

own views in their own way; but they must not blame us if we express an opinion, that they have already made a desperate effort to disparage the Church of their fathers, and to show their disregard of its sound discipline and order. On the contrary, we have endeavoured to retain, in its integrity and purity, that code of faith and discipline which was drawn from Scripture, and systematized by England's great Protestant Reformers, many of whom sealed their faith with their lives. And by God's blessing we will retain it, "the voice of the majority" to the contrary notwithstanding. Whatever blame, in the counsels of God or of man, may attach to the actions of those, who are given to change, we at all events will wash our hands of all complicity in the matter, and willingly permit the responsibility to rest where it has been justly merited.

It has been further urged by your correspondent—"Let the voice of the majority prevail," and then the Synod will be established. This cry has an ominous sound. It enunciates a principle which encouraged the ancient persecutors of the Church and of the servants of God to commit their horrid atrocities on the persons of their heroic victims. It instigated hostile feelings and active proceedings against helpless, but conscientious believers in every age of the Church. And I very much doubt whether even the venerable fathers of the Romish Inquisition would have ventured to kindle the flames of the martyr's fire, if they had not previously entertained a certainty that "the voice of the majority should prevail." But happily for us, the subjects of this protestant empire, the horrid and indignant cry of "Let the voice of the majority prevail" in religious matters is stifled and hushed forever by the wisdom, justice, and liberality of British legislation. Out upon such incipient popery and proscription! We will have none of it.

Really I must say that this is the first time that I have seen a charge of self-shame, implying overbearing conduct, with a desire to "press hard on a retreating foe," brought against the influential party with whom I have the honour to act. Our contributions I believe to all Church objects have, according to our means, been ungrudgingly given; and I much question, looking at the complexion and composition of our leading church committees, and governing bodies, whether our due and proportionate share in such matters is, at this present juncture, meted out to us. Still I am not aware that any of us have as yet complained of having been "left out in the cold." And if any of us did unfortunately happen to feel any pressure from that quarter, I for one am very zealous to resist it—the warmth nor the comfort of the interior of the Synod chamber possesses sufficient attraction to induce us to change either our attitude or position. Such qualities may suit the views and convenience of the movement party, but I do not believe that, beyond its well defined limits, they would excite any amount of ambition, or cause one sentiment of regret. *Suum cuique tribuere* is an old and wholesome aphorism, and we are very willing that it should have its full effect in the present instance.

I will conclude these observations on the communication of S. M. C. by promising him that, whenever he may find "time and space" to favour us with his strictures on my logic as shown in the third deduction I drew from the decision of the Privy Council, I will peruse his lucubrations with all due attention.

Your other correspondent, who did me the honour to reply to my letter appears to me, judging from the tone of his sentiments, to be just waking up suddenly from some previous state of somnolency to a sense of the real character and present position of our church. He also seems to labour under the stereotyped delusion that "a Synod is the primitive constitution and mode of government of the Christian Church." Proof, young man: by all means shew us your proof, that this was so. And then perhaps you may command some notice.

The truth is that the Synodists are here building their arguments on the baseless fabric of a vision. There is not one tittle, in so far as I am aware, in the whole range of ancient Christian literature,—not one tittle, which will support the idea that synodical government in the Nova Scotian sense, prevailed in the primitive church. Antiquity gives no countenance whatever to such a theory: neither do the constitutions and canons of the Church of England. And yet under pretence of returning to ancient customs and restoring primitive discipline, our friends "over the way" actually appeal to a phantom that never existed anywhere beyond the limits of their own imaginations. Call you this just and fair reasoning? Such perverse logic might answer very well as