

which used to be thought great; but acting together it was found that all were as one. There were elders to be met with who would say, "we are voluntaries"; but, in discussing the question, it would be found that the mass of Christian men throughout the country thought alike. He scarcely met a voluntary who, when conversed with, did not admit—"I cannot deny that," though there were doubtless some who were led to deny from an idea of consistency. At the same time he did not think the division of the Church was an unmixed evil. It was not necessary that it should be an unwieldy mass like Rome; but it was better, perhaps, told off into regiments, with separate colors, uniforms, and officers, each rivalling the other to see who would do most in the cause of Christ. Without this, too, it would be impossible to demonstrate to the world that, in spite of differences, there was still a general principle of unity and love. He rejoiced indeed in that opportunity to express the love he felt for the brethren of the other Church, and should be sorry if a bitter word passed between them. He thought the Church to which he belonged was doing a great work. It was teaching the nations several things. They thought it was only when a man said he was a Christian that he was under the law of Christ—the Church would teach him that he was bound to obey that law if he were within its reach; that national sins were to be put down. That word national sins had led to a question being asked what they were—whether drunkenness and worldliness were not national sins? The Church must teach that there were more truly national sins—sins to which a nation set its seal, and for which therefore, it had a corporate responsibility to God, such as that for which he feared the people of Canada might some day have to render a very grave account.

Rev. Mr. SMELLIE said that last year when this subject was taken up, sentiments were avowed on behalf of the church with which it was proposed to unite, which had not so far been disclaimed, but which so long as they were held, must prevent any progress being made in the direction of union. He incurred great responsibility in assuming this ground; but he had to unburden his own mind, and starting from the position that the other church must be held by the avowals of its own committee, he threw aside all discussion about the duties of the magistrate, and decided that union was impossible—that the Church to which he belonged was not at liberty to enter upon such an arrangement, even were the United Presbyterian Church ready to do so. Where there was not perfect unity there could be no true union, which was strength, while to bring enemies together was but to create an idol of iron and clay. He had been more than once on platforms with brethren of other denominations, and, on one occasion, one of them had said to him that it was such meetings which roused discussion of first principles, and that he would rather be away than that the public should think he waved his own sentiments. There were, indeed, principles of separation as well as principles of cohesion that followed even from the language of the Saviour's intercessory prayer, and there had accordingly been separation from the earliest period of the Church. The Reformation was also a separation; and it was separation which gave existence to their own Church. There were principles in the word of God upon which they were bound to separate; and if to separate, then to remain separated. It was a common argument, that you must give and take; but there was, in such a maxim, no respect to truth, and no true love to God or man. Give?—such things were not theirs to give. Take!—no one had a right to take them. There were great principles involved

in this discussion. There was Erastianism, which practically denied the authority of Christ over the Church; and there was Voluntarism, which disowned him as King of Nations. He held that it was the peculiar glory of that Church to contend that he was alike King of Nations and King of Saints. For that principle he had sacrificed the emoluments of the Church he had left, and that principle he was not prepared to give up. Between Erastianism and Voluntarism, he saw no reason why they should not make overtures to one as well as to the other. Why not offer to unite with the Episcopal Church? Why not join with Rome? He saw no end to all this.

Rev. Mr. McMURRAY believed the discussion had done good by drawing nearer to the standard of that Church the brethren of the United Church, whose members he believed were as much divided among themselves on the points of difference, as some of them were divided from the Church to which he belonged. Some members of the other Church held opinions identical with those of that Church; and, so far as they were concerned, the union might be effected at once; but, as concerned those with contrary views, it was not the duty of that church to desire an union. The views he spoke of might be illustrated in this way. Suppose a missionary entered a heathen land and made the King a Christian, the question would then come up, whether the King ought not to take the Bible as the foundation of his laws, and exercise his authority as a Christian. Now, those of whom he spoke held that the King would be bound by his individual responsibility, but not as a King. Thus, if it were the custom of the country to sacrifice a certain number of individuals on a certain day to some idol, the missionary should, as he believed, teach that the King should put forth his authority to prevent it; whereas those of whom he spoke denied that he should do so. To such persons he would propose this question: If the King renounced his christianity, say at the end of seven years, should he command his subjects, supposing human sacrifices had been discontinued, to resume the practice of murder, and should the missionary teach that as the King was no longer a Christian he was not bound by the Bible, and ought to tell his subjects that they might resume their sacrifices without sin? For his own part he held that the missionary should teach the King that, though he did not believe, he was still bound to obey the law of Christ.

A Member of the Court said that the members of the United Secession Church held no such doctrines as were now imputed to them. Everybody believed it to be the duty of all persons to put down murder.

The Court then adjourned.

Afternoon Session, June 19.

UNION WITH THE U. P. CHURCH.

The subject of union with the United Presbyterian Church, was resumed, when various motions were proposed.

Rev. Mr. McRUAR rose to make a few remarks. He was anxious for a union, but he desired a union based on scriptural principles. Union ought to be dear to all those who loved Christ, but never to lead to a compromise on certain principles laid down. A great question had been made of endowments, the millennium and other minor matters, which could be compromised without injury to the church; but there were other things of far greater importance, which they were not allowed to compromise, as "the Headship of Christ over the nations." He supposed there was no one prepared to say that the brethren of the United Presbyterian Church agreed with them on this point; here they were decidedly at variance.