

MG-1
2
B4

THE
DOCTRINE

OF
THE REV. DOCTOR M'GULLOCH,
INCULCATED IN THE
"LECTURE ON EDUCATION,"
CONDENSED.

WITH
AN ADDRESS
TO THE
DIFFERENT PARTIES
IN THE
DISTRICT OF PICTOU.

PICTOU, N. S.

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR.
1832.

W. Gossip, Printer, Water-street.

77-167

FOR RESEARCH ONLY
Hector Centre Trust Archives

TO THE PUBLIC.

A PAMPHLET having lately fallen in my way, entitled "The Nature and Uses of a Liberal Education Illustrated. By THOMAS McCULLOCH," the history of its Author induced a minute examination of its contents, in order to ascertain his title to the celebrity which he has obtained, among a certain portion of the community in this Province. Its subject being a common one, precludes all attempts at originality in the matter, but in the manner a peculiarity may be observed.— Within twenty-two pages of pretty sizeable print, the Pamphlet embraces observations on a vast variety of topics. For exhibiting the necessity, nature, and influence of a liberal education, it touches on the original confirmation and state of the human mind—on the circumstances of man in the first stages of existence, and in the earlier stages of society—on the invention of letters, the art of printing, and the institution of seminaries of learning—on the opposers of education, the benefit of knowing its advantages, its object and end—on just views of the character and relations of man—on that part of the duty of man arising out of his relations in life—on the subdivision of labour, intellectual and manual—on the nature of the learned professions, law, medicine, and the clerical office—on Hebrew, Greek, and Latin.

After wading through this sea of matter, the author found time and space for tautologies and redundancies in expression within so narrow a compass; and, after all, includes by way of conclusion, a charge to the audience to bear in mind their obligations to the generosity of the public, not forgetting a warm tribute of thanksgiving to the ladies, for conferring on the Institution its principal ornament— And lastly, urging the solemn responsibility attached to their situation, when viewed in reference both to an earthly and a higher tribunal.

On laying aside the production, it is natural to suppose that the perusal left a very confused and indistinct impression of its meaning on my mind.

Whatever merits the work may have, the author, notwithstanding his modest insinuation that it was not designed for the Press, has certainly reaped this laurel from its publication, that he has *emitted* to the world *multum in parvo*, of whatever character the *multum* is. No doubt the Trustees and others, still feel the same admiration for this wonderful effusion of the Doctor's brain, that first prompted their humble request of "furnishing them with a copy for the purpose of publication." Granting however that it has all the merit they would fondly attach to it, I am notwithstanding reminded by it of him, who, when occasion serves, assimilates himself to an angel of light. When this dreadful personage is narrowly inspected, even after veiling himself in the closest manner under his assumed disguise, the cloven foot appears. So an unfortunate sentiment or two which appear in the Lecture, throw light on the principles and character of the author, and present him in no very praiseworthy view, notwithstanding his professed zeal and ardour in the cause of education.

One sentiment on which I abstain from making any remark at present, but that it denies the moral responsibility of man, is conceived in these terms "man has originally a power of action, but without a capacity of directing his activity to any useful purpose," this being acquired only by habit.

Another doctrine on which I propose to animadvert at some length, is expressed thus—"Surely what may bring the human race *not far from the Kingdom of Heaven* is a valuable attainment." Previously to entering on a consideration of the various bearings of this sentiment, I should say a word or two by way of caution to the reader. Let him not construe any of the observations that may be made, to a covert design of opposing the interests of education. Let him be assured that his zeal for these interests cannot exceed mine, as I consider education the second best blessing under heaven.

Expecting to have more readers than one, I shall briefly address a certain class of people to be met with in the world, who affect a kind of Platonic philanthropy, which they style keeping aloof from all party interests. These folks look upon it as a most meritorious qualification, to be perfectly indifferent about what a man says, writes, or does; and lament moanfully when their friends, or those for whom they profess friendship, find it necessary to expose what is unprincipled, disorderly, and impious. With all due deference to these gentlemen, I beg leave to condemn this kind of philanthropy, as indifference to the best interests of mankind, as a disregard of the distinction between right and wrong, and at best as a halting between two opinions, which is anything but to be admired or imitated. Peace is certainly desirable, and to be cultivated with all assiduity: but there are limits to the terms on which it is to be maintained, and when it cannot be followed without a compromise of principle, then a mourn-

ful adieu to it. In one word, I had a thousand times rather encounter an honest open enemy, than these plausible trimmers, whom one can not determine to be either fish or flesh.

The attainment which the Doctor hazarded to pronounce as "surely valuable," was, though in a sense different from what he expressed it, originally declared to be that of a Pharisee. Now that the Doctor should become enamoured of the character of a Pharisee, need excite no surprise, as the whole sect were originally of his own kindred—the designations Pharisee and Seceder being synonymous, and so convertible terms. I am not sure however, that were they both to meet, the ancient friend would quietly pocket the construction, put by his modern brother, on the eulogium passed by such high authority. The approbation of our Saviour must indeed, to a certain extent, be inferred from the assertion, "thou art not far from the Kingdom of Heaven." But that this Doctor (for he was a Doctor too) was not at the time an object of the Saviour's complacency, appears evident from his treacherous design, as discovered in the parallel passage, *MATT. XXII. 35*. Another was said to be *loved* by our Lord, which is a still stronger expression, and yet one thing spoiled all. It is however unfair to deprive any person of the praise to which he is entitled, nor is this my intention regarding the ancient Doctor, although it appears to have been that of his modern brother. The attainments made by the Pharisee were doubtless valuable, but only as an *advance* to the Kingdom of Heaven, and not as a *retrograde motion from it*, according to the version of the author of the Lecture, as being not far from the Kingdom, and not as being *brought* not far from it. If this should be condemned as illiberality, captiousness, and hypercriticism, what then, pray, is the direct meaning of the passage? Was not the Doctor, in alluding to the eulogium on his brother Doctor, able to express his meaning with perspicuity? Where then goes his vaunted reputation for accuracy and excellence in composition? Whatever sentiment he intended to convey to the audience and the public by this expression, (which independently of his character, I would at once overlook as a *lapsus pennæ*) I doubt not that it is a faithful index of his mind, upon the respective merits of being actually in the Kingdom, and being at a small distance from it. In the words of the pamphlet, that it is a principle with the Doctor—a principle which illustrates his character, and on which a great part of his history is founded, since Nova Scotia incautiously opened her arms to receive him—that "surely what brings not far from the Kingdom of Heaven, is a valuable attainment."

Let facts speak in proof of this, and facts are sturdy incontrovertible things.

I appeal then to the series of accusations filed against the Doctor, in the long unanswered PRESBYTERIAN.—To the scandalous and Pharisical embezzlement of the collections for the relief of the Mirimachi sufferers, by the awful fire of the year 1825. To the retirement of the Doctor from the pulpit to the Academic grove. And to the doctrines which he, in common with those of his communion, maintains

on certain points of Divinity. To these facts, although others might be adduced, I shall principally confine the following observations, and conclude by addressing the public on the subject.

