kingdom of Christ in its Millennial glory all through to the end. Look at the 19th chapter of Revelation. You will find them both there, and both in such a very prominent position that they are given as the two published *names* of the Divine Rider. His name is called *The Word of God*. In going forth to do battle under that name, He certainly goes to bring a people under positive and unreserved subjection to the Word of God, and that is simply asserting and establishing His own absolute Headship over them. But He has another conspicuous name. 'He hath on His vesture and on His thigh a name written *King*

of Kings and Lord of Lords.’ In going forth to do battle under that name, He certainly goes to bring kings and their kingdoms under positive and unreserved subjection to Himself, and to Himself as *The Word of God*. And so real is their subjection in the end, that He shall ‘rule them with a rod of iron.’ If that is not asserting His Headship over the nations and winning it too, what is it? You can catch His tone towards the kings of the earth in the gracious but authoritative counsel given to them in the 2nd Psalm, ‘Be wise now therefore, O ye kings, be instructed ye judges of the earth. Serve the Lord with fear and rejoice with trembling. Kiss the Son lest He be angry and ye perish from the way, when His wrath is kindled but a little.’ But according to the prophetic picture, no large proportion of the kings take this kindly counsel. At least there are many who do not. In the 110th Psalm the Lord is represented as striking through kings in the day of His wrath, and in Revelation birds are invited to feast upon the flesh of kings and the flesh of captains. It must be either submit or perish that day.

“Then you think that Christ’s people, under the invisible but actual Headship of Christ Himself, shall literally ‘take the kingdom and dominion and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven?’—that they shall assert and establish His right to control, not His church only, but the whole world, according to the laws laid down in the Word of God?

“That is it exactly. And it is quite possible that it shall be done according to established constitutional principles. Two things will probably go together: 1st The most tremendous political confusion and bloodshed, signs enough of which have for years been showing themselves; and 2nd, The quickening, consolidation and marvellous growth of that inner church, scattered all throughout the present visible church—the actual gathering together of those ‘armies of heaven’ on ‘white horses’ going out after the august Rider, who is their Leader. Now, remember these two forces will be at work

together, death and destruction, making awful havoc of human life on the one side, and a present though invisible Lord developing beauty and power and numbers on the other.

“Take your own city. Fasten your eyes on it, and watch the necessary action of these two forces. Soon ‘the people of the saints of the Most High’ would be in the majority, and once there what would they do? Would they not quickly fill all the municipal offices not merely with respectable, moral men, but with men after God’s own heart? From the mayor down to the policemen parading the streets, the uppermost thought of each officer would be how, in the wisest and most effectual way, he could rid the city of every temptation to iniquity, and bring all its institutions and inhabitants up to the closest accord with the Word of God. Let these two forces work on through the whole world, and you see what the necessary consequences would be, and without anything we call a miracle, excepting this, the complete subjection of Christ’s people to His Word.

“But it will be a time of tremendous conflict. The Devil will fight for every inch of ground. The victory will be granted simply because ‘greater is He that is with us than he that is with them.’ It will again be a trial of strength between the Son of God and the god of this world.

“I see, once Jesus Christ is established as actual Head over His own Church, that Church, under His leadership, shall have purpose and power enough, perhaps by the ordinary machinery of constitutional government, to establish Him as King of all the kings and governments of the world?

“Yes. The whole Millennium springs from the church being brought actually to yield to the Headship of Christ over herself; and it culminates and continues by the world being brought, by means of that now loyal church, actually to submit to the Headship of Christ over the nations.

“The First Resurrection”

“What do you understand by the first resurrection, Revelation 20:4, 5, 6?”

“During that thousand years Christ will be actual King over the whole earth, King of its kings as well as over His own church. But He will govern—not visibly in His own person, but by means of some constitutional government in each country. Whether the chief magistrate in any given kingdom be a king or a president will not matter; he will really execute the duties of a lieutenant-governor under the Lord Jesus Christ. The office of legislators will be to work out the principles laid down in the Word of God to the special circumstances of the people over whom they are appointed; the work of judges, to apply the laws so made to special cases, who, during the thousand years, shall occupy these ‘thrones of judgment.’ Men in the very spirit and power of the apostles themselves. The heroes and martyrs of old shall all as it were, come back again, not now to be the ‘off-scouring of the earth,’ but to be leaders of the people, ‘to live and reign with Christ a thousand years.’ A Martin Luther shall again, but effectually this time, rein in the Germans to do the will of God ‘as it is done in heaven.’ A John Calvin shall be the chief magistrate in France and mould that whole nation as he was never able to control Geneva. A John Knox shall take the reins of the British Empire, if it outlasts the earthquakes of the preceding years, and work out the constitution of the ideal church of Christ with no Queen Mary to fight against him. Queen Mary shall remain in her grave. ‘The rest of the dead live not again till the thousand years are fulfilled.’

