

also whose opinions differ considerably from mine; while I cannot see that it would implicate any. It requires no man to abandon or disguise his opinion. It only gives liberty to all to think for themselves, within a certain range. If this cannot be admitted, if an attempt at defining must be made, I see no way in which I and some others can be satisfied, but by introducing into the Basis the doctrine of Providence being committed to Christ, and omitting all beyond, or declaring that all beyond is matter of forbearance. If these terms cannot be granted, then it would seem that some of us must, as honest men, withdraw. It is placing peace before purity, to ask us to violate our conscience.

I must say that one thing which troubles me about the resolutions of the other Synod is, that I do not clearly understand them. The Synod, of course, is not bound to furnish me with intellect. But this document is for the Church, which contains many simple-minded people, and surely everything ought to be made plain to those of weak capacity. Reference is made to certain applications contained in a Report submitted to both Synods in 1858. Respecting these, I and thousands more, are perfectly ignorant. By hunting up, we might possibly obtain the needed information; but why in a case of this kind, should such a process be required,—a process which to many would be inconvenient, and to not a few impracticable? The resolutions either amount to forbearance, to the extent I have indicated as needed by me, or they do not. If they do, I should be glad that were expressed in plain terms. If they do not, then they don't satisfy the claims of my conscience.

It is provided in these resolutions, that a minority of Synod shall, on matters of ecclesiastical government, "be guided in any action on dissent by constitutional order, and the received principles of the United body." Now what is "constitutional order, and the received principles of the United body"? Something yet to be brought into existence, something which shall be enacted by the United Body, and in enacting which, the U. P. Members, being comparatively few, will, of course have a correspondingly small share. Is not this asking us to put our head in a noose? What if the order and principles should turn out such, that were any of us after dissent to feel called on to use what has been styled, "ministerial freedom," and advocate our peculiar views from the pulpit, the platform, or the press, we should be subjected to censure, or possibly to expulsion. Is such a thing without example?

In the clause adopted by our Synod the expression occurs "that in the application of the doctrine of this article mutual forbearance shall be exercised." In the Resolutions of the other Synod we have the words "*practical applications* of said fourth Article." And in the motion carried in that Synod, there is the phrase "on *minor applications* of its doctrine." I have italicised the words on which I wish attention fixed. I fear the meaning may be held to be that the doctrine itself is to be fully and implicitly adopted, and that toleration is to be granted only as to the carrying of it out. If so, that does not at all meet my case; for I seriously object to the doctrine itself without limitation. It is about