I. The paper signed A PRESBYTERIAN, as many of my readers know, is a communication addressed to the Rev. THOMAS McCULLOCH, D. D. which was originally inserted in the *Halifax Acadian*, but was afterwards published on a separate sheet, of which several copies have been circulated through the District, and other places. I shall do little more than most warmly recommend it to the attention of the public; assuring them that it merits careful perusal, and that it will richly repay the trouble of treasuring its contents in their memories. It is written in a plain, but forcible style, in the serious manner of one deeply impressed with his subject, and with the air of one earnestly solicited to enforce upon the object addressed, a sense of the error of his ways, and if possible to reclaim him. I shall just transcribe in their order, the leading charges brought against the Rev. Doctor, with a view to attract more general attention to the original. His temper is characterised by an unchristian asperity and bitterness—his writings are charged with pandering to the depraved taste of the sensualist—his and his brethren's preaching and politics, with holding up the Republicanism of the Americans as an object for imitation. These are further charged with refusing to obey the orders of Government for holding public fasts, and with a readiness to sneer and rail at constituted authorities. The Doctor is declared to be the Editor of the *Pictou Patriot*, and as such to have disavowed unequivocally, being connected with any party—to have given in his own hand writing the celebrated remarks on the celebrated Canada letter, gratefully commenting on that effusion of disloyalty, which was intended to stir up our fellow subjects to insubordination and rebellion. To have invaded the privacies of the domestic hearth, treated with contempt constituted authorities, and considered respectability a sufficient provocation to draw forth calumny and abuse. To have put upon record his solemn and public disavowal of any connection with the Patriot, either as an Editor or as a Subscriber, and of ever having written one line for, or published one line in it,—at the same time that irrefragable proof is offered, of his having been actively engaged in organizing that vile periodical *from its commencement*, of having contributed the leading articles which were intended to give it *eclat* on its first going into operation, and of his having been similarly connected with it throughout. Hence the Doctor's character as a teacher of youth, as a man, as a christian, and as a christian minister, must be judged. Reader, this synopsis of the contents is far from being intended to supersede the necessity of referring to the original. It is only to excite your curiosity that I have said so much. Peruse and re-peruse it, and if your nerves are not of brass, and your sinews of iron, they cannot fail to be agitated.

It has occurred to me on perusing the Lecture on Education, that the malversations here imputed to the Doctor, are only a more ample

development of the principle which he there first broached, that “surely what brings not far from the Kingdom of Heaven, is a valuable attainment.” It is probable he imagined, that in the humble office of an instructor of youth, and in the confined station of a Minister, he could not give his favourite principle the wished for extension, or render it sufficiently influential,—that however, by adding his written injunctions to his *viva voce* admonitions, he would have a fair chance of conveying it from his own personal presence as the centre, through an infinite variety of *radii*, to Earth’s utmost bound, and thus indeed bring the whole human race, to the desired distance from the Kingdom of Heaven. He would in this way have an opportunity of inculcating it by precept and example, both public and private, which would in all likelihood ultimately ensure success. It would not satisfy him to *state* that it was a valuable attainment, to be brought not far from the Kingdom of Heaven, but to *exemplify* it by his visibly or outwardly departing from where he had never really been. The guilt of what he is charged with by the Presbyterian, may in his eyes seem to bring him not far from the Kingdom of Heaven, which by his own shewing should be judged commendable. But to whatever extent in the eyes of others he may have distanced the Kingdom, it is very clear that he is beyond its precincts. Meekness and humility are characteristics of its inhabitants, in contradistinction to the asperity and bitterness of the Doctor. Railing and sneering at constituted authorities, or the powers that be, are forbidden by its laws, and are descriptive of its enemies, even “filthy dreamers that defile the flesh, despise dominion, and speak evil of dignities.” They not only prohibit railing against, but even despising government, which is a stricter restraint. This the Doctor probably knows as well as I do, but he relishes it not, and consequently deems it a valuable attainment to stand clear of the yoke.—In the case of undue and oppressive exercise of authority by the powers that be, these laws permit only humble complaint, and dutiful remonstrance; or at the farthest, admit only reasonable resistance.—But not a word of despising or railing: on the contrary we read, that an Archangel durst not bring a railing accusation against the Devil—a worse, more cruel and oppressive power than any on earth. Doubtless however, Dr. McCulloch knows his duty better than the Archangel; and Michael might perhaps mightily improve, by going through a course of studies at the Pictou Academy. Falsehood, with which the Presbyterian further charges the Doctor, is another thing not admitted within the bounds of the Divine Kingdom; but it is only opposed by one of its laws, and a person by denying that law’s authority, may be brought only not far from—to within a short distance of the Kingdom. The Doctor’s having failed to reply to the Presbyterian, is a demonstration that he is at length reconciled to the idea of being universally known to be without the Kingdom, although at no great distance from it; and it is a thankless office which some undertake, when they attempt to account for his silence on the ground of his deeming the Presbyterian unworthy of a reply. He cannot despise it for the style, as

it can bear comparison in this respect with the most admired of his own productions. He frequently on other occasions wielded the quill under far less provocation, and as often under no provocation at all. This then he will esteem a thankless apology, as it tends to strip him of a distinction by which he covets to be known—even of being contented with the station which he occupies within some distance of the Kingdom of Heaven.

II. I have said the above is a ruling principle with the Doctor, and that he has, within three or four years, had recourse to an employment through which he might render it a ruling one, wherever the *Patriot* should meet with patronage. Within the same period however, he did not think it enough to confine his efforts for this laudable purpose, to the public organ for conveying abroad his wishes and views. He likewise tried his hand at private correspondence, and underhand solicitation, and secret remonstrance, that the principle might ramify through all conceivable channels. His success, though ultimately not very happy for himself, has been truly astonishing, when we consider the characters of some of the proselytes to his doctrine. Who could suppose Mr. MCGAVIN, (author of that invaluable work “The Protestant”,) or a minority of a Committee of sixteen gentlemen, appointed in Glasgow for managing the Fund subscribed to relieve the sufferers in Mirimachi, in 1825. Who would suppose these capable of being so influenced as they have been, by the representations and policy of such a man as Dr. THOS. McCULLOCH? That a portion of the contributors to a Fund, collected for a case of such clamant necessity, should be induced to retract their subscriptions,—that they, combined with the above-mentioned gentlemen, should thus extend the morsel of charity to the mouth of starvation, and then withdraw it, in order to make the gnawings of hunger more keen,—that they should direct the eye of the naked to the warmth of a freely offered hap, and instantly tear it from the shivering grasp, to make the sense of cold more piercing,—that the invitation to a roof, where the houseless might shelter during the wide spreading rigour of an approaching winter, should be next moment succeeded by a rude repulse, to make the desert waste seem more inhospitable still,—that gentlemen of such standing in society as the above, and charged with such a trust, should be persuaded thus to tantalize, thus to refine upon cruelty, thus to “dry up the fountains of charity and brotherly kindness!” and all for what? Marvel reader! To feather and fan the nest of Dr. McCULLOCH! This, this crying, this heart rending declaration, would be pronounced (and Oh! it were desirable it could be pronounced,) false and incredible, in a christian country, but for the flagrant fact as exhibited in the columns of the *Pictou Observer*, of the 28th September last; and originally in the *Glasgow Herald* of the 14th June, and that after undergoing a thorough exposal in the Court of Session, the Supreme civil Judicatory of Scotland. Had success attended this machination of iniquity—had the itching of Dr. McCULLOCH’s fingers for the £600 been gratified, the fact would have been triumphantly in

