

motives of one Church or the other. If, from the side of the Presbyterian Church of Canada any attempt should come to misquote the doctrines or overbear the convictions of the United Presbyterians, we shall not be slow to expose and reprove the injustice. If, on the other hand, we see in the "Canadian United Presbyterian Magazine," a mis-statement of the position and belief of the Free Presbyterian Church, fitted to prolong deplorable misunderstandings and prejudices, we feel it our duty to remonstrate against the course taken by certain correspondents of that Magazine, and by implication sanctioned and relished by the Editor. Although the U. P. Magazine is not an official organ of the Church whose name it bears, it cannot but exercise an influence on the question of Union. We have, therefore, observed the language held in regard to that question in the number for August, with much regret. The peevish note by Dr. Ferrier, at page 227, is bad enough, but scarcely deserving of our notice. Our strictures apply rather to a paper on "Union," signed by "Aliquis," and published without a word of editorial remark or dissent.

It is not consistent with the facts of the case to affirm, as this writer does, that the question involved in the negotiations for union is that of a "State Church," and that "the instruction of the Presbyterian Church to their Committee was, to hold inviolate their grand distinguishing characteristic or principle, which is the essential principle of State-Churchism, or in other words, that the civil magistrate, in his official capacity, has to do with the religion of his subjects." We beg to assure our United Presbyterian friends that this confident statement is a mere delusion. The Presbyterian Church does not require as "a term of ministerial communion," any opinion whatever regarding what is commonly called a State Church, or any permission to civil rulers to interfere with "the religion of their subjects." These phrases are attributed too often to the Presbyterian Church of Canada, but have never been used or authorised by her. Within her pale, as truly as within the United Presbyterian Church, latitude of opinion is permitted to ministers and people on the question of State endowments of religion, and the cause of liberty of conscience is quite as dear to the one Church as to the other. The point at issue is not the relation of the magistrate to his subjects, but the relation of the State, in all departments of its administration, to the Lord Jesus Christ. It is little better than trifling to tell us that on the "civil magistrate's power in religion" the United Presbyterian Church has "no dogma." No one has asked for any dogma on such a point. But can a Church be faithful to the royal prerogatives of the Redeemer, which holds nothing and teaches nothing on the relation and responsibility of nations, both rulers and ruled, to Him in whom all nations of the earth shall be blessed?

The writer in the U. P. Magazine makes a curious acknowledgment, to the effect that the Presbyterian Church takes "the ground of the old Seceders," from which the United Presbyterians have departed. He adds, however, a distinction, viz., that the Free Presbyterians left the Scottish Establishment "on the principle of mere non-intrusion, whereas the first Seceders left contending for free election." On this we think it worth our while merely to remark, that although the maintenance of the non-intrusion principle occasioned the conflicts of the General Assembly with the Courts of Law, it was the wider principle of the spiritual independence of the Church that led to the great Disruption of the year 1843. It is passing strange that the Disruption Church, and her Colonial children, should be suspected of a readiness to betray the independence and freedom of the Church to the civil power!

"Aliquis" is venturesome in his historical statements. He gravely tells us, as one of the things with which the ministers of both Churches are supposed to be "perfectly acquainted," that on the question at issue between them, the Presbyterian Church of Canada goes back for its principles no farther than the year