

believe the man, and were all of Dr. Grant's views, organic union would soon be an accomplished fact. Well is it pointed out that the recent unions of Presbyterians and Methodists were not intellectual agreements, but results of Christian common sense and mutual forbearance, and that the spirit growing may yet bridge over the gulf—every decade lessening—between the Arminian Methodist and the Calvinistic Presbyterian. Indeed there have been manifest signs that Calvinism is ready to acknowledge "Evangelical Arminianism," though we have seen no sign as yet that "Evangelical Arminianism" is equally ready to hold forth the hand to "Evangelical Calvinism."

Our present interest in the article gathers around one or two sentences specially pertinent to the question of union as already ventilated in our columns. First, Dr. Grant quotes Cardinal Newman, who says "The main difference between a large number of members of the Church of England and Catholics is, that the power which we give to the Holy See, they lodge in her bishops and priests, whether as a body or individually." Principal Grant adds: "We Protestants, on the contrary, lodge these powers in the Church, or *the whole body of the faithful*." Had a Congregationalist written these last words we should at once have accepted them; we accept them from the pen of our friend, so far as he is concerned: but we ask, does the Presbyterian Church accept them? As a matter of practical polity a Presbytery, which is "the radical court of the church, or that from which the whole Presbyterian government derives its form," is not "the whole body of the faithful," but a representation, often of a generation past, and limited at that. We explain, for when we discuss practical matters, such as organic union, we must leave the poetry of principles awhile for the prose of actuality. One half of a Presbytery is made up of representative elders. These elders, in many cases, are men elected to office by the members who have passed over to the great majority, and may frequently be, are out of all sympathy with "the present body of the faithful." Yet they are the rulers in this "radical court." Again: "The session rules the congregation," says an authorized expositor of Presbyterian polity. This session is made up exclusively of such elders as we have indicated, with the pastor as

chairman, and they having secured their election, remain the rulers until death, removal, heresy, or crime comes in, often for the church's relief. Nor can others be elected unless this close corporation so wills, so that the rule is not representative but oligarchical. We Congregationalists accept the principle—nay, accept is the wrong term—our platform is that ecclesiastical power is vested in the body of the faithful; and our controversy with Principal Grant is that the church he represents actually does not put the power there, but in a permanent church court. When the Presbyterian Church *acts* upon Dr. Grant's position they become Congregationalists, let the name be what it may, and then, thus far, we join hands.

BUT other issues rise. The second sentence to be noted in the article is the following: "Let us now ask, which of the Protestant Churches in Canada are already so closely allied, so really one in race, language, spirit, doctrine, polity, modes of worship and procedure, that they might be looked to for the initiation of the union movement. To begin with, there is nothing to keep Congregationalists and Presbyterians apart. The fact that they exist as separate churches in this country, with distinct institutions, agencies and missions, shows how completely we are slaves of names and traditions." On which we remark, first, we Congregationalists need no initiation in a union movement. We are unionists in the broadest sense of the term. How broad let the present aspect of the London Missionary Society, and the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions testify. But supposing we were to knock at the door of the Presbyterian Church for admittance, what then? In some form or other the church applying for admission would have to incorporate into its constitution the Westminster Confession of faith; its office-bearers would need to record their general assent thereunto. Doctrinally that confession teaches Calvinism of a decidedly high type. We care little for mere expression, but dwell upon principles. We shall select a crucial one, viz., the extent of the atonement, and we shall state the question in words written by acknowledged Presbyterian pens. Dr. A. A. Hodge, in discussing the atonement, thus states the question on this point: "Did Christ die with the design of