

there are matters of a financial nature which may require time to consider and arrange. The financial matters of the two churches are conducted on systems which differ very materially from each other. In the Free church there is the central "Sustentation Fund," while in the United Presbyterian church each congregation pays its own minister, contributing at the same time to a fund for the aid of weak congregations. But we doubt not that in the good providence of God all these difficulties will be overcome. We rejoice to see that there are many calls to prayer with special reference to this matter. Doubtless these prayers will not be in vain.

We regret that our space does not allow us to set before our readers the noble sentiments so eloquently expressed both in the Free Church Assembly, and in the United Presbyterian Synod. We give however a specimen, selecting first some extracts from the speech of Dr. King in the Synod of the United Presbyterian Church, and secondly some passages from an admirable speech of Principal Candlish of the Free Church. Dr. King in the course of his speech said:

If we accept the religion of Christ as the word of the truth of the Gospel, what does it more earnestly enjoin upon us than to be of one heart and one mind in the Lord? Truth not only demands union, it unites. If we had more truth we should have more charity, and more of its assimilating manifestations—for faith worketh by love—Where divisions have made English Presbyterians a weakness and a reproach, incorporation would immediately render us a respected power in the country. We should exert in England such an influence for good as Evangelical Dissent has already and confessedly exerted on the Establishment in Scotland. Presbyterianism on the Continent would hail such commendation to its principles, and invigoration to its alliance. The day of union should be one of jubilee. There is not a class in these realms, down from our gracious Majesty to her meanest subjects, but would hear its announcement, so clear, and loud, and thrillingly would its silver trumpets sound, and the moral effects would vibrate to the ends of the earth. Are you prepared to forego all this or even defer all this? I am not. In the contemplation of it my apprehensions change sides, and from dreading ill-assorted combinations I dread the result of schism and its sorrows. Two facts have more weighed with me than any reasonings. The eminent men of our Church with whom Providence has brought me into contract have been mostly and characteristically unionists, and they have become increasingly so towards the close of their career. When I was newly licensed, I had an appointment to preach for Dr. Pringle, of Perth, and I could never forget a conversation with him. Its words I forget, but its substance—I trust in some measure its spirit—rests with me. In fatherly and affectionate accents he indicated to me that he had been very jealous about landmarks, and he was far from despising them still, but he had come to discover that every one of them did not define a holy land or a widow's inheritance, and he had come to accept with more comprehensive import and more entire self-surrender the lesson, love of the brotherhood. This personal lesson was delicate advice, and I feel at this moment as if he had given it to me not only for acceptance but for transmission. Let me disappear, then, in thought from our younger brethren. Let them behold instead that venerated patriarch while he smiles upon them with benignant regards and prayerful hopes, and, uncoiling the map of life, points with the finger of devout experience in the direction of concord, and says with accents almost valedictory—'That is the way, walk ye in it.' I might state very many like incidents—report many such remarks made to me by such men in their studies or on their death-beds; but I may say in general, that to the extent of my class-mates and more immediately within the range of my friendship, a lessening estimate