

the Morrisonian heresy? Do you remember how, when the hymn and organ question was being sent down to Presbyteries, the proposal to obtain the voices of separate congregations was scouted as Congregational? How is it now? The resolutions anent the late union were expressly submitted not only to Presbyteries and sessions, but to *congregations*, who are now supposed to have rights?" Presbyterianism has Congregationalized within the past quarter of century to an extent perfectly appalling to the "true blues" of "ye olden tyme." Mr. Sanderson draws attention to the well-known but not sufficiently-observed fact that not only have the laity secured a representation in conferences of the Methodist Church as now happily united, but congregations anticipate the action of the Stationary Committee by "calling" their pastor. The Episcopal church is slowly but surely pressing in the same direction. The principles once scouted as revolutionary, to be banished, accursed, put down by the sword or ecclesiastical anathema, are triumphing, the work is being done, they who are the direct inheritors by name and struggles of those who died in faith, seeing the promise from afar, may be content to drop out of sight until the great roll call is made, only let it never be forgotten that the conflict gained should only render the more enduring in grateful memories the men *and the name* under which the battle has been carried on to victory and to peace. Our consciousness of these truths should render any discussion of organic union calm and edifying.

A FEW words must be spoken regarding our Provident fund. If every church would do something a more healthy tone would result. The small steady stream from systematic benevolence we need, rather than the thunder storms and freshets of spasmodic sentiment. The full report will appear in our forthcoming Year Book, meanwhile the re-appointed board earnestly hope that the pastors and churches will bring the needs of this fund before the people to the end that those whose dependence is in large measure thereon will not be doomed to disappointment and privation.

THE CONGREGATIONAL YEAR BOOK 1884, of our English brethren, edited by the indefatigable secretary of the Union, Dr. A.

Hanney, is before us as we write, a volume of nearly five hundred pages, full of Congregational statistics. The addresses of Dr. Fairbairn, the chairman of last year, are printed in full, and are certainly grand and solid reading. Our English brethren, however, seem chary of statistics, the list of churches and ministers gives not even a hint of membership or finance. It is so far as ministers and churches are concerned a directory, nothing more, and, therefore, eminently unsatisfying to any one who would learn of the comparative strength of Congregationalism in the various localities. Yet there is a mass of information regarding the various institutions of the body, and the labour of compilation must be one of many a weary hour. Its appearance is as it were the greeting of an old friend, and we trust that for many, many years, its worthy editor may be found at his post of honour and of duty.

OUR contemporary, the *Religious Herald*, of Hartford, alluding no doubt to the form in which the Old South Church of Boston convened the late council says:—It appears to us a very questionable courtesy for a Congregational church in good fellowship in the denomination, in its letter missive in calling a council for the settlement of a pastor, to limit the business of the council to listening to the correspondence and to such statements of his religious belief as the pastor elect might choose to make, "preliminary to the usual public services in the evening;" implying that the church had already decided as to the expediency of the proposed relation, and that the council might respectfully listen to whatever communications the church and the pastor elect might be pleased to present, and attend upon the public exercises of his installation; but that they have nothing to do or say about the expediency of the proposed relation. How such an assemblage of pastors and delegates from the churches can properly be called a *council*, we do not understand. The proper course for a church and pastor thus invited upon what was denominated a council would seem to be, to respectfully decline, out of respect for itself and for the principles of Congregational fellowship.—We perfectly agree in this. If an endorsement is asked, certainly an opportunity should be given to say, no, or fellowship becomes tyranny.