Who Will Caro.

Who will oure? Solekt bed ifteened ellew and? ... no an the chrack-yard mould, And the long passofer our feces

Levs its fingers dann and cold; When we dear from earn and sorrow, And the illy of an alify life--Sleep to snow no and to-morrow,

Who will come to weep above us, Lying our so white witte and still, Underneith the skies of summer, Whou all pature's pulses thrill, To a new life gry and tender, Full of beauty, rich and awest, And the world is elid in spleadour, That the scars shall never repeat.

Was will care? Who will care?

Whon Queen Autumn's flowers clossom, And she shops with pits down, With a white flower for our bosom Taken from her royal crown? Who will come to kneel in pity. Hy our long and narrow be When the wild winds sing their ditty, In the grasses o'er our head-

Who will cars?

Who will care? When the spring-time's glad smile lingers, On the mendows for and wide, And san drops, from rosy fingers, Bloom and loaf on every side; Who will come with tender yearnings to the graves of these they miss? Who will sigh for our returning, To their presouce and their kiss

Who will care Who will care

Who will think of white handa Ising, On a still and silent breast; Never more to think of sighing Ever more to know of rest? Who will care? no one can tell us; But if rest and peace befall, Will it matter if they mls us Or they miss us not at all?

Not at all

Union and the the Church of Scotland Difficulty.

Editor British American Presentables. DEAR SIR,-Before proceeding to discuss the above subject, as proposed in my last, allow me a few sentences with reference to recent correspondents. And first, as regards your most volumnious writer. I would simply say that I withdraw from the contest with several other writers, who endeavored to explain questions in dispute, and who are now evidently withdrawing from the field, simply because it is found worse than useless to discuss with such as can discover no light or reason, but through their own heavy ideas and verbose writings; and wh , when they cannot reply to the reasonable explanations of those who ardently desire Christian forbaliance, retire with the utmost self-satisfaction into the shrines of their own superior sanctity, as if all good men should stand, behold, admire and be convinced. When men adopt this course of argument, the only method that remains is, to deal with them as our Lord treated the Essene-Pretists during His earthly sojourn. He let them slone. We do not find that he ever followed them one step into their seclusive retreat of self-admiring sanctity. We notice only one word that this writer quotes from my letter, and we refer to this because it requires no argument, but an explanation. Our friend, after insingating that I understood the word "broad" in the same sense as the Romish Church, then inquires what meaning I attach to the word. Well, when when one assumes to define the sense in which others understand doctrines and principles, we need not wond r that he arrogates the right of showing how we understand words. Our explanation of our use of the word is: As in the Canada Presbyterian Church, there are some who hold more limited views than others of the relation of Church and State, I conclude that this exp under of words and principles adopted the views of the Free Church, and thus the views of the old Kirk:- That the Supreme Lord not only exerc and logislative authority over Church and State, but that his servants should exorcise administrative authority in these respective courts for the advancement of His Kingdom; and that to transgress or cast contempt on the first laws of either, is to resist Hisauthority. I then concluded that I held views as broad as he in these respects. It now appears that I hold more liberal views than he does. For while he would in practice avail himself of the right of appealing to the ovil court, he would have an act to exclude others from this privilege. What I chain for myself I would cheer ully concede to others. But after all that he and his friends have written with reference to the Headship of Christ, I do not find that they have adduced one word from the aspired rule of faith and practice, to explain or defend their position, or to show how Corist is to be practically recog nised as Head of the State as well as of the Church. It is impossible to discover what they would have. Two things they keep before them, the assumed guilt of the Church of Scotland, and the names of cortain men as their highest authority and example, so that they are taking the initia-They acknowledge cortain human authori ties as Lard's over the Church, and the State. And turther, they in effect any:
"We, the ministers of the true pricathood, insist on you, the ministers of the old Kirk subscribing an article as we dictate. We do not deny but that this article is to be found in the conf scion of faith, and subscribed by von. We do not yet call your subscribing to our paper a confession of wrong coinc; but your assent to our article will have a double salulary effect of appear-