“You know the promise in the last of Malachi, ‘Behold I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord.’ This is explicit, yet how has it been fulfilled? Not by the sending down of the actual body and soul that went up to heaven in the fiery chariot, but by giving a son to Zacharias and Elizabeth

in their old age, and by giving him enduement of the Spirit of God like to that bestowed upon the ancient prophet, so that in God's sight he stepped forth among men verily another Elijah. Is not that a fair precedent for the interpretation I have just put upon the 'first resurrection'?" (From "The Man With the Book or Memoirs of Rev. John Ross of Brucefield," Ontario).

1. As it is in the latter day glory that Christ's Headship over the nations will be acknowledged, Professor John Brown, of Haddington, makes the following comment on the twentieth chapter of the Revelation of John:

"The glory and happiness of this thousand years' reign of the saints is to be understood, not literally but spiritually and figuratively, according to the common style of the book, it could not consist with the happiness of the saints to leave the heavenly mansions, and live in bodies needing meat and drink: nor, if their bodies were raised spiritual and incorruptible, would they need any such thing; and in vain would Satan instigate the wicked to war against, and cut off, spiritual and incorruptible bodies. The dead in Christ are also represented as all rising together at the last day. And a proper resurrection is never in Scripture represented as a *reviving* or *living again* of the soul, but of the body. The resurrection of the martyrs' and confessors' souls here spoken of must therefore mean, not the resurrection of these deceased persons; but the remarkable reformation, deliverance, comfort, and activity of the Church in their successors. (Rom. 11:15; Ezk. 42:1-14; Psalm 85:6; Hosea 6:2-3; Zech. 10:1) . And as Elijah is represented as living in John the Baptist, and Anti-Christian Rome is called in this Book, Sodom, Egypt and Babylon, on account of her likeness to them in luxury, cruelty, pride, and idolatry, so the ancient martyrs will live in the Christians of this period (the Millennium) being united to the same Head, members of the same body, and of the same temper, faith, patience, zeal and fortitude, and professing the same Gospel truths. And this

restoration of the church to this peaceable and glorious state, after a long death under the reign of Anti-Christ, in which multitudes of Jews and Gentiles shall be converted to Christ, and shall enjoy much spiritual, delightful and honourable fellowship with Christ, and with one another, and have the governing power in the earth, is called 'the first resurrection,' as it is a figure and pledge of the general Resurrection of the saints to eternal life at the last day. The wicked will not live again till the end of the thousand years, that is, they will be reduced to the same condition in which Christ's slain witnesses were a little before (Chapter 11:7-9), having no authority, power or activity, to make head against Christ and His Cause.

"Gog and Magog here include the wicked everywhere in the world, instigated by Satan to embolden their spirits and combine in a furious and desperate attack upon the Church, which shall issue in a manner more or less dreadful than the last efforts of Anti-Christ."

2. Dr. Wylie in his book *The Great Exodus* gives the following graphic description of this symbolic resurrection.

"The souls of them that were slain for the witness of Jesus shall rise all over Europe. Huss and Jerome shall come from their stake; Hamilton and Wishart, Cranmer and Ridley shall revive from their ashes, and Luther, Calvin and Knox shall stand up from their graves. The martyrs shall arise from the plains of France, from the snows of the Alps, from the lagunes of Venice, from the fens of Holland, and from the moors of Scotland, not in their bones and dust, but in their spirit and power. They will rise in their memories, that these may be vindicated, and that the cruel sentences, which assigned them to the fire, may be reversed. They will rise in their principles, that these may be justified as righteous and holy. They will rise in their cause, that it may be acquitted from the condemnation passed on it by man; and, in the triumph of the systems and churches founded on the principles for which they died, they will enjoy a lasting and glorious reign with Christ their Head. On that day God will roll away

the cloud of obloquy that rested above their graves; their stakes will be converted into thrones; their names will emerge from the black cloud in which they set; and, through all the ages of the future, they will be honoured as the world's greatest benefactors who handed down the truth by their sufferings and blood. "The Great Exodus," p. 79.

