

the union of the Free Baptists with the Congregationalists says: "Well, then, brother, why not abandon sprinkling and return to immersion? On that we can *both* agree. We do not believe in sprinkling, and cannot practice it. You *do* believe in *immersion*. Why not return to the Apostolic practice?" We do not object to contribute our mite to the friendly conference or union, and would to the above question briefly say:

First.—Christian unity is in Christ, not in ordinances. Gal. v. 6; vi. 15; therefore we would not divide upon a mode.

Secondly.—We do not believe in immersion *exclusively*. We doubt very much if the apostolic practice sanctioned such a belief. The newly discovered MS. *the Didache*, represents, we believe, the apostolic practice: "if thou hast not living water, nor other — pour." Had Christ taught in Canada, and under our social surroundings, we believe immersion would not have been thought of. Therefore we cannot *both* agree on immersion *exclusively*, as we do not bind where God's word binds not. We would agree to differ, and aid our brother to realize spiritual good in his way, asking him to reciprocate. Thus the only unity worth striving for "of the spirit in the bond of peace" becomes realized, we really have faith in no other. Men may sound the same shibboleth, and in christian sympathy be far asunder as the north pole from the south.

In the ordinances we preserve the three elements—water, wine, bread—we attach little importance to the quantity in the supper, a sip and a morsel being deemed sufficient; in which the christian church has shown itself superior to the letter which killeth; in the altered circumstances of climate and custom we see no reason why the same principle should not apply to the mode of baptism, at least where friends so read the record and command; therefore, again, we would urge union on the basis of liberty to differ. 1 Cor. x. 33; xii. 6-7.

THE following clipping is from the excellent *Sunday School Times*, and is worthy of attention. The old Levitical law, apart from its moral and typical teaching, is a model of sanitary science: its hygiene is far in advance of even our boasted progress, our physicians might sit at its feet and learn. "It was an old biblical law, enforced by the Jewish and the early

christian churches (Acts 15:29), and, indeed, only repealed by the Roman Church, that the blood should not be eaten with the flesh. In the light of this law, the following item from The American Hebrew is significant:—"Four Christian butchers at Mielec, Austria, have made an agreement with the rabbi of the town to pay a certain fee to the funds of the [Jewish] congregation for having their cattle killed according to the Jewish custom [by which the flesh is drained of the blood,] the meat to be sold to the general public. The consequence was that nearly all the townspeople bought their meat from these butchers, being assured that it was wholesome. The other butchers have complained to the authorities, who have contented themselves with prohibiting the four butchers from charging a higher price than usual for their meat."

HOME RULE.—What way out of the difficulty? The unfortunate position of to-day is that partyism is so rampant that calm deliberation seems to have been banished from Legislative halls. Yet there are one or two positions we may calmly yet firmly hold. The Empire can listen to no proposition that means disintegration, nor allow a foreign power to possess even a joint empire with itself within its own domain. Yet unity, in these days, is best attained by general contentment, and a certain amount of local liberty that does not detract from the general weal. Some measure of Home Rule appears reasonably just. Mr. Gladstone's scheme thus far appears crude, yet it is something to criticise and to be amended. May faction cease contending and all contribute to the common end. All are afterwise, yet one cannot but feel that had our Queen resided in Ireland one half as much as she has done in Scotland, Ireland would be loyal to-day. A certain amount of society and trade follows the court, and absentee landlordism would not have assumed very much of its present seeming oppression. There do still linger marks of conquest, e. g. Irish peers do not sit as English peers in the House of Lords in their own individual right, only a limited number being elected by their peers to represent them. It seems unwise to perpetuate marks of a past that should be dead. Religion and bare prejudice magnify these minor matters. There is no just reason why such stumbling blocks should not be removed, and certainly some-