

so well as the men who are their competitors, competition suffices to exclude them from."

The law of equal freedom must be applied to the church as well as to the State. Women have shared, and do share in the gift of the Holy Spirit. They have been touched by that divine fire and fervour which alone entitles human being to be the mouthpiece of the Almighty. They have received the essential qualification without which it is impossible to be a minister of Jesus Christ.

Let those who may be disposed to cite isolated texts of Scripture on this subject be sure that they interpret the fragments in the light of the whole, and bring the lessons of the centuries to bear on the present.

We draw larger circles round the compass of our knowledge to-day than even the foremost dared to do in earlier times.

If this question is not debatable on the ground of "common sense," it is not likely to be settled by appeals to fragments of Scripture. In the words of Bishop Butler, "The spirit of man is the candle of the Lord. Reason is the only faculty whereby we have to judge of anything, even revelation itself."

When slavery was condemned by the general consent of Christian nations, as "the sum of all villanies," its upholders entrenched themselves behind the patriarchs, and reminded us that the apostle of liberty sent a slave back to his chains.

When the people asked for civil liberty they were reminded of the duty of obedience to those who were over them, "the powers that be," being "ordained of God."

When the long pent-up fury of outraged nations burst upon princes, and crowned heads were sent to the block, the people were told that the Scriptures enjoined obedience to kings, and those who were in authority.

We believe that where the spirit of the Lord is there is liberty, and the church is likely—more likely now than at any other period of her history—to receive in the right spirit whatever gift of service she may have received in any of her members.

ITA.

#### HAVE CONGREGATIONALISTS ANY DOCTRINE OR USAGE TO CONSERVE?

A short time ago there appeared in the New York *Independent* an article headed, "A Mis-

sionary Refused Installation." It seems to have been an anti-Pedobaptist who desired to be installed in a Pedobaptist church. The ministers hesitated to install, but did not object to the church's employing him if they chose. This is a subject of great regrets by the *Independent*, the Brooklyn Congregationalists having, it asserts, settled the question by admitting Mr. Pentecost, who rejects infant baptism. It seems, however, that the "elite of Brooklyn Congregational ministers" did not settle the question for anybody but themselves, for a council at New Haven did not feel bound to follow their example.

The *Independent* regrets the action "because it seems to imply a lingering mystical notion of the efficacy of infant baptism." The *Independent* does not tell us in what way it implied a notion of efficacy. Certainly not saving efficacy, because they who *practise* infant baptism and administer the Lord's supper do not imply by the practice that they believe in the saving efficacy of either ordinance. So neither in requiring those who minister among them to observe the usages of the denomination by which they desire to be accredited, and amongst whom they come to labour, does it imply any superstitious regard of the saving efficacy of the usages?

The *Independent* believes that adult or infant baptism is nothing more than a sign of consecration, but those who reject infant baptism evidently differ with the *Independent* in regard to this, for such will officiate in a rite of consecration, and deny that it is baptism.

The *Independent* regrets it as a blunder on the part of Congregationalists in repelling those who hold Baptist opinions.

On reading the article one naturally asks himself the question, "Have the Congregationalists nothing in creed or usage that they are bound to conserve?" We readily recognize every true lover of Christ who rests his hopes on His death as the great sacrifice for sin, as a brother in the Lord; but while we have a denominational existence, it does seem strange to set up those as teachers who propose to be a standing protest against our usages. Should we admit and install a minister who refused to administer the Lord's supper, or who refused to countenance a Sabbath school? But neither of these are essential to salvation. There is at present a strong tendency in many quarters for Baptist ministers