CHAPTER 21

CHURCH AND STATE

The establishment principle is a principle which, in the words of Dr. Kennedy Dingwall, “is not only worth living for, but a principle worth dying for.” The following extracts are from three lectures on Church and State by the late Rev. James Kerr, D.D., Glasgow, and printed in May, 1893.

Passages Teaching the Doctrine

The doctrine of Establishment is taught in countless passages of the Divine Word, it is taught by the approved examples of kings and their nations toward the Church, by warning of judgments, by prediction and otherwise. In vain will the “Christian secularist” find a single passage forbidding the civil ruler to give preference to the Church of Christ, much less branding such action as intolerance.

“The Lord God of heaven hath given me all the kingdoms of the earth, and He hath charged me to build Him an house at Jerusalem.” (Ezra 1:2)

“Whatsoever is commanded of the God of heaven, let it be diligently done for the house of the God of heaven; for why should there be wrath against the realm of the king and his sons.” (Ezra 7:23)

“God is gone up with a shout, the Lord with the sound of a trumpet. . . . For God is King of all the earth. . . . The princes of the people are gathered together, even the people of the God of Abraham; for the shields of the earth belong unto God; He is greatly exalted.” (Psalm 47:5, 7, 9)

“Because of Thy temple at Jerusalem shall kings bring presents unto Thee.” (Psalm 68:29)

“The kings of Tarshish and of the isles shall bring presents; the kings of Sheba and Seba shall offer gifts. Yea, all kings shall fall down before Him; all nations shall serve Him.” (Psalm 72:10, 11)

“Kings shall be thy (the Church) nursing fathers and their queens thy nursing mothers.” (Isaiah 49:23)

“The nation and kingdom that will not serve thee (the Church) shall perish; yea those nations shall be utterly wasted.” (Isaiah 60:12)

“Behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of Days, and they brought Him near before Him. And there was given Him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations and languages should serve Him.” (Daniel 7:13, 14)

“The Father hath set Him at His own right hand in the heavenly places; and hath put all things under His feet, and given Him to be the Head over all things to the Church.” (Ephesians 1:20, 22)

“The kingdoms of the world are become the kingdoms of the Lord and of His Anointed.” (Rev. 11:15)

Can any student of these passages, with a spark of intelligence, allege that their spirit and letter are not violated by the theory which demands that kings and nations give no preference to the true religion and Church of Christ? In the face of such passages, how does a Christian ruler place on an equality with Christianity, the systems of infidelity and idolatry? How does he maintain that his duty is fully discharged in simply giving “heaven’s truth a fair field

against the devil's lie?" That his duty is fully discharged in taking care that the combatants—the true Church and false Churches—have secured to them fair play in the arena of conflict! No special favour to the bride of Christ among the wolves! Such heartless, Christless policy must draw down from heaven the wrath of an angry God. But among the "all things put under His feet" for the Church's sake, are nations and their sovereigns. When they realise their position and place themselves where the Father has placed them, "under His feet," then they are on the way to honour. "Under His feet" for Christ's sake, they are raised to royal dignity for the Church's sake, for they that honour the royal Bride shall be honoured by the royal Bridegroom.

Opposition to Biblical Doctrine

Religious equality denies the doctrine of Christ's Kingship of the nations. The Lord Jesus is vested by the Father with the entire powers of the Imperial Throne, and His dominion includes nations in their corporate character as well as the individual subjects. They are not, while His subjects individually, at liberty to reject or ignore Him nationally. As nations, they are not swung loose from His dominion and dismissed on a career of self-directed lawlessness. While professing to serve Him, they are not to frame their laws so that His presence in their nation might not be known. The action of any dependency of Britain in professing loyalty to the Queen, while carefully ignoring the mention of her name and titles in their official procedure, lest her enemies might be offended, would justly be regarded as disaffection and treason. By its demand upon the nation not to favour the true religion, religious equality deprives the nation of one of its highest privileges, shuts Christ out of one province of His delegated dominions, and curtails and dismembers the empire of the King Universal. It is an honour to kings to favour and support

the cause for which the King of kings lived in poverty and died on the cross.

