

the parties who are to assist in the ordination services is left to the candidate and the church alone, it may be simply a "hole and corner" affair, and not command the confidence of the churches generally. The associated churches of the neighbourhood should have such matters entrusted to them for counsel. He had succeeded in some parts of England in getting those suggestions adopted with good effect. All applicants for ordination would not require the same examination; but some knowledge of the parties should be obtained by those able to judge of the qualifications of a pastor before the solemn responsibility is undertaken of laying hands on them.

Mr. Yeigh, of Burford, seconded the motion, and mentioned a case that illustrated the importance of some such check as that proposed.

Rev. F. H. Marling felt that something should be done in this matter. For the Union to place stringent restrictions on the admission of members did not meet the case. The churches had admitted them already. The question is—how can we get the churches to be more cautious in this matter?

Rev. W. Hay approved generally of the sentiments advanced in the paper. He thought that our body should afford every facility necessary for young or old to undergo suitable training, whether it be in the college or out of it.

Rev. R. Brown had learned experience by the past. Once, while supplying a vacant church before his ordination, he thought it a great privation that he could not solemnize marriage, and perform other duties required of a pastor. There was a difficulty here that churches felt. But he now saw the necessity of patience before receiving ordination.

Rev. J. Salmon, B.A., thought we should lay special stress on trying to ascertain the call of God to the work. Education was valuable; but it, of itself, did not constitute a call, and nothing could be sufficient if this were lacking.

Rev. S. N. Jackson, M.D., said that we might not all agree as to what constituted a divine call. We all recognize the necessity of it, but we also had to do our part in directing and fitting those who had received the heavenly call.

Rev. Professor Cornish expressed his thankfulness for such a paper as had been read, and for remarks that had fallen from some of the speakers. He knew a case in the Maritime Provinces where a most unworthy person had received ordination from a single minister. He thought the time had come when the Union should deliver itself on this point, and address a circular to the churches touching the subject.

Rev. J. Wood liked the paper in many respects, though he thought the writer had exaggerated some of the evils of our practice in the past. He knew very few, if any cases where such damage had been done as brethren were describing. Churches and ministers had not been so hasty as represented, and they had generally paid great deference to the opinions of their brethren.

A paper was also read by the Rev. J. Wood, on

THE SCRIPTURAL TERMS OF ADMISSION TO BAPTISM.

It was observed that both Baptists and Pede-Baptists were agreed on the general principle of believers' baptism. The difference lies in the two questions—"What constitutes baptism?" and "Who are the proper subjects of it?" Baptism was both a symbol and a seal. It symbolised our ruin by Adam, and our restoration by the blood of Christ, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost. As a symbol, it is specially important and salutary in its application to infants; if we confine baptism to adults, we ignore the symbolic representation of the loss and the regeneration of infants. The argument for infant baptism is based to a great extent on the Abrahamic covenant. The covenant, however, was not of Abraham "but of the fathers." It was mentioned to Noah "Behold, I establish my covenant with you, and your seed after you"—where God says "*my* covenant," not "*a* covenant," as though it was something new or peculiar; it was merely "*confirmed*" in Abraham (Gal. iii., 15), and made more specific. The only change now is the substitution of baptism for circumcision as more in harmony