

such are some of the aspects of our circumstances in this part of the world, what can the ministers do? Check-mated by distrust, by the anarchical character of their people, by the force of long-cherished antipathies, by the influence of voluntaryism run mad—and that on the part of persons who, to make confusion worse confounded, talk of themselves as belonging to “The Established Church,”—the ministers can only fold their hands and devoutly wish that they did belong to an Established Church, in which event, perchance, the tables would be, in some instances, amazingly turned, and not at all to the liking of those who prate so loudly of their fictitious connection with a Church so organized.

Of all the chaotic elements composing the formless yet formidable opposition cherished against Union in this Presbytery, the strongest perhaps is, the fixed impression in the minds of the people that Union means the being subjected to the yoke of another Church's rule. The real fact probably is, that they uneasily anticipate that, if Union should be effected, the same lawless disregard of rule—of the authority of Church Courts—will not be so easy then as now. They need not be alarmed. This is a free country. They will be the same people. It will not be more difficult for them, or any of them, to doubt the veracity of their ministers in Synod assembled when one of the number professes to quote from the Edinburgh Assembly Papers—or to deny the Presbyterianism of Presbyteries when these courts issue edicts repugnant to their principles or their pockets. The astonishment is that so uncoerceable a people should entertain so mean an opinion of themselves, or should be so self-ignorant as to imagine that they could be rendered susceptible of being coerced as a result of the largest Christian union that can be thought of. No, no! Union, let them not be afraid, will leave unaffected that inalienable tendency and right (so to speak) to argue, to dispute, to rebel against any sort of authority, save that based upon their own voluntary allegiance to some person whom they respect, and so to continue attached to individual ministers and to ancient names, while disowning the authority of Church Courts and formal systems, which has descended to them

from time immemorial. Here folks are feudal still, and dearly, therefore, do they love a feud. The writer set out with the intention simply of answering the question: What did the Church at home say on Union at the late General Assembly? He fears, however, that any attempt to show this on his part, will be to no purpose. As with ministers at Synod, so with writers in the *Record*, they will not be believed. Nevertheless, if in your judgment, Mr. Editor, it is worth while to occupy your columns with the subject, the following quotations are taken from what is regarded in Scotland as the official report of the General Assembly proceedings,—that contained in the *Edinburgh Courant*, of date Saturday, May 24, 1873:—

“After addresses by Principal Snodgrass, and Rev. A. Pollok, Dr. Phin, one of the most prominent members of the Assembly, rose to move adoption of the Colonial Committee's Report, and said, *inter alia*: “They desired Christian Union among their brethren in the colonies; and he was sure they all rejoiced that the Union to be formed in Canada was to be formed on such a basis. There was nothing that the Church of Scotland would more desire to have than that the Churches were united on the good old standards of the Church of Scotland, to which they were all bound to adhere.”

The Moderator, in addressing the deputies, said: “They (the Church of Scotland) had been consulted upon the Union in former Assemblies. They had begged not to give them (in Canada) direct advice, leaving it to themselves, for they could judge better what was best to be done than those who were so remote from the scene.” (That is to say, the Church of Scotland has some confidence in the ministers and elders of the Synods in these provinces, although the people in some parts have none. Nay, the Church of Scotland, on being consulted by our Synods as to the best course to take with reference to Union, had so much confidence in our ministers and elders here, as to say in effect—Gentlemen, or Brethren, follow what course seems best to yourselves. What pleases you, we are sure, will please us.) The Moderator continued:—“But this they felt, that they seemed in Canada to have reached the basis for an honest and honourable, substantial and continued league and alliance. There was no mean compromise with them—there was no abandonment of principle with them—they were built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone. Although by