

portune? We stand for liberty of speech and conscience without the *odium theologicum*, and therefore we defend our friend in discussing union, as we shall, if occasion arise, defend our other friend for urging reasons against it. Nor do we fear the discussion. No position we occupy fears the light of Christian discussion. Already has the mention of the subject done good. It has brought out some manly utterances from our brother Mr. Allworth, who makes it manifest that the charge of disunion does not lie against our principles, and that our action in the past cannot be held as recreant to the desire for true union; and we are persuaded that when the true relations of the varied denominations to each other are calmly viewed and stated that so far from "cutting the nerve of our missionary enterprise," it will be found that we shall have the more abundant cause to press on in our unsectarian work, waiting patiently the guidings of the providence that may meet us. We rewrite our words of the July number: "Let us maintain firmly, lovingly, these truths (our unsectarian denominationalism and Christian liberty), have faith in them, and make them sound forth the word of life, the Spirit of Christ. We shall patiently work on these lines, leaving the future with God"; content, if it be His will "to drop out of sight until the great roll-call is made."

WE are glad to insert the letter from our friend, who will be readily recognized under his signature, W. H. A. We like his outspoken *Independency*, though we are scarcely ready to accept his implied charge of lecturing the Congregationalists on union. We recognize the unsectarian character of the Congregational platform and on that account said and say the discussion of union ought not to terrify us, it may the rather bring out in stronger lines our denominational *raison d'etat*.

OUR contemporary, the *Canada Presbyterian*, kindly gives us a lesson in logic. We are, we trust, thankful for all mercies and thus far for this, though it is so small that our grateful emotion would scarcely keep our friend warm, if the thermometer were near zero. As, however, it is genial weather while we write, he does not so much need our help. If our friend will look again at what he saw in the paragraph, on which we were

commenting, he will find that he gave it as a reason for consulting the Presbytery, rather than any higher court that "Presbyteries are nearest the people and are most likely to know the mind of the church." Now either our friend was writing nonsense (and we are the last to think that he was) or this must mean that it is desirable to know the mind of the people in order that it may influence legislation. If his sentence did not mean that, it is not rude to say that it was distinguished by a "plentiful absence" of meaning. And, if it did, then the question as to the comparative authority of different church courts is distinctly made to turn on the degree in which they reflect the mind of the people. It is not necessary for us to teach a writer so learned in church law, that legislation according to the mind of the people is the distinguishing principle of Congregationalism and we must be allowed to renew our expression of pleasure that our contemporary is so rapidly approximating what we hold to be the true point of view. We know Whately pretty well, or did, and have opened the cover of Stuart Mill, Archbishop Thompson and other logical teachers; we have heard of a Sir William Hamilton also and we have no fear as to the fairness of our reasoning as tried by their canon. No doubt the *Presbyterian* will be unwilling "to give up" anything in the way of church government in order to union. But it may be, that some day, he will rub his eyes and find, that though not given up by a deliberate act, it is "all gone"! All, we mean, that really stands in the way. His paragraph convinces us that it is "going—going", and the hammer will probably come down ere long with a smart *gone*!

A WORD, too, about the "failure" of Congregationalism in Canada. We do not feel at all like people who have failed, or are going to fail. What is your standard?—that is the question. Is it energy? We were never so energetic. Is it mutual love and goodwill? We never had more of them. Is it numbers? Well, we were never in Canada so numerous as our friends it is true, but, as to this last year, we need not hang our heads. While the Presbyterian Church reports a clear increase of 380 communicants, we are able to report one of 404. And if we consider