

which desires advice has always the right to ask for it. But for a church simply to decline to ask advice when some members wish to have advice taken, is in itself no sufficient ground for the calling of an Ex-parte Council."

Now, Mr. Editor, after such a clear exposition by so eminent an authority, of the position to be taken by a church when it knows that it has not deprived any who were once members of it, of "their good standing in relation to other churches," but rather enabled them without delay to "commune freely elsewhere," ought we to be accused, as we have been—first, because we did not speak out all into the public ear; and then, because we did speak when self-respect compelled us do defend ourselves? We did criticise, and we submit with reason, the quasi-judicial verdict given by a council that heard only the evidence on one side, and we still are of the opinion that the Council had no right to declare our action as a church *null*, seeing that we did not submit our case to it, for the reasons referred to above.

In regard to Mr. Clark's comment on the position taken by Zion Congregational Church, we will content ourselves with remarking that his reference to "logic" in that connection must be a mere flourish, as it does not require that one be specially versed in the art of thinking and reasoning to see that the cases he compares are not at all parallel.

In closing, we regret that Mr. Clark should have allowed himself to speak of us as "a body of church officials," whose "spirit" he refrained from "*exposing*" by means of the press of this city. Perhaps Mr. Clark belongs to an *immaculate* Board of officials in an *infallible* church, against whom no "railing accusation" was ever brought! And as to the matter of "*exposing*" us through the press, some of those he defended, and whose spirit he compliments, have spared him that task, inasmuch as even "private correspondence" and church meetings were deliberately, though far from accurately, exported and reported by them, *and yet we live* and are ready to "*expose*" ourselves to reproaches and even death for the sake of Christ and the Church.

Yours faithfully,

FRED. DONALDSON.  
E. H. ARMS.  
WM. D. RIDDELL.  
GEO. A. HAMMETT.  
A. B. SALTZER,  
W. C. JEX.

## WATERVILLE CHURCH.

To the Editor of the CANADIAN INDEPENDENT.

Dear Sir,—Our Church has this year sent to the Montreal Congregational College, current expenses fund, the sum of \$45. This sum is largely in excess of the amounts sent in former years; "and why?" you naturally ask. Because one of our number, an energetic business man, hit upon an expedient, and at once set about to carry it through. This was to supplement the usual collection in the Church by a subscription list, which was sent round to all the friends, many of whom were unable to be present when the collection was made on the Sunday set apart for that purpose. At the service, although the claims of the College were ably advocated by Dr. H. E. Barnes, of Sherbrooke, (who kindly came over for the purpose) the collection only amounted to something over \$11. This, of course, we reckoned good for a Sabbath collection, but how much the College would have lost had we contented ourselves merely with the amount so obtained; \$45—\$11 = \$34.

Mr. C. R. Black, the treasurer of the College, in acknowledging the receipt of the amount forwarded, expressing his pleasure, adds, "I am all the more pleased from the fact that it is such a substantial and gratifying increase on previous subscriptions, and proves that *someone has taken a special and personal interest* in the matter. Were this the case in every Church the College would not lack for funds for carrying on its important work, as it unfortunately does."

Now, here is a hint to some other of our lay brethren. Why, indeed, should not our subscriptions both to the College and to the Home Missionary Society be much greater than they are? Do not many of our Churches content themselves with just an annual Church collection for these causes? Let more of our business men look a little more outside their ledgers, and a little further than their office doors; let them but have a thought for these, the crowning glories of our denomination—the School of the Prophets, and that struggling little Society, which has doubtless done much to make the denomination what it is to-day, viz.: The Home Missionary Society—and we should not long hear the complaint, "*We want funds.*"

Toronto, May 7th, 1890.