

The Rev. Jas. Strachan, of Tillicoultry, announced to his people on Sabbath, that, after much consideration and reconsideration, he thought it to be his duty to decline the call he had received from the E. U. brethren in Montreal, Canada. He felt to say "No" to the warm-hearted friends of the far West; but thought that duty dictated his remaining among the hearts of Tillicoultry.—*Christian Times of April 30.*

CONTROVERSY IN HUNTINGDON, C. E.—The second discourse of the series of lectures in St. Andrew's Church, was delivered by the Rev. Mr. Seiveright, of Durham, on the evening of the Sabbath, the 24th ult., subject: "The Creation and Fall of man." The preacher did not touch on the creation of man at all, as he considered the fall of man enough for one lecture. His text was I Cor., xv. 22. "In Adam all die." He occupied considerable time in proving the unity of the race, as having sprung from a common pair. He brought that all are exposed to the penalty of temporal and spiritual death, because of Adam's sin. He maintained that he did not hold that any infants, dying in infancy, perish. But yet he thought, if they were not guilty, they did not need the atonement of Christ. Conversion he regarded as a divine and omnipotent work. Nothing but the Spirit could make the sinner willing. The lecture was very short.

The Rev. Mr. Anderson delivered a lecture in the E. U. Church on the Sabbath evening following, May 1st, subject: "Man." He noticed, first, that man is a complex being, composed of matter and spirit—body and soul. Secondly, the Creation of man—first of his body, secondly of his soul. The soul thinks and feels and wills. Freedom of will does not consist in freedom from all bias towards either good or evil, for God has an infinite bias toward good, and yet he is a free-agent. Thirdly, man in Eden. He was commanded not to eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, on the pain of death, to try him or put him to the test. The death threatened he considered as meaning temporal death. (Gen. iii. 19.) Fourthly, the fall of man. The fruit of the forbidden tree was eaten—our first parents fell. They fell freely. They were free to stand or to fall, else they were not put to a fair test. If so, their sin could not have been foreordained. They were sufficiently able to have stood though free to fall. Fifthly, the consequences of the fall. In Genesis we read of consequences peculiar to the woman, and to the man, and consequences common to both. They both became subject to death. There is an obvious distinction between the paradisaical law and the moral law. Our first parents by their sin no doubt, came under the condemnation of the moral law which was written on their hearts. Why then is the penalty of temporal death only mentioned in Genesis, as the consequence of their sin? 1st. Because it is a penalty they cannot escape. 2nd. Because the same consequence descends to the entire race because of their sin. Our first parents contracted a bias to sin, by their act of disobedience. The race is mortal because of that sin committed in Eden. But no one will be sent to hell for Adam's sin. "The soul that sinneth it shall die." All men are sinners. If Adam surrounded as he was with pure influences, and with no internal derangement of body