

ported by a reference to several publications.

These extracts from Secession Testimonies have been given at such length, not merely for the purpose of supporting what was stated about the "open communion" of the Relief, but also that the reader may the more readily apprehend the ground for the statement made in the only other passage of the Free Synod's Letter that requires to be maintained in the face of the allegations of the Presbyterian Synod. The statement in the Letter is, "While with those bodies, therefore, in their separate position, we could not have entered into communion, the principles on which they lately united are such as still farther to add to the obstacle. They professed to unite, but allow each other to hold their distinctive views, so that it is not easy to know what are the principles of the United Presbyterian Church, and the difficulty is still farther increased by intimations which were openly given in the progress to the union that farther changes in their Standards were contemplated."

The ordinary channels of public information must here be looked to; and it is believed no one will question the general accuracy of the Reports of public transactions that are given in the Scottish Guardian. An account of the proceedings in the United Secession Synod, and in the Relief Synod, with respect to the union, appeared in that Journal from time to time; and few will doubt that the following extracts fully warrant what the Presbyterian Synod call the "reckless" statements of the Free Synod. On Sept. 22, 1846, the Scottish Guardian published a Report with respect to the proposed union from the Session of the Kirkintilloch congregation (Dr. Marshall's) which the Presbytery declined to transmit to the Synod; but which Dr. Marshall himself subsequently read in the Synod, as a part of his speech, on the 7th of the following month. Referring to the way in which the Synod had acted with regard to the libel against Dr. Brown, the Report says, "In the opinion of this Session, the majority of the Secession body who took part in these proceedings, who are not entitled to the smallest credit, nor can possibly obtain the smallest credit, with impartial men, when they declare their adherence to the Westminster Confession, let that declaration be ever so solemn, till they shall have first rescinded these ob-

noxious deeds, so injurious to divine truth, and shall have publicly confessed, before God, and before all the churches, their sorrow for having enacted them." "If it is so that the Relief body are willing to unite with the Secession body in present circumstances, accepting their declaration of adherence to the Westminster Confession, in direct contradiction to their public and unrescinded deeds, this Session are constrained however reluctantly, to look upon them as equally tainted with the Secession body, and to regard their solemn protestations as having precisely the same value—that is, no value at all." According to the same Journal, of the 9th of the following October, the United Secession Synod, on Wednesday the 7th of that month, agreed upon the first and second Articles of the Basis of Union—the second Article being "That the Westminster Confession of Faith and Larger and Shorter Catechisms are the Confession of Faith and Catechisms of this Church, and contain an authorised exhibition of the sense in which it understands the Holy Scriptures; it being always understood that we do not approve of anything in these books which teaches, or may be supposed to teach, compulsory or persecuting principles in religion." Dr. Marshall is reported to have said, in the course of the discussion with regard to this second Article "that he could not possibly reconcile with the public deeds of this body, which were referred to in the sentence he had read [from the Report above mentioned], its professions of adherence to the Confession of Faith, and he could not possibly understand how this Synod adhered consistently to this Confession of Faith, while it allowed those deeds to stand unquestioned and unrescinded.—As soon would he believe in the doctrine of transubstantiation, or anything which constituted in his mind an absurdity, as believe in the present professions of the Secession Synod, while these deeds stood unrescinded. He need only refer to the treatment of the libel which came before the Synod in July 1845, to maintain his position. By that libel the principles of this Synod were tested, according to the Confession of Faith, in many important particulars. How was that libel treated? *The relevancy was not considered*; and why was it not considered? For the very obvious reason that it might have disclosed too plainly the sentiments of the parties. 'It would never do,' said one, 'to consider the relevancy; it might divide us.' [a voice—"Who said that?"] Why, somebody said it. Very likely he was a simpleton who said it—a very great simpleton. [expressions of disapprobation] *The relevancy was not considered—ALL THE WORLD KNOWS THAT*—and why was it not considered? [Question] The man who uttered that saying—allowing there was such a man—was not aware that he was doing the very thing that he did not want