

intend to adhere to their Church, whatever difficulties they may encounter, may be fully appreciated.

In discussing this grave and serious question, it is necessary to glance at the steps which preceded the schism in Canada. It has been the common argument with those who insist that we should give up our separate existence as a Church, that we, in Canada, have nothing to do with old world notions imported from Scotland or elsewhere. But this objection comes with a bad grace from those who appear by their actions to approve of the conduct of men who rent asunder the United Church in 1844, on grounds utterly unreasonable and most reprehensible. But apart from this, we might as well attempt to write the history of Canada, and leave out all that preceded the year 1867; or the history of the United States, leaving out the events previous to the Revolution, which made, of the thirteen revolted Provinces, an independent nation; or the history of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, blotting out from the volume all the struggles, the heartburnings, the strifes that had marked the years during which they were three separate kingdoms, taking up the tale only after the Act of Union was passed with Ireland. Could any one hope by such a method of writing history to account for the events now passing; for the motives for action which now exist; for the differences of opinion which now prevail? The thing is too monstrously absurd to be seriously discussed. Yet this is what we are asked to do in the present case on grounds equally absurd. It would be like taking a philosophical view of the history and actions of Punch and Judy, leaving out of account the doings of the man behind the checked curtain, who pulls the strings, and sets the puppets in motion. Blot out the past records of the history of Canada, and how easy it might become to argue for the absorption of the Dominion into the neighbouring Republic.