

sometimes, between two Christians as there is between a Christian and a worldling. Outwardly, the advantage seems often to lie with the latter. What is the reason? The difference is largely traceable to the *training* they have had after their conversion. Early tendencies and habits have, of course, contributed to it, but the eradication of these, so far as they are evil, is the very object of all Christian teaching. If it fail here, it fails of its highest aim. The church ought to be a school, not for instructing its members in theology only, but for the development of a vigorous and useful religious life. We are first disciples, but we are also to be "soldiers" in our Captain's great army corps, "labourers" in His vineyard, "builders of His Temple, "shepherds of His flock." "To every man his work." How far are our churches realizing this Divine ideal?

We are compelled to answer,—very poorly. Our churches fail here, more perhaps than in any other respect. Young converts are often *chilled to death*, almost, by the atmosphere around them. They are eager for work, but are never taught *how*, or are deterred from doing anything because nobody else does anything, and they are afraid of being considered officious. They are ready to exercise their gifts in the prayer-meeting, or in the Sabbath School, but no one thinks to encourage them to do so. And so they grow up in the church, *idlers*, whose chief business comes to be that of criticizing and fault-finding, because they have never been trained to work.

The first great need, therefore, of all young converts is, *something to do for*

Christ. Let us get them into Bible classes to study His Word. Where there is knowledge as well as zeal, engage them in some department of Christian effort. If no appropriate sphere presents itself, organize work for them. Call on them to pray in some small domestic circle. Interest them in missionary work. Call forth their liberality. Send them on some errand of mercy to the fatherless or the widows in their affliction. Place responsibility on them. Repose trust in them. And, above all, endeavour to keep them near the Cross, and in full view of the crown of glory which the Lord has promised to them that love Him, and with God's blessing we shall soon have less "sorry Christians" among us.

A PRESBYTERIAN VIEW OF THE BROOKLYN COUNCIL.

The *British American Presbyterian* of March 10th has a leading article on the Brooklyn Advisory Council, which we must say causes us not a little astonishment. Written with a view to showing "the contrast in the management of the whole case between what it has been under the Congregational system, and what it would have been had it occurred within the bounds of a Presbytery," it starts out with the assurance, that "had Mr. Beecher been a member of the Brooklyn Presbytery, the case would have been disposed of long ago, and to the satisfaction of all parties. The first sound of the rumour would have called the brethren of the Presbytery together. They would have inquired secretly into the matter in the first instance. It would have been much easier to have got at the facts at the time than it can be now. And the judgment of Presbytery would at least be free of the suspicion of the Court being packed for a certain purpose."