

early church, and writes thus: "Every society formed within itself a separate and independent republic, and, although the most distant of these little states maintained a mutual as well as friendly intercourse of letters and deputations, the Christian world was not yet connected by any supreme authority or legislative assembly."

These testimonies to the Congregational character of the Primitive Church are from the confessedly foremost historians, and leaders of thought. They are not new, but in danger of being forgotten, and the testimony has never been successfully challenged. Let the fact confessed be pondered, the early church was Congregationally Independent.

The testimony of Prof. Binnie is specially important, as indicating the position to which impartial writers even on Presbyterian polity have been driven; and confirming in a marked manner our late chairman's much misunderstood address that the churches "are growing nearer—views have become modified," and there is a drawing nearer to each other. The old orthodox division of the meaning of the New Testament word *ecclesia* was the local church—the local churches associated—the entire body of the faithful. We have still the old threefold division, but made on true Congregational principles. We shall have something to say next on the officers of the N. T. Church.

Our contemporary, the *Canadian Baptist*, is growing hysterical, or something worse. A few weeks ago one of its correspondents, with editorial commendation, denounced almost savagely all Sunday-School literature for Baptists, other than that of its own peculiar type, and now in a more recent issue we have the following:—

"If one is conscientiously a Baptist, then the same sense of duty which leads him to hold Baptist views should impel him to teach these views to those committed to his care," says the *Central Baptist*, and we commend the sentence. We fear the revulsion from exclusiveness has gone too far in the opposite direction. For some time the idea of Christian union has been the prevalent one, and has led to the emphasis of such truths only as the Christian denominations hold, in common, to the neglect of efficient teaching upon those matters where we as Baptists stand alone. In household instruction, in Sunday-School instruction, and in the ministry of the pulpit there should be no uncertain sound. If our views are worth anything, they are worth teaching.

All right, brother, water refracts the beam of

light which passes through it, as many simple experiments make plain, and as the quantity of that medium is one of the two things where our friend, as a Baptist, desires to stand alone, we cannot hope from him straight vision through a water medium.

WE give for the benefit of our friends an order of service selected for—well, we will not take the responsibility of saying where. We found it in an exchange. (Old country. Any such here?)

*Order.—Evening Service.*

- I.—Ballooning by the choir.
- II.—Scriptures read reverentially by the clergyman.
- III.—Hymn. (Congregational.)
- IV.—Prayer. (Minister all alone, and congregation meanwhile wool-gathering.)
- V.—Gloria. (Further ballooning by the choir all alone among clerestory windows, painted roof, etc., etc.)
- VI.—Sermon.
- VII.—Hymn. (Congregational.)
- VIII.—Prayer. (Minister all alone, congregation wool-gathering, putting on gloves, getting *couchant*, ready to spring.)
- IX.—Benediction. (Violent stampede while organ moves off, sky-rocketing and handsprings like a drunken Bacchante.)
- X.—Silence and darkness, and *the restored presence of God.*

*THE LAND QUESTION.*

The tenure by which land is held constitutes one of the most perplexing problems of the day, and is likely to be still moreso if the wrongs of society are pitted violently against vested rights; in other words, if men are compelled to rectify by force what it is given a Christian people to set or keep right by brotherly counsel and Christian charity.

A living writer and lecturer puts a case thus: "To drop a man in the middle of the Atlantic ocean and tell him that he is at liberty to walk ashore would not be more bitter irony than to place a man where all the land is appropriated as the property of other people and tell him that he is a free man, at liberty to work for himself and to enjoy his own earnings." Yet that is the situation of every man in the British Isles not born a landowner, and I suspect of ninety-nine out of every hundred, *e. g.* in Toronto. Every settled country must be in that position, ever has been; is the land millennium to have it so that every child shall be born, if not with a silver spoon, with a title deed in his hand. In the wilds one might possess this privilege, certainly not in civilized life, nor would any save the wildest communist venture any such statement regarding any such possession but land—why with regard to it?