

the system as a whole. This is the real position of hundreds who are inclined to *charity*, but who see that *charity* is in danger of running into *luxury*.

To maintain a separation and a protestation for conscience' sake is becoming more difficult, because Romanism is putting on of late years a *new front*. Witness the attempt at Baltimore a few years since to make it appear that papacy was almost the patron of our republicanism, despite the fact that the allegiance owed by every subject of the Pope to him, as a foreign power, is constructive treason ; witness the present advocacy of temperance, popular education, and of civil service reform, in which Roman Catholic bishops are taking the lead, and the widespread activity of the Sisters of Charity—all of which tend in the public mind to obscure the fact that back of all this attractive guise lie doctrines and practices that demand as emphatic a protest as at the Diet of Spire !

If the union of churches could be secured for which so many are hoping, what would be the effect on missions ? Would not inevitable questions arise on which new separations would be inevitable ? Two devoted missionaries in China, one a Presbyterian and the other a Baptist, were so intimate as friends that they determined to undertake a joint evangelistic tour. All was as smooth as a placid stream, until the converts began to multiply and desired baptism ; then the tour came to an end, from the simple impossibility of further agreement.

Moreover, it has often been said that a wholesome emulation is promoted by the variety of denominations, and that no one church would ever accomplish an aggregate of service equal to the sum of all now done by many different bodies. And, again, with more force it is argued that variety is the sign and fruit of education ; that uniformity is born either of intellectual stagnation or slavery, and that, as soon and as surely as men begin to reason and think for themselves, individuality takes the place of uniformity, as a tree cannot grow without branching, and the larger and fuller the growth the more minute the ramifications. Amid the clamor for church unity it may be well seriously to ask whether any further unity is practicable or even possible than a federation or alliance in which there shall be a cordial allowance for all individual divergences, but at the same time a fraternal cooperation. Thousands of families, with widely differing household life, manners, notions, habits, and preferences may be united in one harmonious state or commonwealth. Why may not all evangelical churches, recognizing their agreements as fundamental and their differences as non-essential, work side by side without interference or needless overlapping ?

Meanwhile an opposite tendency, obviously at work, threatens a *new schism*, or at least *secession*. Louder and more earnest grow the remonstrance and resistance to the alarming spread of rationalism and secularism in the churches, which is seen even in England and America. Professor Howard Osgood, in the Detroit Baptist Congress a year ago, following an