

the U. P. Church, were not and are not an appeal *ad misericordiam*, and that both churches need to *give*, as well as *receive* explanations, a union is not practicable, and if it were, would not be desirable.

From the little I have seen of the country and its necessities, I am convinced that, indefinitely more could be done by the two bodies united, than in their separate state. But if this *at present* cannot be accomplished, by all means let us rather have "union" than "disunion." Let us seek more than ever to cultivate a feeling of mutual respect, and let us all act as substantially occupying a position of Presbyterian parity. So that if we cannot see eye to eye on all subjects, perhaps our successors may, or even ourselves, at some not very distant period.

W. I.

Westminster, Sept. 1857.

UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH HISTORY.

BY THE REV. DR. FERRIER, CALEDONIA.

In addition to the memorial of the United Secession Synod, addressed to Lord Melbourne and other members of the British Government, on the subject of their opposition to additional endowments for the Church of Scotland, they appointed a Deputation to proceed to London to enforce their views on the subject. The gentlemen appointed were the Rev. Drs. Beattie, King, Harper, and James Peddie Esq. Early in Spring, 1838, this Deputation proceeded to the metropolis to enter on their duties. Here they met with Drs. Heugh and Wardlaw of Glasgow, who had been appointed with Dr. Harper, by the Central Board for the same object, and also the Rev. Dr. French of Edinburgh, appointed by the Relief Synod in the same work. These gentlemen representing different Bodies, agreed to act in concert. The selection of these individuals was most judicious, as none better qualified could be found; and by their talents, urbanity, and persevering zeal, they were instrumental in counteracting the object of the friends of establishments. In their energetic movements they were aided by many Dissenting ministers in London, as well as influential laymen, and even several members of Parliament favourable to their views.

Whilst this joint Deputation were in London, a Deputation on the opposite side arrived, to use their influence in behalf of the Church of Scotland in favour of the additional endowments. The Government felt as if they must do something for the Scotch Establishment, but seemed determined to do as little as possible. Their intention was soon known; and the following is an outline of what Lord Melbourne stated as the design of ministers in regard to religious instruction in Scotland.

"1. That the Bishops' teinds shall be applied in providing for the religious destitution existing in certain Highbland and rural parishes, having no unexhausted teinds.

"2. That an alteration shall be made of the Act, 17 respecting the division of parishes in Scotland, so as to afford increase of faculties for the application of the unexhausted teinds in the hands of private proprietors, to relieve the destitution of such rural parishes as have unexhausted teinds belonging to them.

"3. That nothing shall be done for the Towns; that no grant shall be made from any source to provide additional means of instruction for them."

This proposal was displeasing to both parties. The Dissenters considered it too much, and objected to it because it recognised the principle of the Government having power to grant endowments to a greater or lesser extent. Their opponents, however, thought it too little, and objected because it was not commensurate with what they expected, and what they thought necessary.