

BRANTFORD.

Had part of a Sunday and also a missionary meeting. The missionary interest is kept alive all the year by the Young Ladies' Missionary Society. Our congregations were large, and as usual in Brantford, very hearty and enthusiastic. The Rev. Charles Stingfellow (Methodist), from Caiusville, gave a very earnest and useful address.

EMBRO.

Here I had large congregations, and the collections were considerably in excess of last year. The Sunday school is a live institution, and it has had its missionary zeal fanned during the year by helping to build the *Morning Star*. This is a very encouraging state of matters, I imagine, in both church and school; and Mr. Silcox abounds in all kinds of good works. I had one of the finest Bible classes that I have met in any Sunday school. I would put Embro down as one of our strong churches, and though it has not been trained to do much for denominational objects, yet under present guidance it is rapidly improving in this matter also. I visited

STRATFORD

and took part in the anniversary services. The church has made remarkable progress during the past twelve months. There has been a very blessed work in the town in which all the churches have participated, and the Congregational among the rest. Mr. Gordon-Smith appears to be the right man for the place.

Here I must close, and remain, truly yours,
THOMAS HALL.

MANITOBA MISSIONS.

MR. EDITOR.—In the February number of THE CANADIAN INDEPENDENT you insinuate that I have taken an "adverse position" to efforts put forth by the Canada Congregational Missionary Society, in the way of extending their mission work in this country. This charge is too serious a one to pass over without notice. If I have blocked, or in any way hindered, the extension of mission work in this new land, which so greatly needs it, then the friends and subscribers to the Canada Congregational Missionary Society, both in Canada and especially those in England, should know fully and exactly what, and when, and how I have done this. I therefore ask you, in the interests of mission work in this country, that in your next issue you state definitely and as strongly as possible what I have done adversely to the Canada Congregational Missionary Society's work in Manitoba. I ask that the facts, and the most damaging facts you can put in print, be disclosed, and my reply and defence will be facts. It is neither manly nor Christian for an editor to make such an utterly false and baseless insinuation as you have made in the February number of THE

CANADIAN INDEPENDENT, in regard to my relation to the Canada Congregational Missionary Society. By inserting this letter in THE CANADIAN INDEPENDENT you will serve the cause of Manitoba Missions, and greatly oblige.

Yours truly,

Winnipeg, February 13, 1885.

J. B. SILCOX.

The editorial note in our last issue, referred to in the above letter, was written mainly in view of what appeared in the same issue in the communication of "J. B. S." There the Winnipeg Congregational Church's fellowship with the churches of other denominations is styled "Christian fellowship," whereas that Church's fellowship with those of its own denomination is styled merely "Church fellowship," with the plain insinuation that there is the absence of Christianity in such fellowship. Hence, "J. B. S." says "it is a sin for the Canada Congregational Missionary Society to multiply church organizations and waste men and money simply to have a church of 'our order' in this and that village or town." Hence, also, this Congregational Church has taken up collections "for other denominational missions than those of its own," and proposes to do more of it; for the reason, of course, that the Canada Congregational Missionary Society aims "simply to have a church of 'our order'," where it carries on its work. Is it far more important that Congregational ministers should leave their own denomination and join some other "that the Gospel shall be preached in this new land," than that "they should stay with their own and that Congregational Churches should be established," for the further simple reason that that would be

"Enough and too much of the sect and the name, What matters our label, though truth be our aim"?

What matters, indeed, our "sect," our "name," our "Church organizations," or our "Church fellowship," so long as "J. B. S." says, "we are in the closest sympathy with all the other Churches of Christ here"? What need have we of "Church organizations," which are mere shells, so long as we have other organizations which are living "Churches of Christ," such as the Methodist and the Presbyterian? A man calls his home an organization merely; his neighbour's a family; he withholds the fruits of his toil from the one and bestows them upon the other. Is he "adverse" to his own family? He is more; how much, we leave J. B. S. to judge. If this be not the true, unvarnished interpretation of the latter part of the communication of "J. B. S." in our last issue, then we know not how to read either language or logic. The simple fact is that Mr. Silcox in the above letter is fighting himself. His former statement may "be utterly false and baseless," but he himself is responsible for it, we are not. Nor do we think he will be much helped by an appeal to a wider range of facts.

Writing as "J. B. S." wrote in our last issue, it will