

THE CANADIAN INDEPENDENT.

(NEW SERIES.)

VOL. I.]

TORONTO, AUGUST, 1882.

[No. 8.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

Will our subscribers look at the labels on their magazine? Very many subscriptions are yet unpaid, and our exchequer is consequently needy. If the label reads, e.g., Jan., 1882, the subscription for the year IS DUE. If Dec., 1882, it is paid to the end of the year. Don't let the month pass again without "that dollar."

EDITORIAL JOTTINGS.

AT the services in connection with the reception of Dr. Bevan, late of New York, to the new church, Highbury, London, Eng., Mr. Samuel Morley is reported to have said "he shared Dr. Bevan's reverence for Presbyterianism. The main features of Congregationalism were to be found in the New Testament, but a little dash of Presbyterianism would be of great value, preventing many of those causes which led to weakness and division, and which he could not help regarding as the evil of extreme 'Independency.'" We are curious to know specifically what that dash should be. In view of the names *Seceders, Burghers, Old Light, Anti and New, Established, Free, Cameronian, Covenanters and United*, in which the Presbyterian Churches in Scotland rejoice, with many more, we think it plainly utopian to imagine that a dash of Presbyterianism, or of anything else, except grace and common sense, will free from divisions and weakness. The truth is, all fields are green at a distance; they who are *in* see the bare spots and can count the stones.

THE Baptist organ, "The Freeman"—and we are to remember that our Baptist brethren in England have a much closer relation to English Independency than they have here—has the following pertinent remarks upon Mr. Morley's dash of Presbyterianism: "In a paper read by Mr. W. P. Cope before the Baptist Board, there were many illustrations

given of appeals from ministers and Churches in former days for the settlement of differences of opinion. We fear there is not the same docile spirit in our Churches to-day. If by a dash of Presbyterianism is meant a willingness to submit questions in dispute to some fraternal tribunal outside the Church, then let it be cultured amongst us. The tribunal is not far to seek; it is the will that is wanting. If it be meant the application of some strong will from without to put down some strong will within, then this cannot be secured without giving up the full independence of the Churches, and introduce, as we believe, more serious evils still. In considering a subject like this, the end before us should be borne in mind. Our aim is not to provide a society which the world can admire, but to culture souls. Men grow better amidst freedom, even with a little disorder, than in the best ordered autocracy. If the desire be for closer union among our Churches, and for some counsel of wise men to whom difficulties might be referred, then Mr. Morley pointed out the right direction when he turned attention to the associations. It may be well to call things by their right names. It is not Presbyterianism we want, it is not the Congregational ideal, but our attainment of that ideal that is imperfect. It is time that the meaning of this dash of Presbyterianism should be defined. Shall the 'dash' be authoritative or fraternal? If authoritative, our churches will not submit. If fraternal, it may even now be found in associations. Do our friends want the advantages of Congrega-