

past offences in word or deed; and which the churches will do more of than they will the more exemplify the spirit of their Master, and also show more regard to His commands. The Apostle says it is a perfect man that will not offend in tongue; and the churches, no doubt, were manifesting too much imperfection, in offences of the tongue, with regard to each other, since a long time. As to these offences, however, it is vain to talk of reconsideration; the best way is to throw them overboard as belonging to the irretrievable past. I must acknowledge that there were hard things uttered, but I believe that all God-fearing people, whether clergymen or laymen,—even after themselves publishing the same on the house tops,—when they would go to their closets, would implore forgiveness for these as well as all other sins. As we believe, therefore, that all sins confessed, repented of, and forsaken, will be pardoned, on what good or scriptural grounds can we, as a church, be holding any hard feelings towards our sister church? Let us be at once reconciled to each other, and offer our sacrifices together on the same altar, for this is the Divine command.

I was well pleased with an article which appeared last year in the *Record*, from the pen of the Rev. Geo. Grant, on the subject of this union; and also by another one from "a lover of the union;" and by some others, showing clearly the expediency and the necessity of the union, to a certain extent, especially in certain places, where, owing to present circumstances, congregations are divided, and yet both parties, if united, hardly able to be self-sustaining.

A difficulty exists only too well known by those in such circumstances, that strong and undivided congregations cannot or will not sympathize with them, giving them liberty to join each other as one congregation, and have one minister resident among and presiding over them; which would be more convenient both for minister and people, if it could be done without the dear sacrifice of either leaving their own church. No doubt there are many things to be considered concerning this matter; but the sooner done to the satisfaction of both parties, the better. Any good deed we would like to see performed in our day, we should not be leaving altogether to another generation. We should, like David in his day as regarded building the temple, be willing to prepare material such as would be found necessary in accomplishing so good a work as a general union of Presbyterians, especially in these Colonies. Since the cause of separation never passed the sea, except in name and by report, I must honestly say, I would like to see the day when we shall be one; and hope, if suffered to live a short time longer, to see it.

No doubt it will be a hard feeling, to lose old names in connection with churches. One will say, "I am of Paul," and another, "I am of Apollos;" but I hope there may be a satisfactory compromise between both parties, to name after Him of whom the Apostle asks, "Is He divided?" and to name after Him in such a way that the names of Paul and Apollos would be forgotten.

I hope our Synod, in the approaching session, will be more unanimous in the matter than before. I would have been more satisfied with their action at the last session, if the motion anent union by the Rev. Mr. Thompson had received that attention it merited; or had the overture of the previous session been carried, instead of its being dismissed for an indefinite time. Although it is not pleasing to the Synod to carry any matter through when not unanimous, still there have been many good measures carried when good men have not been unanimous in their views concerning them. I hope the churches will all get more of the mind of their Master and Great Head, that they may do in accordance with His will whatever they do in this matter. This is the sincere wish of

Yours truly,

A LAY-PRESBYTER.

*North River, May 27th, 1870.*