representation of the position of these gen ternou. Could they discover that their course sevents of papery, they would doubt less shrink from such a line of conduct. It is very sad to find those who, we caire to believe, in the exercise of that cherity which helpoth all things, wish to honour the Lord Jesus Christ, carry out thoir exclusiveness so as to bring discrace on the Christian name and useless strifes and contentions among Presbyterians. It is indeed lamentable to find how those who assume to raise their flag higher than others and natt their colors aleft regard all who do not idelize their ideals of perfection as tarnishing their Master's colours in the dust. We had thought that the true soldier of the cross required to hold firmly by His Master's colours, until he had fought the good fight and finished his course. When his colours are nailed his good work must be done. It will be a novel speciacle to see men follow a general who has nailed his colours. It is sarnestly hoped that few will make the judifind how those who assume to raise their earnestly hoped that few will make the judi-

Now as regards the Scottish Church. What

we would say of this oft-assailed church is not to proselytise to our views, but rather to show that the adherents of our Church from our point of view, regard ourselves as nonest in our convictions, and as steadisst in adhering to sound principles, as those who second from that church. We yield to none in appreciation of the sincerity and unobtrusive piety of not a few who left the Church of Sectand. But we call no man-Lord and Master. We are fully persuaded that many remained in the Scottish. Zion from conscioutions convictions that said from conscientious convictions that said church, in the legitimate working of her constitution, is entirely free from State control. We have been led to entertain this belief, after anxious and carnest inquiry, and not because we owe anything to her directly in early years. Many in het array against the Scottish Church, owe directly much more to her teaching and influence. Indirectly, we owe everything that we esteem most in human teachings and influence. Had we been like others, and influence. Had we been like others, reared beside the parish church, or in the parish manse, we probably would have valued less the golden opportunities, and be more ready to despise and reprobate such advantages. But while surrounded by those who had no good report of the old church, we were trained to cherish the most secred regard for her as a venerable and divine institution. And viewing our Church in the light of our early training, we were wary in receiving the testimony of her foes, and disposed to listen to the defence of her friends. And weighing all that we could hear or read of this time-honored church ve could never yet discover that her freedom of action, as a Church of Christ, has been curtaied, since the oldest living member of the Pree or old Kirk was bap tised at the baptisinal fount in the Scottish Church, or that she had one shadow of encronchmout from the State, but that to which she had rendered herself liable; that if her church courts were involved in civil damago, it was because the church courts failed to assort the rights of her people, or had violated her constitution, which they were solemnly bound to muintain. We would not then enter the proposed Union as criminals, sucing for pardon, because of our connection with the Scottish Church, but in the clear understanding that neither we nor our church are to be regarded recreant to impor ant prisciples. We desire unobtrusively to give some reasons for the hope that is in us, regarding the safe position of tue Scottish Courch. In order that onan horitus may have some weight with those who differ from us, we shall mainly quote from those outside the Scot

We find Dr. Chaimers affirming in 1828. with much more of the same kind. "We have no other communication with the State than that of being maintained by i... We are exposed to nothing from without which can violate the sanctity of ther apostolical character, if our-solves do not violate it. In things occlosus and we decide all. . . . It should never be forgotten, that in things cclousation the the highest Court of our Church is amenable to no power on earth for its designs," &c. In the year 1843, one mouth or less before the disruption, the late Dr. Burns, in a speech of great power, before the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, utt. rs sentiments similar to the above in defence of the Established Church of Scotland. (We regret that we cannot quote from his speech, as this and many other papers of this class passed from our hands. Havng long ago satisfied ourselves regarding the safe and independent position of the Church of Scotland, and having never therished the concert of being able to convince them who differed from us, we were not careful to preserve these papers). We have not only the testimony of these eminent occlesia tie il authorities, that the Church of Scotland, "in things ecclesiastical decide all," but we have the highest civil tribunal in Scotland, declare on an an appeal from the Church courts, by the minis er of Frasorborough in 1851, the very sentimen e, in reference to the indep in lent position of the Church of Scotland, that the anthority already a noted, expressed twenty-two years hefere. This civil tribunal—there being five judg a on the bonch all concur-ring—lecture "That when the question is purely colesiastical, the civil courts have no right to interfere; that they must trust to the Church Courts doing its duty, and it is supreme, and is parallel to the High Cou t of Just ciary, from which no appeal to any Civil Court, can, under any cheum-stances, ever a mi." I should like to know stances, ever a ai." I should like to know what testime sy can be ever more explicit and satisfactory than these concurrent testi monics.

