

meal for it, as if it could not ruminate, or swallow anything stronger than water gruel. Who would like to be fed by a spoon, or be talked with in Syllogisms? We go farther and assert fearlessly, that even in sermons, sufficient margin ought to be left for the hearers own understanding and appreciation. The progress of the thoughts should certainly be well sustained, but natural ellipses should never be omitted. We who have been taught religious truth, thank God from our infancy, should be dealt with from the pulpit, as, at least, men of Christian *intelligence*. The passages in a book or in a sermon ought to be such, as easily to suggest the meaning of the term—*pass on*. The backstep or penny whistle is a nice dance and nice music for babies, to amuse them, but are surely unsuitable for ladies and gentlemen. We like progress, but certainly not the progress of the door on its hinges. We are also fond of unity—we have great repugnance to see things without connection, but “there is need of plurality to give room for unity—unity in a treatise or sermon presupposes therefore more than one subject, but these subjects should be marshalled in orderly array; not a mob but an army; not stray waifs picked up by the wayside, which may be picked up in detached bundles, but the parts of a time-piece nicely adjusted and forming one whole.

Without infringing our own principles of unity now insisted on, we may here take another step forward. It may be a bound, but our motto justifies transgressions, and long running leaps. We refer to the recently consummated union which with many was a leap in the dark, out of which darkness they have not yet emerged. We never should interfere in other people's affairs, except as these affairs may affect our peace, our reputation and our general interests. We once said in the way of caution, beware of a union that cannot be cemented but by the omnipotence of a word. The word (by the way) has been spoken, but its charm has proved less potent than we anticipated. We then spoke, we say, in the way of caution, we now say in indignation, beware of a union that cannot be consummated except by the slanderous tongue of a Professor of Divinity! Unscriptural indeed, and unchristian must be the principles of that union that stands in need of fratricide in order to success. History records no conduct so atrocious as that of the pretender to a throne, who wades through a brother's or a father's blood to possess it. The existence of the Church of Scotland which the Professor solemnly swore to uphold and obey, is, it seems the obstacle in his way to being king, indeed, and he would destroy. Can it be believed in Scotland, that two churches in Nova Scotia, on the very day of a highly self-eulogised union, when solemn articles were being signed before God, listened without disapprobation to

statements from the chair, affecting the character of the time-honored establishment; and her most inoffensive ministers here.

Can it moreover be believed, that those very Churches made overtures of union to the ministers of that church, which they stigmatized as bound? Can there be a greater confusion of moral sentiment? Does the Rev. Dr. Maitland, Moderator of the General Assembly know these facts, when in his correspondence with the Rev. Mr. Sprott, he highly approves of the union of Presbyterians in Nova Scotia? Does he know also that it has been the custom of some dissenting ministers in this country to write friendly epistles to some of the most earnest men of our church in Scotland, and at the same time bitterly hate her adherents here. We are far from asserting that Mr. Sprott is capable of such duplicity.

For ourselves we shall hold no communion with a Church which by expressive silence endorses the malicious trade of her Moderator, until he makes a full retraction, or until the United Synod clears itself of the charge of complicity.

But we shall not reiterate. However just at this moment an aggressive movement on the part of our Church might be, and however auspicious the time, when malcontents are numerous, and success almost certain, we are far from taking advantage of the dissatisfaction that prevails. No, we never did, and by the help of the great Head of the Church, we never shall stoop to the tricks of Proselytism any more than “suffer as a thief or a murderer.”

—o—

AN ADDRESS FOR THE TER-CENTENARY. DECEMBER 20TH 1861.

It has been usual in all ages to keep up the memory of great events by suitable observances. Circumcision was the seal of the covenant made with Abraham. When the Israelites crossed the Jordan they set up twelve stones in memory of the passage. When the woman poued the ointment on the head of the Redeemer in anticipation of His burial, He approved of the deed, and said wherever the Gospel should be preached, it would be mentioned as a memorial of her.

Englishmen keep up the memory of the Revolution, because it freed them from oppression and arbitrary rule. Americans keep up the memory of the war of independence, because they regained their liberty; and we may well keep up the memory of the Reformation with gratitude and joy, because it has freed us from many evils, and given us many blessings. The Reformation broke the chains of despotism, delivered the nations from the darkness of a thousand years, and accomplished the most wonderful revolution in religion, morals, and literature. It was not merely a literary effort, but rather a religious effort to