

have a right to my share; and if moral principle or the voice of the Synod do not give it me, perhaps civil law may do me justice."

Our readers will thus perceive that "these words," which were to express the condition on which Mr. Mair was legally to found his claim, merely contain a "distinct assertion," and what can we infer from this, but that, in Mr. Mair's mind, conditions of legal agreement, and his "distinct assertions," are synonymous terms. If he has recourse to civil law, as he states his intention of doing, he will very soon get enlightenment as to the difference. But leaving this aside, he goes on to say, "that the Board, in continuing the division, do directly transgress the deliverance of the Synod in 1856." Have the Board, let us ask Mr. Mair, continued the division among more ministers than those to whom they were able to pay the sum which he asserts he is legally entitled to? And though they had done so, did it ever occur to Mr. Mair that the Board by the Act of incorporation (22 Vict., ch. 66, and Minutes of Synod for 1859, page 47) have it in their power to make by-laws which shall be operative until these are approved of or rejected by the Synod; and that the Board did make a by-law, which being ratified by the first meeting of Synod, after it was made, disannuls so far as it differs from that vexed minute of 1856 which he has so sadly perverted, and which, judging from his uncalled for allusion to it, must have often disturbed his dreams? And did it further occur to Mr. Mair that when *versus* the adoption of the by-law, a motion was made in the Synod to revert to the minutes of 1856, which provided, "that if the sum to be disposed of for the payment of ministers' salaries should at any time be insufficient to give to each £100 a year, the division shall be continued, but not after the allowance to each minister has fallen to £50 (Minutes of Synod, p. 22), this motion was lost; and that the by-law which provided that the division should continue, but not after the sum to be divided fell below £50 (Minutes of Synod, 1860, p. 35), was unanimously confirmed? Did these things, we ask, occur to Mr. Mair when he charged the Board with having gone both against the principle and the proviso? If they did, all we shall say on the subject is, that his conduct in making such a charge is only equalled by the imprudence he has shown in seeking out a channel to give effect to it. And if they did not, we must remind him that he is in honour bound, if such a phrase is

applicable in this connection, amply to apologize to those against whom he has made such unfounded accusations. But perhaps we should not have thrown out this suggestion, as, though in the height of his rudeness he has used in his attack such phrases as "peculation, spoliation system, &c.," we know well that neither the commissioners, who originally by appointment of the Synod invested the funds, nor the Board who are at present charged with the payment to the Church of the interest of them, care for having an apology from such a quarter, nor need they.

They are men occupying the highest ecclesiastical, business, and social positions in the country, and possess the unbounded confidence of the Church notwithstanding Mr. Mair's assertions to the contrary, and having all along discharged their duty gratuitously, and, at the same time most successfully, are deserving of, and have its sincerest thanks and most lasting gratitude. An influential member of Synod, whose letter will be found in another part of this number, gives the names of these gentlemen, and also makes observations on Mr. Mair's letter, to which we would advise our readers to refer. We are sorry for having taken up so much space with our remarks on this subject but, having inserted Mr. Mair's first letter at the request of Dr. Cook, in order, by contrast, to bring out more prominently the largeheartedness of the others who had written on the same subject, we could not allow his statements to pass unchallenged, although we did not anticipate that those acquainted either with the circumstances of the case, or with the writer, would have attached such importance to them, as we from the very fact of our having answered them, have apparently, though not really, ceded.

We intimated in our last number that the author of the articles on the Roman Catacombs had agreed to consider favourably a proposal to write a series of articles on Old Testament characters. After deliberation, he has however determined to write instead on the "Points of Contact between Egyptian and Jewish History." The first of the series appears in this number; and as it bears on the extraordinary statements recently advanced by Bishop Colenso, we are sure it cannot fail to attract the attention of our readers, and to afford them much instructive information.

We are much pleased to learn that some of our adherents are taking the trou-