

ing at all, to extend indefinitely her Missionary operations, you see how easily all this can be effected;—and with such objects as these guaranteed on the one hand, and threatened on the other, shall any of our people refuse to make so slight an effort, or seek, under cover of *the hardness of the times*, to escape their share of so light a burden? Such, if such there are, must be of a very different spirit from “the Churches of Macedonia,” when, “in a great trial of affliction,” “their *deep poverty* abounded to the *riches of their liberality*,” and if they “know the grace of the Lord Jesus

Christ who, though he was rich, for our sakes, became poor, that we through his poverty might be rich,” they must have felt little of its constraining power. “We speak as to wise men, judge ye what we say.” We speak as to *Christian* men, and shall wait with some solicitude, but more hope, the declaration of your judgment in the practical response given to this appeal.

By order of the Synod, and in name of the Committee on the self-sustentation of the Church.

JAMES GIBSON, *Convener*.

October, 1858.

Along with the Addresses, a few ruled sheets will be sent for the Missionary Collectors in each congregation; and it would be well that the Treasurer of each Society should provide himself with a book ruled on a similar principle, for keeping his accounts.

*All remittances to be sent to the Synod Treasurer, ROBERT CHRISTIE, ESQ., Rosebank P. O., and it will be convenient that Societies remit their funds quarterly, or at least once in the half year—to meet current expenses.*

LETTER FROM OUR CORRESPONDENT IN SCOTLAND.

MY DEAR SIR,—

GLASGOW, October 8, 1858.

I have read with much interest the recent notices of the movements towards Union between the Free Church and the United Presbyterian Church in Nova Scotia and in Canada. In Nova Scotia the Union seems all but consummated, and among you the cause is obviously making progress. These facts cannot but be gratifying to all who long and pray for the peace and prosperity of Zion. The sin of schism is a sin of very aggravated character, and its results have been most disastrous in the past history of the Church. You will not, however, be surprised, after the statements I have made in former communications, when I say, that the very depth of my interest in the question of Christian Union makes me tremblingly jealous lest a Union should be formed on any basis but such as shall prove equitable and safe. Are you quite convinced that the Basis adopted by your Committees at their meeting in August is such an one? Have you no fears lest, supposing that Basis to be adopted by the Synods, events may arise which shall necessitate a course of action on the part of some among you that will be regarded as a breach of faith,—a violation of the terms of the compact, by some others,—and thus give rise to mutual recrimination and painful feelings of distrust? Public documents are indeed often made designedly indefinite, because the plans and arrangements embodied in them are tacitly agreed to on the principle of compromise. All is clearly and forcibly expressed that refers to the points about which there is no difference of opinion, and those which are matters of dispute have thrown around them clouds of unmeaning or very elastic verbiage. This practice, so common in the kingdoms of this world, has not been wholly excluded from that region in which “Simplicity and godly sincerity” might surely be somewhat more reasonably expected. Do not suppose that I mean to insinuate that your Committees have not been acting honestly. I know some of them too well as men of high integrity and Christian worth to admit such a thought even for a moment; but when I look at the Basis I cannot rid myself of the impression, that, for the sake of peace, they have sowed what may prove the seeds of future quarrels. The famous passage of the 23rd chapter is not, according to the Committees, to mean this, or that, or a third thing. It might, I think, be asked, What does it mean, that is, what is the interpretation against which the Committees would offer no objections? The commentator who can interpret that wondrous specimen of the wisdom of the Westminster Divines in such a way as to satisfy at once the understandings and the consciences of earnest churchmen on the one hand, and of out and out voluntaries on the other, must be an acute logician and most skilful casuist.

The Kilmacolm Case in the General Assembly, of which I gave you an account