According to Dr. Chalmers, "We are exposed to nothing from without which can violate the sauctity of our apostolical character, if ourselves do not violate it." There was a compact of long standing between Church and State. And the consequent decontent and state. And the consequent conference of the State long proved of ineatimable value, instead of it-once persecuting power. The simple question that comes to us, who "violated" this contract? Not-withstanding all that has been written, we could never find that the Btate passed an act or did anything to encroach on or curng our consciences, and will so atone for fail the rights of any church for many years that the great Fathers of the Free Church, your past and that we can receive you into before or since the disraption. But to us "expected too much from 'popular electure Communion." We think this is a fair it is very manifest that the church did tivus." We believe the majority in the

did violate her constitution as a State Church, and consequently did involve herself in civil damages. And we hold that whatever court violates her own contract, that court, whether civil or reclesisation, should suffer the merital penalty. The majority in the Church Courts violated this compact in two respects. In terms of this agreement between Church and State, only the ministers of parishes and their Ruling Elders had the right of sitting in Church The Church Courts, however, em Courts. The Church Courts, however, em-powered the Chapels of Ease ministers, to sit in their courts, without scoking the concurrence of the State, and thus the Church became an illegal tribunal, and liable to have her decisions reviewed by the civil Courts. Were the three legally constitut ed Trustees of one school to add a fourth to their number without securing the concurrance of those who gave themseives legal power, and then attempt to depose their eacher, they would at once be involved in civil damages, and could not expel their teacher, however unworthy of his situation. Accordingly in the Church of Scotland, after the admission of the Chapel of Ease ministers into the Church courts, when an unworthy minister was summoned before the illegal church tribunal, he would raise objections to its constitution, and apply to the civil courts for redress, and when it was clearly shown that the church court was illegally constituted, the Judge was com-pelled to issue an interdict against further proceedings. Now this was represented as an invasion by the civil courts on the spiritual functions of the Church. Whereas we contend that the Church Courts was the aggressor. But it has often been said, "The Ministers of the Chapels were as good and often better and wiser than some of the parish Ministers, and therefore should have a voice in the Church." This may be true, but when there are advantages in any relations, whether in Church or State, there must also be restrictions, and these advantages cannot possibly be permanently onjoyed, except by conceding to each its respective rights. Every church must have rules and conditions for the regulation of her Church Courts, and must also be careful not to invade the civil rights of individual members, and this is not less necessary in a Church in compact with the State. And it should be observed that although it was pronounced a great wrong that their ministers had no legal voice in the affairs of the Church of Scotland, the Free Church was not long in existence until her Courts enacted a rule, that a district or community that failed to raise £80 for the support of a minister, was not entitled to a share in the Sustentation Fund, and consequently cannot have a settled minister, entitled to adjudicate in the spiritual or secular matturs of their church. And why should that be held up as a great evil in one church, and is just and righteons in another? But that which was regarded a felt evil in the Church of Scotland, might have been easily remedied, so as to prevent the many troubles that were occasioned by the passing of this Act previous to 1848. Since then this disallowance has been removed. By a simple process before the court of Tiends, these ministers of the Chapels of Ease are empowered to sit and adjudicate in the Church Courts. During the last twenty years about 200 churches have been endowed with competent salaries, and their ministers have the full right of taking part in the soveral Church courts, and there is every prospect of having 100 more added ore

