

Correspondence.

"THE SIMCOE CHURCH CASE."

As some documents in relation to this case have already appeared in the *Independent*, and as the recent action of the Union was not favourable to the claims of Rev. S. Harris and his friends, we publish the following document. We omit, however, those portions of it which are meant to show that Dr. Clarke and Mr. Vannorman were not *bonâ fide* delegates from the church at Simcoe, for this must call forth rejoinders, and we are not prepared to have the whole case discussed afresh in these pages. The writers of this communication of course repudiate the above parties as their representatives, and the claim of those they did represent to be "the church at Simcoe."

We are not the organ of the Union, nor do we undertake to explain or defend all its proceedings, but some remarks we feel called to add to different points in this document. They are in the form of notes, referred to by numbers.

FOR THE "CANADIAN INDEPENDENT MAGAZINE."

At a meeting of the Congregational Church in Simcoe, Canada West, called together by public notice, held in the Congregational Church, on the 18th day of July, 1858, a Report of the proceedings of the Congregational Union, in the "Simcoe Church Case," having been read, it was,

Moved by ——— seconded by ——— and *Resolved*,—That the following Statement, regarding this matter, be addressed to the Editor of the Canadian Independent, respectfully requesting its publication, in the forthcoming number of the "Canadian Independent Magazine," that the Deacons sign this Document for, and on behalf of this Church, and forward the same for insertion.—Carried unanimously.

To the Editor of "The Canadian Independent," Bowmanville, C. W.

Dear Sir,—In your Journal of 4th June, a communication from us was published in a mutilated form which did not present a true view of our Case and the reasons assigned by you for such a mutilation we regard as insufficient to justify such a procedure. Our object being to present to the country the truth, we regret that the official evidences by which the truth was established, were kept back. We presume that the *ex parte* statement of those expelled¹ on constitutional grounds, from our Church, was published by you in full, as it appeared in the "Canadian Independent" of 7th May, and surely it is no sufficient reason for keeping back the proof of our statement, that they gave no proof² in support of theirs. Had you published the statement as we gave it, with the information therein contained before them, the Union at its late meeting could not certainly have recognised the party presenting himself, as deputy, as having a valid Commission, nor could it have erased our pastor's name from the roll of Membership.³ In justice therefore to our pastor, our church and the country, we beg you to give in the first number of your Magazine a place to the following remarks upon the procedure of the Union on the "Simcoe Church Case."—

I. In the report of the proceedings of the Congregational Union published in the *Canadian Independent* of June 25th, we find that "a certificate of delegation to this meeting in favour of Dr. J. Clarke and Mr. D. D. Vannorman signed by

(1). No communication has appeared in the *Independent* from these parties. The minutes of a council were published.

(2). The council received evidence, but did not publish it in detail.

(3). The document referred to was before the special committee of the Union, as we are informed.