

almost entirely emancipated from the tyranny of the theological systems and schools." He states further (a remark made to him by one of our foremost men twenty-five years ago), "*Stick to your classics and mathematics, sir; you'll have to make your theology yourself by-and-bye; the 'isms' are clean gone from their throne among us. We have come to know, some of us by painful and costly processes, that these systems of theology were of men, and only of men.*"

This much for English Independents. Now, I ask, is it reasonable that we in Canada should be compelled to go back into the mud of past ages, and identify ourselves with their controversies, and fight under their banners, and that, by those whose attention and services are called away by secular pursuits from the great issues of the hour? I do not ask to think for others, but I must claim to think for myself.

Since writing the above, I have seen statements in English papers from two correspondents here, representing the discussion at Hamilton as an attempt to raise the ghost of the old Calvinistic controversy. Some men never see the point at issue, and doubtless some talkers did not keep to the point there; but those mostly interested were not contending for or against any human system, but for liberty, as Congregationalists, to ignore Calvin and Arminius, and preach as we find the gospel in the Bible, believing that men on either side of the controversy may be *trusted to do that*. While it is claimed that the historic faith of the body has been Calvinistic—and it would betray ignorance to deny it—it is also claimed that the historic policy of the body has been liberal, not exclusive. It has never attempted doctrinal uniformity in non-essentials, and it betrays ignorance not to know that the unity of evangelical Congregationalists has been conserved in this way. Depart from this policy, and there will be as many divisions among Congregationalists as among Presbyterians, Methodists and Baptists.

W. H. ALLWORTH.

Paris, Ont., Sept. 16th, 1868.

REPLY TO THE REV. W. F. CLARKE.

[We publish the subjoined strictures which have been sent to us on Mr. Clarke's letter, with the feeling, that although the reply is altogether disproportionate to the space at our disposal, Mr. Pullar has a right to be heard in his own defence. We much deplore the personalities that mar the communications of both these brethren, nor could we have allowed such a question to be *opened* in the Magazine had it not first assumed so personal a character in the Union. Correspondence of this nature is neither pleasant nor profitable, but the opposite, and therefore we cannot long keep our columns open to what is, we are persuaded, altogether distasteful to our readers generally.—Ed. C. I.]

DEAR SIR,—I have hesitated to the last moment whether I should take any notice of Rev. W. F. Clarke's letter in your last number, and have finally decided, with great reluctance, to reply. This hesitation and reluctance do not at all arise from any difficulty in finding an answer, for the way is clear, the material abundant, and the temptation is strong, yet I recoil, for obvious reasons, from the task.

Passing over the opening paragraph in his letter I come to, "Instead of 'attack upon,' read 'defence against' Rev. T. Pullar, and you will come much nearer the truth." He then proceeds to assign my *avowal of Arminianism* as his first proof of my attack upon the Union. He styles it "throwing down the gauntlet." How was this throwing down the gauntlet? It