

It is a curious fact, and one which we have never seen satisfactorily accounted for, that among Congregationalists and Presbyterians the morning congregation is nearly always the larger of the two, while among Methodists, of all denominations, the reverse of this is the case. Perhaps Calvinistic theology, of a moderate type, is favourable to sound sleep, and therefore to early rising! Or possibly the preaching of the morning is more of a logical and didactic character, while that of the evening is more emotional and hortatory; or again, the classes reached by these several churches may be socially different. But, however explained, the fact remains, and although for many reasons we think it is better to have the ear of our people in the morning, rather than in the evening, it is nevertheless a great loss and discouragement to our ministers not to have a fuller attendance than is usual with us at the second service. Young people are gregarious. They are attracted by a crowd, and as their parents do not care to go out in the evening, our churches often look empty and repulsive, and they go off "to see the dipping" in the Baptist Church, or to hear some "great preacher" in the Methodist Church, and we gradually lose them altogether.

Now, we hold that if a church expects a minister to *preach* twice on the Lord's day, that minister has a right to expect the church to *attend* twice on that day. Exceptional cases, of course, will always exist, but as the Lord requires of us a whole Sabbath, and as we require of our ministers a whole Sabbath, let the people give the whole Sabbath to God's house. A conscientious regard to this matter would often fill churches where the people are looking about them, and very innocently asking, why the church doesn't fill up? The reason lies very near them, if they would only see it,—they go *only half the day!*

THE "CHRISTIAN GUARDIAN," AT HOME AND ABROAD.

The Editor of the *Guardian* sometimes gets away from his editorial duties to deliver himself of his views on various theological or philosophical subjects.

On December 10th, 1875, he paid a visit to Cobourg, and, under the auspices of the Victoria College Literary Association, enlightened his audience on "The Tendencies of the Times." Among his remarks were the following:—

"It was unwise, he said, to regard any one as an infallible Pope. He thought we could admire the deeds and the spirit of Luther, Knox, Milton, and Wesley. It was not right for us to accept as our rule and guide of life their opinions. No opinions coming even from high sources should be accepted without a rational inspection on the part of the present age.

"There was also in the present age lack of individuality of character. The people of the present time did not act sufficiently on their own opinions. If we believe a truth we should independently believe it and act accordingly. The highest ideal of human character is gained by acting independently and decisively."

In these sentences the Editor approves of independency of enquiry and action, and snubs those people who do not "act sufficiently on their own opinions." Very good, indeed!

Now look in upon him at home in his editorial sanctum. Scissors in hand, he is clipping the following diatribe from the *Central Advocate*, and sending the scurrilous inuendo out with his approval. A late copy of the *Guardian* contained this paragraph:

"The well-informed New York correspondent of the *Central*, speaking of the more recent developments of the Beecher case, says that they have cast a strange light on the merits of Congregationalism. Amid the calls for general, mutual and advisory councils, letters missive, and what not of their ecclesiastical law, the fabled independence of this denomination drops out of sight altogether. In the language of a recent writer (Presbyterian, if we remember rightly), it shows itself