

fully requested to examine what J. M'C. has said in the pages just now referred to, as explanatory of our views and the views of all the other bodies in Scotland, who agree with him on his fourth proposition, as it would be improper for me to occupy the pages of *The Christian* with the same evidence produced by J. M'C. in the 4th and 5th Nos. of the present volume.

Now, Bro. E., I have several objections to your plan of devoting men wholly to study and preaching: 1st. Because it is in direct opposition to the example and precept of the apostle Paul, which he urges upon the Ephesian elders and others; 2d. Because of the difficulty of reducing it to practice. I do not believe that any ordinary man is able to devote twelve or fourteen hours a day for a whole year to study and preaching; neither did I ever know any community that could afford to listen to preaching every day. Small churches are not able to bear the burden of such men, and in large churches (if constituted according to the primitive order) such men are not needed—for in such churches there will be such a supply of gifts as to render such men unnecessary. In the plan of education you gave us in the first few Nos. of the present volume of *The Christian*, you seem very much to approve of students working five or six hours every day; can you see any good reason why the same rule should not be applied to pastors and preachers? I think they might work six or eight hours every day, and have plenty of time to study and preach.

But although we have hitherto believed that John M'Cartney's four propositions were founded in scripture, yet we are willing and even desirous to see any thing brought from scripture against them. We have no interest, even in a pecuniary point of view, to hold error; for we are not hireling preachers, but only humble advocates of what we believe to be truth. We say then to you, and to all readers of *The Christian*, sift these propositions to the bottom: if they contain errors, let them be defined and condemned by scripture; observe the rules laid down in the first page of this paper, and we shall hear what any one has to say, but we are not to be imposed upon with quibbling, sophistry, circuitous or subtle reasoning.

I remain your dear brother and fellow labourer in the Lord's vineyard,

JAMES SILLERS.

P. S. I hope that the readers will excuse my homely way of expressing myself in the foregoing remarks, as I received but a small portion of education. Moreover, I knew nothing of the language I am writing in until I was grown up to manhood; and this is the first article that has ever appeared from my pen in print; neither would I at this time come forward, did I not consider that truth required it.

J. S.

River John Road, Pictou (N. S.), Sept. 30, 1848.

REMARKS ON THE REVIEW OF JOHN M'CARNEY'S PAMPHLET, IN THE SEVENTH NUMBER OF THE CHRISTIAN.

Though there are some things in the review with which I am pleased, at the same time there are others with which I am not satisfied. As it would occupy both time and space to point out the beauties, I hope the author will pardon me for adopting a contrary course (though it may be