

praying from a book—must of necessity be formal, lip and not heart service. That Protestants who engage so much in hymn-singing, and who have no doubts about the reality of their heartiness and religious spirit when *singing* from a book, can deliberately turn round and charge formalism upon Church people when they *pray* out of a book, is not at all creditable to their sincerity or consistency. If Dissenters and others can worship God in sincerity and truth when singing from a book, is it unreasonable to suppose that Church people can pray out of a book and pray most earnestly and heartily? It is surprising how much such absurd objections have contributed to make people suspicious of the Church, while all the time they themselves have been adopting in their singing the features which they so strongly condemned in the Church's Prayers. The want of a better knowledge of the whole matter, and the dread of Romanism in the days when ignorance largely prevailed among Dissenters, no doubt has had much to do with so uncharitable and illogical a position, but now as Dissenters become more intelligent, and understand the whole subject better, we may look for them to take higher ground, and readily accept a practice which, so far from being an encouragement to formalism, is calculated to promote decency and reverence in worship, and to draw out a true, deep and heartfelt feeling of devotion.

IF we love GOD we must be willing to give liberally of our goods to advance His cause and kingdom.

### "WHY DON'T THE PASTOR COME?"

THE more faithful a pastor is, and the more fit by his very sensitiveness to be a good pastor, the more he is pained by the unnecessary complaints of his people. One form of this annoyance is the complaint of sick people that the pastor does not visit them. The invalid who is a member of a Church ought to know that he has not a friend in the world more ready to come and see him than the pastor. He ought to be the parishioner of a pastor of such a character as to be the most desirable man for the sick man to see; and yet, through all the large Churches people sicken, and sometimes recover, and then go sulking through the Church six months, until at last it is discovered that the ground of their grumbling is that the pastor had not visited them when they were sick. It is this senseless demand of omniscience which is so intolerable.

This naturally brings up the question, whether the pastor *ought* to go to see sick people until he is sent for. What right has a whole congregation to suppose that the pastor knows of sickness when no human being ever presumed upon the physician having that knowledge? It would be less unreasonable to make this latter supposition. A physician passing among the families in which he has patients might begin to suspect from some bodily appearance that sickness would shortly ensue, and *might* therefore be expected to go around in due time to see if the suspected person were really sick. Instead of that, it is the pastor, a man engaged in quite different studies, who