the columns of the Patriot ; congratulatory addresses from all quarters of the land would have been presented before the Academic throne, and the Reverend Doctor, with a complacent sigh at such overwhelming kindness, would graciously hold out the hand for the venial kiss, and pathetically declare, that, now at length, oppression's throne had tottered to its fall ; and the golden sun of liberty, property, and prosperity had risen in the east, to set no more. The criminality would be the same in the event either of success or of failure ; but in case of success, it would be explained away, and could such infatuation befall the Scotch Judges, as to recommend a favourable verdict, their authority and countenance would be gratulatively quoted as proof of innocence. Failure, however, and the execration implied in the opinions of the Lords of Session, put a damper on the spirit of the *Patriot*, and gagged the mouth of its Editor. In a great many cases silence is tantamount to a confession of guilt : and silence in a case so interwoven with his, and his party's interests, is a triumphant evidence that they have been guilty in the view of others, although not in their own estimation. No, not in their own estimation, for their whole conduct in reference to the Mirimachi robbery, has been in perfect keeping with the Doctor's darling principle, as shall be rendered satisfactorily clear by and bye.

It was observed above, that a Pharisee was commended for being not far from the Kingdom of Heaven, and that this commendation suggested to the Doctor the principle, that it is surely a valuable attainment to be brought not far from it. This no doubt put him on searching for other *traits* in the character of the Pharisees, and he found that there was one principle of theirs much to be admired, and worthy to be imitated, viz : That advancing religious interests at the expense of civil duties, bespeaks being on the very pinnacle of piety. Accordingly he cast about to find where, and how, he himself could put this laudable principle in practice. Upon reconsidering the endless variety of scenes which this bustling world presents, he observed in Glasgow a group of charitable individuals, casting their mites into a treasury, with a view to pour it down as a shower of mercy on the burnt remains of the Mirimachi forest. Oh how he gasped for the bursting of the cloud, which conveyed this golden shower in its passage over his own head ! How he pounced in imagination on the unexpected God-send ! But visionary schemes would not do, he therefore employed his emissaries to make some real, some effectual efforts to secure the body ; and as few or none could be found to go directly to work, or to use the high hand of power in the matter, a reason must be found, and a convenient one was ready at hand in the necessities of the Pictou Academy. The Doctor, in imitation of his beloved Pharisees, compasses sea and land to make converts to his project. He squeezes through the straits of Cumberland to Mirimachi. He traverses the Atlantic to Scotland. He prowls among the *purlicues* of Glasgow. He howls in the back lanes and suburbs of Edinburgh. He recrosses the ocean in a barque charged with his sacred person, and falls souse again into the Academic chair.

The result of his herculean labours are these. He finds his Reverend Brother Mr. THOMPSON, at Mirimachi, a pliant instrument for furthering his scheme, whom he induced to believe that misrepresenting the true state of his people, in order to deposit £600 in the funds of the Academy, would be a sacrifice acceptable to Heaven. He found also in Glasgow, several of his own kidney, who were prepared to further his object by confirming the same misrepresentation. By these means, Mr. MCGAVIN, the Treasurer, who it seems in this instance gave into the same Pharisaical principle, was prevailed on to retain the £600 in his own possession, until he should get a favourable opportunity of lodging it in the lap of Dr. McCULLOCH. This praiseworthy scheme would have succeeded to a wish, had not the Mirimachi and Glasgow Committee appealed to the Court of Session, which speedily, but impudently, upon the Doctor's principles, put an effectual *velo* on its further progress Pictouwards, for ever.

This intended embezzlement then, presents us with an exemplification of a Pharisaical principle directly acted upon. The Pharisees taught that if we say to our parents who are in necessity, "Father or Mother, the thing you ask of me is dedicated to God, it is no longer in my power, but you shall have a part in the merit of my offering, which will do you as much good as if I had given it to you," they were then freed from the obligation of succouring their parents. This to a superficial observer, savours much of devotion, and seems to give the chief place to the honor of our Maker—at least looks as if "not far from the Kingdom of Heaven." Let us see now, how the case in point tallies. The Mirimachi sufferers had certainly strong claims on the sympathies and aid of the christian world, which was liberally extended by people of all denominations, till we come to the Doctor and his associates. But *their* language was literally that of the Pharisees—"Suffering fathers, mothers, brothers, sisters, 'tis true a provision has been made through the benevolence of a sympathising public, to repair in some measure your unparallelled losses; but we, considering that your souls are more valuable than your bodies, have dedicated a considerable portion of the contributed aid to the altar of the Pictou Academy. We cannot therefore relieve your temporal privations, but we readily promise you an interest in the prayers and instructions of the students to be educated by the sums arrested in their unholy progress to your temporal relief—and this will do you as much good as if we had given you the money."

A passing glance will enable any one to see the similarity of disposition evinced by the Pharisee and the Doctor. The Pharisee acknowledges the wants of his destitute parents. The Doctor could not but see the Mirimachi distress; it is in vain for him to plead that it did not exist. His deceased brother Mr. THOMPSON, averred it, and it is an insult to common sense to suppose that he himself could for a moment doubt its reality. But the Pharisees altar, and the Doctor's Academy, superseded the demands of parental destitution, and of the bereaved households of a whole district. Taking the sop out of a

mother's famished hands, and the mite out of the purses of families dismembered and rendered houseless, by the awful scourge of a sudden conflagration, for the sake of religion, is a valuable attainment. It is only a little distance *not far* from the Kingdom of Heaven. But why, it will be asked, is the Doctor alone shouldered with this onerous burden, seeing the Trustees of the Institution, and others concurred with him in the nefarious transaction? Plainly for this reason.—He was the person principally to be benefitted—the money was to be fingered by, and the key to be deposited with him in the first place. Again, I have myself been a witness of the domineering and uncontrollable sway exercised by him over every individual connected with the Academy. I have known a full meeting of them, concurring in the same sentiments on one day, on which the negative of the Doctor alone, was put, without assigning any reason. This *velo* put on the proceedings in monosyllables in public, was attended with ominous consequences in private, for by that day week the sentiments and resolutions of the whole body had undergone a thorough revolution. Nay more, they could never afterwards recollect that they had at all assented to any thing contrary to the Doctor's views. The inference is obvious, that this was the effect of the Doctor's schooling—of his scowling frown, or more probably of his sarcastic sneer—and another inference is equally fair, that the Doctor is the mainspring of the whole machine of Antiburgherism, on which depend all its movements, and to which all its alternations must be imputed. Mr. THOMPSON'S case is before the public, and will appear directly in point. At one time, on the evidence of his own personal knowledge, he admits the Mirimachi distress, but three months before, on being better instructed under the Doctor's authority, he denies it, and recommends the propriety of the speculation. I make no question that the consciences of many of the Doctor's coadjutors demurred at the enormous imposition about to be practised on the public, and at the flagrant injustice of withholding £600 from their suffering fellow-creatures, in Mirimachi—but a nod from the all-powerful Doctor, would soon cause them to cower down and confine their conscientious scruples to their own bosoms. “Do not the interests of Education require such a sacrifice?” would he say—“These interests you know are little short of the Kingdom of Heaven, and whatever brings not far from it is a valuable attainment.” Oh! it is convenient to be beyond the jurisdiction of that Kingdom, although but a little distance, not far from it. You can at that enviable distance acquaint yourself with its laws and manners, and embrace or reject such of them as suit or clash with your interests, without being in the least amenable to their controul, and without any great risk of incurring the displeasure of the inhabitants on either side of the boundary line. When the case presses hard on you at last, as final safety is attainable only within the Kingdom, you have the satisfaction of being within ken of its regions, and it is only a step and you are there. Oh, desirable liberty! Nova Scotians, you are blind to your true honour and happiness if you embrace it not. You shall never know what is truly palatable till you have tasted of its sweets!!