Besides, religious equality is opposed to the Reformation so much advanced in these Covenanted lands. The Reformers applied the doctrines of the Scriptures to the public institutions of the kingdom. The nation as such boldly confessed the Lord as King. It was the age of Parliamentary deeds in defence of Christianity, and, therefore, an age in which free States and Constitutions sprang into existence. On the duty of nations and their rulers serving the Lord, there was not a note of discord among all the Reformers. Nonconformists, Episcopalians, Independents, Presbyterians, all held firmly by the obligations resting upon the nation and civil rulers, as such, to profess and support the cause of the Lord and His anointed. The theory of religious equality* was not so much as dreamt of in those days. The statement made by a committee of advocates of the theory, that the application of it would “complete the work of Reformation,” bears its absurdity on its unblushing forehead. Had these “apostles of toleration” lived and prevailed three centuries ago, not a single Act in favour of the Reformation could have been entered on the Statute

* “The Presbyterian Church of America in 1788 changed the chapters and sections of the Confession of Faith dealing with the Civil Magistrate (the state or the nation) in order to make them conform to the new (and false) doctrines of separation of Church and State, and the equality of all religions before the Law, which the Anabaptists (wrongly called ‘Baptists’) and Jeffersonians (followers of Thomas Jefferson, the deistic rationalist) had succeeded in putting across in the new land, and were about to write into the First Amendment to the United States Constitution. We showed from the history of the period, as given in the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, that the Presbyterians in America were in perfect agreement with the Anabaptists and Jeffersonians in this matter and had co-operated with them in their efforts to write these new doctrines into the Government’s Constitution.” (*The Contender*, Nova Scotia, April 1957). W.M.

Book of the realm. There are still some who garnish the sepulchres of the martyrs while proving their direct descent from those who slew them.”

Scriptural Alliance Possible

Some contend that a Scriptural Establishment is impossible, as no Establishments exist in which the liberties of the Church are properly secured; and they, therefore, repudiate all proposals of a proper Establishment as chimerical and utopian. But does the abuse of a doctrine warrant its disuse and abandonment? Is there any institution or right that might not for similar reasons be abolished? The Reformers before the Reformation, in the presence of the apostasies of the Church accumulating for more than ten centuries, might have contended that the construction of a Scriptural Church was impossible. The Martyrs before the Revolution might have relinquished their struggle, alleging that the construction of a free State was impracticable. If tyrants are on thrones, must monarchies and governments be overthrown? If there be corrupt judges, shall the Bench be abolished? If the rights of conscience be abused, will men abnegate the right of private judgment? And though a thousand States had oppressed and enslaved a thousand churches, does it follow that there cannot be any Establishment conservative of the respective rights of both Church and State? In the presence of the existence of Erastian Establishments, it is all the more necessary that all noble-minded members of the Church and citizens should bestir themselves to bring Church and State into subjection to Christ, and both into an alliance productive of each other's prosperity, and honouring to their common Lord. The refusal to grasp and apply a scriptural doctrine, while surrounded with abuses however monstrous, may indicate lack of courage and intellectual power. “In the midst of contrary impulses,” writes a philosopher, “he alone

evinces the superiority and the strength of his mind, who is able to disentangle truth from error. Such are the men whom nature marks out to be the lights of the world, to fix the wavering opinions of the multitude, and to impress their own characters on that of their age.”

In raising this imperial structure, there is necessity, first of all, for the foundation stone. This Stone of foundation has been laid from eternity; and when the ecclesiastical and political builders shall have ceased to reject it, it shall become the Head of the corner also. The edifice must begin with Him who sits on the Throne of the worlds—that Throne before which all consciences must bow and from which all rights must be received. The beginning must be made where John began in Patmos when he was about to look upon a panorama of providence to come: “Behold a throne was set in heaven and One sat on the throne.” A sound theology about the enthronement of Christ is necessary to sound churchmanship and sound statesmanship as well—a sound polity and a sound policy. There must be a clear apprehension, and a loyal acceptance of the universal supremacy of the Lord Jesus Christ. He is the great, only Plenipotentiary of heaven, “Ruling under the throne of the Father, ruling for the Father, ruling by the law of the Father, to the utmost bound of the entire universe of God.” The Son of Man, on His coronation, received lordship over a dominion extending from the roofless heaven to the bottomless pit. This dominion included many kingdoms; so that the imagery of the Apocalypse which represents Him as having “on His head many crowns” is possessed of an appropriate sublimity. On the throne of His Supremacy, He commands all kingdoms to serve Him in the advancement of the glory of the everlasting Father and Lord.

