

cling tenaciously, and not without reason, to the traditions of our fathers, and to the glorious literature which they have bequeathed to us. No blind conservatism holds us to the ancient anchorage, but a deep conviction that the views which have been most surely believed among us are both scriptural, and divinely efficacious in promoting the ends for which they have been revealed.

Yet, on the other hand, we instinctively shrink from creeds and confessions, remembering what our ears have heard, and our fathers have told us, of the worse than Egyptian bondage under which our spiritual ancestry groaned in Old England, in the days of Elizabeth and the Charleses, and the evils to which they gave rise in New England in the earlier period of its history.

The genius of Congregationalism, moreover, undoubtedly favours the widening rather than the straitening of the fellowship which we now enjoy; and while we must never allow the Union to become a Cave of Adullam for distressed and discontented ecclesiastics, we must at least be equally careful to avoid laying a yoke upon the necks of brethren which none of our fathers were able to bear. As a matter of fact we much doubt whether the English Union would reject a well accredited Evangelical Arminian,—such a man, *e. g.*, as the Rev. W. Arthur, or the Rev. W. M. Punshon,—who might embrace our polity, and seek to connect himself with the denomination. We doubt, moreover, if after all our discussions, there be a minister among us who would give his voice against such a brother, on the ground, pure and simple, of his standing on the other side of the line, so difficult to locate, which divides low Calvinism from Evangelical Arminianism. There might be hesitancy about untried men professing to come from that school, but we are much mistaken in the members of the Congregational Union of Ontario and Quebec, if the manifest blessing of God upon the ministry of any man, in the conversion of sinners, were not regarded by them as the best and readiest passport into the ranks of the denomination. And if so, it is clear that the hesitancy in such a case, would arise more from a want of knowledge of the applicant, than from his doctrinal position.

Although, therefore, we may not yet be prepared as a Body to throw wide the doors of the Congregational Union, and welcome to our fellowship all who “hold the Head,” and embrace our ecclesiastical polity,—and no one who does not embrace Independency will ask admission,—we cannot but think that the day is coming, and not far distant, when we shall be constrained by the force of our own most cherished principles to do so. Our brother says truly though somewhat inconsistently, as it strikes us, with the rest of his essay, that “as all Christian truth is vital only as it flows from the inner experience of the soul in union with Jesus, so all doctrinal oneness will have its origin and its strength in this fellowship. To those who are in this spiritual relationship, nearness to the Life and to the Truth will secure unity of doctrine, when all other expedients will utterly fail.” Then why not make “union with Jesus” our term of admission, and trust to it to maintain the “unity of