III. That whatever brings not far from the Kingdom of Heaven, is considered a valuable attainment by the Doctor, appears from his quitting the pulpit for the chair of a Literary Seminary. This fact alone, unconnected with other parts of his history, would, I acknowledge, be a feeble demonstration of the doctrine imputed to him. We have heard of many, marked for respectability, and of unspotted reputation, who finding their health inadequate to the discharge of the weighty duties of the ministry, or perceiving that their talent qualified them more for teaching the young idea how to shoot, than efficiently to communicate religious knowledge, followed the same line of conduct. But then we have never heard a syllable of acknowledgement from the Doctor, that this was the reason which influenced him, in seating himself in the chair of his adoption. On the contrary, he has been known to boast of the facility with which, on any given or unexpected call, he could feed an audience with religious knowledge. What then could have governed his resolution in his descent from the spiritual cure of a congregation, to don the gown of a pedagogue? We know his own alleged *salvo* for his conscience, as well as the apology of his friends, viz: That he might be instrumental in preparing others for the labours of the vineyard, whose united efforts would incalculably more than counterbalance the loss of his personal ministry. Those who can believe, after what has been advanced on the two former heads, that love of souls, and zeal for the Kingdom of Christ, prompted him in assuming the superintendance of the Pictou Seminary, are for a certainty prepared to swallow a camel. That one who is charged, without even an attempt at refutation, with disloyalty of the foulest description, with the Editorship of a *ribald* and democratical periodical, and with being guilty of a public, printed, unblushing falsehood—a falsehood “long and wilfully persevered in,” of the reality of which ample proof can be furnished when it is called for, and to deny which the challenge is not to this day accepted, nor the floored gauntlet taken up;—that a person quiescently lying under these heinous and aggravated accusations, could be supposed influenced by religious principle, requires an extent of credulity unmatched in the annals of fanaticism. The true reason is to be found in the grand principle which I am endeavouring, I trust successfully, to prove a ruling one with him—that what brings not far from the Kingdom of Heaven is a valuable attainment. Literary pursuits do not necessarily belong to the Kingdom of Heaven, and the instruction which leads to the prosecution of them, does not necessarily imply conformity to, or acquaintance with the object of that Kingdom; but as the improvement of the mind is an object with the one and the other, the Doctor preferred those means of improvement which left him free from the trammels imposed by the rigorous jurisdiction of the Divine Kingdom, and which at the same time placed him at no great distance from it. It will be objected that he teaches Divinity.—So do many of his brother teachers; I am confident with more sincerity and success than he, although not the profession for which their services are principally demanded and remune-

rated by their constituents, Let me further call to the recollection of my readers, that the Doctor and the Trustees have publicly disclaimed Divinity as one of the branches expressly taught in the Seminary. And it is well known that the Charter which secures to it all its privileges, never contemplated a Divinity Class. If the Doctor then devotes any portion of his time which the Charter demands for literary, to theological instruction, he departs from his duty, and consequently turns aside from the Kingdom. If I have a man to plough my field, who bestows the whole or a part of the time for which he is hired, on weeding it, being the easier employment, he commits a fraud upon me and forfeits his wages. Now a fraud, though it may be tolerated without the Kingdom, is denounced and absolutely prohibited by its *Eighth Statute*.

Again, if the Doctor does not so dispose of the time specified, and still teaches Divinity, it brings us to where we were before, to the case of many brother instructors, and still leaves literary instruction with him as his professed employment. But further, in the one case or the other—i. e. in the case of his teaching Divinity within the time prescribed for other instruction, or privately he departs from the Kingdom, one of its laws to Ministers of the Gospel being this, “Give thyself wholly to it,”—viz. to Theological studies, and the communication of religious knowledge. And who that has ever known any thing of Divinity, and more especially of teaching it as a profession, but must be sensible that it requires one’s being “given wholly to it”? The Doctor however, instead of thus devoting himself, can find time for half a dozen other branches, some of which singly require all the time that men of ordinary qualifications can bestow for their attainment by others. Oh! but I know not the uncommon endowments of the Doctor?—Well! I should think he would feel it no disparagement to take Timothy, to whom Paul addressed the above injunction, as a fair gage of his talents. Thus stands the case then, the Doctor exchanged the office of a preacher of the Gospel, for that of a Teacher of Youth in literary studies, and by so doing he put himself in a situation not necessarily under the controul of the Kingdom of Heaven, having many notable examples of eminent predecessors, Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, and others who never heard of such a Kingdom. He thus got all at once clear of the drudgery of visiting from house to house, by confining himself to one house—and of the simplicity and uniformity of preaching Christ crucified every Sabbath, by adopting the charming variety of daily teaching the Languages, Mathematics, Philosophy, Natural and Moral;—and rid also of constant clashing with his favourite principle in an office, visibly at least, of the Kingdom, by laying it aside altogether, and publicly declaring, that “what brings not far from the Kingdom of Heaven is a valuable attainment.” Now, who would not try to possess what is a valuable attainment.

But it was not out of love for the bare principle, that the exchange I allude to was made by the Doctor. Being alone it would be a *dry morsel* to chew the cud on, but the latitude it allows in replenishing

the coffers, forms an irresistible recommendation of the abstract tenet. When you are out of the Kingdom of Heaven, though but a short distance from it, you can in given circumstances, acquire unrighteous gain, without being amenable to any tribunal *beyond its verge*. You can for instance become the recipient of £400 per annum, in such a Seminary as that at Pictou, when you cannot exceed the half in any pastoral charge within the District. Now I know not what, upon the principles of the Kingdom of Heaven, to denominate unrighteous gain, unless robbing the Church of your services, by consecrating them to an inferior office, because that office is more lucrative, be such. This then unravels the mystery of the Doctor's love for the principle—it is a gainful one; it secures £400 per annum; whereas an office which must necessarily uphold the principles of the Kingdom of Heaven, would realize no more than half that sum.

I hope, gentle reader, you now see that the principle is indeed the Doctor's; that his adoption of it is not causeless; and that the interests of religion were not the motives which induced him to lay aside his former profession, as his friends very unphilosophically, as well as groundlessly assert. It is a maxim in philosophy, that no more causes should be assigned for an effect, than are sufficient for producing it. Now to bring religion to bear upon the Doctor's mind, when £400 per annum can be employed as a lever to heave him from the pulpit, is quite out of the question. A doubt may arise, it is true, whether £400 led to the adoption of the principle, or the principle to the acceptance of the money. There might be a reaction: but I shall leave the solution of this doubt to the sagacity of the reader, and shall proceed to the last proof.

