

any two Churches can unite we could. I suppose that will be admitted. Does any member of the Committee doubt that it was *possible* for our two Churches to unite? If you admit that it is possible for two Churches to unite, then these were surely the two that could most easily unite. Actually they were one so completely that we never, when disunited, could explain to an outsider why we were not one. I could never get it into the head of an Englishman or an Irishman why we were two. After all my explanations to intelligent strangers, the rejoinder invariably was, "Oh! you Scotchmen have a passion for metaphysical and theological hair splitting that we cannot understand." I never succeeded in explaining our position to an Englishman; at least, I explained, but he would not understand. Again, no one, I think, doubts that such a union was for the benefit of the people concerned; for their benefit in pocket, in peace of mind and conscience, in the forgetting of old feuds instead of warming their hands and hearts at the ashes of the decaying fires which their ancestors kindled in another country. It was better for the people as a whole, and the country as a whole, better so far as the general lifting up and sweetening of public life and religious life were concerned, that these two churches should not remain hostile, but that they should be one. Now, I urge this point because both Mr. Macmaster and Mr. Lang evaded it completely. They graciously conceded that an individual, or individuals, could leave one Church and join another. I think it was unnecessary to come all the way from Montreal to tell this Committee that. Not only did Mr. Lang admit that individuals had the right to leave any Church, but he told us that he wished to give a hearty God speed to all such people. Well, I am not disposed to gush over people who leave their own Church to join another; I am inclined to think that, as a rule, they would do better to remain in their own Church. If they think that they are too good for the Church, they had better remain for the Church's sake, and try to make the Church better; if the Church is too good for them, they had better remain in it for their own sakes. So, while we grant the principle fully—and it is quite unnecessary to say much about it—I am not, I say, as much disposed to gush over such restless individuals as Mr. Lang seems to be. But the point before us, as these gentlemen are well aware, is this: whether it is possible for Churches to unite? That is the question. We maintain that it is possible, and that if any two Churches could unite those were the two. That is my first principle. Have I made it plain? Is there any member of this Committee disposed squarely to deny that Churches can unite? The second principle is this: Did we go the right way about our union? That is a still more important question. Did we leave anything undone that could be done? I want the Committee to be seized of this. I would like any member of the Committee—when I am done, or during the discussion—to mention to me one thing that we omitted to do. Certainly we did not hurry about it; there is no question about that. You see, gentlemen, our Synod