

strength given by a name common to all Christ's people in an organic union in all lands. As a matter of policy, economy and effectiveness, organic union is eminently desirable as it means a world wide impetus and would give us a boldness in proclaiming our common faith that would be followed by a universal Penticostal outpouring of the Holy Spirit for the converting of millions of our race. The Churches of to-day could advance in power by exchanging much present formality for utility.

We are now in a position to approach the third point: IS IT FEASIBLE? Can the disintegrated minds be blended into the mind of Christ, so that the barriers may be swept away as unworthy of existence in the Church of God. We unhesitatingly say that there is no reason why there should not be an organic union between the Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist, Reformed Episcopal, Congregational and the Evangelical Sections of the Anglican Church. *No real barrier exists* if the members are believers in Christ. What man or woman amongst us would not accept the Trinity, the Bible as the inspired word of God, and the salvation through Christ which is taught therein? None! We one and all reject the sacerdotal error of the Romanist and those believing as the Romanist does. We all regard each other as being denominationally a part of the great Church of God. The barriers to organic union are simply matters of name, government and liturgy. Would not the Rev. Ever Faithful of the Church of Christ, London, England, filling the pulpit of the Rev. Make Peace of the Church of Christ, St. Catherine St., Montreal, savor more of real unity, than the same names as belonging to the Presbyterian and Baptist Churches? Would there not be a sort of touch of elbows that would be suggestive of a very globe-girdling? Would not the Chinese merchant be set thinking if he read in his newspaper that the same reverend gentleman from London, England, would subsequently preach in the Church of Christ on Blank street in Hong Kong? Would it not be a gain to be able to abandon the present necessity of explaining the difference between the Baptist and Presbyterian and why the close communion brother will not commune with his unimmersed brother of the Church of Christ.

It seems we are all wrong in this, and only need to be made to see that *names are barriers*; to adopt the feasible plan, of dropping denominational ones for a universal one. In the matter of Church government union is nearer than it seems, differences are here again in name more than anything else. In Episcopal Churches where the