

ing the ages through which such agonies and outlays have been endured, tell us whether their inmost conscience does not bring them under a condemnation compared with which the sense of sin in sinners here is exceedingly light?

* * It is and has been our evangelical understanding of the condition of man as he is under the moral government of God, and we believe emphatically what has been said by one of the ripest scholars of the Unitarian school in America, that orthodoxy cannot readjust its faith till it readjusts its estimate of the scriptures. To this let me add, that the enterprise of Christian missions to the unevangelized millions sprung out of the evangelical conviction that they are in sin and are perishing in their sins.

The discussion as to the fitness of men for mission work who had shadowy notions of an after death probation was carried on without acrimony, though the traditional orthodoxy was plainly in the ascendant. The Prudential Committee were sustained in their caution, the name of Dr. E. C. Smyth (the leader of the New Theology movement,) was removed from the committee—a needless severity we think—and a resolution adopted *nem. con.* that in cases where theological questions come before the Board, a council of churches may be called. Strong feelings were expressed against the Prudential Committee being constituted as an ecclesiastical court to try cases of polity or of doctrine. And thus, what threatened to be a rupture, has been in the meantime safely passed, christian courtesy prevailing, and forbearance exercised.

WE just alluded in our last issue to the Toronto *Mail's* conversion. Its position on prohibition we hail. May it convert its large constituency. We are not by any means so sure of its ultra Protestant position. Whatever we may think of the Papal theology, we as Congregationalists must, in respecting liberty of conscience, respect the conscientious convictions of our neighbors, and in many cases personal friends. Therefore all mad appeals to religious prejudice ought to meet with righteous reprobation. Regarding political rights, Roman Catholics are our equals; we are theirs; and if our Protestant politicians move heaven and earth to secure votes, and get our way regardless of right or God, Roman Catholics only follow our example when they do the same. How little truth there is in mere popular appeals may be made manifest by such a statement as this, which those who ride exclusively the Protestant horse vociferously applaud:—“Two and two make four, in Canada as in

England, and if disestablishment is right in Ireland, it is also right in Quebec.” Congregationalists will be the last to favour Establishments, but the case of Ireland and of Quebec are wide as the poles asunder. The Established Church in Ireland was the church of a conquering and small minority, and an avowedly proselyting church, supported in part by the land of those to be proselytized: the Roman Catholic church of Quebec is the church of the majority, the overwhelming and growing majority, the church over which we Anglo-Saxons have no control save that given by the sword; the Protestant minority only indirectly aid in its support, and are the intruders because Wolf overcame Montcalm on the plains of Abraham. Where is the parallel between the two?

THAT Roman Catholic political influence, because united, is strong, and therefore sought, is certainly true, and that—as in the case of separate schools—such influence may endanger liberty is also true. We humbly think, however, that the evil is only perpetuated and aggravated by this constant division into classes. Why should there be an Orange vote, a Catholic vote, a Methodist vote? We are Canadians, and no special advantage should be given to any religious body as such, but equal standing ground for all. We happen to know something of the central prison talk, and are not afraid to say, there is a purpose, and that not patriotic. Nor is the constant irritation about the schools just, a fact readily determined by remembering that you can tell the side of politics a man is on by questioning him thereon. Partyism for a principle is a political necessity; but partyism for “our party’s” sake is the curse of a people.

MR. HENRY WARD BEECHER has been visiting England, lecturing and preaching with his usual ability and acceptance. There has been some little public correspondence as to the position taken by the English Union Committee of arrangements declining to ask Mr. Beecher to preach before the Union at Norwich, 11th to 15th ult. It has been said that the chairman, Mr. Edward White, took decided ground against the Brooklyn preacher. A calm letter from Dr. Hannay makes it plain that any arrangement other than that of publicly receiving Mr. Beecher, with of course a reasonable liberty of speech, would have made it necessary to change