

changed since then, and this proposal was a proof of it, but if so, they were not a united body, for they would have altered the change. Dr. Bayne read passages from the proceedings of the former Convention, and commented strongly on the sentiments there advanced, and till such were refuted, he could not entertain the proposal at union; and moved that, in present circumstances, it is inexpedient to entertain the proposal.

The Rev. Dr. Willis would not go quite so far as Dr. Bayne, though he agreed with his leading argument. He did not expect a speedy adjustment of differences, but would go as far as to appoint a Committee with certain instructions, and make inquiries if any change had taken place in the sentiments of that Church. Afterwards Dr. Willis moved to that effect, seconded by Rev. M. Clarke of Quebec.

Rev. Mr. McVillar, of Pembroke, would originally have a Committee to confer with the other.

Rev. Dr. Burns seconded Dr. Bayne's motion. He said that the United Presbyterian Church in Scotland was changed, but to the worse, as ere by their recent action in the proposed national school system, and in other matters; and here in Canada the United Presbyterian Church had not improved, for they pushed voluntarism to the very verge of infidelity.

Rev. Mr. Rogers of Peterboro' was in favor of a Committee being appointed.

Rev. Mr. Boyd of Prescott had no hope of a union—and no wish for it all the United Presbyterian Church changed their views. They had not given the least intimation that they had, and why, ask for a union? He disapproved of a Committee, for it was better not to make the attempt.

Rev. Mr. Macpherson of Stratford, in support of his motion, said, it is not the propriety of an immediate union we consider, but it is a Committee to enquire what obstacles are in the way, and to see if the United Presbyterian Church are willing to homologate our sentiments. If Ministers stand in the way of a union the people will force us to take. (Loud cries of no, no.) The United Presbyterians come to us with a flag of truce, and are we to reject them. For the sake of peace, civility, consistency, courtesy, and for our own credit let us not refuse the appointment of a Committee.

Rev. Mr. Scott of London, without a speech, proposed a resolution, which was carried, as was the conclusion of the debate.

The Rev. Mr. McLaren of Amherstburgh seconded it. He said it was a general opinion that the young ministers in the Church differed from the old, that they were more voluntary; but this resolution would show that in the essential point, of nations and magistrature, as such, being under law to God, there was perfect harmony. Besides, it was necessary to enquire respecting the doctrines held, for there were sufficient grounds to doubt the United Presbyterian Church, for he and other two brethren once heard a United Presbyterian minister in his own pulpit, not 20 miles from Toronto, preach a labour of argumentative sermon in favour of Arminianism. Another United Presbyterian minister of high standing he had heard of, who said that they held much lower views of Calvinism than the Free Church, and if they united they must be allowed to hold their own doctrinal sentiments. He stated these things to show the necessity for a Committee to make inquiry on such vital points.

Rev. Mr. Gourlay, Rev. Mr. Ross of London Road and Rev. Mr. McAlister spoke in favour of union.

At this stage the question having occupied two long sittings, there was a great desire for a vote.

Dr. Bayne would withdraw in favour of Mr. Scott's motion, but still adhered to the views he had already stated, only by allowing this motion to pass, and throwing the discussion into the hands of the young ministers it would make them thoroughly study the points in dispute, and give them more light, and lead them more decidedly to his opinion.

Dr. Willis for much the same reason withdrew his motion in favour of Mr. Scott's.

Mr. Macpherson withdrew his motion also; when it finally passed thus, as recorded in the minutes, a copy of which we have been favoured with:—

After lengthened reasoning it was without a vote,

Resolved—That this Synod having considered the memorial from the Congregation of Knox's Church, Hamilton, and the Resolutions of the Synod of the United Presbyterian Church ancient union between that body and this Synod, express their earnest desire to see that object attained, provided that it can be attained on scriptural principles; declare their willingness to consider opinions on the question of the lawfulness of taking State Endowments without Erastian submission to the State as a matter of forbearance, but continue to consider the views which they always held, and formerly expressed by their Committee on the duty of the Civil Magistrate, and the responsibility of nations to God, to be of such vital importance as to demand that they be made a term of ecclesiastical incorporation, and believe the practical effects resulting from the principles referred to, to be of such a character as to render the maintaining of these principles in all their integrity necessary to the best interests of the Church of Christ.

