

shows. If an experienced minister as Rev. Mr. Duff had not succeeded, was it likely that a student, going to spend his summer vacation, would do any better, especially as circumstances had "grown worse." Can the society afford to send a student 1,800 miles to spend a few months experimenting? To this policy I confess I am adverse. The society has wasted too much money in experimenting. They sent an English minister to Brandon in the summer of 1882, who preached a few weeks and then left. Later on Rev. R. McKay was sent. He preached a few weeks and left. The Rev. Mr. Duff was sent to Portage, and he preached some thirteen weeks and left. This is the most cut-throat policy any society can pursue. The common-sense course is to first carefully enquire into the religious needs and possibilities of a place and after concluding that a Congregational minister is needed there, send one to stay and not to experiment. The abortive efforts already made, especially at Brandon, make any future effort doubly difficult.

In reference to my blocking the society from entering Brandon: In January, 1884, I received a letter from Rev. G. Robertson, then of Georgetown, saying he had been invited by the Society to begin work at Brandon, and before deciding he wanted some information, and submitted to me about a dozen questions. I replied, giving as full and accurate replies as I was able. If what I told him led him to decide not to come, then the facts I gave him are to blame and not myself.

Now, who are "the correspondents on the ground" here that encouraged the society to go forward? Mr. C. A. Moore, formerly a deacon in a Congregational church in Toronto, now in Brandon, in a recent letter to me says: "The only correspondence I have had with any one in the East regarding this matter is a letter I got from Mr. Hall in November, 1883," and he adds: "Much as we desire a church here, I can't see how any one could encourage it at present. The time when it could have been done has gone by and now we must wait until the present business depression has passed. I know of no one in Brandon unless J. E. Woodworth that could give any information." In the early days, Mr. Woodworth, M.P.P., was anxious to have a Congregational church started in Brandon but for the last two years and over he has positively refused to encourage any movement in this direction. My letter to Mr. Hall must have been written about the close of 1883. He says they "continued their inquiries," and besides the reverend gentlemen "several correspondents on the ground" encouraged them to go forward. It would be very interesting news to some of us up here to know who these "several correspondents" were. I have made inquiry at Brandon and Portage la Prairie and fail to find a single one, but I do find that the known Congregationalists at these places declared it to be their

conviction that it was unwise to go forward. It is clear enough that the society did not continue their inquiries with those who had previously done something in the way of starting a Congregational church in the place, and who would be most likely to know the facts. The only other place is Pilot Mound, and there is no charge made that I hindered any one going there. The letter from "Missionary U.S.," in the last CANADIAN INDEPENDENT, shows that "Brother Hall is mistaken in his remarks" about the man who did not go there. The Missionary Superintendent seems to have a special faculty for misunderstanding facts. He says I was "twice brought to the Union largely at the expense of the society." That is his statement. What is the fact? I was twice brought to the Union largely at my own expense. The two trips that I made cost me about \$175, the first trip I received nothing at all, but bore the whole expense myself. The last time I received \$30. So the part I bore was \$145, and the part the society bore was \$30. It is a queer arithmetic that concludes I was brought "largely at the expense of the society." He labours to make out a case against me as having been supported by "money drawn from the pockets of Congregationalists," etc. If Mr. Hall will ask any member of the Manitoba Committee who sent me here he will be told that the salary I received here the first year was not sufficient and did not support my family, and if he examines the books of the church he will find that for the last two years I have given more to this church than all the "princely men in Montreal" combined. He says the society was asked for \$600 to supplement my salary. If he had taken the pains to find out why help was asked and what it was asked for, he would have found that it was not to supplement my salary, as a former secretary of the church in his letter to THE INDEPENDENT has shown. According to Mr. Hall, there is only one way of explaining "my whole career." "He cares nothing for his denomination." Why then, after five years' service in a mission church in Toronto, did the committee select me to come to Winnipeg? Why did they not find some one whose career showed he did care for his denomination? His proof that I do not care for the denomination is that I have taken "no collection for the college, nothing for the Missionary Society, nothing for Widows and Orphans, nothing for Indian missions." If Mr. Hall had cared to know he would have found that "my whole career" shows the very reverse. The Western Church, Toronto, will show facts regarding that part of my career, and in Winnipeg since I came here, we have taken collections for every one of these societies, except the Missionary, and if the church has not done all Mr. Hall thinks it should, let him write to the finance committee and find out where the blame lies—if there is any blame. He even descends to attack the internal arrangements