IV. The views which the Doctor entertains regarding certain points of Divinity, are the only other general proof to be adduced at present, to show that he has affiliated the principle which the foregoing remarks tend to establish as his. Now, though he is not the only one of his party implicated in this charge, any more than in some of those already advanced against him, yet from the *status* which he holds in the society to which he more immediately belongs, and from his relation to it, as its acknowledged Theological Professor, his particular and individual share in the guilt is evidently more aggravated. I observed already, that a person not far from the Kingdom of Heaven, from his proximity to it, and consequent facility of acquiring a knowledge of its laws, might and would naturally embrace and reject some of those laws at pleasure, or amalgamate them with such of the maxims of the world, as would constitute a respectable code for promoting self interest. The Doctor with his connections here and elsewhere, (for they are here to be considered jointly) having in my opinion effected such an amalgamation, evince that my assertions, in regard to their favourite principle, are well founded.

In respect to their acknowledged ecclesiastical standards, they are pretty nearly within the Kingdom of Heaven, at least not "far from it," being "the whole Doctrine contained in the Westminster Confes-

sion of Faith and Catechisms, except that part of it which respects the Magistrates' power in matters of religion," together with doctrines in Chapters 23d and 31st.

It would perhaps appear invidious to exclude them from the Kingdom for these few exceptions, more especially as they may seem to many unimportant, in reference to the general interests of religion—nor am I disposed to urge the point. It is on some grounds not necessarily related, but rather contradictory to these standards, that I mean to bring home to them the charge of maintaining that, whatever brings not far from the Kingdom of Heaven, is by them esteemed a valuable attainment.

In the first place—they hold that Civil Government has nothing to do with Christianity. That this is a fact, fearful though it be, appears from considering the following sentiments among others embodied in the ecclesiastical standards of the Seceders in Scotland. Divine Revelation is not the rule by which men are to act in the "formation of their civil constitutions and laws. Jesus Christ does not as Mediator govern the world, his authority is confined to the Church. Nations as such, are not bound to acknowledge Christ or his religion. Magistrates have nothing to do with Christianity."

The Doctor however, and his party may allege, that they and the Seceders in Scotland are different Churches, and act independently of each other. True—but we know that they were originally one, we never heard of any disavowal of the above doctrines from either one or other of them, and we have not ascertained that they are yet rescinded from the standards referred to. But that those sentiments are still cherished on this side the Atlantic, appears from the Doctor and his Brethren giving the right hand of fellowship to Ministers educated in the principles of the Scotch Seceders, as witness Stewiacke and the Lower Settlement of the East River of Pictou. Has there been a recantation of these sentiments required from the incumbents of those Parishes? We have not heard of any, and if there had, we live not at such a prodigious distance, but the echo of it might reach our ears.

Here then, is a total departure from the Kingdom of Heaven, although according to the Doctor's views, it may not be to a far country. Here is one of Christ's crowns attempted to be wrested from his head at once, by the *soi-disant* Presbyterian Church of Nova Scotia. They may fancy they honour him sufficiently by confining his authority to the Church; but then his laws do not admit a compromise.—Embrace one and embrace all, or reject one and reject all, are the sole terms of admission to, or exclusion from his dominions. Otherwise what shall we make of the Apostle's comment on his laws—"He who offendeth in one point is guilty of all"—or of Christ's own declaration, that "all power in heaven and earth was given to him"—or of Paul's doctrine that "Christ is made head over all things to his Church."—Can they, in the face of these truths, suppose that Christ will acknowledge them as subjects, when they expressly deny him the authority which he himself claims as Sovereign of the earth, or the Kingdoms of

this world. It is to be feared that the Doctor would consider the acknowledgment of such extensive authority in the hands of Christ, as in other cases, a mark of a low, slavish and cringing spirit. Nor is it to be doubted, that he apart from his sect, is supremely guilty in this particular, because from his all prevailing influence, he had the power if the inclination, when modelling and organizing a new Church such as he acknowledges, to rectify an error of this nature, or to cause so abominable a principle be disclaimed with abhorrence. But reader, the doctrine that "Civil Governments have nothing to do with Christianity," is a convenient principle, and one which the Doctor found specially serviceable to him in his political career, by furnishing him with abundant matter for railing at all kingly authorities. It supplied him with

" Fire in each eye, and papers in each hand,
To rave, recite, and madden round the land."

Under the impression that Christ would take no cognizance of any interference with the Kingdoms of this world, as being no part of his dominions, the Doctor has been for a series of years, belabouring every one of them without mercy, whilst his vengeance fell with double force upon the Throne to which he is most indebted, and to which his obligations can never be repaid, should he outlive the age of Methuselah. Were he within the Kingdom of Heaven, such extraordinary aberrations in principle and practice would never be tolerated, therefore he judged it a valuable attainment to go not far from it.

Another principle which tends to establish the same position, requires only a reference to the memories of every one in the District of Pictou, in order to prove its paternity on the Doctor and his party,—viz: "That the Redeemer has not purchased temporal benefits for the Saints." This doctrine in conjunction with the former, goes far to shew, that they opine Christ has nothing at all to do with this world. As Mediator, he has in their view, no business either with its government or its privileges. They seem as determined at least, that Christ should not overstep the boundaries of the Kingdom of Heaven, as that they themselves should remain beyond its limits. They evidently regard him as an austere master, to whom they are unwilling to render any service in this world, and to whose *surveillance* they do not wish their political intrigues, and their projects of acquiring temporal comforts to be exposed. They must fancy him, as some heathens did their gods, shrouding himself above the clouds, at an awful distance from mortal ken, and unconcerned about the insignificant movements of such vermin as we on earth are. It would be derogatory to the honour of our Saviour, (such is their own favourite phrase) to suppose that temporal blessings constitute a part of the purchase of his atonement. Is it not in the recollection of some of my readers, that a venerated preacher of their worthy body, asked sneeringly from the pulpit—aye from the pulpit, reader! "Did Christ shed his blood to procure that little grain of dirty sugar on which the flies feed, for the benefit of his saints?" Cannot some of my readers recollect the period when their

ears were grated with this heterodox and fulsome doctrine for several successive Sabbaths, after having with due solemnity been previously announced to the public, as the sole subject of discussion for the service of these Sabbaths? Thus proving that they proceeded systematically, in their endeavours to convince the world, that it would be derogatory to the Saviour's honour, to purchase temporal mercies. But it may be asked, how it happens that it is not derogatory to the honour of his creatures. I consider this *argumentum ad hominem*, for they themselves condescend to allow the Creator supply the wants of every living thing. Whence it is that they imagine it dishonouring to the same Being, to purchase for his people a covenant right to their forfeited privileges, I cannot conceive. Do they regard temporal mercies no privileges? If not, why do they make such a bustle in the world about them, and not rather at once adopt a Cameleon like life, in some anchorite's cell, "far in a wild, unknown to public view." But if they do consider them privileges, I demand whether the Saints have in their own right any privileges—if not, on what ground do they enjoy them? We are assured that God, as Creator, would hold no communion with them in any thing temporal or spiritual, on the footing of their own deserts, that their "sins had separated, and interposed a flaming sword between them and their God." How any privilege should come through such a wall of separation from the Lord to the Saints, except on his account who opened a door of communion, by enduring the full weight of that flaming sword, is to me inconceivable, and I leave it to the theology of the Doctor and his party for explanation. I know it will be petulantly asked, whence do the wicked and the inferior creatures enjoy their privileges? I reply, not on their own account, but solely on the footing of the right of believers, who have a purchased property in the wicked themselves, and all creatures else, seeing "all things are theirs." It is evident from Abraham's intercession for Sodom, and from many other parts of Scripture, that the wicked are spared only on account of the righteous. It must be gross violence to the whole tenour of revelation, to deny that all promises to believers are the fruits of the Redeemer's purchase, being in him "yea and amen," and is it not one of these promises that "bread shall be given the believer, and his water shall be made sure."* But reader, mark the Jesuitism of their conduct, in reference to this point. They know well that this doctrine will not go down with many of their hearers, especially with many whom they expect to make proselytes to their party—

