

ply went asleep. Wesleyan missionaries from England ventured to break the slumber about the year 1850, followed by their brethren of the M. E. Church of the United States which now has 113 ministers in Norway and Sweden. They encountered much persecution but the result of their endeavour and toil is that now the obnoxious laws of intolerance are repealed, the established church has been quickened into newness of life and it regards more favourably, as well it may, those foreign disturbers of its slumbers. I am bold to say that a community with only one denomination in it fares far worse in the way of effort for its moral and spiritual improvement than one in which two or more evangelical churches are laboring side by side, provided these are laboring in fraternal harmony. Unification is very suggestive of stagnation and death.

2nd. The advocates of organic unity need to be reminded that arbitrary administration is likely to be one of the concomitants of the unification for which they plead. I may be told in opposition to this of the blissful contentment, for example, of the people in connection with the established church of Scotland. It does not become me to meddle just here in the controversies of Scotch Presbyterianism. It is however relevant to state that the Presbyterian churches which have separated from the church of Scotland from the secession of 1734 down to the organization of the U. P. church in 1847, have all thought that there was sufficient occasion for their separation in the maladministration against which they protested, while in the mean time it is to be noticed that the grand old church itself claims to be prospering now as much as ever though surrounded by several dissenting bodies. As one outside I see no reason why these churches should not be united but the only point of my reference is that a solitary church of vast and commanding influence in a country is very likely to give occasion for charges of arbitrary exercise of power leading to discontent and dissension. I fear that the thought of the ideal theocracy of Hildebrand really lurks in the modern movement of Protestant unification.

3rd. Objection is taken to the proposed organic union on the ground of its impracticability. If popular sentiment, which is so variable a thing, were unanimously and enthusiastically in its favour to-day there is not the slightest guarantee against cleavage and disintegration to-morrow. If legal constraint were employed to cement the union the new dissensions would only thereby be the more marked. Divergences in opinion and practices will inevitably arise which eccle-