

n the part of the State, and abject submission on the part of the church, let our friends tell us in what stronger or better language such sentiments could be expressed. To us who consider the reception of State-endowment impossible without erastian submission on the part of the church, it is altogether superfluous to speak of making opinions here matter of forbearance. We can form no opinion on receiving State-endowment but that it is a sacrificing of the church's independence: and we hold the independence of the church to be an essential principle of union,—a point, therefore, on which we will not call our brethren, and we think they will not call us, to exercise forbearance. If, however, they seriously think that the church can be independent, and yet endowed by the State, we have no objection to forbear with them in holding such a theory, (for as a mere theory it is innocuous) provided they pledge themselves to us to refuse to reduce it to practice.

Farther, our brethren "continue to consider the views which they have always held and formerly expressed by their Committee on the duty of the civil magistrate and the responsibility of nations to God, to be of such vital importance as to demand that they be made a term of ecclesiastical incorporation, and believe the practical effects resulting from the principles referred to, to be of such a character, as to render the maintaining of these principles, in all their integrity, necessary to the best interests of the church of Christ." Here is a complete dash, in the meantime, to all hopes of union. This part of their Resolution must be literally and thoroughly cancelled before we can once think union with them either desirable or practicable. Here we are thrown back upon principles formerly expressed by them, some of which we fondly hoped they had in some measure abandoned, for they seem to us to be fit only for the dark ages. Let us look at these, for probably some of our readers may not be aware of the reference. The Committees formerly appointed by the Presbyterian and United Presbyterian Churches, drew up eight articles, all bearing on the magistrate's power, in which shades of difference between the churches are to be seen. It would be tedious to enter fully into these, although we are prepared for it if it can serve any purpose, to strengthen ourselves in our own rational and scriptural views on this subject, and to convince our brethren that they greatly overstep the bounds of sober scriptural truth, and sound reasoning.

The following are the views of the Presbyterian Church in the articles referred to, —which we give by themselves, without, at present, attempting to weaken their force by contrasting them with our own, conjoined with which they were originally exhibited. They hold "1. That while the province of the civil magistrate remains the same, the revelation of Christ's appointment as head and king of nations has imposed new duties on nations and rulers. 2. That religion is the concern of legislators and civil rulers as such, and ought not only to be protected by the maintenance of religious liberty, but also publicly countenanced, favoured, and promoted by them. 3. That it is the duty of nations and rulers to make a formal recognition of Christ's Headship, and that the simplest and least objectionable mode, in their opinion, in which this could be done would be a national act incorporated into the constitution of the State, and made the basis, so far as applicable, of all future legislation and administration. 4. That it is the duty of the civil magistrate to make a formal recognition of the authority of the bible, and to appeal to its principles and precepts as his directory in every department of his peculiar duties. 5. That it is the duty of the civil magistrate to suppress and punish such sins, against the first table of the moral law, especially against the law of the Sabbath, where they are offences against society, by being *overt-acts injurious to, or obstructive of, its welfare; and, in particular, that it is his duty to enforce the law of the Sabbath, and to suppress and punish its violators.* 6. That education, in all its branches, ought to be directed and pervaded by sound religious principles, and that the magistrate in providing for the education of the young, ought therefore to discriminate between the true and false in religion, and to see to it that only what is in harmony with, and favourable to, the promotion of sound religion be taught, and further, that it is lawful, and in certain circumstances is his duty, to provide for the young, direct religious instruction. 7. That it is the duty of the civil magistrate to see to it that provision be made for the religious instruction of the nation,—that the mode in which this duty should be performed has not been prescribed, but may vary in different circumstances, and that the provision of means for direct religious instruction, and the appropriation with this view of a portion of the public funds is lawful: but that the adoption of this particular mode of promoting religion at any given time, should be determined by a reference to the consideration of christian expediency." The 8th. article refers to certain passages in the Confession of Faith