

we take these as the basis of the foregoing remark, we are justified in answering yes.

On the other hand, I am ready to enquire, what is the pivot on which all true civilization revolves? What is the great centre from which it emanates. If we are able to answer either of these questions satisfactorily, (for they mean precisely the same thing) then we have gained a point in the argument.

We hesitate, not for a moment, to affirm that, "The knowledge of Jesus Christ and Him crucified" is the true foundation stone upon which the whole of this stupendous superstructure rests.

No one enjoying the blessings of civilization, who has ever honestly and intelligently enquired into the origin of such blessings will ever dare to question our assertion.

Now "The knowledge of Jesus Christ and Him crucified" does not consist in a church formula or a code of dogmas, and can only be gained by a free and open perusal, and study of the Word of God, and this the Church of Rome refuses to give.

We need hardly refer to the history of nations to confirm our statement, yet this we might do without fear of failure; and here we see that that country or nation that has free access to the Word of God, whose thought and intelligence is moulded and governed by its precepts, and whose laws are all founded upon its teachings, is, and ever will be, the nation or kingdom that reaches and retains the highest standard of civilization. It is true that ancient Egypt, Greece and Imperial Rome attained to positions of greatness, but because their laws were not founded upon the teachings of God's Holy word, the constitution of each was rotten at the core, and consequently each in turn crumbled into decay, while those whose laws are thus founded are the instruments in God's hands of carrying civilization to earth's remotest bounds.

Hence, the answer we give to our starting assertion is most emphatically, no.

To the foregoing statement has been added (as a vindication and consequently a clinching argument). "The Church of Rome provides its members with a ritual of worship some things he can see, or in other words, through the sign they are taught to see the thing signified.

But this also (so far as the Indian is concerned at least) is also a fallacy, from the fact that the Pagan Indian is a spirit worshipper, pure and simple. They have the Great Mun-e-doo-or Manitou, the great Giver of all good. From Him they believe their own spirit came at first, and to Him it returns when they die. They believe also that the spirits of their dead relatives return at stated times to this world, or that they hover around the spot where their mortal remains are buried; hence they not unfrequently assemble in families around the graves of their friends that they may eat any good thing the Great Spirit has sent them, and while they eat they believe that the spirits are present to eat with them.

Their mode of worship is very simple and to the more enlightened may seem absurd. The worship consists of thanksgiving for past favors received, and supplications for the supply of present and future wants, (only for the body). But as their light is only darkness, they know nothing of spiritual blessings. But the sole object of their worship is the Great Manitou. During the repetition of their prayers they keep beating two sticks or else rattling a small box containing a few pebbles, to keep off the Evil One.

There is one feature in their respect for worshippers in which they might make the white man blush, viz., their intense respect for other people's mode of worship.

If a Pagan Indian comes near to a

company of white people at worship he will stand and look on with the utmost respect and seriousness, even though every part of the service be utterly unintelligible to him, and nothing can possibly make him to trifle or even to smile. So much cannot always be said in behalf of the civilized white man.

From all that we can learn of the worshipping or religious element of the Indian we see that he needs no sign to direct his worship. But often, often, does our heart yearn (like Paul at Athens) to say unto them, "The God whom ye ignorantly worship, Him declare I unto you."

But we go a step further, and experience has shown us that in the majority of instances the Catholic religion, so far from promoting civilization among the Indians, is, on the contrary, a retarding influence.

We have yet to be shown where the tribe or band of Catholic Indians are, that are in a healthy social position. There may be, and doubtless are, some solitary instances when one or another Indian rises to a position superior to his surroundings; but such are the exception, not the rule.

The priest of Rome, who is master of the Indian language, tells the poor Pagan that if he is only baptized into the church he has nothing more to fear, or in other words, that he is all right for time and for eternity; and sad, sad are the prevailing consequences of such a system of teaching.

On the other hand where the poor Indian has received "the truth as it is in Jesus," and yielded himself to the converting and sanctifying influence of the Mun-e-doo (Holy spirit) he is even as tractable as a little child. It is true their powers of mind are not very extensive, yet the greediness with which they receive any piece of information upon any subject is truly touching, to any right thinking person; and this very credulous disposition in their nature too often make them the dupes of crafty and designing men. We think this fact of itself enough to stir up the sympathies of all true Christian people every where. We hope that all the readers of "THE INDEPENDENT" will arouse themselves to do their utmost both by their prayers and means, to furnish men whose hearts are burning with holy zeal to tell the poor red man of Jesus and His love.

In these days and in the District of Algoma, the worldly prosperity of most of the poor Indians is held in the hands of the priests; and as the bread-and-cheese argument is always a powerful one, it is little wonder that so many are bound down to poverty and ignorance, vice and superstition.

But wherever the Indian is free to think for himself he is willingly led by those who show him kindness, and I know of none so likely to show him kindness as the man whose heart and soul have been baptized with the Holy Spirit; and who has drank in the spirit of Him who gave Himself a ransom for all mankind. Well may we adopt His own words and say "the harvest truly is plenteous, but the laborers are few, pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest that He will send forth laborers into His harvest.

JOHN NICOL.

WHAT OUR FRIENDS SAY.

"Your paper in its new form must give increased satisfaction, and should procure a large addition to the subscription list. Enclosed find two dollars for names on other side."

"I trust that your departure may prove successful, and that the CANADIAN INDEPENDENT may weather the storm."

"Your most improved paper."

CENTRAL DISTRICT MISSIONARY MEETINGS.

The following appointments were made at a meeting of the S. D. Committee, held at the house of Rev. H. D. Powis, Nov. 8th, 1880:

STOUFFVILLE, MANILLA, and UNIONVILLE on the 13th, 14th and 15th Dec., respectively. Delegates: Revs. E. D. Silcox, J. Burton, E. Ebbs and D. McKinnon.

