

announced to him that a union had been effected between these two grand divisions of the Redeemer's army."

And why might it not be? Of course, there can be no such organic union between us as there is being brought about between different branches of the Presbyterian and Methodist Bodies, since the very principle of Independency forbids it. We are not "a Church," but "churches," each being without law, so far as Synodical control is concerned, but "under law to Christ." But why, if proper Christian charity and forbearance were in exercise, might we not come to some understanding, at least upon Missionary ground, according to which the first occupant of a new field, whether Baptist or Congregationalist, should be left in undisturbed possession, until there was material for *two* strong churches? It is easy to see that this cannot be, so long as the principle of *strict* or *close* communion is maintained by our Baptist brethren. Believers in Christ ought to have, and must have fellowship at the Lord's Table, and if conscientious Congregationalists cannot have it with their immersionist brethren, they must have churches of their own. And thus the separation continues. If, however, Baptists will admit us to their fellowship on the same terms on which we are willing to admit them to ours, viz., that of every Christian being "fully persuaded in his own mind," there will be but little difficulty about effecting such a union as is possible in the circumstances. We put the question to *them*, therefore, why might it not be? Would they be any less worthy of the name they bear, if they were to conform more to the practice of their English brethren (most of whom are *open* communionists), and less to that of the Americans? Do they think the Lord Jesus Christ, "both theirs and ours," is more glorified by their separating from us on the disputed point of the *mode* of baptism, than he would be by a visible unity between us in Him? We wait for a reply.

---

### PRINCE ARTHUR'S VISIT.

"Why can there be no other way devised for entertaining Prince Arthur, and introducing him to the Canadian public, but a ball? A large portion of the community deem dancing an irrational amusement, the remnant of barbaric times, and inconsistent with the spirit and precepts of Christianity. It is generally an accompaniment of the drinking usages of society, which temperance men are labouring to destroy. Why should the drinking and dancing portion of the community take the Prince and Governor-General in hand, as if they were the whole people? Could we not have a public meeting of welcome, with music and addresses, and a programme that all loyal citizens could unite in? Surely all the loyalty of the country is not possessed by the wine-drinkers and dancers!"—*Christian Guardian*.

THE RECEPTION OF THE PRINCE.—Does it not show rather a paucity of invention, as well as a rather low state of religion amongst the people of this Dominion, when nothing can be devised in the way of a public *fete* in honour of Prince Arthur, but balls, balls, balls! Everywhere dancing is the order of the day, or, rather, of the night; and, though we think it less injurious than wine at public dinners, there can be no question that it suits the moral sentiments of only a portion of the community. Now, we would ask: Are the religious people, who, on principle, decline to attend balls, of no account? Can nothing be devised in which all could join, without sacrifice of principle,