

fighting men unto the end. They are the legacy which an age of controversy has left to the church—shells that explode when the battle is over. Some brethren are difficult to convince that supposed enemies are in reality friends, and that the day of conflict and controversy is now past. We do not, however, despair. The influence of the new generation is becoming daily stronger, and ere long we may hope that the honoured veterans will come under their sway, and meekly resign the arms of warfare for the pipe of universal peace.

There is a difficulty of another kind, pertaining not to men but to measures, which may perhaps stand in the way of our Union. We have long been wont to look at the least respectable and amiable side of one another's principles and positions, and perhaps been disposed to identify one another rather by our vices than our virtues; hence it has happened that the follies and extravagancies of an individual have been ascribed to the whole body to which he belongs. In this way misapprehensions of each others views and opinions have gained currency and belief. Some measure of this sort of thing will always be found in this imperfect world; but why should we persist in maintaining and fostering these misapprehensions, when our neighbour tells us positively that we are wrong,—that he repudiates and abhors the sentiments we ascribe to him,—that he never held them,—that they are not held by the body generally to which he belongs? As an illustration of this point, we may instance the sentiment which has been often ascribed to voluntaries, and which we remember to have been stated by no less a person than the learned D'Aubigne, namely: "that the Magistrate as a Magistrate was under no obligation to Christ, and had nothing to do with religion whatever." This opinion was denied and repudiated by Dr. Heugh, than whom a better representative of the Voluntary could not be found. It has also been repudiated over and over again, by men whose word may well be honored. Dr. Alexander, in his life of the late Dr. Wardlaw, takes opportunity to deny in the most emphatic terms, any participation in, or sympathy with such views. Why then will we not believe what the best man among our Voluntary friends solemnly tell us, when they say that they hold no such views, as some among us ascribe to them?

A similar prejudice to this has been entertained regarding those on the side of Church Establishments. Some voluntaries allege that they favour persecuting principles, and are opposed to liberty of conscience and private judgment. This we repudiate in the distinctest terms, and say that we abhor persecution for religious opinion in every form, and are prepared both to assert and defend the liberty of conscience and private judgment. We may expect therefore that our Voluntary friends will accept of our candid asseveration, and no longer charge us with holding such offensive doctrines or opinions.

There are however a class of people who are not satisfied with saddling their neighbours with opinions which they *do hold and avow*, but who also saddle them with all the supposed conclusions that may be drawn from them, or consequence in which they may possibly result. In this way any one may be charged with holding opinions which he never could have dreamt of; this is the way