

of establishments in the eyes of the community; and Dr. Ferrier left the Church, and joined the United Presbyterian Church, because he entertained views opposed to those of his brethren upon this point.

The deed of Synod also made this doctrine a term of communion in the Church, virtually at least, and it was a serious thing to do away with any article of the constitution. Another important consideration was as to how far both parties agree on the point on which they differed.—Both believed that God had appointed Christ king of nations as well as of the Church; and never dispute the assertion that wherever the word of Christ was made known every conscience was responsible to him. The United Church held, like them, that there was no moment in a man's life when this responsibility ceased, and indeed if any man should say so, he would decline any Christian fellowship with such man. All men were responsible at all times—in the family—in the Church—in Parliament—on the Bench. It was as difficult to remove from under the canopy of heaven, as from the responsibility which bound all creatures to the throne of God. The refusal to give credit to the United Church for these opinions was their ground of complaint against the Church to which he belonged though perhaps the complaint was not well founded, inasmuch as expressions ought to be understood in the sense in which they were employed. Practically, again, there was no difference of opinion between the parties, that a man might stand up in Parliament and say, I oppose this measure, because it is opposed to the word of God. All were agreed that he might employ every resource of his knowledge and draw arguments from political economy, history, or the bible to strike the individual conscience. Where then did they suffer? Just as to the words "*formal*" and "*national*" recognition of religion; for while an individual might bring forward these arguments and present them to influence others, it was held by some members of the other church that he ought not to insist on the bible being recognized as the standard of law. They said that the civil magistrate wielded the sword, and that if the bible was put into his hands he must wield the sword in its behalf, seeing that from the moment the bible was the statute book, he was bound to employ the sword to enforce it. Another argument was that in the discharge of his duties the magistrate acted not for God but for man. That his duties look God-ward; but in the open discharge of them, his responsibility was to men.—He (Mr. R.) on the contrary, held that the civil province was part of God's empire; and that even civil liberty depended upon the recognition of that fact. The main thing for which Government was established, was the protection of human life; but what made human life and human blood sacred, if it were not the conviction that man was an immortal being, made in the image of God. The security of life, therefore, was involved in this matter. Again, take religious liberty, and the foundation of the belief of the United Presbyterian Church, was, that the civil magistrate had nothing to do with religion.—But what was the foundation of their Church? Why, that the conscience of each man belonged to God, and that no law but his law ought to be obtruded on the conscience. Thus religious liberty was placed on firm foundations. The question of the Sabbath was involved in this question; and there was no difference between the two bodies as to the opinion that the magistrate ought to prohibit Sabbath breaking, nor as to the belief that he had nothing to do with forcing his subjects to worship God, or not to worship him in a particular way, and had only to put down any open scandal within his province. The other church rested the security of the Sabbath on the allegation

that it was a civil right. His Church based it on the great truth that God had claimed one day for himself. Again, as to fasting there was less difference than at first appeared. Some of the voluntaries in England had objected to fasting at the command of the Government on the same grounds on which he would object: he meant that the command came forth accompanied by anathema and that it ignored all other christians, but the established churches. He would fast; but would protest against the edict. While the differences were small, the motives for union were strong. One of the three petitions of the Saviour was that the church might be one, and there was a strong reason for agreement to be found in the common Presbyterianism of the two churches; in the gospel which both taught; and in the worship which both practised, with the exception that the United church had introduced a hymn book. Was it not also a motive for union that all lived in a country where Presbyterianism was not understood. Geographically they were fragments, and yet they differed between themselves on points the world did not appreciate. Again the two Colleges languished and were quite inefficient, while one would be prosperous; and spiritual destitution could not be overtaken, whereas if union were to take place on satisfactory principles, a less number of ministers would be required, and many hands might be spared for uncultivated localities. The evangelization of the world was joined with the idea of the Church being one—"That they all might be one," &c. In the old country, the rivalry of the different denominations was so great that they had not time to go forth to save the world which perished for lack of knowledge. Was there, after all, any ground of union on scriptural principles?—If so, they must go to the scriptures to find it out—and there it appeared that it consisted of having one body; one spirit; one hope of our calling; one God and Father of all: above all, in you all, and through you all. If perfection were insisted on, there could be no unity. All stood on one vast, solid, eternal continent, and to unite, all must draw towards the centre, and not try to push another off. Did not all hold in common the Lord's Supper, and the truth of the Word of Christ, and did they not present him to the world as the only hope of the lost.—Just as gravitation bound by cohesion, so Christ was the bond of spiritual union—of the union between angels and the redeemed family—between every individual Christian and the universal Church. He concluded by moving for a Committee.

Rev. Mr. Rogen said in this matter there were two things to contemplate—what had already been done, and what remained to be done. Much thankfulness was due that so much had been accomplished, and the more he contemplated the question, the more the principles he stood to represent became important in his eyes. The question on that side, however, was presented under great disadvantages. Patronage and establishments had got so confounded together in the public mind, that the world could not separate them. The establishment principle! What had that to do with the question? It was the supremacy of Christ which he contended for—let establishments go to the four winds. On the other hand, the term voluntary principle gave no idea of what was intended. In Canada at any rate, the church was free from establishments on one hand and voluntarism on the other, in connexion with the welfare and support of the ministry; but the voluntary principle, or the establishment principle, made it alike imperative on the church to maintain and promote the ministry in its high and holy mission. What had already taken place should afford encouragement. The two churches had long acted together, in spite of differences