

Congregational Church during the whole of the present year. It is therefore not to be wondered at, that he is in ignorance of the fact, that the matter was mentioned openly and fairly at the two last annual meetings of the College. He cannot have read the last annual report of the College, or he would have seen that the matter has been brought formally and pointedly under the notice and consideration of the Churches, and District Association of the whole Dominion, during the present year, and that the subject has been thoroughly and openly discussed amongst them.

If Mr. Fenwick knew this, he ought not to have written as he did. If he knew it not, the ignorance arose from neglect of duty.

But I deny that the promoters of the College Building have not the right of soliciting subscriptions from the denomination generally, under any circumstances. Is Professor Fenwick not aware that our churches are organized under the voluntary system? If any number of individuals conceive an object to be of importance to the interests of the churches, who is to debar them of the right to ask help from their brethren? Whether they exercise the right or not, is a matter for their own consideration. But the right is unchallengeable. One thing, however, is certain, that in this instance, help will not be asked from those who have no sympathy with the object. Nor will the promoters of the College building seek a surreptitious, misapplication of the endowment fund; though, I am sorry to say, the Vice-Principal thinks them capable of doing it.

The greater part of the Professor's letter is occupied with impugning the wisdom of some of our churches in not calling the alumni of the College to the pastorate, but in looking for supplies from abroad. With respect to this, the first and most obvious consideration is, that these churches are responsible to the Head and Lord of the Church, for their action, and not to any of the officials of the College. It is quietly assumed, with an air of conscious and patronizing superiority, that the Churches of Montreal, Toronto, Hamilton and London have, nearly all of them, been swayed, for many years back, by a mere foolish prejudice, that they, or any of them, have acted with deliberation, and in much prayer, that they have felt the weighty responsibilities attaching to the calling of men to the exercise of the pastoral office, does not seem to have occurred to your correspondent. Besides, it is surely obvious, that officers of churches, would not take the trouble of correspondence with parties, abroad or at a distance, if others, equally eligible were to be found in their midst.

Your correspondent thinks they have been foolish enough, and prejudiced enough to do even this. But the Congregationalists of our cities may surely lay a humble claim to some measure of decent feeling and

common sense. And a very small amount of either would have saved them from such folly as they are accused of by the Vice-Principal.

But, let insinuations be cast forth as they may, I am very sure that the selection of pastors amongst us has, in a large majority of cases, been a matter of grave thought, and earnest consideration for the interests of Christ's kingdom amongst us. Devout men and godly women have prayed, and taken council. And they have, when needful, wisely and rightly considered that Christ's great harvest field was not bounded by the narrow limits of any one country, or even any one denomination. The cure of souls is too grave a matter to be decided by considerations of favouritism and party. When the flock need an under shepherd they are recreant to their most solemn duties if they allow any consideration to sway their choice but the fitness of the man. Other things being equal, the alumni of our College have undoubtedly the right to look for a first consideration. But if things are not equal, what then? There can be no doubt that if the alumni of the College render themselves capable, in the judgment of the churches, of filling higher positions, they will be called to them.

The poverty and weakness of our churches cannot arise from their seeking pastors from abroad. Other churches, which are both numerous and progressive, have done, and are doing exactly the same thing.

In the Baptist Church, the leading pulpits in Montreal and Toronto, have long been thus filled. In the Presbyterian Church, Knox, Toronto, and nearly every church in Montreal, is occupied by a pastor not educated in Canada. The Methodist body furnishes a conspicuous instance of the large development and growth which may arise from the labours of a gifted man from abroad. The same thing is true even of the Episcopal Church, for the labours of Mr. Rainsford, in Toronto, have been blessed beyond perhaps the labours of any man who has exercised his ministry in that body.

In parading the list of names of Congregational pastors who have left Canada, the Professor must have presumed upon the ignorance of your readers. To those who are acquainted with the facts, the recital of the names proves nothing whatever. The only list, which could prove the case, would be a list of capable and faithful men, who have been compelled to leave Canada, because they could not obtain pastoral settlement amongst us. Can such a list be produced? I doubt it. Let it be remembered that it is in the ministry, as in other walks of life. No matter what a man's capacity may be in other directions, if he cannot perform well the specific task of his vocation, he will certainly fail of success. Before the apostles went out to preach the Gospel to the world, they were endowed with the power of *speech*.