

assumption and presumption is the circular headed "Zion Church, Toronto," dated December, 1864, in reference to Mr. Clarke's attack on the Rev. T. S. Ellerby, and recording the manner of his compelled apology, which drew down on him the censure of the Church, and the condemnation of all honorable men.

Mr. Clarke says, in reference to the expression of sympathy on the part of the Hamilton Church with their pastor, "on the ground of his decided maintenance of the terms of communion hitherto observed in the Congregational Union of Canada, and also of England and Wales," that "this quite begs the question." He immediately does what he here condemns, for he adds, "neither of these Unions has ever, so far as I know, adjudicated the case of an applicant or member making the distinct avowal—'I am an Arminian.'" Does he know that the English Union receives all who are connected with local associations, or recommended by members of local associations, on the payment of five shillings sterling, and does not adjudicate directly on any case? But dare he deny that there are members in that Union who avowedly hold Arminian views? In my letter to the Editor of the *Canadian Independent*, of date 18th December, 1867, I state—"He would be more bold than wise who should deny my position, after Dr. Halley proclaimed, thirteen years ago, from the chair of the Congregational Union of England and Wales, that Calvinism is not a term of communion for ministers in that body; after the publication of the lectures of the Rev. John Burnet, of Camberwell, on 'Divine Purposes and Election,' which are decidedly anti-Calvinistic, but against which no pen or tongue among us, so far as I know, has ever moved. After nearly a score of Evangelical Union ministers and students have been recognized as pastors of Congregational Churches in England by some of our most eminent ministers (including the Rev. Thos. Binney and Rev. Dr. Raleigh), and that too not renouncing or concealing their views, but publishing them full and clear before the churches and the world. To these may be added a number of ministers from the Methodist bodies, who, holding Evangelical Arminianism, have obtained pastoral charges among our English churches." The then editor of the *Canadian Independent* did not attempt to controvert this statement, although he animadverted on other points in the letter. And I now defy Mr. Clarke to disprove one item of it, or to dispose of the evidence it affords as to the non-existence of a Calvinistic test in the English Union.

I may here refer to an editorial in the *English Independent*, probably written about the same date as my letter above quoted, and published 2nd January, 1868. From very much more to the same effect, I quote—"Calvinism is not the term of communion in any Congregational church in England. The question in debate between Arminians and Calvinists is left wholly open. If ever it has been otherwise it has been in distinct violation of the principles of Independency. From the time of Robinson, downwards, freedom and liberality of opinion on all, save the Cardinal Doctrines of Christianity, have been characteristic of our churches. They would not bear the yoke of any human creed."

In regard to Mr. Clarke's reference to the "Declaration" of the English Union in its "Twenty Principles of Religion," I beg to observe that all such documents among Congregationalists are merely historical and declarative of what is the prevailing belief at the time when they are emitted;—not creeds to be imposed by ecclesiastical authority, or articles to be subscribed and