

disposed to quarrel, but Mr. Wood has taken the occasion for what seems a fling at the Evangelical character of the Congregational churches. He is reported as saying, "The whole Congregational Union has known for more than eleven years that I have not been a Trinitarian." What reason the Union had for the negative knowledge is not stated, and representative members of the Union plainly say that "as a matter of fact the Union had no such knowledge." We would say the Union and the world had every reason to suppose otherwise. Independency presupposes Christian honour. It refuses to engage in a heresy hunt, leaving men free in the sight of God. Nevertheless Independency Congregationalism as a Christian denomination has fixed principles. It asserts these principles in a "declaration of faith and order," and it leaves individuals to say whether they can honourably abide and work under the same. If any man abuses that confidence he manifests himself unworthy of confidence and reads himself out of the line of true fellowship. We do not ask subscription; we do expect honour; and if a man accepts a position in any of our churches, we do not expect him to travesty or evade the principles of the denomination. To our mind a man who would abuse our denominational liberty is under deeper disgrace than one unrobed by any Synod or conference for heresy, he is a self-convicted dissembler. The Unions are not courts, but should be the visible fellowship of Christian gentlemen.

We did not know when we greeted at the recent meeting of the Union, the delegate from our American brethren, that we were greeting a brother editor. Yet so it seems we were, and we hereby acknowledge our ignorance, which has been put to flight by the reception of the *Madrid Recorder*, Rev. W. D. Williams, editor. Its politics are eminently republican, and its *polity* Congregational, prominence being given to "Our Church," "Our Association," etc. A double fraternity, Brother Williams, will not render us less mindful of each other. Our readers will not object to reading our friend's impressions of our gathering. Here they are:

We have seen something of Canadian Congregationalism. We are impressed with the earnestness of its advocates and the soundness of its representatives. They stand firmly upon the Puritanic principles, and consistently resolve against the slightest encroachment

of Church and State. They are aggressively engaged in propagating our polity and our faith. Compared with other denominations in her Majesty's Dominion they are emphatically a minority, but a well organized and disciplined minority is worth more than a sprawling, scattered majority. Their ministers average high, although there are only a few that are conspicuous enough to be known beyond their own territory. Congregationalism in Canada owes much to Dr. Jackson, of Kingston, and to the untiring labours of the ubiquitous Rev. T. Hall, the superintendent of missions. It also has a periodical and a college. The former is conducted under the able and successful management of the Rev. John Burton, of Toronto. He is the editor and business manager of *THE CANADIAN INDEPENDENT*. The college is presided over by the pastor of Emmanuel Church. During the meeting of the Union, one evening was spent in formally

#### OPENING THE COLLEGE

building—a model of neatness and convenience. The speeches that evening were very able, and a paper read by Rev. Allworth, sparkled with brightness. The chief characteristics of this college are the ability of its teachers and the paucity of its students. It is remarkable for its room to grow. Hoping it may again be our privilege to greet our nearest and best neighbours, and again take another "bird's eye view," we bid them adieu.

A REMARK or two on some sentences in our estimable friend Mr. Hall's letter must be made. Our July number, it would seem, has discouraged missionary work by speaking of union with other bodies. Sorry are we that the mention of that which occupied a place in the Saviour's prayer "that they all may be one" should cause missionary zeal to flag. We hope second thoughts will come, and patiently wait.

BUT then we did not discuss union, nor in any way give up the denominationalship. Our chairman, than whom no more loyal man to our missionary cause we have, did mention union; our friend Mr. Hall's comment "no true friend of Congregationalism would raise the question of Union at the present juncture of our affairs," is a sample of the manner in which, by a few, his remarks were met. We deprecated that manner, we do so still, only that and nothing more. Why should not Mr. Sanderson express his convictions so long as within evangelical bounds? Why should Mr. Hall not express his? And if our chairman raised the question as in his judgment called for, is he to be denounced "as no true friend of Congregationalism" any more than our worthy missionary superintendent is to be denounced as a foe to the denomination because he thinks union inop-