

Union." To this my answer uniformly was, "Although moderate Calvinism is the belief of the brethren generally, it is not a term of communion, either in Canada or Great Britain." "Only indicate clearly your views to the Union and you will soon see where you are," was Mr. Clarke's reply. Being appointed Sabbath morning preacher to the Union for that year, I concluded, after much thought, to preach on one of the principal texts on the subject of election; not to controvert the Calvinistic view, but in a didactic, expository and practical form to give what I, in soul and conscience, believed to be the mind of the Holy Spirit in that portion of his own testimony. I knew that this could not be done in such a presence as that of the assembled Union without clearly and distinctly indicating my views on the Calvinistic system. And indeed it was my determination so to do, yet without controversy, at the same time giving due prominence to the points common to both systems. It was my thought that the side I took could be better presented than it had often been, bringing out more fully its evangelical and practical aspects, and that so presented, few or none of my moderate Calvinistic brethren could be offended, although they might differ from my theory of election. The event was according to my expectation. When I told Mr. Clarke what my subject was to be he was in ecstasies, and urged me to be very plain, and express my views fully. He expected that it would bring matters with him to an issue, and effectually clear the way for his entrance into another fold. He was prevented from being present at the sermon, and was sadly disappointed at the result of its delivery. "Had you given a *certain sound*," said he, "there would have been a commotion, you would have been called to account." I informed him that I had engaged to attend a public meeting of the Evangelical Union in Guelph, at which he was also to be present, and that there I intended to repeat my sermon as a speech. He was present and saw how warmly it was received, and recognized by the friends of the Evangelical Union, and he declared that it verily had a *certain sound*. At that time Mr. Clarke wished for strong reasons for leaving the Union, and their toleration of a non-Calvinistic sermon was anything but agreeable to him. An opposite course on the part of the Union would have placed him in the very position he then coveted, that of a brother compelled to secede because Calvinism was a term of membership.

Such then are the persistent efforts that I have made to put the Union in a false position, and which called forth Mr. Clarke's championship in its defence.

Mr. Clarke goes on to say, "had he accepted the historical truth as to the theological whereabouts of Congregationalism." Have I not? Did I not preface the remarks I made on Friday and Saturday in the Union with such words as these: "No man that knows anything of the history of Congregational Churches will deny that Calvinism, in one or other of its various shades, has been the prevailing belief among them? Did I not distinctly admit the same thing in my letter to the *Canadian Independent* of December 18, 1867?"

Again he says, "Had Mr. Pullar given security by his antecedents that he would preach a good gospel sermon," &c. This is just what every human being who knows anything of me would feel secure that I should do. Even in the sermon on Election the Gospel was fully, clearly, and faithfully preached.

But to have done with these personalities so far as they relate to me. I am "open to complaint," as one "whose avowed aim is to misrepresent his brethren." Mr. Clarke's extravagance in making imputations has here led