and

ess,

e of

vere

ited

up

his

was

k a

low

ide

idi-

liti-

; a first

em-

of

the

the

ille

his

ged

ght

ill;

nst the

the

ust

ho

is

six

of

sts

is-

in

an ve

nt

ty as

าน

ne

ct

And now, sir, I appeal to you, — to the whole Christian Church, and to every man of common sense, whether conduct like this could be sanctioned by those who had carefully studied the New Testament, and who knew the principles on which Christ has founded his Church? Must they not have regarded this conduct as "disorderly?" And must not every one who viewed it in connection with the whole of your past proceedings, have considered it an utterly hopeless task to reform such persons? It excites no surprise in the community that forty six persons determined to come out from among you and to be separate; the only wonder is that, notwithstanding all your influence, your misrepresentations, your promises, and your intimidation, practices which might be acquired from "the experienced" actors at political polling booths, the surprise I say is that so many stay behind.

But then you tell us in the Messenger that forty five only, exclusive of Dr. Belcher, who, as even you had not dared to attempt to exclude from the church, made forty six, whereas the number of members reported to the last Association was 218; yes sir, and 5 added since, made your list of members on the books 223; but where are many of them? Can some of them anywhere be found? How many of them are in actual attendance? I have heard of votes at your church meetings since we left you, passing 8 to 7, making 15 in all. Will you kindly tell us in the next number of the Messenger the average number of members present at the meetings of the Church since the month of October last? When you have done that, I will tell you why the majority of your present members stay away from your church meetings. It may seem a curions fact that our church meetings are more numerously attended than yours. You have yet 177 names on your list of members, how many hearts have you?

I could scarcely restrain myself from cherishing strong feelings of indignation when I read the attack you make on the character and conduct of a gentleman who bore the office of deacon with you, but who retired with others to sustain our new cause. He was not bound by "a decision passed in his presence," when he protested against it as unrighteous, and was sure that it was merely the decision of a Faction, and not the act of "the body to which he belonged." Notwithstanding what you now say, you deeply regretted his loss, and did whatever you could to induce him to return. The best wish of my heart is that every deacon of a Baptist Church stood as high in the community for correct, amiable, and unassuming christian deportment, as does that