* We have known those who could look to the Saviour's merits in connection with the bread which they eat, the raiment they put on, the government by which they are protected—nay, with the afflictions they suffer, and the adversities of their lot, and praise him for them all. We at once allow that their emotions arising from these views are not so vivid, so gladdening, or perhaps so profitable as those which are excited by reflection on the benefits of a spiritual and eternal nature procured by him. But then, as in natural religion, they look through nature up to nature's God, so by the laws of suggestion, the common bounties of the Redeem-

for the other; would he not infer from the language employed, that as the Redeemer had shed his blood for spiritual, so he had also done the same for temporal mercies. Here then the Antiburghers use, and are taught to use in prayer, language with a double meaning, six times a day or oftener. And as they are thus hackneyed in *double entendres* on such solemn occasions, need it be wondered at, that in common affairs they should feel little scrupulosity on the score of duplicity—that you should hear them whining their complaints on the divisions among Presbyterians, while they secretly foster them, and rejoice at their continuance. This they do because these divisions are their life. How could they live a day in Pictou without them? Had they not sown division among the Presbyterians in Pictou, they would not have a follower in a hundred. They themselves separated from the Church of Scotland, and would strive to the utmost to divide others from its communion. Yet *they* whiningly lament divisions! This is only one sample in a thousand, of their *double entendres*, their equivocations, and their Pharisaism.

Again.—In the baptismal vows which they impose on applicants for baptism to their children, they require from them a profession of faith in accordance with the principles of the Westminster Confession of Faith, without any limitation,—at any rate without any limitation affecting the case under consideration. Now, nothing can be more evident than that this principle of theirs is in direct opposition to the doctrine taught in Cap. 12th of that Confession. Observe then the Jesuitical tendency of their conduct in the administration of baptism. They render a solemn ordinance of Christ's appointment, the means of taking religious vows, with mental reservations. They vow publicly, and before the Lord, that their faith accords with the whole of the Westminster Confession of Faith, without at least excepting Cap. 12th. The Doctor and his party themselves acknowledge, according to the Shorter Catechisms, that Christ purchased his people's redemption, and of course that Adoption, the subject of Cap. 12, is one of the benefits of that redemption. Yet temporal provision for the saints is part of this benefit. Now they must very unphilosophically believe that a whole is less than the sum of all its parts, or admit that if Christ purchased the Adoption of Saints, he has also purchased temporal mercies for them, according to the Westminster Confession of Faith. When they do not admit this, and yet require of their people a profession agreeable to the Westminster Confession, how can they stand clear of teaching their people to come publicly under vows with mental reservations. If their people are taught that this line of conduct is safe in the courts of the Lord, what should hinder them from following it up in civil Courts? Does not this thoroughly explain the nature of the testimony given by some of them on John Fraser's trial, and doubtless in other similar cases? The fact is, that when they are required to swear, and declare the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, they may according to the principles instilled into them, construe their oaths, and their vows as they list. If they declare the

truth, although not the whole truth, they think themselves brought not far from the Kingdom of Heaven, and this, according to the Doctor, is a valuable attainment.

May we not from a review of these things, naturally ask, who would entrust his person or his property to a Jury of Antiburghers? Is it not fact, that they are very generally regarded through the country with a suspicious eye, either in sitting as Jury-men, or sitting as witnesses. And if the foregoing premises be considered, is not the suspicion very natural? The fault is not primarily the people's, although even in them it is a grievous fault. It is an unspeakably higher degree that of their spiritual guides, and pre-eminently that of the Doctor, their acknowledged ecclesiastical head. Both he and these guides, not only require others to act such a part, but also set them the examples, by publishing to the world that the Westminster Confession was their Confession of Faith, when they must and could not but know, that they maintained principles in downright hostility to it, such as those doctrines animadverted on in this, and the former head. And what they published as an ecclesiastical body, I suppose they imagine themselves individually, and the people collectively, at perfect liberty to swear to.

I have now, kind reader, in a great measure discussed what I intended to advance, in proof of the Doctor's holding the principle that, "whatever brings not far from the Kingdom of Heaven, is a valuable attainment," as also that it belongs to his party. I might further urge evidences of the same fact, from their Church discipline, its laxity, irregularity, injustice, and partiality—from their inconsistency in the appointment of Ministers not educated by themselves, contrary to their published declaration. Some of them whose *praises* are not in the wilds of New-Brunswick, Bay Chaleur, and other places—from their election and ordination of Elders, whose qualifications in point of morals and knowledge, could not bear a narrow scrutiny, in and from other subjects. But I forbear for the present, and shall proceed to address three classes of the community in Pictou.

And first.—Oh! 'YE STRICT AND RIGID ANTIBURGHERS,' adherents of the Reverend Doctor and his coadjutors, I crave your attention for a little to this subject, and I ask what you have to say to these statements? I fear, in addressing you, I have to deal with people who "care for none of these things." But unless you join hands with some of those with whom you formed an unnatural coalition, on a certain political occasion, and who maintain that the essence of faith consists in believing what is contrary to the evidence of their senses, I consider you yet not quite past redemption. I demand then whether you are not fully aware of the truth of the above statements? Will you disbelieve the evidence of your *own senses* and call this faith? And first for your *eyes*. Do you not see that the "Presbyterian" is to this day unanswered, notwithstanding the onerous charges brought against your Doctor?—Charges of foul disloyalty—of fostering rebellion—of the blackest ingratitude, no less than kicking against the mother who

nursed him—and of the grossest falsehood, to shield him from the vengeance of an insulted public!—Now, what think you of the Doctor, ye Antiburghers?

Again,—for your senses of *seeing, touch, hearing, and tasting*. Did not some of you see the effects of the Mirimachi conflagration? Did not others of you handle the money intended for the relief of the sufferers? Did you not feel it burning with the curse of the poor and the oppressed? Did not some of you hear the cry of the distressed, the moan of the orphan, and the groan of the widow? And oh! did you not taste a bitterness in the sop which you wrested from the mouth of the hungry? Did you not shudder at with-holding—*with-holding*, did I say, at *robbing* such complicated wretchedness of a pittance of £600!! And will you still bow the knee to him who was the principal instigation to this ever-to-be-abhorred transaction?

