

were interested in recommendations he would make. He recommended to them four of our best seniors whom they heard but they were not enthused about any of them. Then there was a fellow who graduated from seminary about 7 or 8 years before and who had preached in a church 3 or 4 years and then kind of did not get along well. I would say he was not particularly good, though had rather a pleasant personality. But I guess he had sense enough to get busy and really work on one or two excellent sermons. They heard him preach, and the question wasn't after they heard him, Shall we ask him? The question was, Can we get him? Will he be willing to come? So they got him as their pastor, much to the disgust of our graduate who was on the faculty of NBI. He said, he saw a man from the church a month later and he said, How are you getting on? How is your new pastor? Oh, he said, he's all right." Well, I guess he could give two good sermons and that was about all.

That's the tendency of congregational congregations so w that is why the Presbyterian ideal will not work will not work unless it's worked by people. But as an ideal that in ordaining we will not give a sanction that has a lasting value, but we express our opinion and we still have a right to change our opinion later if the man changes as so many do, and also the idea that occasionally the higher body can send some people into the church ~~and~~ who have had experience and who can consider matters and can be helpful. It's half-way between the other two. It doesn't have the strength of the Methodist church and === but it has a lot of strength, and it has more of a possibility of having men who are trained, if they will, give real consideration to whether the doctrine is being kept sound.

In my opinion the trouble comes when they begin trying to act as a group in making decisions about mission work and all kinds of