Again, the Church violated her compact with the State when the "Veto Law" was passed. To this law, as calculated to bring the Church into trouble, Dr. Chalmers and many other wise counsellers were strongly opposed. By this law the people were allowed to reject a licentiate of the Church without assigning any reason. It also re-stricted the right of call to male heads of families, being communicants. By the constitution of the Church in her alliance with the State, the Presentee land a right to be put on his trial before the Church, and the Church Court legally constituted, had the power to admit into, or exclude him from the parish to which he had been pre-sented. Had the Church adhered to her own constitution, it might always be said of her, "In things ecclesiastical we decide all." At the disruption the Church of Scotland was released by those who mainly constituted the majority in bringing the Church Court into collision with the State; and then practically acknowledging her error by purging her Courts and proceeding to legislate with due regard to her constitution. As the result, the Church Courts find that no appeal to any Civil Court, can under any circumstance avail.

It is true that the much mi-represented Lord Aberdeen's Bill was passed after the disruption. This act certainly does not restrict, but perhaps somewhat extends the power of the people. We should like, did space permit, to give this entire Act. It more especially authorizes, that "if any one or more Parishoners, being members of the congregation has any objections to the individual presented, in respect to his ministerial gifts or qualities, either in general, or with respect to that particular parish, or any reason to state against lis settlement in that parish . . . that if the Presby-tery in judicatory of the Church shall come to the conclusion, as their judgment in the whole matter, that the said objections reasons, or any of them are well founded, and that in respect thereof, the individul presented is not a qualified and suitable person for the functions of the ministry, and ought not to be settled in the same, they shall determine to that effect," &c. Accordingly it is well known to every one who the Courch of Scatland, during the last thirty years, that the Church Courts have absolute control in admitting and rejecting Presentees, and that Church Courts have rejected worthy ministers, chiefly, if not solely, because the majority of the parishinners was adverse to their being settled. But our settled conviction as that too much has been inade of this "popular election," as the right of the people. One of the most enlightened Christian Philosophers living, and once of the Free Church, allows

"violate" her compact with the State. The Church of Scotland is now again expecting Church Courts after 1829, provious to 1843, too much from popular election; that both Churches are givin ; more place to this ele-ment than the Word of God authorizes. This we showed in you paper in May last. But we might easily speaty instances in which there had been more usedenly proceedings in connection with the settle ment of ministers, putside of the E dahlish ed Church during late years than there had been for many years in the Old Church where the presence of the military would have been a seemely relief. In one instance the members of Court proposed to send for the assistance of the civil authorities. We atate this solely to show that trouble may and do arise outside of a Church having lay patronage. As the result of this pressure for popular election in Scotland find that a Romosh priest in Edinburgh and another in Glasgow, were elected to take charge of the Education of truth in Scot A priest of Rome controlling the education of truth in Scotland! The Church of Scotland did not raise a finger to bring about such a state of things, but her onemies. Is this advancing Christ's Head-ship over the Church and nation? For ship over the Church and nation? For ourselves, we shall infinitely prefer to see any Presbyterian Church in Scotland having the entire control of schools and Universities than see popular election arrive at such a state of matters. Our conservative principles are sorely tried in presence of such and the prospect of the end. What would Knox say of these who helped to bring bring about this in the land that fought so long to east off the domination of Rome. We cannot think that this can be pleasing to the Great King, who has set his seal to the doom of Rome.

But further, as regards the Church of Scotland. We have Dr. Hanna's, of the Free E. Presbytery, and author of the "Life of Christ"—one of the most valuable works on this greatest of themes—we find work on this greatest of themes—we find him nobly declare, years ago, that it is wrong to charge the Church of Scotland with denying the Head-hip of Christ over His Church. Also Mr. Smith, at that time member of the same Presbytery, utters a similar sentiment in a sermon pub-lished by him. Some of his less generous brothron desired him to withdraw it. be refused to do. And volumes might be adduced from those within the Church proving to a demonstration, as we think that this oft repeated charge was without a shadow of foundation. We are ready to make allowance for the forcing discussions of those days when popular rights were so warmly discussed and when damages were incurred by the Coursh Courts coming into collision with the Civil courts, but we can not understand how any intelligent Chris tian man, who has taken an interest in the fate of Presbyterianism, can persist in maintaining that the Church of Scotland denies the Hendship of Christ over His Church, or persist in charging her with crastanism. With the same amount of fairness, we believe, the Free Church of Scotland may be charg od with ernstinnism, when the Civil courts compelled her courts to "satisfy pro '2 in the famous case of McMillan of Cardross, after her General Assembly deposed him without hearing his case, in said court, in terms of the laws of his Caurch. on learning t a: he had applied to the civil

