

"There is some chance for one's life," he thinks, "in a Synod or Conference whose proceedings must be regulated by statute, and whose composition necessarily frees it from the prejudices, the spleen, or the tyranny of one or a few local men—ministers or laymen—or both, who may, without law, without articles of faith to appeal to, throw the weight of their opinions and influence into the scale against us."

The Rev. Morley Punshon, President of the Wesleyan Conference of Canada, thinks, on the other hand, that Independency involves too much personal freedom. He is evidently afraid lest some of the young preachers of that Connexion should look over, with longing eyes, into the green pastures of Congregationalism, and, perhaps, leap the fences between us. In a charge of great excellence and beauty, delivered to them at the ordination service at Kingston, and reported in the *Christian Guardian*, he says:—

"You are in danger from exaggerated ideas of your own personal freedom. You are not Independent ministers; you are members of the Methodist Connexion. If each one of us would insist on his own independence, the bond that unites us would be like a rope of sand."

We know not how far this language may apply to ministers of other Methodist Connexions, but we certainly regard it as anything but complimentary to the members of the body over which he presides, or at least to the "lesser lights" belonging to it. But if it be true that a man's independence is sacrificed by connection with a Conference, we can the more readily account for the large number of ministers who have preferred to retain their personal freedom, even at the cost of separating from the system that denied it to them, and have sought a home among us. "I wonder," said a good Methodist brother to us the other day, "there are not more of our preachers who join you;"—to which we replied by pointing out ten ministers whose portraits are to be found in the new photograph of the Congregational Union, all of whom, with one or two others not included in that group, have forsaken the several standards of Methodism to rally round that of Independency. We thought we would spare the brother's feelings, and so did not add, as we might have done, that not one of our ministers in Canada has ever yet been obliged to seek protection from the imaginary cliques, which are supposed to be so characteristic of Independency, in the kindlier embrace of a Methodist Conference! Rightly or wrongly, they have had the impression that they enjoyed fully as much liberty and security for "life" and character where they were. We have been personally present at every meeting of the Congregational Union for fifteen years past, and have been on one or other of its standing committees at almost every annual session, and we can certify that not only have we seen nothing of "the prejudices, the spleen, and the tyranny" alluded to, but that there has uniformly been, with one or two very rare exceptions, the most loving and generous bearing on the part of the members towards each other. Not being an ecclesiastical court at all, it is never troubled with "findings;" and hence all that our editorial brother says about the facility with which "we may mix a little spleen, or personal animosity, or prejudice, with our