

will be selected from it, to grace the Great London Exhibition, will do much towards removing the erroneous impression which our Countrymen at home have received regarding our province, and of attracting them to it as a desirable place of residence. The only matter of regret about the Exhibition was the place in which it was held. Sussex Vale, as most of your readers are aware, is on the line of railroad which connects St. John with Shediac Bay, being about half way between St. John and Moncton. It is perhaps one of the most lovely and fertile valleys in the province, and in itself well adapted for the purpose, but unfortunately, being so far removed from St. John (about 45 miles) or from any large town, it was impossible that so great a concourse of people could be accommodated, and the greater part required to travel each evening to St. John in search of lodgings greatly to the detriment of person and purse.

His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor presided on this occasion, and took a deep interest in its proceedings. It is probably among his last public appearances, as he is shortly to be succeeded by the Hon. Mr. Gordon, a son of the Earl of Aberdeen. His Excellency will be much regretted, as his conduct, while Governor of this Province, has been such as to win for him the respect of all classes.

I daresay you have been more than surprised at the extraordinary ebullition of wrath with which the decision of our Synod on the subject of Union has been received by our Free Church brethren. What all this means we are at a loss to understand, unless it is that they expected to make some extraordinary gain out of the Union, and are disappointed that their pet scheme has been thus cruelly frustrated. We fear that Mr. Bennet's professions of patriotism and disinterestedness are not quite what he represents them, and perhaps, if all are known, that hankering after status and after the leaves and fishes, which he is so anxious to lay to the charge of the opposite party, is quite as keen with them as with us.

The whole of Mr. Bennet's remarks are founded on a false assumption. We suspect this is a characteristic of Irish logic, for we have noticed the same thing more than once in the writings of some of Mr. Bennet's confederates who figure pretty often in the *Colonial Presbyterian*. Mr. Bennet takes it for granted, and repeats the statement over and over, that our Synod had virtually shelved the subject of Union. Having thus thrown glamour in his readers' eyes, he gets up a fine story about the inconsistency and disingenuousness of said Synod, making out that they have retreated from their position. Now, I confess I am astonished at Mr. Bennet, for I never saw our Synod go so far as they did on the occasion of its last sitting—a great deal farther, I confess, than I was disposed to go.

Mr. Bennet has not, in my opinion, betrayed a very fair or amiable spirit in dissecting so minutely, speeches which were never meant to be published, and which, not being edited, padded, convey, in as few and ungarish terms as possible, the hastily-collected thoughts of each gentleman at the moment. They certainly were never meant to grace the columns of the *Colonial Presbyterian*, and, probably had they had more pretensions to the name of speeches, they would not so readily have found a place there. The party might at least have dealt fairly with us, and sent a reporter who would not make us say the very opposite of what we did say, as was at least done in one case, as I can personally testify.

As both Mr. Bennet and Mr. Elder seen anxious to know what are our reasons for not leaping at once into the marriage halter, I may be as well to enlighten them. One principal reason, I believe, is, that we are attached to our old mother and are unwilling to leave her, the more so as we believe that with all her faults she has been unjustly maligned. We are unwilling to forego connection with her if we can possibly avoid it. We have never seen any reason to leave her. We believe that so far from our being chargeable with the sin of schism by not yet having joined the other party, as Mr. Bennet insinuates, the charge is all the other way, and we are really surprised at the effrontery with which Mr. Bennet makes this statement. Another reason is, that we have not as yet that confidence in the other party which would make a Union with them in the meantime desirable, and I suspect all discerning men who have been witness of the sudden burst of fury to which they have recently given vent—nobody knows for what—will allow that we were wise to pause before cultivating too close a relationship with such men. Mr. Bennet is much mistaken if he thinks he will advance his cause by a strain of unamiable satire, well enough in a politician, but certainly most unbecoming in a Christian pastor.

Be the way, Mr. Bennet betrays his usual logical acumen by his learned definition of the term "political" as used by the Rev. Dr. Donald, which every school-boy knows means, in the lips, especially, of a clergyman, any thing connected with civil government.

I am unwilling to detain your readers longer, but Mr. Bennet's remarks on the Cardross case, which, as usual, give a false representation of the matter, and place us in a false point of view, should not be allowed to pass unnoticed. Mr. Bennet resolves the whole affair into some slight technical irregularity of which the Free Church Assembly had been guilty; whereas, if I understand the case aright, it involves a most essential rule in all Presbyterian Courts, viz.: that a superior Court cannot take up anew what there has been no difference about in an inferior Court, and from which, therefore, there has been no