It is our deliberate and matured opinion,

that there is not a Church in Scotland more

court for counsel.

independent in the exercise of all that ap pertains to the pritted and ecclesiastical jurisdiction of a Church of Christ, and that there is not unother Church in the would that has more unrestrained power for doing good than the Church of Scotland We do not ask the e who differ to adopt these sentiments. We believe, moreover, that the Church of Scatland was falsely accused. Therefore to concede an article as a basis of Union, that would in the remotest degree imply that we or the Church to which we have been connected was guilty of this charge, would, we conceive involving ourselves in the sin of others We are not prepared to do this. We have, it must be admitted, more than enough sins of omission and commission of our own to coufers and we endured more than enough unjust declamation because of our connection with the Church of Scotland, and we are propared to boarn continuation of this to the end of our days, rather than make what we regard as unjust concessions. Let, then, what has been said of unnecessary schem and donial of the Headship, he set aside, and no more he set down to the account of either, otherwise it is better to hearned to practice more Christian charity. For our elves we are a thousand times sick of these profitless disputations—that ministor strife with little edification. Let those who wish to transmit the old war cry as a heritage to their children and to all, continue to uphold strift and contention and bit-terness between the Presbyterian families while their breath lasts if they will have it so. I mean this to be my last letter on this inhappy question unless special cause should arise. We have done our best to ferward the proposed re-union. Our best hope for an on was not for our weak efforts or the best human efforts. We had been for some time indulging the fond belief that the Great Head of the Church was working very graciously and powerfully on the hearts of the people proparing thou for Union. Should we not see and acknowledge His right hand in the friendly inter-course and charifulle utterances exchanged by those were only recently in cold oppos-ing ranks. Therefore we do not yet lose hope of the Union. Our confidence is that He who has begun the good work will carry it on to completion. And we do pity the man, who can only see it his duty to use his influence and his efforts to retard or prevent so desirable a consummation. I am, yours very truly,

ALEX. McKAY.

The Manso, Eldon, 6th Jan., 1874.

It is no disgrace for such who have the gift and grace of extemporary prayer some-times to use a set form, for the benefit and behoof of others. Jacob, though he could have marched on at a man's pace, yet was have marched on at a man a pace, yet was careful not to overlive the children and them. Man owes big with young. Let ministers remember to bring up the rear in their confined and the fight gregations, that the meanest may go along with them in their devotions.

Junius Britus Booth Repeating the Lord's Prayer.

The Lord's Prayer contains sixty-five shaple words, and no other three-score-and-five had ever been together on so many human lips. For a thousand years they have been the household, the cradic words of Okcistens dom. Children innumerable in both homisphores, have been taught to say them in their first lessons in articulate speech. They have been the prayer of all ages and conditions; uttered by mitred bishops in onnations; aftered by mirred bishops in gradid cathedrals, and lisped by poor men's children, with cloved eyes in cots of straw at night. The feet of forty generations, as it were, have been trodded out of them. Indeed one often hears them from the pul-pit is if they were were out by repetition. A lew pretentiously educated minds may even ask their secret thoughts, "Can these dry words live?" Yes, they have been made to live with overpowering vitality.

