

Confident we are, from the prevailing desire for Union, that earnest prayer will be presented by many in either Church, that the Lord Jesus may be in the midst of that assembly of his servants to guide its deliberations and secure that decision which shall best promote his declarative glory.

The spirit that pervaded the United Presbyterian Synod, in regard to Union, at its meeting last week, and the Resolutions adopted thereanent, may well excite gratitude to the Church's Head and prompt congratulation among the lovers of Sion's peace and prosperity. There was no dogmatising in regard to the only matter which, mist-like, divides the two Churches—there was no demand made, or even silently breathed, that brethren of the sister Church should give up a single sentiment which they hold, or relinquish any practice that obtains among them. The Christly genius of brotherly tolerance was delightfully supreme, and all-pervading. This only needs to be reciprocated, by the brethren in a state of severance, to render Union certain at no distant day. If the Union be now arrested, the blame, we feel assured, will not be laid at our door by the enlightened and liberalised Church of the future, having done all that conscientious men can do in consistency with sacred principle and the right of private judgment—having reached and taken our stand on the high, heaven-sighted, and broad table-land of *mutual forbearance*, where, sooner or later, all who hold to the “one Lord, one faith, one baptism,” shall meet and walk together in love.

There is a fear, which we trust time will prove to have been groundless, that some brethren of the Presbyterian Church will seek to insert into the basis of Union, under the guise of Christ's Headship, which all of us gratefully hold, the fatal wedge of magisterial authority, and dictation in matters purely religious—a wedge which in times past, driven alternately by professed friends and open foes, has sadly rent and shattered Christ's spiritual building on earth, viz., the Church, and given Satan an opportunity to triumph. If anything of this sort be insisted on, the hope of Union is, for the present, blasted. Indeed we hesitate not to say that it should not be, and cannot be accomplished on terms implying, however latently, the right of the civil magistrate to usurp the authority which belongs alone to Christ, or to trench on the sacred territory of conscience. That our brethren conscientiously believe that no such blasphemy and wrong are implied in their view of the duty of the civil ruler we rejoice to know; but if we, as conscientiously believe that such dire results would of necessity follow were their principles embodied in practice, it is manifest that Union is impossible, unless we both agree to cast our opposing sentiments on that subject into the yet almost empty bag of forbearance. Surely these brethren would not wish us to sacrifice conviction. We would scorn to require any such sacrifice at their hands. If Union demands such a sacrifice on either side, better far that we remain apart. But we firmly believe it requires no sacrifice but that of prejudice and party spirit, and the sooner these are laid on the altar, the better will it be for the life of God in the soul, and for the prosperity of the Church.

It has been asked, “Shall forbearance extend to every possible opinion as to the civil magistrate's duty?” We answer, assuredly not. It is a possible opinion, that the magistrate ought to commit murder, or otherwise violate the laws of God and of his country. Who ever doubted that the