

feeling what
rs withdraw.
ry? If there
ection cannot
ust be with-

ation of the
fesses to do ;
y, "we with-
is no fellow-
owship from
be said that
mistake. An
neither fine,
can do is to
his seems to
As regards
ies no moral
by it other-
or contempt.
nnocent man
uncharitable,
have with-
f separation,

ee and will ;
ve to me to
against their
nally, and

unions, as in
inconsistency
ore strictly
old Episco-
ommunion
exercising
views?

e been the
rawn from
is the case

rsued with
nd the law
r conduct ;
e case with

nied, when

the propriety of withdrawing is palpable ; when to remain would be a desecration of the principles of Church fellowship, and a nominal union with all the elements of disunion?

It has been said, that there is a mode of separation by dismissing. This does not touch the principle ; and the question is too important to be disposed of by a side wind. Does a member's freedom of conscience and will give him a right to withdraw when it is manifest that the bond of union has been dissolved? This is the question. But, in part, this objection concedes the principle, for the right to require a dismission recognizes the right to separate from the Church with which the member is in connection, and, that right being admitted, it will be impossible, I believe, to maintain the principle that the Church, from which he so separates, has a right to regulate his action after he has left it. It has been said, I believe, that a Church has a right to see that its members do not go abroad into the world without the restraining influences of Church relationship. It must be remembered that a Baptist Church is not the Church ; it is only *a* Church ; and leaving it does not import the going into the region of heathenism, and heresy, and error, or even the leaving the services of a Baptist Church. The relations between the withdrawing member and his Church may be inconsistent with dismission ; besides it may not be convenient to join another Church ; there may be none conveniently situated, or congenial ; or other reasons may prevent the possibility or the desire to join another Baptist Church at that time. In the case of change of doctrinal opinions, and where the individual unites with another Denomination, dismission is unsuited to the circumstances.

Another answer I understand has been that if the freedom of action here contended for were allowed, the Church might become depopulated. This shows but poor reliance on the power of truth, and is making a prison indeed of a Baptist Church.

Members of Granville Street Church moved by a sense of the great violation of Christian duty on the part of the Church in a matter so deeply affecting one who had but recently been their pastor, and who was connected with them by strong ties of relationship or friendship, and knowing that their bond of union with the Church had been irreparably sundered, formally withdrew from the fellowship of the Church, and gave notice in writing through the Clerk of having done so.

These acts of withdrawal were not recognized by the Church, and on the 18th day of April, resolutions for withdrawing fellowship from each of them were passed by the Church, this act was delayed for many months, and my son and myself have since been united with the Baptist church at Dartmouth.

The task I have had to perform has been a most distasteful and repulsive one. Pretentious rhetorical displays where the sense is not commensurate with the sound, false assumptions and inane conclusions, petty quirks, and the little artifices common to minds that mistake cunning for wisdom, and artifice for intellectual acumen, pervade this Reply, and offend taste and reason ; but far worse than this is the utter disregard for truth, displayed in almost every page.