

is not only a libel on our profession of Christianity, but it is a great hindrance to the gospel of Christ." "Let us," they say "be one in name, one in interest, as we own but the 'one faith, one Lord, one baptism,'" and then we will be stronger and more formidable in the "front" we present to the common enemy. Others say, "that to pronounce *for union* in the state in which matters now are, argues ignorance of the principles for which the church to which we profess to belong, was contending, when at the cost of much odium, and exposed to the grossest misrepresentation, her members sternly resisted the re-establishment of an ecclesiastical tyranny, which Scotland had risen in her might to throw off at the time of the Reformation."

There can be little doubt in the minds of far seeing, calm thinking men, but that there are yet grave obstacles in the way of a satisfactory union. That a *union on grounds of expediency* is required, we do not deny; but we are far from believing that a union on such a basis could be satisfactory or permanent. Where expediency does not call for it, the general feeling is rather against than for it, even on both sides; but where by uniting two weak congregations (which separate, cannot support a minister of either denomination,) a minister could be well and comfortably supported, is rather *for* than against, yet there obtains the hope on *both sides*, that if such a union were to take place, the minister will be of the party to which each belonged previous to the union.

But if other than a co-operative union be generally so desirable, and prospectively so beneficial, how, or why, after so many years of "courting and coquetting," is there not more mutual confidence, and unity of charitable sentiment, between the parties desirous of a relationship that should exclude jealousies, distrust and all uncharitableness? Why do we continue amid talk on the "desirableness" of union, and essays on the "necessity and benefits" of it, to fight so shy of each other? Why do we have such mingled *fear and delicacy* in proposing a change of pulpits, and how do we continue to have always on hand such good excuses for declining each other's proposal of exchange, when made? Why only one season in the year when union prayer meetings seem legitimate? And are the reserve, the stiffness, &c. which are brought to these, either intended or calculated to ripen the feelings for permanent union? Why not more candour and frankness in acknowledging our mutual prejudices and bigotries? Why not go hand in hand in the night of day, and in the face of the world, and dig a deep grave for them, and there bury them out of sight and remembrance, and over their grave vow tolerance, friendship and charity towards each other? When this is done, a step is taken in the right direction towards a union

that will be satisfactory, solid, and permanent. And what good purpose will it serve if we endeavour to construct a stately edifice with stones, ever so well hewn and polished, if there be no cement to bind and hold them together? With what hope for good, can discordant elements be juddled together, no matter by what name called?

Until the hand of charity become more actively employed in "plucking up" every "root of bitterness," the less said about union the more consistent.

There are a few congregations where a union on the *grounds of expediency* might be effected with great temporal advantage—we would recommend that in *these*, such a union should be agreed upon by both Synods. It might serve to pave the way, and mature the general feeling for union on higher grounds, and more solid bases. Let it be tried in the case of Barney's River, Lochaber, Earlstown, the Strait of Canso and a few other congregations, where *both parties are pretty equally divided*, but unable separately to support a minister, and let the majority decide on what *party* the minister shall belong to, and it shall then be seen whether disintegrating elements will "put in an appearance."

We have ever been ready to hail a union of the Presbyterian Churches on proper bases, and just and sound principles, but a union that tacitly leaves at our door, charges of dereliction of duty, of "taking the crown of Christ and placing it on an earthly Sovereign," of being a mere secular corporation, charges, that have never been retracted, cannot commend itself to us, and notwithstanding all its professed advantages, we would feel it our duty to withhold from it our sanction or approval.

#### A LOVER OF UNION.

—o—

#### Meeting of the Presbytery of Pictou.

The Pictou Presbytery met in St. Andrew's Church, Pictou, on the 6<sup>th</sup> ult., and was constituted with prayer. There were present Rev. Mr. Herdman, moderator; *pro tem*, Revs. W. Stewart and McMillan, and W. Gordon and John McKay, Esqrs., elders.

The minutes of last meeting were read and sustained.

The Presbytery having met with the special view of considering the circumstances of Gairloch congregation, and expediting the settlement of a pastor over said people, but there being no one present in the interests of said congregation, the Presbytery proceeded to other business.

It was moved by Rev. Mr. Stewart, seconded by J. McKay, Esq., and agreed to, that all ministers be enjoined to produce their Session Records for examination at next ordinary meeting of Presbytery, also, that it be enjoined on all the congregations within