

Then came the voting; old Kirk Ministers, and Preachers from Kirkcudbright, Dumfries, Roxburgh, Selkirk, &c., supporting the Duke every man of them almost. Gratitude was strong in the bosoms of some, and, perhaps, hope animated others. A few—such as Mr. Phin of Galashiels, Mr. Whitelaw of Athelstaneford, Dr. Robert Lee, Mr. Young of Auchterarder, &c.,—had the courage to rise above paltry sectarian considerations, and to express publicly their preference of high literary attainments to extensive territorial possessions. Perhaps Mr. Young recollected the fierce denunciation of the *veto* in the Upper House of Parliament and thought old Harry had peculiar claims on his support. The Free Church Ministers opposed the Duke with a unanimity that led their Bond brethren to whisper “*Sites*” and “*Canobie*,” and the U. P. *alumni*, being roused to indignation at the thought of the Chancellorship of their University being dragged in the mire to aid Dr. Robertson and his endowment schemes, gave Brougham their cordial and earnest support. The Duke’s supporters were sadly chop-fallen when the result of the poll was announced, and the friends of Brougham cheered with much enthusiasm.

The difficulties connected with the Sustentation Fund, which have been pressing on the Free Church for several years past, are becoming more and more formidable, and the folly of sanctioning the erection of Congregations in circumstances in which self-support could not reasonably be looked for is becoming more and more obvious. There are not fewer than 306 Congregations whose contributions to the Sustentation Fund are decreasing, and out of 788 Congregations only 160 contributed last year £150 and upwards. No fewer than 466 Congregations gave last year less than £65 each on the average to the Fund. Of 110 Congregations the average contribution was only £35. Such a state of things cannot but be unhealthy and dangerous. I understand that in the U. P. Church there is a strong desire on the part of many to reduce some of our small Congregations to the position of preaching stations in the event of a vacancy.

I am, dear Sir, yours sincerely.

SPECIAL SERMONS ON FIRST OF JANUARY..

To the Editor of the Canadian U. P. Magazine.

PERRYTOWN, PORT HOPE, C. W.,
19th November, 1859.

MY DEAR SIR,—The year 1860 opens with a Sabbath. New-Years’ Day is the Lord’s day. Might it not be well to have on that day, throughout our Congregations, a special object of prayer, and subject of discourse? Would you allow me to suggest such through your pages for December?

There is no Christian but must feel a deep interest in the outpouring of God’s Spirit in other lands, convincing of sin, of righteousness, and of judgement, and earnestly desire such a time of refreshing in Canada. Suppose, then, the invitation go out through the Magazine to all our Ministers to lead the people to pour out their hearts before God for a revival and extension of the Redeemer’s work amongst ourselves and throughout this land.

In regard to a special subject of discourse, might we not be led from the prevalence of the use of intoxicants at that season to select “*Temperance*”—point out the sin of drunkenness—the temptations to that sin—and urge upon the Church to “*abstain from the very appearance of evil.*” Let there be a temperance sermon from each pulpit—who can tell the evil that might be prevented, the good that might be done?

Some may regard the matter of prayer and discourse as not being harmonious. Let such reflect on the words of the Apostle in the Epistle to the Ephesians v. 18. “*And be not drunk with wine, wherein is excess; but be filled with the Spirit.*” Does it not appear that being excited with wine, in which there is excess, is a hindrance to being under the influence of the Spirit? And let them mark the