

gregationalists in Canada ever having been "sent to the street to beg," for any reason whatever. Our churches love their pastors better than that. By the way, we should like to know by what means a Presbytery compels a congregation to support a minister they will not have over them any longer?

The last sad hope for Congregationalism has fled. The *Presbyterian* believes "disintegration is inevitable as the result of the late Council. It has already appeared in the resignation of Dr. Storrs from an important trust because of the Council's action. Others in the Congregational body will assuredly follow, and this time-honoured denomination will be broken into a thousand fragments. The only hope we have for Congregationalists is that, taught by experience, they will become Presbyterians." For ourselves, we are not quite hopeless yet.

The Rev. Dr. Storrs, of Brooklyn, recently reviewed the action of the Advisory Council called by Plymouth Church, in a Sabbath evening lecture (we think he might have chosen some *other evening* for such a purpose), in which he endeavours to show that the Council, though fairly representative in its *personnel* of Congregationalism, had been chosen because of their known sentiments favourable to Mr. Beecher—a fact which, he thought, prevented it being regarded as reflecting the views of the body. As to the findings of the Council, he reviewed them severally, criticising each unfavourably, declaring them inconsistent with the findings of the Council of 1874, and subversive of Congregationalism in all its important aspects. It was because these declarations were so radically at variance with his views of Congregationalism that he had

retired from the official positions held by him as President of the American Congregational Union, and a Director of the Home Missionary Society. The Rev. Drs. Budington and Taylor (of the Broadway Tabernacle, New York) have, it is reported, expressed similar views. It should be remembered, however, that the last-named gentleman is a Presbyterian in principle, and that the first two, though very eminent and excellent men, must be supposed to possess some considerable *animus* in connection with the affair, in consequence of their names having been objected to by Plymouth Church, when first proposed to be invited to take part in the Council.

On the other hand, the Rev. Dr. Bacon, of New Haven, is out, in a letter to one of the pastors of Andover Church, in reply to an article from his pen, in the *Congregationalist*, urging the Andover Church to take steps for immediately bringing Mr. Beecher to trial, in the way proposed by the Council. The letter concludes:—

"Let not the cause on which your heart and the hearts of thousands more are set be in any degree imperilled by devolving on Mr. Moulton, on Mr. Bowen, on anybody who has a personal interest in the affair, or even on some such good brother as Mr. West, the grave responsibility of appearing as complainant or 'public prosecutor' in this momentous case. O, my brother! many a good thing has come out of Andover, but never yet has any better thing been done by your church or your seminary than you and your brethren will have done if, by your faithful yet loving diligence, the truth and the whole truth in this case shall be uncovered, be it what it may."

The action of the Brooklyn Advisory Council is being criticized somewhat severely by several of our own denominational exchanges, chiefly, however, on technical grounds.