The Establishment at the Reformation

The Establishment reared by the Scottish Reformers in the best times of the Reformation, stands in history as a refutation of the opinion

that Church and State cannot be nearly allied without the surrender of freedom. The Reformers, without exception, maintained the principle of Establishments and urged upon the nation the duty of acknowledging and rendering support to the Church of Christ. Their convictions on this question are often dealt with unjustly by the opponents of this principle. The author of a prize essay on "Civil Establishments of Christianity Indefensible" cites in illustration of his argument, the address of Andrew Melville to James VI, giving, however, that part only which bears on the headship of Christ over the Church and excluding the part referring to the king's duty to the Church. "Thair is Chryst Jesus the King and His kingdom, the kirk, whase subject King James is, and of whase kingdom nocht a king, nor a lord, nor a heid, but a member." But the quotation should have been continued. "Those whom Christ hath called and commanded to watch over His Church have power and authority from Him to govern His spiritual kingdom both jointly and severally; the which no Christian king or prince should control and discharge but *fortify and assist, otherwise they are not faithful subjects of Christ and members of the Church.*" To cite Andrew Melville as a supporter of the independence of the Church to the exclusion of establishment, is doing a grave dishonour to his memory. It is making him the friend of a theory which he would have denounced as rank heresy. To cite part only of the passage in the connection, is a piece of literary dishonesty; it is the strangling of a witness while in the act of giving his testimony; and is all the more offensive by those who are crying down 'intolerance' and crying up 'political justice.' This grave offence has been perpetrated also by the authors of the "Statement by the Committee of the Synod of the United Presbyterian Church," and by the compiler of the "Treasury of the Scottish Covenant." The latter also omits quotations from the Second Book of Discipline in favour of Establishments while producing several on the Church's independence. In all equity such passages as the following should

have been given: "It pertains to the office of a Christian magistrate to assist and fortify the godly proceedings of the Kirk in all behalfs; and, namely, to see that the public estate and ministry thereof be maintained and sustained, as it appertains, according to the Word of God. To make laws and constitutions agreeable to the Word of God, for advancement of the Kirk and policy thereof, without usurping anything that pertains not to the civil sword, but belongs to the offices that are merely ecclesiastical."

With such clear views about Church and State, Melville and Knox and the reformers in the Second Reformation, reared their Establishment. The Church met, framed her standards, appointed her government and whole polity, and laid them before the State. The State considered, approved, ratified. The free Church and the free State became allied and were still free; both leagued together as servants of the Crown. The formation of this relation between the Church and State, placed the Crown on the edifice of the Reformation. The late Dr. Andrew Symington refers thus to the general principle of Establishments and to the Establishment then happily constituted:

"A civil establishment of religion, according to the sound and scriptural theory of such a national institute, implies no barter of the Church's privileges for the countenance and pay of the State, but a civil confirmation of privileges already possessed by the Church by solemn donation from her exalted Head. . . . It is for the mutual advantage of both Church and State, to be united on sound scriptural principles. . . . We conceive that in the Second Reformation, these two provisions were admirably fulfilled. Church and State acknowledged the common obligation of submission to the Redeemer's Headship. . . . To the Christian, the lover of the Saviour and His Church, this period is pregnant with instruction and with promise, the brightest day of Scotland's Church, a day in which millennial glory seemed to dawn. A Church, holding

directly her Head in heaven, with doctrines and institutions and polity based immediately on the Holy Scriptures; with standards so excellent; with ministers so pious and faithful; with a people so enlightened and devoted; allied to a Christian reformed State, without any encroachment upon its independence or compromise of her own; with schools for scriptural education and seats of learning consecrated by sound religion, and banded together in holy covenant, and standing fast in the liberty wherewith Christ has made her free, and resolutely prosecuting her proper purposes, presents an object commanding admiration.”

