

imate as closely in principle as individuals in the same church can do, the members of those churches should hasten to tear down the wall of partition reared only by mortal hands, built, possibly, on mere prejudice; nay, perhaps, formed of rubbish that has accidentally accumulated in the course of time, in order that the enmity necessarily created by it may be slain, and that brethren who are perfectly joined in the same judgment may exhibit their unity, by extending to each other the right hand of fellowship, or rushing into each other's bosoms. To condescend to particulars, there is no reason, in our view, for the existence of these separate Presbyterian Churches in this Province. We are of one accord on matters of faith, discipline, and practice, extending even to points the most minute. To say nothing of our common ancestry, we observe the same forms of worship, follow the same rules of discipline, have the same ecclesiastical polity, and subscribe the same symbolical books with this difference only, that we allow the brethren to declare that they do not hold intolerant or persecuting principles, which some think to be taught in a particular Chapter of the confession, but which neither of the other sections of the other Presbyterian Churches have admitted to be contained in it, and for that reason, I suppose, do not extend the indulgence we claim for ourselves. All our pulpits, too, give forth the same sound. The time has passed away when in any of the churches any moderator or minister, in the presence of his brethren, could venture to put the question, "Who are the worst enemies," and answer it in this manner:—"They are those among others who, while they subscribe a Calvinistic creed, teach Arminian, Pelagian and Socinian heresies." The forefathers of our church did not quit the Establishment of Scotland from any dissatisfaction with her creed, or from any discontent with her discipline, as set forth in her standards, but because effect was not given to her principles, and because her rules were not faithfully applied, for which they were unable to find a remedy. They did not find fault with the principles of the Church of Scotland, but with her practice, which was inconsistent with her principles. They refused to consider themselves dissenters, and took the name of Seceders. The fathers of the Free Church again, withdrew very much on the same ground. They admitted the reasonableness of the complaint on the part of our forefathers, and finding themselves at length in a majority of the General Assembly, were proceeding to administer, though but in a moderate degree, a remedy, when they were interrupted by the civil power, and told they were stepping beyond the limits of their jurisdiction. The fathers of the Secession came forth testifying against the defection of the judicatories of the church, believing the power to correct the evils of patronage, their principal grievance, to be lodged in their hands. The fathers of the Free Church again seceded, bearing testimony against the civil power for its encroachment, as they considered on their right of jurisdiction, with special reference to the evils our fathers complained of. Between the two churches, therefore, there is the strongest affinity. Not only are they united in matter of faith and practice, and discipline, their testimony before the world is substantially the same. Can any man forbid that these churches which are united in heart should not be united in hand, and under the same spiritual roof "dwell together in unity?"