And further, that this Synod, while convinced that no union which ignores these principles can be effected, or if effected, can prove beneficial, nevertheless, appoint a Committee to confer with the Committee of the United Presbyterian Church, and to devise, in accordance with the terms of this deliberance, measures which may conduce to harmony of opinion and action on this and all other points of doctrine and practice

which this Church holds vital, and, where practicable, to the effecting of a proper and lasting union with the Committee to consist of Dr. Bayne, Dr. Willis, Dr. Burns, Frederick Young, Messrs. Donald McRae, M. T. Smith, W. Lee, W. George, R. Boyd, J. M. Rogers, J. B. Cameron, O. Fraser, J. Scott, W. McLaren, Messrs. and Messrs. J. Smith, W. Boyd, J. Hall, J. Grant, A. Adams, W. Brown, W. McMillan, and D. Kennedy—Mr. Lee to be Chairman.

UNION.

It will be seen by our reports of the Synods of the United Presbyterian Church and Free Church, that the subject of union was before them. It is true that the Free Church Synod has appointed a Committee, but it has been done against the opposition of a powerful party; and it has been done by stating certain conditions in the resolution, so that it is doubtful how far our Committee can, with due regard to the honor of the Church, agree to have a joint meeting. Had the Free Church Synod positively refused, in terms of Dr. Bayne's motion, our way was clear; or had they only appointed a Committee without conditions of agreement, the way was equally clear; but at the outset they have erected their platform, and say we must first of all come on this, else they can have nothing to do with us. Now, whatever may be individual opinions on the way our Committee proceeded and argued on a former occasion of conference, (and we remember we dissented from their course then, in these terms, when the Synod cordially approved of the Committee's procedure, and the papers read, "Against this Mr. Jennings dissented, on the ground that this Committee had urged their views on Voluntarism as opposed to Establishments, further than the standards of the Church warranted, and the sentiments on the subject in the Testimony which are really avowed and held by our Church,") whatever, we say, may be individual sentiments, the Church is already committed to principles which it has not renounced; and we suppose will not, and the door is shut against union, indeed against conference, by the Free Church resolution, unless we shall first ignore all that we have said and done, and come up to the terms laid down, and then begin to negotiate. It is humiliating. It is the note of antagonism sounded at the very outset. We deeply regret it. In this Magazine the subject of union was first broached, and sincerely are we prepared to advocate it on fair grounds, and with due regard to denominational honor, but, whatever we may do, we confess hesitancy as the case now stands.

Connected with this, it is worthy of notice, that the statement has been often made to the effect, that the young ministers of the Free Church were voluntaries, but here we find, the resolution that was carried was by the young ministers! and certainly contradicts in fact what has so often been asserted as a supposition. Next, it has been often said, that the Irish ministers in the Free Church, in their supposed liking for government dotatives, would be the most opposed to union with our church, whereas, we find that they were the most earnest.

But there were other reasons, besides those publicly expressed, which influenced many to adopt the course indicated which goes for union in appearance, but prevents it in reality. They will get public credit, so far, by what they have done; and if we do not immediately look out, and adopt another kind of spirit of brotherhood, their reasons will soon be found to be valid, and their expectations fully realised.

The Free Church Synod has resolved that, for the future, the sum of £300 given for Knox's College by the Free Church in Scotland, be not taken, but that they support it altogether themselves. Their preachers coming from Scotland receive no guarantee of any money, and their expenses of voyage also are defrayed by the Church in this province. Thus they are now wholly self-supporting, and receive not a penny, from any source, beyond their Canadian Communion.