

solid ice, more than a foot thick—yet all are wishing that that union may speedily be dissolved, and the drops of water run free again. There is such a thing as a dead, frozen, external unity; we don't want that—no frozen unity for Congregationalists, if you please, but a living, warm, feeling unity—one of heart and life—give us that, and we are careless about the outside bond.

OUR Montreal College friends are very secretive, and no information whatever has been volunteered to us regarding Dr. Barbour, who has accepted the position of Principal. We believe, however, that the following items, gained from a friend, may prove interesting to our readers: Dr. Barbour is a Scotchman by birth, early coming to the United States, received his college training at Oberlin; after a successful pastorate in Salem, Mass., he was called to fill the chair of Systematic Theology in Bangor Seminary, from whence he went to Yale, where he filled the post of preacher to the college. As to his work there we give the following extract from the *Yale News*:

The announcement made in another column that Dr. Barbour has formally accepted the principalship of the Congregational College, Montreal, will be read with mingled regret and pleasure; regret, that our college is to lose the service of so faithful a servant, and pleasure that another institution of learning is to have the benefit of his care and labour. During Dr. Barbour's long pastorate there has been a great improvement in the religious spirit and moral tone of the college, and no small part of the credit of this change in the religious life of the students is due to his faithful and conscientious labours. By his kind and courteous manners he has won many friends among the students, and is held in affectionate remembrance by hundreds of Yale graduates throughout the country. We congratulate our sister institution of learning in securing the services of Dr. Barbour, and we sincerely hope that his labours in this new field of activity may be crowned with even greater success than has attended them here.

WE are sure that "Our College Column" will be found a most welcome element in our pages, and the fresh discussion of denominational matters both stimulating and useful. Our *confrères*, however, must accept an editor's position, which completely frees him from any concern regarding the woe of having all men speak well of him. We venture a few remarks on the answer to the question, "Why we are few?" as given in our last issue. "Reasons four and five" are in our opinion the ones principally concerned, and regarding "five" the

remedy is largely in our own hands. The future lies in our understanding this, and acting accordingly.

ON "six," we have a word to say. We do not know where the sentiment that seems to be in the Montreal air regarding English Congregationalism has arisen. The statement of doctrines adopted by our last Union says (article x.), that Congregational Churches, "under the guidance of the Holy Scriptures, and in fellowship with one another, may determine—each for itself—their organization, statements of belief and forms of worship, may appoint and set apart their own ministers, and should co-operate in the work which Christ has committed to them, for the furtherance of the Gospel throughout the world." If more can be made of the independence of the local church than is made by the words we have italicized, we do not understand the English language. English Independency, as we have more than once contended, never meant separation from sister churches—never! Robert Browne maintained the privilege of "seeking to other churches to have their help," saying that "a Synod is a joining or partaking of the authority of many churches met together in peace, for redress and deciding of matters which cannot well be otherwise taken up." The attitude of the Established Church in England, in their Acts of Uniformity, the disabilities under which Dissenters were, and are, and the want of facilities such as we have for intercourse, forced churches apart; but the English Union, which has passed its jubilee, bears testimony to the yearning for honourable co-operation, which finds therein a practical manifestation. One swallow does not make a spring, and one voice against such organization does not constitute English Congregationalism.

A GREAT deal has been said (not in our College Column) about the ultra-Independency advocated by the late Mr. Roaf, in this city.

No perfect whole can our nature make,
Here or there the circle will break;
The orb of life, as it takes the light
On one side, leaves the other in night.

In a day when the most strenuous efforts were being put forth to establish a church in Ontario as in England, men of strong convictions, such as Mr. Roaf was, were apt to be extreme; but they fought freedom's battle, and won it too; we are enjoying the fruit of their labour. In the heat of battle even