

to do. By the attempts at concealment they were making a disclosure."

The Report of the meeting of the joint committees of the Secession Synod and the Synod of Relief, had recommended that the 9th Article of the Basis of Union should be, "That the United Church regard with a feeling of brotherhood, all the faithful followers of Christ, and shall endeavour to maintain the unity of the whole body of Christ, by a readiness to co-operate and hold fellowship with all its members in all things in which they are agreed." After a discussion, it was carried in the United Secession Synod that the words "and hold fellowship" should be left out: and that the Article thus amended should be enlarged by the following prefix: "That the respective bodies of which this Church is composed, without requiring from each other an approval of the rules of procedure of their fathers, or interfering with the right of private judgment in reference to this, unite in severally recommending as still valid the reasons on which they have hitherto maintained their state of secession and separation from the jurisdiction of the Established Church, as expressed in the authorised documents of the respective bodies, and in maintaining the lawfulness and obligation of separation from ecclesiastical bodies in which dangerous errors are tolerated in the discipline of the Church, or the rights of her ministers or members are disregarded." The import of this Article seems to be that while, on the one hand, the Secession were not required to approve of the rules of procedure of the fathers of the Relief, nor the Relief to approve of the rules of procedure of the fathers of the Secession; on the other hand, neither were they required to renounce the principles on which they had been hitherto acting, not merely as separate, but, as has been shown, as antagonistic bodies. The Article thus far seems to speak only of continued distinctness and separation.—At length, however, the word *unite* appears. These respective bodies, without interfering with the right of private judgment in the matters of difference just referred to, *unite*—yes unite; but in doing what? Why, they unite in *severally*, that is, *separately*, recommending the authorised documents of the respective bodies. This United body does not unite in recommending the authorised documents of the Secession, for these would be spurned at by the Relief; nor do they unite in recommending the authorised documents of the Relief, for these would be an offence to the Seceders; but, as these documents must have the appearance of being still held in honour, they unite in order to show that there is no real union, by *separately*, or, if they will, *severally*, recommending their respective documents. And it seems this is the kind of union that would delight the brethren of the Presbyterian Synod of Nova Scotia.

Even after this Article had been agreed to, Mr. Renton is reported, in the Scottish Guardian of Oct. 9th, 1846, to have said, "It was plain that up to this hour a large majority of the Secession Church had manifested no desire for this union. He held this to be unsatisfactory." "He adhered to the conclusion, that a union without the heart of the people was not a safe nor a right union; and that, unless a feeling in its favour be manifested by the people, the union had better be delayed. But he would also ask, were the two churches at one in their doctrines? He knew they were at one speculatively and upon profession. On making inquiry upon this subject lately, he had been told that the booksellers' shops were open—to go to the Confession of Faith, and judge from it whether they were at one. But that was not enough. If they were to judge of the orthodoxy of any Church by its Confession and Catechisms, he would say this Church had no right ever to have existed as a Secession Church—no right to lift up its voice against the Established Church. Whatever may have been the defects of that Church, it never denied the Confession and formulas to which they (the United Secession) adhered. Besides, he was ignorant of the doctrines of the Relief Church; he did not know what were the doctrines preached from their pulpits on various subjects, such as the atonement.—He was not prepared to acquiesce in the opinion that if they were only ignorant of ill, they must take it for granted that all was right. Another reason for objecting was, that there was such a diversity in the state of discipline between the two Churches, that there was not only on this account no confidence in a union, no desire for it, but that there was amongst the congregations a positive disinclination to it." An elder also is reported to have said, that "he could not agree with the principle of free communion on any account, and he believed many of the congregations of the Secession Church held the same views which he did on that subject." It is true, a Mr. Thomas is reported to have explained to the worthy elder "that all that the Relief Synod asked was, that this should be made a matter of forbearance, which it was already to a certain extent in the Secession Church. The Relief brethren deserved the recognition of this principle at their hands. The only difficulty was in the regulation of the principle." But that was a difficulty; for where the principle is recognised restricted communion is at an end. However, let the rules of Christ's house be what they might, Mr. Thomas thought that the Relief brethren deserved that the point should be yielded at their hands. It was accordingly yielded, in the terms of an Article which took its place as the sixth in point of order.

When the Articles had been agreed to on both sides, a deputation from the Relief Sy-