

was not, on his own showing, telling the Union a new fact, for he affirms that I had preached, five years before, an Arminian sermon in presence of the Union. Of this sermon the Union never made any complaint, nor did Mr. Clarke until the late anniversary (his own expressed fear at the time being that the sermon was not *sufficiently* Arminian). How then could my avowal five years afterwards, that "I was on the Arminian side of the line," be throwing down the gauntlet? It could only be so on the assumption that Calvinism is a term of communion in the Union; which, to use Mr. Clarke's own words, "quite begs the question."

"What passed at the late Union meeting resulted," so says the letter, from this avowal of Arminianism. Now I grant that, Mr. Clarke,—outraging common sense and common propriety,—took occasion from that avowal on my part, to attempt to raise a side issue, and to put the Union and myself in a false position. The question before the house was not my sentiments (although I had occasion to refer to them), it was not, is Calvinism or Arminianism *true*? but is Calvinism a *term of communion*? This was the question raised by the reading of Rev. K. M. Fenwick's paper, and the sole question then before the Union. Mr. Clarke made a desperate effort to make my opinions the subject of discussion (for which I was compelled to call him to order), and he, with great condescension, for a Calvinist not yet more than three years old, and with great sympathy for an old fellow-sinner in the paths of Arminianism, proposed to bring in a bill to "quiet my title" to a place in the Union.

"In the discussion that followed this announcement, Messrs. Pullar and Manly maintained that Congregationalism has no doctrinal character as between Calvinism and Arminianism;" and, further on, reference is made to Mr. Manly's citing the confession on which he was received into the Canadian Union, as evidential that Calvinism is not a term of fellowship in that body. Well, Mr. Manly's proof is quite conclusive in regard to the Canadian Union, that Calvinism is not made a term of fellowship. Does then the reasoning imputed to Messrs. Pullar and Manly by Mr. Clarke differ so widely after all from his own, as reported in the proceedings of the Union in the *Hamilton Spectator* of June 15th, as follows: "Rev. W. F. Clarke argued that Congregationalism had not in its essence a doctrinal basis, but that its principles naturally tended, if left to themselves, to Calvinism. . . . Parliament sometimes passed 'Acts to quiet titles,' and he would like certain brethren to know that their title to membership in this Union is perfect and unquestioned, though they *may* avow themselves Arminians."

So much for Mr. Clarke's first proof that he made no attack on me, but that I made an attack on the Union, which he defended by opposing my nomination to preach next year at Montreal. Now for his second proof of the same thing. It is as follows: "When appointed not long since Union preacher at Montreal, Mr. Pullar preached on election for the express purpose of showing that the Union could swallow a dose of Arminianism without gulping!" This, he asserts, was my avowed motive for preaching the sermon. So long as Mr. Clarke rides his present hobby the memory of that sermon will haunt him. He ought to be, in the circumstances, the last man to allude to that sermon. When five years ago he had *drifted*, not, *was drifting*, to Arminianism, and was making preparation to join the Wesleyan Methodists, and was attempting to persuade me to accompany him, his constant plea was, "With our sentiments, Mr. Pullar, we have no legitimate place in the