WHITBY AND BOWMANVILLE, December 13 and 14. Revs. Wrench, H. D. Hunter, W. H. Warriner and W. H. Hen. De Bourck.

PINE GROVE, HUMBER SUMMIT AND BOLTON VILLAGE, January 12th, 1881. Supplied by Ministerial Association.

GEORGETOWN, CHURCHILL, SOUTH CALEDON, ALFON AND NORTH ERIN, December 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17. Revs. J. Unsworth, R. Hay, F. Wrigley and Wrench.

NIAMARKET, December 16. Revs. H. D. Powis, H. D. Hunter and W. H. Warriner.

OWEN SOUND AND WIARFON, December 14. Rev. E. D. Silcox.

ORO, RUGBY AND VESPRE. To be arranged by the pastor, Rev. J. I. Hindley. TORONTO AND YORKVILLE. To be arranged by the pastors.

The Brethren will kindly remember the above appointments, make arrangements accordingly, and each one endeavor to be at his post.

W. HENRY WARRINER,

Sec. Sub-Committee.

Correspondence.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—We cannot ensure the insertion of any matter in the week's issue, reaching us later than the Monday preceding. The Editor is not responsible for the opinions of Correspondents.

A PRAYER-MEETING IN YORKVILLE.

Editor of "The Canadian Independent."

DEAR SIR, —I have such good news to tell you that I hardly feel like squeezing it into a short paragraph, but must beg room for a letter.

You know sir, that the Church in Yorkville has, from its very proximity to Toronto, to fight against peculiar difficulties. Most of the wealthiest families in the city, and the working classes are constantly coming and going while the Church itself has lost most heavily through removals to other places. Nevertheless we have struggled on and gained some ground. We have, within the last six months, erected a new and (in our eyes) beautiful School-room, and last Wednesday night, at the prayer-meeting, our good friend, Mr. Hague, of Montreal, surprised and gladdened our hearts in a most royal way.

The Church originated in great part through Mr. Hague's munificence and zeal, it has from time to time received generous gifts from him, but now he has crowned all his other kindnesses by handing to the Trustees a Discharge of the Mortgage on the Church property, and so in one act wiping off an indebtedness of Two thousand six hundred dollars.

It was an absolute surprise to us all, and the manner of giving has made the gift more precious, for in his address Mr. Hague spoke of it as "paying a debt" — and "not much after all," he was "the happiest man in the room," he said, and glad we saw in it a token of God's goodness. He wished us to look upon it as such, for it would make him happier and do us more good. Our hearts are filled with gratitude, more than we can express; we see in it a token of God's favor, and would consecrate ourselves afresh to Him who careth for his own.

W. HENRY WARRINER.

Yorkville, Nov. 13, 1880.

Editor of the Canadian Independent.

DEAR SIR —Please publish the following reply to R. W. Wallace and oblige. To the Rev. R. W. Wallace.

DEAR SIR —The Forest Church will sustain the right of judgment in this case to our gentlemen, be they ever so excellent.

We do not wish to set a precedent deviating from the simplicity of Congregationalism, by which each church is held to be the proper and final judge of its own matters.

Besides, sir, whatever your motives were, we consider that you violated the rules of common civility and Christian charity in your mode of procedure against the Rev. Mr. Frazer, and the Forest Church. We here give you our reasons for so thinking, which we calmly submit to your candid consideration:

First, then, notice Mr. Frazer was the chosen pastor of a sister church, during the space of nine months you heard nothing but good reports of him from his field of labor.

These very facts we say entitled him to be treated by you, at least, with common civility.

Supposing that in the meantime you discovered something in his past history which you considered discreditable to his position and injurious to the fair fame of Congregationalism, if you wished to act the part of a gentleman, before you ever hinted the matter to his own congregation, you would make it a point to see Mr. Frazer personally, and tell him all you heard concerning him, hear his explanations, and see his documents, and, if satisfied, go and say no more about it. But if not, if you sincerely believed him to be a bad man, then you would be justified in bringing the matter before his church, give them an opportunity to hear the evidence of your charges, also his explanations in his own defence. If they agreed with you, all right, if not, it would be then time enough for you to let the public know, and the churches generally know, your reasons for differing from them.

Instead, however, of acting thus, without asking any explanation of Mr. Frazer, without giving him a moments warning, as the self-constituted judge and infallible discernor of motives, in the name of Congregational purity, you ruthlessly smote, and attempted to destroy, the character and usefulness of a brother minister, when zealously engaged in the noblest work in which man can be employed, in the very midst of his congregation to whom he had endeared himself by his amiable Christian deportment. The Church of Forest will certainly not encourage such vandalism as this amidst rev. gentlemen, and until you retrace your steps, and make some acknowledgment, we certainly will not be guided by your counsel.

In conclusion, we submit the following questions for your consideration and our information, if you or any other gentleman should think fit to reply: Has a brother layman the right to make charges against a pastor to the deacons and members of his charge, stating that he can prove them true, and, when called upon to give evidence, refuse to do so, and turn round and insult the intelligence and moral sensibilities of that church, by telling them that he has no confidence in their judgment, or in their capacity to judge right from wrong? Would such conduct as this be tolerated in a layman? Have even rev. gentlemen any right whatever to act thus, without violating the fundamental principles of English Congregationalism? Or is the right to act thus, the self-assumed special privilege of R. W. Wallace alone, who, in the splendor of his fame and glory, we fear has somewhat lost his balance, and imagines himself to be above all law civil or ecclesiastical.

DUNCAN CAMPBELL,

In behalf of the Forest Church. Forest, Nov. 12, 1880.