

middle ground, as Cæsar used to meet the Gallic Generals; one cannot pretend to a right to absorb the other.

5. BUT WHAT GUARANTEE IS THERE THAT IF THEY WERE UNITED THEY WOULD LONG REMAIN SO? Would not the united Church be in danger of again falling to pieces for want of homogeneousness? The tendency of the age, for one thing, would help to keep them together, until such time as the old division lines had been forgotten. And the very fact of uniting would imply a determination *not* to break up again. A sense of consistency too would help to prevent a recurrence by any of the parties to the Union, to the old party watch-words, so that a revival of the old cries would be impossible. And then if the teachings of the past go for anything, they should tell us the folly of dis-union and the wisdom of keeping together. The Secession Church first broke into fragments, and then came together again; and the principle of union, in this case, has been long enough in operation to be thoroughly tested and found sufficient. The same is true of Union in the U. P. Church of North America and in the Church of the Lower Provinces; and so far as the Union in Canada has yet been tried, it has worked most harmoniously. Here, then, are *facts* which should go to combat the speculations of those who predict that the Union, we are arguing for, would be of short duration. There must be no more seceding by minorities, because they cannot get things their own way. "Come ye out from among them," is a sublime motto, when a minority in a Church feel that the great principles of christianity are lost sight of in that Church, and cannot, by any effort of theirs, be restored, as when Luther