

Your avowed plan, *never* to act on the "*offensive*," is surely the most wise and the most Christian like, as human nature has but little need of having combustibles thrown into her path by the Ministers of the Gospel of Peace. From the present temper of the religious part of the population around us, we may expect a sufficient share of opposition, if we do nothing but assert and explain our principles, without attacking theirs. For, to assert and maintain what we most certainly believe to have come down from the very days of the Apostles, will be considered by many as an attack on their faith. But as *all* denominations claim the right of explaining the articles of *their* religion, and *inculcating* them on the *members* of *their* Churches, why may not *we* do the same? We ask no more, and I do not see that you claim any more in your Prospectus than there is in full exercise among all classes of Christians. This fact ought to inspire the breasts of the professed followers of Jesus with mutual charity and forbearance, and to allow those that differ from them the same liberty which *they* claim for *themselves*. Yet, notwithstanding the boasted liberality of the age, it is not a little surprising to find that it is very frequently another term for bigotry. Modern liberality is a curious subject. It takes so many shapes, and makes so many different appearances, that it escapes from my grasp, when I endeavour to bring it to some consistent form. At one time, it teaches me to think equally well of all religious creeds and professions; but this is generally for the purpose of inducing me to think lightly of my own, that I may embrace others, which I shall soon be taught to hold fast. At another time, it teaches me that it consists in hearing every preacher that comes and goes, and in contributing to the support of every plan of benevolence that is started; but on my refusal—the glorious liberality of which I hear so much, seems to take wings to itself, and fly away, and something remains in its place, or at least occupies it, which cannot be liberality—that turns about with a haughty air, and pelts me with all the terms of reproach and opprobrium that language can afford. On this review of the matter I am exceedingly struck with the discrepancy that I find between profession and practice. For, a liberality of this kind is no more than to think well of me, on condition that I fall in with those who hold it, and take them for my guides. It makes no allowance for difference of opinion, however conscientiously that opinion may be held. It does not appear to have charity and forbearance in its composition, but a domineering desire of being followed; and if we refuse, it pours upon us, not the language of Gospel charity, nor that of common civility, but the language which the bigotry and intolerance of every age have employed.

Liberality, as I understand the term, is perfectly consistent with a full compliance with the apostolic charge, "*to contend earnestly* for the "*faith* which was once delivered to the saints," as also with your motto, "*stand fast in the faith, be strong, quite you like men*," and it commands this manly, Christian conduct, to be maintained with charity. While it earnestly contends for the faith, and stands fast, immoveable