

to remain in the Establishment. And although it has been the fashion with some to resolve the whole matter into the angry passions of the human heart, and to raise an outcry particularly against the Free Church for what they have been pleased to call the bitterness of feeling with which she conducted the controversy, it would not be easy to point out a case in which principles so important were contended for, in which the contest was spread over such a length of time, and in the progress of which so much unjust and injurious treatment was met with; in which, nevertheless, there was less of improper feeling manifested, than was by the Free Church in the "ten years' conflict." The detail, short as it is, which has been given in some of the preceding Articles, shows that it was indeed a contest for principle: and the more fully the principles for which the Free Church contended are examined and tried by the standard of God's word, the more clearly will it be seen that they are principles which should be maintained by the Church Universal, and which no length of time can ever render obsolete. It may suit the views of some to say that they think the Free Church of Scotland was right in the cause which she maintained, and that if they were in Scotland it is with her rather than with the Establishment that they would join; but that still, in this country, there is no occasion for keeping up the difference. If these principles, however, are Bible principles in Scotland, they are not less Bible principles in Nova Scotia. The breadth of the Atlantic cannot alter their character; and if there are those in this country who think it right to keep up a connexion with the Scottish Establishment as it now is, and to attempt to give an appearance of respectability as a Church to that abject "creature of the State" which consents to be "laid prostrate," as Dr. McCulloch of Greenock expressed it, "at the feet of the civil magistrate;" then there is a duty laid upon all who would faithfully maintain the Bible principles for which the Church of Scotland has struggled from the days of the Reformation, to protest against any such connexion—to maintain all the more strenuously the interests of the truth, and, like the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, as formerly noticed, to show by their adherence to the Free Church, where it is that they find the body that truly represents the Church of their fathers. Those who profess to be Seceders, should not

need to be reminded that God's word denounces judgments against every corrupt ecclesiastical system. While christian charity may rejoice to recognise the workings of divine grace in those who may be the members of a Church which they may feel themselves bound to protest against as corrupt—and Free Churchmen may think with warm emotion of those whom they still regard as christian friends whom they have left behind in the Establishment; yet enlightened christian friendship would remonstrate with those who are unhappily entangled in such a connexion, would point out to them the danger of their position, and would press upon them the call of God's word,—"Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues." God's people though they are, they occupy a dangerous position, and it will be their wisdom to leave it without delay.

The Synod of the Free Church, in their Answer to the communication which they had received from the Presbyterian Synod, refer to the United Presbyterian Church in Scotland as presenting a third obstacle to the proposed Union. They say,—"The United Presbyterian Church in Scotland, which was formed lately by the union of the United Secession and the Relief Churches, is now regarded by you as your parent Church. We have no wish to refer unnecessarily to that body, but since union with you would involve us in communion with them, we must state in all plainness that this forms another obstacle which we cannot overcome, to the contemplated union." The brethren of the Pre-byterian Synod, in their Reply, seem now to be unable to understand why any reference should have been made to the United Presbyterian Church. In a passage already quoted in this Article, they say of the differences between the Free Synod and themselves, "the amount of them is, that we do not dislike the Established Church of Scotland so heartily as they do, and that we are more favourably disposed toward the United Presbyterian Church. They do not object to our faith or practice, but only to our feelings toward third parties, with whom we are not connected, and for whose acts we are not responsible." Again they say, "But supposing all their objections to the United Presbyterian Church to be well-founded, we repeat that in her proceedings *we are not at all implicated*, nor did we ever ask from our Free Church brethren any ap-