

sideration of, the *confessio fidei* of the church, with a view to the reconstruction of its doctrines. He would be a bold man who would make any serious attempt of this kind in the Presbyterian communities of the present day. It is a remarkable fact that throughout the churches of the Presbyterian family, there is in our time a most complete *ex animo* acceptance of the doctrines of the Westminster Standards. With the exception of some parts pertaining to the civil magistrates, which some churches have altogether removed, and others receive with explanation, and in respect to which there is little difference of opinion among any; there is, we may safely say, an unanimous consent to the clear, bold, and broad enunciation of divine truth contained in the confession. This is a most satisfactory state of things, and one of which Presbyterians may well be proud. There is, we believe, no body of Christians in the world upon whose doctrinal teaching so much dependence can be placed, or in which so much uniformity can be found.

In the Church of England it is not so, she claims to be a Church of comprehension—receiving and tolerating within her rigid polity the utmost latitude and laxity in doctrine. From one pulpit you may hear the high phrases of ultra-Calvinism, and from another the loose generalizations of the lowest Arminianism. From a third the pure protestant faith, and from a fourth the effete doctrines of the papacy. The result of this is that Episcopacy has become an organization of heterogenous elements, each of which is ever striving for the mastery and either neutralising the strength, or endangering the peace and integrity of the whole Church.

While, again, we would not impugn the general orthodoxy of Congregational Churches, it will yet be allowed, by even their own members, that the same consent in matters of doctrine among either ministers or people is not to be found amongst them that may be found in the Presbyterian Church. This may be to them a source of satisfaction. They may think it a good thing for brethren to have perfect liberty to adopt what views of divine truth they may please, and to be untrammelled, as they express it, by creeds or confessions; we are not disputing this question at present. Waiving altogether the supposed advantages or otherwise of creeds or confessions, all that we would say is, that in the Congregational Churches there is not at the present day, and has never been such a uniformity in doctrine as to entitle them to be regarded as *one* in faith. This it is we believe that hinders these bodies, more than their jealousy of ecclesiastical authority, from uniting as a community for the prosecution of common christian objects.

The only Church that presents any parallel to the Presbyterian in uniformity of doctrines is the Wesleyan. The sermons of John Wesley stand to Wesleyans in the place of our Confession of Faith. The doctrines contained in these, all its ministers profess to teach. One always knows what may be heard in a Wesleyan Church. We are not amazed at hearing Calvinism caricatured and abused in good round terms, and the Arminian views of divine truth plainly declared in their pulpits. We at the same time always expect the great doctrine