

with cold indifference. Away with the mere thought that fickleness or indifference in regard to such an important matter is chargeable to our ministers.

(2.) Nor can we admit that they are powerless to influence the views of their respective congregations on this or any other matter which affects the welfare of our venerable Zion, and aims at lengthening her cords and strengthening her stakes. Our experience never taught us the fact that our people are either a "priest-ridden" or a "priest-riding" people. While they are capable of forming an opinion, and holding it with true Presbyterian grasp, they are respectful to their ministers and open to conviction from their lips. Let the ministers tell the whole truth in love and with unwavering consistency, and they will be guided both in opinion and action. But if the ministers blow hot and blow cold alternately on any matter, but especially on a question like the Union, which is so fraught with consequences, the people, true to their conservative Church-instincts and prejudices, will shrink from any change which implies real or imaginary sacrifices. Let, then, the arguments for and against union, be fully and fairly laid by each minister before his congregation, and, judging from the tried and well-known love and loyalty of our people to their Church and country, we do not fear but the verdict of ninety-nine out of every hundred will be favourable to Union.

One word more before closing this letter, already too long. From the minute of a late meeting of the Truro Presbytery of our sister Church, as reported in the *Presbyterian Witness* of 8th Nov., we learn that the Oppositionists of Pictou have allies in Truro. The amendment to the motion on Union proposed at said meeting is open to unfavourable criticism. (1.) The mover and seconder of that amendment, which stated a preference for the so-called smaller union, seem to be acting somewhat inconsistently. It is true that the mover of said amendment had the honour to be the only member of Synod who gave his vote against the basis of Union as agreed upon by the Joint Committee of the negotiating Churches. Still, he neither dissented nor protested against the decision of the Synod,—while we take it

for granted that the seconder was among the overwhelming majority. Now, under their long list of *whereases* with which they preface their resolution, there is not one reason given which has not been answered a thousand times since the Union negotiations began, and which was not as well known to them (we, in charity to their intelligence, suppose) at the meeting of Synod as at the late meeting of the Truro Presbytery; yet they recorded no objection to the decision of Synod.

(2.) The amendment seems also to be defective in logic. The reasons which are adduced by these ministers against the so-called larger Union, are equally applicable to the smaller Union of which they seem enamoured.

We think, then, that it would be better for the credit both of their sincerity and logic, if they had long ago, or even now at the eleventh hour, come out openly and boldly and said, we do not want Union either with the Church of Scotland in the Maritime Provinces and old Canada, or with our own Church in old Canada.

N. B.

Presbytery Home Mission.

The object of this scheme is to raise money by collectors in each Church within the bounds of each Presbytery to meet the demands of weak congregations in the support of their ministers. For many years, all the money required in this way was drawn from the Colonial Committee of the Church of Scotland. Those weak congregations which were receiving aid in some instances were making no effort to become self-sustaining, and almost nothing was done by the Church generally to save the Colonial Committee advancing so largely. It was not surprising to those who observed this state of matters when word was received that such liberal grants could not be continued. The Secretary of the Colonial Committee, writing on the 19th September, 1861, to his correspondent in New Brunswick, states that while the Committee accept the explanation as "to the inability of the people to support their own ministers," they "fully expect to be relieved, in the course of another year, of the burden of the Lower Provinces altogether." He added further that it was "perhaps