

obvious, for it is freely admitted, was in keeping with the views and desires entertained by the body at large. The same thing was attempted before, at a time when our Church in Charlotte-Town was vacant, but the attempt proved a complete failure, although it was espoused and supported by some who are now members of St. James' Church. There is every reason for saying that circumstances were more favorable to them at that time than they have ever been since. The increase in the Presbyterian population, excluding those who belong to the Free Church, is not so rapid, nor is the influx of members and adherents from their congregations in the country so great, as to justify their doing now what they could not accomplish then.

Any one acquainted with the population of Charlotte-Town must know that for all purposes two Churches and two Ministers are amply sufficient for all the Presbyterians residing there, and that a third can only be expected to prosper by the withdrawal of parties from the congregations with which they have connected themselves—an event likely to be greatly more detrimental to the interests of religion and Presbyterianism than the planting of a third Presbyterian Church can be favorable. I think it cannot be difficult for any one acquainted with Charlotte-Town, and having the interests of Presbyterianism at heart, to conclude that, in point of fact, there exists no reason for the organization of another Presbyterian congregation there, beyond that which a determined ambition to have a denominational existence in the capital of the Island, furnishes. When the immediate predecessor of the present Minister of St. James' went to Charlotte-Town, he did all that could possibly be done to be on the most friendly terms with the Ministers and congregations in the Island connected with the Presbyterian Church of Nova Scotia, and, for a while, friendly co-operation and communion were maintained. For a time previous to his removal, however, some Ministers of that body kept aloof, and the connection gradually formed in his mind, that he was not looked upon with such a friendly eye as formerly.

No reason could be thought of by him of sufficient weight to account for this change, until it became known to him that the Presbytery to which these Ministers belonged had been scheming for the formation of a congregation at Charlotte-Town; nor was the explanation thus furnished arrived at until he ascertained that their Synod had agreed to prosecute their plans. It then became apparent that, as far as our Minister in Charlotte-Town was concerned, co-operation was at an end, and the effect of this upon the general question of cooperation between the two bodies, it was easy to see, could not be favorable. It might have been different had there been a superabundant Presbyterian population there to work upon; but when every inch of ground to be gained was of the greatest consequence, the appearance of any Minister of that body in St. James' pulpit, could only be prejudicial to the views entertained by those interested in this uncalled for movement, as well as to the views of the friends of co-operation.

But there is a subsequent step taken by that body, which has proved even more prejudicial to the progress of co-operation. In 1856, the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Nova Scotia, determined to send some of their members to Charlotte-Town to commence the formation of a congregation there. The results of previous attempts must have been known to them. They must have known that in the in-

terval no very great increase in the Presbyterian population of the city had taken place; and they must have known that a congregation in connection with the Free Church Synod had, in the mean time, been formed, amply sufficient, together with ours, which had just become self-sustaining, after contending with numerous difficulties to meet the wants of that increase. Still they determined—whether after or without deliberation as to the effects that the proposed movement would have on the interests of co-operation, is not known but to themselves—to have a Church in the capital of Prince Edward Island. Ministers were accordingly appointed, charged with this mission. In the mean time, our Synod met some days after their session of Synod closed, and two of their Ministers appeared as a deputation from them to advocate co-operation. They did advocate the matter very warmly and very eloquently, and the members of our Court were not behind them in point of warmth, and I believe sincerity. At the time, all felt it to be a profitable and solemn occasion. It was advanced by at least one of that deputation, as a special ground of co-operation, that one Presbyterian body should not interfere with another, in the occupation of a certain locality. This was particularly noticed by some members of your Court, as events had but recently transpired productive of very lengthened and very angry controversies, in connection with two of the Presbyterian bodies of Nova Scotia, showing that with one or other, and perhaps both, there had been a want of caution and consideration, in their occupation of certain places. While all this was going on, our Synod was ignorant of the movement toward Charlotte-Town by the other Synod. The proceedings of our Synod, however, had scarcely been finished, when the announcement was circulated that that Synod, the most forward in co-operation, had appointed one of their very deputation to proceed forthwith to Charlotte-Town, for the purpose aforesaid, and he it was who advanced, as a special ground of co-operation, the non-interference of one body with another, in the occupation of a particular locality. Up till this discovery, I am not aware that the desires of any member of our Synod for co-operation had cooled in the least degree, or that there was any disposition to regard the confidence that had been exercised as misplaced. But it is easy to see that the effect it has produced—though in some respects erroneous impressions may be entertained—is a very natural one. The conclusion must be adopted, however reluctantly, that for the present, the co-operation contemplated is not possible. They say they are ready for union. There are two parties interested in judging of their readiness. One of them has found them unprepared for even co-operation.

