

Presbyterians, took exception to the introduction of an organ, and seceded. According to the theory, these gentlemen would have joined any one of the congregations originally of the Free Church in which no organ is used. But did they? So far from that, they built a church almost under the shadow of the one they left, and sent for a United Presbyterian minister to Scotland. Clearly they were wrong, according to the new theory. But, unfortunately for theorists, there is in man a great deal of human nature.

But we are told that the effect of the junction will be the greater and more effectual spread of the Gospel. When the Presbyterians of the United States resolved to cast in their lot together there was great enthusiasm shown, and a large memorial fund was raised. It is but a short time since that took place, and the Committees on Missions are already at their wits' end to raise money for their work. They seem, the report states, to have reached the limit of giving on the part of the people; church building has almost ceased, so far as we can ascertain. Truly there is nothing here to justify the glowing anticipations of those who use as an argument for union the additional power to be gained.

But another argument is that we must be liberal, in accordance with the liberality of those who regard all adherence to doctrine as absurd so long as a man acts up to the light that is in him. Mr. Grant, of Halifax, tells us, and he is an authority in the faith of the new departure, that he hopes to see the day when the Presbyterian may preach Arminianism and the Methodist Calvinism, if he finds it in the Bible. In the expurgated edition of the reported proceedings of the Evangelical Alliance at Montreal, the words "*without requiring to leave his pulpit*" have disappeared, although in the original report. Are our brethren prepared to follow Mr. Grant in abjuring the Confession of Faith and Standards of the Church of Scotland? Such a gross violation of decency would be branded with a very emphatic name among ordinary business men, who regard adherence to obligations as necessary to maintain their reputation. Before Mr. Grant took upon himself the vows taken by every minister of the Church of Scotland, he, presumably, satisfied himself that the Standards were in consonance with God's Word. He took the vows and signed the formula because he believed they represented his views of Scripture. He engaged to preach the Gospel, not because he had signed and vowed to teach according to a certain interpretation of the Scriptures, but he signed and vowed, we must believe, because he believed in that interpretation, and had resolved to teach men so. If he does not believe now what he says he believed then, is he entitled to hold his pulpit to teach false doctrines (that is, false according to the Standards which he professed to believe)? By what right does he use his influence as a Presbyterian minister to break up a Church whose existence he vowed to maintain, whilst he mocks the beliefs not of that Church only, but of all Presbyterian bodies? Yet he is the leader of some very young men, who are prepared to set all creeds at naught, and to despise, like Beecher, all systematic theology. "We have not so learned Christ,"