

result of conviction, or are they only matters of worldly convenience or advantage?

Political summersaults are not uncommon; we expect such things from the necessitous adventurers who sometimes find their way to Parliament, although it is to be hoped that public sentiment will never become so debauched as to think lightly of them. But surely the community has a right to look for something better from men whose business it is fearlessly "to declare the whole counsel of God." They, above all other men, must be faithful to truth, and to their convictions. Defection on their part is "as when a standard-bearer fainteth."

Let us not be misunderstood. Men often do, conscientiously, and at great personal sacrifice, change their ecclesiastical relations, although this rarely occurs, probably, after they have passed the age of forty. Of such we have nothing to say, except to commend them for following out their convictions. "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." If, in such case, any one finds himself landed (where, of course, we think he ought), on the solid foundations of orthodox Congregationalism, we rejoice; if not, we are sorry. What we deprecate is, the transference of such relations as a matter of *convenience* or of *worldly policy*, and without any change in doctrinal or ecclesiastical views to warrant it, and the subscribing of creeds and standards with a declaration of "unfeigned assent and consent," which cannot be honestly given. From such tampering with truth and duty every honourable mind must shrink, and for ourselves, we want no man to join us, or to remain among us, who is not in hearty sympathy with the views of the Congregational body.

THE COMMUNION QUESTION AGAIN.

DEAR SIR,—The first part of your remarks on the Communion question, in the last number of the *Canadian Independent*, will have little weight with those who think for themselves. Intelligent readers of the New Testament will not fail to perceive that in Acts ii. and elsewhere, those who received the Word were baptized and added to the Church, and also that in this matter, the Apostles acted in accordance with the command of Christ. These are simple facts, and require neither "reasoning" nor "inference" to bring them out.

Your attempt to divert the attention of your readers from these simple facts, to what you call my *inference*, is a piece of shuffling worthy of Abelard, and the scholastics of the middle ages. As such, I will let it pass without further comment.

You tell us that "If G. M. is prepared to say that no Pedo-Baptist can be a Christian, or what amounts to about the same thing, can be conscientious in rejecting immersion, he may adhere to the principle he is defending consistently enough."