

direction which drove millions from Episcopacy, and attached them to the simpler forms of worship of the dissenters. It is no less remarkable that the only great defection that took place from the Church of Scotland, namely, that of the Free Church, was not by reason of any dislike to the forms of the Mother Church. It certainly cannot be said that those who broke away from the establishment in Scotland, in 1843, headed by the great CHALMERS, were lacking either in "style of education," intellectual ability, or in zeal to serve God. Yet they did not deem a renovation of the then existing worship necessary. Nay they adopted its forms to the letter, and the Free Church of the present day is a more determined conservator of these, than even the Kirk itself.

And, if we are to unite with this great christian body, the similarity of our Church forms is of inestimable importance. Neither would have to sacrifice anything in this respect. Now, keeping in view the desirability of a closer relationship with the Free Church, would it not be highly imprudent for individual churches, or for the Church of Scotland in Canada, as a whole, to introduce or countenance innovations, that would throw an obstacle in the way of the consummation of union between the two great Presbyterian families.

I consider this one circumstance of sufficient importance to warrant every true Presbyterian in vigorously opposing innovation in our forms, the very severity of which, through now alleged to be "a grievous hindrance to communion with the Church of Scotland," has won many adherents to her pale.

In conclusion perhaps some explanation is necessary. Did I not believe that much delusion exists on this subject I would not have undertaken to expose what I would fain believe to be a misconception arising from an error of judgment, or a want of proper appreciation of the