

them." These testimonies are necessary to your salvation. They testify of Christ. They offer eternal life to you through him. They ask you to be reconciled to God. They call upon you to believe in Jesus. He that believeth is saved: he that believeth not is condemned. Listen to the word of God. If you despise that word—if you slight the Saviour offered—if you continue in unbelief—if all the entreaties and warnings of God are equally ineffectual—if God's testimonies are despised, whether they speak of heaven or hell—if they excite in you no wonder, no admiration, no love—then, God will bring upon you the threatenings of his word and the violence of his judgments. "Because I called and ye refused, I stretched out my hands and no man regarded," &c.

REMARKS

ON THE

"Reply of the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Nova Scotia, to the Letter of the Free Church Synod declining the Union."

BY THE REV. PROFESSOR KING.

FIRST ARTICLE.

Nearly two years ago, a series of Letters, dated from Antigonish, and subscribed "Thomas Trotter," appeared in the "Guardian" newspaper of this city. These letters, four in number, were addressed to the members of the Free Synod of Nova Scotia, and, although of course unofficial, assumed something of the character of a Reply to the Letter which the Free Synod, at its sittings in June 1849, had addressed to the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Nova Scotia. To any one desirous of showing up the blunders into which conceited ignorance is apt to fall, these letters presented a very inviting subject; but, in taking it up, there would have been the unpleasantness of having to do with letters which, aiming at smartness, had only reached scurrility. At length, however, the substance of these letters appears in a new shape. The Synod of the Presbyterian Church, at its meeting in June last year, appointed a Committee to draw up a formal Reply to the Letter of our Synod; Mr. Trotter being Convener.—Before they could have an opportunity of reporting to their constituents, the Committee gave their Reply to the public. It appeared some time ago in the

"Eastern Chronicle". From thence it was copied into the "Presbyterian Witness," in its numbers of the 10th and 17th of May last. It is understood that the Reply has been since formally approved of and adopted by the Presbyterian Synod, at its late meeting in June. No copy was received by the Free Synod; and, as the document is now before the public, there is no interference with what might more properly be regarded as the business of the Synod, in offering some remarks upon what has been thus published.

The Committee, with some regard to what was due at least to their own character, have made considerable retrenchments in the sneering tone, the insinuations and the direct charges of insincerity and dishonesty, in which the letters of Mr Trotter abounded, against a body of men for whom they professed to entertain high respect, and with whom they express a hope still to be united as members of the same church. Enough of this, however, still remains to indicate the influence which has prevailed in drawing up the Reply. This is noticed for the purpose of stating that there is no wish to ascribe what thus remains either to the Committee as a body, or to the Synod who have, perhaps without much consideration, adopted a Reply to which the Committee, with perhaps as little consideration, had appended their names. It is but justice to the ministers and Elders of the Presbyterian Church to entertain the persuasion that there may have been some misgivings—some uncomfortable feelings—in agreeing to such a Reply to a letter which certainly did not deal in insinuations—to a letter which did not contain a single word that was disrespectful to the body to whom it was addressed—to a letter which, while it stated with all plainness and earnestness the existing difference of views and principles which precluded the possibility of a union, expressed no feeling but what became one body of christians to entertain towards another from whom, on various matters, they conscientiously differed. It were well if the readers of the Reply could, in connexion with it, read the letter to which it professes to be a reply. There would then be little difficulty in seeing which of the bodies has been most tender of the character and the feelings of the other, which of them has been most anxious to avoid adding to existing grounds of difference, which of them has shown the greatest desire,