

its appearance in last number of the *Record*, on this subject of a proposed Hall in Halifax. If the reader has perused what I wrote in the September No., he will no doubt be surprised at the extraordinary language in which the Respondent indulges. If I had committed an act of felony against that gentleman, he could scarcely have written in a different tone. The noose was hanging empty. Why did he thrust his head into it, and swing himself forth into the void air? If a man commit suicide, it is not fair to accuse his brother of murder. From nothing that I said could the reader have guessed that he (the writer aforesaid) was in any way personally responsible for the errors complained of, but he has voluntarily taken all the charges (such as they were) home to himself. No eye but that of Macbeth saw the ghost of Banquo, though the festal board was crowded. I regret, for the sake of the writer himself, and for the sake of sweet charity, that with the view of weakening the force of my arguments, he has had recourse to such singular logic as appears throughout the production which bears his name. Referring to the irregularities of which I complained, he says:—"The charges, if true, mean a great deal; if untrue, what are we to think of Mr. Philip?" This is an indirect way of saying something which is intended to mean a great deal. In the same spirit he proceeds to prove, by a simple and yet ingenious method of reasoning, that the overture in question was brought before the Synod in a perfectly proper and regular manner, by announcing to the public that "I opposed the Foreign Mission Scheme, that I induced Mr. Law to leave Halifax on Saturday, in order to go to Truro with me, and that on Monday (when the Synod was wound up) I was away at Truro attending to my own private or congregational business." The spirit which animated the writer when he could pen such things as these, is too manifest to be mistaken. The reader may be puzzled to discover what connection these things (had they been correctly stated, which they are not) have to do with the subject of a Divinity Hall, or the regularity or irregularity of an overture. With respect to the first, I must needs inform him. Know, then, that in this country, a Foreign Mission Scheme is of all schemes unspeakably the most popular. This man opposed that scheme; therefore beware of him. This is the logical connection. I may remark (since I am forced into irrelevancies) that the reader will observe, from the reported proceedings of the Synod, that the Synod itself saw meet to abandon that Scheme, in the form in which it came before the Court, and in which I opposed it, and to adopt an entirely new plan of helping the heathen, suggested by Mr. Geddie, the great missionary of the U. P. Church; the plan of simply remitting to him whatever contributions we could raise, to be applied toward the support of *Native Teachers*. To this

plan I cordially assented, like the rest of my brethren, because it left us at liberty to give according to our ability, without incurring heavy and permanent obligations which we might not be able to discharge. My opposition, then, appears to have been, somehow, pretty well grounded. As to my "having induced Mr. Law to leave the Court on Saturday, to go with me to Truro," this is a pure invention of the writer's imagination, and does not happen to stumble on the fact. And "I was away at Truro on Monday, attending to my own private or congregational business, and (consequently, absent from my place in the Synod." It would have been more correct to have written that I left on Saturday, in order to preach to my people on Sunday, and, like some others, was not expected to return on Monday, when only a few loose threads of business had to be wound up.

I am sorry to say that the things my Respondent states (having any reference to the question at issue), are capable of being presented in a very different form from that into which he has moulded them, and I shall now proceed to perform this painful but necessary duty.

He affirms "that the project in question was brought before the Synod in precisely the same way as the Dalhousie College overture had been brought up three years previously, and he challenges Mr. Philip or any other man to name a single scheme or measure which came before us in a different way ever since he had been a member of Court." The reader may bear in mind, in the first place, that facts are very stubborn things, and that the loudest gusts of wind will not blow them off their feet. In the second place, I affirm again that what I stated as to the extreme haste and irregularity with which the present overture was got up and carried through Court, IS A FACT; and I accept the case of Dalhousie College by which to test the correctness of this statement. There was no secrecy, no surprise, no immaturity in the way in which that overture was brought before Synod. That scheme did not suddenly emerge out of darkness. It had been discussed for years at Synods and at Committee meetings and at Synods again, and had become familiar in men's mouths as a household word, before it was adopted as an overture; and when the final step was about to be taken—when the measure was to be passed as a law, every minister and adherent of the Church throughout the Provinces had made up his mind on the subject. The first ground of complaint which I stated in reference to the overture anent the *proposed Hall*, was that it had never been publicly mooted before, nor any whisper breathed of its intended introduction, and that, to many members of Synod, no opportunity was afforded to give it due consideration. Moreover, and what was worse, the great body of the people were in the same predicament. The first intelligence they had of the scheme was in the