

illustrates principles. Suppose that church had refused, because of somewhat less convincing evidence, to entertain neighboring pastors' suggestions, as they had a right to do? What then? Independency would answer, "nothing can be done." The cause meanwhile suffers everywhere: debauching rumors, only a little exaggerated, go abroad, many of our own people, and those of other denominations are asking: "Are you not going to do anything"? Congregationalism would answer, "Yes; the church at Danville or the church at Eaton will be requested to call a council and deal with the case." "What"? thunders Independency, "What has any other church to do with it"? Congregationalism would calmly answer: "First of all the Danville or Eaton churches, having carefully gathered the evidence, will, in neighborly and Christian terms, urge the church and minister at Melbourne to call a council. To show reason for the request, some of the evidence might be cited. If the request is refused a letter missive will be issued, asking neighboring churches to convene by pastors and delegates, for the purpose of trying the Melbourne minister, on definite charges of immorality. Even after the council assembles, it will send a renewed invitation, if practicable, to the Melbourne church and minister, to be present by representation duly sent. If this is declined, the council will, without bias, examine the charges; and if they are sustained, can proceed to depose the man from the ministry; or, to make assurance doubly sure, will adjourn until a delegation waits on the Melbourne church, and asks to be heard. If still not listened to, the council can take final action, and the Melbourne man is no longer a Congregational minister—and the church is no longer a "Congregational church." The denomination has no responsibility for either.

The effect of Independency is shown by the fact, that at first the question was seriously asked, "How and by what process can we depose from the ministry"? "We can expel from the Association." Yes, but the man remains a minister. Only a council could ordain him—only a council can depose him. Action in both cases being taken on the principle of fellowship, in the name of the church calling the council. Not many instances of depostion from the ministry in regular way are

on record in Congregationalism, even fewer, if any, in Independency. The last Melbourne council is conspicuous in our history, because at the request of the church, it expelled its minister from their membership, and deposed him from the ministry. Let us be Congregationalists.

HENRY E. BARNES.

P.S. The question is repeatedly asked, "How did such a man get into our ministry"? His credentials were: 1st. A certificate of membership in a Congregational church in Canada. 2. Men and women present at his ordination, among them his pastor, who had known him for two or three years as apparently a Christian worker. 3. Testimonials from leading ministers of our denomination, who had also known him for the same time. After his flight from his own country to this, in disgrace, and after the assumption of a name, for three years, by guarded behaviour, including, what proved to be, a *Uriah Heep* kind of "umblе" bearing, he "deceived the very elect."

H. E. B.

THE PULPIT IN ITS RELATION TO POLITICAL AND SOCIAL QUESTIONS.

BY REV. D. M'CORMICK.

FIRST PAPER.

Coming into this country, and coming in contact with your churches, ministers from the old country are surprised at a good many things; but at nothing more than the relation between ministers and politics, between the churches and social questions. In the old country our ministers, as a rule, are thorough-going politicians; not always from choice, but from necessity; not as a matter of preference, but of stern conscientious and religious duty. Personally for some years, I was Vice-President of our Local Liberal Association. When our President became our candidate, I conducted the whole election from the first nomination to the declaration of the poll. When I came to Canada, I was told that, as a minister, I was not expected to have anything to do with politics. I simply answered, "All the better for me, all the worse for politics." I made further inquiries into this matter; and first of all was gravely assured, that ministers, in virtue of their office, were con-