In the next place,—Let me appeal to all your senses without exception. Did you not see the Doctor descending from the holy office of directing the sinner's eyes to the sceptre of grace, to the ordinary avocation of causing the shining morning face of the Schoolboy to tremble in terror of the *ferula*? Did not this, in his circumstances smell rank of an avaricious love of worldly lucre? Did you not feel some misgivings, some undefined thrill of suspicion pervading your frame, regarding the purity of the Doctor's conscience on this change of profession? Did you not heave the half suppressed sigh of injured piety, on this dereliction of duty in one of its seeming votaries? Does not this in all its bearings, taste killingly of the fatal leaven of Demas' apostacy? And this being demonstrably true of the Doctor, will you still offer him the incense of your admiration?

In the last place.—Let me appeal to your judgment, reason, and common sense. Do you think it consistent that Christian Magistrates should have nothing to do with Christianity? If you read your New Testament, do you believe it possible that all the Saints' privileges, temporal and spiritual, are not the fruit of Christ's purchase "*all things being theirs,*" *because they are Christ's*? It is reasonable that rational beings should appeal to the Omniscient for witnessing the truth of declarations, which they know, or ought to know are false? And do you not judge the ministrations which foster such duplicity, in church and state, to be the grossest blasphemy!

Thus to you ends my catechism.—And I wish you could do me the justice to believe that I have advanced nothing but what I seriously considered to be the truth. I will in return do you the justice to allow, that you do not *all* knowingly participate in such complicated guilt. But sins of ignorance are sins still. I therefore, as your fellow-mortal warn both you, who are comparatively innocent, as well as the gross criminal, to renounce your connection with the instigator to this guilt. Be renegades no longer! Most of you are such, few amongst you having been Anti-Burghers previous to your arrival in this Country. If in the face of all the statements here made, which you cannot deny to be substantially true, you will still

persist in your desperate relation to the Doctor and his Reverend Brethren, it is "more in sorrow than in anger" that I denounce you as convicted participants in their disloyalty, speculation, religion, and heterodoxy, to your utter confusion where you must tremble to appear, under such a load of aggravated criminality.

SECONDLY, I address those whose connection with the Doctor and his party, has been influenced more by circumstances than inclination. Dear friends (for such I know you to be at heart, although situated as you are, you dare not avow it,) what think you of these things? I am morally certain that when your situation is thus clearly defined, some of you piteously wish it had never been yours, and inwardly curse the day when you inconsiderately entered into such a disreputable, and (what now appears indubitably to be) an impious connection. I would fain hope that others of you resolve without hesitation to renounce and abjure for ever such a relation, at whatever cost and sacrifice. There may be others among you, even you of a lukewarm, indolent, irresolute cast, as among all other religious bodies, who will coldly reply to all this 'our Saviour himself sanctioned the conduct of the beloved brothers of the Doctor, the Scribes and Pharisees of old, when he said "Do as they say, but not as they do."' But you will bear in remembrance that he sanctioned this only whilst they sat in Moses' seat, and taught what Moses taught. Would he, think you, sanction it if they sat in Balaam's seat, and surely instancing Balaam is no disparagement either to the Doctor's learning, foresight, covetousness, penetration, and (I am sorry to be obliged to add) his piety. We know Christ would not sanction it, because he himself in express terms denounced "them that hold the doctrine of Balaam."—That your reply will not vindicate your connection with the Doctor, appears evidently from the doctrine of one who knew the mind of our Saviour well, even Paul, who says, "though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other Gospel to you, than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." Now I think I have shewn pretty clearly, that the Antiburghers preach another Gospel than this, in excluding Christ as Mediator, almost entirely from any dealings with this world, in direct contradiction to one of the clearest and most precious passages of the Gospel, viz. "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life." But you will say, you seldom or never hear them preach such doctrines. I think however, I have sufficiently explained the reason to be, that in the present day, it would militate against their self-interest. You have either heard them, or of their preaching such doctrines, and I ask you, and you may demand of them, whether they have relinquished or renounced them. You may perhaps rejoice again, (as what will not those pushed to the wall do?) that they do not attach great weight to these opinions, and that they may in time recant. But that they do think them important, you may judge from their portentous consequences, as detailed in my address to your elder brethren—for we always determine the regard people have

for their opinions by the use they make of them, and their influence over themselves. Now have not both the practical fruits and the influence of the Doctor's tenets been such as are sufficient to shock any mind that is not seared as with a red hot iron? As to the hope that he and his party may in time see their errors, and renounce them, so far as to merit confidence in their sincerity, I fear it is perfectly groundless, and that the mountains and seas shall sooner exchange situations. You will need no clearer evidence of this than the reply which shall be hurled against me, if they dare to attempt a reply; and if they dare not, their silence will be another evidence, which may determine your minds on the point. Therefore relinquish their society, renounce fellowship with them, follow them not, hear them not, on pain of being involved in their certain ruin. As their Chief teaches, and his subjects believe, that to be where salvation is impossible, even that to be brought not far from the Kingdom of Heaven is a valuable attainment, then if your children are already in the Kingdom of Heaven, the Doctor will use all his endeavours to pluck them out of it, by teaching them his own beloved principle. I can conceive then, only one other refuge you can betake yourselves to—that you cannot be tarnished by their errors. It is a false one, and your very hesitation on the case, is a mark of their leprosy on you already. See then that you be not wholly covered with it—you know who says, “Evil communication corrupts good manners.”

In the last place.—I shall in reference to this subject, shortly address that portion of the community in this District which is in connection with the Church of Scotland.

Beloved Brethren, in addressing you I hesitate not to commence with a confession of two faults. One of which I have been guilty of—and of the other, in my own view at least, only seemingly so. The latter is that I may have appeared to you to tread too closely in the Doctor's own footsteps in the management of my argument, by treating grave subjects too lightly. If I have done so, I am at least ready to acknowledge my fault, but he vaunts every line he wrote since the Province was blessed with his effusions, and tells the world that “he never published a sentence in Nova Scotia, which he is not prepared to avow and defend,” although at the same time you see him boldly appearing before an infant Seminary, and before the public, stating that “what brings not far from the Kingdom of Heaven is a valuable attainment.” I do not however stand vindicated to my own approbation, for treading in a somewhat cleaner path than the Doctor. His example would be a very indifferent standard by which to measure my steps. I stand on safe ground, on unquestionable authority, both in profane and sacred writings, when I assert that things in themselves absurd and ridiculous, cannot be properly treated in any other way than by a ludicrous representation. Among other examples of this nature, I refer to Elijah's conduct towards the prophets of Baal. Now can there be any thing more absurd than the Doctor's character, when viewed through the light that has been thrown on it above—living on the

bounty of Government, and yet Editing the *Patriot*, its bitter, its violent, its frantic foe ; instructing the ignorant, and providing means, literary and religious, for the poor, by robbing their pockets ; advocating the interests of piety, by deserting the post in which these interests could be best supported and defended ; furious for purity of doctrine, and by the fierceness of his zeal pulling down a great portion of the fabric he would uphold.

