

treatises of modern times on the law of the Sabbath has lately come from the pen of a minister of the United Presbyterian Church, the Rev. Mr. Gilfillan of Stirling; but I entertain no doubt at all that the brethren of that Church hold with us, that it is the duty of the civil magistrate to protect, by public law the outward rest of the Lord's day; and this, not as the late Dr. Wardlaw strangely used to maintain, with reference to the lower and more secular ends of the Sabbath, as conducive to physical health, but with reference to these as inseparably bound up with its higher and more peculiar religious uses and ends.

We can only add a few paragraphs from the noble address with which Principal CANDLISH closed the discussion:

HISTORICAL POSITION OF THE TWO CHURCHES.

As to the principles which we must hold to be inviolable, I trust that those who represent the Free Church of Scotland in any conference upon the subject of union with our brethren of the sister Church will not be too anxious about explicit declarations, on the part either of the one side or the other, as to the application in this or that case of the great principles which we hold in common. I say this with reference both to our Church and the United Presbyterian Church. I trust that we shall be satisfied with coming to a clear understanding upon the general principles which we hold in common as regards the duty of the civil magistrate to regulate his conduct by the Word of God, and that we shall not be too careful to drive one another into settling how we would apply this great general principle on this or that suppositions case. Let us, I say, have confidence in one another's integrity, good faith and good sense; and if we come to a clear understanding upon a Scriptural principle, let us not be trying too minutely to test one another as to the particular application of it but let us leave this to be settled as cases may actually occur in the Providence of God. In regard to our historical position, I may be allowed to speak, as having been one of those who were concerned in vindicating our historical position in times past, and vindicating it very earnestly. But I think it right that it should be borne in mind that we have never sought to assert our historical position against our brethren who left the Establishment, in former years, and have sought to assert our historical position as against the present Establishment, and we shall continue to assert our historical position against the present Establishment, to the effect of maintaining that our Disruption was not the secession of a portion of the Church from the remainder of the Church, but the separa-

ration of the Church, as such, from her alliance with the State. We shall therefore contend that we are the Church of Scotland. Viewed in the light of history, as well as in the light of principle, we shall always continue to maintain that the present establishment is but the creature of yesterday—that the Established Church is not the old hereditary Church of Scotland, but that we are the old hereditary of Scotland, if our judgment on that point be formed on any sound Scriptural or historical basis. But then, we shall certainly not ask our friends of the United Presbyterian Church to come forward and recognise us as the Free Reformed Assembly, before which their protest lies.—We shall not go back to former times. We have no intention, and we never had any intention, of asserting our historical position as against them. Even in this document, in which we have asserted our historical position most strongly, we have asserted our oneness with those who left the Establishment before us, on the very same grounds substantially on which we were compelled to separate from the State.

A PRACTICAL MEASURE.

Moderator, if our brethren of the United Presbyterian Church saw their way to relieve their Professors of their pastoral charges, and set them apart as Professors, to lecture and teach during the winter months as our own do, I venture to say that our three colleges would be at their service. I venture, moreover, to say that there would be no great difficulty in arranging that the tickets of the Professors might be mutually interchangeable. I think we might, upon the platform of some arrangement as to the training of our theological students, come to a practical understanding much sooner than perhaps in other circumstances that might arise between us. I throw out this merely incidentally. I believe that no Church ever possessed more valuable or trustworthy Professors of Theology than the United Presbyterian Church possess at this moment.—I believe there is not one of their Professors who might not be recognized by us as eminently qualified to teach the department entrusted to his care. If we look at such men as are not Professors, yet who unquestionably ought to be Professors—such men as Dr. Cairns of Berwick—we might consider whether it might not be practicable to come to some understanding as to some of them joining us in those larger premises here, in Glasgow, and in Aberdeen, as to something like a reciprocity, of recognising one another's tickets.

IMPORTANCE OF THE SUBJECT.

I have no hesitation in saying, as many have said before, that I look upon this day's proceedings, in connection with the proceed-