

It is hoped that the brethren will, as usual, either personally or by exchange of pulpits, urge the claims of the Home Mission enterprise upon their people at each preaching station, on the Sabbath before the meeting is held. It is also particularly requested that all possible publicity be given to the above appointments, and that the work of collecting be attended to in good season, so that full financial returns may be made up at the close of the annual meeting.

Guelph, Nov. 24, 1863.

WM. F. CLARKE,
Sec. W. D. L. C.

Correspondence.

COLLEGE REMOVAL.

GUELPH, Nov. 24, 1863.

MR. EDITOR,—“Occupying a stand-point of *my own*, but” without “declining all controversy,” I wish to say, in reference to a communication which appeared in your last issue on this subject—

1. What is chiefly complained of is the want of such due notice of so important a motion, as would have secured full discussion and deliberate action. I *was* present at the Hamilt'on meeting, but nothing of the sort was openly mooted, and “I certainly did not hear gossip.”

2. The forbearance of the “sixty Montreal subscribers,” in not voting, is duly appreciated; but it has no bearing whatever on the point at issue, that being, as I have stated, the want of proper notice of motion.

3. A very large portion of “the discussion in June” seems to have strangely escaped being “noticed.” Most assuredly there *were* “unfavorable comparisons” and “depreciatory allegations” indulged in, whoever may have failed to “hear” or “notice” them. Nor were they of the nature of “gossip,” but public “utterances in debate.” In thus speaking, I do not at all question the statement of your correspondent as to his “honest convictions.” Convictions may be thoroughly honest, but at the same time thoroughly incorrect. Certainly it was the chief plea of which I made use, in urging a year's delay, that the removal decided on in Montreal, for such reasons as were mainly dwelt upon, would throw the Montreal and Toronto brethren into invidious relations toward each other. The result has been as I feared; and our action, instead of alluring toward us the brethren who have stood aloof so long, has tended to repel them the more. I must dissent from the statement that “the churches in Toronto, with their respective pastors, are loved and honored, as they ought to be.” The treatment which the fraternal and eminently proper “circular” of the First church, respecting the constitution of the Union, received from the body at large, was anything but indicative of love and honour. A general, hearty, kind response from the churches and pastors belonging to the Union, would, I firmly believe, have done much to win them to our fellowship. “We are verily guilty concerning our” brethren; we have acted too much in that spirit of mistaken independency which says, “If you don't choose to join us, we can do without you.” I sympathise, perhaps, as little as any one with the peculiar views of the First church, Toronto, in reference to the constitution of the Union, and have more frankly debated the points at issue than any other member of the Union; but I am satisfied a more practical and kindly demonstration of brotherly love,