

dent churches to match those 46 presbyters. I have wished to commend to your favorable judgment the earlier plan, the larger parish.

It will not be worth while here to concern ourselves with the vexing sectarian divisions which now mar the unity of Christendom. Their healing must be a slower work. For the moment we may indulge the view that in Boston, or Brooklyn, or Newark, or Westfield only the Christians of our own denomination, whatever it is, are worth counting. Why not, then, as in ancient times, for that denomination the one church of Boston, or Brooklyn, or Newark, or Westfield?

A practical Congregationalism now distinguishes all Protestants, and not merely that one denomination which prides itself in that name. According to this system, there is no more organic connection between the Broadway Tabernacle in New York and the Pilgrim Church, or between the Old South and the Mt. Vernon in Boston, than between the Church of Eastport, Me., and the Church of Portland, Ore. Let me suggest certain advantages of the larger parish of ancient times, if there might be, no matter how many the congregations in each city, one church of New York, one of Boston.

But what would be the advantages, or what disadvantages are there in the present system? We may leave out of view the smaller communities where only one congregation is needed. Our subject has to do with the larger towns, and, most of all, with the great cities, where you have, scattered through the place, a large company of true Christians to carry on the Lord's battle against sin, to save the fallen, to help the poor, to realize the Saviour's gracious mission in the midst of a perishing world. Now, I ask, what are the disadvantages of the present congregational system for carrying out that fight to a successful issue?

I dropped into a meeting of the New York Presbytery a few weeks ago, and found that that body had just sanc-

tioned the removal of two more of its down-town churches (including that in whose edifice it was then meeting) to upper New York, to that little strip west of the Park. Pastors of churches already established in that strip protested against the removal, saying there were enough churches there now for the present need. Dr. Schauffler sprang to his feet, with characteristic impetuosity, to ask why some of these restless churches do not move down-town, instead of up. But the presbytery granted the request.

*The Congregationalist* of Boston, commenting on this action in its next issue, said: "It is the result of a selfish, short-sighted policy on the part of church officials, and reflects on the courage and wisdom of presbytery. Such a course makes one almost sigh for the opposite policy, best represented by the foresight, strategy, and resoluteness of the Roman Catholic Church, which plants no churches by whim, and does not desert them when the decrees of fashion and the inroads of business appear to make it necessary."

Strong language; deserved, perhaps—our own Boanerges of Madison Square has used still stronger on the same theme—but if our Congregational brethren must so belabor us poor Presbyterians for following out to its logical extreme that congregational policy into which they have tempted us, may it not be their duty to search out and hold up before our eyes a safer example to follow? Indeed, even up in Boston I seem to have heard rumors that almost the last church left in the old city is planning to slip its cables and drift westward with the tide of wealth. The simple fact is that in these days an independent church cannot often afford to stay in that part of any large city which most sorely needs its helpful ministries. For in this matter need and demand will often be inversely proportional. If any churches do survive in lower New York or at the north end of Boston, they must expect to be run on a niggardly scale, their financial