The editorial in the August number is headed "Prospects of union with the Free Church." Nearly one-half of the article is an attempt to show that the altered state of their relations with your Synod, is a circumstance, by which the Providence of God is specially forwarding that union. Who are to blame for the altered state of the relations of the one Synod with the other? If there be any truth in the preceding paragraph of this letter, they should know; and, really, it is too bad to exult in the consequence as a leading of Providence! Truly, if the writer of that article were to pen a treatise on the subject of a particular Providence, it would contain some queer illustrations. A number of details are specified to give the circumstance referred to an extraordinary interest and force. The

original motion in their Synod for friendly co-operation, is represented as having been made to include both the other Synods, very grave doubts being entertained as to their respective and comparative friendliness. It seems you made very great professions—you know whether they were sincere or not—I believe they were. Then the members of the "Kirk Synod" are said to have warmly invited them to send a deputation, promising a far better reception than the Free Church gave. The promise (if given) was fulfilled; they acknowledged this themselves. As to the invitation, (if it was ever given) it could only have been by one or two of the members of your Synod, and it must have been that kind of invitation which a man gives when a friend tells him he has determined to pay him a visit: "Well, I'll be glad to see you;" for the motion for co-operation was carried in their Synod in 1855, before your Synod met, and before any of your Ministers residing out of Halifax had arrived, or heard anything of it. It did not even seem to be positively known to the members resident in Halifax. All this and something more, augured favorably for co-operation between them and you; but in proportion to their expectations, so, it seems, has been their disappointment. They have sent two deputations, the Editor tells us, to your Synod, and you have not had the courtesy to reciprocate. Now, you know, they got about as much as expectation of a recompense was their motive. When the message announcing to your Synod that their Synod had appointed a deputation, was made, you had just commenced your proceedings for the session, and that message was accompanied by the request that an early hour would be named for their reception, as their Synod would close the following day. It was out of the question to reciprocate then, but they were warmly received—they were received with confidence—they departed with your prayers upon them. A Committee was appointed to attend specially, throughout the year, to the work of co-operation. That was in 1855. The two Synods parted, the one to meet the following year at New-Glasgow, the other at Pictou, for reasons best known to each, for, "Pending a union, we must be allowed to prosecute our denominational interests wherever the well-being of the Church appears to demand it." One thing is certain: that the Synods did not meet in the same place and at the same time the following year, was no studied or intentional slight on the part of your Synod. In 1856 your Synod met after their meeting was over. One of the first things done, after the usual preliminaries, was to hear the Report of the Committee on Co-operation, and to re-appoint them for the following year, making such alterations as would enable them to meet and attend to their duties more conveniently. On the day following the transaction of this business, their deputation met you, and were as warmly received, and with as much confidence as before. Nay, as showing the light in which their re-appearance was viewed, it was repeatedly stated by different members of your Synod, that a second deputation, before the first was returned, was worthy of special acknowledgement. They announced, in the course of their remarks, that their Synod was to meet the following year at Truro. There was nothing to take your Synod there, as everybody knows, but the re-appointment of a Committee had been previously provided. That brings us down to the time when, by their own inconsistency, they damaged the whole cause. But, in addition to the want of courtesy in this respect, the Editor of the *Instructor* declares that the "Record, the