For fidelity to these happy attainments—this complete Established uniformity, the servants of Christ were driven from their benefices, intercommuned, outlawed, shot down on the moors, drowned in the waters, carried to heaven in chariots of fire. Their sufferings were on behalf of Establishment in principle and in fact. The late Dr. C. J. Brown, referring to the Act of 1649, said: “How finely does the existence of this very statute demonstrate the practicability of an alliance between Church and State on terms honourable to both; and further demonstrate how nobly and successfully the Church had struggled during the previous years to maintain her spiritual independence. . . . Voluntary churchmen, out of an Establishment, talk of the independence of the Church; our forefathers, within one, bled and died for it.”

Programme for Christian Patriots

What, then, is to be the programme worthy of the most thorough adherence of all members of the Church and lovers of the commonwealth? Are there no nobler objects for the servants of God in this Empire than the shifting programmes of one or other of the great parties in the State? The programme of present momentous importance may be summarised in this:—The acknowledgment of

the Universal Supremacy of the Lord Jesus Christ. All other aims and ends should fall back into obscurity in the presence of this: Church and State scriptural and allied together under their common Lord. The object to be kept in view, is that which was seen on the old flag that waved over the hills and through the glens of Scotland when the battle was being waged for Christ's crowns and men's liberties—"Reformation in Church and State, according to the Word of God and our Covenants." If the claims of the universal Sovereign and the rights of humanity are not to be surrendered and lost, the people must wake up, and lay again the foundations to which these nations owe their civil and religious liberty. The Will and Word of God must be accepted as the standard of action in all the relations of life. The Sovereignty of the Father and the Supremacy of Christ must be acknowledged by imperial statute. The subjects must learn that civil government is a divine institution. In short, a strong and sustained enterprise must be undertaken to reduce the whole political and ecclesiastical condition into submission to the throne of Him from whom alone comes liberty, order, happiness, and prosperity. He must be the stone of foundation and the stone at the head of the corner. The glory of Christ must be set up in the land.

Impracticable? Impossible?

In view of these outlines of the programme, thousands will cry, Impracticable! Herculean! Visionary! But who are those who thus deride these proposals? Why, the very persons who are more or less responsible for the unhappy conditions into which churches and nations are drifting. Within the memory of this generation, many fundamental changes have been introduced which, at their first proposal, were received with similar derision. Impracticable? Impossible? Is the situation more hopeless than when Hezekiah and Josiah succeeded to the kingdom of Judah? Is it more hopeless than

that of the Christian Church in the Roman Empire, before Paganism was repudiated and Christianity ascended the throne of the Caesars? Is it more hopeless than before the Reformation in these lands when Romish superstition and tyranny covered the people as with a funeral pall? Is it more hopeless than before the Revolution, when Cameron and his compatriots nailed their declaration to the Cross of Sanquhar, and gave the first peal to the bell that tolled the knell of the tyrant. The Reformers of this age have the examples of all the past times of Reformation—like lighthouses lining the pathway they are bound to take. The construction of the Scriptural will be accompanied by the demolition of the unscriptural. As at the Reformation from the Papal Establishment, the sword and the trowel must be employed together. If one tithe of the energy and sacrifice now being put forth for and against the great political proposal of the day were exerted for the reform of Church and State according to the Word of God and for their alliance in promotion of His glory, the attainment of these exalted objects would soon be achieved. Soon, both Church and State, those sons of oil,* would shine with splendour as satellites to the Sun of Righteousness and flood this earth with the light of heaven. “As I live, saith the Lord of Hosts, the whole earth shall be filled with My glory.”

Valour and Victory

The programme is visionary and utopian! But is it right? “I would rather be right,” said Adams, “than President of all America.” Is it right? Is not the proposal to bring all powers on earth into loyalty to King Jesus scriptural? Is it not celestial? Is it not divine? Is it not consistent with the issues that shall be revealed at the dawn of

* Zechariah 4:14

the Millennial day? If so, then it shall be realised. And if so, it is the pressing duty of every soul to bend its whole strength to have it realised now. "Whosoever is fearful and afraid, let him return and depart early from Mount Gilead." But "O blessed hands," says Rutherford, "that shall put the crown on Christ's head in Scotland"; and "all the world shall fall before Him, and (as God liveth) every arm lifted up to take the crown off His royal head, or that refuseth to hold it upon His head, shall be broken from the shoulder-blade."

