

work of art and a work of nature, between a "manufactured article" and a growth owing to its origin to life. To crave for organic union before the indwelling life of Christ has brought us into relationships of sweet fellowship, is to mistake the effect for the cause. I hope for organic union, but I do not think we shall secure it by seeking for it first of all. When it comes it must come as an outflow of the increase of the very spiritual life for which we long. The more speedily we admit the fact that organic union between some of the existing religious bodies is as undesirable as impossible, until very great changes in practice and beliefs occur, the more quickly we shall arrive at the goal of good-will, mutual appreciation of one another's good works, and mutual co-operation for which Prof. Scrimger so eloquently pleads.

But there are denominations that have already reached this goal and between whom jealousy or conflict is unjustifiable as fratricide. Presbyterianism and Methodism are mentioned by Dr. Scrimger, and furnish a concrete example of what I mean. The only real doctrinal difficulty in the way of their union is found in Calvinism and Arminianism. Yet, in practical piety how much difference does variety of belief here make? The Calvinistic battle-axe and the Arminian rapier are already beaten into the gospel plowshare

for the breaking up of the fallow ground, so far as nine-tenths of our people are concerned. Transfer from one denomination to another is the easiest thing possible amongst our members, and is not a very exceptional occurrence in the ministry. Has not the hour come for denominational federation if not for organic union? The latter may be delayed, the former occurs to me an early and imperative necessity.

Why should there not be a central board or council, to whom the erection of new churches and the continuance or discontinuance of present charges, in our smaller settlements, might be referred? What possible excuse is there for Presbyterian and Methodist ministers dividing a small population in a little French Canadian village? Why, in a growing suburb should both denominations rush in to their common weakening? Can we satisfy our conscience or justify our conduct to an intelligent Christian public, if we perpetuate the existing state of affairs? And in our north-west and upon our mission fields in general, what apology have we to offer for a prolonged persistence in a policy which promotes no good object and retards the evangelization of the world? I foresee what I would not advise, but what must come if the leaders of both denominations do not render it unnecessary by wise and prompt action. The generous contributors to our mis-