

proof of this. The Free Church, as yet, insist on the exclusion of the Note; and if the Article remain, the Note seems essential to guard, not only the consistency, but the principles and honor of the United Presbyterian Church. The idea will never surely be entertained of allowing an Article of Union to stand unexplained, when it is manifest one of the parties may attach an entirely different meaning to it from the other. It will never surely be judged a right or proper thing, under the pressure of desire for Union, to accept the Article with such oral explanations of it as the occasion of Union may admit, and then leave the whole question involved, open for discussion in the future. This might secure apparent agreement for the time, and might be applauded as a triumph of Christian love; but it is almost certain it would be followed with a painful reaction hazardous in the extreme, to the "unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace."

After all candid expression of sentiment and explanations that have passed, there is no use in disguising the fact, that a considerable difference of opinion exists in the two Churches on the Magistrate's power. The brethren of the Free Church hold the Headship of Christ over the nations in such sense as that a National Establishment of religion, in a community of professing Christians is according to His revealed will. This, in brief, plain words, is their belief. They are careful to guard the Independence of the Church—they are willing to part with State pay, rather than part with liberty of action as members of Christ's Church—but they maintain the Civil Magistrate in a nation such as ours, is under obligations to concede these in establishing what is believed to be the true religion in the land. They do not think or say it was wrong in the Parliament of former times to sanction the Confession of Faith; to establish the Church that received it as her creed, and to endow her Ministers from funds belonging to the nation. They believe this to have been an acknowledgment of Christ's Headship over nations, in full accordance with Scripture, and hold that rulers are still bound to own him in a similar way, while they grant to the Church, so established, freedom within her own sphere. Divested of abstract terms and generalities, this appears to me a fair statement of the sentiments of Free Church brethren respecting the Magistrate's power.

Now we of the United Presbyterian Church entertain a very different view from this, of the Headship of Christ. We believe it was wrong in Parliament to sanction any religious creed as the national faith, because, however scriptural that creed is in itself, the public sanction of it is beyond the Magistrate's sphere; and we hold that all national endowments of any Church are in every condition impolitic, unjust, and unscriptural. We are careful, at the same time, to guard our sentiments on this subject from the inference that has been rashly drawn from them, to the effect that we annul the Headship of Christ over nations, and affirm that the Civil Magistrate is under no obligation to obey Him, or nations to submit