

question; but probably \$500 would put up a school-house there, which would correspond fairly with the houses which the missionaries occupy, and which would be extremely useful to our station and the missionary work. It interests me very much that Mrs. Currie's memory is thus preserved in the hearts of our friends in Canada, and that it is in their minds to keep it fresh in the thoughts of our missionaries, and of those for whom they labour in Western Africa."

Now, we propose that the Woman's Board, organized last June, take this in hand and so take the place among our working organizations, while they find inspiration in so congenial a task. Mrs. Macallum is president; Miss Wilkes, of Brantford, corresponding secretary; and Mrs. B. W. Robertson, of Kingston, the treasurer. The Ladies' Missionary Society, of Calvary Church, Montreal, have already voted themselves an auxiliary, and the Missionary Needles of the same church will soon do the same, as well as lay down something like a twenty-fifth part of the memorial fund. Who takes the other twenty-fifths? Do not lose the chance; send to the treasurer, Mrs. Robertson. FOREIGN MISSIONARY SECRETARY.

INDEPENDENCY AND CONGREGATIONALISM.

MR. EDITOR,—I must request the favour of your inserting a few words of explanation.

I did not say that *Congregationalism* had been found wanting in England; very far from it. Neither did I say that *Independency* had been found wanting across the Atlantic. I said that it had been tried and found wanting in Canada.

But what is the difference between *Independency* and *Congregationalism*?

I will illustrate it by recalling the past.

About fifty years ago there was a strong drawing together of the English churches, and a growing sentiment of the desirableness of closer union and co-operation. This resulted finally in the formation of the *Congregational Union of England and Wales*.

The proposal to establish the Union met with bitter and determined opposition from some of the more "sturdy" sort in those days, who cried out: *Presbytery, prelacy, tyranny, and prophesied all sorts of alarming things. Independency, I know, is not always like this. But this is what may be called its pure, undiluted spirit, which means isolation and jealousy as opposed to co-operation and trust, and this is what I mean in using the word as opposed to Congregationalism. There are remnants of it still to be met with in England; and, personally, I have vivid recollections of certain cantankerous exhibitions of it, and of their wretched consequences, as they passed before me then, nearly forty years ago. There were districts of England where that style of thing was*

rampant. But apparently both the name and the thing are gradually dying out.

With regard to Canada. When it was proposed, some thirty or more years ago, to assimilate our church methods to those of our brethren in the States, a determined and bitter outbreak of this spirit of *Independency* arose in Toronto. This, however, has long ago passed away, though its effects have not. For many years back the churches have given their adhesion to the essential features of *American Congregationalism*.

The resolutions respecting councils passed at the Union meeting held in Montreal in 1876, and which are repeated in the reports of the Union meeting held in Toronto in 1881, are clear and explicit on this point. And they have never been questioned since.

With regard to what is called freedom of thought and freedom of speech, it is not the *Congregational churches*, but the *Unitarians and Freethinkers* that are the champions of this.

The *Congregational Union of England and Wales* long ago drew up a declaration of faith and order, and they re-affirmed the substance of it within the last few years in direct response to a challenge for freedom of thought after a conference at Leicester.

The *Congregational Churches of Canada* have a similar declaration of faith. It will be found in the record of the same meeting which is referred to, viz., the meeting in Toronto in 1881.

I am well aware that these declarations both in England and Canada are guarded by a statement that they do not constitute a creed to be subscribed. Nevertheless it is given forth that the churches of Canada *hold* certain things. This word *hold* is not one to be lightly shuffled off.

With regard to Cromwell and Milton, they were both members of the political party called *Independents*. Whether either of them was ever a member of the *Congregational or Independent Church* (and there were such) is not clear. But one thing is clear, Cromwell was a stout State churchman. His policy (I quote from Dr. Stoughton's *Ecclesiastical History*), was "State recognition, State control, State support, State protection, State penalties"—a pretty stiff catalogue.

I am afraid some of the "sturdy" *Independents* of modern times would have cried out lustily under such a yoke.

GEORGE HAGUE.

Mar. 17, 1887.

Our esteemed correspondent must pardon a few comments, and not mistake brevity for curtness. His first explanation puzzles us, inasmuch as we have not charged him with saying that "*Congregationalism* had been found wanting in England," nor anything like it. On the other hand, our friend did not say that *Independency* "had been tried and found wanting