

the article concerning the Word of God has been removed from the primary and controlling place it has in the confession and relegated to an inferior and subordinate place; and the substitute has weakened on Inspiration, and been fitted in to antecedent statements based on reason as at least of equal authority in religious matters. Thus there seems to be a preparation for Rationalism, where the intuitions of Reason and conscience are accorded an equal, if not a higher, place of authority for religious belief. To this we may not assent; no confession of faith can be acceptable to the Presbyterian church which does not "exalt God's word above all His great Name," and recognize in matters of salvation the word of God as the only rule of faith and directory for duty.

3. But the confession stands in the way of union with other churches. Certainly not. All that our practice requires is, that before any man is ordained to hold office, he shall *ex animo* assent to the system of doctrine contained in the confession, as founded on and in accordance with the word of God. Union is a good thing where secured by deferring to all the conscientious convictions of the parties uniting. But it cannot be successful or a blessing, if in order thereto Presbyterians must lower the banner which our fathers displayed for the truth, and abate their conscientious conviction that God is sovereign in this grace and that salvation is of God and not of man. The history of the past and the trend of opinion at present make it as necessary as ever to hold "Justification by faith" without works as its ground. But if in order to union changes are to be made, we wish to know in what direction and how far are we to go? To conciliate Arminians, must we give up the Scripture doctrines of Fore-ordination and the Perseverance of the Saints? To comprehend Baptists, must we change our Scriptural doctrines of Infant Baptism and make immersion imperative? To meet the views of advanced Episcopalians must we revise our doctrine of the church and of the sacraments? To effect a union with Rome must we lower down our Scriptural condemnation of supererogatory works, entangling vows, purgatory, Anti-Christ, etc.? To include Universalists and Restorationists must we strike out the plain teaching of God's word and introduce vague expressions of a poet's "Larger Hope"? It seems to us that to do this would not promote union, but would at once produce disruption. Even if a majority should accede to such proposals, a large and determined minority would never enter a unionist church with such a feckless creed. If our union comes, it must