

that is here endeavouring to excite the prejudices of the ignorant—and against whom it is that the attempt is made to excite such prejudices. Let the reader also judge whether, in the present case, it would serve any good purpose to beseech the offending party, “in the name of all that is fair and honourable in conduct,” to desist.

What, however, can the Synod of the Presbyterian Church mean, when, in their Reply, they say, “Knowing the favour, in which the Westminster Standards are justly held by the Scottish Presbyterians, the object of our brethren on the whole seems to be to produce the impression upon the less intelligent portion of the community, that we are less attached to these standards than they are”? With a delicacy of feeling towards the Presbyterian Synod which that body have not been able to appreciate, and which they have but ill requited, the Free Synod, in their Letter, satisfied themselves with the following short and simple statement: “Regarding the proposed Basis of Union as involving an adherence to the entire doctrine of the Westminster Confession of Faith, it appeared to us that little difficulty could be met with, that Basis being agreed upon, in arranging the relations in which we should stand to other Churches, according as they might be recognised as holding the same faith with that united body, which we hoped was to result from the negotiations into which we had entered with you. The obstacles to union, however, which have been presented to us in this part of our negotiations, have been such as to impress us with the painful conviction that you and we do not entertain the same views either of the Basis of Union; or of the Confession of Faith to which it specially refers.” They then proceeded, without a word of complaint against the Presbyterian Synod for the mistake as to the import of the Basis of Union into which it is evident they have so unaccountably fallen, to shew the grounds of this conviction by referring to *other bodies*, their relations to whom would be affected by the terms upon which the proposed Union would be gone into. They shewed that the conviction which they had expressed was warranted by the fact that the Presbyterian Synod would not join with them in maintaining the Testimony of the Free Church—that they would not join with them in their Protest against the established Church of Scotland, as now consti-

tuted—and that they required that the united body should acknowledge the United Presbyterian Church in Scotland as a parent church. And is the conviction which they thus expressed groundless? It has been shewn that the Basis of Union engages to the entire doctrine of the Confession of Faith. That is the light in which the Free Church regards it. Do the Presbyterian Synod view it in the same light? Do they hold by the entire doctrine of the Confession of Faith? If they do not, Why should they be afraid to let the truth be known? When they appear before the world under such colours? Or can they really imagine that it is only “the less intelligent portion of the community”, who will conclude that they who object to portions of the Confession of Faith must be less attached to it than those who are anxious to maintain it in all its integrity?

Perhaps that Synod wish it to be understood as an indication of their great attachment to the Confession of Faith, that they refer with such an air of satisfaction to certain circumstances connected with the appointment of Mr. Bannerman to the Professorship of Theology in the New College, Edinburgh. They do not indeed commit themselves expressly to the gross mistatement of Mr. Trotter, in the third of his Letters, where he says, “it is a fact of which you cannot be ignorant, that there are many in the Free Church, and that the number is rapidly increasing, who are willing to dispense with the Confession of Faith altogether, which would leave them at liberty to maintain or depart from its doctrines as they please;” and as an authority for such a statement proceeds to quote a passage from the speech of Dr. McKay, delivered before the Commission in August 1848. But Mr. Trotter's Letters had been for some time before the public, Mr. Trotter had a special hand in drawing up the Reply, it is the same quotation which had been given in Mr. Trotter's Letter that is given in the Reply, and while, in the Reply, the Synod do not employ a single word that was calculated to correct or to guard against the false and injurious impression which Mr. Trotter's statement was so well fitted to produce, they make the quotation for a purpose which requires that it should be viewed in the very light in which it has been so grievously misrepresented by Mr. Trotter—they refer to it for the purpose of shewing the inconsistency of the Free Church here in professing