

I ask what right has any man, thus leaving the church that ordained him, to interfere with a settled Pastor? And what claim to consistency or even honesty, can the church or any individual member of it make, who becomes the abettor of such men, in unsettling their pastor, with whom they have entered into the most binding obligations. How can a church take hold of and be counselled by a man of whom they know little or nothing; when in doing it they reject the counsel of a Pastor, who has proved worthy of their confidence. Let the churches beware of those men and ever remember their first obligation is to their Pastors, the men of their choice

But very much of this unpleasantness arises from the idea, first on the part of the church, that it is an independent body having a right to ordain any man and unsettle him at pleasure. And second, on the part of the denomination that the man thus unsettled is a regular minister of the denomination, and it is our duty to accept him as such and receive his counsel; and though we have a Pastor yet we are independent and not obligated to heed his gifts. Some churches willingly claim the Pastor as their servant but ignore the fact that it is their duty to be subject to the gifts bestowed on him, of the Lord. If he give counsel or express an opinion on an important subject, he is soon told that he is the servant of the church and hence has no voice. Thus they reject the very *gifts* that they have acknowledged God has called him to exercise in their *midst*. He is the servant of Christ and not of the church. "One is your master" even Christ. No church is independent of, or complete without its Pastor. We believe in church independence but we should draw a distinction between independence and license. Is it church independence for us to ordain a man, keep him a few months, and then turn him upon the body of other churches of the same faith. To ignore their counsel in important matters and obligate them to endorse *our* acts and *judgement*? It may be independence, but it does not, to us appear, reasonable. Is it consistent for the minority to deliberate for, and reject the counsel of, the majority upon the most vital questions? But it may be urged that the