

have decided against us, we conceive to be right ; but, in ignorance of the facts of the case, you have allowed it to flow in a wrong channel, and directed it against the wrong parties.

Allowing, as we most unreservedly do, that the disruption in Canada could only have been brought about by the most inexcusable folly as well as wickedness,—allowing that, in the circumstances in which the Synod was placed, by the disruption of the Church of Scotland, there existed no *necessary* occasion for a disruption among its members,—no strong temptation even to such a course as would lead to it,—nothing, in a word, that could have led to it, among wise, honest, and true-hearted men,—allowing this, we would put it to yourselves, *does* this show, or *can* this show that we are the guilty authors of the disruption ; or does it prove that occasion did not actually arise for it, or, in other words, that a course of procedure was not actually adopted by the majority of the Synod, which rendered our separation from them a duty. To ring the changes, as so many seem to do, on the melancholy fact that there *ought not*, and *needed not* to have been any occasion for the disruption in Canada and, under the feelings thus excited, to neglect the essential enquiry, whether that event did not actually become necessary, through the course pursued by the Synod, and to jump to the conclusion, that on our heads the sin of an “uncalled for disruption” is to be laid, is a course unworthy of intelligent men.

The fact, that the supporters of the Presbyterian Church of Canada happened to be in the minority in the Synod, and were thus the moving party in the disruption, has led some well-meaning persons, not accustomed to reflect on such subjects, to suppose that, as a matter of course, *they* are the cause of the disruption, and that on them the blame of that event must lie. But, we would beg such persons to consider, that the moving party in a disruption are not always the real disruptionists,—that the guilt of rending,—aye, of unnecessarily rending,—a Church, may lie on the heads of the remaining, or Residuary party ;—and that a disruption may have been unnecessary and uncalled for, in the sense of there having been no such difference of *professed* principle among those who have taken part in it, and no such strong temptation to deviate from the path of duty, as should have presented any formidable barrier to a reconciliation of differences of opinion, and to an agreement to act together on the side of truth and principle ; and yet, that that very disruption may have been rendered inevitable, and the secession of those who are the moving