

public sentiment. In other words, it is a security for that on which, next to the power of the Spirit of God, the health and the life of a Church most depend. And we may be very sure that so long as we make the proclamation of divine truth, in its purity and fulness, a leading object, the hearts of the best people will be drawn to us. They will instinctively cling to a Church which proves itself to be what the Church was meant to be—the pillar and ground of the truth. We do not say that there will be no defection, but only that we are in the best way to prevent defection.

They have tried in other churches, for example in the Church of England, to secure soundness in the faith by acts of parliament interpreted by courts of civil law; and we see with what melancholy results.

The *Presbyterian*, from which we quote, very justly says that preaching is not and never should be the *only* part of public worship to be much attended to.

“We believe that the scandalous neglect of other parts of worship is one of the points on which Presbyterianism has not been true to itself, and is in some danger of perpetuating its old error. Undoubtedly there is a very pressing need for improvement both in the prayers and in the psalmody, and in the devotional tone of the whole service. The two classes of objects have no necessary antagonism; but, on the contrary, they work into one another. Although we may not have a liturgy, a more liturgical structure of prayer (that is, a structure more adapted to be taken up by a whole congregation) is often to be desired. Although we may not fall down before mere taste, and make it our god, a greater regard to taste and culture in the conducting of our worship would be of great benefit. Although the great fundamental truths of the gospel must never cease to be the backbone of our sermons, a little more variety of subject, and application to the lesser matters of ordinary life, would both prevent monotony and promote edification. Although there must be no tampering with the fundamental doctrines of the faith, a greater candor in acknowledging difficulties, and a measure of greater freedom in the interpretation of particular passages, would not hinder, but help the vital interests of our people. Such things are quite compatible with what ought ever to be regarded as one of the chief bulwarks of our Presbyterian system—the full and conspicuous promulgation of the truth of God.”

Preachers should never be mere intellectual machines, but living, sympathizing, warm-hearted men, *feeling* every word they say. There is need that Presbyterians should cease to be “dry” and “hard.” Our system will never live or thrive unless there is *heart* in it.

In our system of Government we have a very great advantage. In proportion as men get accustomed to the idea of taking a part in the affairs of the State, they get a desire, more or less consciously, to have something to say in the affairs of their Church. The growth of popular rights and popular government has always been favorable, *ceteris paribus*, to the Presbyterian Church. In the United States of America, it is said of those who are Episcopalians when they emigrate thither, no fewer than eighty per cent. ultimately join one or other of the non-episcopal denominations. We cannot vouch for the number, but it is admitted that the genius of the Episcopal Church does not harmonize with the feelings of the great bulk of the American people. They are too much accustomed to take part in the management of their affairs to be easily reconciled to a system where the government is so much in the hands of the clergy. This, too, let it be observed, is the state of things in a Church which has admitted the laity to a much more important place in its affairs than the laity either of England or Ireland possess. It is instructive at the same time to observe, even in Episcopal churches, how much the laity press for power. Either they will succeed, or they will not. If they do not succeed, their attachment to the Episcopal Church will decrease, and perhaps they will cease to belong to it. If they do succeed, they will so far check and impair the bishop, and bring him down from his pre-eminent position.

“Let us look for a moment at the Episcopal Church of Ireland. The present arrangement which makes voting by separate orders necessary, and virtually gives all the power to the clergy and bishops, can hardly be expected to be long borne with. The laity cannot tamely look on and see the measures of which they are in favor carried