

of Ferntosh we consider too horrible for publication. We make reference to these painful matters not for the purpose of bringing to light painful things better to be forgotten; but for the purpose of placing them side by side with the sentiments of the noble generals who are in the van leading on the present movement. These men have anything in view rather than secession. Nay, many of them, Professor Charteris among the number, have expressed themselves desirous of clearing the way towards a union of co-operation with the Free and U. P. Churches in Christian work. The mighty arguments of Norman McLeod tell wherever read or heard. He views the Church as every man who would give an estimate worthy of consideration should view her in the light of her history for the past quarter of a century. Dr. Gillan is also among the number, and his service in advancing this great change in the constitution of the Church, his metaphorical manner of expression, and his characteristic readiness of repartee, add an element of pleasantry to whatever he advocates. There are besides in the movement, Lords Provost of great cities, members of both Houses of Parliament, and good and true churchmen, officers of the army, and leading merchants of the day. When such men take a matter up with right upon their side, a government will find that they will be compelled to surrender.

In thus commenting upon the Patronage modification movement, we express no opinion as to the *principle* involved in the working of Patronage. That men become dissatisfied with a measure, or even that it has outlived its own necessity, says nothing against its principle; and whether or not the abolition of Patronage would tend to advance the interests of true religion and divine truth, remains to be seen. We believe a change

would benefit the Church—it would at any rate stop the mouths of gainsayers, and as we admire the statesmanlike style that has marked the proceedings so far, and the truly christian and gentlemanly spirit pervading every word spoken and everything done, we wish the Church success in the effort. And we feel assured that the men of the present movement will not abandon the enterprise even though success may not attend their first effort, but will unflinchingly prosecute their purpose till the success they desire is attained.

The most difficult problem will be to get hold of some principle upon which to frame a system of election or selection to take the place of the present system of presentation by the Patron. Pure popular election is not to be thought of.—Even the Voluntaries of Scotland themselves have avoided this. The Free Churchman or the United Presbyterian, though he be a pew owner, and regular attender, has no vote in the election of his own minister unless he be also a Communicant. Pure popular election will not, we feel assured, be the form adopted. It would be premature to make any suggestions. We shall watch the movement from time to time; and when any particular method of election is adopted, we will return to the subject and again draw the attention of our readers to it.

---

WE would take the liberty of drawing the attention of the clergy and laity of the church to the fact that the collection for the Synod Fund falls this year to be made on the last Sunday of the present month. A much larger contribution will be necessary, as some expense connected with last year's Delegation to Montreal was incurred. It is hoped that our vacant congregations will not forget this very important collection.