

we consider that so many of the people were emigrants from the old country and of course intensely interested in all its church questions. From such a beginning it was thus barely possible to escape. And were Presbyterianism a thing merely Scottish, a plant that would thrive only under conditions essentially Scottish, it could not be helped if this beginning were to continue to the end, or at any rate until the divided Churches in Scotland had come to see eye to eye. But as we all think higher things of the pure Apostolic polity that is ours, we look for and must work for a nobler history. In New Zealand and all the Australian Colonies the divided Churches have all reunited; and, while presenting an unbroken front, are blessed, internally, with a singular measure of prosperity. What is to hinder us from entering on the same path? The causes of separation have been tradition, prejudices, politics, one-sided views, embittered feelings; and, higher aims, interests, and principles have been subordinated to those. It will do no good to rake up the past and try to find out which side has been most to blame. I believe that all must share the blame—where blame is deserved—pretty equally;—some in one way, others in another way;—one for this offence, another for that. But it is more to the purpose to ask, are we not prepared for a better state of things now? Let us leave the feuds that are behind and press forward to the work that is before.

What would a union imply? In the first place, it would not imply a good many things that some may perhaps assume that it would. The ideal kirkman might still put as little faith as he liked in the ideal Anti-burgher or have as little to do with him, and *vice versa*. An universal cordiality and oneness of sentiment would not be indispensable. No congregation would change its minister, no man or woman need have new friends instead of, or in addition to, the old ones. All our ordinary social life would go on unchanged, or at least any change would be at each person's option. All Christians know that they are brothers and sisters, but they do not give all the same place in their hearts. The principles of natural selection or circumstances determine our set or coterie for us; and in our own church there may be persons we have a very poor opinion of, and in another Church persons for whom we have the strongest natural affinity. When two Churches unite then it by no means follows that each of us is prepared to take every member of the other Church into our confidence or into the bosom of our family. We don't do that with all the members of the Church to which we already belong. We would unite because there is no good reason for remaining disunited; because being of the same race, and holding the same traditions and living in the same country and believing the same truths, and loving the same polity, we could,

if united, better promote a common cause. All together we would not constitute more than one-sixth of the population of the Maritime Provinces;—separated into two or three, how can we even dream of the work that every man with the feelings not of a sectarian but of a national churchman must always have in his mind. We especially who profess to cherish the theory of a national Church ought to ask ourselves what the theory means. Does it mean that we are to admire it at a distance, across the wide Atlantic, that is: or is its meaning confined to the teinds of Scotland, or to possible future endowments here when the skies shall fall and larks be caught?

Again, union would take from no one anything that he now is or has. Of course the basis of union would be those venerable standards that all Presbyterians cherish as heirlooms and symbols, and no one would propose the addition of a word that would reflect directly or indirectly on the Church of Scotland as she now is. Would there be loyalty and disloyalty to the Church in again declaring our attachment to those doctrines, and that government and discipline which she has always upheld, and in seeking to render them more operative in the new world by combining for their support all to whom they are dear? Would such an act bring on us the censure of the parent church, or cause her no longer to recognize as her ministers those whom she had ordained to the sacred office? There is no difficulty in answering such questions. Those who were her ministers in Australia are still her ministers, and should they return to Scotland are as eligible as ever they were, to be called to parishes there; or to urge a minister of the United Church as such could not be recognized as a minister of the Church of Scotland. But that is simply our state at present. She recognizes and can recognize none of us as her ministers except those who have been licensed and ordained by Presbyteries in Scotland:—so half of our present ministers in the Dominion could not even be called to congregations in Scotland. But if any one thinks that union would bring him under any disability, the matter could easily be settled by a letter to the Colonial Committee. What the views of the leaders of our Church in Scotland are on the whole subject are well known. And as with the leaders so with the mass of the rank and file. In fact it is wonderful how little sectarian feeling and how much Catholicity there is in the Church of Scotland. At the last General Assembly I met with a great number of her ministers, and the universal opinion with respect to us seemed to be, 'well, you in the Colonies are the best judges of what you ought to do; but we are amazed that you don't try to bring about a comprehensive Presbyterian union'.—So certain am I of the cordial concurrence of the Church in