I might advert to other things which evince equal absurdity.—He pleads for equality of rights, and deprecates undue influence exercised over any one portion of the community by another, at the same time that he would have the Anti Burghers ruling without competition, uncontrolled, unresisted in Pictou, of whose population they form not above a third.—He loudly complains of our Rules being partial in their patronage, and their disposal of the public funds, and yet he would heartily have £400 per annum, over the necks, and in part from off the shoulders of nearly two thirds of the population of the District. But there is no need for multiplying such instances of absurdity—those given, in my opinion, sufficiently warrant the style I have adopted. And, in the face of these things, is it not wonderful that in this Province, (denominated par excellence enlightened) any should be found to admire such a mass of inconsistencies—that the First Commoner of the land should resound his praises within the walls of the Senate, earnestly deprecate reasonable opposition to him, and, leaning on the arm of the lame, march with an accelerated pace, in double quick time, to the right ear of the Colonial Secretary, with an humble supplication that the worthy Doctor should be placed on the British Civil List, for £500 per annum ; that the inferior satellites of the Doctor view him with profound respect, and reverential awe, as seated aloft with a “*noli me tangere*” inscribed on his brow—that even the little urchins, puling in their nurses’ arms are taught to sound the Doctor’s praise, as the grand, the good man.—And last of all, that it was publicly declared, with all the gravity and solemnity due to so important a fact, so sublime a discovery, “when Doctor McCulloch is dead he will teach no more !” Is not all this a wonder ? But happily or otherwise as you may take it, we are not here without a precedent.—It was long ago said, “the whole world wondered after the beast.”

The other fault with which I confess myself justly chargeable, is that I continued so long blind to the necessity of resistance, and to the value of your zealous opposition to this unchristian hierarchy. Previous to my bidding adieu to the peace, the tranquillity, and the brotherly harmony which I always witnessed and enjoyed in my dear native land, I knew nothing, but by report, of party feuds, and such unholy skirmishings as so often jar on the feelings, and recur with redoubled virulence and violence in Pictou. I consequently was quite unprepared to enter the field all at once, and hoped that the war might be honourably ended by treaties and negotiations, and such other means as are usually resorted to, before belligerents come to extremities. But I found that all attempts of this nature tended only to widen the breach,

as if peace had pronounced her final valediction in Pictou, and left it as the undisputed residence of "fell furies and discord dire." Therefore, after giving the case all the attention in my power; and viewing it with all the candour of which I am capable, I concluded that although you, my friends, may not be entirely blameless, yet the head and front of the offending rests with the Doctor and his friends, and that any blame chargeable on you, in these unhallowed contests, is the result of their unprovoked persecution. I deem it my duty, then, to enter the lists against them, and contribute the aid of my feeble arm to reduce them to reason, or, if that be impracticable, to purge the land of their poisonous leaven by all fair and honest means.

I congratulate you, my brethren, for having so steadily persisted in opposing their aggressions, in eschewing their wiles, in watching against their allurements, and in waiting patiently the day of better things. I trust you will also see particular ground of congratulation, in having been providentially favoured with instructors, who delivered you from the pangs of hope deferred, and aroused your sinking courage. I mean neither to flatter you nor them, by asserting that they are unblemished or perfect men or ministers—but I think it is no more than justice to pronounce them so in comparison with those whom I have here exposed. They neither preach nor publish disloyalty—they do not veil any treacherous designs under the mask of disingenuous equivocation, or false disclaimers—they feed not themselves or their flocks by oppressing the poor, or robbing the hungry—they endeavour to occupy the station, and to discharge the functions of the office, to which they have been in the course of Providence called, without thinking of relinquishing their post, while health and moderate means, even with many privations, permit. They exclude not the Redeemer from his Sovereignty over this world, or from administering sustenance to the bodies of his followers in their pilgrimage through life. Now if all this is chargeable upon the Antiburghers, what have they to offer in compensation? Do not our Ministers as well as theirs, attend upon the stated ministrations of the Sabbath? Do they not visit from house to house? Do they not laboriously discharge the duty of Catechetical instruction? And when it is desired and expedient, do they not hold fellowship and prayer meetings with their people? What advantage have the Antiburghers, then, or rather to what disadvantage are they not subject, when they expose themselves to be constantly misled by corruption in doctrine and in practice? Such corruption may not present itself on ordinary occasions, but when adequate temptation occurs, we have seen how deep it lies, and how rank it grows. This tends to resolve a question with which I have frequently observed conscientious people exercised—viz. whether they should countenance such Ministers by their personal attendance?—for surely, on a review of what has been advanced in these pages, there will be found sufficient to justify all such in withdrawing their personal attendance from the assemblies of Antiburghers on the Lord's Day, and in persisting thus to discountenance them, until their preachers dissolve their con-

nection with Doctor McCulloch, publicly renounce their share in the guilt charged upon them above, and distinctly express their contrition for having so long adhered to what they cannot but condemn, in their serious moments—if such they have. When they shall have done all this, wholly and unequivocally, I shall consider you then, my brethren, at perfect liberty to act as your consciences may direct. I will go further—I shall recommend attendance upon their ministrations in this their renewed character, in preference to what, when it can be helped, is highly sinful, “forsaking the assembling of yourselves together, as the manner of some is.” But if you appear in their churches, polluted as they must be by persons remaining unhumbled and impenitent under such heavy accusations, I do not see how you can acquit yourselves of countenancing them in their guilt, and consequently of participating in it, though in an inferior degree. It appears to me that the only question you have to ask, in order to resolve your doubts, is “shall we do evil that good may come of it?” “Shall we by our going thither, and leaving the Pictou taught ministers and their associates, abet the Editor of the Patriot, the spoliators of Mirimachi, the politic hunter for filthy lucre, the heterodox dethroners of our Saviour,—and through all this miry clay, hear the Gospel?” If you receive goods which you know to have been stolen, do you not participate in the guilt of the theft, and do you not encourage the thief to persist in his unlawful doings? In like manner if you receive instruction from any of Dr. McCulloch’s coadjutors, or pupils, do you not countenance their nefarious principles and conduct, and encourage them to persevere in their contaminating proceedings? I think it not then too severe to parallel a thief with Dr. McCulloch, and his accessories in the Mirimachi case. For, it is not probable, if an opportunity offered, that both he and they would not again endeavour to appropriate public charities to their own private use. They have attempted it once—What proof have I that they either did it not already in other cases unknown, (say, contributions from Bible Societies,) or that they will not do it again? I possess no evidence of their repentance. Dr. McCulloch has not answered the Presbyterian, neither he nor they acknowledge guilt attaching to the robbery of Mirimachi, and late occasions have evinced the unchanged existence of their usual rancour, and unbrotherly animosities. Be ye not, therefore, my brethren, directly or indirectly partakers in their evil deeds. At the same time I repeat that, if they do give public tokens of repentance, in the terms above mentioned, although I scarcely expect they will do it so as to satisfy me of their sincerity, yet I shall rejoice if they can satisfy you. In the mean time I hope I have said enough, to convince you of the propriety of abstaining from countenancing them by attendance on their Sabbath ministrations, or on any duties of a religious nature performed by them. Such attendance will necessarily subject you as honest men to the obligations of paying their services—and paying their services, in their present circumstances and character, is a bounty on all the guilt with which they appear chargeable in these pages.

I have now, my friends, at great length, discussed much of what I intended to advance on this important subject, and although my remarks may appear too severe, even to those who will admit the correctness of my statements, I yet could not, from the aggravated nature of the charges here made, affect a milder tone, or use a calmer style. Recommending the subject to your serious consideration, and promising if occasion calls for it, more by way of explanation,

I remain,

Your sincere Friend,

X.