Those who, in the spirit of Christ's loyal servants in the past, would labour for the recognition by all institutions of the crowns of Christ, may not be a multitude, but they must stand firm. They are on the winning side. On that day when, at Waterloo, the destinies of empires were trembling in the balance, a courier from a part of the field where a regiment was being hard pressed by the soldiers of France, dashed up to the Commander-in-Chief, represented the peril in which his men were placed, and asked reinforcements. The Iron Duke, knowing that all his available forces were in action, but convinced that it was necessary for that regiment to hold its position, replied, "Stand firm." Soon another dashed up, explaining the increased peril; still the same reply, "Stand firm." Yet another, one of the highest officers in command, stating that the regiment was being decimated, and they must yield if not sustained. Again, with throbbing heart, the calm reply, "Stand firm." "All right," responded the officer as he galloped off, "you will find us there." And they were found there, every man fallen with his face to the foe. But the victory was won. The despotism that menaced Europe and the world was thrown off to rise no more. The Captain of the hosts of the Lord calls upon every soldier to stand firm, and every loyal soldier will.

In the battle of the present hour, principles of the last importance stand out in the fields of destiny, ever coming into deadlier collision. For "there is war in heaven; Michael and his angels fought against the dragon, and the dragon fought and his angels." The three frog-

like spirits of the Apocalypse, coming out of the mouth of the dragon, and out of the mouth of the beast, and out of the mouth of the false prophet, are gathering the kings and nations together to the battle of the great God. The despotisms of earth in array against the supremacy of the Great I AM. Beams from the crowns of Christ would soon melt these anti-Christ's clean away. And at the thrilling blast of the seventh trumpet and in the reeling melee of the Armageddon struggle, this triumvirate of hell shall be flung back into their own abyss, and the "kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ."

His name for ever shall endure,
Last like the sun it shall;
Men shall be blessed in Him, and bless'd
All nations shall Him call.
And blessed be His glorious name
To all eternity;
The whole earth let His glory fill,
Amen, so let it be.

Psalm 72:17, 19 (Metrical)

CHAPTER 22

THE INSPIRATION OF THE SCRIPTURES

We take this opportunity to point out to our members and adherents at home and abroad two of the main doctrines which are essential for the establishment and progress of the Kingdom of Christ on earth. These two are (1) The Inspiration of the Scriptures, and (2) The need of an enlightened heart to receive unto salvation the divine truth of the Inspiration of the Rule of Faith.

There is no occasion here to present any detailed statement of the truth of the Inspiration of the Word. Such statements can be got in appropriate books, specially for ordinary, popular purposes, in the writings of Halyburton. All that we have in view is, to lay emphasis on the Westminster Confessional statement. The ultimate ground of receiving the Rule of Faith as inspired is not, evidently, the majesty of the whole and harmony of the parts—useful although these and other points—are but that the scriptures are self-evidencing. This implies that while men are unregenerate, they cannot spiritually discern the divine rule to be inspired at all. No one therefore apprehends in a due manner, the self-evidencing light of scripture, but those belonging to the Israel of God. It is essential for a soul to

be divinely illuminated to appreciate savingly the scriptures. These two fundamental doctrines of inspiration and internal illumination embrace, in their implications, all the confessional doctrines.

A common objection is that, owing to the transcription of manuscripts down the ages, the church lacks the original copies. The view of the Reformed Church regarding this is that God's special providence watched over scripture. Moses Stuart points out that about 95 per cent of the existing variations have about as much significance as the question whether "honour" should be spelled with or without the letter "u." Although there are "various readings," yet "not one doctrine of religion is changed," says Stuart. "Not one important fact altered, by the whole of the various readings collectively taken." Apart from the relatively few and unimportant variations, which are perfectly evident, *we are in possession of the inspired Word of God.* We therefore earnestly direct the attention of our people to these two fundamental doctrines of the Westminster Confession, namely, that scripture is self evidencing, or seen to be the holy infallible Word in its own light, while, at the same time, it cannot be savingly discerned as such, apart from the regenerating grace of the Holy Spirit. To be established in these two complementary doctrines leads on to being rooted and grounded in the other doctrines of the one, holy, supreme rule given for the salvation of immortal souls. To keep intact these doctrines, Revs. D. MacFarlane and D. MacDonald and others took the stand they did in 1893, and by the grace of the Holy Spirit, the Free Presbyterian Church in 1954 stands exactly where they did.

