

sentiment seems to me perfectly just and reasonable in itself; and the author has great weight and authority among his brethren. It was generally allowed that he was the real originator and director of many movements connected with the formation of the Free Church, though more bustling men carried them out, and had their names associated with them. But let me caution our friends not over-hastily to expect so desirable a result as the acceptance of such a Basis. Time must be allowed for cool reflection. Many I hope will by and by gradually, and at length cordially, concur, who would at once declare opposition were such a proposal now made; and having committed themselves they would of course stand on the ground they have assumed. I am impressed therefore, with the idea that while there ought of course, to be nothing but perfect openness and honesty, it is of great consequence that there should, at the same time, be wise and skilful management. The more haste, the less speed.

May I here subjoin a short extract from a private letter from Scotland? The writer is a minister whose name, if I might present it, would carry with it no small weight. He is highly favourable to Union, and at the same time to moderation with respect to the Basis. "I will not presume" says he "to give any opinion on the subject, both because I know there are clear and able heads among you that will hold by the truth and maintain it; and also because I have not had time to study the points so closely as to authorise me to give a judgment. I have looked over several papers in the Canadian Magazine—papers of very varied merit. But I may say that I never could understand the precise doctrine of the Free Church respecting Christ's Headship over the nations—that I have never seen it distinctly stated in any of their standard books (perhaps that is owing to my ignorance)—and that I do not fully know on what it is founded. I could not say that 'Christ is King of Nations;' because that seems to me to mean he is king in things Civil. The king of a nation is its Chief Magistrate—the head of its Civil affairs; and if you say that Christ is King of Nations, the expression is to be taken in that sense, and implies that he is the Head in things Civil, or the Chief Magistrate of the nations. He was so among the Jews, but in no nation since. I know that he has authority given him over all flesh, but that is that he may give eternal life to as many as the Father has given him—that he has been made Head over all things, but that is for his body the Church—and that his Providence is universal, but that is that he may control all things, and render them subordinate to the execution of his Father's gracious designs in the salvation of the chosen, and the punishment of the finally impenitent. Beyond this the Bible does not seem to me to go, and I cannot go farther. Under the expression 'Christ is King of Nations' lurks, I am afraid, the old doctrine of the Civil Magistrate's power about religion, which Mr. Bruce of Whitburn, Dr. McCrie, Dr. Paxton and all the writers I have ever seen *were never able distinctly and clearly to define*. They first let him into the Church and then they hasten to fetter him, or to put him out, not being willing to allow him to use his lands for any purpose *but*