

at the Quarterly meeting of the Committee, held at Leicester last month, when two supplementary resolutions were passed, viz:—

"1. That the memorialists be respectfully informed that the committee have considered their memorial, and declare—that the resolutions adopted by them, to which the memorial refers, do not pledge the brethren who enter upon mission work unmarried to continue so beyond the term of two years, during which they are preparing for, or are doing, a specific mission work. That the marriage of brethren who may have entered upon work unsuitable to married missionaries does not, and cannot, disqualify such brethren for work in other departments as missionaries of this society.

"2. That the resolutions adopted by this committee originated in no want of confidence in our missionary brethren; and were not designed to reflect, in the slightest degree, on their character and work. The devoted self-denying labours of many of them have often commanded our warm admiration, and led us to magnify the grace of God in them. Towards them all we desire ever to cherish the hearty sympathy to which we deem them well entitled, in the difficult and trying positions in which they are placed."

A perusal of these resolutions will suffice to convince your readers that Mr. C. M. Grant has grossly misrepresented the Committee of the Baptist Missionary Society. They have *not* called for men "who are unmarried, and who pledge themselves, as long as they remain in connection with the Baptist church as missionaries, to remain unmarried." They have *not* required their missionaries "to enter into a competition with the native Fakirs." I might go on, for Mr. C. M. Grant's letter furnishes ample materials for animadversion and rebuke. But I forbear. The Committee's resolutions speak for themselves.

Speaking of the Baptist "Home Committee," Mr. C. M. Grant says:—"We all know how they 'nagged'—(that word is not in my dictionary)—the 'Serampore three'—how they grieved Ward's affectionate nature, ruffled the calm even of Carey's temper, and by foul inuendo and open calumny broke the heart of Marshman."

Mr. Ward died in 1823; Dr. Carey in 1834; Dr. Marshman in 1837. The present Committee cannot be responsible for the acts of the "Home Committee" who were in office from *thirty* to *fifty* years ago. Whether *they* "broke the heart of Marshman," or of any one else, Mr. C. M. Grant is totally unable to prove.

Yours, &c.,

J. M. CRAMP.

Wolfeville, Nov. 25, '69.

[We insert the foregoing, as the writer declares that justice demands it, but we are inclined to think that Dr. Cramp would have done justice to himself better had he written in less haste. We need not quarrel about "the style" of the Rev. Charles M. Grant's letter, as that is a matter of taste; and the Rev. Mr. Grant ought to be quite as good a judge of what is and what is not "vulgarity" as the Rev. Dr. Cramp. The style speaks for itself; though we may say, in passing, that it has received the highest commendation from quarters not less important than Wolfeville. And it matters little whether the word "nagged" is or is not in Dr. Cramp's dictionary. It is a first-rate word, is used by the best writers of the day, and every body knows what it means. But the charge of "grossly misrepresenting the Committee" is a question of fact, and to be determined by the facts. What, then, are the facts of the case?

1. Mr. Grant writes from Calcutta in August, giving a summary of a despatch received by the Baptist Missionaries from their London Committee, and giving the opinion of the Calcutta Missionaries generally, on what they understood to be the meaning of the despatch. Did he give a faithful account of what was known and felt in Calcutta? If he did, Dr. Cramp is the one who "grossly misrepresents." We pledge ourselves that he did, for we have the best reasons to know. In the first place, the Calcutta Missionary Conference of all