Junius Brutus Booth, the celebrated tragedian, was a man who throw into his impersonation an amount of heart and soul which his originals could scarcely have equalled. He did Richard III. to the life equalled. He did Richard III. to the life and more. He had made human passions, emotions, and experiences his life gtudy. He could not only act, but feel rage, love, despair, hate, ambition, fury, Lope, and rovenge, with a depth of force the half amazed his anditors. He could translate himself into the here of his impersonations, and he could breathe a power into other and he could breathe a power into other men's written words which perhaps was never surpassed. And, what is rather remarkable, when he was inclined to give ilmarkatio, when he was inclined to give il-lustrations of this faculty to private circles of friends, he nearly always selected some passages from Job, David, or Isaiah, or holy men of old. When an aspiring young professor of Harvard University went to him by night to ask a little advice or in-struction for civilitating himself. struction for qualifying himself for an orator, the vetran tragedian opened the Bible and read a few verses from Isaiah in a way that made the Cambridge scholar tremble with awe, as if the prophet had rison from the dead and were uttering his sublime visions in his ears. He was then residing in Bultimore, and a pious, uroan gentleman of the city, hearing of his wet urvan derful power of elocution, one day in lite him to dinner; although strongly depress a ing the stage and all theatried therefor mances. A large company do da to the table and on returning to taving room one of them requested at a special favour to them to repe "d's prayer. He signified his willing and all eyes were fire a gratify thom, from his chair, slowly and reverently r trombling with the burder of two great con-contions. He had to real 2 * 2 * character attributes and prosence of the Almighty Bong ho was to address. 1.1 was to transform himself into a poor, and may stumbling, bonighted, needy supplie to the ring hombonighted, needy supplie and attending, age, asking broad, parton, hold and guidance. Says one of the containty present:
"It was wonderful to week the play of countenance. He became deadly pale, and in yes, turned trombling, upward, we wot with tears. And yet he had no we with silence could be felt; it had been thealthe. silence could be felt; it had been absoluteas it by an electric shock, a colly such toned voice, from white lips, syllated with Our Pather which act in Heaven, with a pathos and fervid solemnty the thrilled all hearts. He finished; the vit continued; not a voice was heart were a muscle moved in his rapt nudloneo, more from a remote corner of the room, a lake the sol remote corner of the room, a distinct son was heard, and the old gentalman, (the host) stepped forward, with stempling eyes and tottering frame and seized (toth by the hand. 'Sir,'saidhe in bre's a scents, you have afforded me a pleasu, a for t high my whole hie will feel grateful. I me an old man, and every day from by cloud to the present time I thought I bad reported the Lord's Prayer; but I have to beard it before, never! 'You are regist, epided Booth; 'to read that prayer as 1 read caused me the severest read caused me the severest (1) and labor for thirty years, and I am (1) from being satisfied with my rendering of that wonderful production. Hardly one person in ten thousand comprehends how pushing the satisfied of the second statement of the s beauty, tonderness and grandeur can be comdesira densed in a space se small, and is simple. That prayer itself sufficiently illustrates the truth of the Bib e, and coraps upon it the seal of divinity. So or it was the effect produced, says our it that conversation was sustained but a bloom of the seal of short time longer, in subdued we seed lables, and almost entirely center; and soon after, at an early hour, the continued broke up and retired to their several broke. with sad faces and full hearts."

"Can these words live?" Let any upon who thinks, and almost says they have had their 'ife by repetition, ask any one of the company that listened to Junius bout that evening, to say what opinion on that evening, to say what opinion on that question. But some conscientious persons may possibly object the the effect be produced was dramatic; this he only gave to the words the force of act ed feeling. Suppose this be granted artificial or counterfeit feeling could p duce such effect, what impressions ough not genuine emotion in the utterance of that simple and heautiful prayer to produce on an accionce.—Ten-Minute Inl's—by Elhu Burritt.

Prayer to God is a moral necessity. It is the justinet of humanity—of the creature toward the Creator. Before reason and without, the soul, in its conscious inferior ity and weakness cries to the great Creatur for help.

Thousands more would find it easy to love God if they had not such miscrable types of Him in the solf-suking, impulse-driven purposoloss, faithfoss beings who are all they have for father and mother, and to whom they are no dearer than her litter is to the unthinking dam.

Be friendly to all; but make none your friends until they know you and you know them. Many a friendship, born in the darkness of ignorance, hath died suddenly in the light of botter acquaintance with