

together again for perhaps many years. And so it would be with us; for he had not seen the first sign of any concession on the part of the Presbyterians.

Rev. John Morton, Hamilton: The two bodies were not, he thought, ready for union; but were *coming toward it*. And to appoint this Committee would be a move in that direction. One barrier was a written creed, as contrasted with a *living* creed! Their "living" creed is very near ours. Dr. W. M. Taylor admits that they have not discovered an "orbit" to harmonize their individual church-action with their organized constitution. We are one on the subject of state-control of religion; one on the subject of sacerdotalism; we work together in all moral reforms. The "living" faith of the Presbyterians we are at one with; it is only their *written* creed, which is in "the sere and yellow leaf," that we object to.

Rev. Robt. Aylward, London: The denominational idea, run to excess, is destitute of Scriptural authority and of common sense. It becomes us to do something against it. He thought this movement expedient. "Union" is in the air. It will go on. The Presbyterians are holding out a friendly hand, on terms honorable both to us and to themselves.

Rev. B. B. Williams, Guelph: He desired to defend himself, as one of the signers of the document in Toronto. Did not like a former reference to "the flesh-pots," in this debate. He had been careful to say in Toronto that he spoke only for himself. Congregationalism will live! What he regretted was that so many of our young people drifted away; largely to the Presbyterians.

Mr. S. P. Leet, Montreal: As a lawyer, he would give them an "opinion." They would soon need a lawyer to define their rights and privileges! The Presbyterians have many laws and regulations. What would follow union? The brethren who have met with our brethren say, "We would not require that your churches should subscribe to the Confession of Faith." But no *new* churches would be granted such privileges as they would give to the existing Congregational churches! The next generation would be in all respects Presbyterians; and our people would be entirely absorbed—or else there would be a "split" in the Presbyterian church. How could they grant—or continue to permit—privileges to our Congregational churches, which they could not, or would not grant to *all* their churches? We cannot have any union, as things are, that would not entirely obliterate our churches in Canada.

Rev. John Wood, Ottawa: His heart went in the direction of this movement, but his judgment *did not* go in that direction. He thought Mr. Duff's motion did not cover precisely the ground

desired. We complain of over-crowding. He believed in confederation or alliance, by which this overlapping might be done away. He thought Mr. Leet was right. Suppose they say, "We will admit you Congregationalists without your accepting the Confession of Faith"—could they do this, and deny to others the like liberty? He thought corporate union an impossibility. We are "independents"; that implies that they are "dependents"—that is, they are dependent on their church courts.

Rev. E. C. W. MacColl, Brigham: It is often said, "We are one in doctrine"; but that is merely to draw a veil over the matter; we *are not* with them in doctrine. In the practical work of saving souls, we can work beautifully with both Presbyterians and Methodists. We look for *conversion* in our members; but it is a soul-destroying delusion to advise a man to come into the church, *in order to be led thereby up to Christianity!*

Rev. John McKillican, Montreal: He desired a better representation of the country churches in this matter. In 1841 the American Congregationalists cancelled just such an arrangement between them and the Presbyterians. *All* had been counted "unsound" if they came from Oberlin. *All* the new churches in the West were made Presbyterian. He wanted to be assured that we should have all our privileges retained; but we had no pledge of that!

Rev. John G. Sanderson, Danville: They did not propose union, they proposed a committee for conference. There were circumstances both in this country and in the heathen field, that called for mutual conference and co-operation.

Rev. D. S. Hamilton: Corporate union is not proposed to-day. The proposed committee is to find out what the other party will do—and report to us. He was in favor of a committee. We are free men, and the men who visited the Presbytery had a like freedom. We have heard of our fathers "dying," in old days; but he wanted to hear what Congregationalists were dying for to-day?

Dr. Wild, Toronto: We are unwise to-day, in saying anything about our Presbyterian brethren. It was an overstraining of liberty for these brethren to go to the Presbytery; and bring their private action into this Union. It should never have been brought in here. The Presbyterian deputation to our Union last year, never gave these brethren the privilege of doing as they did. Many "folds" but one "flock," are what Christ spoke of, in 17th John. The personal liberty which these brethren took, has reflected very seriously on our peace and harmony in this Union and in our churches.