

too, in which heretics were made to appear so horrid and impious in past times. It was not considered sufficient that they had departed from some important doctrine of the orthodox faith, but to this must be added all the possible consequences of their heresies. Romanists have ever used this kind of weapon with fatal effect against protestants, and in fact it appears to be peculiar to human nature to defame and caricature opponents and enemies. From such treatment Calvinists have suffered much at the hands of Arminians, and Arminians equally at the hands of Calvinists. It is high time that such tricks and artifices of debate were abandoned by christians, and that we should learn not to ascribe to any one opinions which he disavows, and only to lay at the door of an opponent those sentiments which he himself acknowledges. If this had been done in the early stages of the voluntary controversy we should have been spared an immense amount of pamphlet-writing and of eloquent speaking. By acting on this plan in the present case, we shall the sooner come to a clear understanding of each others opinions, and be able to discuss without mistake or misapprehension, those points on which we differ.

It is delightful to find that so much progress has been made during the past year in the settling up of our marches. Two points of *doctrine* may be considered as conclusively settled, namely those upon the "Headship of Christ" and the "Liberty of Conscience." These we may regard as shelved. Over them we may shake hands and say we agree,—we are one. A formula has been found which expresses the *doctrinal* views which we both alike hold on these points. A third article, on the "Duties of the Civil Magistrate," is that which is most difficult of adjustment, and concerning the terms and practical interpretation of which there will doubtless be some difference of opinion. It will, however, be difficult to find many either in the Free Church or in the United Presbyterian, who will or can object to these articles *so far as they go*; they evidently very clearly express the amount of *doctrinal* agreement which exists between us. The joint committee have doubtless arrived at them by a process of wise and discriminating abstraction. Each has evidently picked out from the other's heap of opinions that which he could not accept, and this process being completed, a skilful amalgamation of the two heaps has been effected. We do think that this experiment at Union has so far been eminently successful; another experiment undertaken by equally sound heads and sincere hearts will we are persuaded result in something still better. If we can get all our manifest agreements classified and marked, they may after that be safely let alone as things done and settled; we may then proceed to unravel the manifest differences and reduce them to the least minimum possible. The result of this further operation cannot fail to be a nearer approach to each other, and a greatly increased desire for complete amalgamation and union.

There is no need to veil under obscure terms our respective opinions; let us by all means be candid and honest. Nothing will be made of compromises or reservations; neither party wishes for this, or will consent to patch up a Union on such unsatisfactory terms. To say that we agree on all points would be to