

GUY RICHARDS, Esq. St. Andrews.
Doct. E. W. ARMSTRONG, Kingston.

To the Editor of the Christian Register.

SIR, I see by the Boston Recorder of Saturday May 10th, that R. has determined to make as decent a retreat from the defence of "the New England Company" as circumstances will possibly allow; but in order to preserve the appearance of recititude and courage to the last, he maintains a sort of *running fire*, and no doubt expects his retreat to be covered by the smoke of his own arms; but if it be possible for him through the thick vapour with which he has surrounded himself to discern objects with any degree of distinctness, I will beg leave, through the medium of your useful publication to place before him a few additional things for his contemplation in the solitude of his retirement.

Before I proceed further, I beg to assure R. s incredulity that I am really and truly another Englishman, and not "the identical person from whom Mr. Morse derived his intelligence"; and I will also add, for R's satisfaction, that without travelling 500 miles, I can find other English Gentlemen, who can corroborate the testimony which has already been adduced relative to the facts necessary to be established in this controversy.

I felt somewhat surprised on reading the following passage in R. s answer to my letter. "Neither am I, as the Gentleman would intimate, acquainted with any member of "the New England Company"—nor am I under any peculiar temptation to cover their sin. *I desire only that correct statements respecting the funds and the conduct of that Corporation may be laid before the public.*"

What am I to think of this? Is it so—that R. begins to feel ashamed

of being thought an acquaintance of the New England Committee,—or does he truly mean to confess that whatever knowledge he may formerly have pretended to, he really knew nothing of the matter? And if he really did not know any thing of "the New England Company" and its affairs, how could he dare to make the following assertion—"The funds of this Society are not large, nor its exertions great; the latter however correspond with the former." It is in this way that R. in the plenitude of his consistency exemplifies and proves the ardour of his "desire only that *correct statements* respecting the funds and the conduct of this Corporation may be laid before the public"—but a recollection of my signature induces me to suppose that R. s real design has been to elicit truth by means of discuss.

I feel the English Gentleman and myself flattered by the explanatory parenthesis of "R" in the following answer: "Good people (excepting of course the two English Gentlemen in question) would rather make extraordinary efforts themselves than become accusers of the brethren."—R. should recollect that many good people are also weak people; I would imitate their goodness while I compassionate their weakness, and I can assure R. of his full share of benefit in this sentiment.

It is surely no very strange thing to suppose that any thing is more agreeable to the generality of even good people than to admonish others for their wickedness, however clearly it may appear to be their duty, but for my own part I should esteem it a greater honour to be singular as the reprovcr of crime than to be associated with thousands as its apologist.

If the funds of "the New England Company" have been laid by in a napkin or buried in the earth, instead of being used for the purposes de-