

by party cries and party denunciations. Other gospels than that of Jesus Christ have been preached, other enemies than those of Jesus Christ have been denounced in the worshipping assemblies of Dissenters. We cannot be approached with sins like these. The genial Christianity of our Mother Church teaches us to love our neighbor even when his views are not identical with our own. Our childhood has been influenced, our manhood has been informed and directed by the pure teaching of her sanctuaries: our sympathies have been enlarged, our views extended, our love towards those who are of the household of faith stimulated within her broad and Catholic pale. Ours is not the sectarianism which contracts and ossifies, but the large forbearance and good will, striving to emulate the Master's, which causes the heart to expand and the life to drop sweetness. We are no sect, for we have no hatred and no *ism*, and because the unionists of Nova Scotia have chosen a sectarian basis, and have uttered both before and since the union words of sectarian bitterness, we intend, being on that very account doubtful of the experiment, to keep aloof and watch the progress of events. At the same time we shall patiently wait and earnestly pray for the advent of that better day when we shall become the great and united brotherhood in Christ which we ought to be, when we shall cease to compete with each other in might but labors of love, when Ephraim shall no longer envy Judah, nor Judah vex Ephraim.

One observation more and we close our remarks on this subject for the present. There can be little doubt, we should imagine, that so long as the Churches in Scotland remain separate there must be a feeling of insecurity among those who have united or may unite in the Colonies. We are not and cannot be, as numerous analogies suggest, independent of the attitude of the Scottish Churches. This fact is satisfactorily proved by our present divided state. Questions have been imported from Scotland which never could have arisen out of the circumstances and relations of the Churches here, tests have been introduced from Scotland which are worse than meaningless here: we have had voluntaryism where all must be voluntaries, evangelism where all are evangelical, moderates where there can be no practical moderatism. On the establishment of the Republic of Paraguay in South America, the leaders resolved to imitate even the blemishes and to enact the revolutions of ancient Rome. Not only had they the Consulate with all its forms and symbols, the Senate, the Comitia, the Tribunate, the questorship, aduleship, censorship, and the other paraphernalia of the commonwealth, but they had also a Marius and a Sylla, a Cæsar, a Cicero and a Pompey, a Catalinian conspiracy and a servile war, two triumvirates, and at last a dictator, in the person of the celebrated

Jr. Francia, who put an end to the farce by rendering himself absolute and supreme. Our imitation of Scottish ecclesiastical broils has been no less exact, and only less ludicrous because from its very nature less boisterous and demonstrative. We have been servile mimics of party names and cries and leaders, and so close is our neighborhood to the mother country, so intimate our relations with it, so near and dear our kinship of blood and descent, our passions still so hot and our partizanship still so keen, that we fear were another *imbroglio* occurring there it would straightway embroil us here. Notwithstanding our recent and profuse displays of liberality and love, the good time that is coming has not yet arrived. The Free Church is not at present in a very amiable mood. She has been setting up claims, which no constitutional state, can consistently entertain, and has been foiled and baffled. She has appealed to the sympathies of popular Assemblies, but though her eloquence has stirred the crowded hall, has failed to affect the press or public opinion to any appreciable extent. Hence her discontent. Will any one guarantee that Professor King, sympathizing, as we feel assured he does, with the irate and disappointed leaders at home, is not ready to discharge another spirit of venom? Or, suppose that the U. P. Church of Scotland despite the huge efforts that have been made in that direction, should fail to implement the wishes and obey the commands of Candlish and his brethren in the agitation of the Cardross case: suppose that they should come to an open rupture on the issues involved in that case, will that affect the relations of the two Churches here? We know that, with the exception of a few clergymen, only one of whom (Dr. Cairns) has any claim to be a leader, the Secession body is, like the press and public opinion on both sides of the Tweed, hostile to the claims and position of the Free Church. The Presbytery of Glasgow, the mos. influential Presbytery in the connection, has, while permitting individual clergymen to say what they please on the subject either in public or in private, expressly declined to be identified with the attempt at agitation. The Presbytery of Kelso, too, with Mr. Renton—a man of talent—at its head, will overturn the next U. P. Synod on the same side. These are two instances of public action on the part of the U. P. Church of which we are aware. Other Presbyteries will follow in due course, and the result may be that, as far as the U. P. Church is concerned, our Free brethren may be left to fight their own battle unaided and alone. In that event, will the union in Nova Scotia be endangered? Will it be at all affected? Or, let any other question be mooted; let the voluntary controversy, for instance, be revived,—what then? Will we have a pitched battle here? We hope not, but we fear. We wish the union every success, though we