

During my visit, I had a few words with Mr. Pardee, who had had a very successful Sunday School tour in the South, where he was warmly received everywhere, and was off again to Kentucky that day; a pleasant interview with Rev. J. H. Vincent, Secretary of the Methodist Episcopal Sunday School Union; and another with Rev. Dr. Duryea, pastor of a new Presbyterian church in Brooklyn; one object, in the two latter cases, being to secure the attendance of these gentlemen at our Provincial Convention this fall. But as time and place, and, indeed any meeting at all, were then doubtful, I could not make positive engagements.

And here, I will "pull up short," out of respect to your space. Cordially congratulating you on your editorial *debut*, and confidently anticipating for you as successful a career in this as in all your other official positions, I am, yours faithfully,

F. H. MARLING.

Toronto, August 13th, 1868.

THE "ATTACK" UPON REV. T. PULLAR.

DEAR BROTHER.—It would be unpardonable in me not to notice the item and editorial comment in last month's "News of the Churches" on the above subject. I am singled out so plainly as the offending party, that silence on my part would be tantamount to a confession of judgment. So far from doing that, I put in as my plea "*NOT GUILTY*," and appeal to the facts in evidence.

Instead of "attack upon" read "defence against" Rev. T. Pullar, and you will come much nearer the truth.

Let it be remembered that what passed at the late Union meeting resulted from Mr. Pullar's throwing down the gauntlet, by his avowal of himself as an Arminian. Commenting on the passage in Rev. K. M. Fenwick's admirable paper, which stated in reference to the liberty we have in Christ, that while brethren had run the entire Calvinistic gamut, no one so far as he knew had crossed the line above to Antinomianism, or crossed the line below to Arminianism, Mr. Pullar distinctly stated, "I have crossed the lower line to Arminianism." In the discussion that followed this announcement, Messrs. Pullar and Manly maintained that Congregationalism has no doctrinal character as between Calvinism and Arminianism, and the latter gentleman told us the Union had no *right to know* which of the two systems a minister applying for membership espoused, clinching the declaration by citing the confession on which he was personally admitted, and from which, as he very correctly stated, no man could tell whether he was a Calvinist or an Arminian.

With all this in view, added to the recollection that when appointed not long since Union preacher in Montreal, Mr. Pullar preached on election for the express purpose of showing that the Union could swallow a dose of Arminianism without gulping, it was a *defensive* and not an *offensive* act on my part to demur to Mr. Pullar being selected as the Montreal preacher. As you truly observe, "the motion to amend the report of the Nomination Committee was carried, not on account of the theological sentiments of the party first nominated, but on entirely different grounds." Those grounds so far as I am concerned, were Mr. Pullar's persistent efforts to put the Union in a false position. Had he courted a representative appointment on broadly catholic grounds, had he accepted the historical truth as to the theological