Rev. D. A. MacFarlane, M.A., Dingwall (Theological Tutor)
(Extract from "Proceedings of Synod" May 1954)

CONCLUSION

We have endeavoured to place on brief record the contendings of witnesses of recent years for the Scriptural pattern of New Testament worship, doctrine, government and discipline as ordained and instituted by the Lord Jesus Christ the alone King of Zion, and their contendings in defence of His Kingship over the nations.

In setting up the Tabernacle and the worship of the Old Testament Church, Moses was commanded to do all things after the pattern shown him on the mount. To this command Moses proved himself faithful. The Apostles also showed themselves faithful in following out the pattern—the “all things whatsoever” commanded them by Christ in establishing the New Testament Church.

We as a nation and as a generation have departed far from the pattern on the mount. Apostacy abounds, but when the Lord will turn back Zion’s bondage, there will be a turning to the divine pattern. The *ius divinum*—the divine right of Presbytery will be universally recognised and established. All other forms of church government, the Papal, Prelatic, Independent will crumble and vanish. The Word of God will be supreme, universally accepted as inspired, infallible and inerrant. The doctrines will be the pure Calvinism of the “Westminster Confession of Faith.” Arminianism will hide its face for shame, for Satan not only as a roaring lion but as an angel of

light shall be bound for a thousand years. Antinomianism, too, shall be no more. The Moral Law summarily comprehended in the Ten Commandments will be the accepted divine rule of life and conduct, with the holy Sabbath recognised, honoured and hallowed as an integral part of the Decalogue. Voluntaryism will return to the pit from whence it came, for kings and kingdoms shall then willingly submit to the sceptre of righteousness of Zion's king. The Lord Jesus Christ will get the place which is His due as Prince of the kings of the earth, the Governor among the nations and the Prince of Peace. The Psalms alone will be the manual of praise in the sanctuary. Hymns, paraphrases and organs "the insignia of Baal," as Luther calls them, will be cast forth. Choirs, solos, etc., which make a "fair show in the flesh" shall be no more in the house of the Lord of hosts.

The innovations of the Anabaptists will be a thing of the past. The scripturalness of infant baptism and the scripturalness of sprinkling in baptism will be observed as in the apostolic and primitive Church, and as practised by the Reformers, Martyrs, the Covenanters of Scotland and all who have adhered to the apostolic pattern. Justin Martyr, born at the close of the first century, observes when speaking of those who were members of the Church, that "a part of these were sixty or seventy years old, who were made disciples of Christ from their infancy." But there was never any other mode of making disciples from infancy except baptism. Augustine, born in the middle of the fourth century, says, "The whole Church practises infant baptism: it is not instituted by councils but was always in use." He also says that "he did not remember ever to have read of any person, whether Catholic or heretic, who maintained that baptism ought to be denied to infants."

The negation and pessimism of the Amillennial interpretation of prophecy as destitute of the mind and light of the Holy Spirit as was the fashioning of the golden calf by Aaron the priest of God, shall vanish before the millennial rays of the Sun of Righteousness.

Christ shall reign gloriously in His Jerusalem not by His personal advent to this earth, as the various schools of Premillennialists hold, but through the outpouring of the Holy Spirit in rich measure. His advent at the millennium will be in the power of the Holy Spirit. His second personal advent will be at the last day, “when He comes to judge the world in righteousness, justice to give each one.” Hebrews 9:27, 28.

Those adhering to the pattern on the mount are few in number in this “day of small things,” a day, too, “of trouble, and of rebuke and of blasphemy,” but faithful is He who hath promised, “A little one shall become a thousand, and a small one a strong nation: I, the Lord of hosts, will hasten it in his time. (Isa. 60:22.) “Moreover, the light of the moon shall be as the light of the sun, and the light of the sun shall be sevenfold, as the light of seven days, in the day that the Lord bindeth up the breach of His people, and healeth the stroke of their wound.” (Isa. 30:21.) “And the Lord shall be king over all the earth: in that day shall there be one Lord, and His name one.” (Zech. 14:9)